global warming and issues such as that. This week in Beijing, U.S. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner followed the Pelosi model, remaining mute on human rights abuses that are going on today, and spoke only of environment issues.

In 2005, I gave a series of speeches on the threat China poses to our Nation. Now, 4 years later, we are in a position where they are the largest holder of our national debt, and my concerns regarding China remain the same.

I have spent many years in activity in Africa, primarily Sub-Saharan Africa, and right now we are competing with China for the energy that is there. China is doing a better job than we are. They are competitors of ours not just militarily but economically. It is of great concern to me that as we continue to grow in our relationship and our dependence on China, our U.S. Government officials seem to place more value on the Chinese Government’s treatment of the environment and the treatment of their own people and the threat they pose to our Nation.

On the 20th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre, Pelosi and Geithner’s omission is a disgrace to those who seek to lift China up and who died as they pleaded with the government to allow them basic freedoms that we as Americans possess and enjoy.

So ignoring these issues is exactly what the Government of Beijing wants. They would like nothing more than to erase the memory of the Tiananmen Square massacre from our minds and from the minds of all people around the world. The Chinese Government would like the image of that courageous man standing before the line of tanks and geishas to be erased as quickly as possible. As China grows economically and continues to exert its influence globally and thus considers itself a significant player on the world stage, I believe China should be held to a standard of political, religious, and ethical responsibility.

Our country was founded by those who were seeking basic freedoms, and we have to stand for those who are doing the same in other countries. When basic freedoms can be practiced, countries thrive and prosper because people are free to practice their cultures and beliefs. That is what is happening today.

On the occasion of the 20th anniversary of Tiananmen Square, my colleagues and I have introduced S. Res. 167 to remember the families and the victims who were killed in the June 1989 protest and to call on the Government of China to put an end to its continuing human rights violations. Our country must not remain silent, and many of my fellow colleagues in the Senate who are co-sponsors of this resolution agree.

This resolution calls on the Chinese Government to release all prisoners still in captivity as a result of their suspension in Tiananmen Square protests and to release all others who are currently being imprisoned without cause. This resolution puts the Senate on record, encouraging the Chinese Government to allow freedom of speech and to access information, while ending the harassment, intimidation, and imprisonment practices the government has carried out against those who are minorities and who seek religious freedom. We also call on our government to uphold human rights in China. Our alleged co-sponsors are those who lost their lives and freedoms in Tiananmen Square.

We have this resolution right now. So far, we have co-sponsors who have just found out about it and called in, including, in addition to Senator Brown and myself, Senators Graham, Lieberman, Kyl, Coburn, Vitter, Menendez, Webb, and Brownback. I encourage others to join in this message that I believe is a very clear message that should be sent by the United States.

Today—this very day, this moment—there are 150,000 people who are protesting in Hong Kong right now because of the problems we are addressing with this resolution. So I encourage my colleagues to join in this resolution and get this message out loud and clear.

GUANTANAMO BAY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, one of our colleagues from Illinois was talking about their desire to have those detainees from Guantanamo Bay come into the United States for trial. Let me just suggest—I am not a lawyer, but I do know this: I have spent a lot of time down there. I know the situation. I know it is a resource that we have to have, that we have to keep. There is no justification at all for closing Guantanamo Bay. No justification. All we hear is: Well, this came at a time when there was suspected terrorism or torture of prisoners in other areas. But never at Gitmo. There hasn’t been a documented case of torture that went on there. This is a resource we need.

My friend from Illinois suggests bringing them to this country. The rules of evidence are different. These are not criminals, these are detainees. The proper place for them to be adjudicated is in the tribunals. The only place available right now is the tribunal that is set up in Gitmo. If we bring them to this country, under our laws, quite a few of those would actually be released. When they are released, they could be released into society. For those who say we need to use some other incarceration in the United States, as opposed to using Gitmo, to incarcerate these people, that would become a new magnet for terrorist activity in the United States.

