legislation to an orderly conclusion. Obviously, we want to see all issues that relate and that are germane to this energy bill adequately considered, but at this point, 5 weeks into the debate and starting week 6, I think most Senators have had ample opportunity to present their amendments and raise the issues they think are of concern.

I see there are other Senators seeking recognition. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

THE FIX IS IN ON O'HARE AIRPORT

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, in the upcoming discussion on the expansion of O'Hare, in which I know the Presiding Officer has been deeply involved, one of the issues the Senate will be debating will be a competitive bidding requirement for the contracts and concessions at O'Hare Airport. I intend to offer an amendment that would apply Federal competitive bidding procedures to the contracts at O'Hare and which would require the city of Chicago to disclose the recipients of those contracts.

The lead articles in the two major Chicago newspapers over the weekend illustrate precisely why this competitive bidding amendment is essential. The two papers, taken together, report a pattern of flagrant and chronic abuse in the city of Chicago. The Chicago Tribune reports that Mayor Daley's pals get rich yet again on a huge public works project that the city of Chicago thoroughly misrepresented. Simultaneously, the Chicago Sun-Times reports that, because of a budget crisis, city workers get the choice of unpaid days off or layoffs. That is the pattern: The connected guys get the bucks; the ordinary guys get the shaft.

Yesterday, the Tribune reported that a major Chicago deal was enacted with the aid of an intense public relations campaign that misled the citizens of the city and the State on a number of key issues. That deal—Soldier Field—followed a distinctly Chicago pattern. After the deal was rammed through, we find that misrepresentations were so egregious that it is difficult to call them misrepresentations and not outright fabrications. We also find that several political friends and allies of both the mayor and the Governor make serious money off their inside connections.

I will read from the Tribune. The title of the article is ''Bears play, Public pays.'' It is by Andrew Martin, Liam Ford, and Laurie Cohen.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 21, 2002]

BEARS PLAY, PUBLIC PAYS

(By Andrew Martin, Liam Ford and Laurie Cohen)

As construction at Soldier Field advances, a Tribute analysis of the $632 million project shows that the public bill for the stadium renovation is higher than city officials have said it would be while benefits to taxpayers—in terms of promised parkland and additional part revenues—fall short of what was promised.

The bottom line is that the new Chicago Bears stadium will get one of the largest government contributions in the history of professional sports, a fact obscured by a public-relations strategy that tried to divert attention from the public costs. Among the Tribune's findings

City officials have said the public bill for the project won't exceed $406 million; in fact, another $26 million in public costs is buried in bond documents. That money brings the total public tab to $432 million.

While Mayor Richard Daley praised the Bears's $200 million contribution to the project as ''unheard of'' for a publicly owned stadium, neither the mayor nor anyone else involved in the project noted that the city's contribution also might be unprecedented.

Officials with the Chicago Park District, which owns Soldier Field, have called the renovated stadium a good deal for the agency. But an internal Park District analysis shows the agency will make $900,000 less the first full year the stadium is open, figures that officials now dispute. Meanwhile, the new stadium is expected to double the value of the Bears franchise, experts said.

Proponents of the stadium renovation pointed to the creation of 19 acres of parkland for Chicagoans. But officials counted landscaped medians and sloped berms beside a parking garage as part of the acreage, according to one of the project's architects, Dirk Lohan.

In reality, only about 10 acres of usable parkland is being created, according to an analysis by Friends of the Parks, which is suing to stop the renovation. The lawsuit could be decided at a hearing Thursday.

''You're not able to play on a slope or on the middle of a roadway,'' said Erma Tranter, the group's president.

The strategy to sell the Soldier Field renovations, mapped out in a 1990 memo by the Bears' public-relations firm, was based on emphasizing the new stadium's amenities, such as new parkland and expanded lakefront parking in an underground garage, while downplaying public costs for the Bears facility.

''The problem with the current debate is that it is too often about the Chicago Bears and not about the future of Chicago and its prized lakefront,'' according to the memo, crafted by the firm, Burson-Marsteller. The public-relations advisers recommended a strategy recommended a strategy that includes changing ''the conversation from 'public funding for the Chicago Bears stadium needs' to a civic-led discussion'' about such things as preserving Soldier Field as a landmark and ''doing things right, the Chicago way,'' said the memo, a copy of which was obtained by the Tribune.

