Mr. REID. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield for a comment?

Mr. BYRD. Absolutely; gladly.

Mr. REID. As directed by the two managers of this bill, we have asked both Cloakrooms to clear their request: that there be a filing of amendments by 4 o'clock today, which gives people ample time, many hours. It was announced even prior to the break that the Interior bill would be the first bill brought up, and we even indicated when it would be brought up. So I hope we can get this cleared right away.

I say to my friend, the junior Senator from Montana, who has done such a good job in getting this bill to this point, the holdup now is on that side. Maybe if we go into a quorum call Senator BURNS will be gracious enough to see if he can move this along. Until that happens, my experience is this bill is in a flounder.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished whip.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, it is my hope that we can do this by 4 o'clock this afternoon. There is no need for us to dillydally around here when we have other things to do. I only have one thing I have to do at 2 o'clock this afternoon. I have to introduce a couple of judges who have been nominated to the Montana district court system. By the time I get that done, 4 o'clock should be our cutoff.

We should be talking about amendments right now. There is no reason why we cannot move this bill to final conclusion tomorrow.

Mr. REID. I believe the Senator from West Virginia still has the floor, if I can make another comment.

Mr. BYRD. Surely.

Mr. REID. It is my thought, if the two managers agree, that at 12:30 p.m., if there is still a problem with hotlining, a unanimous consent request be made and if anybody objects to it, they are going to have to come here in person to object to it. That is my suggestion. On a bill as important as this, we need to have the Senators, not the staff lurking in some of these rooms around the Capitol complex making objections for their Senators.

After we go into a quorum call, upon consulting with the two managers, I make the suggestion that perhaps that is what we should do.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada, the majority whip, for his suggestion. I like it. We have just heard Senator BURNS voice his opinion.

Mr. BURNS. We will do everything we can to get that taken care of. We do not want to close anybody out either, understanding the sensitivity of that. I believe we have made a reasonable request. I thank the chairman.

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

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

## RECESS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there being no Senators seeking recognition and having discussed the following request with the distinguished majority whip and the distinguished manager on the other side of the aisle, it appears it might be best if the Senate stood in recess until 12:15 p.m., during which time some work may be done hopefully that will speed up the entire process to some extent.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 12:15 p.m. today.

There being no objection, at 11:39 a.m., the Senate recessed until 12:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. STABENOW).

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. With the consent of Senator BYRD, I ask unanimous consent all first-degree amendments to H.R. 2217, the Interior appropriations bill, be filed at the desk by 4 p.m. today, Wednesday, July 11.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 880

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes an amendment numbered 880.

Mr. BYRD. Madam 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:

On page 157, line 7, insert ''Protection'' after the word ''Park''.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside.

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

The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 879

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. DAYTON, proposes an amendment numbered 879.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam 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 prohibit the use of funds for the conduct of preleasing, leasing, and related activities within national monuments established under the Act of June 8, 1906)

On page 194, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

**SEC. 1 . PRELEASING, LEASING, AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.**

None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to conduct any preleasing, leasing, or other related activity under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) within the boundary (in effect as of January 20, 2001) of a national monument established under the Act of June 8, 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), except to the extent that such a preleasing, leasing, or other related activity is allowed under the Presidential proclamation establishing the monument.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I note that the Republican ranking member is not on the floor at this time. I will proceed and, of course, afford all opportunity for him for comment or rebuttal or perhaps a speech in support of my amendment. I want to make sure I extend that courtesy to him since he is not currently in the Chamber.

The amendment I bring before us today is one that is very straightforward. I suppose I could have had it read, and it would have made it very clear what I am setting out to do. It basically will prohibit any preleasing or other related activity within the boundaries of a national monument.

What it boils down to is, there are certain lands in the United States which have been designated as important national treasures. We call them national monuments. Virtually every President in the last century, save three, decided to designate certain areas of land in America that were so important they wanted to preserve them so that future generations could enjoy the bounty which God has left us.

There are those, of course, who see that land not as a great treasure to be valued but as a resource to be used. The purpose of my amendment is to stop oil and gas drilling on national monuments across the United States.

We owe the existence of many of America's natural treasures to pioneers of yesterday. Their appreciation of our rugged, untamed new country gave them the foresight to preserve many of our natural resources and public lands for future generations to enjoy.

Theodore Roosevelt was one such pioneer. In 1906, he established Devils Tower in Wyoming, the first national monument.

Right outside this Chamber in the hallway is one of the most remarkable busts of a former Vice President—the bust of Theodore Roosevelt. Every time I walk by it, I can just feel the life in that piece of stone. He has his jaw stuck out as if he is ready to take on the world. I can imagine in 1906 when Teddy Roosevelt said to a lot of people in this country: You know what. We have resources in this country that are worth fighting for and worth preserving, and we are going to do it. There were probably people standing on the sideline saying that Teddy Roosevelt was crazy, that he certainly did not want to set aside land that might have had great value to our future. Yet he did it. Not only did he do it; he established a standard that President after President followed.

The Republican Party, of which Theodore Roosevelt was a proud member at one time, certainly was that party of preservation and conservation. It set a standard that the Democratic Party followed, and I am glad they did. It was a bipartisan idea. These are treasures that don't know the difference between parties, the treasurers which our children and future generations should enjoy. Roosevelt said this at one point, and his words I think tell the story: ''We must ask ourselves if we are leaving for future generations an environment that is as good or better than what we found.''

That is simple. That inspired him in 1906 to create the first national monument at Devils Tower, WY. Unfortunately, not every President has been inspired by Teddy Roosevelt. Sadly, I come to the floor today because of threats by this new administration in Washington to at least consider the option of drilling for oil and gas in these national monuments across the United States.

Some leaders in Washington lack the foresight of our Founding Fathers and pioneers. They hide today behind the shield of an ''energy crisis''—an energy crisis, which they believe means that we have to change all the rules, saying we can no longer keep this land at least protected so future generations can enjoy it. They say because of our need for energy we have to break a lot of rules; we have to start drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; we have to start drilling in the national monuments; we have to start looking for oil and gas in places that a lot of Americans honestly believed we had declared off limits.

President Bush and Interior Secretary Gale Norton have publicly stated they believe that some of our national monuments would be good places for oil and gas drilling or coal mining. Oddly, the monuments being targeted have one thing in common: Every single one was designated by one President, President William Jefferson Clinton. So when they look at monuments across the United States that they want to go drilling on, they have only picked one group—those designated by President Clinton.

President Bush needs to realize that damaging these irreplaceable lands is not going to solve America's energy crisis, but it could cause a crisis in conservation. Americans are rightfully concerned about energy security. But I don't think that most Americans believe that we are in such dire straits that we should invite the big oil and gas producers into these protected lands.

My amendment would simply prohibit new mineral leases from being issued in designated national monuments. My amendment does not affect any valid existing rights or prevent leasing in any area that was authorized for mineral activity when the monument was established. I want to make that point clear. Some will come before us and say: You are going to shut down oil and gas drilling and mining in these monuments, and it has been going on for years. If it took place before, if it is existing, if it has been approved, this amendment has no impact whatsoever. But it is the new drilling, the new mining, this new exploration in these national monuments that would be prohibited by this amendment.

When a President issues a proclamation designating a national monument, it is not unusual for existing rights to drill to be maintained. The real intent of this amendment is to preserve the existing boundaries of monuments so this administration can't shrink them to make even more lands available for energy exploration.

Since 1906—the day of Teddy Roosevelt that I noted earlier—14 of the next 17 Presidents of the United States, Democrat and Republican alike, unapologetically and proudly designated national monuments under the Antiquities Act, for a total of 118 national monuments. Only three Presidents in the 20th century did not designate national monument territory—Presidents Nixon, Reagan, and the elder George Bush.

People say, well, I have heard of national parks and national forests. What is a national monument? Half of our national parks started out as national monuments. Let me tell you what they include. The Grand Canyon was designated as a national monument; Glacier Bay; Zion; and Acadia National Park. The national monument is the first designation of a piece of land in America that can have lasting values as part of our national heritage. Can you imagine, for a moment, if those who preceded us did not have the foresight to protect those lands, what America would have given up not to have these resources available, so that families of today and tomorrow can take their children and look out at that magnificent expanse of the Grand Canyon and stand in awe and wonder of God's creation? Thank God, someone had the foresight to think ahead and believe it was worth designating that, first, as a national monument and then as a national park, to be protected.

This amendment is addressing a new mindset that says when it comes to today's national monuments, it is a different story; they are up for grabs. We are involved in an energy crisis. People can drill for oil and gas on these new monuments designated by President Clinton. That is so shortsighted. It loses vision when it comes to what our country is all about and should be all about.

The Bureau of Land Management has the responsibility of managing public lands across the United States, and we have thousands and thousands of acres. I see Senator HARRY REID from Nevada is here. I don't know what percentage of his home State is Federal land——

Mr. REID. It is 87 percent.

Mr. DURBIN. It is 87 percent. Many Western States have similar percentages of Federal land within their boundaries. In the earliest days of our country, of course, there wasn't a great hue and cry to have private ownership in this land. The Federal Government owned it, and some of it may never have any real practical value when it comes to residential or commercial development. But the Federal Government took the responsibility under an agency known as the Bureau of Land Management. This is kind of the landlord for America's public lands. The Bureau of Land Management has determined that 95 percent of the lands they manage across the United States are already available for oil and gas leasing. So if you hear an argument from the other side that we now have to go and drill into the national monument lands because we have nowhere else to look for oil and gas and precious minerals, that is just not the fact. Ninety-five percent of the Federal lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management are already available for oil and gas leasing.

Instead of hopping onto the drilling bandwagon, we should first focus on energy exploration in existing areas before we turn to these precious national monuments. I am afraid that the President and many of the people in the energy industry talk about oil and gas development as though it were the cure for all of our energy woes in America—drill and burn, drill and burn, drill and burn. There is much more to the challenge that faces our Nation.

The President has to acknowledge that the longstanding supply and demand and balance in the United States will not be solved overnight, and it won't be solved with 19th and 20th century thinking. Our Nation consumes 9.1 million barrels of oil a day. We import about half of that—more than half, frankly. Oil production from Federal lands—all Federal lands—supplies about 10 percent of our total oil needs. This isn't enough to bring U.S. energy independence or significantly meet the U.S. demand. It is interesting that the Wilderness Society——

Mr. REID. Will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. Yes.

Mr. REID. First, I ask the Senator to list me as a cosponsor.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that that be the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARNAHAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, is the Senator aware that the U.S. Geological Survey has estimated that the reserves within the 15 national monuments designated since 1996 would produce 15 days' worth of oil and 7 days' worth of natural gas for our country? Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator is right. Those are the numbers I was about to quote.

Mr. REID. I am sorry.

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to have the Senator add that to the debate. Frankly, if we are talking about energy needs in America and drilling in places we never would have considered drilling before, whether in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge or national monuments, certainly someone has to make a compelling argument there is so much energy there that America cannot turn its back. The statistics the Senator from Nevada has quoted and an analysis by the Wilderness Society come to the same conclusion.

The total economically recoverable oil from the monuments that I protect in this amendment is the equivalent of 15 days, 12 hours, 28 minutes' worth of energy for the United States. Economically recoverable gas, as a portion of total U.S. consumption, is 7 days, 2 hours, 11 minutes.

What would we give up for that small opportunity to bring that much energy into the picture in the United States? Frankly, we would be drilling in areas which have been designated as special and important treasures that the United States should preserve.

I am glad we are having this national debate about energy conservation and energy efficiency. It is important that we have it, but it is also important that we do not believe the answer to all of our energy problems is to find new places to drill.

Just last week I joined my colleagues, Senator FITZGERALD of Illinois and Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan, at a press conference on the banks of Lake Michigan on a rainy Tuesday before the Fourth of July. As hard as it is to believe, there is one Governor of a State adjoining Lake Michigan who now believes we should drill for oil and gas in Lake Michigan and the Great Lakes. There are those of us who think that, too, is a rash judgment and one we can come to regret.

A lot of people say: It would only be a small little derrick or a small drill out there. I had the experience, I guess it has been over 15 years ago or close to it, of going up to Alaska after the *Exxon Valdez* spill. *Exxon Valdez*, if I remember correctly, was about the size of three football fields. It was a long vessel. When it ran ashore and when its tanks and all its crude oil spread out across the area, it devastated wildlife and left contamination for decades to come.

When we talk about drilling for oil and gas, we have to be careful that we do it in a responsible environmental way so that we do not run the risk of contamination or ruination of important national treasures, such as the Great Lakes, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, or the national monuments designated by President Clinton.

As we can see from the situation in California, energy conservation does work. When they saw the high prices, they reduced their consumption by over 11 percent in a short period of time. It is a lesson to all of us. We can all do better, every single one of us. Before we start drilling into these pristine areas, should we not have a national policy that talks about sustainable, renewable fuels and energy conservation?

I am afraid this administration focuses on drilling and drilling and drilling, and that just is not the answer to all of our challenges.

This land is protected as national monuments because we realize all of the Nation's public landscapes are not appropriate for oil and gas drilling. These lands have intrinsic value. Just because there may be some energy there, even if it is very limited, does not mean we need to drill for it and run the risk of contamination and ruining these great national treasures.

The national monuments belong to the American people. The Government has agreed to hold these lands in trust for our generation and future generations to appreciate. The President of the United States, as a successor to George Washington, as a successor to previous Presidents, was given the responsibility of protecting these lands—first and foremost, protect our national natural heritage—not destroy them.

This energy crisis should not be used as an excuse for us to do things we will rue in the days and years to come. Exploiting our national monuments for a tiny bit of mineral resources will not ease energy prices today, tomorrow, or even next year.

Let's not be misguided. Let's focus the energy debate on responsible energy development, renewable energy, efficiency, and conservation efforts. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I leave my colleagues with this quote, again from Theodore Roosevelt whose words still ring true today:

> Conservation means development as much as it does protection. I recognize the right hand duty of this generation to develop and use the natural resources of our land, but I do not recognize the right to waste them or to rob by wasteful use the generations that come after us.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, I oppose this amendment. It seems we want to make a blanket assertion on what we should do with our monuments. We have to remind ourselves that we are energy deficient.

As for Montana, where there was a national monument created, there are 77,000 acres of privately held land. Even the former Secretary of the Interior, Bruce Babbitt, recommended that oil and gas production in that area should be sustained.

There was a public process. The resource advisory committees in each of these areas made the same recommendation: Gas and oil production could be sustained without harming the land in that national monument.

These areas have also been studied. They have been studied by different committees whose members live in the area. They understand that land and the recommendations that were made.

We in Montana want to contribute something to the energy situation in this country. So far, no one has come up with any solid replacement to oil and gas production for transportation or power generation fuels.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I rise today to support the Durbin amendment that will protect our national monuments from energy exploration. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this important amendment, and I thank Senator DURBIN from Illinois for his work and tremendous efforts on behalf of our national heritage and our national monuments.

The truth is, we should not need an amendment to protect our country's national monuments from energy exploration. These unique landscapes, including the Hanford Reach National Monument in my home State of Washington, were designated as national monuments because they are important in their own right and they deserve to be protected.

We should not need an additional amendment to keep oil derricks out of these lands, but unfortunately that is where we find ourselves today. The Bush administration has proposed exploring for energy even in our national monuments.

When I go home every weekend and talk to my friends and neighbors and go to the grocery store, my constituents come up to me and ask: Is nothing sacred anymore? Drilling in our national monuments is just wrong. This amendment says the Federal Government should not promote energy exploration on our most precious lands, on our heritage.

I recognize the need to find new sources of energy. The Federal Government has always actively promoted the extraction of new energy resources. This can and will continue. During the Clinton administration, thousands of new drilling permits were actually issued for Federal lands. Since the early 1980s, the projection of natural

gas on Federal lands has been increasing steadily. Efforts to find energy on our Federal lands must continue. But attempts to find energy in our national monuments must never begin.

Today, 95 percent of Bureau of Land Management lands in the Western States are open to coal, oil, and gas leasing. We do not need to open up our national monuments, as well. I realize this is a challenging time because we are facing an energy crisis. In my home State of Washington, we are experiencing dramatic rate increases because of the many factors involved, including a drought and too little energy production and a spike in gas prices.

Thousands of my constituents are out of work because of high energy costs. No one needs to tell anyone in Washington State we have to increase energy production. We know we need to increase capacity and that is what we are doing. We are working to site new generation capacity. On the Oregon and Washington border, we are constructing the country's largest wind farm. We have natural gas plants going up. We have a proposal for a coal-fired plant. We are upgrading our transmission system to deliver new generation supplies.

We know what we need to do and we are taking action. But we know we don't need to drill for natural gas in our national monuments.

The Hanford Reach National Monument is a national treasure. It includes the last free-flowing stretch of the Columbia River. It is the most productive spawning ground for threatened salmon in the entire Columbia River Basin. It is home to threatened sage grouse and 2 plant and 40 insect species that are brand-new to science.

The monument also includes and borders important historic and cultural features. The area is rich in important Native American, early pioneer, and nuclear production history. The Hanford Reach National Monument may be the most unique monument in the entire country.

I have heard some people suggest that the national monument designations made by President Clinton were made too quickly, without public involvement, and without consideration of energy production values. That is simply not true. I have been working since my first year in the Senate, 9 years ago, to protect the Hanford Reach. I introduced legislation in the previous three Congresses to protect that area. We held numerous public meetings, we got lots of local input from local leaders, local folk, and we debated a lot of different proposals.

The administration had 8 years of knowledge developed by the consideration of various protection proposals. The plans considered irrigation, farming, and the potential for gas outside the monument's boundaries. The plan considered commercial development of lands by ports and cities. In fact, the final designation even included a provision ensuring a new right-of-way for energy transmission lines to go across the Hanford Reach. All of those considerations helped define the final boundaries of that national monument. So for some to suggest now that we never thought about our future energy needs is just plain wrong.

