

by in an account and we want to rescind those funds, then that is pretty straightforward. We direct the rescission of those funds and do not earmark it to a specific State. If we are going to start the game, though, of earmarking—which I believe is what this does—obviously there will be a lot of other Senators who believe in earmarks who will say I want my turn also. I do not happen to believe in earmarks, but some of my colleagues would say: Look, if you can do this for one State, you can do it for my State. So if every State can direct specific spending to their own State, then we are right back in the business of earmarking.

I will not necessarily speak to the purposes behind the change in the project, although it is pretty clear from newspaper articles out of Nevada that this money is going to be used for a road project. I will leave the defense of the policy to others. What I will say is that the provision without a shadow of a doubt meets the definition of an earmark under rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The bottom line is that the provision in the bill will direct Federal funds to a single State.

Rule XLIV of our standing rules, the Standing Rules of the Senate, as we all know, defines what is a congressionally directed spending item. I will quote that rule:

... a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Senator providing, authorizing or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State—

It goes on to say:

locality or Congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process.

There was a reason why that language is included in that rule and it is what is happening here. If you could simply direct funds to your State, then, as I said previously, we are back in the earmarking business.

Furthermore, the bill before the Senate was written based on the understanding that there would be no earmarks. Everybody is running around saying there are no earmarks in the bill. Everybody has been very public about saying that. That posture was well received. It was commended, in fact. It was commended, in my judgment, in part because many understood that a highway bill that included earmarks simply would not pass. In other words, a “no earmark” policy was necessary to get this bill done.

So at the moment I am very concerned that we will have damaged the Senate bill, our legislative process, and hurt the chances of a highway bill getting done. I think the highway bill makes a lot of sense for our country, but we have to solve this kind of problem. I cannot support the bill with an

earmark for one State, the State of Nevada.

Even the President of the United States has weighed in on this. He has taken a very strong stand. He said, “If a bill comes to my desk with an earmark inside, I will veto it.”

This highway bill is far too important for us to jeopardize its passage or to invite a veto by the President, just because the provision is very hard to find and buried at page 463.

I think there is a way to move forward on the highway bill, at least as far as this is concerned. I think our State and local leaders are hoping we pass a highway bill. There are a lot of good things that could happen with it, but this has to come out of the bill. This needs to change, and my hope is the Senate will agree to my amendment to do just that.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Morning business is now closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ADALBERTO JOSE JORDAN TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Adalberto Jose Jordan, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate will finally vote on the nomination of Judge Adalberto Jordan of Florida to fill a judicial emergency vacancy on the Eleventh Circuit. Finally, after a 4 month Republican filibuster that was broken by an 89 to 5 vote on Monday, and after Republicans insisted on two additional days of delay, the Senate will have a vote.

Judge Jordan is by any measure the kind of consensus nominee who should have been confirmed after being reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee last October. Despite the strong support of his home State Senators, Senator NELSON, a Democrat, and Senator RUBIO, a Republican, Republicans filibustered and delayed this confirmation for months. They prevented the Senate from voting on Judge Jordan's nomination in October, in November, in December, and in January. And it should not have taken another 2 days after the Senate voted overwhelmingly to bring the debate to a close to have this vote.

This superbly-qualified nominee will be the first Cuban-American on the Eleventh Circuit. His record of achievement is beyond reproach. The only statements about this nominee—by me, by Senator NELSON and even by the Republican Senators who spoke—described him as qualified and worthy of confirmation. The stalling, the delays, the obstruction, even the votes against ending the filibuster were all about something else, some collateral issue. They should not have marred this process and complicated this nomination. They should not have delayed this moment when Cuban Americans will see one of their own elevated to the second highest court in the land. I appreciate the attention that Hispanics for a Fair Judiciary and the Hispanic National Bar Association have given this important nomination. Their work will finally be rewarded, as well.

The junior Senator from Kentucky held up this nominee for his own purposes—purposes having nothing to do with the nominee. He did it in order to gain leverage to force a vote on an unrelated and ill-advised amendment. You cannot amend a nomination. So now that he has forced the Senate into 2 days of inactivity, the Senate will finally vote.

As I said yesterday, the goals of Senator PAUL's amendment are already the law of the land. The new conditions on military aid for Egypt, which I wrote with Senator GRAHAM, passed by an overwhelming bipartisan majority and were signed into law just 2 months ago without Senator PAUL's support. Those conditions require certification by the Secretary of State that the Egyptian military is supporting the transition of civilian government and protecting fundamental freedoms and due process. Unlike Senator PAUL's proposed amendment, these conditions again, already the law—do not pose a risk of backfiring on us and on our ally Israel.

Moreover, once this misguided obstruction is ended and the Senate has voted to confirm Judge Jordan to fill the judicial emergency vacancy on the Eleventh Circuit, the Senate will turn back to its work on the surface transportation bill. As Senator BOXER said this morning, that bipartisan bill can save or create 2.8 million jobs. That, too, should be a priority, not a pin

cushion to attach ill-advised foreign policy amendments.

This is the kind of obstruction that is hard to explain to the American people. A Florida lawyer and former prosecutor was quoted in the Orlando Sentinel saying: "It's a good reason why Congress' approval rating is 10 percent." He continued: "Politics should have no place in the nomination and confirmation of excellent jurists like Judge Jordan. Shouldn't happen. We need qualified judicial nominees on the bench, big time." It is the kind of senseless obstruction that comes at a great cost to the millions of Americans living in Florida, Georgia and Alabama who are affected by the judicial emergency vacancy on the Eleventh Circuit. I am glad that they will finally have a judge to fill that vacancy.

