

posing relevant, tough questions and getting candid, correct answers. While the Constitution gives the President paramount authority as Commander-in-Chief, the Constitution gives the Congress the sole authority to declare war. That congressional authority and responsibility have not been appropriately exercised considering what has happened in Korea and Vietnam and in the resolutions authorizing the use of force in Iraq in 1991 and 2002, none of which constituted congressional declarations of war.

On the ultimate issue of increased U.S. forces: Congress should not, and this member will not, support a policy of increasing U.S. forces in Afghanistan until such policy is warranted by candid and correct factual information and preferable alternatives cannot achieve the desired objectives.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, could I inquire as to the regular order?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority has 30 minutes remaining in morning business.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask when the majority would then be recognized?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I 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. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. INHOFE. Madam President, if the Senator controlling the remainder of the majority time would like to reserve his time, I will go ahead and start.

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

DEFENSE

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, as we speak, there is an announcement coming from the White House, it is my understanding, that they are going to cancel the Eastern European sites we have been working on for such a long period of time. I think it is appropriate to quote something I saw many years ago and was foreseen by President Reagan when he was President. He said:

Since the dawn of the atomic age, we have sought to reduce the risk of war by maintaining a strong deterrent and by seeking genuine arms control. Deterrence: Making sure the adversary who thinks about attacking the United States or our allies or our vital interests concludes that the risks to him outweigh any potential gains. Once he understands that, he won't attack. We maintain the peace through our strength; weakness only invites aggression.

I wish people today would understand those words of Ronald Reagan quite some time ago and how prophetic they

were as we look right now and see the administration is talking about canceling this program.

I arranged to be in Afghanistan at the time Secretary of Defense Gates announced the budget, I believe last February, the Obama budget, so far as defense was concerned. I was very much concerned. I was concerned about what happened to the F-22. Initially, we were going to have the only fifth-generation fighter that this country has. We, initially, were going to have 750 of them. He terminated the program at 187.

I was concerned about the termination of the C-17 program. I was concerned about the termination of the Future Combat System. The Future Combat System is the only ground system that has gone through a major change in probably 50 or 60 years. So we will not have that improved ground capability for our young men and women who go into harm's way.

Also, I made the comment that I suspected at that time, when he suspended the radar site in the Czech Republic and the interception capability in Poland, that that was easing into terminating that program. I think we are finding out today he is terminating that program.

On February 3, 2009, Iran launched a satellite, on the 30th anniversary of the 1979 Islamic Revolution. On July 9 of 2008, Iran tested nine missiles, including the Shahab-3, which has a range of 1,240 miles.

I recognize the threat to Western Europe—this wouldn't quite do it. It is 1,240 miles. I think the range in order to be able to get something to Italy would be about 2,000 miles.

On the other hand, we never guess these things right. I remember so well, in 1998, the Clinton administration made a statement in response to a question I asked on August 14, 1998: How long will it be until they have the multiple-stage capability in North Korea? The White House responded it was going to be between 10 and 15 years. Seven days later, on August 13, 1998, they fired it.

This is how far off we are in our intelligence. We don't know. I don't want to guess this thing too close. Riki Ellison from the Missile Defense Advocacy Alliance said:

The Islamic Republic of Iran has just proved for the first time that it has the capability to place satellites in space by successfully launching a 3-stage liquid fueled rocket that has placed two objects in low-Earth orbit. . . Iran has demonstrated the key technologies of propulsion, staging, and guidance to deliver a weapon of mass destruction globally.

I am hoping the White House doesn't come out and say that is launching a satellite. It is the same technology, launching a nuclear warhead. This is getting very serious right now. The U.S. intelligence community has estimated Iran may have long-range ballistic missiles capable of threatening all of Western Europe and the United States by 2015.

Madam President, 2015, that sounds reminiscent of August of 1998, when they said it would be 10 to 15 years. Delaying this creates all kinds of problems for us. Our credibility in Eastern Europe is something that bothers me. I was recently in the Czech Republic. President Vaclav Klaus—they were cooperative in saying yes. The Parliament debated it and decided we could put a radar site there which would allow us to see something coming in; otherwise, we would not be able to do it. Then, next door in Poland, to have an interception capability—they agreed to do that. Parliament didn't want to do it. They were concerned about Russia's response and a lot of opposition that there might be. The thing I do not understand is why Western Europe is not lining up with us and saying we have to have those two sites. They are the ones who are naked now if we don't have that.

