RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 14, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 14) to enhance the energy security of the United States, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Campbell/Domenici amendment No. 864, to replace ''tribal consortia'' with ''tribal energy resource development organizations''.

Dorgan amendment No. 865, to require that the hydrogen commercialization plan of the Department of Energy include a description of activities to support certain hydrogen technology deployment goals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 30 minutes equally divided for debate in relationship to the Dorgan amendment No. 865.

The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 865

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered is an amendment we will vote on this morning. I was disappointed yesterday to discover that there was opposition to the amendment. This is an amendment that passed without opposition in the last Congress. So surprisingly now I am discovering that some have changed their mind.

I will describe why, if this Congress has any gumption at all to decide that we ought to change course and move in a new direction and be bold and big when we think about our energy future, they will support this amendment.

President Bush said the following about our dependence on foreign oil in his State of the Union Address: America's energy security is threatened by our dependence on foreign oil. He said: We import 55 percent of the oil we consume. That is expected to grow to 68 percent by 2025. Nearly all of our cars and trucks run on gasoline. They are the main reason America imports so much oil—that, from President Bush—two-thirds of the 20 million barrels of oil we use each day for transportation.

Fuel cell vehicles offer the best hope of reducing our dependence on foreign oil. The President said that because he was proposing a new direction for America's energy supply: Hydrogen and fuel cells.

Following his State of the Union Address in which he proposed that, he had a gathering at the Building Museum in Washington, DC. He invited all of the industry leaders throughout the country to come. He gave a great speech. I was there with my colleague Senator DOMENICI. We were invited to be a part of it. He talked again about striking out in this new direction and talked about developing hydrogen and fuel cells as part of our future. That made sense to me.

I have spoken often of the first old car I had when I was a young kid. I bought a Model T Ford and restored it as an old antique. The way you gas up this 1924 Model T Ford is you pull up to a pump, stick a hose in the tank, and pump it full of gas. And what do you do with a 2003 Ford? Exactly the same thing. Nothing has changed in almost a century. We are still running gasoline through those carburetors.

What the President says—and I agree with him—is let's decide to change that and reduce our dependence on foreign oil because that is where the growth in energy use is coming; that is, on America's roads and America's vehicles. Do we want to be at a point where we have over one-half of our oil coming from off our shores, much of it from very troubled parts of the world? Do we want to be at the point where we have 68 percent of it coming from other parts of the world, where if, God forbid, some morning we woke up and discovered terrorists had interrupted the supply of oil and this American economy would be flat on its back? Is that how what we want to be held hostage? I do not think so.

So the President says let's strike out in a new direction. He proposed $1.2 billion on a hydrogen program. It is exactly the right thing to do. I commend him for it. But $1.2 billion is timid; it is not enough. Nonetheless, it is moving in the right direction, and for this American President to put his administration on the line to move in that direction is not insignificant at all; it is very significant.

I have pushed and pushed, and now this Energy bill has almost tripled the amount the President recommended for a new hydrogen-based economy and fuel cell future.

I proposed $6.5 billion over 5 years, an Apollo-type program. President Kennedy said: Let's put a man on the Moon by the end of the decade. He set a goal. And we did. I said: Let's have an Apollo program, decide we are going to move toward a hydrogen fuel cell future for our vehicles.

Do my colleagues know that a vehicle is twice as efficient using a fuel cell as it is using gasoline through a carburetor? It is double the efficiency getting power to the wheel. And what do you get out the back end of a vehicle that uses hydrogen in a fuel cell? Water vapor. You are not driving around town belching black smoke. You get water vapor. It is good for the environment, good for this country's energy security, and good for this country's economy. The fact is, this is moving in exactly the right direction. So I commend President Bush.

We also made progress in the Energy Committee, saying let's increase that which the President recommended, but it is still short of where we ought to be, No. 1. No. 2, it does not include targets and timetables. I do not suggest they be mandatory, but I do say this: Let's decide where we are headed, and when we give the Department of Energy and others $3 billion plus, let's say here is where we would like to go, here is our destination, here is our map. I say let's aspire to have 100,000 vehicles on the road in the year 2010 that are hydrogen-powered fuel cell vehicles and 2½ million vehicles by 2020.

My colleague yesterday said, well, we think maybe it is a mandate. I said, no, it is not a mandate at all. Just ask the Department of Energy to develop a strategy that says here is what we would like to do. We cannot force that to happen, but at least a goal is established.

Japan has goals and strategies with respect to hydrogen and fuel cells. They are moving very quickly. Europe is moving very quickly. Japan wants 50,000 by 2010 and 5 million vehicles by 2020. General Motors has a goal of having 1 million vehicles by 2010—Ford, Nissan, DaimlerChrysler. The fact is, the industry is moving very quickly as well.

I just do not happen to think we ought to throw a bunch of money at Energy and say: Do what you can with it and report back. I guarantee, if $3 billion or $3.5 billion is put into a bureaucratic envelope and sent down to an agency and they are told to report to us when they have half a notion and tell us what they have done, we are not going to make much progress.

What I believe this Congress ought to do is say: Here is what we aspire to achieve. This is a big, bold plan, and we want to make progress. We would like by the year 2010 on the streets in this country 100,000 automobiles that are powered by hydrogen and use fuel cells. We would like 2½ million by the year 2020.

Why do I say we need some targets and timetables? Because this is not easy to do. This is not something that one company can do or one industry can do. This requires a combination of private sector investment and initiative, and it requires public policy that accommodates this conversion.

First of all, we have to deal in a whole range of areas. How do you produce hydrogen? Hydrogen is everywhere. It comes from everything. It can come from natural gas, from coal, you can take hydrogen from water. You can use a wind turbine and produce electricity from the air and use that electricity to separate oxygen and hydrogen in water, store the hydrogen, use it in a fuel cell, and double the efficiency of how you power an automobile and have water vapor coming out of the tail pipe of the automobile. How wonderful this country's future. But it will not happen unless the Congress and the President decide we are going to move to a different future.

The first antique car I bought and restored when I was a kid was 75 years old. I put gas in it the same way I put gas in a car today. It is never going to

change unless in public policy we accommodate the private sector's investment and the initiative that comes from both the private sector and public policy, to say here is where our country aspires to be. Here is where we want our country to move with respect to an energy bill.

There is a lot to this Energy Bill. Any energy bill worth anything, in my judgment, has to incentivize additional production. It has to provide for significant amounts of conservation because we are wasting a great deal of energy. It has to provide for new efficiencies with respect to all the appliances we use. Most importantly, in my judgment, the fourth title of an energy bill has to be limitless renewable sources of energy. Yes, that is ethanol, which we debated last week; it is biodiesel; but most importantly, it is trying to move toward a new energy future with respect to our vehicle fleet. That is hydrogen and fuel cells.

I am not talking during this conversation about stationary engines, although that is another application for fuel cells, and we have fuel cells that are deployed and being used in this country. We also have fuel cells and vehicles using hydrogen. I have driven one. We have had a fuel cell vehicle drive from California to New York. It is not as if this technology does not exist. It does. Like all other new technologies, it is originally very expensive. As the research and development into the new models and prototypes are done, it is very expensive. But those costs come down, down, way down, as our country embraces the notion that we want a different future for our vehicle fleet; we want a hydrogen fuel cell future that relieves this country of being held hostage by sources of oil that come from out of our country.

If we just think for a moment about that, this American economy is the strongest economic engine in the entire world by far. There is nothing close to it. Yet some catastrophic event could happen that could shut off this supply of oil to this country because over half of it comes from outside of our shores. Something could happen to shut off the supply and this economy would grind to a halt. It would be flat on its back. And everybody knows it. When it happens, if it happens, and God forbid it happens, but if it happens everyone will say, We told you so. That is why this President wants to move to a different path, go to a different place, to embrace hydrogen and fuel cells, and has stated so in a State of the Union Address. He is dead right. We have to do that.

I don't understand why establishing an aspired-to target and timetables engenders opposition. A year and a half ago when I offered this amendment it was accepted by voice vote. I have no idea why all of a sudden some people say, this is radical. What a bunch of nonsense. Radical? Yesterday, I was told, what we are talking about are wild guesses: 100,000 vehicles by 2010, 2.5 million by 2020. Do you think General Motors has an aspiration of putting 1 million cars on the road by producing 1 million fuel cell cars by 2010? Do you think they go to the board of directors and say, We have a wild guess to talk to you about. These are not wild guesses. This is public policy, from our standpoint, of stating our goals.

I find it fascinating; although this is not a mandate at all, it is trying to establish some benchmarks. Instead of just giving money to bureaucrats or a Federal agency and saying report back when you get half a notion and let us know how you are doing—the report will show not much is going on. Instead of mandates, I put some targets in and say, aspire to achieve these. We ask the Department of Energy to give us a strategy on how they will achieve these.

Some who would not want to put this kind of a strategy or this sort of a target in law will come to the Senate and say, on national missile defense, we are going to spend $9 billion this year on national missile defense and we demand you deploy a system. It does not matter whether it is not ready or whether the technology does not exist, and it does not matter if you cannot hit a bullet with another speeding bullet; we demand you deploy that system by 2004. So the mandated targets are fine with respect to a national missile defense system for which you want to spend $9 billion.

All of a sudden, when the President says, do a hydrogen fuel cell initiative for America's energy security and you put in a rather weak, in my judgment, set of targets, just so you have targets rather than no targets and timetables, they say, gosh, what on Earth are you doing here? Why would you suggest that?