I am certain that all Americans will be well served by Judge Adalberto Jordan. He has proven through his long career on the bench and as a prosecutor to be a public servant of tremendous quality and integrity. I congratulate Judge Jordan, his family, Senator NELSON, Senator RUBIO and the people of Florida on his confirmation today.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am advised that there is nobody else who wishes to speak, so I ask unanimous consent to yield back any time and ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Adalberto Jose Jordan, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 19 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Akaka	Cochran	Inouye
Alexander	Collins	Isakson
Ayotte	Conrad	Johanns
Barrasso	Coons	Johnson (SD)
Baucus	Corker	Johnson (WI)
Begich	Cornyn	Kerry
Bennet	Crapo	Klobuchar
Bingaman	Durbin	Kohl
Blumenthal	Enzi	Kyl
Boozman	Feinstein	Landrieu
Boxer	Franken	Lautenberg
Brown (MA)	Gillibrand	Leahy
Brown (OH)	Graham	Levin
Burr	Grassley	Lieberman
Cantwell	Hagan	Lugar
Cardin	Harkin	Manchin
Carper	Hatch	McCain
Casey	Heller	McCaskill
Chambliss	Hoeven	McConnell
Coats	Hutchison	Menendez
Coburn	Inhofe	Merkley

Mikulski	Risch	Tester
Moran	Roberts	Thune
Murkowski	Rockefeller	Udall (CO)
Murray	Rubio	Udall (NM)
Nelson (NE)	Sanders	Warner
Nelson (FL)	Schumer	Webb
Paul	Sessions	Whitehouse
Portman	Shaheen	Wicker
Pryor	Shelby	Wyden
Reed	Snowe	
Reid	Stabenow	

NAYS—5

Blunt	Lee	Vitter
DeMint	Toomey	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and other Senators, including TOM UDALL and the Presiding Officer and Senator WHITEHOUSE, be permitted to speak for the next 60 minutes.

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

GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I fear one of the major issues that not only faces our country but faces our planet is not getting the kind of serious debate and discussion it needs in the Senate; that is, the planetary crisis of global warming, what its impact is having now in our country and in other countries throughout the world and how, in fact, we can address this enormous crisis.

I understand politically some of my colleagues do not believe global warming is real and they do not think there is much our country should or can do to address this crisis. I understand that. But with all due respect, I strongly disagree with that position and believe, in terms of the future of our planet, the lives of our kids and our grandchildren, that is a very wrong-headed position and could lead to enormous problems for our country and for the rest of the world.

But the truth is, the real debate about global warming is not whether other Members of the Senate disagree with me or Senator UDALL, the issue is what the scientific community, the people who have studied this issue for years, in fact, believes. As I think the Presiding Officer understands, the overwhelming consensus in our country and around the world from the scientific community is, A, global warming is real, and, B, to a very significant degree global warming is manmade.

That is not just my position, not just what I say or what other Members of the Senate say. Far more important, it is what leading scientists all over the world are saying.

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

It is fine for radio talk show hosts to have their view. Frankly, I think it is more significant that the scientific community from all over the world is in agreement. Let me repeat what they say: “. . . climate change is happening even faster than previously estimated" and the "need for urgent action to address climate change is now indisputable."

Mr. President, 18 scientific societies, including the American Geophysical Union 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.

That is not I; that is 18 scientific societies, including the American Geophysical Union and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

They continue:

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.

But it is not only the scientific community. It is agencies of the U.S. Government that have to deal or worry about the impact of global warming.

The Department of Defense says:

Climate change is an accelerant of instability.

What they worry about is, as the planet warms, as floods occur, as drought occurs, we are going to see migrations of people, we are going to see countries fighting over limited natural resources, whether it is farmland or whether it is water. From the Department of Defense perspective, they say, and I repeat:

Climate change is an accelerant of instability.

That is the U.S. Department of Defense—not BERNIE SANDERS.

The CIA—our intelligence agency—says: “. . . 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 not a Senator on the floor. That is the Central Intelligence Agency, the business of which is to gather and assess threats to our country.

Interestingly enough, there are segments of the business community that are also speaking out on climate change and global warming for their own reasons.

The insurance industry, in a report from the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, found there is “broad consensus among insurers that climate change will have an effect on extreme weather events.”

What we are seeing is that scientists all over the world, academic institutions all over the world, governmental agencies right here in the United States of America—including the Department of Defense and the CIA—and the insurance industry saying global warming is real, it is a real threat to our planet, and it is imperative we address it.

I have more to say on this issue, and some of us will be on the floor for an hour, but I want to give the floor over to Senator TOM UDALL from New Mexico, who has certainly been a leading advocate in the fight for policies that will reverse global warming and move us in another direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, thank you so very much.

I first wish to ask my colleague from Vermont a little bit about some of the things he said that I find remarkable.

We are still in a very fragile recession. The economy is starting to grow, but it is not strong enough, and we could slip back. So what has happened is, we have these—what we call in this language—tax extenders. What we are talking about is jobs, isn't it? We are talking about the idea that we can have a clean energy economy; that over the last couple years this has been the fastest growing sector, and we have a production tax credit for wind, we have a section in the Treasury Department's 603, and those provisions create jobs.

I just wish to ask the Senator, it seems to me, at this particular time, we have the potential to grow the American economy, but we have to get off the dime because these things expire on February 29—in less than 2 weeks.

Mr. SANDERS. I say to my friend, he is absolutely right. The issue we are talking about now is not only trying to reverse global warming and save the planet, what we are talking about is creating, over a period of years, millions of good-paying jobs.

We may not know it from some media reports, but the fact is the solar industry in this country is exploding. All over this country, we are seeing more and more installations of solar panels, we are seeing the production of solar. One of the issues I think Senator UDALL is referring to is whether the United States of America will be a leader in sustainable energy or are we going to give that whole enormous economic area over to China.

I know the Senator and I are in agreement that we believe American workers can manufacture those panels. We think American workers can install those panels.