We have to get over this thing of everybody lining up and saying we have to close it. Guantanamo Bay is something we need, and we have to have it. There is not a pleasant alternative. It would cause the release of terrorists in the United States. If that is what the Senator from Illinois and the Democrats and the President want, they are going to find that virtually all Americans disagree with them.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Mr. VOINOVICH. As my colleagues know, supporting the development and expansion of the nuclear industry is something that has been one of my top priorities since I came to the Senate. I have been working to shape nuclear policy in this country at least the past 8 years as chairman or ranking member of the Clean Air and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee. I wish to recognize my colleague, Senator INHOFE, for the leadership he provided before I became chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission committee.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first, I compliment the Senator from Ohio.
When he was Governor of Ohio, he had the reputation of being the most knowledgeable person on air issues. Of course, the primary concern we had at that time was that we had a crisis in energy, and the one thing that had to be in the mix to resolve that crisis was to build more nuclear power plants. There is nobody who has carried that banner more forcefully than the Senator from Ohio. I appreciate our joint efforts to make that happen. I believe we will be successful with the number of applications that are the subject of this hearing, and the progress that has been made.

Mr. VOINOVICH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I take pride in the fact that our committee has helped transform NRC into one of the best and most respected regulatory agencies in the world. We have worked very hard on placing the right people on the Commission and providing the Commission with the resources and tools necessary to do its job and holding them accountable to the results. In fact, we have held more than 20 hearings involving the NRC in the past 8 years. So it is no accident that we have seen a dramatic improvement in the safety culture and the reliability of the 104 operating nuclear reactors today over the past 8 years. Without the public confidence that these plants are safe and secure, there won’t be any nuclear renaissance.

We have spent time and effort to make sure the NRC has the resources—particularly the human capital—it needs to make sure that our 104 nuclear plants are operating safely but also to ensure it can process multiple license renewal applications and combined license applications for the new plants coming on board. We wanted to make sure the NRC doesn’t become the bottleneck.

In 2005, we introduced three pieces of legislation as part of the 2005 Energy Policy Act to provide flexibility in hiring and employee retention. As a result, the NRC was able to hire over 1,000 highly qualified engineers and scientists over the last 3 years to replace retiring workers and also bring on those new people who are going to be necessary to process the new applications coming in. I am also pleased to note that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has been rated as the best place to work by the top regulatory agency for 2 years in a row. They have a great workforce, and they are a top-notch organization.

The good news is that the NRC now has 17 applications for 26 new power reactors under review. All indications are that NRC’s review of the applications is progressing on schedule. I haven’t heard a complaint from anybody who filed applications. We are expecting that these applications will be approved in late 2010 or in early 2011. Obviously, it is not a done deal yet. We have every reason to believe we are on the right track. As a matter of fact, five utility companies today—Southern in Georgia, SCANA in South Carolina, NRG in Texas, Constellation in Maryland, and Progress in Florida—have signed engineering-procurement-construction contracts and are gearing up for construction pending NRC approval and loan guarantees from the DOE. In other words, it is not a done deal, but we have every reason to believe we are on the right track. As a matter of fact, we have every reason to believe we are on the right track. As a matter of fact, every reason to believe we are on the right track. As a matter of fact, every reason to believe we are on the right track. As a matter of fact, every reason to believe we are on the right track. As a matter of fact, every reason to believe we are on the right track.

Mr. President, I have an opinion piece I wrote in the Nuclear News magazine last year, entitled “Making the Case for Nuclear.” This paper outlines the need to expand the use of nuclear energy in the carbon-constrained economy and provides a roadmap to overcome challenges faced by the nuclear industry.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to read this. Anybody interested can get it on my Web site, voinvovich.senate.gov.

As I watch the climate change debate unfold in this Congress, I rise to raise in case in point: Prime Minister Gordon Brown recently signaled his intent to rebuild nuclear power. In fact, France exports 80 percent of its electricity comes from the nuclear renaissance is in full swing. In France, for example, almost 80 percent of its electricity comes from nuclear power. In fact, France exports 80 percent of its electricity generated to its neighboring countries, including Germany. President Sarkozy has announced plans to build five additional plants within the next 5 years, in addition to one currently under construction.

Prime Minister Gordon Brown recently signaled his intent to build nuclear energy in the United Kingdom, saying: “Whether we like it or not, we will not meet the challenge by running the gauntlet of nuclear power without the far wider use of nuclear power.” He went on to note that the International Energy Agency estimates that we are going to have to build 32 nuclear powerplants each year if we are going to halve greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. That is more than 1,300 new reactors.

Italy, Finland, and Switzerland have all announced plans to build new reactors after spending the past 25 years to shutter their phases of nuclear power. These European countries have come full circle in reembracing nuclear after two decades of trying to solve their energy and environmental challenges with conservation and renewables alone. That is a significant step.