The Soldier Field deal contradicts previous public statements from the mayor and Gov. George Ryan, who had balked at government financing for the stadium.

It also ran counter to a trend in the NFL in which teams in lucrative markets such as the Washington Redskins and the New England Patriots are paying most of the costs for their privately owned stadiums, the Tribune analysis found.

Meanwhile, in nearly every city where government subsidies were used for a publicly owned NFL stadium in the last decade, a referendum was held to ask voters whether they approved of the idea. In Chicago, the city went to court to stop a proposed referendum on the plan.

Daley on Saturday defended his support for the Soldier Field project, saying the $200 million private contribution was unprecedented and the public portion was paid for by taxes on hotel rooms, not property taxes.

Had the city not proceeded with the stadium deal, the mayor said, ''Soldier Field, what are you going to do with it?''

Daley appeared to confirm the Friends of the Parks allegation that the project would only create 10 acres of usable parkland, not 17. ''They're building 10 acres of open space and another seven acres of landscape in all of that. That's what you need to make it environmentally friendly.''

The city's longtime point man on the Soldier Field deal, Edward Bedore, a former city budget director who now is a lobbyist for the city, Park District Supt. David Doig and other Park District officials declined to be interviewed.

Bears Chief Executive Officer Ted Phillips and former Bears President Michael McCaskey declined to comment.

Barnaby Dinges, a public relations consultant for the project, said the Park District will save money in the long term by not paying the increasing costs of maintaining an old, deteriorating stadium.

''There are tremendous benefits to this project,'' Dinges said. ''After 30 years of trying, the Park District, the Bears, the city and the state finally found a plan that does right by taxpayers, park and Museum Campus users, the lakefront, sports and entertainment fans and the people of Illinois.''

In written responses to questions, Park District officials said that the Bears' contribution to the project far exceeds what most other teams have chipped in for stadiums. Park District officials also stood by their estimate for new parkland, which was revised from 19 acres to 17 acres after the deal passed the state legislature and more precise calculations were made.

''This figure includes the planted medians, which amount to just a fraction of an acre,'' the statement says.

Lohan, the architect, said, ''A berm can have plants on it, and isn't that part of a park?''

A DEAL IS STRUCK

Although most of the principals would not comment, others familiar with the deal suggested that the decades-long logjam over a new Bears stadium was broken because of a confluence of several key points. There was a flash of inspiration by the Bears' architect about how to squeeze a new stadium into a historic landmark, an infusion of cash from the NFL and a change of leadership in the governor's office and the Bears' executive suites.

At the same time, the deal created a huge public-works project with plenty of hefty contracts for friends and political allies of City Hall and Springfield. For instance, the bond work went to former proteges of Bedore's, security for the construction site is provided by an alderman's brother's firm and the local partner for the construction team is a major Ryan contributor whose vice president was chairman of the governor's inaugural ball.

The Soldier Field project was sold to the public, in part, because of the $200 million contribution by the Bears, which is the largest private contribution for a publicly owned NFL stadium. But the Bears are contributing only about $30 million of their own money. The remainder comes from $100 million from the NFL and the sale of personal seat licenses to season-ticket holders.

The public portion, $432 million, is being financed by an extension of a 2 percent city hotel tax originally levied by the Illinois Sports Facilities Authority to pay for Comiskey Park.

On its face, the city's portion of the Soldier Field project is the largest public contribution in the NFL, in which stadiums are larger and generally more expensive than those in other professional sports.

The next-biggest public contribution for a football stadium is in Cincinnati, where taxpayers paid $400 million for Paul Brown Stadium, the Bengals' new $449 million home, according to a Tribune analysis of NFL stadiums built in the last decade.

Precise comparisons are difficult because some stadium deals, including the deal for Soldier Field, provide amenities outside of the stadium. Similarly, some stadiums include costs for land acquisition. Some, like Soldier Field, do not because they are on publicly owned property.

The cost of building just the stadium at Soldier Field is estimated at $383 million, prompting the Park District to claim that the Bears will pay more than half the cost of the new facility. But critics say that calculation is imprecise because it does not include the cost of amenities that will primarily serve the stadium, such as the parking deck south of Soldier Field and landscaping on stadium access roads.

Marc Ganis, president of the Chicago-based sports consulting firm Sportscorp Ltd., said the high cost of the stadium and the public contribution reflect a decision to keep the Bears playing on the lakefront in a historic landmark rather than building a new stadium elsewhere.

