

per household and business and didn't take into account the property losses from the historic wildfires I have just been talking about.

We continue to see the destruction that accompanies climate change happen on a global scale as well, threatening the critical infrastructure we rely on for international trade. This week, I mentioned the recordbreaking temperatures they are seeing in England and in Europe and in Germany and other places.

Most tragic of all, these climate-induced events are putting people's lives at risk. Extreme heat is the leading cause of weather-related deaths in our country. According to NOAA, the 12 most costly extreme weather events in 2021 alone resulted in the deaths of nearly 700 people.

Addressing this crisis is the challenge of our time. It is directly tied to the prices we pay at the pump and in nearly every facet of our lives.

Instead of doubling down on policies that continue to fail American consumers and the planet, as some of our colleagues have been advocating for today, we should focus our attention on passing legislation that accelerates our transition to a clean energy future and leaves no community behind in the process. It is our ticket to a brighter future and one without recordbreaking heat waves, high gas prices, and unprecedented devastation.

Let me close with apologies to Stephen Stills. Stephen Stills is a great songwriter and singer with Buffalo Springfield, an iconic group. Long ago, he wrote a song that has these words. We have heard them a million times. It starts something like this:

There is something happening here, [just] what it is ain't exactly clear.

Those are his words, the opening line from one of the great songs of all time.

Well, with apologies to Stephen Stills, there is something happening here, and it is exactly clear what is causing it. It is a climate crisis. We have way too much carbon in the air. We are producing more. That is the bad news.

Here is the good news: We can do something about it. We can do something about it. Part of it is—I will just close with this—30 percent of our carbon emissions in this Nation come from our cars, trucks, and vans—30 percent. More and more, we are seeing automakers build cars, trucks, and vans that run not on gas and diesel but on electric. We are beginning to install literally thousands of charging stations all over the country to help provide an opportunity for people to charge their batteries and also to buy hydrogen, when we switch to hydrogen, for fuel cell vehicles. Those expansions and those investments will put literally hundreds of thousands of Americans—probably more than that—to work across the country, in every corner of the country, to enable us to reduce carbon emissions from our mobile fleet.

Instead of just burning coal and to some extent natural gas, we have the opportunity to create clean energy from advanced nuclear. I am a Navy guy, 27 years in the Navy all in. We have been doing nuclear energy in the Navy for 50 years. Do you know how many people have died in the Navy from exposure to radioactive materials? Zero. Fifty years—perfect record. We are now in the beginning of a new development and a new exploration in pursuit of nuclear energy using small modular nuclear reactors—a lot safer than the ones we have been building for years.

We are in a position now to have, literally, from Maine all the way down to Maryland, offshore wind that creates enormous amounts of carbon-free electricity that we can use to charge our cars, trucks, and vans and actually put a lot of people to work building those windmills and doing good things for our planet.

The climate crisis is here. The question is, What do we do about it? And there is an opportunity to meet it head-on. And it is not like you got to eat your broccoli. No, no, no. This is something we can do, and we could actually not just do good things for our planet, help us avert greater disasters in the days going forward, we could actually create a lot of economic opportunity, a lot of jobs and we can do that and we can do both. We need to do that. We need to do that.

I yield the floor to my friend from Texas. I think I will sit here and hear what he has to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, while my friend, the Senator from Delaware, is on the floor, in Texas we are known for oil and gas production, but the truth is, and what I think we really should be known for, is for an “all of the above” energy policy.

We produce more electricity from wind turbines than any other State in the country, and that is a surprise to a number of people.

But one reason for an “all of the above” energy policy is that during the current hot spell we are experiencing in Texas—I think we have had over 33 days of over 100-degree temperatures in my hometown of Austin, TX. It is hot. Some might say: Well, of course it is hot. It is July in Texas. But what has happened, we have seen this phenomenon where the wind is not producing nearly as much electricity because it is not blowing as hard as it might otherwise do.

So, again, I think if we can encourage an “all of the above” energy policy, then different segments of the energy picture can fill in at different times and satisfy our overall need.

I thought while my friend was speaking on that topic I would just mention that interesting lesson that we have learned here recently in Texas.