In the end, the final decision was that the ecological and historical values of the Hanford Reach merited protection as a national monument. We knew what we were doing by that designation. We knew we were choosing to protect the unique and vital habitats. We knew we were honoring important cultural sites, and we intended to leave this legacy to future generations.

Protecting certain areas for generations to come is an admirable goal. These designations were made after full consideration. This Congress should not now in any way undermine those legacies in favor of the energy industry. We should not have to fight back these attacks on our very limited protected lands.

I believe we should preserve these ecological and historic treasures for future generations. These lands belong to all of us. We are responsible for protecting them. That is why the Durbin amendment is so important. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I thank my colleague from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I rise today to support also the amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN. I am proud to join him in this effort and to be an original cosponsor of his amendment.

My colleague from Illinois seeks to make certain that amendment language offered by the Congressman from West Virginia, Mr. RAHALL, which would prohibit drilling for oil and gas and mining in our national monuments is included in the Senate bill. The Rahall amendment passed the House overwhelmingly by a vote of 242–173.

Madam President, I support this amendment because I believe that to not speak loudly against the Bush administration's proposals to re-open many of these monuments under the guise of our present energy concerns is a dereliction of responsibility for this body and this Senator.

It is the responsibility of this body to review areas designated as national monuments to determine whether or not additional designations should be conferred—such as creating a national park or a wilderness area out of lands administratively protected as a monument.

Presidents have designated about 120 national monuments, totaling more than 70 million acres, and given that Congress has done its review, most of this acreage is no longer in monument status. For instance, Grand Canyon National Park initially was proclaimed a national monument but was converted by Congress into a national park.

Congress should responsibly exercise its authority, and be clear about its intent, which this amendment does. This amendment prohibits the administration from proceeding with drilling for oil and gas and mining in our national monuments. This amendment will prevent these activities which are incompatible with many of the federal land use designations Congress might confer until we truly examine these areas. Monument designations create expectations on behalf of our constituents, Madam President, that these areas are protected and we should work to make certain that is so.

I am aware that Presidential establishment of national monuments under the Antiquities Act of 1906 has protected valuable sites but also has been contentious. President Clinton used his authority 22 times to proclaim 19 new monuments and to enlarge 3 others. The monuments were designated during his last year in office, with one exception, and I will speak about that exception in greater detail. President Clinton's 19 new and 3 enlarged monuments comprise 5.9 million Federal acres. Only President Franklin Delano Roosevelt used his authority more often—28 times—and only President Jimmy Carter created more monument acreage—56 million acres in Alaska.

The monument actions, regardless of one's position on them, were needed because Congress had not acted quickly enough to protect these Federal lands. The best response to concerns about the monument process is to support my colleague from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, and not allow modifications to the monuments that some perceive were created unfairly to be made in an equally concerning fashion.

My constituents do not support expansion of oil and gas drilling and mining in lands designated by Presidential declaration as national monuments. I personally know the value of wild areas, and the threats that mineral, coal and oil and gas exploration pose. Though I have not been to all the monuments designated by President Clinton, I have hiked the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, an area that the Senator from Illinois and I believe should be designated as wilderness.

I hiked down a 65-degree slope to Upper Calf Creek Falls in the Grand Staircase. It was a challenging and spectacular trip. Calf Creek meanders along a shallow valley with several deep clear pools before the upper falls, where the creek drops 88 feet over a cliff face at the head of Calf Creek Canyon. This deepens gradually for 2.5 miles south then doubles in size below the 126-foot lower falls. The path to the falls is down a steep slope of white slickrock marked by cairns of dark, volcanic pebbles then across flatter sandy ground to the canyon edge, with a total elevation loss of almost 600 feet. My experience is that this monument is a spectacular place and one with now tremendous recreational value and use. I should be preserved that way.

I use my Upper Calf Creek trip as an example of why the Senator's amendment is needed. We should be preserving our options with these lands, not opening them for development. I support this amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I don't know if any Senators are here to speak in opposition. If there are, I will yield to them. I would like to speak and close debate, but I want to make certain the other side has ample opportunity to express its point of view.

Mr. BURNS. I ask the Senator from Illinois, as I understand it, the amendment prevent any further drilling, or does it bar all drilling, even though there are rights there in the first place?

Mr. DURBIN. The amendment clearly states if there is existing drilling, existing rights, it does not in any way infringe upon those. It is a question of new drilling, new leasing in these areas.

Mr. BURNS. If that resource is there and it can be done in an environmentally sensitive way, why is that bad or wrong?

Mr. DURBIN. I say to the Senator from Montana, I don't believe either of us would consider drilling on the Capital Mall or perhaps in the Grand Canyon or near it. There are certain things where we draw the line and say we know there may be energy resources, but if we are so desperate in this country that we have to reach that point, we have gone too far.

I think when you look at the estimated resources available in these monuments, they are so minuscule in terms of our national energy picture, many of us believe it is far better to say to future generations: Listen, we found another way to find energy, to conserve energy. We didn't spoil something that future generations will treasure.

Mr. BURNS. We had the Secretary of the Interior up in Montana. In the upper Missouri, which was designated as a national monument, I tell my good friend from Illinois, we asked the Secretary, No. 1, to find the gas well and then find the pipeline that carried the gas from the wellhead into the main pipeline. He could not find it. He could not find either one of them—he tried by air and by land—until we showed him where they were.

What I am saying is we should consider the new technologies and how we regard our lands, especially the big open lands. I am not talking about a monument such as The Mall; I am talking about land that is in bigger country that is very seldom ever walked upon by the people who probably own the grazing lease. We still allow grazing in national monuments. Very seldom are those lands ever walked on by anybody else.

We have an area in Montana that is going to demand some more attention in the next 2 or 3 years because it is along the Missouri River and that was the route of Louis and Clark. Of course, this will be the 200th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase, and the trek of Louis and Clark will draw a little more attention to that area.

But tell me why we would completely close out the possibility, even under emergency conditions, in areas where we could develop that energy—and especially natural gas, which is the cleanest of all energy that is coming from the fossil fuels we take from the Earth—why we would close out that possibility.

Mr. DURBIN. I say this to the Senator from Montana, whom I respect. We come at this with a different attitude towards national monuments and national lands. I think we do have a genuine difference of opinion. I am aware, and I am sure my colleague is, too, that 95 percent of the Federal public lands under the management of the Bureau of Land Management are currently open for oil and gas drilling. I do believe it is not unreasonable to say that 5 percent of the Federal lands that we own are so important to our national heritage that we are not going to go in and drill.

No matter whether you can sneak in there and come out again and folks say, ''We were not even sure they were there,'' every time you do that you run a risk—I am sure the Senator from Montana knows that—that it will not be as clean an operation as you want it to be. You run a risk you will change an ecological balance in an area that has been the same for centuries.

I think it is not unreasonable for us to say, as we do in our normal lives, there are certain places that are treated differently than others. We treat our churches a little differently than we treat our shopping malls. We just view them differently. I think when it comes to our national treasures, our national monuments, it is not unreasonable to say these are areas which will be treated differently.

Mr. BURNS. I tell my good friend, it is that kind of mind-set that said we are going to save the suckerfish in Klamath Falls, OR, and it takes precedence over 1,500 families and their future and our ability to provide food and fiber for this country. It is a trash fish. That is going on right now in that basin.

That is what I am saying. When we take a look at what our attitude is about a certain thing and hide behind the screen of green and throw out all logic on the management of those lands, then we may have to reassess how we look at all lands, even those that exist in the State of Illinois. That is what I am saying. It is something that creeps into the mind-set, that it is all right to disrupt our lives and our families—even though we do it right and in an environmentally sensitive manner—because of a mind-set. I think that is where we have a basic philosophical difference on how we manage land.

I look at it much differently. I know you come from down there not too far from where I was raised. I was raised in Missouri. I never thought about water rights until I went west, where there wasn't any. There wasn't any water. Those things become very important. But they never entered our life when I lived in the lower Midwest.

I just think it is a mistake whenever we close up an area because of a mind-set that we cannot do it right and we here in Washington, DC, are basically in a better position to make the decision, more than having the decision made locally. Even the Senator from Washington says we had local input. We did the boundaries originally. We looked at the land that was sensitive, and we set it aside.

I agree with that. There are areas in the Missouri Breaks that I think should be set aside and even made wilderness. The river is already a protected river. I agree with that.

But whenever you take one broad swipe across a huge amount of land, especially when you have 77,000 acres of in-holdings and you have to cross public lands just to get to them, then we make a decision here that impacts people's lives in a real way. Those people have faces. That is why I oppose this amendment. I am not calling for the repeal of the Antiquities Act. What I am saying is we are impacting our own Nation's ability to produce food and fiber and energy because of a mind-set that sounds warm, green, and fuzzy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Montana. I know his opinions are heartfelt. He and I have talked about this on the floor on previous occasions. But I hope we can put this in some perspective.

America is a great nation. God has blessed us with resources that many nations around the world envy. Fortunately, leaders in this country with foresight decided long ago that there were certain treasures, national treasures in America, that needed to be protected and preserved.

Mark my words, when they made those suggestions they were not always popular. There were people who had ideas that something else could be done with that national park or that national monument. But those leaders stood their ground and said: We can find other ways to provide for the occupations and professions of people living in these States. We can find other sources of energy. We do not have to spoil a national asset, part of our national heritage that we can never, ever again reclaim.

The Senator from Montana talked about national monuments, and, I guess, the energy potential that they offer to the United States. Here is a summary from the U.S. Geological Service about the economically recoverable oil and gas from national monuments.

I might remind those following the debate that it is now President Bush who wants to initiate new drilling for oil and gas in national monuments—protected lands set aside by the previous administration to be preserved for future generations. This President wants to let the oil and gas companies come in and drill on these lands.

When the Senator from Montana talked about trash fish, I can't argue the story. I don't know that side. This is not trash. This is a national monument. This is a beautiful span of land set aside for future generations by the previous President.

Picture, if you will, in this rare piece of real estate in America, oil and gas drilling. Have we reached that point? This is not trash. This is a treasure. We shouldn't take it lightly when it comes to oil and gas drilling in America's treasures.

Let me give you an example of some of the national monuments and what the geological survey estimates is available there if we follow President Bush's recommendation to go ahead and keep drilling; let's find new areas for oil and gas drilling in these national monuments.

In the Upper Missouri River Breaks in Montana, which the Senator from Montana made reference to earlier, the economically recoverable oil from that entire national monument is the equivalent of one hour's worth of gas consumption in the United States.

I didn't take those numbers because the Senator mentioned his own State but just to put this in some perspective.

We are going to go drilling in these national monuments to try to recover one hour's worth of energy for our country. And what do we leave behind? If we are lucky, not much—maybe a few footprints in the soil. But we can never be certain that we haven't spoiled or changed that forever.

All of the economically recoverable oil from all of the national monuments—where President Bush now wants to go drill—is the equivalent of 15 days, 12 hours, and 28 minutes of America's energy consumption. All of the economically recoverable gas as a portion of the total U.S. consumption from these monuments where the President now wants to go drilling is the equivalent of 7 days, 2 hours, and 11 minutes' worth of America's energy.

I listened to the news this morning. I hear there is a bill over in the House of Representatives on energy, and they are talking about perhaps for the first time that we are going to start establishing fuel-efficient standards for SUVs and trucks in this country. That is not radical thinking. I think it is sensible. I voted for it in the Senate. Just a little bit of energy conservation and a little bit of fuel efficiency makes this debate totally meaningless. With just a little change in Detroit we can save more oil than we can possibly derive from monuments. But the oil and gas companies want to get in there, and they want to make a profit. They have put these national treasures in the United States on the altar of greed and profit and the bottom line. That is just plain wrong.

I don't think I will prevail on this amendment. But I tell you that, as Senator FEINGOLD from Wisconsin, Senator MURRAY from Washington, and Senator REID from Nevada said, this is worth a fight.

You don't get many opportunities to cast a vote while on the floor of the Senate that have a lasting impact for generations to come. This is worth a fight. This is worth a vote.

I hope some of the Republican Members who come to the floor will remember one of the greats in their political party, Teddy Roosevelt—whose bust is right outside this door—who really defended conservation for America and made his party the proud patriarch for conservation in America. I hope they will remember when they come to the floor and take real pride in that rather than the oil and gas companies that just want to get their dirty hands on our national monuments.

We can do a lot better in this country. The oil and gas people have 95 percent of the Federal land to deal with. They do not need the 5 percent that we should be preserving and protecting for future generations. This amendment says to them: Keep your hands off of it. Leave it for future generations. Let's find other ways to meet our energy needs that are environmentally sensible and responsible.

If I lose on this amendment, and if the Bush administration goes forward with the oil and gas drilling, a lot of people will, frankly, never know it. How many of us visit all these national monuments? But some people will—some who go to look for that treasure that was set aside will find it is no longer the treasure it once was; it has been used; It has been exploited; it has been spoiled and perhaps even ruined in the name of profit.

The starting point, for those following the debate, is these are public lands. This is not private property. These are national monuments and public lands. They are lands that belong to all of us as Americans. It is not just the 285 million alive today but our children and grandchildren as well. If we don't have the courage to stand up and say protect and preserve a small part of it for future generations, then we are turning our back on the legacy of wise stewardship that has guided this country for so many years. It has been 95 years since a Republican President named Teddy Roosevelt had the courage to stand up and say they were going to protect that heritage. Ninety-five years later, another Republican President says, no; we are going to drill for oil and gas in that heritage.

What a difference. We will put an end to it with this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, there is a great deal of what my colleague from Illinois has said that I just won't disagree with at all. This is an important thing to be corrected, though, in his statement because we must deal with facts here when we are talking to the American people about the choices they will have to make depending on the policies we create.

First, the Bush administration is not advocating drilling in all of the monuments of the lower 48 States. That is a falsehood. What is important to say is that the Bush administration is proposing an energy policy that would open up public lands to be explored for the purpose of finding additional energy resources to determine whether or not they ought to be developed. That is a very real and different statement than the one my colleague from Illinois just made.

What is important about this debate is a choice that we are asking the American people to make. I think it is an important choice. I think it is worthy of the debate that we are having.

Energy security, the right of the family to know that their energy is secure, that their lights won't go out, or the cost of driving their minivan or their SUV is going to double or triple over the next couple of years, or the right and the power of big oil and OPEC to dictate that because policymakers were asleep at the switch or used false arguments to cause fear amongst the American people—if that is true, then shame on those policymakers. But bravo to the policymaker that is willing to stand up for the security of our country and the security of the American family.

That is what is important. Should the mom have to pay three or four times what she is paying now to drive her son or her daughter to a soccer game? Well, her costs have doubled in the last year. The reason they have doubled is because this country has not had a national energy policy. We had to go begging to the thieves in the Middle East, the OPEC crowd. That was the policy of the past administration—grab my tin cup and beg and let mom pay at the gas pump.

Was it the right policy? I don't think it was. I am not even going to suggest that drilling or allowing exploration in monuments is the right policy.

But what I will suggest to you today and to my colleague from Illinois is, do we have to make very hard-line choices in a world of modern technology and the talent that we possess today? Can we not shape an environment and shape a national economy that are compatible?

I agree with my colleague from Illinois. If you want to step back 30 years and use the argument of 30 years ago, he wins. If he is opposed to drilling or if he is opposed to exploration, that is correct. And I lose, if I am for it being based on 30-year-old technology. If you want the technology of today and tomorrow, then my guess is that it is a bit of a tossup.

We have preserved and protected the environment. But most importantly, we haven't forced mom to go to the gas pump and double her prices.

I recently talked to a young man who is vice president of a new technology company out in California. We know what has gone on out in California, and we can pick losers and winners and those to blame. I will tell you what was wrong with that young man. He had not made any bad choices. He was frightened. He drives a minivan; He has an economy car; and he has a house. But he said: Senator CRAIG, I am frightened I am going to lose my job. I have spent 20 years building a retirement, and the company I work for is teetering today because their energy costs have tripled, their profitability is disappearing, and they are laying off people.

That is as a result of this Senate, and others, not making the right policy choices over the last decade. That is why that young man in California is frightened today about his future.

What does that have to do with national monuments or the 23 new monuments that former President Clinton created in the lower 48? I believe it has something to do with it. I believe it has to do with the fundamental question that is being asked of my colleague from Illinois today, and that I ask of all of us: Can we live together compatibly in an environment in which we can apply new technologies to have abundant energy or do we have to pick winners and losers?

I totally disagree with him on his using Teddy Roosevelt as a facade to argue. Yes, you are right, Teddy Roosevelt, in 1908, created the great forest preserves of our country. I know. I am a bit of a student of Teddy Roosevelt. I do not use him when it is comfortable. I study him, and I believe in him. And he went on to create some of the grand national parks. But my guess is, he would not have run around the country in his last 5 years creating all kinds of monuments for the sake of developing environmental votes. He did it because he saw the need to create and protect the true jewels of our country's environment. What Teddy Roosevelt also knew was that you had to have something that was in balance.

I will tell you, the Senator from Illinois is absolutely right: If we take all of these monuments off the table and we do not drill in them, we will not feel it tomorrow, and we will not feel it the next day, and our dependency on foreign oil will grow from 50 percent to 60 percent to 70 percent. If we can play games with the OPEC boys and we can keep them at about $28 a barrel, then we are OK—probably.

Now your gas prices have doubled. For a family making $15 to $25,000 a year, that means 30 percent of their income gets spent on energy. But for somebody such as the Senator from Illinois or myself—we are making pretty good money—it probably will not affect our lives very much because it is a smaller percentage of our total spendable income.

Shame on a country today that understands technology and understands the environment and isn't willing to try to make both of them work together. The Senator from Illinois and I want clean air, we want clean water, and we are going to insist on it because we think that is the right public policy. And we want to preserve the crown jewels of our Nation because that is the right public policy.

But when a President comes to my State and carves out 250,000 acres, it is not the Washington Monument; it is 250,000 acres of sagebrush land with a few rocks on it and a few unique geologic features. Interestingly enough, there is no hydrocarbon because it is a volcanic formation, and they were all burnt out about 2½ million years ago. So the argument does not apply to Idaho.