I suggest this, because I think if we are going to spend money, we ought to spend it effectively. If you are going to go on a journey, you might want to get a map. If you want to take a trip to go to a different kind of energy future, you might want to have a spot in mind about your different nation. Those who want to take the taxpayers' money and throw it at a problem and send it to an agency and say, do the best you can, I say, God bless you, but I will show you how not to make progress. Just do that, keep doing that, and you will never, ever, make progress.

If we want a different energy future, then we have to be driving the train. We have to decide this is what we aspire to achieve; these are the goals we set for our country. If you do not want to set goals, do not tell me you support an energy future different from today. Don't tell me you want to withdraw and disconnect from 55 percent dependence on foreign energy—55 percent going to 68 percent. This is a habit that is destructive to this country. It is destructive to our future, and it is destructive to our security. It is a habit we must end. This President has supported an approach to do that.

I have worked on hydrogen for some while, as have others in the Congress, Republicans and Democrats. But working on hydrogen and fuel cells to try to move to a different energy future, while a worthwhile enterprise, is not going to move us down the road unless this Congress decides to be bold and decides to have big dreams and big goals. The fact is, we try to incrementalize everything. We talk big and think little. If we want to do something, this amendment should be attached to this Energy Bill. As I said before, this amendment was accepted by voice vote 2 years ago. I don't have the foggiest understanding of why someone would oppose this. It is not a mandate. It is not a wild guess. It is not radical. In fact, in many ways it is the most conservative of approaches to say, let's not spend money unless we know what we are going to do with it, unless we have a strategy, unless we aspire to achieve certain goals good for this country and that fit with what the President intends to have happen with respect to a hydrogen and fuel cell future.

I ask unanimous consent Senator FEINSTEIN be added as a cosponsor to my amendment No. 865 to Senate Bill S. 14.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I understand my time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes and the other side will be added 5 additional minutes to the closing side.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me show a couple of photographs that might be helpful for people to understand what this issue is about. This is a DaimlerChrysler fuel cell bus introduced in Germany in 1997 that runs on fuel cells. I rode on a fuel cell bus in California. For anyone who thinks this technology does not exist, it does. We have fuel cells. We use hydrogen.

Let me give another example of what is happening in the private sector: The Ford Focus fuel cell vehicle, 2002.

This is a Nissan Xterra, fueled by compressed hydrogen that was tested on a California road beginning in 2001.

This General Motors Hy-Wire fuel cell concept car was unveiled in August of 2002.

Let me make a point about all of this. You can't convert a vehicle fleet in this country from a fleet that pulls up to the gas pump and you take the cap off and you stick a hose in and pump away—you can't convert a vehicle fleet from a gasoline-powered vehicle fleet to a hydrogen-powered fleet without substantial public policy initiatives that complement where the private sector wants to go. One cannot do it without the other.

That is why, even as all these companies are working very hard on these

issues, they need public sector and public policy support. This is a picture of a hydrogen fueling station at Power TechLabs. So if you had a car with a fuel cell that uses hydrogen, where would you go to fuel that car? Where would you go to power it? Where would you find a supply of hydrogen? So you have a whole series of questions.

As I mentioned earlier, you have to develop the question of how do you produce hydrogen in large quantities. It is not terribly difficult. You can produce it in many ways, but what would be the predominant method of production? How do you store it? Where do you store it? How do you transport it? All of those are important issues that the private sector and public policy will answer, in my judgment.

Then, what kind of infrastructure can develop and how do you incentivize its development so those who are purchasing the new fuel cell vehicles powered by hydrogen have a place to come where they can fuel those vehicles?

We have plans for many areas of public policy, whether it is Social Security or Medicare—a whole series of issues. We have all these studies and plans of where we aspire to be and what we aspire to do. The goals in this amendment, while not mandates, are very simple. In my judgment they are reasonable goals and ones that ought not frighten anyone in this Chamber into believing they are mandates.

We know California's Clean Air Act requirements will ensure there will be many fuel cell vehicles on the road in California in the future. By this year, 2003, 2 percent of California's vehicles have to be zero emission vehicles, and around 10 percent must be zero emission by 2018. California will have nearly 40,000 to 50,000 fuel cell vehicles on the road by the end of the next decade.

One of the other considerations in public policy is Federal fleet purchase. We can be the first purchaser of these technologies and put thousands, tens of thousands of vehicles on the road through the Federal fleet purchase. Those are the kinds of activities I think can make a big difference.

Let me finish as I started. I am very disappointed. I hope perhaps a good night's sleep will have persuaded those who came yesterday, who were a little cranky about this amendment and wanted to see if they shouldn't maybe oppose this amendment—I am hoping maybe a good night's sleep would have provided some sort of epiphany to those who would have otherwise opposed it and they will decide that they should support what the Senate unanimously supported 2 years ago. This is not anything other than a step in exactly the right direction.

If you want to be big, you want to be bold, you want to agree with President Bush that we ought to move to a new energy future, if you want to do all that and believe hydrogen and fuel cells, as the President says, are the future—and I do—if you believe all that, then let's do this the right way: Set timetables and targets and goals. If you want to spend money, then let's make those who are going to receive the money give us the strategies that relate to where we want our country to move. Or do we just want to throw money in the air and sort of mill around and thumb our suspenders and smoke our cigars and say we did a great job; we spent $3 billion on hydrogen, and boy, we hope something comes of that. That is not the way you do business. The way you do business is you have a plan. You decide where you want to go for the future of this country and what you want to do and how you want to achieve it. That is what this amendment does. It just sets out those goals. I am hoping when we have this vote it will have a very sizable victory here in the Senate later this morning.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and the Senator from Louisiana be allowed to offer her amendment.

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

The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 871

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU] for herself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Ms. COLLINS, proposes an amendment numbered 871.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce the dependence of the United States on imported petroleum)

On page 238, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

**Subtitle E—Measures to Conserve Petroleum**

**SEC. ___. REDUCTION OF DEPENDENCE ON IMPORTED PETROLEUM.**

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1, 2004, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report, based on the most recent edition of the Annual Energy Outlook published by the Energy Information Administration, assessing the progress made by the United States toward the goal of reducing dependence on imported petroleum sources by 2013.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall—

(A) include a description of the implementation, during the previous fiscal year, of provisions under this Act relating to domestic crude petroleum production;

(B) assess the effectiveness of those provisions in meeting the goal described in paragraph (1); and

(C) describe the progress in developing and implementing measures under subsection (b).

(b) MEASURES TO REDUCE IMPORT DEPENDENCE THROUGH INCREASED DOMESTIC PETROLEUM CONSERVATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall develop and implement measures to conserve petroleum in end-uses throughout the economy of the United States sufficient to reduce total demand for petroleum in the United States by 1,000,000 barrels per day from the amount projected for calendar year 2013 in the reference case contained in the report of the Energy Information Administration entitled ''Annual Energy Outlook 2003''.

(2) CONTENTS.—The measures under paragraph (1) shall be designed to ensure continued reliable and affordable energy for consumers.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION.—The measures under paragraph (1) shall be implemented under existing authorities of appropriate Federal executive agencies identified by the President.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, we are today continuing a very important debate on fashioning an energy policy for our Nation. We will be voting on many key amendments as we attempt to move this very important bill off the Senate floor, to conference with the House, and to the President's desk for signature.

It is crucial that we increase domestic production of oil and gas.

It is crucial that we invest more money in research and technologies for alternate fuels that are more environmentally friendly. It is crucial that we reduce our consumption, particularly of oil, as well as have a revitalization, in my opinion, in the appropriate ways, of our nuclear industry—they are all important aspects of this bill—as well as have the deregulation components of electricity and the expanding of the electric grid, in the appropriate ways, which is quite difficult because there are regions of the country that come at that issue from a variety of different standpoints, and it has been very difficult to negotiate those particular aspects of the bill.

But I compliment the chairman from New Mexico and our ranking member from New Mexico who have worked beautifully together trying to fashion a bill that is balanced and is actually possible to pass and not get logjammed in ideological battles; it is something that will help our country move toward more energy efficiency and security; increasing our national security and improving efficiency in our economy, hopefully putting people to work in developing these new technologies. So I commend them for their patience and persistence and their guidance.

I believe the amendment I offer today will go a long way to minimizing the consumption of oil in this country. We are a nation that has only 3 percent of the world's known oil reserves. Yet we consume more oil than any country per capita or in any way you might

want to arrive at that conclusion. It is simply essential that we reduce our consumption of oil.

You might say to me, Mr. President: That is strange, Senator, since you are from a State that produces oil. We are a proud producer, as you know, of oil and gas. We believe we contribute to the wealth and security of this Nation. We believe and know that these oil and gas wells have brought jobs and wealth and opportunity and prosperity to our State. Yes, it has come at some environmental cost, particularly 40 and 50 years ago, where the science was not where it is today, the technology was not where it is today, the safety measures were not where they are today. We made mistakes, but we are quickly learning from our experience, as any smart individual or enterprise does. We are now engaged in new technologies that minimize the footprint. We are engaged in making tremendous improvements in environmental restoration projects.

So I hope people will not think it is strange that a Senator from Louisiana would be offering what I consider a very reasonable amendment to reduce oil consumption in this Nation because even our oil and gas producers themselves are willing, and know, in the long run it is in everyone's interests, including theirs, to diversify our source of supply, to minimize our consumption and our dependence on foreign oil by improving and increasing domestic production of oil and gas, which is a centerpiece of this bill which I am proud to support.

So, therefore, I offer this amendment which will save, if adopted—and I am pleased to offer this amendment with the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SPECTER, as the lead cosponsor; Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER, from the great State of Tennessee; as well as Senator COLLINS from Maine—so we offer this as a bipartisan amendment to save the taxpayers and the businesses and the consumers in this Nation 1 million barrels of oil a day. That is the essence of this amendment.

