

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Approximately 55 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. So I would have perhaps 30 minutes left. I propose that I be allowed to proceed when we come back. I have probably a little less than 55 minutes. I am somewhat reluctant to start and be interrupted. I would propose to the leader that we might use the remaining time for Senators who want to speak in morning business, and I be allowed to introduce my opening statement at 2 o'clock when we come back. We will probably have statements and take amendments as they come up.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could respond to my friend from Alaska, what the Senator from Alaska proposes is that we go into a period of morning business until 12:30, and at 2:15, when we return, the Senator from Alaska be recognized for up to 1 hour; at 3:15, the Senator from South Dakota, the majority leader, or his designee would offer a modification. The Senator has suggested that he proceed at 2:15.

For the convenience of everyone, I propose that the majority leader, or his designee, at 2:15 lay down the modification, which would take a matter of a few minutes at the most, and then the Senator from Alaska would have 1 hour to present his opening statement.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. If I may respond, I certainly have no objection to the procedure of the majority leader laying down his modification. I don't want to be bound by a time agreement. We didn't discuss a time agreement on opening statements. It is not my intention to speak at length, but I would not like to be limited necessarily.

Mr. REID. I think that is entirely appropriate. I would like to hear the Senator speak longer than an hour.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I am sure the Senator would.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period from now until 12:30 be deemed as morning business; at 2:15 Senator DASCHLE, or his designee, be recognized to offer the modification; and, the Senator from Alaska, the ranking member on the committee, be recognized to give his opening statement.

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

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 President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### ENERGY POLICY

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I simply begin by thanking you, first, for your

statement in the Chamber today, but also, more importantly, for the leadership that you, Senator MURKOWSKI, and others have demonstrated to bring us to this point today. I cannot speak for the rest of my colleagues, but I am delighted we are in this Chamber and have begun the debate. It has been long delayed, but it is a most important debate on whether or not we are going to have an energy policy for this country of ours.

At the end of the Vietnam war, as a young naval flight officer, I moved from California to Delaware to enroll in the University of Delaware Business School. One of my earliest memories of coming to Delaware is sitting in line, waiting to buy gas for my car. We were in the middle of an oil embargo, and at that time you could only buy gas every other day. We did not have an energy policy in the mid 1970s. We do not have one today.

Twenty-eight years ago, some 30 percent of the oil we used in our country was imported. We had a trade balance that was pretty much even. There was not much of a deficit. Greenhouses at the time were something in which we grew plants. We did not worry about greenhouse gases and whether or not we would have a hole in the ozone layer of our atmosphere. That was 28 years ago. Today, almost 60 percent of the oil we consume comes from other places around the globe. A lot of it we buy from people who don't like us very much and, I am convinced, use some of the money we send them to try, in some cases, to hurt us or our interests.

Our trade deficit has ballooned to \$300 billion, and not all of it but a good chunk of it is attributable to the oil we import. Today, when people talk about greenhouses, we still grow plants in them, but we also worry about greenhouse gases and what is going on with the hole in the ozone layer, what is going on with a rising global temperature, and what is going to happen to our sea level in this world over the next 100 years if we do nothing about it.

The question we are going to be answering in the next couple weeks is, What kind of energy policy should we have in this Nation?

Like most of my colleagues, I would argue that the answer to that question has two parts. One part says we create more energy. And while we work to do that, in a variety of ways, the second part says we need to conserve more energy.

Let me talk a little bit about both of those issues: First, the creation of more energy and, second, the conservation of energy.

I live in a State where, I am told, we actually grow more soybeans in Sussex County, DE, than any other county in the country. We also have more chickens in Sussex County than any other county in the country, including those in Arkansas. We can look to those soybeans for a source of energy. Frankly, we can look to those chickens as a

source of energy, as well, as we go along.

We raise soybeans in Delaware to feed chickens. We feed them the hull of the soybean. The oil that comes out of the soybean we do all kinds of things with in this country. We create soy foods, soy milk. We also can create something called soy diesel fuel: 20 percent soy, the rest is diesel. We can burn it in our diesel-consuming machines, and it works just fine. It is energy efficient. It works well in the machines, and the emissions are no worse, for the most part, than any regular diesel fuel. In some cases, they are actually better.

We have too much soybean in this country; we have a glut of that commodity. It is a good alternative to use the soybeans that are in excess on our farms to help lessen our reliance on foreign oil.

We have figured out how we can burn animal waste to derive the Btu value, including chicken litter, in ways that are environmentally friendly.

In my State, we have the biggest independent producer of solar energy panels in the country. We are proud of the work they do at AstroPower. And it is not just at AstroPower; there are places all over this country that are relying more and more on solar energy in developing evermore efficient ways to create that solar energy.

Windmill farms are becoming more common in this country. Hopefully, as we continue to perfect that technology, they will become even more efficient.

Others have spoken, and will in the weeks ahead, about geothermal energy, how we can take hot air in the summer and run it 300 feet underground to cool it off, and then use it to cool our homes in the summer; and we can take cold air in the winter, run it 300 feet underground to warm it up, and then use it to warm our homes and businesses in the winter.

Those are just some of the ideas of renewable energy that we can use, that we can rely on, that we are more relying on, and need to do more so in the future.

We also have, as Senator BINGAMAN said earlier, a lot of coal in this country. I think he said we are the "Saudi Arabia of coal." I am privileged to represent the State of Delaware in the Senate. I was born in West Virginia. I know full well they have a lot of coal there and other places around our Nation. We ought to find ways to burn that coal without doing more harm to our environment. We can do that. Clean coal technology is very promising. We need to continue those efforts.

There has been some discussion already today about natural gas. We are starting to rely more on natural gas from other places around the world. We have a lot of it in our country. But consumption is going right through the roof because we have such good environmental consequences compared to other fossil fuels we use. There are