But my guess is, the Senator from Illinois has picked something that is very popular, if you argue it only on one side. But I challenge my colleague from Illinois to tell the American household and the American mom that they will forever be secure in that the lights will never go out or the gas bills will never go up much more than they have gone up now, and we will work collectively together to build a national energy policy that includes conservation and modernization and technology, and that we become self-reliant, and that we build a national security that says we can produce our own energy and we do not have to ask the world at large to provide it for us.

That is a part of this debate. It really is a part of what we ought to be considering today when we decide whether we are going to deny the right to explore on public lands in this country. I think that is a worthy debate. I thank my colleague from Illinois for bringing the issue to this Chamber because it is important for all of us to understand: 20 years ago, you bet, lock it up to protect it; today, modernization and technology says—and I think America believes—that we have come a long way and we can do a better job of balancing the environment and the economy and the use of it all together in an effective manner. And today's debate is just a little bit about a lot of that.

I am concerned about the families of America and their energy security. I do not want them paying more and more of their hard-earned money on energy. But I am not sure that the kind of policy that is being advocated today in this amendment will guarantee that. And I am not at all confident that the Senator from Illinois can assure it. But that is the crux of the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank my colleague, the Senator from Idaho. We clearly have a different point of view. If you listened to his argument, you would think the Durbin amendment would prohibit oil and gas exploration on 95 percent of Federal lands saying that we can only use 5 percent for that purpose. Exactly the opposite is true.

Currently, we can explore for oil and gas on 95 percent of lands under the Bureau of Land Management—Federal public lands which are open to find energy resources to serve our Nation's needs. I am not arguing with that. I accept that.

This amendment says that for 5 percent—1 acre out of 20—we are going to treat it differently. These are national monuments. These are special lands. These are not your run-of-the-mill pieces of real estate. These are lands designated by President Clinton, and monuments that have been designated by previous Presidents, that are being protected and treated differently.

The Durbin amendment says: No oil and gas drilling or mining in the new national monuments designated by the previous administration—a relatively small piece of real estate that has special important value.

The Senator from Idaho has said I am trying to come up with a hard-line choice here. Guilty as charged. It is a hard-line choice. It is a choice that says there are certain pieces of real estate in America worth fighting for and worth protecting and worth saying to private industry—whether it is big oil or big gas—keep your hands off. You have plenty of other real estate to look at. Don't go up to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and don't go into the national monuments designated by President Clinton because I want to be able to take my grandson one day to take a look at them and see the beauty that God created and not have to duck the pipelines and the trucks and all the economic activity of people trying to make a buck off Federal public lands.

Ninety-five percent of the Federal public lands are open to this exploration. For 5 percent there should be a different standard. Yes, there should be a hard-line choice.

Let me address for a second the issue that has been brought up over and over again: What about our energy crisis? We do face an energy challenge. There is no doubt about it. In my home State of Illinois, and across the United States, in the last calendar year we have seen some terrible examples. Home heating bills have gone up dramatically in my home State of Illinois, and other places; electric bills in the State of California; gasoline prices between Easter and Memorial Day—that has now become the play period for big oil companies. They run the gasoline prices up a buck a gallon between Easter and Memorial Day, and then after every politician gets a head of steam and starts screaming at them, they bring them back down. I would like to believe this has something to do with whether or not we are going to drill for oil in a national monument, but honestly I do not.

We are victims of oil companies now that are making decisions that have

little or nothing to do with supply and demand. This is the only industry I know that can consistently guess wrong in terms of the supply available to sell and make record profits. And they have done it consistently for 2 straight years.

So to argue that the only way to deal with our energy challenge and the OPEC stranglehold is to start drilling for oil and gas in precious lands set aside as national monuments is so shortsighted. Are we so bereft of original and innovative ideas in Congress and in Washington that we cannot think of another way to help provide modern, sustainable, reliable energy to America other than to drill for oil and gas in our national monument lands? I do not think so.

I think there are other ways—sustainable, renewable fuels, conservation; things that work, things you will be proud of, 21st century thinking—not the drill-and-burn thinking of the 20th century and the 19th century that has inspired this administration to decide that, unlike President Teddy Roosevelt, this Republican President is ready to start exploring and looking for oil and gas in these national monuments.

We can end our dependence on foreign oil, but we don't have to do it at the expense of America's national and natural treasures. I urge my colleagues in both political parties to agree with me that setting aside 5 percent of Federal lands, keeping them separate and sacred, is worth the investment. We can find another answer, an answer that preserves those lands for future generations and still meets the energy needs of America.

If there are other Senators seeking recognition on this amendment, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, there has been a lot of historic revision going on with respect to the creation of national monuments. I rise to set the record straight.

The record is available for those who will research it, but for those who may have been listening to this debate, it needs some accuracy in terms of what happened.

I was involved in it right from the public beginning, but I cannot say I was involved in it from the real beginning because the creation of the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument was done in the dark. It was done without consultation with any member of the Utah delegation. And when members of the Utah delegation called the administration and asked what was going on, we were told: It is not happening.

To be very specific, in one example, let me describe to the Members of the Senate and to the Chair an exchange I had with Katie McGinty, chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality.

First, to put this in historic context, a story appeared in the Washington Post saying that President Clinton was considering a major national monument in the State of Utah. Immediately after that story appeared, the administration denied it and said it was just a consideration, just an idea, and under no circumstances were they that far along in serious consideration of a national monument.

Understand that the law required, under NEPA and appropriate environmental laws, that there be full public examination and consultation. The administration knew that. So they said, no, there will be no consultation because this is just an idea.

I had had experience. I called Bruce Babbitt. Bruce Babbitt and I had a very frank relationship. Even though we disagreed on many things, we could be honest with each other. I called Bruce Babbitt. He was appropriately professional; he didn't let out any secrets. But he let me know that it was perhaps more than just an idea.

I said: What should we be worried about? He told me some things we should be worried about in a theoretical sense. In case this was a real monument, we should be worried about the following. I wrote him a letter about them.

Finally he called me. He said: Come on down to the Department of the Interior and we will talk about this. And with the other members of the Utah delegation, Senator HATCH and Congressman HANSEN, I went down to Department of the Interior. It was on a Saturday morning when there was nobody else around. We sat in his conference room. Katie McGinty was there, along with a large number of his staff.

I asked him repeatedly and directly: Mr. Secretary, will the President announce the creation of a national monument on Wednesday of this coming week, as the press is speculating that he will?

Bruce Babbitt, being a careful lawyer, looked at me and said: No decision has been made. He didn't say yes and he didn't say no. He just said: No decision has been made.

I took that, from my experience with the Clinton administration, to mean ''yep, it is a done deal; I can't tell you about it, but it is done.''

So convinced that the monument was going to be created, on Monday morning, in my office, Katie McGinty was there as the leading administration spokesperson on this issue. And I said: Ms. McGinty, you say this is under consideration but no decision has been made. Given the consideration, can you give me a copy of the map so that I can see what lands are under consideration?

She looked me in the eye and said: Senator, there is no map. We are not that far along. This is just an idea. There is no map.

I said: As soon as there is a map, can I have a copy?

Oh, yes, Senator, as soon as we have a map, but we are not that far along.

That was Monday morning. On Wednesday morning I get a phone call from Leon Panetta, Chief of Staff to President Clinton.

Leon Panetta said: Senator, I am calling to tell you that this afternoon in Arizona, President Clinton will announce the formation of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, the details of where it will be and everything with respect to it.

I held my anger because Mr. Panetta obviously had nothing to do with this. This was a done deal outside even the office of the Chief of Staff of the White House.

I said: National monuments require—and I listed all of the things that were involved in the creation of a national monument.

He said: Yes, national monuments require all those things. There will be a 3-year period after the creation of the monument in which we will deal with those issues.

Every one of those issues should have been dealt with publicly and openly prior to the creation of the national monument, but all of them had been held in secret.

I expressed my disappointment in that. Mr. Panetta, in a moment of candor said: Well, Senator, we have 3 years in which to try to clean it all up.

When Katie McGinty appeared before the appropriations subcommittee, I sat with the subcommittee and I said to her: I want to see all of the documents relating to this decision. You didn't create this out of whole cloth in a 24-hour period.

I made it very clear that I did not believe her earlier statement that there was no map and no consideration if, in less than 48 hours, the President made a complete public disclosure of it. Presidents don't do things in 24-hour periods. Something as major as this doesn't just happen overnight. It isn't an immediate decision. It is staffed out somewhere.

I said to her: I want to see all of the documents relating to the decision to create this national monument.

Oh, yes, Senator. I will provide this. It was a completely open process.

And then we got a map. I discovered, by the way, that the map had been in circulation among environmental groups for 3 months prior to the time when I asked her for a copy, and she told me none existed.

We looked at the map to see how carefully drawn the boundaries were of this national treasure we were hearing about. In one of the towns in Utah, the high school football field was in the national monument. The map was drawn in secret. The map was drawn with people who would not consult with those who knew what was going on, and they had drawn the line so wildly that they had picked up the football field of a high school, thinking that was part of the national monument.

One of my constituents found his front driveway in the national monument. He had to drive across national

monument lands to get to his house because they had ignored the procedures so fully, they were so anxious to do this in secret and not consult with anybody so that they would have a political coup to announce in the middle of a Presidential campaign, that they made those kinds of mistakes.

Is it now so sacred a land that we cannot take the football field out and turn it back to the high school?

Is it so sacred a piece of land that we can't give the man his driveway back? I ask those questions rhetorically because we did that. In one of the previous Congresses, we redrew the boundaries and took out the football field and the driveway and some other mistakes that were made. I got my first set of documents from Katie McGinty, which were a speech made 3 years before and a travel bureau brochure. I went back to the Appropriations subcommittee meeting. It is not usually my style, but I am afraid I embarrassed her by holding these up and saying, ''You are suggesting that these are the basis of a decision to lock up 1.7 million acres in my home State? You are saying this is the complete record? I am sorry, I cannot accept that.''

Finally, at a later time, we got the complete file that she had with respect to the creation of this monument. I will say this in her defense. She did not shred any documents. When she turned the documents over to me, the file was complete. It contained the following documents in it: One dated several months before, where she says, ''We will have to abandon the project of trying to find lands in Utah that qualify for a national monument because it is clear there are none that do. Let's forget the Utah project because we can't find any lands that will qualify.'' And then, what I consider the smoking gun, there was a 5½ by 8½ piece of paper in which she had written in her own hand a note to the Vice President. The Vice President had been her boss. She was on his staff while he was a Senator. That would explain the familiarity of the note. It said: Al, the enviros have $500,000 to spend on this campaign, either for us or against us, depending on what we do in Utah. Signed, Katie.

I can't vouch for that being the exact language, but that is close enough. I read and reread that note many times. The national monument was being created in southern Utah in the dark to stimulate the expenditure of $500,000 of campaign activity on behalf of the Clinton-Gore ticket in 1996. There was the entire motivation following on the earlier document where she said there aren't any lands that qualified.

Now, the Senator from Illinois has said these are special lands and that they can explore for oil and gas on 95 percent of the public lands. This is reminiscent of a statement President Clinton made when he announced that monument. He said, ''Mining jobs are good jobs, but we can't have mines everywhere. So we will set this land apart so there won't be any mines here.''

If I had been there and had the opportunity to have an exchange with President Clinton, I would have said: President Clinton, you are exactly right. We cannot have mines everywhere. We can only have mines where there are minerals. Sure, you say 95 percent of the land is open for exploration. But nobody wants to explore lands where there is nothing to look for. Nobody wants to explore lands where there are no mineral resources. Why was this land set aside in a national monument?

The Senator from Illinois says he wants to take his grandson out some day to look at the beauty of the land. I suggest to him, bring your grandson to look at it right now. You will have the same reaction we are getting from tourists who are coming. We were told when this was created that we would have an economic bonanza of tourists coming to look at this magnificent piece of scenery. I have gone to the county commissioners of the counties around there and said, ''How much tourism have you had?'' They said, ''None.'' None? This has had so much publicity, surely people have come from all over the world to see this scenic wonder. Yes, they come—once. They say we have come to see this magnificent scenery President Clinton talked about on the rim of the Grand Canyon. He picked that as his backdrop to make the announcement. That is scenic and it is worth coming from all over the world to see. That was his visual aid when he talked about the land in Utah. The folks show up from Germany and Japan and elsewhere to look at the land in Utah, but they say: This doesn't look any different than any of the other BLM land we can see. What is the big deal?

They don't come back. We have seen two counties be destroyed economically since the creation of the Grand Staircase-Escalante Monument, as people were afraid to invest in those counties. They were not very viable to begin with and have no tourism. With all of the publicity, there is no tourism.

All right. I suggest to the Senator from Illinois, if he wants to take his grandchild to see this grand scenery, he can do it, and it will be there in future generations because it will look like all the rest of the scenery around it. Why was this monument created? It was created for one purpose, and one purpose only, and the documents I got from Katie McGinty that are made part of the public record make this abundantly clear, along with the smoking gun saying we are going to have $500,000 spent on our behalf if we do this, or spent against us if we don't.

The reason the environmental groups were so anxious to see to it that this monument was created was because of the coal on the Kaiparowits Plateau. Let me describe to you how much coal there is there. It is not available on any of the other 95 percent of public lands. It is only available on the Kaiparowits Plateau. The average coal seam is about 4 to 6 feet high. You go into a mine that has a coal seam in West Virginia—and I see the senior Senator from West Virginia here, and he knows more about coal than any of the rest of us—you are going to think you have a pretty good seam if it is 6 feet high. The coal seam in Kaiparowits is 16 feet high. It runs back from where the mine mouth will be, over 160 miles. There is enough energy in that coal to heat and light the city of San Francisco for 300 years. And it has been known for decades. You don't have to explore this. You don't have to go looking for it. People have known about it.

Over and above the coal generated by that incredible seam of coal is a pool of methane gas—coal methane gas, which, if tapped, would produce even more energy than the coal itself. There are no reliable estimates as to how much coal-based methane gas there is, other than ''huge.''

Now, neither the coal nor the coal methane gas can be used to deal with America's energy crisis. Instead, we are told: Go look someplace else. You have 95 percent of the public lands to look for. Don't look here where the coal is. Don't talk about a pipeline for methane gas here, where the methane gas is. Go look on lands we don't care about.

The sole purpose of the monument was to prevent the development of that resource at Kaiparowits. Here I go way back in history and share with you this insight: When my father was here—he came here in 1951, elected in 1950—the No. 1 issue facing the West was water. One of the proposals that was made during the Eisenhower administration was that we build a dam on the Colorado River that would be known as the Glen Canyon Dam and would create behind it Lake Powell. The predecessors of today's environmental groups came and testified against the building of the Glen Canyon Dam.

One of their arguments was: We will never, ever, need that much power. You have Boulder Dam—or Hoover Dam. It was called Boulder Dam in those days; now it is called Hoover Dam—we have all the power we will ever need for southern California, Arizona, Nevada, and Utah. To build the Glen Canyon Dam to produce that power will give us a glut of power, and we absolutely do not need it and never will need it. However, they said—and here is the point—if by some possible chance we are wrong and we do need that power, you still do not need the dam because there is all that coal at Kaiparowits. Let's burn the coal at Kaiparowits.

This was in the 1950s when my father was here. I remember the debate. I was serving on his staff while much of it went on.

Now the time has come when we need all the power at the Glen Canyon Dam which, incidentally, the Sierra Club wants to tear down, and we need some more power, and there sits a source of power perhaps unique in the world.

But, no, we cannot touch it. The way to make sure we cannot touch it is to create a national monument around it and to do it in such a way that it will never be subject to public comment or review. We will do it in secret. We will do it without telling anybody, and when members of the Utah delegation ask us about our plans, we will lie to them.

I am sorry to be that strong, but that is what happened because I asked the question directly, and I was given the answer directly, and the answer was a lie, demonstrable, provable in the RECORD. The answer I got was a lie.

Now we are being told: Oh, these are special lands that we must preserve for our grandchildren, when in fact the genesis of this monument makes it clear these are special lands primarily because of the mineral resources that are in them, the energy sources that are there, the low-sulfur coal which, by the way, if mixed with more traditional coal, would lower emissions at every powerplant where it was used.

For those who are concerned about greenhouse gases, they ought to be clamoring to open Kaiparowits to lower the emissions of greenhouse gases. If you say let's not do the coal, the coal is too bad, how about the coal-based methane gas? How about getting that out in these tremendous quantities? Oh, no, no, that would involve building a pipeline; we can't build a pipeline over these lands.

That is the history, Mr. President. This is not as it has been painted to be. And I do not impugn the motives of those who are painting it differently because they were not there. They do not understand the degree of duplicity that went into the creation of this monument.

If I sound angry, it is because, frankly, I was, as was everyone else associated with it, everyone else who was involved with the chicanery that was employed to create this monument.

Are there portions of the Kaiparowits Plateau that probably belong in national monument status? The answer to that is yes, there are. Am I and the other members of the Utah delegation in favor of preserving those lands in national monument status? The answer is yes, we are, but it should be done in the kind of open process that the Congress decreed when they created NEPA. It is too late for that now.

As Leon Panetta said to me, we have 3 years to pick up the pieces. The 3 years have passed and, quite frankly, the Interior Department and the folks at the BLM have, indeed, come up with what I consider to be an acceptable and logical management plan for the monument. But the fact is that all of those marvelous qualities for preservation in a national monument can be preserved and the coal can still be taken out.

I have been to the site where the mine mouth will be, and I say mine mouth singularly because you can get at that entire seam that I described through a single mine entrance. It would not require multiple entrances.

As luck would have it, or as nature has created it, that particular mine mouth is at the bottom of a circular canyon, which means it cannot be seen unless you are standing at the edge of the canyon looking down on it. It could not be seen by anybody 200 yards away. They would look right over the top of it on to the other side of the canyon and not even know it is there.