Unfortunately, many proponents of a cap-and-trade scheme, such as Lieberman-Warner or Waxman-Markey, seem to be stuck on fantasies that we can achieve the emission reduction goals with just conservation, efficiency, and renewables. Even those who believe nuclear has a role to play espouse policies that overwhelmingly favor renewables over nuclear. As I watch the climate change debate unfold in this Congress, I rise to raise the case in point: Prime Minister Gordon Brown recently signaled his intent to rebuild nuclear power. In fact, France exports 80 percent of its electricity comes from the nuclear renaissance is in full swing. In France, for example, almost 80 percent of its electricity comes from nuclear power. In fact, France exports 80 percent of its electricity generated to its neighboring countries, including Germany. President Sarkozy has announced plans to build five additional plants within the next 5 years, in addition to one currently under construction.

Prime Minister Gordon Brown recently signaled his intent to build nuclear energy in the United Kingdom, saying: “Whether we like it or not, we will not meet the challenge by running the gauntlet of nuclear power without the far wider use of nuclear power.” He went on to note that the International Energy Agency estimates that we are going to have to build 32 nuclear powerplants each year if we are going to halve greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. That is more than 1,300 new reactors.

Italy, Finland, and Switzerland have all announced plans to build new reactors after spending the past 25 years to shutter their phases of nuclear power. These European countries have come full circle in reembracing nuclear after two decades of trying to solve their energy and environmental challenges with conservation and renewables alone. That is a significant step.

Unfortunately, many proponents of a cap-and-trade scheme, such as Lieberman-Warner or Waxman-Markey, seem to be stuck on fantasies that we can achieve the emission reduction goals with just conservation, efficiency, and renewables. Even those who believe nuclear has a role to play espouse policies that overwhelmingly favor renewables over nuclear. In case in point: Prime Minister Gordon Brown recently signaled his intent to rebuild nuclear power. In fact, France exports 80 percent of its electricity comes from the nuclear renaissance is in full swing. In France, for example, almost 80 percent of its electricity comes from nuclear power. In fact, France exports 80 percent of its electricity generated to its neighboring countries, including Germany. President Sarkozy has announced plans to build five additional plants within the next 5 years, in addition to one currently under construction.

Prime Minister Gordon Brown recently signaled his intent to build nuclear energy in the United Kingdom, saying: “Whether we like it or not, we will not meet the challenge by running the gauntlet of nuclear power without the far wider use of nuclear power.” He went on to note that the International Energy Agency estimates that we are going to have to build 32 nuclear powerplants each year if we are going to halve greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. That is more than 1,300 new reactors.
American people about the reality of what is possible. They continually tout the need to increase the renewable energies to solve our dependence on foreign sources of energy. They say we need to double our use of renewable power. I tell you this: A doubling of the utilization of renewables will bring us to 6 percent, and it would likely take at least 10 years or more to accomplish. Further, it is unlikely that a doubling in renewables would lead to any significant decrease in the use of oil because of the industry's reliance on oil for 2 percent of the electricity in the country today.

Particularly, I think it is incredible that some policymakers, such as the newly appointed Chairman of FERC, suggest we can get our energy needs strictly from renewable sources of energy. Give me a break. At only 3 percent of total U.S. electric generation, it is simply intellectually dishonest to suggest that these renewable sources can replace some of the base-load electricity currently generated by coal and nuclear in this country. Don’t let me get wrong. I do support expanding the use of renewables such as solar and wind, and we see that industry growing in my State. But to just say that is it and not to look at reality is intellectually dishonest. My point is that, realistically, we are not yet in a position to be able to rely on them for base-load power generation. This is despite receiving government subsidies.

Here is another little statistic people are not aware of. Most Americans are not aware of the fact that, in 2007, nuclear energy only—this is according to the Energy Information Agency—received a $1.59-per-megawatt-hour subsidy while wind received $23.37 and solar received $24.34 per megawatt hour.

Today, there is a huge energy gap between renewable electricity and the reliable, low-cost electricity we must have. We need to look at the way to get the job done. If we want to generate carbon-free electricity, nuclear needs to be a big part of it—I am not saying the only part, but it has to be a big part.

The 104 nuclear powerplants we have operating today, which is 20 percent of the electricity generated, represent over 70 percent of the Nation’s emission-free portfolio. In other words, the 20 percent coming from nuclear represents 70 percent of the emission-free electricity in this country.