''A 61,000-seat open-air football stadium on a clean site would likely cost less than $400 million,'' Ganis said.

CREATIVE FINANCING

Officials have pegged the public cost for the project at $406 million, but the actual amount is $26 million higher, thanks to some financial moves designed to skirt a legislative limit on the value of bonds sold to pay for the deal, the Tribune found.

Soon after the legislation was passed, it became clear that the project's costs, including the cost of issuing the bonds would exceed that limit, documents and interviews show. The funding problem worsened after Sept. 11 because a sudden drop in Chicago tourism threatened to erode the hotel tax revenues that would be used to pay off the bonds. Shortfalls would require the city to tap its share of state income taxes.

The solution involved a financing device that allowed the Illinois Sports Facilities Authority to raise $425 million on the bond sale in October while keeping the original value of the bonds at the legislative limit of $399 million. This was done by setting such low prices on some of the bonds that investors were willing to pay extra to buy them; the extra amount, or premium, wasn't included in the value of the outstanding bonds.

The total public bill comes to $432 million after adding $7 million in interest income on the bond proceeds.

While the public costs of the deal are higher than advertised, the benefits to the Park District appear to be lower. The agency's claims that it will make more money from the new Soldier Field are belied by its documents.

''Neighborhood park users win because a renovated Soldier Field will generate at least $10 million in net annual revenues for neighborhood park programs,'' Supt. Doig said in a 2001 letter published in the Tribune.

According to a city memo last year to Chicago aldermen, the Park District's profit from Soldier Field had been about $9.5 million a year. That figure will drop to $8.6 million in 2004, the first full year the new stadium will be open, a Park District forecast shows.

But even the $8.6 million profit forecast is inflated because it includes an annual subsidy from the Illinois Sports Facilities Authority that was wrapped into the Soldier Field legislation, meaning that one public agency essentially will be funding another. That subsidy, which will come from Chicago hotel taxes, will total $3.6 million in 2004.

In the written responses, Park district officials said that the $8.6 million forecast for 2004 didn't include another contribution from the Illinois Sports Facilities Authority—a $1.5 million annual payment for Soldier Field improvements—and a projected $500,000 fee from the Chicago Fire.

The soccer team, which played at Soldier Field before the renovation, plans to play at the new stadium in 2004 but has made no commitments beyond that year, a Fire official said.

Documents obtained by the Tribune did not include revenue forecasts beyond 2004. Park district officials said they are optimistic that revenues will continue to grow but declined to provide specifics.

FRIENDS LAND CONTRACTS

The Park District may be coming up short at Soldier Field, but some political supporters of Daley and Ryan are not.

Bedore, who retired from City Hall in 1993, has served as the city's consultant on Soldier Field for years. A former budget director for both Daley and his father, Bedore lists Michael Daley, the mayor's brother, as an attorney for his consulting business, records show.

The lead bond underwriter for the Soldier Field bonds was George K. Baum and Co. of Kansas City, Mo., which beat out several Wall Street companies for the work. Though the financial advisers for the Illinois Sports Facilities Authority ranked at least two other firms ahead of Baum, sources familiar with the deal said City Hall demanded the Baum get the assignment.

Baum's Chicago office is headed by two former city budget officials and Bedore proteges, Anthony Fratto and Albert Boumenot. Baum also had been selected to sell bonds for Millennium Park, another project that Bedore launched for Daley.

When Baum was selected for the Soldier Field work in March 2001, the firm never had been lead underwriter on a deal for more than $350 million, according to the information service Thomson Financial. Baum collected fees of at least $1.3 million for the deal, bond documents and interviews show.

Jerry Blakemore, the sports authority's chief executive, declined to comment on the bond deal, as did the authority's financial advisers. Fratto and Boumenot could not be reached for comment.

The prime contractor for the Soldier Field renovation, selected without competitive bidding by the Bears, is a joint venture that includes two national firms with stadium-building experience and Kenny Construction, a Wheeling firm whose principals are campaign contributors to both Daley and Ryan. The company's vice president also was chairman of Ryan's inaugural ball.

Security at the construction site is being provided by Monterrey Security, a 3-year-old firm that is partially owned by Santiago Solis, the brother of Ald. Danny Solis (25th), one of Daley's closest allies on the City Council.