The entire facility to take the coal out of the Kaiparowits mine could be on 60 acres at the bottom of that circular canyon. We are not talking about a huge environmental disaster that will spread over several square miles. We are not talking about a visual blight that could be seen for hundreds of miles. We are talking about a mine mouth at the bottom of a circular canyon that could go right into a sheer cliff, into the seam of coal, and bring out enough coal to light and heat the city of San Francisco for 300 years, and we are talking about coal-based methane gas on top of that coal seam that has even greater energy potential.

It could be exploited without affecting in any way, other than psychologically, the beauty and power of the landscape on top of it. It can all be done underground—no strip mining, no open pits, no oil derricks. It can all be done in such a way that people who want a wilderness experience can have it unless somebody tells them: There is a pipeline 40 miles away from you. Oh, well, that spoils my experience to know there is a pipeline there.

You cannot see it. It does not affect you in any way. You cannot hear it. But the fact that it was put in there somehow will spoil the experience.

I am not suggesting we need to automatically go in there and start mining the coal right now, nor am I suggesting that we need to start putting down the initial wells to start getting the methane gas right now, because that would be as precipitous as the action was to create the monument in the first place. That would be a political action rather than an intelligent examination of this resource and what needs to be done.

I am saying let's give the President the authority to do the studies, make the examination, receive the public comment, go through the process that should have been done in the first place; then, with all of the facts on his plate, make a decision that I hope will not be driven by political considerations. I hope that nowhere in the files will be a note that says: There is $500,000 for the campaign if we act this way, and $500,000 against us if we act that way.

To summarize: I, the other Members of the Utah delegation, and the citizens of my State are as proud of the national heritage that we have received as anyone in this country. We take no back seat to anyone in our determination to see to it that these lands are kept as pristine and as preserved as they can possibly be.

I will share an experience I had on the campaign trail for the first time I was down in that part of the State. A woman I had been talking to, hoping to get her to support me, walked out of the restaurant where we were meeting, in a small Utah town. She said: BOB, look around.

I had no idea what she was talking about, but I looked around; I dutifully looked around.

And she said: What do you see?

Again, I didn't realize what she was talking about, so I didn't answer.

She said: It is pristine, isn't it?

It was then I realized she was looking at the land.

I said: Yes, it is pristine. It is beautiful.

Then she said: My family and I have been earning our living off this land for five generations. Tell me we don't love it. Tell me we have not been good stewards and can't take care of it and somebody else has to come in and order us off it in order for it to remain in good hands.

I have always remembered that comment. It is indicative of the way the people of Utah feel about our State. We are making plans to do everything we can as we look ahead. The demographic trends say our State will double in population within the lifetime of my children. We are making plans now to preserve the open spaces, to preserve as much of that which is beautiful and magnificent as can be preserved. We take our stewardship very seriously and we take a back seat to no one in our determination to see that stewardship is passed on to our grandchildren and our great grandchildren. But we want to do it intelligently. We want to do it in a way that makes sense. We want to do it with everybody participating in the process who will come to the table and talk to us. We want to hear every idea. We want to hear every point of view.

We don't want to see a repeat of what Katie McGinty and others in the Clinton administration did, of creating something in the dark, cramming it down people's throat without any opportunity for comment, and then declaring that it is forever and ever inviolate. That process only breeds ill will. That process only creates bad feelings. There is no place for that kind of process to ever be repeated.

My objection to the amendment by the Senator from Illinois is—and he would enshrine the results of that process—not the process; he had nothing to do with the process. He didn't know what was going on. If he had, given his sense of fair play, he probably would have objected to it, but he would enshrine the results of that process into law forever. That, frankly, doesn't make sense. It is a process that does not deserve to be rewarded with that kind of perpetual reference. We need to deal with our lands in a way that is good for the lands, a way that is good for the people, a way that is good for our posterity, and enshrining what was done in the case of the Grand Staircase-Escalante Monument is not the way to do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators FEINGOLD and BOXER be added as cosponsors to my amendment.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the majority whip if this is appropriate, we have a unanimous consent that the rollcall vote on this amendment be scheduled for 2:45.

Mr. REID. We will work on the exact time.

Mr. DURBIN. I will suspend a unanimous consent request on a specific time.

I will respond to my colleague and friend, the Senator from Utah, Mr. BENNETT. I have heard him speak before about the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. He is a man of great control and moderation. I can tell it brings his blood pressure to a high level to recall the creation of this particular monument. He has heartfelt feelings about this process and he has expressed them, hopefully, in private.

I do say in fairness that one of the people he mentioned several times on the floor is someone I respect very much and worked with for many years, Miss Katie McGinty, who worked for the Clinton administration. I found her to be entirely professional and ethical, with the highest integrity and great skill. I want to make certain that is part of the record.

I also do want to make note of the following for the record, as well. With regard to the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, the Bureau of Land Management has utilized an extensive process to develop a management plan to administer the new monument. The planning team included five representatives nominated by the Governor of Utah, Mike Leavitt. Over 28 meetings were held and over 9,000 comments considered prior to finalizing the monument management plan in February of 2000. In addition, following establishment of the monument, the Department of the Interior worked closely with the State of Utah to negotiate a major land exchange that traded State and Federal land so as to help maximize the value of State lands for the benefit of Utah's schoolchildren and provided a $50 million payment to the State.

My amendment addresses whether or not we will drill for oil and gas and mine minerals, particularly coal in this case, in the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument.

I make the following comments for the record: According to the U.S. Geological Service, all of the recoverable oil in the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument would provide for America's energy needs for a total of 4 hours. All of the recoverable gas in the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument would provide for America's energy needs for 1 hour.

On the issue of coal, fortunately, we are not at the mercy of anything like OPEC when it comes to coal in the United States. The U.S. Department of the Interior has estimated we have 250 years worth of coal reserves right here in the United States. The Senator has said repeatedly that the coal in this national monument can light all the lights in San Francisco for a long period of time. I suggest all the coal in the United States could light the lights of most of the western civilization for a pretty substantial period of time. We have a lot of coal. I am glad we do. I have three times more coal in my State of Illinois than the Senator from Utah believes he has in his State, at least by estimates from the Department of Energy.

The Interior Department bought back all of the Federal coal leases within the Grand Staircase at a cost to taxpayers of $20 million. There are no existing leaseholders, no coal development taking place in this national monument. So those who were there were compensated when they left.

Let me go back to what this amendment is all about and why I have offered it. The Bush administration said they are prepared to explore the possibility of drilling for oil and gas in national monuments. When visiting Washington, DC, and you hear the words ''national monument'' you think of the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial. But national monuments under Federal lands are tracts of land set aside by Presidents over the history of this country to be preserved for future generations.

Beginning with Republican President Teddy Roosevelt, 14 of the 17 Presidents who served since 1906 have used the power to set aside land, saying this is special land and is part of our natural national heritage that should not be developed and should be protected. In all, these Presidents, Democrats and Republicans alike, have established 122 national monuments. After the Presidents did that, Congress came in and agreed with the President in at least 30 different instances, saying these national monuments should be national parks, the next stage of the process.

We are talking about the California Coastal National Monument, the Giant Sequoia National Monument in California, Craters of the Moon National Monument in Idaho, Vermilion Cliffs National Monument in Arizona. The Grand Canyon was once a national monument that became a national park. Those who support my amendment believe we ought to take this special real estate in America and treat it in a special way. We ought to say that for a small percentage of the land that we call America, that God has given us, we are going to protect it from economic exploitation.

But not President Bush. President Bush and his administration says no; we are prepared to drill for oil and gas and mine coal in these lands.

You cannot protect the special character of these lands and use them economically. You cannot hope to say to your children, grandchildren, and their children and grandchildren, that they will be able to see something spectacular and special, untouched by man, if you allow this kind of economic exploration.

This is a photograph taken of one of these national monuments. It is a beautiful piece of land. I am sure we are all proud it has been set aside so future generations can come to see it, visit it, and know it is to be protected. Mr. President, 95 percent of all the Federal lands we own in America—and we own millions of acres—can be drilled for oil and gas, and mined for coal. We believe that is appropriate because we are not going to sacrifice something that is really special. My amendment says that for 5 percent, 1 acre out of 20, special rules will apply: No drilling for oil and gas, no mining of coal.

I hope those who have followed this debate will understand that existing leaseholders on these lands will not be disadvantaged. In fact, all we are saying is that this heritage, to be left to future generations, should be protected.

At the end of consideration of this amendment, there will be some people watching the final vote very carefully. They will be people who work for the big oil companies and the gas drilling companies, some coal mining companies out west, who really think if they can get their hands on this land there is money to be made.

There will be others watching, too: People across America who understand a special responsibility which elected officials have today in the Senate and in the House of Representatives and, yes, in the White House as well, to preserve this national heritage.

I encourage all my colleagues to join me in voting for this amendment. It had a strong bipartisan vote in the House of Representatives: Democrats and Republicans and an Independent alike, believing it was important we speak with one voice when it comes to something as basic as this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning at 4 p.m. second-degree amendments be relevant to the first-degree amendments under the previous order already entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I listened with great attention to the debate concerning the amendment that is before us. I would like to specifically identify the amendment in some detail because I think Members should have an understanding of just what the intention of the Senator from Illinois is.

In the amendment, the specific purpose is to prohibit the use of funds for the conduct of preleasing, leasing, and related activities within national monuments established under the act of June 8, 1906.

It is further appropriate to reflect on the concluding sentence of the amendment, which states:

> . . . a national monument established under the Act of June 8, 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), except to the extent that such a preleasing, leasing, or other related activity is allowed under the Presidential proclamation establishing the monument.

So one has to question just what the purpose of the amendment is. It says, on one hand, no funds will be allowed for preleasing within national monuments, and then it concludes by saying: ''except to the extent that such preleasing, leasing, or other related activity is allowed under the Presidential proclamation establishing the monument.''

What we have here, in the establishment of a monument, in the normal course of events, is a Presidential proclamation. And in that proclamation it is specifically addressed as to what can occur within the monument.

I really question the necessity of the amendment. I question the applicability of the amendment. I question the application of the amendment. I question the purpose and objective of the amendment.

I am not one of the managers of the bill, but one of the more expeditious alternatives would be to accept the amendment because the amendment does not do a thing. It implies that you are not going to have any funds for preleasing and related activities—and I assume we mean oil and gas or mineral exploration in national monuments—but then it goes on and says: ''except to the extent that such preleasing . . . or other related activity is allowed under the [authority of the President],'' which basically states the authorization for the proclamation establishing the monument. Hopefully, that is clear.

I assume there are some out there who would say, we do not want oil and gas or mineral exploration occurring in national monuments. We have heard from Senators who have had some experience with national monuments, the creation of these monuments under the Antiquities Act. Certainly one of the more recent States is the State of Utah and the case of the Grand Staircase-Escalante episode where a monument was created with very significant acreage. It took off the development scenario of some coal leases that the State of Utah was going to use to fund their educational system. I think, unfortunately, the application of the Antiquities Act in that particular case was inappropriate.

Our previous President took that action. He did it without the knowledge of the Governor of Utah, and without the knowledge of the congressional delegation of Utah. Furthermore, he did not have the compassion to even make the announcement in the State of Utah. I believe it was made in Arizona.

So the application of the Antiquities Act, traditionally, on national monuments is well established. But the criteria of what can be done in those national monuments are ordinarily left up to the Presidential proclamation establishing the monument, which certainly is the case in the amendment pending before this body. I hope Senators, upon reflection, will recognize that this particular amendment really accomplishes no purpose.

One of the things that concerns me, however, is the implication and the lack of understanding of terminology associated with the designation of public land.

We have all seen the concern expressed on the floor—both in the House and in the Senate—as to the issue of developing resources offshore or within our States or within specific designated areas. But I would like to share with you a chart that shows the designated areas that have been taken off limits in recent years by State and Federal action. It is kind of interesting to note the entire east coast—from Maine to Florida—has been removed from any OCS (Outer Continental Shelf) activity. And the merits of those action speak for themselves. These States simply do not want any activity off their shore.

We saw an agreement on lease sale 181 in Florida the other day where a significant portion of the lease was removed. Yet the inconsistency is, Florida wants very much to receive a portion of the energy that would come from exploration offshore in the gulf. It is kind of hard to have it both ways, but some would like that.

The chart also shows the Pacific coast—the entire area from Washington State to California—is off limits. In other words: NIMBY, Not In My Backyard. We have in the overthrust belt the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Montana. These are States that have oil and gas development and production. As a consequence of the roadless area promulgated by the previous administration, we have seen a significant area of prospect for oil and gas, particularly natural gas, taken off limits. There were estimated to be about 22 to 23 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in this overthrust area. We have taken it off limits. That means basically no resource development.

There you have it. With the exception of the gulf area—Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Alabama, that support OCS leasing—we find ourselves in a position where we have an energy crisis. We find ourselves in a position where we are becoming more and more dependent on sources overseas coming into the United States.

We debate the merits of the inconsistency in our foreign policy where we find ourselves dependent on 750,000 barrels of oil a day from Iraq, from our old friend Saddam Hussein, where we fought a war in 1991 and 1992. We lost 148 U.S. lives in that war. And now we are importing oil from that country. We buy Iraq's oil, put it in our airplanes, and then go bomb him while enforcing a no-fly zone, basically a blockade in the air. We risk U.S. lives in doing that. We have flown over 230,000 individual sorties over Iraq.

So here we are putting our own area off limits, going overseas, not really caring where our oil comes from. Whether it comes from a scorched-earth refinery or a scorched-earth oil field in OPEC, we find ourselves subject to the cartel of OPEC. Cartels are illegal in the United States. We would not even pass the test associated with that type of business in this country because we have antitrust laws, but we are, in effect, supporting the viability of the OPEC cartel by becoming more and more dependent.

I am sure the Presiding Officer remembers, back in 1973, we had gas lines going around the block in this country. We had the Arab oil embargo at the Yom Kippur war. We had the public indignant, outraged because there were gas lines around the block. We were 37-percent dependent on imported oil at that time. Today, we are 57-percent dependent. The Department of Energy says the way we are going, we are going to be 63- or 64-percent dependent by the year 2007 or 2008. Where is it going to come from?

People generalize, very conveniently, that we have alternatives: We have renewables; we have solar power; we have wind power; we have new technology. If you really think about it, most of these sources are for stationary power generation. But they do not move America. They do not move the world.

Mr. President you, and I, and others, do not fly in and out of Washington, DC, on hot air. Somebody has to produce the oil, refine it, and put the kerosene in the jet. Only then do you take off. Whether it is your planes or your trains or your automobiles or your boats, America and the world are dependent on oil. And we are becoming more and more dependent on one source, and that is OPEC.

We are sacrificing our national security interests; there is no question about it. To give a recent example, just a few weeks ago, Saddam Hussein didn't get his way with the U.N. So he cut his oil production. He pulled 2½ million barrels of oil a day off the world market. We thought OPEC would

make up that difference. They took one look at it and said: No, we are going to hold off. So we were short that month. This previous month, about 60 million barrels were held off the world market. It kept the price up.

Look at what happened in this last year with OPEC in developing their internal discipline. They developed a floor and a ceiling on oil: $22 was the floor; $28 was the ceiling. It has gone over that. They have a discipline. We are becoming more and more dependent on that source, and we are becoming more and more exposed from the standpoint of our national security.

Where is it going? We are debating an amendment that doesn't do a thing to address supply. We should be debating an energy bill at this time in a timely manner to address the crisis ahead. As we saw out in California, it can happen very fast. When we look at the concern the American people are exposed to over the coming blackouts, how does that affect the security of the American taxpayer? Maybe there are some children at home and there is a blackout. There is a lack of power. What does that do to increase crime? These are exposures that real people have and real concerns that can be alleviated if we take up an energy policy in a prompt and efficient manner.

As we look at this chart, there is no exploration everyplace: No exploration in the Great Lakes, no exploration on the west coast, no exploration on the east coast, no exploration in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, and eventually no exploration in the 40 percent of the land in the Western U.S. owned by the Federal Government.

I am not here to promote the amendment of my friend from Illinois in the sense of oil and gas activities in the national monuments, because the Presidential proclamation will make a determination of that. What I am concerned about is where this energy is going to come from.

We have all heard the issue associated with the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge or ANWR. I want to communicate to my colleagues the difference associated with some of the nomenclature that flows around here.

We are dealing currently with an amendment that would prohibit the use of funds in the conduct of preleasing within national monuments. Does the public know what a national monument is? I think they have a perception. Maybe it is a park. Maybe it is kind of a wilderness. Maybe it is kind of a refuge.

The reality is, a national monument can be just about anything that it is designated to be in the Presidential proclamation. You can have oil and gas activity, if it is permitted. Mostly it is not. National monuments are created by the Antiquities Act. The Antiquities Act can preclude oil and gas or mineral leasing. These are all alternatives that are determined at the time that the national monument is established.

That is why the application of this amendment has no meaning because, again, it says: No money for preleasing within national monuments except to the extent that such preleasing or other related activity is allowed under Presidential proclamation establishing the monument.

There we have it. Let me just take my colleagues for a little walk into the wildlife refuges. What is a refuge? What does that mean? It might mean in the minds of some, a place for wildlife, but we have oil production in many refuges. We have mineral production in many refuges. We have gas production in many refuges. We have coal production. We have salt water conversion. We have many activities in this particular nomenclature of refuges.

Here are the States. We have 17 refuges in Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, Mississippi, four in California, Montana, Michigan, my State of Alaska. These are activities that are authorized under the terminology of refuges.

This chart shows where these refuges are. It is important that the public understands the difference between national monument designation under proclamation by the President and what is allowed in them by the proclamation and refuges. In Alabama, there is the Choctaw National Wildlife Refuge. Oil production in national refuges and wetlands management districts is a concept that has long been fostered by the Congress. It is specifically the balanced use of Federal funds and the reality that it is accepted and is commonplace.

