by shifting costs from an unregulated utility-owned business to the public utility. We can agree to disagree on whether FERC needs new authority or simply needs to exercise its existing authority. I anticipate that FERC will use its existing and new authority to address demands designed by small businesses and financial groups, but I agree that if there are problems, we should take a look at them.

Mr. BROWNBACK. The amendment is simply intended to ensure a level playing field between small businesses and utility affiliates, to protect ratepayers, and the financial integrity of utilities, and to preserve fair competition.

Mr. DOMENICI. I commit to the Senators from Wisconsin and Kansas that I will work with them through conference to ensure that the final version of this bill does not undermine consumer protections or the financial integrity of utilities, or harm America’s small businesses and public utility companies. Finally, I suggest a General Accounting Office report on affirmative action transactions by holding companies and affiliate businesses of public utility companies. Such a report could be a useful resource for us in the future.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I commit to the Senators from Wisconsin and Kansas that I will work on this important issue in conference and ensure that the Energy Committee holds a hearing on this important consumer protection, fair competition, and financial integrity issue. In addition, I agree to request, jointly with the Senators from Wisconsin and Kansas, a GAO investigation into the potential for abusive transactions by holding companies and affiliate businesses of public utility companies, such as such a report could be a useful resource for us in the future.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I appreciate the chairman and ranking member’s commitment and look forward to working with them.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Yes, we thank you and look forward to working with the committee on this common-sense proposal.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to address the issue of climate change and the various proposals that have been debated this week on the energy bill including the McCain-Lieberman amendment, the Hagel amendment, and the Bingaman-Specter amendment. Climate change is a matter of great international importance and I believe any successful plan to address it must balance environmental protection with the need for economic development and jobs.

I have voted many times for environmental protection for renewable energy and conservation measures. Most recently, in the Energy bill I voted for the Bingaman amendment to mandate that 10 percent of U.S. electricity production be from renewable sources by 2020. I also supported the Cantwell amendment to reduce U.S. oil consumption by over 7 million barrels per day by 2025, in addition to the 1 million barrel per day reduction by 2015 already incorporated into the Energy bill which I have advocated.

On climate change specifically, the most recent vote of significance prior to the current debate was on October 30, 2005, when the Senate voted on the McCain-Lieberman bill, S. 129, the Climate Stewardship Act, which failed by a vote of 43 to 55. The Senate again today rejected a similar amendment to the Energy bill by a vote of 38 to 60. I voted against this amendment and the previous bill because it is very difficult to meet the strict emissions limit of the year 2000 by the year 2010 in times of unpredictable national and State economies. Additionally, it is very difficult to limit industry in the United States when we do not have a plan for the rest of the world in curtailing greenhouse gas emissions. I have urged the President to work through international means to address global climate change and support his efforts and those of individual companies to voluntarily curb domestic emissions, but I cannot sit by and see current efforts taken in the future on a multinational basis.

I have been encouraged by the recent efforts of Senator BINGAMAN, the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to bring to the Senate a proposal based on the recommendations of the National Commission on Energy Policy, NCEP, which issued its report in December 2004. The Commission’s recommended approach on climate change would be to implement a mandatory, economy-wide, tradable-permits system designed to curb growth in U.S. greenhouse gas emissions by 2.4 percent in 2010, while capping initial costs at $7 per metric ton of carbon equivalent. This would start the U.S. on a path toward reducing greenhouse gas emissions compared to business as usual, while calling for Government reviews at 5 year intervals of global action on climate change. This new approach addressed two of the basic questions that have led, in my opinion, to the failure of the McCain-Lieberman legislation concerns about cost and U.S. action in the context of international efforts.

In contrast to Senator BINGAMAN’s amendments calling for Congress to enact a comprehensive and effective national program of mandatory, market-based limits on emissions of greenhouse gases that slow, stop, and reverse the growth of such emissions. It calls for this to be done in a manner that will not significantly harm the U.S. economy and will encourage comparable action by other nations that are major trading partners and key contributors to global emissions. This amendment received a very substantial vote of 54-43 against tabling, or setting it aside, and was subsequently accepted by voice vote.

I am also pleased to see the action taken by the Senate to include the Hagel amendment to the Energy bill, which would promote the adoption of technologies that reduce greenhouse gas intensity—emissions per dollar of GDP—by providing loan guarantees for up to 25 percent of the total cost of eligible projects that employ advanced climate technologies or systems. This amendment also promotes the adoption of such technologies in developing countries by allowing U.S. companies that invest in such technologies overseas to fully deduct the cost of investment. I supported this amendment because I believe it is a step in the right direction, however, I believe further action is necessary to address global climate change.

While I was unable to support the McCain-Lieberman amendment, I believe the actions on the Hagel and Bingaman-Specter amendments will give us the ability to fund a deal with global climate change. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate on this important issue in the hopes of finding common ground and a sensible balance between the goals of environmental protection and economic development.

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, the long-standing moratorium in place on oil and gas exploration in the Outer Continental Shelf has slowed our vital coastal areas from drilling. This moratorium has worked. Over the last quarter century, North Carolina’s coast has become an increasingly popular destination. North Carolina’s Outer Banks are world-famous for their beauty. The influx of tourists have brought much needed dollars and jobs and lifted up what previously were some of the poorest counties in the state.

Today, however, our coastal communities and economies face a great threat—the provision that would allow individual states to “opt out” of the moratorium, and not just for exploration but for actual drilling off the coast.

A State’s decision to opt out of the moratorium and drill for oil would obviously affect its neighboring States. Water borders are not like land borders. Water actually knows no borders. It is fluid, continuous and moving. An environmental hazard caused by drilling off the coast of one State would not be problematic for just that State. An oil spill would just keep spilling across these supposed “borders” and spilling into the waters of neighbor States. This is just common sense. It would negatively impact water quality, fisheries, wildlife, tourism and local economies.

As I stated Tuesday during another offshore drilling debate, drilling off our coast would endanger North Carolina’s booming tourism industry, a true economic engine of my state.