Before I explain the details of the amendment, let me just talk a moment about the importance of reducing our dependence on fossil fuels. As I said, we need to develop alternative fuel sources. One of the reasons is because oil provides nearly 40 percent of U.S. energy consumption. Sixty percent of the oil we consume today is imported, and that number is set to rise. Unless this amendment and others like it are adopted, that trend will continue to go up, putting at risk our national security and putting at risk our international economic competitiveness.

Because oil is truly an international commodity, and the United States is the world's largest consumer of oil, it is particularly vulnerable to any event that would affect supply and demand. As I said earlier, our daily consumption of oil is almost four times the next two largest oil consumers, Japan and China. Let me repeat: Our daily consumption of oil is four times the next two largest oil consumers, Japan and China.

The price of oil in our country is at the mercy of world events, and not just in the Middle East, which we see played out on television every day, but in Venezuela, which might be off the front pages but, believe me, it is not off the front pages of the business journals in this country where they see their prices and their businesses jeopardized because of the turmoil in Venezuela and Nigeria.

We owe it to ourselves to try to minimize the volatility of oil prices. We do that in two ways: increasing domestic production, which obviously Louisiana would support; and also by reducing our consumption, which people in Louisiana—average families, businesses large and small—all would agree to.

I continue to advocate for responsible and robust domestic oil production, as I said, but we need to do more to reduce consumption. Oil is a critical component of nearly everything that affects our daily lives: from transportation, to food production, to heating. And rising oil prices actually act like a tax by foreign oil exporters on the average American. We have spent a great deal of time trying to reduce taxes on the floor of the Senate. We have done that sometimes in a bipartisan way. Sometimes the majority has pushed through tax relief. We can debate that issue at another time. But there is no disagreement that when we can reduce taxes in a responsible manner, we most certainly should do so.

This amendment, which asks the President to reduce the consumption of oil in this Nation by 1 million barrels a day—we are consuming about 19 million barrels a day, so this would require and basically meet his goals, as outlined in his State of the Union speech—gives him broad latitude as to how to do that. It would be like a tax reduction because currently middle-class families pay about 5 percent of aftertax income for energy needs. As the price of oil increases, family aftertax income continues to decline.

When businesses pay higher taxes, pay for higher oil prices and disruptions in oil supply, this increases inflation and reduces profits, production, investment, and employment. Let me repeat: It increases inflation, reduces profits, reduces production, reduces investment, and reduces employment. We need to be increasing production, investment, and employment. My amendment will help us to do just that.

Consumers are spending $50 billion more in annual energy bills than a year ago. If we could reduce our consumption by the amount that our amendment suggests, we would begin to save consumers money they could spend on other most needed and necessary things for themselves, their children, their grandchildren, or their businesses.

The amendment I offer today, as I said, would direct the President to develop and implement a plan to reduce oil consumption by 1 million barrels a day by the year 2013.

I show you a chart I have in the Chamber because this amendment would actually put into law—I am hoping we can get a broad bipartisan vote on this amendment—it would actually put into law the words the President himself spoke in his State of the Union speech when he said U.S. oil consumption would be about 1.8 million barrels per day lower in 2020.

So what my amendment says is, instead of saying there would be a 1.8 million reduction by 2020, let's try to shoot for a 1-million-barrel-per-day reduction by 2013, which is just about the equivalent—a little different goal but you could argue an equivalent goal. The benefit and beauty of this amendment is that it does not tie the President's hands, but it gives him great flexibility in how to achieve the goal he has outlined.

There are any number of reasonable and simple measures the President could adopt that would help us to consume a less significant amount of oil and reduce taxes on the American people, increase our national security, improve our environment, and create jobs. It almost sounds too good to be true, but it is true.

We are not mandating a specific approach, which is the beauty of it, because the approach some have argued for I have actually disagreed with and want to give the President great flexibility but hold to this important goal.

There are any number of ways we could do that. The President could consider renewable fuels standards. A different approach could save 175,000 barrels of oil per day by 2013. Weatherizing of homes under credit enhancements or encouragement or new techniques that some local and State governments have found very helpful could save 80,000 barrels per day. Air traffic improvements, just simple improvements in the way and timing of our airplanes taking off and landing, which can be increased effectively by additional technologies, could save 50,000 barrels of oil per day. As to reducing truck idling, there are several new technologies being developed, employing scientists and engineers and putting Americans to work developing these new kinds of technologies which make the engines more efficient. They don't have to idle or, at the idling stage, don't use as much oil. That could save 50,000 barrels of oil a day. Just replacing tires, using our tires and keeping them filled with air as opposed to flat, new technology regarding the tires could save money.

The point of this list—and I could go on because I could speak about 30, 40, or 50 known actions that could be taken by the President in this realm without dictating exactly how the savings would occur—is to illustrate the plethora of choices where he could go to achieve these savings.

The amendment I offer today with Senators ALEXANDER, BINGAMAN, SPECTER, and COLLINS is a clear and reasonable objective for oil savings. It will reduce our dependence on oil.

Let me show a couple of examples of the way the President could achieve these goals, some of which we have already passed on the Senate floor. Ethanol is now a part of this bill. There were some Members who disagreed with the ethanol fuels standard. I actually supported, along with Senator DASCHLE, Republicans and Democrats, that new standard. This will save oil consumption in the country. The President would have that option. In addition, I talked about the tire savings, replacement tires with the appropriate rules and regulations could save us 270,000 barrels of oil. And finally, the idling engines, this is a visual to show that with some new technologies to keep our airplanes flying and spending less time on the ground and more time in the air, which passengers would appreciate—believe me, as a frequent flier myself, if we could just keep our airplanes flying and keep them from idling; there are new technologies helping to do this—we could save oil.

In the past, we have focused the debate on just one way of saving oil which was directed at our transportation sector. My amendment does not direct these savings at the transportation sector, although I acknowledge that the transportation sector is the largest user of oil. This amendment provides flexibility. It sets a realistic goal that matches the President's, basically the equivalent of the President's own goals. And I think it would create, if adopted, a tremendous balance in the bill because again we have increased opportunities for production. We have given incentives for more domestic production. But that has to be coupled with Senator BINGAMAN's leadership on energy efficiency and savings to reduce our consumption of oil as we promote in the appropriate ways over the appropriate timeframe the use of other alternative sources of energy.

I offer the amendment in good faith. There will be Members who will speak hopefully for the amendment. Hopefully we can pass it by a good margin to show we are indeed serious about a balanced energy policy which promotes in the right ways domestic production but also oil savings.

I will ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a Business Week article that had a great impact with me as I read it, ''Taming the Oil Beast.'' It is time, since the business community realizes we can and should get smart about oil, that we do so. I think this is a very good amendment about getting smart about oil because it sets a goal of reduction, but it gives the President and his departments flexibility as to how this would work.

I would like to submit that for the RECORD because it would serve as a basis for the offering of the amendment today.

I would also like to reference an article by the Concerned Scientists Association, over 2,000 scientists who have written a paper, very illustrative, encouraging action on this subject. I say that because some of our brightest minds, some of the best scientists in the country are thinking along these lines and fully support this amendment to save 1 million barrels of oil. Perhaps we can save more. I would actually be open to saving more. If someone wants to offer an additional amendment, I would consider voting for it. But I am certain this is something we can accomplish. The President himself outlined this as a goal. The President's own budget that he laid down cited as a goal the equivalent, basic goal of what I am offering.

We have voted any number of times in the Senate and have come very close to reaching this goal. So while some may argue that we should try to save more, I think this is an amendment that can pass, that can get us moving in the right direction. I submit both of these from a business perspective, from an environmental perspective for the RECORD, to substantiate the value of the amendment.

I see my colleague from Tennessee on the floor who has probably come to add his good words as a cosponsor of the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to print the document I referenced.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From BusinessWeek, Feb. 24, 2003]

TAMING THE OIL BEAST

A SENSIBLE, STEP-BY-STEP ENERGY POLICY IS WITHIN OUR REACH—HERE'S WHAT TO DO

American troops are massing outside of Iraq, preparing to strike against Saddam Hussein. And as war jitters rattle the world, there's one inevitable effect: a rise in the price of oil. Crude is up more than 33 percent over the past three months, climbing to $35 per barrel in the U.S. Economic models predict that if the price stays high for three months, it will cut U.S. gross domestic product by $50 billion for the quarter. If the war goes badly, with Saddam destroying oil fields in Iraq and elsewhere, or if disaster or unrest chokes off oil flowing from other countries, the whole world's economy is in for a major shock.

There's no escaping the consequences of our thirst for oil. It fuels a vast engine of commerce, carrying our goods around the nation, taking mom and dad to work, and carting the kids to soccer practice. As long as the U.S. imports more than 11 million barrels a day—55 percent of our total consumption—anything from a strike in Venezuela to unrest in the Persian Gulf hits us hard in the pocketbook. ''We are vulnerable to any event, anyplace, that affects the supply and demand of oil,'' says Robert E. Ebel, director of the energy program at the Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS). In a Feb 6. speech, President Bush put it bluntly: ''It jeopardizes our national security to be dependent on sources of energy from countries that don't care for America, what we stand for, what we love.''

It wasn't supposed to be this way. Remember how Richard Nixon insisted in 1973 that the nation's future ''will depend on maintaining and achieving self-sufficiency in energy''? Or how Jimmy Carter proclaimed in 1979 that ''beginning this moment, this nation will never again use more foreign oil than we did in 1977—never.'' Even Ronald Reagan said in 1982 that ''we will ensure that our people and our economy are never again held hostage by the whim of any country or cartel.''