BREAKING THE LOGJAM

Despite decades of squabbling over a new stadium for the Bears, the football club's fortunes began to change in late 1998.

That fall, the Bears' architect, Benjamin wood, raised the possibility of renovating Soldier Field, an idea that had always fizzled because there didn't seem to be a way to fit enough seats along the sidelines without ruining the stadium's historic charm.

During a visit to Chicago, Wood measured the distance between the colonnades of the stadium and thought he might be able to squeeze a stadium into Soldier Field by positioning all the skyboxes and club seats on one side.

The result: a narrower field that would fit within the stadium's colonnades while positioning most of its seats between the 20 yard lines. Seats in that area offer better views and higher prices.

In January 1999, George Ryan became governor, replacing Jim Edgar, who had fought with Daley for years over stadium deals. Ryan vowed to work with the mayor and the Bears to resolve the stadium issue ''short of spending taxpayers' dollars on a new stadium.''

A month later, McCaskey, who had openly feuded with Daley over stadium proposals, was ousted by his mother as Bears president and replaced by the more amiable Phillips.

With a new design for a stadium in the works, Phillips was a crucial funding boost in March 1999 when the NFL approved a program to help bib-city teams build arenas by offering to match a team's contribution to a stadium project.

Daley and Phillips later used the NFL money to pressure state legislators to pass the stadium deal during the fall veto session in 2000, saying the money could disappear unless it was used quickly.

The day the legislation was rushed through Springfield infuriated some legislators.

''It came out of left field carried by a Hall of Fame bevy of lobbyists and lawyers who told us that the sky is falling, the world would come to an end, civilization would end as we know it, unless we did this deal in the next 72 hours,'' state Rep. William Black (R-Danville) told his colleagues.

But late last week, NFL spokesman Greg Aiello indicated the legislative rush may have been unnecessary to land the NFL's $100 million commitment to the Bears.

''There wasn't a specific time frame,'' he said.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will read an excerpt from that article:

The park district may be coming up short at Soldier Field but some political supporters of Daley and Ryan are not. Bedore, who retired from City Hall in 1993, has served as the city's consultant on Soldier Field for years. A former budget director for both Daley and his father, Bedore lists Michael Daley, the mayor's brother, as an attorney for his consulting business, records show. The lead bond underwriter for the Soldier Field bonds was George K. Baum and Co. of Kansas City, MO, which beat out several Wall Street companies for the work.

Though the financial advisers for the Illinois Sports Facilities Authority ranked at least two other firms ahead of Baum, sources familiar with the deal said City Hall demanded that Baum get the assignment.

Baum's Chicago office is headed by two former city budget officials and Bedore proteges, Anthony Fratto and Albert Boumenot. Baum also has been selected to sell bonds for Millennium Park, another project that Bedore launched for Daley.

When Baum was selected for the Soldier Field work in March 2001, the firm never had been lead underwriter on a deal for more than $350 million, according to the information service Thomson Financial. Baum collected fees of at least $1.3 million for the deal, bond documents and interviews show.

Jerry Blakemore, the sports authority's chief executive, declined to comment on the bond deal, as did the authority's financial advisers. Fratto and Boumenot could not be reached for comment.

The prime contractor for the Soldier Field renovation, selected without competitive bidding by the Bears, is a joint venture that includes two national firms with stadium-building experience and Kenny Construction, a Wheeling firm whose principals are campaign contributors to both Daley and Ryan. The company's vice president also was chairman of Ryan's inaugural ball.

Security at the construction site is being provided by Monterey Security, a 3-year-old firm that is partially owned by Santiago Solis, the brother of Alderman Danny Solis, one of Daley's closest allies on the city council.

What the Tribune has reported is flagrant, conspicuous, insider dealing. The friends and allies of the mayor get rich on huge public works projects that are, to begin with, misrepresented to the people. We have seen it with Millennium Park in Chicago, and we are seeing it now with Soldier Field. Does anyone really believe it is going to be any different with the O'Hare expansion?

The only difference with O'Hare will be the scale and the scope, both of the misrepresentations of the consequences of the project and of the amount of money that will flow to the friends and allies of the mayor.

Chicago is indeed the city that works, and it works the same angle over and over. The city cut the template on this kind of a deal: Ram it through, fabricate the details, and watch as the money comes home to daddy.