We also understand it is not just solar, it is wind; that these industries need some of the help that the fossil fuel industry has been receiving for years. I think we will also be talking about the whole issue of energy efficiency and weatherization, which in my State is enormously important. We are creating jobs, saving consumers money, as we retrofit their homes and cut back on their use of fuel.

So, yes, I say to the Senator, we are talking about a major jobs issue.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I say to Senator SANDERS, the thing we should focus on, when it comes to wind farms, is how much these wind farms can be expanded in terms of jobs. The average wind farm in America built today has 50 large wind turbines. Each turbine can produce electricity to power roughly 500 homes, even accounting for the variability of the winds. So the average wind farm can power about 25,000 homes.

The average wind farm, then, produces many other benefits. This is what is remarkable to me: There is \$20 million in construction payroll in a year from an average wind farm; \$875,000 per year to rural local school districts; and also \$280,000 per year to rural county governments; \$150,000 per year in ongoing direct payroll for employees; \$1.5 million in contract labor payroll; and \$300,000 to \$600,000 per year in royalties to land owners, farmers, and ranchers.

So when we talk about wind—wind power—what we are talking about is American jobs, clean energy jobs, growing the economy, and it mystifies me that our friends on the Republican side and in the House are saying: These things are going to expire in 2 weeks, and there is no hurry to push them, to put them in place, and to move it. Is

that the Senator's understanding, that they are saying we are going to let them expire?

Mr. SANDERS. Absolutely. It is incomprehensible. Here we have technologies that are incredibly successful. They are producing substantial amounts of energy, without pollution, without greenhouse gases. They are creating jobs. Of course, we should continue these tax credits, these extenders to make sure these industries can flourish.

Some people may think when Senator UDALL and I talk about wind and solar, we are talking about some kind of fringe idea. Let's be clear; in the State of Texas today they are producing 10,000 megawatts of electricity through wind. That is the equivalent of 10 average-sized nuclear powerplants. That is not insignificant. In Iowa, as I understand it, about 20 percent of the electricity in that State is generated from wind.

So we are in the beginning, in the first stages of a real revolution to transform our energy system to clean, safe energy which, in the process, can create, over a period of years, millions of good-paying jobs.

So I would certainly agree with the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I say to Senator SANDERS, one of the things that I think is very instructive is that the history of the wind production tax credit has been completely bipartisan. I would like to lay out a little bit of that history.

The production tax credit began in a bipartisan energy policy in 1992, signed by then-President George H.W. Bush. It was extended in December 1999 by a Republican Congress and signed into law by President Clinton. It was extended again in 2002 and in 2004, this time signed into law by President George W. Bush. In 2005, it was extended again as a part of bipartisan energy legislation, the 2005 Energy Policy Act. The Senator and I, I think, were both in the House at that time, and we voted for that in the House. In December 2006, it was extended again. Most recently, it was extended in the 2009 Recovery Act, which was signed by President Obama.

So Congress should continue this bipartisan tradition and extend the wind production tax credit, these other tax credits that create clean energy jobs, and stay focused on the good job we have been doing that has been bipartisan. That is why I do not understand the House, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee saying: Oh, we can do these later. We need to do this work today. We need to put that in place now so that we can grow these clean energy jobs. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. SANDERS. Well, the Senator is absolutely right. Everybody understands that if you are in business, if you are in wind or in solar, you have to be planning for the future. And if you do not believe or you are uncertain about whether these tax credits are

going to be available, what is going to happen is you are not going to go forward. We know there are examples right now of major projects that have already been canceled.

Furthermore, we are not talking—given the context of U.S. Government expenditures—about a huge amount of money, but it is money that I think is very well spent, protects our environment, and creates jobs.

I see the Senator from Rhode Island has joined us. Senator WHITEHOUSE has surely been one of the strongest advocates for our environment and the need to address global warming.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I am glad to have a chance to join with you today. I appreciate very much Senator SANDERS convening us on this day when we have agreed, it appears, to extend the payroll tax; we have agreed, it appears, to extend unemployment insurance; and we have agreed, it appears, to extend the payments for doctors under Medicare, under the so-called doc fix. And the one piece that has fallen out was the tax extenders that support our clean energy industry.

Our clean energy industry has more employees than Big Oil, and there are well-paying jobs. It is a growing industry, and it creates American manufacturing and American installation.

Senator UDALL was talking about the economic value of these wind farms. I know that in his home State, there are plenty of wind farms that are built on the land. In my home State, we are working toward having wind farms that are built offshore. And the ability to construct those giant turbines at Quonset Point in Rhode Island, in order to install them offshore and enjoy the power and the jobs that result, is something that is really important to us.

So I am glad the Senator has called us together to focus on this question of the tax extenders and also to focus on the environmental harm of climate change. I will turn it back to the Senator, but I wish to make one last point before I do, which is that there is a certain amount of sort of snickering around Washington about climate change, which is a unique feature to Washington. If you go out in the scientific community, nobody is laughing. They are very anxious. They are worried.

The major scientific organizations have all signed off on public letters urging us to do something about this because it is so significant. We have looked out at the first dozen billion-dollar storms year that we have had. Wherever you look around the world, we are seeing extreme weather. And the notion that when the scientists predicted extreme weather and now we are seeing it—if that should not be cause for additional concern, that really flies in the face of both prudence and reality.

The last area where we are really getting clobbered is with our oceans. As we pump, in human time, unprece-

ded amounts of carbon into our atmosphere, it is taken up by the oceans. It is absorbed by the oceans. During the course of the Industrial Revolution and to now, the oceans have absorbed enormous amounts of carbon. It is changing the oceans. It is killing off coral reefs in the tropical areas. It is making the oceans so acidic that the little organisms that are at the base of the food chain are having trouble growing to their proper size. It is becoming a hostile environment. Creatures do not live well in an environment in which they are increasingly soluble.