How empty those vows seem now, when one nation, Saudi Arabia, is sitting one the world's largest proved reserves—265 billion barrels, or 25 percent of the known supplies—and can send global prices soaring or falling simply by opening or closing the spigot. For now, the Saudis are our friends. They are boosting production to keep prices from spiking too high. But what if Saudi Arabia's internal politics change? ''The entire world economy is built on a bet of how long the House of Saud can continue,'' says Philip E. Clapp, president of the National Environmental Trust.

The good news is that we can make a safer bet. And it doesn't entail a vain rush for energy independence or emancipation from Middle East oil. Based on interviews with dozens of economists, oil analysts, environmentalists, and other energy experts, BusinessWeek has crafted guidelines for a sensible and achievable energy policy. These measures build on the positive trends of the past. If implemented, they would reduce the world's vulnerability to wars in the Middle East, production snafus in Russia, turmoil around the Caspian Sea, and other potential disruptions. The plan has the added benefit of tackling global warming, which many scientists consider the greatest economic threat of this century.

The energy policy BusinessWeek advocates comes down to six essential steps. To deal with oil supplies, the U.S. should diversify purchases around the world and make better use of strategic petroleum reserves. It must also boost energy efficiency across the economy, including making dramatic improvements in the fuel efficiency of cars and trucks. How do we accomplish this? Nurture new technologies and alternative energy sources with research dollars and tax incentives, and consider higher taxes on energy to more accurately reflect the true costs of using fossil fuels. Projecting the precise effects of these policies is impossible, economists warn. But BusinessWeek estimates that, at a cost of $120 billion to $200 billion over 10 years—less than the cost to the economy of a major prolonged oil price rise—it should be possible to raise energy efficiency in the economy by up to 50 percent and reduce U.S. oil consumption by more than 3 million barrels a day.

These steps draw on the lessons of history and help highlight what not to do. Meaningful progress has long been held up by myths and misconceptions—and by the scores of bad ideas pushed in the name of energy independence. Remember ''synfuels'' in the 1970s? Today's misguided notions include trying to turn perfectly good corn into ethanol and rushing to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife refuge. Indeed, looking over the past couple of decades, ''my reaction is, thank God we didn't have an energy policy,'' says David G. Victor, director of Stanford University's Program on Energy Sustainable Development. ''The last one had quotas and rationing, causing lines at the gas pumps and incredible inefficiencies in the economy.''

One false notion is that making the U.S. self-sufficient—or doing without Middle Eastern oil—would protect us from supply cutoffs and price spikes. In fact, oil has become a fungible world commodity. Even if we cut the umbilical cord with the Persian Gulf by buying more oil from Canada, Mexico, or Russia, or by producing more at home, other nations will simply switch over

to buy the Middle eastern oil we're shunning. The world oil price, and the potential for spikes in that price, remains the same. As long as there are no real oil monopolies, it doesn't matter so much where we get oil. What really matters is how much we use. Reducing oil use brings two huge benefits: Individual countries have less leverage over us, and, since oil costs are a smaller percentage of the economy, any price shocks that do occur have a less dramatic effect.

Yet reducing oil use has to be done judiciously. A drastic or abrupt drop in demand could even be counterproductive. Why? Because even a very small change in capacity or demand ''can bring big swings in price,'' explains Rajeev Dhawan, director of the Economic Forecasting Center at Georgia State University's Robinson College of business. For instance, the slowdown in Asia in the mid-1990s reduced demand only by about 1.5 million barrels a day, but it caused oil prices to plunge to near $10 a barrel. So today, if the U.S. succeeded in abruptly curbing demand for oil, prices would plummet. Higher-cost producers such as Russia and the U.S. would either have to sell oil at a big loss or stand on the sidelines. The effect would be to concentrate power—you guessed it—in the hands of Middle Eastern nations, the lowest-cost producers and holders of two-thirds of the known oil reserves. That's why flawed energy policies, such as trying to override market forces by rushing to expand supplies or mandating big fuel efficiency gains, could do harm.

The truth is, the post-1970s de facto policy of just letting the markets work hasn't been all bad. painful oil shocks brought recessions. But they also touched off a remarkable increase in the energy efficiency of the U.S. economy. From the 1930s to the 1970s, America produced about $750 worth of output per barrel of oil. That number doubled, to $1,500, by the end of the 1980s. But the progress largely stopped in the past decade. Now we need policies to continue those fuel-efficiency gains, without the pain of sudden oil shocks.

The critical balancing act is reducing oil use without hurting the economy—or without allowing energy prices to fall so low that companies and individuals abandon all efforts to conserve. Successfully walking this tightrope can bring big gains. The next time we are hit with a spike in the price of oil, or even of natural gas or electricity, we may be able to avoid the billions in lost GDP that would otherwise result. Here are the details:

*1. Diversify Oil Supplies*

The answer to the supply question is a delicate combination of technology, market forces, and diplomacy. New tools for drilling in waters nearly two miles deep, for instance, are opening up untapped sources in the Atlantic Basin, Canada, the Caribbean, Brazil, and the entire western coast of Africa.

That's helping to tip the balance of power among oil producers. In 1973, the Middle East produced nearly 38 percent of the world's oil. Now, that percentage has dropped below 30 percent. ''Our policy has been to encourage oil companies to search for oil outside the U.S. but away from the Persian Gulf,'' explains CSIS's Ebel. ''It's been rather successful.''

There's plenty of oil to be tapped. While there are now about 1 trillion barrels of proved reserves, estimates of potential reserves keep rising, from 2 trillion barrels in the early 1980s to more than 3 trillion barrels today.

The Caspian Sea area, for instance, promises proved reserves of 20 billion barrels to 35 billion barrels—but could have more than 200 billion barrels. Skeptics argue that this Caspian resource, surrounded as it is by Iran, Kazakhstan, Russia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia, is a bastion of instability and could easily become the backdrop for a future war linked to oil. But history shows that even bad guys are eager to sell their oil.

If energy policy were only about economics, we might argue that the world should take advantage of the ample supplies and relatively cheap prices and just keep consuming at a rapid rate. But there are additional costs of oil not included now in the price (step 6). And we have other important goals, such as doing more to protect the environment and reducing the political leverage of the Middle East. Says ExxonMobil Corp. (XOM) Chairman and CEO Lee R. Raymond: ''The key to security will be found in diversity of supply.'' In other words, whimsical though it may seem, we should strive to maintain a Goldilocks price for oil: It should be high enough to keep companies and countries investing in oil fields but not so high that it sends the world into a recessionary tailspin.

*2. Use Strategic Reserves*

The nation now has 599.3 million barrels stored in underground salt caverns along the Texas and Louisiana Gulf Coast. That's enough to replace Iraq's oil production for at least six months. Yet this stockpile isn't being used correctly, and it never has been, many experts believe. In the 1991 Persian Gulf War, ''oil prices were back to the normal level by the time the U.S. got around to releasing the strategic petroleum reserve,'' says energy economist W. David Montgomery of Charles River Associates, Inc. We shouldn't make that mistake again. With oil prices already up, ''we should release the stockpile immediately,'' he says.

Other experts argue that the reserve should be used as a regular hedging tool rather than being saved for extreme emergencies, which so far have never materialized. One idea: Allow companies to contract with the government to take out barrels of oil when they want to—as long as they agree to replace it later, along with a bit extra. That way, this big store of oil would smooth out glitches in supply and demand while also taking away some of OPEC's power to manipulate the market. There are similar reserves in Europe, Japan, and South Korea—for a total of 4 billion barrels, including the U.S.—that should be used in this way as well. And by making the reserves bigger, we gain more leverage to dampen the shocks.

*3. Boost Industrial Efficiency*

After decades of concern over energy prices and the big improvement in the overall energy efficiency of America's economy, you would think that U.S. companies would be hard-pressed to find new gains. ''In my experience, the facts are otherwise,'' says Judith Bayer, director of environmental government affairs at United Technologies Corp. (UTX) UT discovered savings of $100,000 in just one facility by turning off computer monitors at night. ''People talk about low-hanging fruit—picking up a dollar on the floor in savings here and there,'' Bayer says. ''We picked up thousands off the ground. It's embarrassing that we didn't do it earlier.''

Just last year, Salisbury (N.C.)-based Food Lion cut its energy consumption by 5 percent by using sensors to turn off lights in bathrooms and loading-dock areas and by installing better-insulating freezer doors. ''The project saves millions a year,'' says Food Lion's energy-efficiency expert, Rick Heithold.

Even companies with strong efficiency track records are doing more. 3M Corp. (MMM) has cut use of energy per unit of output by 60 percent since the Arab oil embargo—but is still improving at about 4 percent a year. One recent innovation: adjustable-speed factory motors that don't require energy-sapping brakes. The efficiency gains ''help us reduce our operating costs and our emissions—and the impact that sudden price increases have on our businesses,'' says 3M energy manager Steven Schultz.

Last year, the New York Power Authority put in a digitally controlled power electronics system—essentially, a large garage packed with semiconductor switches and computers—in a substation that handles electric power coming in from Canada and northern and western New York. Along with conventional improvements, this vastly improved the system's ability to manage power. The state now has the capacity to transfer 192 more megawatts of available electricity, or enough to power about 192,000 homes.

The nation's entire antiquated electricity grid should be refashioned into a smart, responsive, flexible, and digitally controlled network. That would reduce the amount of energy required to produce $1 of GDP by 30 percent and save the country $100 billion a year, estimates Kurt E. Yeager, CEO of the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). It would eliminate the need to build dozens of power plants, cut carbon emissions, and slash the cost of power disruptions, which run about $120 billion a year. Such a network would also break down existing barriers to hooking up new sources of power to the grid, from solar roofs on thousands of houses to small, efficient heat and power generators at businesses. And soon, it will be possible to rack up big efficiency gains by switching to industrial and home lights made from light-emitting diodes (LEDs), which can use less than one-tenth the energy of incandescent bulbs.