This is oil and gas activity in 30 refuges, and there are 118 refuges from coast to coast where we are safely exploring for oil and gas. We have over 400 wells in Louisiana refuges alone. And we have them in Alabama, Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Texas, Alaska—the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge—North Dakota, Mississippi, Michigan, and Montana.

I am not going to get into a presentation of the merits of ANWR. What makes it any different than any of the rest of these refuges? Certainly not from the establishment of the terminology ''refuge.'' ANWR is included as a refuge, therefore oil and gas activity is allowed, subject to the authority of the Congress. That is what that debate is all about.

But as we look at the reality associated with the energy crisis, we have to recognize we are going to have to look for relief. You are not going to get it from alternatives. You are not going to get it from renewables. In spite of the fact that I support the technology, I support the subsidy, I support continued taxpayer support of these, they still constitute less than 4 percent of the total energy mix. We have expended about $6 billion in the last 10 years. It has been money well spent, but it is not going to replace our dependence on conventional sources of energy.

How did we get into this thing? Why are things different now? I could talk about oil and gas, but if we look at foreign oil dependence—now at 56 percent, up to 66 percent by the year 2010—the national security interest of this country is in jeopardy. What are we going to use as leverage?

In 1973, we created the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Some people say that can be our relief. Do you know what we found out when the previous administration took 30 million barrels out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve? We found out we didn't have the refining capacity to refine it into the heating oil that was needed to meet the crisis at that time in the Northeast Corridor. We were genuinely concerned.

When we took that oil, we simply found we had to offset what we would ordinarily import. We didn't have the refining capacity. I think we achieved, out of that 30 million barrels, somewhere in the area of a 1-day supply of heating oil for the Northeast Corridor. It just won't work. If you don't have the refining capacity, you can have all the oil in the ground you want, it isn't going to do the job. You are not going to be able to increase, if the need is there, any more than the extent of the capacity of your refineries.

The reason things are different this time is we have natural gas prices that have soared. They have gone up as high as $10. They are down now, thank God, but we are still using our reserves faster than we are finding them. We haven't had a new nuclear plant licensed in this country in 10 years. We haven't had a new coal-fired plant of any consequence built in this country since 1995, and coal is our most abundant resource.

We have technology for clean coal. Nothing has been done in that area. Why? It isn't because the supply isn't adequate; it is because we haven't had the conviction to come to grips with the reality of the law of supply and demand. Even Congress can't resolve the law of supply and demand, unless we increase the supply or reduce the demand.

Demand has gone up and supply hasn't. That is why it is different this time. I indicated that there have been no new gasoline refineries in 10 years. So if we look at our increased dependence on foreign oil, increased price of natural gas, no nuclear plants—nuclear is 22 percent of our stationary energy—no new gasoline refineries, no new coal-fired plants, and to top it off, we find our capacity to transmit our natural gas and electricity is inadequate. Why? Because we have become more of an electronic society. We leave our computers on; we leave our air-conditioning on. We could, perhaps, buy a more fuel-efficient refrigerator and use half of the energy, but if the old one isn't worn out, you won't do it.

The point is that the ''perfect storm'' has come together in the sense of energy. We have an energy crisis. As a consequence of that crisis, I would have hoped that we would be debating how to address this energy situation as opposed to debating the merits of a national monument determination that

isn't going to result in any significant activity, other than some of the media might be misled that it is going to terminate any activity in areas of national monuments, which it will not. We have skyrocketing energy prices, gas shortages, and I guess I will conclude with a reference to, again, how important energy is, how we have a tendency to take it for granted.

You know, the American standard of living is based on one thing: affordable and adequate supplies of energy. That is why we prosper. If we don't keep up with the increased demand by increasing the supply by conservation, alternatives, renewables, we are going to jeopardize that standard of living. And with it goes our economic security, and with it goes our national security.

I think we all feel exposed to the potential of being held hostage by a foreign leader such as Saddam Hussein. We have our job security at risk—to keep Americans working and create more jobs. Energy certainly powers our workplace. It moves the economy—moves it forward and brings each of us along with it, giving us personal security and flexibility to live our lives as we choose. We saw in California what happens when stoplights don't work and when the elevators become jammed.

I think we have to focus in on what we must do for American families—the consumers—and address the reality that we do have a crisis. I am going to conclude with a reference to something that I think America sells itself short on in times such as this, and that is America's technology and ingenuity. We have the capability to meet the challenges associated with a responsible environmental sensitivity and the reality that we can do things better. But there is no magic to it. Somebody has to produce this energy. It has to come from some identifiable source. I am speaking primarily of what moves America, and right now that is oil. I wish we had another alternative, but for the foreseeable future, we simply do not.

As a consequence of that reality, we have before us an energy plan. I intend to work cooperatively with Senator BINGAMAN toward a chairman's mark. We have an outline given by the President and the Vice President and their energy task force report. So I guess everybody is waiting, if you will, on the process in the Senate. It is moving in the House. The House is moving on an energy bill. We should be moving on it here. I am very pleased to see that it is now in the Democratic leadership's recommendations of activities. We haven't gotten a schedule on it at this time, but I hope we will in the very near future.

So, again, to get back to the debate at hand with regard to the amendment, prohibiting preleasing-related activities within national monuments by disallowing any funding and, yet, recognizing in the amendment to the extent that such a preleasing or other related activities is allowed under the Presidential proclamation establishing the monument, would seem that the amendment is neutral to the issue of supply, neutral to the issue of whether or not there is any authority for oil or gas and mineral activity within any new national monuments that might be created in the future is certainly not applicable to those already in existence.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 believe all debate on this amendment is completed, and the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 vote on or in relation to the Durbin amendment occur at 4:10 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I move to table the Durbin amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator to allow an amendment to his motion to table—that there be no second-degree amendments allowed to the amendment prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the request to have the vote occur at 4:10 p.m.?

Mr. BURNS. I move that the Durbin amendment be tabled, and I ask for the yeas and nays, which vote will occur at the agreed time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First, the Senate needs to address the request raised by the Senator from Nevada of having the vote at 4:10 p.m. He propounded a unanimous consent request to have the vote at 4:10 p.m. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Reserving the right to object, what is the request?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend, the manager of the bill, we will have a motion to table the amendment at 4:10 p.m. today, and prior to the vote there will be no second-degree amendments to the Durbin amendment.

Mr. BYRD. A vote on the motion to table would occur at 4:10 p.m. today.

Mr. BURNS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada asked unanimous consent the vote occur at 4:10 p.m. There has been no objection. The Senator from Montana has moved to table and asked for the yeas and nays at 4:10.

Mr. BURNS. And the vote occur at the agreed time at 4:10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. BYRD. What was the request, ''and then 4:15''?

Mr. BURNS. The meeting with the President and the group downtown was not in until 4:15. We are going to begin the vote at 4:10 and they will have time to vote; 4:15 had nothing to do with it. We agreed at 4:10 to table the Durbin amendment.

Mr. BYRD. I remove my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second on the motion to table.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senator from New Jersey be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes as if in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. TORRICELLI are located in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.''

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote now scheduled for 4:10, on a motion to table, be rescheduled to 4:20. This has been cleared with the minority.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in 10 minutes or so, the Senate will be voting on my pending amendment. I believe the Senator from Montana has been given authority to offer a motion

to table the amendment. But I want my colleagues who come to this Chamber to understand what the nature of this amendment is because it is very simple and straightforward.

My amendment will simply prohibit new mineral leases from being issued in designated national monuments. It does not affect any existing, valid right, or prevent leasing in any area that was authorized for mineral activity when the monument was established.

That description is pretty legal. Let me try to translate it so that those who have not followed this debate will understand what is at issue.

We have designated, in this country, various national monuments. These are tracts of land which Presidents of the United States, since Teddy Roosevelt, have set aside saying that they have special importance and value to the future of our country. These tracts of land have been set aside by all but three Presidents since President Roosevelt. President Nixon, President Reagan, and former President Bush did not establish national monuments. Virtually every other President—Democrat and Republican alike—made these designations. And, of course, this national monument land occasionally will mature into something which Congress decides is of great value.

When you look at former national monuments, they include the Grand Canyon—designated first as a national monument—Glacier Bay, Zion National Park, and Acadia National Park.

So though I use the term ''national monument,'' most Americans are familiar with the term ''national park.'' Although they are not the same legally, the fact is that many of our national parks began as national monuments.

We have taken great care when it comes to these national monuments to say that they are so special and important that we will be careful what we do with them once we have designated them as treasures for our Nation to protect.

The reason I have offered this amendment is that we have had a clear indication from the current administration and the White House—President George W. Bush and his Secretary of the Interior, Gale Norton—that they are now going to explore the options of drilling for oil and gas and mining minerals in this national monument space designated by the previous administration.

The House of Representatives, when they considered this, on a strong bipartisan rollcall, agreed with my amendment and said we should prohibit this administration and this White House from drilling for oil and gas in national monument tracts across America.

This land is too valuable to our Nation, it is too valuable to our national heritage, to say to any oil company or gas drilling company or mining company: Please come take a look at our national monuments as a possible place to drill and to make a profit.

Some will argue—and they have in this Chamber—that it is shortsighted for us to limit any drilling for oil and gas or the mining of minerals at a time when our Nation faces a national energy crisis or an energy challenge. I disagree. Of all of the Federal land owned in the United States by taxpayers, 95 percent of it is open to oil and gas drilling and mining. We have said, if you can find those resources on that public land, we believe it will not compromise the environment nor jeopardize an important national treasure to go ahead and drill. But for 5 percent—one acre out of 20—of Federal public lands which we have designated as special lands—monuments; some may someday be a national park—in those lands we do not want to have that kind of exploration and economic exploitation.

If some step back and say: You must be turning your back on a great amount of energy resources if the Durbin amendment is enacted and prohibits the oil and gas drilling on these national monument lands, in fact, that is not the case at all. The U.S. Geologic Service did a survey of these national monument lands to determine just how much oil and gas there would be available. After they had done their survey, they established that all of the monuments I have protected with this amendment all of them combined have economically recoverable oil as a portion of total U.S. consumption that amounts to 15 days, 12 hours, and 28 minutes of energy. When it comes to gas: 7 days, 2 hours, and 11 minutes in terms of our national energy consumption. It is a tiny, minuscule, small part of the energy picture.

I have listened to some of my colleagues from other States talk about our energy crisis. You would believe that the only way we could keep the price of a gallon of gasoline under control is to allow the oil companies to go in and drill on lands that have been set aside by administrations to be protected because of their important historic and natural value to the United States. That is not the case.

In fact, there are many things we can and should do to deal with our energy crisis. I do not believe we have reached a point where this energy crisis or challenge should be used as a battering ram to beat down that which we hold sacred in this country. I think it is pretty clear, on a bipartisan basis, that at least Senators in this Chamber do not want to see us drill for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, as President Bush has proposed.

I think it is also clear when it comes to drilling off our coastal shores, there are many States, including the State of Florida—coincidentally, governed by a man with the same surname as the President—that don't want to see drilling offshore. They think it is too dangerous when it comes to spoiling the beaches and the recreational activity that are part of the States of Florida, California, and others.

This amendment says there is also an area of America we should take care not to exploit as well, and it is the national monument space.

The Senator from Montana has offered a motion to table my amendment. He opposes it. He has stated his position very effectively. But I would implore my colleagues on both sides to understand that this is a bipartisan amendment. It is an amendment which was supported by Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives because when it comes to conservation and the protection of our natural resources, why in the world should this be a partisan issue?

Teddy Roosevelt was a great Republican. Franklin Roosevelt was a great Democrat. All of these Presidents set aside land that was important for future generations.

I am certain that some Republican President—either now or in the future—will do the same. And I hope that Democratic Members of Congress will respect it. But if we are going to show respect for these national monuments, we have to understand that allowing for the drilling of oil and gas runs the risk of spoiling a national treasure.

I have asked my colleagues to also consider the fact that the Bureau of Land Management has told us that 95 percent of the Federal land is already open for this kind of exploration to find these sources of energy. We are not closing that down.

This amendment makes it very clear that if there is a national monument designated somewhere where they have established that oil and gas drilling will not jeopardize it, that will continue. If it is an existing lease, this amendment does not affect it. The only impact it will have is on the national monument space designated by the previous administration.

One of my colleagues from the State of Utah came to this Chamber and was clearly disappointed, to say the least, by the designation of a national monument in his State. The fact is, the national monument is there. We are saying, with this amendment: Keep the oil companies, keep the gas companies, keep the mining companies off of that national monument land.

In 1906, Teddy Roosevelt established Devils Tower in Wyoming as our first national monument. I take great pride in hoping that the Senate will carry on in his tradition of standing up to special interest groups which, frankly, want to make a profit; they want to come in and drill on Federal public land, land owned by all of us as taxpayers to make a profit. They are in business to make a profit. But I invite them to make that profit in other places, not on these lands that have a special import and a special significance for all of Americans living today and for future generations.

This administration has been challenged for the last 6 months on environmental issues. They have not been as sensitive as they should have. The

American people have said, overwhelmingly, they want an administration in the White House that understands that though energy is important, we cannot compromise important values in this country such as environmental protection and protecting our national monument lands.

I hope this Senate, on a strong bipartisan vote, will reject the motion to table offered by the Senator from Montana and will enact the Durbin amendment which protects these lands and says to the Bush White House: Help us find other sources of energy, other sources of energy that do not compromise important and pristine areas in this country.

There are things we can and should do as a nation to deal with energy: Sustainable, renewable, clean energy; finding ways to conserve; having Congress accept its responsibility when it comes to fuel efficiency in the vehicles that we drive.

These are the things that are going to help us be a better nation in the 21st century. To stick with the philosophy and notion of the 19th and 20th centuries, to drill and burn our way into the future is so shortsighted. To think we would even consider going to lands such as national monument land that has such special value to every American citizen would be a serious mistake.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against the motion to table and, once it has been defeated, to support the passage of the Durbin amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may summarize my argument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

Mr. BURNS. I will be very short.

Mr. DURBIN. I have no objection.

Mr. BURNS. The figures the Senator cited are from a USGS survey taken in 1995. Those figures have changed and moved up. No. 2, if he doesn't want people to drill there, where can they drill? How many people in this body or in this town drove an automobile or rode something here that required energy? How many? Do we close off the whole Nation because somebody is making a profit? Do we take the same mindset into agriculture, into production agriculture, as they have in Klamath Falls where 1,500 farmers cannot irrigate because of a suckerfish? It is a mindset.

I move to table this amendment for the simple reason that it will impact the country. You say only 5 percent or 2 percent or 1 percent. I say to the Senator: $5 is not very much to some of us. But it is when you don't have it. We have that possibility with this kind of a mindset.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 3 minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the order was that amendments should be filed by 4 p.m. today. I have in my hand a list of the amendments that were filed by 4 o'clock and the authors thereof.

I shall state them at this point: An amendment by Mr. CRAPO; Mr. DURBIN—that is the pending amendment—Mr. BYRD; Mr. KYL, three amendments; Mr. KERRY; Mr. MURKOWSKI; Mr. SESSIONS; Ms. COLLINS; Mr. HARKIN; Mr. ENZI; Mr. BREAUX; Mr. CORZINE; Mr. STEVENS; Mr. NELSON of Florida; Mr. NELSON of Florida; Mr. KERRY; Mr. NICKLES; Mr. ENZI; Mr. SESSIONS; Mr. SMITH of Oregon; Mr. ALLARD; Mr. DURBIN; Mrs. FEINSTEIN; Mrs. FEINSTEIN; Mr. MCCAIN; Mrs. BOXER; Ms. CANTWELL; Ms. LANDRIEU has six amendments; Mr. BINGAMAN, four amendments; Mr. LEVIN; and Mr. CRAIG. The amendments are numbered from 878 to 918 inclusive.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 879. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 229 Leg.]

YEAS—42

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen | Gramm | Miller |
| Bennett | Grassley | Murkowski |
| Bond | Hagel | Nelson (NE) |
| Breaux | Hatch | Nickles |
| Brownback | Helms | Roberts |
| Bunning | Hutchinson | Santorum |
| Burns | Hutchison | Sessions |
| Campbell | Inhofe | Shelby |
| Cochran | Kyl | Smith (NH) |
| Craig | Landrieu | Smith (OR) |
| Crapo | Lott | Stevens |
| Ensign | Lugar | Thompson |
| Enzi | McCain | Thurmond |
| Frist | McConnell | Voinovich |

NAYS—57

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Akaka | DeWine | Leahy |
| Allard | Dodd | Levin |
| Baucus | Domenici | Lieberman |
| Bayh | Dorgan | Lincoln |
| Biden | Durbin | Mikulski |
| Bingaman | Edwards | Murray |
| Boxer | Feingold | Nelson (FL) |
| Byrd | Feinstein | Reed |
| Cantwell | Fitzgerald | Reid |
| Carnahan | Graham | Rockefeller |
| Carper | Gregg | Sarbanes |
| Chafee | Harkin | Schumer |
| Cleland | Hollings | Snowe |
| Clinton | Inouye | Specter |
| Collins | Jeffords | Stabenow |
| Conrad | Johnson | Torricelli |
| Corzine | Kennedy | Warner |
| Daschle | Kerry | Wellstone |
| Dayton | Kohl | Wyden |

NOT VOTING—1

Thomas

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the yeas and nays.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 879) was agreed to.

Mr. DASCHLE. I move to reconsider that vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we have been working with the distinguished managers of the bill. I would like to propound a unanimous consent request. I think it has the agreement of both sides. I have consulted with the managers of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent the Nelson amendment be the next order of business; that it be debated for a period of 3 hours, equally divided, and that the vote occur following the expiration of the 3 hours tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I do not object. Would the distinguished majority leader make that verbiage ''not to exceed 3 hours''?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would so ask, that it not exceed 3 hours; that the time be equally divided, and that there be no second-degree amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. NICKLES. Reserving the right to object, I ask the majority leader, I think there were two Nelson amendments, one was a 1-year and one is a permanent ban. Would you tell us which one this is?

