

Virginia senators Robert C. Byrd and Jay Rockefeller should show their respect for the dead, and for what the United States has been put through, by voting against this callous amendment.

[From the Albuquerque Journal, Oct. 1, 2001]
POLITICAL MANEUVER BLOCKS DEFENSE BILL.

So, is this a time of national unity, in which divisive policy issues are to be set aside while we deal with the emergency at hand? Or, is the rush to pass the enabling legislation to clear our military for action just another golden opportunity to steamroll unrelated partisan issues over the opposition?

For some Republicans, it is the latter.

Sen. James Inhofe R-Okla., has refused to withdraw his amendment to the Defense Authorization Bill that would tack on energy legislation passed by the House and a Senate energy bill sponsored by Sen. Frank Murkowski, R-Alaska. Both would open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil exploration.

Fast-track solving of legislative problems by tacking amendments onto unrelated bills is a congressional practice in normal times, if a bit short on legislative honesty.

But, these are not normal times. The maneuver makes a mockery of the touted bipartisanship to deal with the situation left in the wake of the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks.

There have been bipartisan calls for quick action on the \$345 billion defense bill.

"Our troops are counting on it; the Pentagon needs it," said Senate Majority Leader Thomas Daschle, D-S.D. "I can't think of a more urgent piece of legislation than this right now under these circumstances."

Sen. Inhofe, however, sees the urgency only as a rare opportunity for a bit of political war profiteering—if he can get a majority in the Senate to go along.

The question of drilling in ANWR is a contentious issue Congress will have to deal with at some point. But, blocking an essential defense bill in an effort to slip it past without debate on its merits is a reprehensible tactic in these troubled times.

To his disgrace, Inhofe has already blocked action on the defense bill until next week. Senate colleagues should reject his maneuver and get back to unity of purpose in addressing the urgent task at hand.

Time enough to pick up on the contentious and important ANWR debate on its own merits after Congress has done all it can to provide for the anti-terrorism effort ahead.

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

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

CONSIDERATION OF AN ENERGY BILL

Mr. INHOFE. I was hoping the assistant majority leader would stay on the floor so I could tell him I was very pleased with what happened last night. I have dealt with the assistant majority leader and majority leader for several weeks now in an attempt to get an

energy bill to the floor. I understand an agreement has now been announced that the majority leader and assistant majority leader will bring one to the floor.

I started to say to Senator REID, when I saw him walk out—I wanted him to be here so he could hear me compliment him on this action. I think it is critical.

I believe we should have gone through an extensive committee markup. On the other hand, as the weeks go by and we get closer to adjournment, I think this would be an impossible thing to do at this point.

Second, I am hoping when this bill comes to the floor—and there is now a commitment from Senator DASCHLE to bring it to the floor during this Congress, before adjournment—that we get it in time to be very deliberative, in time to consider all the amendments.

I do not know what this energy bill will look like when it comes to the floor. I will read this now to make sure it is in the RECORD in case someone else hasn't done so:

At the request of Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Chairman Jeff Bingaman today suspended any further markup of energy legislation for this session of Congress. Instead, the chairman will propose comprehensive and balanced energy legislation that can be added by the majority leader to the Senate Calendar for potential action prior to adjournment.

While it did not have a chance to go through the committee process, which I would have preferred, when it became apparent that it was not going to go through, I thought the next best thing was to go ahead and send it straight to the floor; let us work on it here. We need to put amendments on it. We need to be in a position where we are able to offer the amendments to make sure it has the necessary provisions to do something about an energy policy for the future.

I do not say this in at all a partisan vein because I started, in the 1980s, trying to get the Reagan administration to have an energy policy.

Then I tried to get the Bush administration, the Bush I administration, to have an energy policy for this Nation. They would not do it. I thought surely he would, coming in from the oil patch, but he did not.

Then of course we tried during the Clinton administration, and they decided they were not going to do it.