These are exciting developments, but what do they have to do with oil? The answer lies in the idea of fungible energy: Eliminate the need for a power plant running on natural gas, and that fuel becomes available for everything from home heating to a source of hydrogen for fuel-cell vehicles. A subset of the nation's energy policy, therefore, should be doubling Federal R&D dollars over the next five years to explore technologies that can boost energy efficiency, provide new sources of power, and, at the same time, address the problem of global warming.

*4. Raise Car and Truck MPG*

To make a real dent in oil consumption, the U.S. must tackle transportation. The numbers here dwarf everything else, accounting for a full two-thirds of the 20 million barrels of oil of oil the U.S. uses each day. And after rising from 15 miles per gallon in 1975 to 25.9 mpg in 1988, the average fuel economy of our vehicles has slipped to 24 mpg, dragged down by gas-guzzling SUVs and pickup trucks. Boost that to 40 mpg, and oil savings will top 2 million barrels a day within 10 years.

Detroit says that's too high a goal. But the technology already exists to get there. In early January, General Motors Corp. (GM) rolled out ''hybrid'' SUVs that use a combination of gas-engine and electric motors to bump fuel economy by 15 percent to 50 percent. That same technology is already on the road. Honda Motor Co.'s (HMC) hybrid Civic and Toyota Motor Corp.'s (TM) Prius, both big enough to carry four adults and their cargo, each top 45 mpg in combined city and highway driving.

Adding batteries and an electric motor to vehicles is just one of many ways to increase gas mileage. Researchers can also improve the efficiency of combustion, squeezing more power out of a given amount of fuel. In an approach called variable valve timing, they can adjust the opening and closing of an engine's intake and exhaust valves. Such engines, made by Honda, BMW, and others, are

more efficient without sacrificing power. Researchers are now working on digitally controlled valves whose timing can be adjusted even more precisely. The gains? Well over 10 percent in many cases.

More improvement comes from reducing the power sapped by transmissions. So-called continuously variable transmissions eliminate individual gears so that engines can spend more time running at their most efficient speed. And auto makers can build clean-burning diesel engines, which are 20 percent to 40 percent more efficient than their gas counterparts.

Estimates vary widely on what it would cost to raise gas mileage to 40 mpg or higher for the entire U.S. fleet of cars. Assuming a combination of technologies, we figure the tab could be $1,000 to $2,000 per car, or $80 billion to $160 billion over 10 years. That's less than fuel savings alone over the life of the new vehicles. Carmakers already have the technology. What we need now are policies, ranging from higher gasoline prices to tougher fuel-economy standards, that will give manufacturers and consumers incentives to make and buy these vehicles.

The ultimate gas-saving technology would be a switch to a completely different fuel, such as hydrogen. Toyota, Honda, and GM already are testing cars that use fuel cells to power electric motors. Such vehicles are quiet, create no air pollution, and emit none of the carbon dioxide linked with global warming. They also are expensive, and 10 to 20 years away from the mass market.

There's one other problem: Where would the hydrogen come from? The element must now be extracted from gas, water, or other substances at relatively high cost. But there are intriguing ideas for lowering the tab, such as genetically engineering bacteria to make the gas or devising more efficient ways to get it from coal. We need a strong research program to explore these ideas, plus incentives to test fuel-cell technology in power plants and vehicles. President Bush's $1.2 billion hydrogen initiative is just a start.

*5. Nurture Renewable Energy*

Tim Grieves shares a vision with a growing number of energy giants: harnessing the wind to generate cheap, clean power. The superintendent of schools in Spirit Lake, Iowa, Grieves has overseen the installation of two wind turbines that hum away in a field not far from his office. They generate enough juice to allow Spirit Lake to proudly call itself the only electrically self-sufficient school district in the nation. ''We're not dependent on the Middle East,'' says Grieves. ''This is just smarter.''

Although less than 0.5 percent of our power now comes from wind, it's the cheapest and fastest-growing source of green energy. The American Wind Energy Assn. believes the U.S. could easily catch up with Northern Europe, where wind supplies up to 20 percent of power. In the U.S., that's the equivalent of 100,000 megawatts of capacity—or more than 100 large fossil-fueled plants. The Great Plains could become the Middle East of wind.

Without tax credits and other incentives, wind power couldn't flourish. but oil and other fossil fuels also have big subsidies. So we should either eliminate those or provide reasonable incentives for alternatives such as wind, solar, and hydrogen. Even if the new sources still cost more than today's power, continued innovation, spurred by the incentives, will lower the price. Moreover, having some electricity produced by wind turbines and solar panels helps insulate us from spikes in natural-gas prices. Some states now require that a percentage of power come from renewable sources. We should consider this nationwide, with a target of perhaps 15 percent, up from the current 6 percent.

*6. Phase in Fuel Taxes*

The main reason fuel-efficiency gains in the U.S. slowed in the 1990s is that the cost of oil—and energy in general—was so low. ''Yes, we are energy hogs, but we became energy hogs because the price is cheap,'' says Georgia State's Dhawan.

Even though it seems like the market is working in this regard, it really isn't. There's widespread agreement that the current price of oil doesn't reflect its true cost to the economy. ''What Americans need to know is that the cost of gasoline is much more than $1.50 a gallon,'' says Gal Luft of the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security. But the invisible hand could work its magic if we include costs of so-called externalities, such as pollution or the tab for fighting wars in the Middle East. That would raise the price, stimulating new energy-efficiency measures and the use of renewable fuels.

The tricky part is pricing these externalities. Some economists peg it at 5 cents to 10 cents a gallon of gas. Others see the true cost as double or triple the current price. Just by adding in the more than $100 billion cost of having troops and fighting wars in the Persian Gulf, California State University economist Darwin C. Hall figures that oil should cost at least $13 per barrel more. ''That is an absolutely rock-bottom, lowball estimate,'' he says. More dollars come from adding in numbers for the costs of air pollution, oil spills, and global warming.

Imagine, though, that in an ideal world, we could settle on the size of the externalities—maybe $10 per barrel. We obviously don't want to suddenly slap a $10 tax on oil. Doing so would slice more than $50 billion out of GDP and send the economy into a recession, forecasters calculate.

But phasing it in slowly, over 10 years, would give the economy time to adopt fuel-efficiency measures at the lowest costs. We should also consider additional taxes on gasoline, since a $10-per-barrel price rise amounts to only about 25 cents per gallon of gas—not enough to make a big change in buying habits. This approach works even better if the revenue from these taxes is returned to the economy in a way that stimulates growth and productivity—by lowering payroll taxes, for example. Plus, there are big environmental benefits from reduced pollution.

There's a fierce debate about whether the economy gains or loses from such tax-shifting. Many economists agree, however, that the bad effects would be relatively small. ''There may not be a free lunch, but there is almost certainly a lunch worth paying for,'' says Stanford economist Lawrence H. Goulder.

If energy taxes prove politically impossible, there's another way to achieve realistic fossil-fuel prices: through the back door of climate-change policy. Already, Europe is toying with carbon taxes to fight global warming and multinationals are experimenting with carbon-trading schemes to get a jump on any future restrictions. Even Republicans such as Senator John McCain (R–Ariz.) are pushing curbs on carbon dioxide. If the U.S. put its weight behind efforts to fight climate change, it could help push the entire world toward lower emissions—and moderately higher oil prices. The best approach: a combination of carbon taxes and a cap-and-trade system, wherein companies can trade the right to emit. That way, the market helps find the greatest reductions at the lowest cost. Economists figure that a $100-per-ton tax on carbon emissions, for example, would equal a rise of 30 cents in the cost of a gallon of gas.

Under the Bush Administration, this too, may be difficult to enact. What's left are regulations and mandates. There may be just enough political will to boost CAFE (corporate average fuel efficiency) standards for vehicles—and to remove the loopholes that hold SUVs to a lower standard. But we need a smarter rule than the current one.

One good idea: give companies whose cars and trucks do better than the fuel-economy target credits that they could sell to an auto maker whose fleet isn't efficient enough. That way, ''good'' companies such as Honda are strongly motivated to keep improving technology. By being smarter about regulations and mandates, ''we could do a lot better than what we are doing now,'' explains Stanford professor James L. Sweeney.

If we implement these policies, here's what we'll get: A reduction in projected levels of oil consumption equal to 3 million barrels a day or more within 10 years. That means we could choose not to import from unfriendly countries (although they will happily sell their oil to others). In addition, oil-price shocks should be fewer and smaller, allowing us to avoid some of those $50 billion (or more) hits to GDP. A more fuel-efficient economy will free up oil for countries such as China and India, notes Platts Global Director of Oil John Kingston. And the technologies we develop will help those economies become more efficient.

Economists will argue about the costs of these measures. But the benefits of greater energy efficiency and reduced vulnerability should, over the long run, outweigh the $120 billion (or more) cost of getting there. Painful though they were, the oil shocks of the 1970s sent the U.S. down the road toward a more energy-efficient—and less vulnerable—economy. Our task now is to find a smoother path to continue that journey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Senator from Iowa has been waiting for a while. I would like to set the vote for the Dorgan amendment if I may, and then I would be glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa to let him make his remarks. Then I would like as a cosponsor to speak in support of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that that be the case, that Senator HARKIN be recognized followed by the Senator from Tennessee.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, pursuant to the order of last night, I ask unanimous consent that the vote in relation to the Dorgan amendment No. 865 occur at 11:30 today with two minutes equally divided prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I will not object, I would hope that we could also line up the Senator from Louisiana to have her vote in a reasonably short period of time. She has indicated she thinks there may be a number of others who wish to speak in favor of the amendment. We would hope we could move on to that. We want to get to the Wyden amendment. There is an order in effect that would set up 2 hours on that amendment. Senator WYDEN will be ready immediately after the caucus. He would have

been ready this morning. He would be ready after the caucus to move on that. I hope we can get do that amendment right after the caucus and dispose of this even prior to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Reserving the right to object, I have a question. Does the Senator think it would be possible to do that before lunch? I think my colleague would probably only need 30 minutes for our debate, equally divided between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Maine.