I am very much concerned about that. MG Vladimir Dvorkin, who is the head of the Center for Strategic Forces in Moscow, said: "Iran is actively working on a missile program," adding that Iran is "1 or 2 years" from having a nuclear weapon. This concerns me. We have those individuals we seem to be catering to, the Russians, in order to leave ourselves without a type of defensive system to protect Western Europe and the Eastern United States. It is troubling to me.

In April 2009, North Korea furthered their missile and nuclear development by a Taepodong-2 missile in the China Sea. That has a range of over 2,000—about 2,500 miles. That would reach Rome. That would reach Berlin. There has to be a concern that they have this capability, they have demonstrated this capability very clearly.

NATO leaders stated in December of 2008, last Christmas, that:

Ballistic missile proliferation poses increasing threat to allied forces, territory and populations. Missile defense forms a part of the broader response to counter this threat. We therefore recognize the substantial contribution to the protection of allies from long range ballistic missiles to be provided by a planned development of the European-based United States missile defense assets.

That is what we are talking about. In Poland, the site in Poland would include up to 10 silo-based, long-range interceptors capable of shooting down hostile missiles from Iran in their mid-course. Let's put the chart up here.

A lot of people do not realize this is very sophisticated. Our missile defense system takes into consideration three courses. For the segment here, the boost phase, we don't have anything there yet. We are supposed to be working on it. I was disturbed that one of the things that was terminated by this administration is that effort.

The terminal defense segment is one we are working on right now. The airborne laser in the boost phase is one of the programs I believe the administration is canceling. The site in Poland would include up to 10 silo-based, long-range interceptors. The radar site in

the Czech Republic would house a narrow beam midcourse tracking radar that is currently used by our missile defense system in the Pacific. These are things we know work.

I am very concerned about it. I have not heard the statement from the White House, but I have a feeling we are going to hear the same thing we heard back in 1998, and it is very troubling. This is something that can be—should be an act of desperation in terms of Western Europe at this time.

CAP AND TRADE

Having said that, this is some good news. That was the bad news. The good news is we have notice this morning that the Democratic caucus, as reported in Politico, is split over the bill, the cap-and-trade bill we are talking about, with coal-, oil- and manufacturing-State Democrats raising concerns that a cap-and-trade system would disproportionately spike electricity bills for consumers and businesses in their regions.

There is a recognition now that this thing we have been talking about ever since the Kyoto treaty—the threat at that time that they were talking about is now. Everyone realizes that is not what it was. Science has changed dramatically and most scientists now are saying this is something that was overstated that one time.

The cost, though, is the big thing. I quit arguing about the science a long time ago. I gave a speech from this podium not too long ago. If anyone is interested, I ask my colleagues to go to the Web site inhofe.senate.gov, where we listed 700 scientists who were on the other side of the issue who are now on the skeptics' side, recognizing the science is not there. David Bellamy from Great Britain is one who was always talking about—he was on Al Gore's side on this thing. After going through and restudying and reevaluating the science, he agreed everything wasn't there.

The same thing is true with leaders in France and Israel. But what we have now is something people do understand and that is the cost of this, the consistent cost. Kyoto's cost, if we lived by the emission standard, would be somewhere, according to the Wharton Econometric Survey, I think it was called back during the Kyoto days, would be between \$300 billion and \$330 billion every year. As bad as the stimulus was, at least that is a one-shot deal and the people would not have to pay for it every year. This will be every year.

Then along came McCain-Lieberman in 2003 and 2005 and the same estimates came about that it would be a \$300 billion tax increase. I remember 1993 when we had the Clinton-Gore tax increase, which was the largest tax increase in three decades.

During that time we looked at it, it was a \$32 billion tax increase: increasing inheritance taxes, marginal rates, capital gains, and all of that. That is only \$32 billion. This is 10 times that size.

