

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. REID. I say to the Senator from Wyoming, the Democrats have an important meeting we are going to have from 12:30 until 2 o'clock. So during part or all of that time, we will ask to be in recess.

Mr. THOMAS. Until 2 o'clock?

Mr. REID. From 12:30 to 2 o'clock.

Mr. THOMAS. Then at 2 o'clock we would go into morning business for as long as people want to speak?

Mr. REID. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Minnesota.

(The remarks of Mr. WELLSTONE pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 172 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Submitted Resolutions.")

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, what is the allocation of time between now and 10:30?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators may speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. THOMAS. It is not allocated between the two sides?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

ENERGY

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I again rise to focus the Senate on an issue that is without question a high priority one for the Congress and for the American people and one I hope we can deal with before we recess or adjourn this first session of the 107th Congress. I am talking about the critical need for a national energy policy.

For over a decade, we have wandered in the energy world without a policy that truly directed our resources and our public policy toward assuring that our Nation was self-reliant on its primary energy sources. Over that time, we have grown increasingly dependent upon foreign sources for those primary resources.

As a result, if what is now going on in the Middle East were to erupt in a

broader shooting war, it is possible we could see a curtailment of supplies out of those oil-rich countries that could not only create a critical crisis here but would drive up fuel prices at the pump dramatically. It is not happening right now. It is not happening largely because of a flat economy, less use, and because the OPEC nations recognize that the world economy is soft at this moment and have chosen not to turn the spigots on their oil wells down; therefore, driving up the price.

It is temporary, and we all know that it is temporary. Over a year and a half ago, they made it very public that it was their intent to drive the world price of crude oil up to \$28 to \$30 a barrel and to try to sustain that price. It is now below that.

It is obvious to me and to all of us who watch this issue that they are intentionally holding the price down because of the world economy and their fear of its softening.

That is one side of the issue. The other side of the issue for us is a quick examination of our infrastructure and the systems of our infrastructure and the failure of that to deliver the kind of energy our growing economy and our growing Nation needs. We saw that for almost a year in California with rolling blackouts that truly crippled the economy of that great State, largely because they had chosen the wrong policy as it related to continuing to develop energy sources and to upgrade the infrastructure that served the public.

As a result of all of that, we had a new President come to town not quite a year ago and say that without question one of the most critical needs of this Nation is a national energy policy. He established that as a very high priority.

Well, while he was doing that, we in the Senate, and our colleagues on the other side of the rotunda in the House, were busily working at the crafting of such a policy. We have spent countless hours and over 3 years in the Senate, with literally 100 or more very detailed investigative kinds of committee gatherings for the purpose of trying to determine how that policy ought to look, how we ought to shape it, and how we ought to present it to the American people.

All of that work has been done. In fact, the House worked rather quickly. They sensed the urgency, as we did, and before the August recess they had produced their version of a national energy policy. It appeared to me—and I think to all of us—that by late fall we would have a similar bill and we would be voting on it on the floor of the Senate because the Energy Committee, under the guidance of Chairman BINGAMAN, was working its will, starting a markup. Our attempt was going to be considerably more extensive than that of the House. But that work was well underway.

Then comes September 11. We are refocused for a moment, as you know, and for all the right reasons. But this

Senate is not a single-action Senate. There are 100 Senators, and there are multiples of committees and lots of chairmen, and there are hundreds of staff people. Clearly, the Energy Committee of the Senate should have been, and could have been, continuing its work toward the production of a bill to come to the floor of the Senate.

Then, in a rather unprecedented move, over a week and a half ago, the majority leader of the Senate basically told the chairman of the Energy Committee to cease and desist. No longer was he to mark up a bill and get it to the floor. Why? The argument was that it was politically too divisive. Too divisive to talk about a national energy policy, to tell the citizens that this Senate was going to work with the President to develop a policy to move us toward energy self-sufficiency, that is divisive? I don't think so. I think that is leadership. I think that is what our country calls out for at this moment, and people certainly are getting it in most instances.

But in the area of national energy policy, the leader of the Senate is not leading at this moment. Now he says he has instructed the chairman of the Energy Committee to craft a bill that they will build up through the office of the majority leader and it will come to the floor, or it could come to the floor, or it is possible to have a vote on it prior to a recess or adjournment of the first session.

Well, that is not good enough. I don't believe so. I believe a strong majority of the Senate agrees with me that it is time we dealt with a national energy policy and let the chips fall where they may, let the votes fall where they may. As a result of that, FRANK MURKOWSKI, our ranking member of the committee, I, having served on the committee for a good number of years, and a lot of other folks are engaged in trying to craft an energy bill. It won't be as broad or expansive as it might have been had we had the will to work the committee and had the committee not been instructed to stand down and desist, but we will introduce that bill. We believe that can be done on Monday.

We are working with the administration. Now we are asking in a very straightforward way, and I think an honest and responsible way, for the majority leader of the Senate to give us time to bring his bill to the floor; let us bring our bill to the floor and let us work out our differences. Everyone knows the issues at hand and all of us have a pretty good idea of what a national energy policy ought to look like. Then we can work with the House. Prior to adjournment, or following adjournment, we can rest assured that a national energy policy bill will be on the desk of the President of the United States, so that if there is a dramatic energy shock in the future, we will have done the right thing. We will have prepared the country, directed our resources, directed the infrastructure of this country toward the development