Mr. REID. I hope that will be the case. Until Senator DOMENICI gets here, we cannot agree to that.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, will the Chair please state the unanimous consent now before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote in relation to the Dorgan amendment will take place at 11:30, with 2 minutes of debate.

Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, first, briefly, the Dorgan amendment to put 100,000 hydrogen-powered vehicles on the road by 2010 and 2.5 million by 2020, with the requisite fueling infrastructure, is one that is going to help grow our economy, make our economy stronger. The amendment by Senator LANDRIEU and others to cut down on the use of oil by a million barrels a day also is going to help improve our economy by making us focus on things such as ethanol, for example, alternative fuels, renewable energy and, of course, along with the Dorgan amendment, fuel cell vehicles. It all has to do with making us more energy independent, and that has to do with growing our economy. The more we continue to send our hard-earned dollars out of the country for the energy we need, the less dollars we are going to have to rebuild our economy here at home.

Yesterday, I attended a hearing Senator DORGAN had that was devoted to the question of our economy. The question was: Will the Bush economic plan create jobs?

Well, I think throughout the hearing what became clear was that the Bush economic plan will not create jobs, unfortunately. The plan advocated by the majority rewards their friends and supporters with large tax cuts but will do very little to create jobs. Many respected economists warned of this months ago, but Republicans and the administration paid them no heed.

Unfortunately, it is not only experts who believe this prediction; history gives the same warning. These trickle-down economic policies have been tried before, and they have failed before. In 1981, Congress passed massive tax cuts for the rich, just like we did here. Then Director of OMB David Stockman called it a ''riverboat gamble.''

Well, it was a gamble. Within 2 years, following the 1981 supply side, trickle-down tax bill, we lost 1.4 million jobs. In 2001, the Bush administration tried it again. They passed the first round of massive tax cuts. And guess what. We lost 2 million jobs. As all major newspapers reported this weekend, the national unemployment rate is now at 6.1 percent, its highest level in 9 years.

Despite these two previous losing gambles, the President and the majority party in Congress decided to give it a third try last month. I think we ought to call the tax bill that was passed and sent to the President the ''Bill Bennett betting bill'' because it is going to have the same effect on our country that Bill Bennett's gambling addiction had on him. It cost him, as I understand it, lost millions. It is going to cost our economy lost billions.

But in the midst of it all, the wealthiest Americans will have massive tax breaks. In fact, on average, those Americans making over $1 million a year are going to receive a tax cut of $93,000 a year. They are going to have a great time. Unfortunately, who is going to pay the bill? Well, it will be paid by the rest of us, especially the younger generation—those now going through college, going out to make their way in life. They will be saddled with a huge, new debt.

As pointed out on the editorial pages of the Des Moines Register this weekend, these irresponsible policies will create pressure for higher State and local taxes, tuition hikes at State colleges and universities, rising health care costs to those lucky enough to have insurance, and further cuts to important initiatives.

The wealthiest in America got more than their share under this tax bill, but the folks in the middle class pay the bills. By contrast, the United States took a fiscally responsible approach in the 1990s. In 1993, Congress passed a budget to grow the economy, create jobs. In the 2 years following that passage, 6.4 million jobs were created. That plan put us on a path not only toward the lowest levels of unemployment in memory, but also to balanced budgets, the largest projected budget surpluses ever.

I find it most remarkable and disheartening that at the very time when it is obvious that economic policies should seek to stimulate demand, stimulate new jobs, the majority party opposes those things that would stimulate the economy the most, such as increasing the child credit for working families making under $26,000 a year.

Well, the Democratic priority may yet prevail, as it did in the Senate last week. I hope it does. But further stimulus, such as putting people directly to work, building new schools, roads, and bridges, communications systems, upgrading our water and our waste water systems, making sure we weatherize homes all over America, will also save us on imported fuel. These are the things we can do now that will put people to work now. But the majority party says no.

I also fear that their policies will lead to exploding Government debt. On the same day we passed this ''Bill Bennett betting bill''—that is what I call the tax bill—the debt limit was increased by an amount equivalent to putting an additional $3,500 on the credit card of every man, woman, and child in America—$3,500 on the credit card of every man, woman, and child in America—to pay for this ''Bill Bennett betting bill.''

Most of us are aware that the real cost to the Treasury of this recent tax cut will be higher than advertised because the bill used gimmicks and tricks to stay within some nominal budget limit. The Speaker of the House was quoted as saying the real cost will be a trillion dollars, at a time when our exploding deficit is approaching $500 billion for this year alone. Well, with typical British clarity, the Financial Times wrote on May 23, the day the tax bill passed: On the management of fiscal policy, the lunatics are now in charge of the asylum.

The result, as this administration is well aware, is that it will put pressure on Social Security and Medicare. These programs are targeted by the administration for reforms, which means privatizing Medicare and Social Security. We are going to have a debate here, I assume, in the Senate in the coming weeks on how we are going to provide prescription drug benefits under Medicare. But as I see the Medicare bill progressing and developing, it is nothing more than a shell, a subterfuge to move toward the privatization of Medicare, which, of course, has been the Republican Party's dream for many years. Don't take my word for it. Former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich said Medicare ought to wither on the vine. The third ranking Republican in the Senate, my friend from Pennsylvania, said the Medicare benefit should be phased out.

So make no mistake, when we are debating the Medicare bill coming up, we have to get out of the weeds. What they are really talking about is taking the first step toward privatizing Medicare. The President's own press secretary was quoted in the story:

> There is no question that Social Security and Medicare are going to present future generations with a crushing debt burden unless policymakers work seriously to reform those programs.

You pass a tax cut for the richest in the country that the Speaker says is going to cost us a trillion dollars, and then you say we are going to have a lot of pressure on Social Security and Medicare because the money will not be there for them, so now we have to reform them, which is their way of saying privatize them. I hope we now understand the picture: A tax cut for the wealthiest, huge debts for the rest, immense pressure on Social Security and Medicare; therefore, you have to privatize them; turn them over to Wall Street. That is where we are heading.

Exploding deficits and the debt will act like a cap on our economy. It will increase interest rates when the economy does begin to recover. It will undermine confidence. We need to create jobs in the short term, but we need to do it in a way that is fiscally responsible, to take care and protect the retirement security and health needs of seniors. We need to change course. The course set by this administration will only lead to further deficits, further debts piling up on our kids and grandkids, economic stagnation, importing more oil from abroad—which is why I am such a strong supporter of the Landrieu amendment and the Dorgan amendment.

I am afraid the administration may be opposed to these amendments, just as they are opposed to a sound rational means of getting our economy moving again. As I said, the Federal Government can be a great instrument, doing it in a fiscally responsible manner that actually provides the basis for further private sector growth in our country.

I was listening to former Congressman Jack Kemp, an old friend of mine of long standing, go on and on about how we need to make sure we have more money in the private sector for investments. I understand that, and that is a legitimate argument, but what about the need for societal investments? What about the need for investing in human capital? What about the need for investing in education? You can give all the tax breaks you want to the richest in this country and the corporations. Are they going to turn around and invest in higher teacher pay, better teacher training? Are they going to invest in rebuilding and modernizing schools all over America? There is no return on that capital, at least not in the short term and not in a way that would accrue to the bottom line of a company.

As we all know, that kind of an investment accrues to our national economy. Rebuilding our schools all over America—this is something that is estimated to be in the neighborhood of $180 billion. Think of the jobs it would create. When you give someone an extra dollar for consumption right now in our society, they may buy a new shirt, but that shirt may be made in Malaysia, Thailand, or India. They may buy a new TV set, but that TV set sure is not made in America, or a stereo not made in America. They may buy a new car. Maybe that car is not made in America. To be sure, some of that money does fall out in this country because we have people selling those items, storing them, and shipping them. But the bulk of it could go outside the country.

If, however, you make a societal investment in building a new school, all of the workers are in America. Almost all of the materials used from the lighting to the heating to the wallboard to the sheetrock—everything, building materials—almost all, I would not say all—almost all are made in America. Not only do you put people to work, you build something of a lasting nature that provides for a strong foundation for the private sector in America.

Take the issue of weatherization. We could save huge amounts of oil and natural gas each year simply by weatherizing homes, and I do not mean just in the North where it gets cold, but I mean in the South where it gets hot in the summertime. Guess what, these are not jobs that take a lot of training. These are jobs we could fill with unemployed people right now. We can put them to work weatherizing homes all over America.

What do we get? We get immediate job creation. We use materials basically that are made in this country. And we get something out of it that is going to help us: more fuel-efficient homes of low-income people who will not be using their money to pay high heating bills or cooling bills to pay for imported oil.

Yet, for some strange reason, we cannot seem to do that here. But, boy, we can sure give billions in tax breaks to the wealthiest in our society.

I will have more to say about this in the weeks ahead. There is another pathway—that is my point—there is another pathway to economic growth and jobs in our country, to which this administration has turned a blind eye, by investing in the veins and arteries—the roads and bridges, the highways, the sewer and water systems, the schools, the education, the scientific research, the mathematical research, the physics research, the chemistry research, the medical research—that will set the stage for future economic growth and prosperity in our country.