These are not theories, these are measurements by scientists who go out and actually measure what is happening. The blindness in Washington to this problem is something that is not only a cause for concern now but is going to be a cause for harsh judgment in history's eyes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, may I just ask the Senator—and I know he may have other places to go, but he mentioned offshore wind on the Atlantic coast, and the study out of the University of Delaware indicated that off of the Atlantic coast there is the potential in wind to generate enough electricity to power the entire east coast group of cities—very large cities, as you know—from Providence, to New York, to Boston. And Google is already out there starting to lay the grid with some other partners. So we have huge potential to move forward, and basically what we are being told at this point is, oh, let these things expire.

That is a very shortsighted position. But that study about the coast is an eye-opener because it tells the American people: Look, here is clean energy. We do not have to import oil anymore. We do not have to bring in energy from outside. Just off our coast, we can go out there and put a grid in place and generate wind energy. I know the Senator has probably heard about this study.

Mr. SANDERS. If I can, let me just jump in to ask unanimous consent that Senators WHITEHOUSE, UDALL, and I be permitted to engage in a colloquy.

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

Mr. SANDERS. If I could ask Senator WHITEHOUSE and Senator UDALL a simple question—and Senator WHITEHOUSE raised this issue—all over the world, there really is no debate within the scientific community about the reality of global warming, the basic causes of global warming, the severity of global warming. Yet suddenly here in this Congress it becomes a major political issue. We fund the National Institutes of Health. We fund scientific organizations. They do research on cancer. They do research on heart disease. They do all kinds of research. I don't see great political debate about what this says. And suddenly, when you have almost unanimity within the scientific community, this becomes this great dividing political issue. How did it hap-

pen that where there is so much unanimity among the scientific community in this country and around the world, this has become such a hot-potato political issue?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Special interests would be my answer. We have seen it before. We saw the science mocked that tobacco was injurious to human health. We saw the science mocked that the lead in paint was injurious to children. And now we have seen mockery of the science that shows that when you put unprecedented amounts of carbon into the atmosphere, it changes things.

The science is actually not new. The scientist who created the global warming theory was a scientist named Tindall who published his work around the time of the American Civil War, and it has never been controversial. The idea that when you put enormous amounts of carbon into the atmosphere, it creates a warming effect, a blanketing effect, we have known this literally since the horse-and-buggy era. The difference is that there are now powerful special interests that are involved.

To Senator UDALL's points, we are at a point of choice. We can choose to go toward having the environmental needs of the country met and the energy needs of the country met with clean, American-made, manufactured power that is renewable. The Senator is right about the capabilities of offshore wind on the east coast, but that is not the only road we can take. We can continue to support multinational megacorporations that have no loyalty to any flag or nation, that traffic internationally in oil, and that want to make sure that we stay, as President Bush said, addicted to oil. There is a choice, and I think those special interests have a clear desire as to what choice this country should make. I happen to believe it is contrary to this country's national interests, so that is why we are here fighting to try to steer in the other direction.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Just to the point of why we aren't able to move—and I agree with Senator WHITEHOUSE, and I think Senator SANDERS has seen this also—when you get into energy, there are huge, powerful special interests—especially those special interests that are representing fossil fuels—and they would love nothing better than to just have the status quo. What we have seen is they are relying—and this is amazing to me, and the Senator has been one of the leaders on this issue where Big Oil is getting subsidies today from the Federal Government, and we have tried to take those Big Oil subsidies and move them over into the clean energy area. They resist that even though President Bush and the leaders of their industry say: We don't need these subsidies.

Mr. SANDERS. If I could just point out, picking up on Senator UDALL's point, in recent years we have seen, as everybody in America knows—not only

are we paying outrageously high prices at the pump, but we are seeing oil companies making huge profits. My recollection is that in the last 10 years the oil companies have made about \$1 trillion in profits. ExxonMobil has made more money than any corporation in history. Yet, over the last 10 years, there have been examples, there have been cases in a given year where a major oil company—ExxonMobil being one—made huge profits, billions in profits, and ended up paying zero in Federal income taxes and, in fact, got a rebate. So you have this absurd situation where hugely profitable oil companies are paying nothing in taxes, and some of us think that does not make any sense at all. We think they should pay their fair share and that to a significant degree that money should go into sustainable energy so that we can break our addiction to oil.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. And the results are really profound.

I will close with this point in this discussion. For as long essentially as mankind has been on this Earth, for 800,000 years—to put 800,000 years in scale, we have probably been engaged in agriculture as a species for 10,000 or 15,000 years. Before that we were pure hunter-gatherers. So 800,000 years—8,000 centuries—is an enormous period of time in human history. It is essentially the entire sweep of the human species on the face of the Earth. Throughout that period, we have existed within an atmosphere that stayed within a range of carbon concentration. For the first time in 8,000 centuries, we have now rocketed outside of that range. That ought to be a pretty significant warning to us that we are in new and untested territory in terms of the basic conditions of the environment that supports our species. And because the concentrations in the atmosphere have grown so greatly, so has the acidity of our oceans. If you go back into geological time to look at what changes such as these can potentially lead to, you see really massive adverse events such as catastrophic die-offs of species.

So we are playing with potentially very big consequences. We are playing outside of the boundaries that have governed our planet for 800,000 years, and we are refusing to correct what is going on, I believe, as both of you have pointed out, because of one predominant reason; that is, the power of special interests to phony-up a debate in this town.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Two weeks from today, the payroll tax cut championed by the President and extended by Congress in December will expire.

Congress should renew this financial relief to American working families while our economy is still recovering.

For a family making \$50,000 a year, the payroll tax cut means about \$1,000 a year, or about \$40 in every paycheck.