CHIPS ACT

Mr. President, last night, the Senate moved forward on the CHIPS Act. As

colleagues have heard me talk about this before, this was actually filed in 2020.

Senator WARNER, the senior Senator from Virginia, a Democrat, and I, a Republican from Texas, introduced this bill more than 2 years ago.

The main concern was that our supply of microcircuits that run everything from our cell phones to our laptops, to F-35 Joint Strike Fighters—we depended on a vulnerable supply chain from Asia for those advanced semiconductors. The United States produces zero percent of the advanced semiconductors we need here in America.

And anybody who has tried to buy a car lately or even a washing machine or a laptop or a desktop computer knows that the supply chains of semiconductors, and thus these products, are severely constrained because our economy has taken off post-COVID-19, but the supply chains can't keep up with them and particularly the supply of these semiconductors. So that is why this bill is so important.

Over the last several days, I have worked with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to craft a dramatically slimmed-down version of the competitiveness bill we passed here in the Senate last summer.

The final text of the bill was not released before the procedural vote last night, which was a point of frustration for a number of colleagues, and I can certainly understand. Here they are, asked to vote on a procedural vehicle to get on this bill, and they don't know exactly what the bill is going to look like. And that was the reason some of them decided to vote no against the motion to proceed. I completely understand that.

But our colleagues will have time to review this bill in the coming days, and I hope that support for this legislation will continue to grow. After all, it is a matter of our economic and national security.

The global semiconductor shortage has claimed a lot of attention over the last couple of years because of the impact it has had on consumers, but these aren't existential threats; these are inconveniences because of these constrained supply chains.

If, for example, there was another pandemic or a natural disaster or if, Heaven forbid, the People's Republic of China decided to forcibly unify with Taiwan, this could potentially block access to all of the advanced semiconductors that we need in America, and this would be a dramatic negative effect.

First of all, it would create almost instantaneously a recession here in America. Thousands of people would be put out of work. But what I want to focus on are the national security consequences.

When we send our troops on any mission—by air, land, sea, or cyber—we need the very best equipment and technology available. And now more than

ever, this technology cannot function without semiconductors, without these chips.

Just one example is, look at the Javelin missiles that we are sending over to Ukraine to defeat the Russian Federation invasion. Each one of these Javelin missiles that the Ukrainians are using to such good effect requires more than 200 semiconductors in just one Javelin missile, and so far we have sent 5,500 of them to Ukraine.

But it is not just these big items that need chips, it is things like the helmets that our fighter pilots use to fly and navigate; communications devices like radio sets to call in reinforcements to save American lives; smart hand-held cameras that attach to our troops' gear that see around the corners to keep them out of harm's way; and even advanced body armor uses semiconductors.

If we ever needed to deploy the full force of the U.S. military and ramp up production to replenish our supplies, we would need an astronomical number of semiconductor chips.

That is why bringing that manufacturing capacity back onshore, back home to America, is so important.

This had been a big bipartisan priority, as I said, for the last couple of years, and this isn't the first time that semiconductors have been regarded as a matter of national security.

Interestingly, in the 1980s, it was a big priority item for President Reagan. At that time, our country was up against the Soviet Union's expansive military forces. President Reagan knew that maintaining our edge would be a result of smarter military systems, not just bigger ones or more of them.

As two national security and foreign policy experts from the University of Texas put it, "Reagan didn't merely outspend the Soviets, he . . . sought to out-innovate them" as well.

He pushed to maintain our competitive edge in chips, thereby helping us lead in the advanced weapons and airframes that they enabled.

But this isn't just about what happens tomorrow or 6 months from now; we are talking about safeguarding the developments that will underpin our national security in 10, 20, or 30 years. That is why so many people from diverse political viewpoints support this effort.

As we all remember, the CHIPS for America Act received broad bipartisan support when we first voted on it. It was adopted as an amendment to the annual Defense authorization bill by a vote of 96 to 4. Ninety-six percent of the U.S. Senate supported the bill.

Since it became law a year and a half ago, we have heard from a range of voices and stakeholders who don't typically align.

For example, former USTR—U.S. Trade Representative—Robert Lighthizer, who served in the Trump administration, has been a vocal advocate for chips funding.