And what about the ordinary guys? A headline in the Sunday Chicago Sun-Times: Daley to city workers: Take unpaid days or face layoffs. The paper reports:

Mayor Daley is asking unions representing all city employees except police and firefighters to make a painful choice—take five unpaid vacation days, put off their raise for six months or face 425 layoffs—to generate $15 million in savings to help solve Chicago's worst budget crisis in a decade. . . .

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article from the Chicago-Sun Times from April 21, 2002.

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

DALEY TO CITY WORKERS: PICK UNPAID DAYS OR LAYOFFS

''DON'T HOLD YOUR BREATH,'' REPLIES POLICE UNION CHIEF; OTHER LABOR GROUPS UPSET

(By Fran Spielman)

Mayor Daley is asking unions representing all city employees except police and firefighters to make a painful choice—take five unpaid vacation days, put off their raise for six months or face 425 layoffs—to generate $15 million in savings to help solve Chicago's worst budget crisis in a decade, labor leaders said.

''It's not anybody against anybody. It's trying to keep people surviving,'' Daley told reporters Saturday at a far South Side school.

Sworn police officers and firefighters would be exempt from layoffs partly because their contracts prohibit them unless non-safety personnel are sacrificed first.

But police and fire unions are being asked to contribute by accepting one unpaid furlough day. That would cost the average sworn police officer about $200.

''Don't hold your breath,'' said Mark Donahue, newly elected president of the Fraternal Order of Police.

''Our new board will be consulted. A decision will be made early next week. But I don't know that it has a great deal of chance to be considered. There's a lot of frustration among uniformed sworn personnel over our recent contract negotiations.''

James McNally, newly elected president of the Chicago Firefighters Union Local 2, refused to comment on the city's request, except to say that Chicago firefighters who changed union presidents this week are ''looking for a contract.''

Ousted Local 2 President Bill Kugelman, who got the boot because of the three-year wait for a new contract, didn't mince words.

''They've been sticking it to us all this time, and now we're supposed to be nice guys? All of these unions that Daley has no use for, and now he needs our help? Forget him? Where was he when we needed him? They haven't done a damned thing for us,'' Kugelman said.

''That's up to them,'' Daley said. ''You can only ask them, and that's what we're trying to do. We're trying to have no one laid off.''

The Chicago Police Department also is exploring the politically volatile possibility of slowing the steady march of recruit classes through the police academy to cut costs, said Lisa Schrader, a spokeswoman for the city's Office of Budget and Management.

The training academy has been churning out about 10 classes a year, each with 60 to 100 recruits.

If rookies hit the streets at a slower rate, it would reduce police protection at a time when the city is losing 650 to 700 officers a year to retirement and grappling with a rising homicide rate that last year made Chicago the murder capital of the nation.

''There have been internal discussions about what the effects would be of delaying a class. How much would it save,'' Schrader said. ''We don't want to do anything that will compromise public safety. But that's one of the things that's being looked at.''

There are 13,248 sworn police officers on the street, said Kimberly O'Connell-Doyle, manager of police personnel. Daley's 2002 budget authorized 13,522 sworn officers.

The Chicago Sun-Times reported earlier this month that Daley was extending a city hiring freeze through the end of the year, ordering a 5 percent cut in non-personnel spending and considering employee layoffs and more unpaid furlough days to close a $25 million first-quarter gap caused by lower than expected local tax revenues.

The mayor has said that tax increases on the eve of his 2003 re-election bid were a ''last, last, last resort,'' but he has refused to slam the door on either layoffs or new revenues.

Already, the budget crisis has prompted the City Council to establish an unprecedented $200 million line of credit to pay the city's bills if there's a repeat of what happened in February when the state was late with a $20 million income tax payment.

Late last week, City Hall began meeting with city labor leaders to discuss specific union givebacks.

At a meeting Friday hosted by the Chicago Federation of Labor, union leaders representing 14,050 non-safety employees got the bad news from John Doerrer, the former labor liaison now serving as the mayor's director of intergovernmental affairs.

Doerrer told them the city needs $15 million in personnel savings and that there are basically three ways to get there unless they have other ideas: 425 layoffs, five unpaid furlough days or a six-month deferral of their 3 percent mid-year pay raise.

Daley has the power to order layoffs without union consent so long as he goes about it as outlined by union contracts. Furlough days and pay raise deferrals need union approval.