I'm encouraged by recent progress that Congress will resolve this issue,

but the payroll tax cut is not the only tax provision that can create jobs in New Mexico, and across the Nation.

The production tax credit for wind is set to expire at the end of this year. The Treasury Grant Program for renewable energy tax credits expired this past December.

One of the best things we can do to help our economy recover is invest in the clean energy economy. It has created the jobs of the future while the broader economy was struggling. According to the Brookings Institute, the clean energy economy grew twice as fast as the broader economy during the recession.

To maintain the growth of wind energy jobs, Congress should renew the production tax credit as part of the payroll tax cut. If we wait until the end of the year, or delay until 2013, many projects will be delayed and thousands of jobs will be lost. The production tax credit has, by any measure, been extraordinarily successful. It was first used in 1992 and has led to the installation of wind energy capacity in America equivalent to 75 average coal-fired power plants, and it is rapidly growing.

We added the equivalent of 10 large power plants worth of wind power in 2011, and are on track to do even more in 2012. In New Mexico, we have enough wind power either already built, or currently under construction to power 200,000 homes. New Mexico has tremendous wind capacity, with 20 times more capacity in the planning stages. Those plans depend in large part on Congress continuing to support the American wind industry. The tax credit has been extended seven times by Presidents and Congresses of both parties.

Wind is becoming cost-competitive with fossil fuels. A 4-year tax credit extension would allow the industry to thrive long term. With 60 percent of wind turbines made in America, the beneficiaries of the wind production tax credit are legion, including: U.S. iron and steel producers, over 400 U.S. manufacturing facilities in 43 States, 85,000 employees in well-paid engineering and technical jobs, thousands of farmers and ranchers who lease their land, rural school districts that receive tax payments, and rural local governments.

The future is wide open. The Department of Energy estimates the U.S. could receive 20 percent of its power from wind by 2030. Wind is not just in the west and midwest. The east coast can be powered by huge offshore wind resources in the Atlantic Ocean.

If the wind production tax credit is the engine for the clean energy economy, the Treasury grant program is the turbo boost. Enacted as Sec. 1603 of the Recovery Act, this program allows renewable energy tax credit earners to receive the value of the tax credit as a grant.

This eliminates the need for complex financing arrangements and finding other parties who are able to use the

tax credits. Typically financial institutions will receive 10 or 15 percent of the value of renewable tax credits in return for financing a project.

The Treasury grant program removes the middle man, and has led to the rapid expansion of renewable energy in the last 2 to 3 years, especially with solar energy. Until it expired in December, the program awarded over 4,000 grants worth \$1.75 billion for 22,000 solar projects in 47 States.

This innovative financing then supported over \$4 billion in private sector investment. One report found that an extension of the program would create an additional 37,000 jobs in 2012 in the solar industry alone. China, the EU, India, Japan, and other nations are acting aggressively to take leadership of the clean energy economy. They want the job growth and the energy security that results.

I am confident that our workers and entrepreneurs can compete with anyone.

But if we do counterproductive things, and pull the rug out from underneath our fastest growing clean energy industries, our economy and our energy security will fall behind. The payroll tax extension is a logical vehicle for extending other expiring tax provisions that benefit the economy.

On the other hand, the payroll tax extension is a terrible place to make unrelated policy that subverts Congressional process on behalf of special interests. The Environmental Protection Agency is, by and large, following the Nation's long-standing environmental laws and court orders when it updates standards to reduce pollution.

If Members are opposed to the Clean Air Act or the Clean Water Act, then they can propose bills to change those laws. Pollution does not create jobs. In fact, reducing pollution saves money for business and reduces health care costs for citizens. I am personally opposed to wholesale rollbacks of long-standing, bipartisan environmental laws.

But I am even more strongly and passionately opposed to backdoor attempts to undermine those laws on unrelated legislation.

Congress has voted down several resolutions of disapproval for EPA updated standards.

While I have opposed those efforts in the past, at least that is a legitimate process under the Congressional Review Act.

Holding much needed tax relief hostage for anti-environmental policy riders will not stand up to public scrutiny.

We must remain vigilant and keep upcoming legislation focused on tax relief that will benefit working families and invest in clean energy jobs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

The material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS ABOUT AN AVERAGE AMERICAN WIND FARM

An average wind farm in America built today has about 50 large wind turbines.

Each turbine can produce electricity to power roughly 500 homes, even accounting for variability of wind.

So the average wind farm can power around 25,000 homes.

That average wind farm then produces many other benefits: \$20 million in construction payroll in the year of construction, \$875,000 per year to rural local school districts, \$280,000 per year to rural county governments, \$150,000 per year in ongoing direct payroll for employees, \$1.5 million per year in contract labor payroll, \$300,000 to \$600,000 per year in royalties to landowners, farmers, and ranchers.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, as to the history of the wind production tax credit, the production tax credit began in the bipartisan Energy Policy Act of 1992, signed by President George H.W. Bush.

It was extended in Dec. 1999, by a Republican Congress and signed into law by President Clinton.

It was extended again in 2002 and 2004, this time signed into law by President George W. Bush.

In 2005, it was extended again as part of bipartisan energy legislation, the 2005 Energy Policy Act.

I voted for that legislation when I served in the House.

In December 2006, it was extended again.

Most recently, it was extended in the 2009 Recovery Act, which was signed by President Obama.

Congress should continue this bipartisan tradition, and extend the wind production tax credit very soon.

We should avoid the mistakes of the past, where last minute extensions led to uncertainty and job losses.

I would like to thank the Senator for asking us to come to the floor, for leading this debate. This is a debate we need to carry on until we get the production tax credits and other tax extenders in place and move our clean energy industry forward.

