

He said:

We cannot wait for the final proof—the smoking gun—that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud.

Mr. President, again, it was not true. The committee's report states:

Statements by the President and the Vice President indicating that Saddam Hussein was prepared to give weapons of mass destruction to terrorist groups for attacks against the United States were contradicted by available intelligence information.

At the time of the President's speech, the intelligence community believed Saddam Hussein did not possess nuclear weapons. The President preyed on Americans' fears of a nuclear attack, perhaps the most terrible fear we could have, to bolster his case for an unwarranted war.

Finally, the President led the American people to believe if it came to war in Iraq, America's military would easily help liberate a grateful nation. In Cincinnati, in 2002, he said:

If military action is necessary, the United States and our allies will help the Iraqi people to rebuild their economy, and create the institutions of liberty and a unified Iraq at peace with its neighbors.

This was the "hope against all evidence."

Analysis by the Defense Intelligence Agency assessed that:

The Iraqi populace will adopt an ambivalent attitude toward liberation.

That is an understatement.

The CIA wrote, in August 2002, that "traditional Iraqi political culture has been inhospitable to democracy."

According to the committee's report:

Statements by President Bush and Vice President CHENEY regarding the postwar situation, in Iraq in terms of the political, security, and economic [situation], did not reflect the concerns and uncertainties expressed in the intelligence products.

The view of the President and Vice President that American troops would be "greeted as liberators" did not take into account the complex social, political, and sectarian dynamics at work about which the intelligence community was well aware. Yet this administration still led the American people to believe our troops would be welcomed, that the war would be short, that the burden in lives and dollars would be light, and that victory would be absolute. This delusion has cost our service men and women and our Nation every day since. Once again, it was not true. It just was not true.

If this administration had made the least effort to give an honest review of classified intelligence, it would have been known to be untrue. All too often in these 7 long years we have seen this administration cast aside facts and principles that did not conform with its political aims.

We have seen it attempt to take great institutions of our country—our intelligence community, our Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Justice—and twist them to its own ends, without due regard for the welfare of the American people. I be-

lieve the irresponsibility and mismanagement of this administration will go down in our history as among the darkest moments our Government has witnessed. It rocks the very fiber of democracy when our Government is put to these uses. We do not yet know all the damage that has been done. Yet we hope, through the efforts of this committee and this body, to continue the long and difficult repair work we have begun.

We can look ahead to next January when we in our Nation can begin again with a new administration, an administration that will not break the essential compact of honesty with the American people.

#### READING IS FUN WEEK

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, let me briefly compliment the Senate staff for their patience and diligence yesterday when put to the task of reading the bill. I know it was Reading Is Fun Week in Rhode Island from May 12 to May 18. I guess the minority found an interesting way of making it "Reading Is Fun Day" in the Senate yesterday.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

#### GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to urge my colleagues to put aside our partisan differences. Let's follow the leadership of Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator WARNER, and Senator BOXER and find a way to move forward with the global warming legislation. It is so important to this country.

The scientific information is clear. There is something happening out there. We all know about it. We know the weather changes. We see extreme weather taking place—the droughts, the floods, the impact it is having on our food chain, the drought in Australia with the wheat crop and what it has done with bread prices. In my State of Maryland we see the warming of the Chesapeake Bay and the impact it has on blue crabs with the eelgrass which is critically important for juvenile crabs not being there.

The Governor imposed a restriction on the taking of blue crabs during this season. I could give 100 more examples.

If I can't convince my colleagues on the science, let me refer to an issue on which we can all agree; that is, we need energy independence. Our global warming bill leads us to energy independence. We need energy independence for national security, so we are not dependent upon other countries. We need energy independence so we don't have to wake up every morning to find out what OPEC is doing that affects gasoline prices in the United States. We need energy independence for our environment.

This legislation uses market forces to solve the problem of greenhouse

gases. We did that with acid rain, and it worked, far less expensively than the projections, and the benefit ratio to cost was 40 to 1. If we unleash our economy, we can solve this problem.

Let me state the obvious: When we invest in renewables—and this legislation does—we invest in energy efficiency. If we invest in public transportation, we are going to have less use of gasoline by Americans—yes, less use of oil. If we have less use of oil, gasoline prices are going to go down, supply and demand. If we have less use of oil, we are going to be less dependent on other countries. If we use less oil, we control our own economic future.

But this legislation goes further than that, providing assistance for, perhaps, consequences we can't fully understand. So we provide help to heavy industry. Maryland is a proud manufacturing State. It has a great history of manufacturing. I want to make sure Maryland has a future in manufacturing. This legislation deals with that, providing help to our industries. We don't know exactly what impact it is going to have on different constituencies. The legislation provides help for consumers. Just as importantly, this legislation provides that it is deficit neutral; that we will make sure we don't have to borrow more money. In fact, this legislation will mean Americans will borrow less. It is good for our economy.

Another part of this bill I found very helpful and that hasn't received a lot of attention is that we establish a level playing field so if other countries don't put a cap on their carbon emissions, they have to pay a tariff to bring their product to America, so that we don't put American manufacturers, producers, or farmers at a competitive disadvantage.

There is one particular section of this bill I would like to underscore and I am particularly proud of because I introduced the amendment in committee and worked with Senator BOXER, and that is the public transit provisions. It provides over \$170 billion during the life of the bill to build stronger public transportation in America. One-third of all CO<sub>2</sub> emissions come from transportation. But in the last 15 years, 50 percent of the increase in our emissions have come from the transportation sector.

The projected growth in the next 30 years of vehicle traffic alone would negate all the benefit from the CAFE standard increases we passed last year if we don't take more aggressive steps to get cars off the road. Public transportation is critically important. It reduces emissions.

People are interested in public transportation. Since 1995, we have seen a 32-percent increase in ridership, 10.3 billion passenger trips in 2007. In the first quarter of this year, there has been a 3.3-percent increase in public transportation. That is 85 million more trips on public transportation. The problem is the physical infrastructure