''They have a shortfall of 425 jobs in two corporate funds, and every furlough day is [the equivalent] of 81 jobs. They're looking for $15 million. They don't care how they get to it,'' said Dennis Gannon, secretary-treasurer of the Chicago Federation of Labor.

''They gave us those choices, but we're not to the point of picking. The labor community chose to have the city talk to fire and police and see what can happen there, then come back and talk to us again,'' he said.

Another labor leader in attendance, who asked to remain anonymous, said the city ''didn't seem to have a well thought-out plan . . . They just said, 'Here are the options. Let's see which one is most doable.' Obviously to us, layoffs are the worst-case scenario, but most of the unions were pretty upset with it.''

Five years ago, union leaders allowed the city to reduce its contribution to their over-funded pension funds in a landmark deal that paved the way for a $20 million property tax cut, head-tax relief and $200 million in neighborhood improvements.

In exchange, the city agreed to lobby the General Assembly to increase the maximum retiree benefit from 75 percent of an employee's highest salary to 80 percent.

That never happened. And it left a bad taste in the mouths of the union leaders whose support Daley now needs to solve the budget crisis.

''If we go to our people and say, 'The city needs a hand,' they're going to say, 'They came to us before, and they didn't live up to their promise. Why should we help them out?' '' said one labor leader, who asked to remain anonymous.

Gannon agreed it's ''pretty hard to make more concessions when we're still waiting on things that were promised to us years ago.''

''I'd like to see them pass the pension bill, see how many people take retirement and then come back and talk to us about reality,'' he added. ''We could actually have 600 people take their pensions. We might not have to lay so many people off.''

Schrader insisted the options laid out for union leaders are not written in stone.

''We need to achieve a certain amount of savings, and there are several ways we can do it. It's not that rigid. We're saying, 'Let's work together and be creative,' '' she said.

The impact of layoffs on city services won't be known until specific employees are targeted. But it could translate into delayed garbage pickup, one union leader said.

Ten years ago, a budget crisis forced Daley to eliminate 1,474 jobs, 837 of them layoffs, and cancel a $25 million property tax cut that was the cornerstone of his 1991 reelection campaign.

The next year, he ordered an additional 740 layoffs and proposed a $48.7 million property tax increase. A rare City Council rebellion forced the mayor to settle for a $28.7 million property tax increase and cancellation of a supplemental increase to finance a new police contract.

The Mayor's pals get rich and the workers get to choose between layoffs or unpaid days off. What a contrast.

But here is a different idea: why not take it from the inside guys for a change? Why not take it from all the people who use their connections and clout to cash in on no-bid contracts and concessions at O'Hare, or Soldier Field, or Millennium Park?

Why not learn from Millennium Park and Soldier Field and exempt O'Hare before the Mayor can do it again? We have a competitive bid proposal for concessions and contracts at O'Hare. It is comprehensive. The Daley-Ryan forces are opposing it. I wonder why that might be?

Maybe Mayor Daley should tell us, before the discussion goes any farther, who's going to pour the concrete at O'Hare? Will it be someone who has been lobbying for the expansion at O'Hare? Who will be hired as consultants or so-called ''expediters''? Who will get a cut of the contracts? Will it be Jeremiah Joyce or will it be Oscar D'Angelo? Who is going to get a piece of the action on the insurance? Is it Mickey Segal or is he too hot right now? What about the bonds? Who is going to rake it in there? Is it Baum and Co., and Tony Fratto? And what about the janitorial contracts? Will that be John Duff, Jr. and his sons, the Duffs?

We have a chance to pass a Federal competitive bid provision for O'Hare in the U.S. Senate. If we pass it, it should mean a markedly different way of doing business in Chicago, at least at O'Hare. There are a number of arguments we will make, and precedents we will review. Mr. President, I look forward to the debate and to continuing to work with my colleagues on that issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer, in his capacity as the Senator from West Virginia, suggests the absence of a quorum.

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 (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, are we on the energy bill at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has not been laid down yet.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 517, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 517) to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through technology transfer and partnerships for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Daschle/Bingaman further modified amendment No. 2917, in the nature of a substitute.

Dayton/Grassley amendment No. 3008 (to amendment No. 2917), to require that Federal agencies use ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel in areas in which ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel are available.