So this is our chance right now. As long as we have lip service, saying, yes, it is important; yes, it is important for our national security to have an energy policy, but not doing anything about it, we are doing a great disservice to our Nation.

Here we are in two wars for all practical purposes right now. In Iraq you may have noted this morning another one of our Predators was shot down, and of course what is happening in our

war on terrorism around the world. This is no time to be playing around with what is probably the single most important aspect of our ability to defend America, and that is our current reliance upon foreign sources for our ability to fight a war.

When Don Hodel was Secretary of Energy and Secretary of the Interior, back during the Reagan administration, he and I went around the Nation giving speeches as to why our dependence on foreign countries for our ability to fight a war is not an energy issue; it is a national security issue. We went, I remember, to New York and Chicago and different places to try to explain to people we cannot be dependent upon foreign sources for our oil and still be able to fight wars and defend America as the American people expect of us.

At the time that Don Hodel and I went around the Nation, we were 37 percent dependent upon foreign sources for our ability to fight a war. Today that is now 56.6 percent.

What I am saying is we are importing 56.6 percent of the oil we are using to run America and to fight wars. Today, in this current environment, it costs much more, in terms of amounts of oil, to fight a war than it did in the past.

Of the 56.6 percent that we are dependent upon for our ability to fight a war—we have to say it in that way—half of that is coming from the Middle East. Do you know who the largest contributor to our dependency is, in the Middle East? It is Iraq. Here we are at war with Iraq. They just shot down one of our Predators, a third one, this morning. We are sending battle groups over there to defend America, sending them into combat situations with Iraq, yet we are dependent upon Iraq for our ability to fight a war against Iraq. That is preposterous. It is not believable that this could be happening.

That is why I say we have to get out of this position. We have to establish a national energy policy that is comprehensive, that does have as one of its cornerstones the maximum that we are going to be dependent upon foreign sources for our ability to fight a war. And that is not just the Middle East; that is other parts of the world also.

To be in a 56.6 percent dependency—and, incidentally, by the end of this decade, if we don't do something to dramatically change it, it is going to be 60 percent. That is 60 percent dependent upon foreign governments for our ability to fight a war.

What happened last night is a major breakthrough because we now have the majority leader stating that he will have a comprehensive bill before us to vote on before we adjourn. That is major. We are going to have to consider all aspects. I don't want to see something coming down that is not comprehensive. It is going to have to talk about where our untapped resources are in this country.

I can see right now all the lobby of the far left environmental extremists are going to say this is an ANWR bill. It is not an ANWR bill. Of the comprehensive bill, H.R. 4, from the House of Representatives, that passed—and that is the one we will probably go into conference with—out of 200 pages, only 2 pages talk about ANWR. That is a very minuscule part of it. It covers a lot of items. For example, we have untapped resources in the United States other than ANWR. We have some offshore opportunities, where we have tremendous reserves.

I happen to be from the State of Oklahoma. We had huge stripper well production. When we talk about stripper wells, we are talking about small wells, shallow wells that only produce 15 or fewer barrels a day.

But if you had producing today, right now, all of those stripper wells, or marginal wells that we have plugged in the last 10 years, then it would equal more oil than we are currently importing from Saudi Arabia. That shows it is out there.

Why can't they do it? They can't do it because to lift a barrel of oil out of the ground, it costs us 10 times as much in the United States in marginal production as it does in Saudi Arabia, for example. So it is not the price of the oil so much as, when they make this decision as to whether or not to explore for these marginal wells, they have to have some idea of what the price of a barrel of oil is going to be when it is ultimately produced—and that will be a period of a year. We have jumped around from \$8 to \$35 a barrel in less than a year, so how can they predict that? That has to be included in a comprehensive energy policy so we can exploit all of these opportunities.