That means we are avoiding 700 million tons of carbon dioxide each year because of nuclear—700 million tons. What does that mean to the ordinary citizen? That means 13 million tons is avoided by wind and solar today. That is compared with 700 million in terms of nuclear power. To put this in perspective, 700 million tons of annual greenhouse gas emissions is being avoided by our nuclear plants is more than what Canada collectively emits each year. In other words, nuclear nonemitting into the air is the equivalent of all of Canada. In terms of something we may better understand, it is the equivalent of 130 million cars each year. That is what nuclear power is doing for us. In effect, it is the equivalent of reducing emissions of 130 million automobiles each year in the United States.

Nuclear power is the best source we have available to meet our energy needs while also curbing emissions of greenhouse gases. People are recognizing the importance of nuclear energy because they understand the facts.

Public opinion widely supports utilizing nuclear energy. According to a recent Gallup poll, 59 percent of Americans support it. We are not going to be able to turn around our economy, meet our energy needs, and enact some of the environmental policies being discussed today without expanding the use of nuclear energy.

I look at nuclear as a three-fer. Without it, we are not going to be able to provide the base-load electricity we are going to need for our country. And without it, we are not going to be able to rebuild our manufacturing base in this country.

At a time when we are struggling to regain our economic footing, nuclear energy offers thousands of well-paying jobs in all stages of development and production. Each new nuclear plant will require an average of 2,000 workers during construction, with peak employment at 2,500 workers. If the industry were to construct 30 reactors that are currently planned, well over 60,000 workers would be required during construction. And once constructed, each plant will create 600 to 700 jobs to operate and maintain it.

That is not to mention the ripple effect this undertaking would make in other industries. Aris Candris, CEO of Westinghouse Electric, and Mike Rencheck, president of AREVA, recently told me that about 12,000 jobs will be created for each new nuclear plant if you include the manufacturing jobs.

This means that more than 200,000 manufacturing jobs will be created to supply the needed parts and components for the 30 nuclear reactors that are currently planned. And that is not counting the jobs associated with export opportunities to Europe, China, and India.

Organized labor understands expanding nuclear power will create a lot of well-paying jobs. In fact, here is what John Sweeney said at a roundtable discussion on nuclear workforce issues I chaired last year:

This isn’t a Republican issue. This isn’t a Democratic issue. It’s an American issue.

I couldn’t agree with him more. I have met with Mark Ayers, Build- ing and Construction Trades national president, a big union. He and his union members are actively supporting construction of new nuclear plants.

They have also partnered with local community colleges and the nuclear industry in training workers. They are already training workers for the renaissance.

I have been working hard to get this message out for several years. Ohio and the surrounding Midwestern States have been the backbone of this Nation’s nuclear manufacturing base. Ohio’s small to medium-size enterprises are poised to lead the Nation’s transition back into this market. In fact, hundreds of manufacturing jobs are already in existence in Ohio to support the nuclear industry, and more are to come in light of two announcements that are going to be coming up in the next couple of weeks that Ohioans will be very happy about that again will increase the number of people working in this industry.

I recently gave a speech at the Nuclear Manufacturing Infrastructure Council and had an opportunity to talk to some of these company executives. Their message was loud and clear: A clear policy statement from the administration and Congress is absolutely critical in acknowledging that nuclear power generation will be a key part of our Nation’s energy mix and investments in programs that will support the nuclear industry’s near-term implementation needs are absolutely vital. The No. 1 thing is getting that $50 billion loan guarantee so we can get more of these people off the ground.

They all see the long-term potential growth in nuclear and they would like to invest in nuclear manufacturing, but they need a clear commitment from the government before they make those investments.

I think what these people are saying is we need Presidential leadership to acknowledge what most of us and the rest of the world already know: We need to get there. We need to get there now, without nuclear.

I am convinced that nuclear power is the only real alternative we have today to produce enough low-cost, reliable, clean energy to remove harmful pollutants from the air, prevent the harmful effects of global climate change, and keep jobs from going overseas.

The biggest challenge remains the financing, particularly in nonregulated States. The deepening global economic crisis is putting additional pressure on the nuclear industry and on utilities. As I mentioned, we have applications coming in, but right now DOE currently has 14 nuclear projects, representing a total project cost of $188 billion, and loan guarantee requests of $122 billion. Basically what I am saying is that unless we can get this $50 billion loan guarantee taken care of, it is going to bring the progress we have been making to a halt.