That will not come about by giving more tax breaks to the wealthy or business tax breaks. It comes about by us in the Congress of the United States fulfilling our responsibility to pass tax bills and energy bills that are responsible, that are commonsense, and that will lay this kind of secure foundation for the future. That is why I support the Landrieu amendment so strongly, because it will start to do that, and so will the Dorgan amendment that has been set aside. These are commonsense approaches. These are the programs we should be doing for our economy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I stand to congratulate the Senator from Louisiana and join with her as a cosponsor of her amendment. She and I are members of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. We are very proud of what our chairman and ranking member have done this year in taking a diverse array of opinions and coming up with a very good bill with a very good amount of bipartisan consensus.

There is consensus about supporting a diverse array of energy sources. The Energy bill, which the Senators from New Mexico have led us to fashion, encourages hydrogen fuel cell cars in the economy. It encourages renewable energy. It encourages clean coal. It encourages oil and gas. And it encourages nuclear power.

What I think it is important we also do is make sure we encourage conservation, and to do that in a way that puts conservation high on the list of priorities. It is a low-cost way to have more energy. It is a no-pollution way to have more energy.

In my way of thinking, the Senator from Louisiana has come up with a sensible approach. It also helps to have the President involved. When the President said, let's build a hydrogen fuel cell car, he was not the first to say that, but everybody heard it when he said it and it gave a lot of impetus to the work on hydrogen that had been going on in this body from both sides of the aisle.

So the Senator's idea is to reduce our petroleum import dependence by having the President come up with a plan to conserve oil throughout our economy, not just in transportation but throughout the economy; to reduce our total demand by a million barrels per day by 2013. By my computation, that would cause us to reduce that by about 5 percent by 2013.

We ought to be able to do that. We ought to be able to go ahead with nuclear powerplants, with all the gas explorations. We ought to be able to go ahead with renewable energies and coal gasification. We ought to conserve at the same time.

Just one example. The Senator from Iowa was mentioning weatherizing homes. That is one good way, if we paid more attention to it. Another good way is idling trucks. Truckers who are so frequent on our highways often idle their trucks in order to keep their air-conditioner and all the other services going that they have in the truck. There are companies that permit the truckers now to turn off their truck and to plug in a device and by doing that enabling operation of the appliances they have but they do not pollute the air at the same time. It is such a simple idea that we would hope any one of us could have thought of that but, in fact, having the President develop a plan that will focus on reducing our consumption of oil by 2013 would include such ideas as weatherizing homes, as encouraging truckers not to idle, keeping tires properly inflated. These may seem to be small ideas but they can add up, we suggest, to a million barrels per day by the year 2013.

I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana on what I think is a commonsense, reasonable approach to add conservation to our arsenal of activities, to give it a higher profile in this bill, and I am glad to join in cosponsoring her amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I, too, am pleased to join my colleagues, Senators LANDRIEU, SPECTER, BINGAMAN, and ALEXANDER, in offering this amendment to reduce our consumption of oil by a million barrels a day by the year 2013. This is a very reasonable and achievable goal, and I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana for coming up with this initiative and reaching out to those of us who share her concern that our Nation is too dependent on foreign oil.

Increasing energy efficiency is the single most effective way to reduce our reliance on foreign oil. Without a greater focus on energy-efficiency measures, the Energy legislation before us, which has many valuable provisions, will not be effective in reducing our dependence on foreign oil. As long as we continue to guzzle foreign oil, we will be at the mercy of those nations that control that oil. We are already nearly 60-percent reliant on foreign sources, and the Energy Information Administration projects that our dependence will increase to 70 percent by the year 2010 if we do not act. If we do not do more to improve the energy efficiency standards, America will only grow more dependent on foreign oil and the price of gas and home heating oil will only rise accordingly.

Our amendment would help to reduce oil consumption by a million barrels a day by the year 2013. It would do so by giving the President the flexibility to decide among any number of simple energy saving measures to achieve these savings. For example, simply weatherizing homes which use home heating oil could save 80,000 barrels of oil per day. Using energy-efficient engine oil could save another 100,000 barrels per day. Just keeping our tires on our automobiles properly inflated could save 200,000 barrels per day. In short, by taking a few easily adopted measures, we could reduce our consumption of oil by a million barrels a day.

We currently use about 19 million barrels a day. So this would make a real difference. It would result in a reduction of consumption of imported oil. Reducing our consumption by 1 million barrels per day will also help to keep energy prices down and will keep billions of American dollars at home where they belong. In fact, this proposal we have advanced could save American consumers upwards of $20 billion each year.

I call upon my colleagues to join us today in supporting our commonsense measure to reduce our reliance on foreign oil by reducing our consumption of oil by a million barrels a day. It is right for our environment. It is right for our economy. It is right for the American consumer.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 865

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry: Am I correct that there will be a vote on the Dorgan amendment at 11:30?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask to speak to that amendment until 11:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have already agreed to 2 minutes of debate equally divided at 11:28 so we can vote, but the time until 11:28 is available so the Senator has the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have already spoken, as have Senator ALEXANDER and others, against this amendment. By being against the amendment, it does not mean we are in any way in derogation of the efforts by the distinguished Senator, Mr. DORGAN, in his efforts to pursue a hydrogen economy for the United States, in his efforts to move forward with the hydrogen cell and with the hydrogen car. I compliment him for that.

His amendment, which says we should move ahead with certain quotas, with specific amounts, with goals, with mandatory achievements, should not be done. It would not be of any benefit.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of time equally divided on the Dorgan amendment.

Who yields time? The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. This amendment is very simple. It establishes timelines and targets: 100,000 vehicles on the road by 2010, 2½ million by the year 2020. It is not a mandate, it is not enforceable, but at least it sets targets that we aspire to achieve. The opposition would say, well, let's just throw money at the Department of Energy and hope something good comes of it. That is not the way to address this issue, in my judgment.

I know my colleague complimented me but the greatest compliment, of course, would be voting for my amendment. What is disappointing is that this amendment passed the Senate by unanimous voice vote a year and a half ago. This amendment has already been embraced by the Senate. I am disappointed that it will not be passed by a voice vote today because if we are, in fact, going to move toward a hydrogen fuel cell future, we need to think big and bold. Then we ought to set some targets and have some aspirations and say to the Department of Energy, here is three-plus billion dollars and, by the way, this is what we would like to see achieved with that money. We would really like to see these goals achieved—not mandates, just strategic goals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I compliment the Senator but I cannot vote for his amendment. This committee has added to the $1.3 billion proposal by the President for the hydrogen car, $1.6 billion suggested by the Senator from North Dakota and others on that side.

The issue is whether we want to add to the bill a target that we have 100,000 hydrogen fuel cell vehicles in the United States by 2010. I respectfully suggest that is a wild guess. I drove a $2 million Ford hydrogen car around the block in Washington. I did that, I believe the Senator and several others did, and it costs $2 million to make the car. It actually works. We drove around and got so excited we came up on the Senate floor and put into law that we ought to have 100,000 of them by the year 2010. It is not mandatory.

It reminded me, as I mentioned yesterday, my friends were guessing wrong about the facts technology. I respectfully will vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 212 Leg.]

YEAS—67

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Akaka | Dorgan | Lugar |
| Baucus | Durbin | McCain |
| Bayh | Ensign | Mikulski |
| Biden | Feingold | Murray |
| Bingaman | Feinstein | Nelson (FL) |
| Boxer | Graham (FL) | Nelson (NE) |
| Breaux | Graham (SC) | Pryor |
| Brownback | Grassley | Reed |
| Burns | Harkin | Reid |
| Byrd | Hollings | Roberts |
| Campbell | Hutchison | Rockefeller |
| Cantwell | Inouye | Santorum |
| Carper | Jeffords | Sarbanes |
| Chafee | Johnson | Schumer |
| Clinton | Kennedy | Sessions |
| Coleman | Kerry | Smith |
| Collins | Kohl | Snowe |
| Conrad | Landrieu | Specter |
| Corzine | Lautenberg | Stabenow |
| Daschle | Leahy | Warner |
| Dayton | Levin | Wyden |
| DeWine | Lieberman | |
| Dodd | Lincoln | |

NAYS—32

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Alexander | Cochran | Fitzgerald |
| Allard | Cornyn | Frist |
| Allen | Craig | Gregg |
| Bennett | Crapo | Hagel |
| Bond | Dole | Hatch |
| Bunning | Domenici | Inhofe |
| Chambliss | Enzi | Kyl |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Lott | Nickles | Talent |
| McConnell | Shelby | Thomas |
| Miller | Stevens | Voinovich |
| Murkowski | Sununu | |

NOT VOTING—1

Edwards

The amendment (No. 865) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 871

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 12:15 be equally divided in the usual form for debate in relation to the Landrieu-Domenici amendment; provided, further, that at 12:15 the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to that amendment, with no second degrees in order to the amendment prior to the vote; and, finally, that following the vote the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like incorporated in the unanimous consent request 5 minutes. This amendment was offered as the Landrieu-Specter amendment.

Mr. REID. No objection.

Mr. DOMENICI. We have no objection.

Mr. President, I add 5 minutes to the time in the request, with the Senator from Pennsylvania having that 5 minutes. The vote would occur at 12:20.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I am sorry, we did not know that, I say to the Senator. We would have asked you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

Mr. President, the amendment is at the desk. We will be voting shortly on the Landrieu-Domenici-Specter-Alexander-Bingaman-Collins-Schumer-Feingold oil savings amendment. It is a very reasonable approach to an extremely serious problem. That problem is, unless we make some adjustments—and the time to make those adjustments is now—to our policy regarding the consumption of oil, we will be seriously increasing, as opposed to decreasing, our dependence on foreign oil and hurting the American economy and taxing American citizens and businesses unnecessarily.