I thank the Senator for that.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Senator for the good work he is doing. What I would like to do is just pick up on a point Senator WHITEHOUSE just raised; that is, the record of history shows us that we cannot take the climate for granted. Our relatively limited experience of advancement over the last 10,000 years, during the time of stable climate on a planet that is billions of years old, has distorted our view of the Earth's complex climate system.

A recent National Academy of Sciences report stated:

... it seems clear that the Earth's future will be unlike the climate that ecosystems and human societies have been accustomed to during the last 10,000 years. ...

That is the point Senator WHITEHOUSE just made, and that is according to the National Academy of Sciences.

The reason is that human activities—primarily the burning of fossil fuels—are increasing greenhouse gas emissions and causing global warming. According to the U.S. Global Change Research Program, “global warming is

unequivocal and primarily human induced.”

We have altered the climate that has sustained humanity for the last 10,000 years. We are now at 392 parts per million of carbon dioxide, up from 280 parts per million in the 18th century. What an extraordinary increase in carbon dioxide in that short period of time. And greenhouse gas levels are rising steadily. In fact, carbon dioxide levels are increasing faster than at any time on record, according to our EPA.

Maybe that 392 parts per million seems like an abstract number, so let me put it into context. According to UCLA researchers, the last time carbon dioxide levels were consistently this high—the last time—was 15 million years ago—15 million years ago. The Earth, at that time, was warmer by 5 to 10 degrees Fahrenheit than it is today. At that level of warmth, there is no permanent sea ice in the Arctic and little, if any, ice on Antarctica and Greenland.

That explains, in part, why sea levels at that time were 75 to 120 feet higher than today. If sea levels today even approached half that level, we would inundate—inundate—major coastal cities around the world and create hundreds of millions of displaced refugees. And that is what we are talking about.

So let me repeat: The last time carbon dioxide levels were consistently this high was 15 million years ago, at which time the Earth was warmer by 5 to 10 degrees Fahrenheit than it is today.

There is no doubt, if we do nothing to reverse global warming, we are doing more than just threatening harm to the environment. We are jeopardizing the future of our planet and much of humanity. All too often we talk about global warming as if the impact will be somewhere down the line—maybe in 100 years, maybe in 200 years, and isn't it too bad those polar bears are trying to get by on that little block of ice. The reality is that global warming is impacting our planet today, and the impact is devastating.

Mr. President, I see the Senator from Minnesota is here. He has been very active on this issue, and I know he has some important points to be made, so I yield the floor for Senator FRANKEN of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. I thank the Senator from Vermont and also the Presiding Officer and the Senator from Rhode Island for engaging in this colloquy that is so important.

Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues in the Senate to support an extension of the renewable energy production tax credit. This tax credit, slated to expire at the end of this year, has created thousands of jobs for the wind industry, has reduced our dependence on foreign oil, and is hugely important to Minnesota and to the Nation. But because it takes a lot of time

to order and manufacture new wind turbines, investors need to know the credit will exist in 2013 or else they will not invest. That is why the credit must be extended now, along with the payroll tax extension and unemployment benefits.

If Congress lets the renewable energy production tax credit expire, we will let down the 80,000 people working on wind farms and manufacturing facilities across the Nation, and we may cost this country \$10 billion in lost investment. Already, because of uncertainty about the fate of the production tax credit, investment in the wind industry is drying up. America cannot afford to wait any longer. Congress must act now to extend this important measure for American business and manufacturing and, indeed, for the future of our planet.

Just a few weeks ago, I received a letter from Terry and Janet Carlson, who run a family farm in Parkers Prairie, MN, and are developing a wind project in their community. They write:

Our family believes in renewable energy and the benefits it can provide to our local community. Besides being environmentally friendly, wind energy has proved to be a great economic benefit to the State of Minnesota and small communities such as ours. But the 2012 expiration of the production tax credit has created a high level of uncertainty in the wind industry. . . . We have a significant amount of time and money invested in this project and the production tax credit expiration has a significant impact on our project moving forward. It also has a significant impact on the thousands of renewable energy related jobs in America and the economic boon it would provide to our community.

Terry and Janet have good reasons to be concerned. A Navigant Consulting study found that if the tax production credit is not extended, construction of wind turbines will drop by 75 percent in 2013. That means a lot fewer manufacturing jobs and construction jobs. And, in fact, if Congress fails to extend the production tax credit, the wind industry will lose half of its jobs, dropping from 80,000 in 2012 to 41,000 in 2013. That means 39,000 well-paying construction and manufacturing jobs will evaporate if Congress fails to extend this tax credit.

What a shame that would be. We have had this discussion. We have had a colloquy before on global warming. As the Senator from Vermont said in his opening remarks, the world community knows this exists. The world scientific community knows where this is going. And so China is doing wind, Germany is doing wind, and Denmark is doing wind. This is the future of our energy. If we stop producing wind energy, we are going to cede this to the rest of the world. If we don't act now, and renew the production tax credit, we are going to lose 40,000 jobs right now, but we are also going to lose the future.

On the other hand, this tax policy has major potential for the American

economy now and in the future. With a 4-year extension, the production tax credit will continue to support growth in the wind industry, boosting construction of wind farms by 25 percent, and instead of losing 39,000 jobs, an extension of the wind production credit will create 15,000 additional well-paying construction and manufacturing jobs.

With the help of the renewable energy production tax credit, the wind industry has been a bright spot in these tough economic times. There are over 400 facilities across 43 States manufacturing for the wind energy industry. Sixteen of these facilities are in Minnesota and support about 3,000 jobs. Currently, a majority of wind industry parts are produced here in America.

I think that is so important. We talk about the future of our economy. We talk about all the time here, or at least should be talking about all the time here, the future of our economy. Think about that. Over half of wind energy parts are now produced here in America, whereas in 2005, a quarter of components were made in this country. That is what we have to continue to do. That is the story we want to hear.