Mr. REID. One is a year and one is 6 months.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. It is the 6-month ban identical to the House provision, amendment No. 893.

Mr. NICKLES. I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 893

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 893.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. NELSON] proposes an amendment numbered 893.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds to execute a final lease agreement for oil and gas development in the area of the Gulf of Mexico known as ''Lease Sale 181'')

On page 194, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

**SEC. 1 . LEASE SALE 181.**

None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to execute a final lease agreement for oil or gas development in the area of the Gulf of Mexico known as ''Lease Sale 181'', as identified in the Outer Continental Shelf 5-Year Oil and Gas Leasing Program, before April 1, 2002.

Mr. BYRD. Will the distinguished Senator yield for a unanimous consent request without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Of course, I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent the committee amendment be agreed to, that the bill as thus amended be considered original text for the purpose of further amendment, and that no points of order be waived by this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LANDRIEU). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, in offering this amendment, let me frame the amendment so everyone understands the context of the amendment. In the House of Representatives' discussion of the Interior appropriations bill some 3 or 4 weeks ago, a bipartisan amendment was offered by two Members of Congress from Florida.

The amendment that was attached by an overwhelming vote in the House of Representatives was with regard to a proposed lease sale, designated as 181, in the Gulf of Mexico, for the purpose of drilling for oil and gas. The House of Representatives, in a fairly substantial bipartisan vote passed a prohibition of the offering of the lease sale for 6 months. Specifically, this amendment tracks the House amendment identically, in essence saying no money appropriated under this act, the Interior appropriations bill, can be used for the purpose of offering for oil and gas drilling lease sale 181.

Lease sale 181 was originally proposed as a tract of some 6 million acres. It is in the eastern planning area of the gulf, an area that heretofore has not been violated with any drilling.

When the White House saw that there was considerable opposition, almost unanimous, from the Florida congressional delegation, the White House scaled back the proposal from approximately 6 million acres to some 1.5 million acres. It is in a location that starts to violate the eastern planning area of the gulf by some 1.5 million acres, in which drilling for oil and gas could occur.

Why am I opposed to that? I could say that clearly the people of Florida have expressed their opinion over and over and over again, in huge numbers, with huge majorities, whether that be in the expressions through previous bills in previous years, by both the Senate and the House delegations from Florida, or whether that has been in the body in which I last served as an elected, statewide cabinet official of the State of Florida, in resolutions by the Governor and the cabinet of Florida opposing offshore oil drilling off Florida.

Why is there such intensity in Florida about not having drilling in the eastern planning area of the gulf?

It is simply this: We have a $50 billion-a-year industry of tourism. A lot of that tourism is concentrated along the coast of Florida. The Good Lord has given us the beneficent sugary white, powdered sand beaches. The beauty of those beaches has attracted, over decades and decades—indeed, over the last century—people to come to Florida to enjoy our beautiful environment.

It is without question in most Floridians' minds that they see the possibility of oil spills from drilling off of Florida in the eastern gulf planning area, and it would, in fact, be a devastating economic blow—a spike right to the heart in our $50 billion-a-year tourism industry.

Floridians happen to have another reason for not wanting drilling. That is the fact that we are very sensitive about our environment. As a matter of fact, so much of our tourism is inextricably intertwined with preserving our environment and protecting it. The bottom line is that Floridians simply do not want waves of oil lapping onto the beaches.

I think we will hear testimony today by those who are on the opposite side of the issue who will say that drilling for oil and gas in the offshore Outer Continental Shelf has, in fact, became a lot safer. That well may be the case. But the fact is that according to the Minerals Management Service, the chance of an oil spill in lease sale 181 is all the way up to a 37-percent chance. Floridians simply do not want to take the risk of a 37-percent chance of an oil spill and that slick floating across the waters of the Gulf of Mexico and washing up onto the beaches of Florida where so much of our prized environment is displayed for the wonderful people who come to enjoy the natural bounty and beneficence of Florida.

I want to draw your attention to this map of the Gulf of Mexico. This map is very revealing with regard to the Florida story. I have talked to Senators in this Chamber who have had the White House tell them their side of the story. When they see this map, they say: I had no idea it was like that.

This map tells a completely different story. The story they are being told by the White House is that a compromise has been made that is acceptable, a compromise in which originally lease sale 181 included 6 million acres, part of which was this stovepipe that came up close to the Alabama shoreline, which was, in fact, within about 30 miles of Perdido Key, which is our western most beach in the State of Florida.

What they are being told by the White House is that the compromise of shrinking lease sale 181 is acceptable because it narrows it down, as represented here by the yellow, to a tract of 1.5 million acres instead of 6 million. They point out that it is 100 miles from Pensacola Beach, and that it is some 280 miles from Clearwater and St. Petersburg. Whereas, the original lease sale 181 was 213 miles from the west coast of Florida, and still 100 miles from here up at the top of the stovepipe. Of course, it was much closer.

But what they are not telling is the full story, and that is what I wanted to show with this map.

The green color indicates the existing drilling leases in the Gulf of Mexico. Beyond this boundary is the eastern planning area in which there is no drilling for the simple reason that Floridians have insisted each year that the threat is too great and the risk is too great to despoil our beaches and our environment.

As well as that, the estimated future reserves were expected to be very little. In all of the Outer Continental Shelf, which includes not only the Atlantic seaboard, all of the gulf, as well as the Outer Continental Shelf off of the west coast of the United States, California, Oregon, and Washington, 80 percent of the future gas reserves are estimated to be in the area that is already being drilled in the Gulf of Mexico—not in the eastern gulf planning area. And 60 percent of the future oil reserves are estimated to be in that area that is already being drilled known as the western gulf planning area and the central planning area—not in the eastern planning area.

We come to the table quite naturally to make our case to the Senate, having had the case overwhelmingly made to the House already that if the future reserves are mostly off the States of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, the area already being drilled, and the future reserves are not here, why take the risk of an oil spill that would despoil some of the world's most beautiful beaches that support the economy of Florida. To repeat myself, the Minerals Management Service says the chance of a spill in lease sale 181 is up to 37 percent. That is a risk simply not worth taking.

I think this map tells the whole story. This area has not been violated—an area called the eastern planning area. Now in the attempt at a so-

called compromise, the White House is pushing 1.5 million acres that now go eastward into this area that has not been violated in the past.

As you can see, with all of this drilling activity, that yellow spot right there on this map of the gulf is what I call the proverbial camel's nose under the tent. You can see that dirty little nose sticking underneath the edge of that tent.

What is going to happen in the future? That camel is going to start crawling into that tent, and that drilling is going to proceed in an inevitable march eastward straight for Tampa Bay. The people of Florida think that is too much of a risk.

We could talk about energy and a lot of the things that we ought to be doing that are not the subject of this particular amendment, but I am compelled to bring up the fact that, goodness gracious, if we but improve the miles per gallon for new automobiles manufactured—and there is another very controversial lease sale, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—by 3 miles per gallon on all new vehicles—not the existing vehicles, new vehicles—it would save the equivalent amount of energy that would be produced by all of the oil to be drilled in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

So as we approach an energy crisis—and I am looking forward to having a debate when the Department of Energy authorization bill comes to this Chamber—what Senator GRAHAM of Florida and I will probably be offering at that point is a complete moratorium. But for purposes of this Interior appropriations bill, I am offering an amendment that is identical to what was adopted in the House so that if adopted here this will not be an issue in the conference committee but, rather, would be accepted in the conference committee and would become a 6-month moratorium on the offering of this lease sale.

So perhaps what we ought to do is to rethink the White House's energy policy of drill, drill, drill. Drill in the areas where the future reserves are already proven. Drill in the areas where the States do not object to the drilling off their shore. Drill in the area where a State such as Louisiana really does not have the God-given beaches, the white sand beaches that we have in Florida that are so much a part of our economy.

Save energy by conservation. Use our technological prowess to produce an automobile that will have a much higher miles-per-gallon average.

I had the pleasure of riding in one of these hybrids. I could not believe it. It was just as comfortable. The car was just as roomy. The car had just as much pickup. In the hot summer Florida Sun, the air-conditioning worked just as well as any other car. All of the electrical demands of radio and CDs and tape players were all there, with no sacrifice.

As we drove down the road, I, as the passenger, could not help but have my eyes riveted to the TV screen in the middle of the console that showed how the engine would be running partly from the gasoline and partly from the battery, and when it was not running from the battery, that the battery, in fact, was recharging—a vehicle known as a hybrid. And I was astounded for my host, the driver, the owner of the vehicle, to tell me that, in fact, this hybrid got a total, in city driving, of 53 miles per gallon.

Can you imagine, if we used our technological prowess to get serious about our automobile and transportation fleets, how much energy we could save. Regardless of what we do here, I think that makes just good, sound national energy policy and that we ought to pursue using our technology to improve our miles per gallon.

But I bring that point up to say that we have an old country expression in Florida: There are many ways to skin a cat. And you don't just have to skin that cat by saying: We are going to drill, drill, drill; and we are going to do it to the risk of a $50 billion a year tourism economy in Florida. We know in this Nation what the spill of the *Exxon Valdez* tanker did to the shores of Alaska. We also know what the winds and the wave currents can do with an oil slick in carrying it hundreds of miles within days. And, ladies and gentlemen, Senators all, it is not fair and it is not worth the risk to Pensacola and Fort Walton Beach and Destin and Panama City and Mexico Beach, and all these fragile areas of the ecosystem around Apalachicola Bay, and the big bend of Florida, and down into Cedar Key and the mouth of the Suwannee River, and coming on down to the white sand beaches of Clearwater Beach and St. Petersburg, and then into the very fragile ecosystems of Tampa Bay, and on south from Manatee County and Bradenton, all the way south past Sarasota, down near Charlotte, and into Fort Myers—some of the most beautiful beaches in the world—and south of Fort Myers to Naples—one of the hottest spots for new people to come to Florida and enjoy the environment of Florida—just south of there to Marco Island—a place known as the ''Ten Thousand Islands''—one of the most productive fisheries in the world, and not to speak of coming on around into the Florida Straits into this beautiful land known as the Florida Keys—something that ballads have made famous by people such as Jimmy Buffett who would tell you the same thing that I am telling you today: It is not worth the risk to the Florida environment nor to our economy. That 37-percent risk of oil drilling off of Florida could produce an oilspill that would become a slick that could travel, by wind and wave action, miles within days to despoil these Florida beaches.

So I make a plea on behalf of 16 million Floridians that the Senate will debate this, understand it. Do not confuse it by saying that this line is not over the Alabama line. Where is the Alabama line? The Alabama-Florida line is up here as shown on this map. These are the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. And this line right here is the line of demarcation, the beginning of the eastern gulf planning area that has never been violated by drilling.

So do not listen to the arguments that this is not over the line. This is over the line, 1½ million acres over the line. That simply is not worth the risk to us.

There are others who have a similar set of circumstances. I want to remind the Senators, the Senators of the Great Lakes, they do not want drilling off their shores. The Senators of New England, especially off of Maine, and that great lobster industry, they do not want the drilling off of their shores. The Senators of the eastern seaboard, with all of their tourism and ecological activities, don't want the drilling there. The Senators off the west coast of the United States don't want the drilling there either.

The fact is, the drilling has not occurred here for years because the future reserves are simply not there.

I am expecting others and I expect to be joined by my senior Senator, Mr. GRAHAM. What I will do is reserve the remainder of my time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry: What is the time sequence and who is in control of the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 3 hours evenly divided on this amendment, and the Senator from Florida has used 25 minutes. There is an hour and a half remaining on the opposing side.

Mr. BREAUX. I yield myself 10 minutes from the time in opposition.

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

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, the subject matter is energy. I just came from a meeting with the Vice President and a group of Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, who are trying to see what we can do as a Congress to come up with an energy policy that makes sense for this country.

It is very clear that the United States at this time is in dire circumstances with regard to where we get energy, how much we get, and how much it costs. Over the last several weeks and the last couple of months, we have seen the price of gas go up. We have seen people panicking because they cannot afford their electricity bills because of the high price of natural gas. We see the uncertainty of areas of this country suffering blackouts and businesses having to close and suffer economic damage because they don't have enough energy.

At the same time, we import 57 percent of the energy we consume every

day from foreign sources. Many of these foreign sources are undependable. They are not our allies, and they certainly do not have the best interests of the United States as the premise for their operations. Yet 57 percent of our energy comes from overseas. It comes from organized cartels that regularly do things for which, if done in this country, they would go to the penitentiary.

What they do every day is fix prices of energy that we have to buy from them. They tell us how much we are going to have to pay by controlling the amount they produce. Yet we as a nation, in the year 2001, have been comfortable with allowing that type of energy policy to govern how we exist when it comes to energy supplies.

If we imported 57 percent of the food we eat, people would be marching on the capital of this country saying that is an unacceptable condition because food obviously is important to our national security and the way we live in America. That is absolutely true. But it is no less true that when we import 57 percent of the energy, that is an unacceptable set of circumstances we must address.

How do we address it? Unfortunately, one of the ways that we have, over the years and over several administrations and over several Congresses, was to say what we were not going to do. We have said that we are not going to look for oil in the Outer Continental Shelf, which has some of the most promising resources of any place in the world off the coast of the United States; that we are not going to do anything from Canada to the Florida Keys because those areas are too valuable and should not be touched; and through congressional moratoriums and through Presidential moratoriums, basically everything from Key West to the border of Canada is off limits: Don't touch it.

In addition to that, when we look over to the west coast, which happens to have some of the States that consume by far the greatest amount of energy per capita, we have said, through moratoriums, both congressional and Presidential, that we are not going to do anything from Canada on the west coast all the way to Mexico on our southern border because those areas are pristine, they are nice, we should not have the potential for having an oil spill.

The only area of our Outer Continental Shelf in which we have had production, which produces the greatest amount of natural gas, the greatest amount of oil and gas, and has done so for the last 60 years, of the offshore areas is the Gulf of Mexico.

We have said we are not going to touch ANWR. We are not going to touch the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We will not touch the monuments. We will not touch the east coast. We are not going to touch the west coast. But go drill for oil and gas in the Gulf of Mexico.

I represent Louisiana. I am happy with that policy because it provides jobs. It provides energy. We make a contribution to solving the energy policy of this country. We understand it. We have developed the industry. We know its faults. We know what it can do and what it cannot do, and we have done it for 60 years. The technology that has been developed in the Gulf of Mexico is the technology that is used worldwide.

Less than 2 percent of the oil that is spilled in the oceans of the world comes from offshore exploration and production activities. Where does it come from? It comes from seepage, which is natural. It comes from ballast discharges from ships. And it comes from rusty, leaky tankers that import oil from all over the world.

The Senator from Florida mentioned the *Exxon Valdez*. That was not a drilling accident, that was a ship accident. That was a tanker delivering oil, as they do every day to the ports of the United States, where we import 57 percent of the oil that we use, coming to this country in tankers that have a far greater risk than any risk that possibly could occur from drilling activities in the offshore waters of the United States.

The State of Florida, under a Democratic Governor, Lawton Chiles, our good friend and our former colleague with whom I served in the Senate, and a Democratic President of the United States—at that time, President Clinton—reached an agreement on lease sale 181. It was proposed under a Democratic administration, and it was agreed to by a Democratic Governor. The original sale has the potential to supply Florida with as much as 7 years of the natural gas they use every day to cool their homes in the summer and to possibly heat their homes if it gets cold enough in the winter months. That sale can provide 7 years of their natural gas supplies.

They import 99 percent of the natural gas they use. Yet now they say: We are going to object to a sale that has been worked out, carefully crafted, proposed by a Democratic administration, approved by a previous Democratic Governor, because it has the potential to damage their coastline.

We have done that in Louisiana for 60 years. While the beaches of Florida may be prettier than the beaches of Louisiana, I argue that the value of the coastal estuarial area is no less valuable in Louisiana and Texas and Alabama and Mississippi than it is on the coast of Florida. In fact, I argue that the coastal estuaries of Louisiana are far more important in the sense that they are the habitat for waterfowl, for ducks, and for geese, and for finfish, and for shrimp, and for oysters, and for fur-bearing animals, alligators, everything that is important to an ecosystem.

We have been able to preserve those areas and to do so while producing the largest amount of oil and gas for our neighbors in the other 49 States in the history of this country. We have done so successfully. We have done so in a balanced fashion, and we have done so with a minimum impact. Is it perfect? Of course not, but nothing is perfect.

It is fine to drive around in battery-operated cars. I am all for that. It is great to have windmills, and it is great to have geothermal power. What is not great is to import 57 percent of our energy from foreign sources which are undependable and unacceptable. What if we start blocking the Gulf of Mexico? Are we going to fight to open up California? Are we going to fight to open up George's Banks? That is not going to happen.

I daresay we make a very serious mistake to say: Oh, let them do it over there, but not in my backyard. We will consume; we want it cheap; we want a plentiful supply; but, by golly, don't do it in my backyard. Do it somewhere else. We are too good to have oil and gas production off our coast because our beaches are clean.

Well, my beaches and coastline are also very valuable, but we also show that it can be done in a compatible fashion to produce energy needs for this country and at the same time preserve and protect the environment and wetlands.

The Democratic bill offered by the chairman, Senator BINGAMAN, calls for going forward with lease sale 181. A Democratic President proposed lease sale 181, and a previous Democratic Governor of the State of Florida approved lease sale 181. I don't know what has happened, and I don't understand the politics of it, but something has changed. The administration, in an effort to say, all right, we are going to do something—I think what they did was terrible. They took sale 181 and cut it by 75 percent. They said we are going to cut out 75 percent of the size of this lease sale and only allow 25 percent. I think that was a terrible decision. I told them that.

For them to now say Congress has to come in and postpone all of that—even the 25 percent remaining—is absolutely, in my opinion, unacceptable. If we are going to have an energy policy in this country that makes sense, we are going to have to have a balanced policy. I suggest that saying ''not in my backyard, never, ever, don't want to see it, let's get it from somebody else'' is unacceptable, not prudent, and is bad public policy. I think it is something that should not be adopted. At the appropriate time, I am sure we will have a vote on this. I hope colleagues will join with me in saying that at least in the Gulf of Mexico—if we can have it nowhere else—we will be willing to have a reasonable exploration program in an area where we have already done it for the past 60 years.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time?