A very important point that often goes overlooked in this discussion is the fact that the loan guarantee program authorized under the Energy Policy Act requires the borrowers to pay all the
The 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act established a nuclear waste fund, a fee paid by utilities to create a fund to deal with nuclear waste. Since its beginning, it has collected over $20 billion. However, the lack of a repository has inhibited us from licensing new reactors.

That being said, we must pursue a long-term solution now. If Yucca Mountain fails, then we owe the American people a viable alternative. The 1992 Nuclear Waste Policy Act established a nuclear waste fund, a fee paid by utilities to create a fund to deal with nuclear waste. Since its beginning, it has collected over $20 billion. However, the lack of a repository has inhibited us from licensing new reactors.

In my hand, I have a copy of a recent MIT study on the future of nuclear power. The authors of this study include former Clinton administration officials John Deutch and Ernest Moniz. The central premise of the MIT study on the future of nuclear power is that in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and mitigate global warming, we must reevaluate the role nuclear power has as part of this country's energy future.

I want to share the conclusions of this report because I believe it fits rather nicely with this speech:

The current assistance program put into place by the 2005 Energy Policy Act has not been effective and needs to be improved. The sobering fact is that more is not doing clear power will diminish as a practical and timely option for deployment at a scale that would constitute a material contribution to climate change risk mitigation.

I commend to my colleagues this MIT report on the future of nuclear power.

Another issue that has plagued the nuclear industry for decades is the United States government's failure to meet its commitments to ensure responsibility for spent nuclear fuel. First, let's set the record straight. I have talked with many experts and policy people, including Secretary Chu and NRC Chairman Klein. They all assured me—it is impossible for everyone in this room to not understand this—that the current spent nuclear that is being stored today in dry casks and pools are safe—are safe—and secure for at least 100 years. That is very important because folks are saying you cannot go forward with this because we don't know what to do with the waste; we would like to do something more permanent than what we are doing.

But the fact is that with the dry casks we have, we are in good shape for at least 100 years. The lack of a repository at Yucca Mountain should not be something that inhibits us from licensing new reactors.

That being said, we must pursue a long-term solution now. If Yucca Mountain fails, then we owe the American people a viable alternative. The 1992 Nuclear Waste Policy Act established a nuclear waste fund, a fee paid by utilities to create a fund to deal with nuclear waste. Since its beginning, it has collected over $20 billion. So everything we have discussed so far, since that act went into effect, we have collected $29 billion from ratepayers in this country. Unfortunately, the fund is on

required fees, including what is called a subsidy cost and, thus, there is no cost to the government. In other words, if they borrow $5 billion, they are going to have to come up with close to $1 billion to secure that loan so if things do not go well on the loan, we have a billion to pay.

The subsidy cost is levied on each loan guarantee, similar to a downpayment on a mortgage, in case of a default. Any potential defaults are covered by fees paid by the applicants.

In fact, I was on a climate change ribbon panel about a month ago that was sponsored by the German Marshall Fund, when we met in Brussels. I was amazed at the number of people who said: Mr. Senator, we are never going to meet the Kyoto or Copenhagen goals for reducing our emissions without the use of nuclear power.

It is time President Obama and this Congress get it. We have to launch a nuclear renaissance in this country. We just cannot get there from here without nuclear.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

The Senator from Florida.

THE STIMULUS

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, the question that has been posted before the Senate is, What has the stimulus bill done? It has some famous name—the recovery bill— but, in effect, it is known as the stimulus bill. It was an expensive bill. With the country in the economic doldrums that we have been in, it was hoped it was going to get money out there in the economy and provide a kind of electric shock therapy and stimulate the economy to get it moving again; that it would turn the engine of the economy and, therefore, as those dollars in the stimulus bill got injected into the economy and it turned over, it was going to create jobs.

Indeed, the number of jobs that it was expected the stimulus was going to create was something like 2% million. So the question is: Is it stimulating the economy? Well, a few minutes ago, the CEO of the Shands Health Care Center at the University of Florida was in my office. He told me the story of how the Shands Hospital in Jacksonville—there are a number of these Shands Hospitals; it is a true medical center complex over several cities—was short some $35 million, and he didn't know what he was going to do and how that was going to affect their operation—possibly the shutdown of major portions of that hospital.

Remember that one part of the stimulus was that we were putting out money into Medicaid to help the States, and there were States that had not been doing their part on Medicaid,