Instead of exporting manufacturing jobs to other countries, the wind industry has been bringing well-paying, high-tech jobs back to America, where the technology was first invented, and that is thanks to the renewable energy tax credit. If we don't extend this tax credit, we will fail these facilities and the people whose jobs are at stake. As uncertainty about the tax credit deepens, we have already seen that orders to wind manufacturing facilities are slowing down and companies are making layoffs.

This is our fault, here in Congress, and it is unacceptable. The longer we wait, the worse the layoffs and shutdowns will become. In fact, if we don't extend the tax credit this month, it will be too late for the wind industry to build any turbines in 2013. Wind turbines are big, and wind farms need to plan and order parts a year in advance. If the wind farms can't depend on the tax credit of 2013, they can't make plans to build for the next year, which means they can't make orders to 400 manufacturing facilities across the country for parts.

Because of the uncertainty of the tax credit in 2013, production now in 2012 has already come to a halt. That is why we need to extend this tax credit now, immediately, in the payroll tax package.

For the past several months, we have been celebrating reports that the unemployment rate is improving. This is fantastic news. But we can't rest on our laurels yet. We must be sure to enact smart policies that promote businesses and job growth in the parts of the economy that need it most and which are the future. The renewable energy tax credit does just that. It will promote growth in manufacturing and construction—industries that deserve our help the most.

America has tremendous wind resources, most of which are still untapped. Take Minnesota, for example. We are ranked fifth in the country for the most installed wind capacity. Yet our wind resources could still provide 25 times more energy. This is a huge opportunity for this country—an opportunity that we can't afford to dismiss.

Wind blows all over this Nation. It blows in red States and in blue States alike. It is an abundant, cheap, clean energy resource that is proving to be a boon to our economy. We cannot stop developing it now. I urge my colleagues to extend the renewable energy production tax credit immediately, at the same time we extend the payroll tax cut and unemployment benefits.

I want to thank the Presiding Officer for his leadership, and I want to thank the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Rhode Island, and so many others, who are leading this fight. This is smart on an economic basis, but we are facing a crisis that scientists around the world agree on.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont. I have said what I wanted to say about the wind production tax credit and the other renewable energy tax credits. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The point that he makes is indisputable; that is, if we are serious about creating decent-paying, meaningful jobs in this country, why in God's name are we not extending 1603 for solar and wind and the renewable energy tax credit? This will enable us to create good-paying jobs, make sure sustainable energy is an important part of our economy, and allow this country to play a leadership role in reversing greenhouse gas emissions and combating global warming.

I think there are some people who say: Well, maybe global warming might be real, but we don't have to worry about it today. Its impact will not be seen for decades or centuries to come. I would suggest that is not quite correct. We are seeing the impact of global warming climate change right now. Let me give an example.

According to studies, in my own State of Vermont in northern New England, if we fail to reverse global warming we will see continued temperature increases. Vermont's climate, by 2080, is projected to be similar to Georgia's climate today. Mr. President, 2080, in the great scheme of things, is not all that far away. To think that Vermont, northern New England, will have a climate similar to Georgia's today is rather extraordinary if that takes place by the year 2080. Clearly, if that trend takes place, it would be devastating in many respects for Vermont, including our winter tourism and our sugar maple producers, among other aspects of our economy.

Lake Champlain, our beautiful lake which borders New York State and Vermont, which used to freeze for 9 out of every 10 years in the early 20th century, froze over just three times in the 1990s and has not fully frozen over since 2007. So in my small State, the State of Vermont, northern New England, we are seeing the impact of climate change today. The idea that by the year 2080 Vermont's climate will be similar to the State of Georgia's climate today is just unthinkable and extraordinary and tells us the impact that global warming is having.

According to NASA, 2010 tied 2005 for the warmest year since records began in 1880. Nine of the ten warmest years on record have occurred since the year 2000. The last decade was the warmest on record.

We have seen temperature records being recorded all over the planet in the year 2010. During that year, Pakistan set a record for recording the highest temperature ever in Asia, hitting 129 degrees Fahrenheit. Iraq set its own record for high temperatures at over 125 degrees. Sudan reached a record 121 degrees. Los Angeles, right here in our country, had a record 113-degree day. Houston, TX, set a record for its highest monthly average temperature.

In the United States, according to a New York Times article, two record-high temperatures are now set for every one record low. The National Climatic Data Center shows that 26,500 record-high temperatures were recorded in weather stations across the United States in the summer of 2011. Texas set the record for the warmest summer of any State since instrument records began. Oklahoma set a record for its warmest summer, exceeding the record set during the Dust Bowl era in the 1930s.

But we are not just looking at hot temperatures and hot days. What are the impacts of those kinds of weather changes? What does it mean to people's lives? Scientists used to say they could not tie a particular event to climate change. That is no longer true. Our understanding of climate and extreme weather has advanced.

NASA's James Hansen and his colleagues can say that some of the extreme heat waves we have seen, such as those in Russia and Texas and Oklahoma, over the past several years were caused by global warming because their likelihood would be negligible if not for global warming.

Let me give some other examples of what global warming is doing in terms of heat waves and its horrendous impact on the lives of people.

Some of us remember Europe in 2003. During that period in Europe, 2003, a heat wave caused temperatures to reach or exceed 100 degrees Fahrenheit in the United Kingdom and France and led to high temperatures throughout Europe for weeks which killed 70,000 people, according to the World Health Organization. Many older people, people with respiratory problems, people

who were fragile in health died during that period. In the heat wave in Europe in 2003, 70,000 people died.

In Russia in 2010, a week-long heat wave sent temperatures soaring above 100 degrees Fahrenheit in areas where the average temperature that time of year is 67 degrees. Mr. President, 56,000 people died during that period as a result of that heat wave, and wildfires created a smoke plume nearly 2,000 miles wide, which was visible from space.