Well, the White House was trying to say, and several of them on the other side in our committee—in fact, the chairman of our committee—it is going to cost a postage stamp a day. People are willing to pay for that.

Those postage stamps must be getting pretty expensive. Now we have found out there is an analysis released by the U.S. Department of Treasury that was held down, not released. Now we know what it is. They said the cost would be between \$100 and \$200 billion a year.

The cost—this is according to their figures now—to an American household would be an extra \$1,761 a year. This is their analysis. I think that is right. In fact, we have seen the CRA report that shows the cost of this—and MIT agrees with this, I might add, because they evaluated the Warner-Lieberman bill 12 months ago—right now being closer to \$366 billion a year, with a cost per family, the study has shown, in my State of Oklahoma and in the State of Texas, we would be the highest taxed. It would be \$3,300 a year per family. That is huge. I know the east coast and the west coast is a little bit more than half of that, but still it is a huge tax increase.

Finally, this report that was put together by the Department of Treasury has been released. And they admit it. So we can quit talking about some of these things that are not realistic.

We know what the cost is. We know also the likelihood of it coming up this year is most unusual. I do not think it is going to happen. The Senate majority leader stated, I think 2 days ago, that the Senate may not act on comprehensive energy and climate change legislation.

Senator BEN NELSON from Nebraska, a Democrat, I might add, said: We have enough on our plate at the moment. With the fight over health care reform, it is questionable to open another front.

The Senate majority whip, DICK DURBIN, last week added that: It is a difficult schedule. Members are already anxious about health care reform. So I do not think it is going to come up. And I frankly will be ready here to fight to make sure it does not come up when the new year comes in.

I do not think there are too many people in the Senate who want to go into their reelection in 2010 having voted for the largest tax increase in the history of America. This is exactly what it would be. Let's keep in mind, what was the largest tax increase in the history of America was the 1993 tax increase. This would be 10 times greater than that. And the people now realize that. That was good news today.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MEL MARTINEZ

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I wish to add my comments to a few other comments on Mel Martinez whom we all loved so much. I do not

think I have ever seen anyone since Jesse Helms who was loved by so many people as Mel Martinez. He had a way of smiling, and in talking about things in a way that others did not understand. My colleagues have already come to the floor and talked about his escape from Cuba and how he came over and how then he was able to get his father over. It is a story that America will always remember. It will always be in our history books.

He was always such a great guy. He will be missed around here.

One of the things that was not said much about him was his sense of humor. I have to say I enjoyed being around him because he was, in his own subtle way, a very humorous person. I can remember, and I have had the occasion, probably more than any other Member, going into the areas in Iraq and Afghanistan and Africa where there were hostilities. But I was making probably my 12th or 14th trip into Baghdad on a C-130. It happened to be Mel Martinez's first trip. So we were talking about: Once you get out, you are going to run over to the helicopter, and they are going to take you to the Green Zone, all of the things to anticipate. I said to him: One of the problems we are going to have is that when we leave, we have these old C-130E models. They should be re-engined. We should have J models, but we do not. Because of the cuts in the military, we have not been able to upgrade those systems.

So I said: When we climb out of here, it is going to be in a C-130E model. We are not going to be able to climb as high and as fast as we want, and there are surface-to-air missiles out there that we have to be concerned about. And, of course, they are all set up. We have very capable pilots and crews in these C-130s. So I said: We will be well taken care of if something happens. Sure enough, it happened.

The first thing you do when you get out of your helicopter in Baghdad to get on a C-130 to come back to Kuwait or wherever you might be going is you take your helmet, your life jacket, your vest off, because they are so heavy and uncomfortable—you get in there and you take them off. Well, we all did that.

I was sitting up with, as I do quite often, the pilots, when all of a sudden the explosion came, the light was there, and we deployed the heat-seeking devices that are on a C-130. Of course, that is already very loud. Someone who has never gone through that experience before would assume we were about to go down.

I ran downstairs and I saw Mel Martinez sitting there without his helmet, without his protective vest by him; he had put them back on. I said: Mel, what are you doing putting your vest and your helmet back on?

He said: Well, I assumed that we were going to be shot down. And if Kitty—that is his wife—if she found out that I did not have my vest and my helmet on, she would kill me.