Mr. NICKLES. I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I yield myself 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I listened to my colleague and friend from Florida on his amendment that would basically block any production in a large area of waters, not only off the coast of Florida, but also off Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

I have great respect for State sovereignty and for listening to Senators who are dealing with areas surrounding their States. When they talk about the Everglades, I want to listen. I want them to listen to me when I talk about Oklahoma. I have a tendency to give great deference to Senators from their home States. I think the Senators from Alaska know Alaska much better than we do, and we should listen when they have recommendations to make about their lands, the development of it, and the balance of policies.

I also think we should listen to Governors. I know this lease sale 181 was somewhat controversial. I was kind of disappointed. I know originally Governor Bush of Florida was opposed to it. He is not opposed to the modification. The amendment of the Senator from Florida would stop any lease in this entire area. This lease, as modified, has been reduced by 75 percent. The lease that we now have, which the administration has negotiated with the Governors of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, has been agreed to by all of the Governors, including the Governor of Florida.

So I am thinking, wait a minute, I want to listen to the Senator from Florida and give him some deference, but this is not just off the coast of Florida. This is not even close to the coast of Florida. This is 285 miles from Tampa—285 miles. If someone visits the coast of California, they will see a lot of rigs that are in State-controlled waters. That is within 3 miles of the coast of California, which also prides itself on beautiful beaches and shoreline. They don't want those desecrated in any way. Neither do I. I happen to be a fan of the beaches, and I want to keep them as pristine as possible. But I want to use common sense, too—285 miles from Tampa, 138 miles from Panama City, 100 miles from Pensacola.

I heard my colleague say, ''This is in Florida waters.'' It is not in Florida waters. This actually goes down the borderline, and it is on the Alabama side. The negotiated deal—and maybe this was to get the Governor of Florida to support this deal, but all of the lands directly south of Florida were taken out of the lease.

I agree with my colleague from Louisiana; I think the administration gave up too much in the negotiation. They took a lot of potential area—area that is well beyond the boundaries—and said we are not going to ever look at those lands. I heard my colleague from Florida say that there is not much there. Well, we don't know because there hasn't been any exploration. There is not simultaneous desecration of the beaches because somebody happens to do some exploring to find out whether there is any potential for gas.

I am bothered by the fact that maybe there are people saying, yes, we know this is an energy problem, but don't touch it in my backyard. I understand that. But this is not somebody's backyard when it is 285 miles away or it is 100 miles from the closest point to someone's State. That is not in their backyard; that is a long way away.

As a matter of fact, we have formulas that share royalties and lands that are offshore areas that are close to lands and get a higher royalty. This is not close; this is in Federal waters a long way from the State of Florida. The very fact that the Governors of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Florida support this modified sale tells me it is a reasonable compromise and one that should not be vitiated or postponed indefinitely.

I know one amendment says to postpone it permanently and another says for a certain period of time. It basically says: We don't want to drill or explore or have oil and gas, but, incidentally, we would like to have a pipeline to run from Mobile, AL, down to southern Florida because we are going to need gas.

As a matter of fact, the State of Florida is the third largest consumer of petroleum products in the country. Yet they are saying don't drill or touch or explore anywhere hundreds of miles from our coast. I find that to be inconsistent. Are we going to say you don't get to use natural gas or oil? Don't they use oil and gas? Yes, they are the third largest consumer of petroleum products in the country. It is a growing State and a beautiful State. There is nothing inconsistent with having some exploration off the gulf coast.

If you listen to my colleagues from Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, there is a lot of drilling off the coast of Louisiana. If you look at the map in the Venice area, and so on, there is a lot of activity in those areas. They have been able to do it in ways that preserve the beautiful environment of southern Louisiana and Mississippi. Southern Mississippi and southern Alabama also have a coast, and they have casinos, and they have a lot of tourism in those areas. They are concerned about them. It can be done in an environmentally safe and compatible manner and in a way that provides energy resources that are needed to keep the lights on, to keep the jobs going, to keep the economy growing, to keep the tourists renting cars and visiting the beaches and enjoying the Florida coast.

To say we want to have a moratorium on any exploration this far removed—285 miles from Tampa or 100 miles from the coastal point in Florida—I think goes way too far. At some point, somebody is going to have to say, wait a minute; use a little common sense.

I do not think, with all due respect, this amendment should be adopted. I understand the intention. I do not question the motivation of my colleagues from Florida for offering the amendment, but when the Florida Governor supports this modified lease, when the other Governors who are logistically much closer to this potential lease support it, I say let this go forward; let's not block it; let's not block it indefinitely; let's not make this dependency on unreliable sources even greater.

That is exactly what we are doing. Some people are asking the question: How did we get into this energy crisis? Why are we importing 56, 57 percent of our gas needs? And that number will increase as the years go by, especially if we adopt these kinds of amendments.

If my colleagues want to increase our dependence on unreliable sources, such as in the Middle East, on Saddam Hussein, on people who have political agendas directly contrary to ours, then support this amendment. It is very shortsighted for energy policy; it is very shortsighted for the well-being and future national security of our country; and it is very shortsighted for the people of Florida who need energy, who happen to live in one of the growing, thriving economies in our country which needs energy—oil and gas.

This amendment is a serious mistake, and I urge my colleagues to support us. When we make a motion to table the amendment, I urge our colleagues to support that motion.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, I am not sure who controls the time in opposition. I yield whatever time the Senator needs. Ten minutes?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I am looking for the brilliant staff to plead my case.

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

Mr. BREAUX. I will take 5 minutes off the time.

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

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, so that people who may be watching on their monitors in their offices can understand a couple things about lease sale 181, this lease sale did not happen overnight. As I indicated before, when President Clinton was serving in office

and negotiating with Governor Lawton Chiles —two Democrats—on this lease sale 181, President Clinton said: We are going to set off limits all the areas in the eastern gulf, but we are going to have lease sale 181.

In 1996 when they released the plan, the Governor of Florida, Lawton Chiles, expressed his appreciation for Minerals Management designating lease sale 181 to not be within 100 miles of the coast of Florida. It is 70 miles off the coast of Louisiana. It is much closer to Louisiana, but in no case is it within 100 miles of the coast of Florida. It is 285 miles from Tampa, 213 miles from their coast, 138 miles from Panama City. It is only 70 miles, as I indicated, from the coast of Louisiana.

In 1996 when we had a Democratic Governor and a Democratic President, they thought this compromise was fine and agreed to the compromise at that time and said this is something that fits into our plans for energy and thank you very much for making sure it does not come within 100 miles of the coast of Florida. That was their agreement.

It has proceeded forward under those terms until, because of opposition of the current Governor of Florida, the administration lopped off 75 percent of the sale in addition to that agreement in 1996. This amendment takes the remaining 25 percent and says we cannot have that either.

As the Senator from Oklahoma has indicated, when one is talking about a balanced energy policy in the country, this is something that is not acceptable.

The other point I will make is we have done exploration in the eastern Gulf of Mexico for decades. This is not a first movement into the eastern Gulf of Mexico. Drilling for natural gas and oil has occurred in the eastern Gulf of Mexico for more than three decades. For more than three decades we have had activities off the Destin Dome, which I happen to love, which is a beautiful part of the country. I spent many summers on the beautiful beaches in Destin.

They have not gotten anything. They have had extensive exploratory wells. Shell had in the past a bunch of dry holes right off Pensacola.

We have been drilling in the eastern gulf for three decades. I suggest it has been done without any problems, without any spills or anything of that nature.

We have a compromise based on a compromise based on a compromise. Yet today we have an effort to say even those compromises are unacceptable.

If you have a State that imports 99 percent of the natural gas they consume, they, too, have an obligation to help contribute to the supply of something that is clearly the cheapest burning fuel in the world.

Unfortunately the area they knocked off, the top area, is the area that has the greatest potential for natural gas because the natural gas fields are flowing off the coast of Louisiana, moving in a northeast way. All the activity has been in that area. That is where the natural gas is. Unfortunately, it has already been removed. That is where most of the natural gas potential is.

As I indicated, the Minerals Management survey said if you have wholesale gas, that could supply as much as 14 years of the natural gas needs for the State of Florida. With the reduced area, the projection is, even lopping this off, it has enough potential natural gas alone to supply Florida with 7 years of their natural gas needs for cooling, operating their industries and businesses, and also for heating in the winter whenever it might be necessary on those rare days.

To say this compromise is still not acceptable is, in fact, unacceptable and the amendment should be tabled.

Mr. NICKLES. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BREAUX. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. NICKLES. I know in the State of Louisiana and I know also in the State of Texas there is a lot of activity off the coast. I asked my staff to find out what percent of our domestic oil production and gas production right now comes from the Gulf of Mexico. They told me about 25 percent of our domestic oil and 30 percent of our gas is produced in those areas.

That is a big chunk of our domestic production: A fourth of the oil and almost a third of our gas. Has that production caused harm to the ecology, to the environment, to the coast of Louisiana, to the wildlife which is so abundant in the southern part of the State of Louisiana?

Mr. BREAUX. The Senator makes a very good point. I answer his question with two points. Some in Florida—and I understand their argument—say we have beautiful beaches; we do not want oil to be spilled around our beaches.

I do not want it to happen either. I argue the wetlands in Louisiana, which are about 25 percent of all the wetlands in North America, with the wildlife—the birds, the ducks, the geese, fish, shrimp, oysters, fur-bearing animals, alligators—all of that ecosystem which is probably the most complicated anywhere in the world has been able to thrive and do very well in supporting those wildlife features and at the same time support the largest amount of oil and gas production anywhere in the world.

In addition to that, the statistics say what the risk is. Advances in technology have made this operation the cleanest activity of finding energy anywhere in the world. For example, for the period between 1980 and 1999, a 20-year period, 7.4 billion barrels of oil have been produced in the Outer Continental Shelf with less than .001 percent spill. That is a 99.999 percent safety record for oil.

I dare any industry anywhere to come up with those safety numbers. That shows we can have that kind of activity which produces that amount of oil with that little oil spill.

If we had a lousy track record out here, the Senator would be correct in saying do not put it here because it is going to damage our coast. But if one looks at the last 60 years, one can see what has occurred is huge amounts of production and yet a very insignificant amount of spill into the waters of the ocean.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield for one other comment?

Mr. BREAUX. Yes, I yield.

Mr. NICKLES. Isn't the risk of spillage even greater from shipping, tanker movements than it is from the production record in the Gulf of Mexico?

Mr. BREAUX. We have been doing this for a long time. I say to the Senator from Oklahoma, when I was in the House in the seventies—it seems like the Dark Ages now—we wrote the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. We had the National Academy of Sciences—and it has been updated. This is not the National Petroleum Institute; this is not the State of Louisiana, but the National Academy of Sciences said less than 2 percent of the oil that is spilled in the oceans of the world come from offshore drilling activity—less than 2 percent. Most of it comes from tanker discharges with rusty bucket tankers bringing in oil from foreign countries, as we have happening in this country, from natural seepage, from ballast discharges, and from other activities, allowing nonpoint source runoff into the Nation's waters, into rivers, and finding its way into our bodies of water. Less than 2 percent of oil that is spilled in the oceans of the world, the National Academy of Sciences says, comes from OCS activities.

I think that is an enviable record for anyone.

I yield whatever time the Senator from Alaska requires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I would like to reflect on some realities associated with this project because I think there is a question as to what the risk is. What is the risk to the residents of Florida? What is the true understanding of what this risk is? What are we talking about developing? We are talking about developing, in this lease sale, a significant, known deposit of natural gas.

When you take natural gas out of the reserve and you take it ashore and condition it, basically you are taking out the impurities, the wet gas. You are taking the oil that happens to be mixed in it, you are taking it ashore, conditioning it, and then moving the clean gas, in theory, to Tampa where it would be utilized for the benefit of Floridians.

What is the risk associated with that conditioned gas? It is pretty minimal. If you had some kind of fracture of that pipeline, you are not talking about unconditioned gas, which includes oil and various components associated with hydrocarbons; you are

talking about pure, conditioned gas. It would bubble up and dissipate. You are not talking about moving crude oil or the risks associated with crude oil from a pipeline.

We have heard of the NIMBY theory: not in my backyard. I think that has been pretty well exercised. But one of the things that is frustrating—obviously, I do not have a constituency in Florida, but I am sensitive to the concerns of my friend from Florida relative to what is good for his State. But at what point do we have a reasonable definition of what is offshore of my State or the State of Louisiana or any other State? This is 285 miles, in one case, to this area which is now the alternative that has been agreed upon. According to my understanding, it has been agreed upon by basically all the parties concerned.

The Secretary of the Interior modified the boundaries of the lease sale in response to the concerns of the State of California, the Governor of California. The indication by this agreement is there will be absolutely no new leases off the coast of Florida. They have modified the sale to one-fourth of the original lease area. What constitutes a reasonable determination of what is offshore? We used to have the 3-mile limit. We have the 12-mile limit. We have the economic zone. Now we are 285 miles to 213 miles offshore and we are saying that is offshore. I think we have to be reasonable.

Therefore, the amendment proposed by my colleague from Florida that would cancel the authorization for even the compromise, I have to state in my own opinion, is rather unrealistic.

I want to show another chart because I think it reflects a reality that is occurring. That is the NIMBY theory: not in my backyard. We have taken the entire east coast off limits for oil and gas exploration. We have taken the entire west coast off limits for exploration. We have taken an area of the overthrust belt in Montana, Colorado, Wyoming, a number of States known to have significant deposits of natural gas. As I recall, it is about 23 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that was found in this area, known to exist, available for commercial recovery, and with the last administration banning road access into these areas we made these areas off limits. Where is the energy going to come from in this country?

If we look at realities associated with the status of the OCS leasing program as evidenced by the next chart, I think we can get a better understanding of just what is happening.

These are various provinces. These estimates show oil and gas potential reserves; whether you start in Washington-Oregon or northern California or central California or southern California, you note and identify reserve estimates of considerable merit. The only problem is the areas were withdrawn from leasing through January 30, 2012.

These were done, for the most part, without any public hearing process before congressional bodies. These were done at the request of individual Members, attaching riders to legislation moving on the floor. So they really have not been subject to any debate. Some have been included in previous Interior appropriations bills. If you look at the entire east coast, you will look at the North Atlantic area, the mid-Atlantic area, the South Atlantic area, all with considerable oil and gas potential from the standpoint of estimated reserves. They, too, are off limits—everything in the buff color.

If we go down to Florida the same thing is true in the eastern Gulf of Mexico; it is off limits. The remaining area, the blue area, is off the coast of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama. The occupant of the chair is well versed, obviously, in the significance of what oil and gas development does in the State of Louisiana. But why should Louisiana alone, and to a degree Texas and Alabama and Mississippi, have to bear the brunt of the requirements of the rest of the Nation when they do not have to share in any of the impact?

The occupant of the chair was very active in CARA legislation last year, which was to suggest that, indeed, these States impacted deserve some consideration associated with the impact of activity off the shores of Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, and Mississippi—and justifiably so. That was not resolved to the satisfaction of those of us who supported it. That was, indeed, unfortunate. We are going to come back again. Because if you are looking to just a few States to support the rest of the Nation, those States that have to bear that impact are entitled to some consideration. That consideration was to come from the Federal account associated with oil and gas funding that came into the Treasury.

I think we have, if you will, an obligation to address the responsibility of those States that have to bear this burden and have not been given the courtesy, or the consideration of any sharing of funds that go into the general fund, a portion of which should certainly go to these States.

As we look at reality, again the red indicates existing leases; the buff color is the national marine sanctuaries; we have my State of Alaska here, an area off the Aleutian Islands in Bristol Bay that is also off limits, but we have 31,000 miles of coastline in the State of Alaska.

What has happened over an extended period of time is not much credit has been given to the capability of the industry to develop oil and gas safely in OCS areas. They have a remarkable safety record. It is not perfect by any means, but it is improving with advanced technology and will continue to improve because the consequences of an accident are so devastating. So the interest is certainly there as is American ingenuity, American know-how, and American capability, to ensure, if you will, that the risk is minimal.

Make no mistake about it. I think it is disingenuous, in a sense, to simply take for granted that most of the 50 States enjoy oil and gas, and they don't give a moment's consideration that it has to be produced from somewhere. Somebody has to discover it. Somebody has to produce it, refine it, and distribute it. We all take these things for granted.

When we recognize how significant it is that there are so few areas supporting the rest of the Nation, I think we have to recognize reality and where we go from here. If we want to import energy, that is fine. Then we are going to be beholding more and more to the merits of the OPEC cartel and others who have traditionally had a significant capability in producing energy. But the ramifications of that dependence speak for itself. If you look at our relationship with Iraq, on the one hand we are importing oil and on the other hand we are enforcing an air embargo. An air embargo for all practical purposes is similar to what you do in the ocean when you stop all shipping. That kind of an action is potentially an act of war in the minds of many.

As a consequence of our increased dependence on foreign energy sources, we sacrifice to some extent the national security of this Nation. We sacrifice as well our oil dependence. We increase our balance of payments. I could go on and on with the dangers associated with increasing dependence on imported oil.

I think we should go back again to the chart and ask what is reasonable relative to States that do not want oil and gas activity off their shores. The proposed agreement put together with the cooperation of the Secretary of Interior and the Governor was basically three-quarters of the area has been withdrawn and we are still looking at something like 213 or 285 miles offshore. It is certainly beyond the reasonable consideration given to the protection of individual States from oil and gas. This is 100 miles from Pensacola; 100 miles from Mobile, AL; Biloxi, 123 miles; Venice, 70 miles. It is a long way out there.

Again, if you look at the experience of the industry in the Gulf many miles offshore from Louisiana, they are drilling now in 3,000 feet of water. They have developed the technology to have lease sales on 6,000 feet of water.