So this is not some kind of abstract issue: Oh, my goodness; isn't it too bad it is really hot today. What we are talking about are prolonged heat waves that kill substantial numbers of people.

In India in 2010, they recorded temperatures of over 100 degrees that killed hundreds of people; Chile in 2011, a heat wave, drought, and wildfire destroyed 57,000 acres of forest and land and forced 500 people to evacuate; Australia in 2012, the start of 2012 was the hottest start of any year for Australia in the century, according to ABC News, with temperatures exceeding 104 degrees and electricity cut off in some areas to prevent the igniting of fires.

Prolonged and more severe drought is likely to increase as global warming continues, according to the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Colorado. This means increased risk of crop failure, wildfires, and water scarcity. A recent study published in *Scientific American* found that climate change has cut production of cereal crops—wheat, rice, corn, soybeans—causing these crops to be nearly 19 percent more expensive than if global warming was not occurring.

I could go on and on about this issue. But the main point I want to make is the following, and let me summarize it here. According to virtually the entire scientific community in the United States of America and around the world, according to virtually every agency of the United States Government, global warming is real, and it is significantly caused by human activity. People are mistaken if they believe the impact of global warming will just be in decades to come. We are seeing very negative impacts today. The scientific community tells us if we do not begin to reverse greenhouse gas emissions, those problems in America and around the world will only get worse.

If there is a silver lining in all of that, it is that right now we know how to cut greenhouse gas emissions. We know how to move to energy efficiency, mass transportation, and automobiles that get 50, 60, 100 miles per gallon. We know how to weatherize our homes so we can cut significantly the use of fuel. What we also know is that in the middle of this recession, if we move in that direction—energy efficiency and sustainable energy—we can create over a period of years millions of good-paying jobs.

Let me conclude by saying: we now have the opportunity to be in a win-

win-win situation. We can save consumers money, we can significantly reduce greenhouse gases and protect our planet, and we can create substantial numbers of jobs that we desperately need in the midst of this terrible recession.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SYNTHETIC DRUG USE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in the fall of 2010 I came to this Chamber to speak about my growing concern of synthetic drug use in this country.

Specifically, I raised concerns about a popular new drug known as K2, or Spice, and I learned about this myself for the first time because a constituent of mine by the name of David Rozga committed suicide. David killed himself shortly after smoking a package of the drug he and some friends bought at a local shopping mall.

At the time, David's death in June 2010 was one of the first associated with what was a new and very dangerous drug craze. Nearly 2 years after David's death, the use of synthetic drugs like K2 has exploded and is becoming a major problem across the country.

In 2009 the American Association of Poison Centers reported only 13 calls concerning synthetic drug use. One year later, in 2010, over 1,300 calls were made to poison centers about synthetic drugs. So I have gone from 2009 to 2010, and now 2011. We have gone from 13 to 1,300 to last year, 12,000 calls to poison centers regarding synthetic drugs.

The Monitoring the Future Survey, a survey of high school youth, asked students for the first time last year if they ever tried synthetic drugs. Roughly one in nine high school seniors responded they used synthetic drugs last year.

These numbers are quite obviously an astonishing increase in just 2 years and they illustrate, of course, how rapidly the use of these drugs has come on the scene. These drugs are having a terrible effect on those who use them. Emergency room doctors across the country are reporting increasing uses of synthetic drugs in the number of users coming to the hospital.

My staff heard from one such doctor from upstate New York about what she has seen. Dr. Sandra Schneider, from Rochester, NY, reported that users in her ER experienced psychotic episodes, rapid heart rate, very high blood pressure, and seizures. In some cases, users—many of whom were in their teens and twenties—suffered heart attacks and strokes and died as a result.

Other cases involved users who tried to kill themselves, harm others, or got into a car accident while high on these synthetic drugs.

How do we get from practically no use to where we are now? The people who manufacture and sell these drugs have circumvented the laws to easily sell synthetic drugs online, at gas stations, in novelty stores at the local shopping malls, and in tobacco stores and other shops. Many of the drugs are manufactured overseas, in countries such as China, and then imported into the United States. They spray chemical compounds, that have not been tested on humans and were not intended for human consumption, on dried leaves. They package and market these drugs to appear as legitimate products such as incense, bath salts, plant food, and snow remover. They slap a label on these packages stating that the product is not for human consumption to get around FDA regulations.

Over 30 States have passed laws to ban various synthetic drug compounds. The Drug Enforcement Administration has also acted to stop these drugs. Although the DEA has used its emergency scheduling powers to control seven chemical compounds, there are too many on the market now for DEA to go through the long and laborious process to schedule each and every one. The makers of these drugs know this as well and have altered their chemical formulas—some as little as a molecule—to get around existing State and Federal laws.

This is exactly the case in my home State of Iowa. Iowa passed a law last year that banned many chemical compounds. However, the law only listed a specific set of chemical compounds and the drugmakers are now altering their formulas.

Recently, two Iowa youths have become victims of the new drugs. One is a Polk County teenager who got into a high-speed crash smoking a product called 100 Percent Pure Evil.

This teen had two other passengers in her car. After smoking this product the driver became agitated and stated she wanted to kill herself. She started driving her car into several trees. When paramedics arrived at the scene they reported that everyone was badly hurt and the driver was vomiting blood. Thankfully all passengers survived the crash.

Another teen in central Iowa experienced a near-death experience after smoking the same product. This teen purchased the product—remember the name, 100 Percent Pure Evil—purchased it at a local store and started convulsing and vomiting shortly after smoking the drug. Once a paramedic got this boy into the hospital he fell into a coma. He, however, awoke from the coma the next day but had failed to recognize his mother or grandmother at the hospital. Thankfully this boy has since recovered his memory. Now he suffers occasional anxiety attacks.