The other day I was on a program with one of our well-respected Senators, and I made the comment almost in jest that you can't expect to run the most highly industrialized nations in the history of the world on windmills. He said, in fact, you can. He talked about this wind technology. Fine. We want to go after these other technologies and exploit other opportunities out there—hydroelectric, the sun, and the wind. But until that comes along, we have to look very seriously not just at oil and our dependency upon foreign nations but almost nuclear.

I can remember back in the 1960s when people would protest nuclear plants. Now they realize there is a serious problem with the quality of our air. A lot of those people are saying: Let's go back and reexamine nuclear energy. No. 1, it is the cheapest; No. 2, it is the cleanest; and, No. 3, it is the most readily available.

I think we should address that in a comprehensive energy policy. That is what I hope will be on the floor.

We have something that is very significant. I am sure the American peo-

ple, since the days of my going around the Nation with Don Hodel back in the 1980s, and since we went through a very large Persian Gulf war in 1990, now realize we can't be dependent upon the Middle East. That is the hotbed. That is where the problems are today. We are concerned about North Korea and Afghanistan and about many areas, but the Persian Gulf region is where there is a tremendous threat—yes, almost a terrorist threat.

I commend the majority leader for making the agreement to bring up a comprehensive bill. But I am asking him, since it is in his lap—he is totally responsible for keeping his word on this—that he bring something to the floor early enough so we can go through the process, debate it, and have amendments. Then we can go to conference with the House. They have already passed theirs way ahead of us. We can come up with an energy policy, which we have been trying to get through. The President, I am sure, will be happy and anxious to sign it. He already stated that he would this year before we adjourn.

It is something that we must do. It is something that is long overdue. But the opportunity is here today.

I feel very strongly that this is an opportunity we cannot bypass. I commend the majority leader and am anxious to see what that product looks like. I hope we are able to work on that product and get it to conference so we get an energy policy and get it signed. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:07 p.m. recessed until 2:04 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BAYH).

CHARGING OF TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. CLELAND. I yield.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think it is clear for the record, but we wanted to make sure that the last approximately hour and a half is charged against the postcloture proceedings on the bill before the Senate. I am quite sure that is the case, but I wanted to make it clear.

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

AVIATION SECURITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, almost exactly 1 month ago to the day this Nation was rocked by the most horrific act of terrorism ever leveled against the United States. Following the events of September 11, we resolved as a nation to work together to secure our borders and do all in our power to prevent a repeat of the kind of assault that shook this country 30 days ago. Key to the security of America is our ability to quickly put in place enhanced security measures at our airports and on our planes to ensure that our skies are safe and that Americans are no longer afraid to fly. Yet the legislation that is key to ensuring that America's aviation system is secure—the very measure that is our most direct legislative response to the hijacking of four U.S. airliners—has been stalled now for a week. This body is in agreement on many issues in this bill and we have compromised on others. It is time that we bring this critically important bill to the floor and openly debate the differences which remain.

Whether or not to "federalize" airport security personnel is an issue that still deeply divides this body. I also attended the briefing by El Al officials which the distinguished Chairman of the Commerce Committee and others have referred to throughout this debate. We are all aware of the extraordinary security measures the Israeli airline has put in place and the extraordinary success of those measures. Because of the constant threat of terrorism to Israel and the Israeli people, El Al has taken the following steps to ensure the safety of its passengers and the integrity of its operations: armed, plain-clothes, in-flight guards; extensive passenger questioning and Interpol background checks; extensive luggage inspections, both visual inspection by employees and high-tech explosive detection, including the placing of luggage and cargo in decompression chambers; and secure cockpit doors that remain locked from the inside. Since the implementation of these measures, no Israeli airline has ever been hijacked. This record speaks for itself.

In that briefing the El Al officials were asked if airport security personnel were government workers or contract workers. The response was telling. The El Al officials did not even know what contract workers are. They want government workers on the front line to enforce the tightest security measures possible. As others have pointed out, we want Secret Service, government employees to provide the greatest protection possible to the President of the United States. We want Federal law enforcement officers