When you have an agreement put together, you have to respect it. What does the Governor of Florida say about the Secretary's decision? My understanding is that he supports it. The statement by Governor Jeb Bush regarding Lease Sale 181 is that today's unprecedented decision reflects a significant problem in Florida's fight to protect our coastline. In its defense of Florida's coastal waters, the Department of Interior's proposal under President Bush goes far beyond any previous proposals contemplated by

past administrations, including the Clinton and Chiles administrations. As a result, there will be no new drilling in the Lease Sale 181 areas off the coast of Florida. That is a statement of the Governor of Florida.

There is an agreement. It has been developed as a compromise between the Secretary of Interior, the Governor, and certainly it is beyond the reasonable consideration of what point are we going to put our body, so to speak, in front of the reality that we have to develop energy in this country. You can say, if 285 miles is too close, why don't we go 500 miles? Where is the limit? This is truly beyond the limit of reasonableness.

I think the amendment by the Senator from Florida really is unnecessary. You have an agreement now. It appears that most parties are happy.

Again, if the argument of the Senator from Florida prevails, then to what extent are we going to limit, if you will, reasonableness in determining where a lease sale offshore can take place, if one can't take place as proposed in the amendment between 213 and 285 miles offshore?

For the time being, that pretty well accounts for my opinion as to the necessity of recognizing where energy comes from and the reality that we have a workable compromise which certainly seems fair and equitable.

When you consider reasonableness on the distance from the coast of Florida, the reality that Florida will benefit in receiving conditioned gas from this lease sale and the practicality that if it doesn't go to Florida, Floridians are going to be paying a higher transportation cost at least for their gas because that gas will have to come overland from either Louisiana, Mississippi, or Alabama, then across country and down into Florida, Floridians will then be paying undoubtedly a higher price. But the most efficient way to transport their gas is through a pipeline to Tampa.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED). Who yields time?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Louisiana may proceed under the time in opposition.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, my colleague from Florida wishes to speak at this time. I will reserve my time after he speaks for about 10 minutes and will speak in opposition to the amendment. But in all fairness to the proponents, I would be happy to allow him to go first.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The sponsor has 64 minutes. The opponent has 45 minutes.

Without objection, the request of the Senator from Louisiana is agreed to.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I want to respond to some of the things that have been said on the floor. The Senator from Alaska has referred to the proponents of this amendment throwing their bodies in front of the train, a vehicle, or whatever. I gladly do so because of the stakes that are in this for the State of Florida.

I would like to point out that according to the statistics compiled by the Department of Interior, during the period between 1980 and 1999—almost two decades—some 3 million gallons of oil was spilled from Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas operations in 73 incidents. In addition, in one incident in April of this year, more than 90,000 gallons of saltwater and crude oil spilled out of a pipeline in Alaska's North Slope, becoming the fourth major incident there.

I point out the Department of Interior statistics simply to counter the perception that all of the Senators who have spoken in opposition to this amendment, of invading the eastern Gulf by drilling in an area which heretofore has been off limits to drilling, come from an oil-producing State.

What do you expect? They articulate the interests of the economic engines of their State. But when they give the impression that, in fact, offshore oil drilling is so safe, that there is no risk, and say instead the risk is in tankers, indeed, we know the risk in tankers because we saw what happened with the *Exxon Valdez*. But when they point out the fact that oil drilling and gas drilling is so safe and there are no spills, that is not what the facts say as compiled by the Department of the Interior.

Some 3 million gallons of oil from Outer Continental Shelf have been spilled in 73 incidents in time period between 1980 and 1999.

I want to clear up another statement that was made. It is stated there is all this oil out there. That is contrary to all of the engineering and the technology we have seen.

Indeed, let me tell you what has been estimated is in this lease sale 181. It is not some huge find. In this new lease sale 181, it is, in fact, a find of only 10 days' worth—10 days, T–E–N, 1–0—of energy for this country. Is that worth the risk to an industry that needs to protect its beaches and its environment? I say that it is not worth the tradeoff. It is not worth the risk.

As a matter of fact, the Natural Resources Defense Council has stated that in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, where the oil and gas industry has been pressing to drill—this area that, as you can see, is not violated, including this area shown on the map that is shaded in yellow, which is the subject of the lease sale we are trying to block—indeed, it said 60 percent of the Nation's undiscovered economically recoverable Outer Continental Shelf oil and 80 percent of the Nation's undiscovered economically recoverable Outer Continental Shelf gas is located in the central and western Gulf of Mexico.

So protecting this area that for years we have had a moratorium on because of its sensitivity to the ecology and economy of the surrounding areas—protecting that area will still leave a vast majority of the Nation's Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas available to the industry.

According to one study that even minimizes the risk of an oil spill, the chance of an oil spill in this area is as high as 37 percent. That is according to the Minerals Management Service.

So I want to respond to my colleagues, all of whom are from oil States, I want to make it very clear to them, this is not a NIMBY amendment that we are offering. We are not saying: Not in my backyard because oil rigs might spoil the view from our famous beaches. Indeed, we acknowledge that the latest plan—not the former one but the latest—would keep them out of sight. But Florida is unique in its dependence on those beaches, and it is unique on its dependence on the visitors who come to those beaches. Expanding drilling into this eastern gulf poses a serious risk not only to our precious natural resources but also to our entire economy.

Tourism is the lifeblood of that economy. It is in the range of $50 billion a year. Nothing could wreck our tourist industry quicker than waves of black oil lapping up on our white-sand beaches, regardless of whether the spill occurred 30 miles offshore or whether it is 100 miles offshore.

By the administration's own reckoning, the new leases would provide only enough oil and natural gas to meet just a few days of our Nation's needs. Is that worth the risk? Of course not. This is a commonsense approach. It is not worth the risk—not to Florida, not to the Nation—and it is not worth the risk to an area whose economy is so intertwined with a lot of the population that do not want this drilling.

My amendment would prohibit the Interior Department from selling new oil and gas leases anywhere in this eastern gulf planning area for 6 months from the time of enactment of this bill—only 6 months. It is intended to be a first step toward what I hope Senator GRAHAM and I will be able to offer—and I think we have assurances of offering an amendment to the Energy Department authorization bill for a continuation of this moratorium. For the sake of Florida, and for the sake of our Nation, I ask for your support.

I reserve the remainder of our time and yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we have been consulting with Senators on both sides of the aisle. I appreciate very much the help and cooperation of both our managers. I am now at a point where I can make a unanimous consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote in relation to Senator NELSON'S amendment No. 893 occur tomorrow morning immediately following the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to the House bankruptcy bill, H.R. 333,

and that there be 4 minutes of debate equally divided between the votes.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, in light of this agreement, there will be no further votes today. We will resume consideration of the bill tomorrow after the cloture vote. The managers have indicated to me that they believe we can finish the bill tomorrow. If we finish the bill tomorrow and dispose of the Griles nomination tomorrow, then we will have no other rollcall votes on Friday or on Monday. There will be tomorrow, as I noted in the unanimous consent request, a debate for a period of 3 hours, beginning at 9 o'clock, on the House bankruptcy bill, H.R. 333.

Following that, we will then come back to the Nelson amendment on which there will be 4 minutes of debate equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, the Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for my colleague who has recently joined us in the Senate from the great State of Florida. I have so enjoyed working with him on many issues that are important to us, such as education and health care, issues on which our constituencies have a great deal in common. I look forward to working with him in the future as well. But I am unwilling to support his amendment on this particular issue for, I think, many good reasons.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment because not only is it not the right thing for Florida or for Louisiana or the gulf coast, it is not the right direction we need to take for our Nation. It will not put us on the right path for a sound energy policy, self-sufficiency, or necessarily for a cleaner environment in this world that we need to treasure more.

I associate myself with the remarks of my senior colleague from Louisiana, who has been a wonderful and very eloquent spokesperson, displaying a lot of expertise in this particular area both during his years in the House and now in the Senate. He continues to bring this Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, to some reasonable arrangements regarding the energy needs for our Nation.

I also associate myself with the remarks of the ranking member of the Energy Committee, Senator MURKOWSKI, and acknowledge his leadership in this area.

Mr. President, as the Scripture says: ''Come, let us reason together.'' If there was ever a time when Members of the Senate —both Democrats and Republicans—need to sort of lay down our swords and come, reason together, this is it because our country needs a well thought out, well-balanced energy policy. And in crafting one, we are all going to have to give a little as well as bend a little to do what we need for this Nation to sustain, support and protect the economic growth that is threatened by backward politics as in this case.

This is much broader than a few oil and gas States against the one State of Florida.

This debate is about national security and our economy. It is about compromise and common sense. It is an important debate.

To answer some of the points raised by the Senator from Florida, first, it is important to say that one of the proponents of this argument in the House said that people such as myself, or those of us who are trying to make the argument that if you want to consume oil and gas, you need to be willing to produce it as well, said if that was the case, then it goes to say, if you don't raise pigs in your backyard, you shouldn't eat bacon.

That might make some sense initially in its first blush. However, the fact is, every State produces some food product that we all consume. Florida produces wonderful oranges. I have enjoyed them every year. Louisiana produces some as well. The State of the Presiding Officer has commodities of which it is proud. Some of us grow cotton. Some of us grow soybeans. Some of us grow wheat. Some of us run cattle. Some of us grow other food products. We all contribute to the overall food supply of this Nation.

While we don't all grow the same crop, while we don't all run the same kind of cattle or livestock, every State in the Union contributes to the food supply of this Nation. That is the way it should be.

Every State should also contribute to the energy supply of the Nation. We have great resources in oil and natural gas. In addition, there is clean coal, nuclear and hydropower. We have a diversity of fuels to choose from in this nation and we should make use of all of them.

This attitude of ''I want to consume the power, but I refuse to produce the power'' has got to come to an end. It is not fair. It is not right. It is not smart. If we get caught up in this hysteria, we are going to lead this Nation into a dangerous place where our businesses are hurt and our economy cannot survive.

Let me talk about the State of Florida.

The State of Florida is the third largest consumer of petroleum products in the Nation. The State of Florida only produces, however, roughly 2 percent of the petroleum that it consumes and a very small percentage of the natural gas.

From 1960 to 1994, Florida electrical demand increased 700 percent. It is not the only State that has increased its demands, but it has been one of the fastest growing States. We are all happy and proud of the development in Florida and we want Florida to continue to grow and to expand, as we want all of our States in this Union to grow and to prosper but it must hold up it's end of the bargain as well.

From 1960 to 1994, Florida's fossil fuel use for electrical generation, made necessary by this extraordinary growth in population and electrical demand, has increased 551 percent. More than 80 percent of Florida's electrical demand is met today by fossil fuels.

Right now Florida, as every State, uses energy produced by fossil fuels. In south Florida, the natural gas demand for electricity generation purposes is expected to double by the year 2008. However, there are no increases in the number or size of nuclear power or hydroelectric power foreseen in Florida to supplement this need.

There is rising demand in Florida but it makes it quite difficult for those of us from Alabama and Florida to want to help in Florida when they are not willing to help themselves. It makes it very difficult for us to want to help Florida when they are not willing to help themselves.

There is not yet the significant increase in solar or wind production in Florida or generally in the United States, to adequately take the place of fossil fuels. Although those technologies are very promising we have not made the adjustment yet. I disagree with the President's decision to cut funding for those kinds of research and development projects. We need to increase funding.

In addition, from 1995 to 2002, a minimum of 24 new electrical generating plants will be added to Florida's power grid, and 21 out of the 24 new plants that are being planned for and designed today have to run by natural gas.

This amendment doesn't make sense for Florida. It doesn't make sense for Louisiana, Alabama, Texas, Mississippi, or the Nation but it certainly does not make sense for Florida. Florida needs more natural gas, not less.

I grew up on the beaches of Florida and appreciate their beauty. My family vacations all over the gulf coast. The compromise announced by the Administration, which is threatened by this amendment, allows us to salvage almost half of the natural gas and oil resources from the original lease sale area and is more than 100 miles from any part of Florida's coast.

It is not just Louisiana or Florida waters where there is gas and oil but the waters of the United States. In this day and age we can drill with minimal footprints and minimal risk to not only the Florida coast, but the entire gulf coast, and also provide states such as Florida, Mississippi, Alabama and Georgia with the power we need to grow.

I want to talk about that growth for a minute. When we talk about growth, we are talking about jobs, about people creating wealth, about people having a dream to start a business, about a new family buying their first home, and the electricity they need to run that home. This is about people who need to get to work, and the transportation they need

to get there. This is real. This isn't about mere statistics. If we can't power our economy, how can people feed their children and families?

Let me talk about risk for a moment. We have had people come on the floor and say we can't risk the beaches. However, in reality there is minimal risk. As the senior Senator from Louisiana pointed out, there is minimal risk associated with drilling. There is more risk from the possibility of oil spills when tankers have to transport the oil to our country.

This amendment, and others like it, will not decrease the risk, it will increase the risk because we will have more tankers coming into this Nation. The environmental leaders should be strong enough in this Nation to stand up and admit this fact.

There are also other risks to consider. The risk of a recession. I want the President to know I strongly disagree with his decision to modify this lease sale. He should have held his ground. We should be exploring for oil and gas in this entire lease sale area as originally proposed. If we do not supply states such as Ohio, California, Illinois or Louisiana, with the oil and natural gas to generate the power they need, we risk jeopardizing the economic future for our Nation. So if we are going to talk about risk, let's not just talk about environmental risk, let's talk about other risks to this Nation.

Another important risk to consider is that of our national security. The risk of our dependence on oil from the Mideast is well known. I don't mean to be overly dramatic, but I want this Senate to know that this is not just a fight between Alabama and Florida or a fight between Louisiana and Florida; this is involves the entire country. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Let me talk about a more parochial issue as a Senator from Louisiana. We are proud of the contribution we have made to the oil and gas production in this country. However, the people in Louisiana also want a clean environment. The industry that operates off our coast has made great strides in making sure we can produce the oil and gas necessary to support the electricity needs of this nation while doing so in an environmentally responsible manner.

Louisiana and other gulf coast States have argued for some time now that if we are going to continue to drill in the central and western gulf there should be reasonable compensation not only for the environmental impact, but also for the infrastructure necessary to produce this oil and gas that is crucial to our nation.

Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas and other States are asking to share more equitably in the revenues that are produced from this offshore development. Currently, if $2 billion in royalties is collected from production in the Gulf of Mexico, all of it goes into the Federal Treasury and is being spent in a variety of different ways. However, the states that permit production off their shores should be compensated fairly for their contribution to the nation as well as the impacts they incur. Whatever we decide and however we can come to terms, as reasonable people can agree, I hope one thing we will agree on is that, because interior States get to keep 50 percent of the revenues from development in their states, the States that are serving as a platform for offshore production will be fairly compensated as well.

In conclusion, we do not want to drive this industry off the shores of our Nation to other places in the world. We need a viable industry here for economic as well as national security reasons.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. With all due respect to my good friend, the Senator from Florida, this is not the right direction in which to lead our Nation.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this is not related to the issue at hand, although I want to speak on that under whatever time I am yielded. This is under leader time on a resolution. I believe Senator DASCHLE will be joining me momentarily. We want to be sure to do this when we both can be here.

## COMMENDING GARY SISCO FOR HIS SERVICE AS SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 127, which is at the desk, and ask that the resolution be read in total.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 127) commending Gary Sisco for his service as Secretary of the Senate:

S. RES. 127

Whereas, Gary Sisco faithfully served the Senate of the United States as the 29th Secretary of the Senate from the 104th to the 107th Congress, and discharged the difficult duties and responsibilities of that office with unfailing dedication and a high degree of competence and efficiency; and

Whereas, as an elected officer, Gary Sisco has upheld the high standards and traditions of the United States Senate and extended his assistance to all Members of the Senate; and

Whereas, through his exceptional service and professional integrity as an officer of the Senate of the United States, Gary Sisco has earned the respect, trust, and gratitude of his associates and the Members of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Senate recognizes the notable contributions of Gary Sisco to the Senate and to his Country and expresses to him its deep appreciation for his faithful and outstanding service, and extends its very best wishes in his future endeavors.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to Gary Sisco.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 127) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I wanted the entire resolution to be read in the RECORD because I did want a complete record of the appreciation of the entire Senate for Gary Sisco who has served so capably over the past 5 years as the Secretary of the Senate.

I appreciate Senator DASCHLE joining me for this time because he knows, as I know, that we have some very dedicated officers of the Senate and other employees of our floor staff who put in long hours and do a great job in making this institution function the way it should. We do not say thank you enough to those who serve in the Chamber with us who make it possible for us to do our job, and we do not say thank you enough to the officers of the Senate, people such as the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms, the Chaplain, and others who work every day to help make this place function.

I have a very personal warm feeling for Gary Sisco. He is from Tennessee. He was born in Bolivar, TN, a small town. He grew up in strictly a blue-collar family. I believe his father did serve for a period of time as sheriff in that county in Tennessee.

I got to know him way back in, I guess, 1962 or 1963 at the University of Mississippi. We became friends. I managed to even talk him into joining the fraternity to which I belonged. We developed a very close friendship.

He wound up having a blind date with his now wife, thanks to the arrangement of my wife. Mary Sue Sisco is from Pascagoula, MS.

He went on to work with IBM after graduation and was involved in gubernatorial campaigns in Tennessee. He served Gov. Lamar Alexander, and then wound up in Washington and worked for Congressman Robin Beard as his administrative assistant. He worked for Howard Baker reaching the position of executive assistant. He then returned to Tennessee and had a very successful business life.

Five years ago, I called on him and said: We need somebody who understands computers, somebody who understands how to manage a pretty good size operation, somebody who knows how to keep the books straight, somebody who has political instinct and knows and loves the Senate. You are the man.

He left his business in Nashville, TN, and came to Washington and has been in the position of Secretary of the Senate for 5 years. He has done a wonderful job.

The only thing I ever asked of him was: Gary, when we have a few things