Landrieu/Kyl amendment No. 3050 (to amendment No. 2917), to increase the transfer capability of electric energy transmission systems through participant-funded investment.

Schumer/Clinton amendment No. 3093 (to amendment No. 2917), to prohibit oil and gas drilling activity in Finger Lakes National Forest, New York.

Dayton amendment No. 3097 (to amendment No. 2917), to require additional findings for FERC approval of an electric utility merger.

Feinstein/Boxer amendment No. 3115 (to amendment No. 2917), to modify the provision relating to the renewable content of motor vehicle fuel to eliminate the required volume of renewable fuel for calendar year 2004.

Murkowski/Breaux/Stevens amendment No. 3132 (to amendment No. 2917), to create jobs for Americans, to reduce dependence on foreign sources of crude oil and energy, to strengthen the economic self determination of the Inupiat Eskimos and to promote national security.

Reid amendment No. 3145 (to amendment No. 3008), to require that Federal agencies use ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel in areas in which ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel are available.

AMENDMENT NO. 3141

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, last week the Senate adopted an amendment that deals with vehicle efficiency. It deals with the issue of fuel cells. I want to describe the amendment, because I think it is a very important amendment.

The amendment directs the Energy Department to develop a program that would create measurable goals and timetables with the aim of putting 100,000 hydrogen fuel cell vehicles on the road by 2010, and 2.5 million by the year 2020, along with the needed hydrogen infrastructure. DOE would have to report annually on its progress toward achieving these goals.

The amendment is designed to have the Department of Energy work with the auto manufacturers to ensure these goals are met. With this amendment, we are sending a strong signal that our goal is to accelerate and enhance the development of fuel cell vehicles and fuel cell technologies with concrete targets and timetables.

I have asked the question with respect to our energy policy, especially with respect to our transportation sector, about whether our policy is going to be ''yesterday forever.'' I have said on previous occasions—and I will say it again—my first car was an antique 1924 Model T Ford that I bought for $25 as a young kid, and I restored it. It took me a couple of years to restore that old Model T. But a 1924 Model T Ford is fueled exactly the same way as a current model Ford. You drive up to the gas pump, stick a hose in the tank, and start pumping. Nothing has changed. Nothing has changed in 78 years, and it ought to change.

The issue of how we run our vehicles what kind of engines we use and what kind of fuel we use—we ought to inspire these changes by developing aspirations and national goals with respect to new technologies. I drove a fuel cell car here on the Capitol grounds some months ago. It has essentially a limitless battery that allows you to run the vehicle using this fuel cell. The fuel cell combines hydrogen and oxygen and the only byproduct is water vapor. Fuel cells have the potential to dramatically improve the efficiency of automobiles and dramatically reduce emissions, as opposed to the vehicles that we use now, which have the internal combustion engine we have used for decade after decade after decade.

We can decide that the debate will be a debate about our energy supply, as it has always been. That has been the energy debate we have had for a long while and will be again 25 and 50 years from now, unless we decide to create national aspirations and goals for new technologies.

I believe we ought to do that with respect to automobiles. Our transportation sector consumes the largest amount of energy in our society: about 40 percent of the oil products our Nation consumes each year, or nearly 8 billion barrels of oil each day. In 2001, we imported about 53 to 57 percent of our energy from abroad. That is expected to increase, according to the Energy Information Administration.

So the question is, What do we do about that? Some say we should just adopt CAFE standards. Others say let's develop new technologies. Others say let's not do anything at all. Let's let the marketplace decide who buys what, when, and why.

I think this country ought to encourage the development and the capability to move to a new technology. The Ford Motor Company representative stated that alternative fuel technology has the potential to significantly improve the fuel economy of vehicles, which could reduce U.S. dependence on imported oil, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and save consumers substantial money at the pump.

Most major automakers are racing to produce prototype fuel cell vehicles. DaimlerChrysler has been talking about this now for several years. They plan to have a fuel cell car in production by the year 2004. California has a Clean Air Act requirement that will ensure that many fuel cell vehicles are going to be on the road. By next year—2003—2 percent of California's vehicles have to be zero-emission vehicles, and around 10 percent of its vehicles must be zero-emission vehicles by 2018. That means California could have nearly 40,000 or 50,000 fuel cell cars on the road by the next decade.

The amendment I offered is supported by the Alliance to Save Energy