The amendment has been developed by many of us—Democrats and Republicans—and it is based on lots of good work. Two issues I pointed out earlier this morning in the debate are in a lengthy article recently published by Business Week—not a liberal magazine by any stretch, a middle-of-the-road business organization that argues that we need to get smart about oil.

As a Senator from an oil-producing State, let me say I agree 100 percent. We like to produce oil. We are proud to produce oil. But we know it is in the interest of our State in the short, intermediate, and long run to have greater supply, a diversity of supply of fuels, and not be overreliant. Why? Because it puts our economy, our industrial base at risk.

I also mentioned earlier today the statement by the Union of Concerned Scientists, over 60,000 scientists and citizens working together to come up with some proposals for reducing our dependence on oil, and they are clearly outlined in these articles and these papers.

What this amendment simply does—submitted on behalf of those I mentioned—is give the President all the flexibility he needs in his administration but to reach very specific goals. This amendment, when adopted, will save 1 million barrels of oil a day by the year 2013, which is equivalent to the President's own goals, but it will put this in law in the underlying Energy bill.

I propose this amendment to the Senate for its careful consideration and hope we will get a broad vote.

Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania would like to add some remarks, as well as other cosponsors who may be in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am pleased to be the original, principal cosponsor, along with Senator LANDRIEU, on the Landrieu-Specter-Bingaman-Collins amendment. I am pleased to see that now the Senate is on the verge of taking a significant step, albeit a modest one, on petroleum conservation, a step long overdue in this country.

Last year, I cosponsored, along with Senator CARPER, an amendment which would have targeted reduction in oil consumption, and it was defeated on a tabling motion 57 to 42. A few days ago, I introduced S. 1169, which was a repeat of the Carper-Specter amendment. And today I am pleased to join with Senator LANDRIEU on a broader amendment which goes for reduction of oil dependency beyond transportation but calls on the President to set a standard for reduction of oil by 1 million barrels a day from a projected use of some 24 million barrels.

This is a significant step, albeit a modest one. It is a first step. But it is very important for the United States that we reduce our dependence on foreign oil for many reasons. First of all, simply stated, we use too much foreign oil. Secondly, we are dependent upon the OPEC countries, especially upon Saudi Arabia, and it has an effect on influencing our foreign policies in ways which may well be undesirable. There have been very serious charges as to the Saudis on sponsoring al-Qaida and sponsoring terrorism. There is much yet that has to be proved on that subject, but we should not be tied to or dependent upon any nation, especially Saudi Arabia.

The dependence on foreign oil results in a tremendous amount of our imbalance on foreign trade, with oil imports now accounting for one-third of the Nation's trade deficit which exceeded $400 billion in the year 2001.

There is much we could do to reduce our dependence upon foreign oil. I am pleased to report on a $100 million grant by the Department of Energy to a plant in Pottsville, PA; a $612 million plant which will turn sludge into high-octane fuel is now moving forward. We have tremendous coal resources in this country, some 20 billion tons of bituminous coal alone in Pennsylvania, 7 billion tons of anthracite, and coal across this country which can be turned, with clean coal technology, into reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

I am pleased to see the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, chairman of the Energy Committee, is now cosponsoring this amendment so that what you have, although slightly different than last year on a tabling at 57 to 42, is an amendment gaining very substantial momentum. That is a very good sign for conservation, a very good sign for the future of the American economy, and a very good sign for environmental protection.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am pleased to join as an original cosponsor of what we are going to call the Landrieu-Domenici amendment. I note the presence of Senator ALEXANDER who was one of the original Senators who spoke to this matter on the floor. I hope in the remaining time he gets a chance to speak. Let me say there are a lot of people who come up with new formulas, attempt to set new formulas on automobiles, on the mileage that cars will have, and the like. None of them seem to work, and none of them seem to get through this body. This is an ingenious idea of my friend from Louisiana who has been extremely helpful in getting an Energy bill passed. I think when we pass it in a few weeks, and we will, she can take a great deal of pleasure in knowing that much of it was due to her interest, enthusiasm, and support.

I hope we will vote for it unanimously, saying to our President, find ways to do this. I believe it is the best way for the Senate to handle it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Ms. BUNNING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be listed as a cosponsor of the Landrieu amendment.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. How much more time remains under the unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I would like to have 1 minute to close and then turn to one of the original cosponsors, the Senator from Tennessee, who may want to add. Let me again thank the chairman and ranking member for their able help because without their support, this amendment would not have been possible. We worked on many different approaches, several different drafts. Finally, we did come upon a way that sets a very clear goal.

I would agree with Senator SPECTER, it is somewhat modest, but it is a compromise. It is a clear goal. It is an attainable goal. It is a reachable goal. It gives the President and the administration the flexibility they need to do it in a way that is most helpful to this economy. It will create jobs, reduce taxes that people pay because of the price of oil and energy, and it gives the flexibility necessary to come up with a smart approach to this very serious problem.

I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana. We should not pass an Energy bill that does not put conservation up on the platform along with our encouragement of nuclear power, oil exploration, and hydrogen fuel cell; all of that is important. And this amendment by the Senator and various cosponsors makes it clear to the country that commonsense ways to conserve oil are equally important in our arsenal of having an economy that is less dependent on foreign oil and in a better position to produce clean air.

I am proud to join as a cosponsor. I congratulate the Senator and congratulate our chairman for being able to move this bill forward with such a bipartisan consensus.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield back the time I have. I might say to Senators, we tried very hard to get the vote within 15 minutes last time. I was asked by a number of Senators to please try to do that on the votes. I have no authority to say that will be the rule, but as the floor manager, we have a 15-minute rollcall vote on this amendment. It is a simple one. It is not too hard to find your way to the floor. I trust that in 15 minutes we will have disposed of this.

In the meantime, before that occurs, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes at 2:15, the pending amendment be set aside and that Senator WYDEN be recognized to offer the nuclear commercial plant amendment under the debate limitation which was agreed to last week.

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

The question is agreeing to amendment No. 871.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 213 Leg.]

YEAS—99

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Akaka | Dodd | Lincoln |
| Alexander | Dole | Lott |
| Allard | Domenici | Lugar |
| Allen | Dorgan | McCain |
| Baucus | Durbin | McConnell |
| Bayh | Edwards | Mikulski |
| Bennett | Ensign | Miller |
| Biden | Enzi | Murkowski |
| Bingaman | Feingold | Murray |
| Bond | Feinstein | Nelson (FL) |
| Boxer | Fitzgerald | Nelson (NE) |
| Breaux | Frist | Nickles |
| Brownback | Graham (FL) | Pryor |
| Bunning | Graham (SC) | Reed |
| Burns | Grassley | Reid |
| Byrd | Gregg | Roberts |
| Campbell | Hagel | Rockefeller |
| Cantwell | Harkin | Santorum |
| Carper | Hatch | Sarbanes |
| Chafee | Hollings | Schumer |
| Chambliss | Hutchison | Sessions |
| Clinton | Inhofe | Shelby |
| Cochran | Inouye | Smith |
| Coleman | Jeffords | Snowe |
| Collins | Johnson | Specter |
| Conrad | Kennedy | Stabenow |
| Cornyn | Kerry | Stevens |
| Corzine | Kohl | Sununu |
| Craig | Landrieu | Talent |
| Crapo | Lautenberg | Thomas |
| Daschle | Leahy | Voinovich |
| Dayton | Levin | Warner |
| DeWine | Lieberman | Wyden |

NAYS—1

Kyl

The amendment (No. 871) was agreed to.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived and passed, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:56 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. THOMAS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

## CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, on Thursday, June 5, on rollcall vote No. 209, I voted yea. It was my intention then to vote nay. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oregon is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 875

(Purpose: To strike the provision relating to deployment of new nuclear power plants)

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], for himself, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. REID, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Ms. SNOWE, proposes an amendment numbered 875.

Strike subtitle B of title IV.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President and colleagues, this amendment is sponsored by three Democrats, three Republicans, and one Independent. I hope this afternoon that it will have the support of Senators with varying degrees of views about the advisability of nuclear power. I am particularly pleased that the lead cosponsor, Senator SUNUNU, is with us today.

I will make a few brief remarks to begin the debate and then I am anxious to have plenty of time for colleagues.

The reason three Democrats and three Republicans and one Independent are sponsoring this amendment is that I think many of us in the Senate are neither pronuclear nor antinuclear but we are definitely protaxpayer. That is why we are on the floor this afternoon, because the loan guarantees that are in this legislation to construct nuclear power facilities are unprecedented and represent, in my view, particularly onerous and troublesome risks to the taxpayers of this country.

Frankly, people in my part of the country know a bit about this. It is not an abstraction for the people of the Pacific Northwest where we had the WPPSS debacle and 4 out of 5 facilities were never built. It was the biggest municipal bond failure in history, and it has certainly colored my thinking with respect to why we are on the floor today.

The loan guarantees—we did some research into this—are unprecedented with respect even to nuclear power. As far as I can tell, in the early days of nuclear power, there were subsidies for nuclear power but never before were the taxpayers on the hook from the get-go. That is what the Senate is confronted with now.

When it comes to the question of risk, I hope the Senate will focus on what the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has said on this topic. I will quote. It is at page 9 of the Congressional Budget Office analysis that we have made available to Senators. The Congressional Budget Office considered:

The risks of default on such loan guarantees to be very high, well above 50 percent.

Colleagues, first, when we are talking about risk—because nothing in life is foolproof and there are no guarantees of anything—I hope in looking at these guarantees you will first focus on the fact that the Congressional Budget Office has specifically said in their analysis that the risk of default on the