On February 28, 2001, the House unanimously passed an identical measure, H.R. 558, introduced by my colleague, Congressmen PATRICK TOOMEY and TIM HOLDEN. I am hopeful that the Senate will also see fit to pass my bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Judge Edward N. Cahn.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 757

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF EDWARD N. CAHN FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 504 West Hamilton Street in Allentown, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the “Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse”.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse”.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 94–118, reappoints the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 2001

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes the business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 24. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business, equally divided, with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VOINOVICH. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator NELSON of Florida.

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

Mr. VOINOVICH. 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. NELSON of Florida, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

OIL DRILLING

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise to discuss a matter of critical importance to the State of Florida: that is, the prospect that soon, under the new administration, we might have the sale-for-lease tracts for offshore oil drilling off the coast of the State of Florida.

There has been in place presently a moratorium in one form or another since 1989 regarding drilling off the coast of the State of Florida. And there is presently offered, through this new administration, through the Department of the Interior, a proposed lease sale called “lease sale 181,” which comes within 30 miles of Perdido Key, which is in northwest Florida. It is explained by the new administration that most of the tract for lease is 100 miles off the coast. But there is indeed a part that comes to within a few miles of the coast of Alabama and close to the State of Florida-Alabama line. This lease tract would come within some 20 to 30 miles of the pristine white beaches of the State of Florida.

I can tell you that 15 million Americans residing in the State of Florida do not want drilling off the coast of our State and have spoken vigorously against it, which is why we have had a moratorium off the State of Florida. Yet the administration continues to persist.

Now let me read for you a statement that was made by candidate George W. Bush in the past campaign. He made this statement at West Port Richey, north of Tampa, FL. He said that when the time in the campaign, when asked about offshore oil drilling in Florida:

I’m going to work with your Governor about offshore drilling here in Florida. We are both against it. Twice he said he was against it. But it is now his position to offer it.

Last week the Tampa Tribune, a very conservative editorial newspaper—in an editorial last Thursday, said:

Had George W. Bush openly supported the sale of these leases before they were broken, he would have lost Florida and the Presidency.

Now that is the truth. And promises are being broken. The fact is that they don’t need to be because we could address our energy problem if we would be wise by increasing our R&D on alternative fuels, on increased conservation. You don’t have to produce your way out of the energy crisis. You can be a lot wiser with using alternative methods.

In the discussion of the budget, we saw some dramatic testimony showing that the consumption of energy in the United States, in large part, is allocated to transportation. Why should we not use research and development to build a new automobile that in fact can get 60 to 80 miles per gallon? That would cause a tremendous conservation of energy in this country. That is just one alternative, but it is an alternative we ought to explore and keep the promises that were made in the election.

This whole matter of offshore oil drilling suddenly caught my attention back in the early 1980s, when, as a junior Congressman representing a congressional district off the east coast of Florida, suddenly I was confronted with the Reagan administration, through the person of the former Secretary of the Interior, James Watt, offering leases for oil drilling off the east coast of the United States. Far south as off Fort Pierce, FL. As a junior Congressman, I went to work with the Appropriations Committee in the House to get them to insert language that would say in the Department of the Interior appropriations bill: No money may be used under this appropriations act for the purpose of offering oil and gas leases in tracts such—and such—and then we described all of the tracts that were being offered.

We won in that year in the Appropriations Committee because of bringing to that committee dramatic testimony from Floridians who would be the environmental and economic damage to our State if waves of oil were lapping up onto the beaches of Florida—not only environmental damage, but economic damage as well, particularly considering Florida’s tremendous tourism industry.

Well, I thought my fight was over. But sure enough, after a year’s lapse,