At a Senate Finance Committee meeting 2 years ago, he said semiconductors are a key part of our economy as well as the future of American security.

Biden officials have shared this same sentiment. The Secretaries of Defense and Commerce recently sent a letter to Congress urging swift passage of this chips funding, saying it is "an imperative to our national security."

Countless organizations, experts, businesses, and industry groups have expressed the same point of view. Some of the most respected men and women in the national security world wrote a letter to Congress urging quick action on this funding. That group included a former Secretary of Defense, former CIA Director, and former Director of National Intelligence.

We have also heard from the National Governors Association and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, which represents State and local leaders across the country.

We have heard from groups that represent automakers, the defense industry, consumer electronics, and telecommunications companies as well.

Last month, a group of more than 120 tech CEOs sent a letter to congressional leaders urging quick action on this legislation.

It is rare, especially today, to have such a broad consensus from so many different perspectives on a single issue advocating one priority, but that is how important this legislation is.

I am optimistic about where we are at the moment after 2 long years of getting here, and I am glad Speaker PELOSI has said the House will take up the Senate bill as early as next week.

The bottom line is, there is a lot at stake here, and I hope we can deliver a major win for our national security in the coming days.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

ENERGY POLICY

MR. MARSHALL. Mr. President, well, summer is in full swing, and all across the Midwest, people are preparing for lake vacations, for family barbecues, but new to this year's agenda, they are also preparing for Biden blackouts.

The shocking new inflation numbers show Americans already paying 42 percent more for energy than this time last year, but now, due to the White House policies, we may not be able to generate enough electricity to meet demand.

Now, let us not forget that under Republican leadership, we had a nation completely in control of our energy security. We were the global leader in energy production, and we were a net exporter of oil products.

However, under Democratic leadership, we are making plans for the lights to go out, and I hope everybody has their candles ready to go at home.

But it isn't this administration's fault, of course, so just ask them—just ask them. No, this White House states

they are powerless to the whims of a global marketplace, and don't bother asking them to own the consequences of their actions.

Did President Biden actually believe canceling the Keystone XL Pipeline on his first day in office would not have negative effects on the global energy markets? Think about it. The United States, the largest oil producer in the world, stopping the transport, the importing, of nearly a million barrels a day, over 5 percent of our supply—who could have ever predicted decreasing supply could impact the cost at the pump?

And who could have predicted that halting all leasing on Federal lands would impact global supply? I even asked the Interior Secretary if this policy made it more difficult for oil companies to drill, and she couldn't give me an answer. She didn't care. This administration doesn't care about the cost of gas at the pump; that is, until they get it high enough to make driving electric cars more comparable.

Don't even think about implying that John Kerry, Biden's climate envoy at COP26, would cause private companies to take coal-powered plants offline and eliminate baseload without a plan going forward. After all, he said in Glasgow:

By 2030, in the United States, we won't have coal. We will not have [any] coal plants.

Well, we may not have coal, but we will have blackouts.

And it was Joe Biden on the campaign trail, in his own words—I am sure you all remember—who said:

Kiddo, I want you to just take a look . . . I want you to look into my eyes. I guarantee you, we are going to end fossil fuels.

And we wonder why Americans won't invest tens of millions—hundreds of millions—of dollars into this energy sector to drill new oil. Yet this President has declared war on American energy, and every American is paying the price at the gas pump. And yet this President wonders out loud why companies won't invest in any more exploration when it takes 5 or 10 years for a payback on these types of investments. He continues to create uncertainty.

It doesn't have to be this way. Republicans have been sounding the alarm on the negative impacts of this administration's policies since President Biden took office. Honestly, this should be surprising to no one. Yet the left seems confounded, stupefied, and without a plan except to turn off your air conditioner and your freezer.

Even more, they have resorted to outright lies. In fact, they repeat these lies over and over, hoping America will eventually fall for them. They repeatedly claim they have not been interfering with American energy production and now deceptively spout they support the industry that they have been vilifying for years.

It is clear, we need more traditional fuel production. I know it; the American people know it. And to be completely clear, I think the White House knows it as well.