

years, setting off on new adventures is nothing new to Senator KERREY, who has already followed many different paths during his lifetime. While serving in the Senate, BOB KERREY has never feared to take the path less trodden, to follow his convictions and his principles no matter how rocky or lonely the road. His independence of thought and action is legendary.

After earning a Master of Science degree in pharmacy in 1966 from the University of Nebraska, he volunteered for military service in Vietnam. Not only did he volunteer to bear arms for our Nation, he distinguished himself during service. He earned a Bronze Star, a Purple Heart, and as a U.S. Navy SEAL. In doing so, BOB KERREY displayed such courage, dedication, and heroism that he was awarded the Medal of Honor by President Nixon.

In March 1999, on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the events giving rise to his receiving the Medal of Honor, I joined with my colleagues in the Senate to salute him for his courage, his determination, and his heroism. His heroic story is inspiring.

After Senator KERREY's return from service as a U.S. Navy SEAL, he started a chain of restaurants and health clubs in his home State of Nebraska. Then, in 1982, he ran for Governor of Nebraska and won. He served as Governor of Nebraska until 1986, when he announced, to the surprise of many, that despite a 70-percent approval rating, he would not seek another term as Governor. He was prepared to take a turn down a different road, and 2 years later, he won a seat in the United States Senate.

When his face was added to the Senate picture in 1989, he became a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. It was my pleasure to welcome him, as I was chairman of that committee at that time. I appreciated the clear vision and the unflappable demeanor that Senator KERREY brought to the committee. In 1997, he chose to leave the Appropriations Committee for the Senate Committee on Finance. The countenance of that important committee will drastically change when we return, God willing, in January, after Senators MOYNIHAN, BRYAN, KERREY, and MACK depart from the Senate, of their own volition and on their own choice.

I commend Senator KERREY for his willingness to work hard on issues of interest to him and to his constituents.

During his 57 years of life, he has thus far been a scholar, a U.S. Navy SEAL, a Medal of Honor recipient, a scholar, a restaurateur, a fitness club founder, Governor of Nebraska, and a United States Senator. He has made his life unique. I wish the Senator from Nebraska well as he sets off down the path for his next adventure. Knowing Senator KERREY's propensity for taking his own road, I shall close with the following lines of verse written by Robert Frost. We are all familiar with that great poem, "The Road Not Taken."

THE ROAD NOT TAKEN

Two roads diverged in a yellow wood,
And sorry I could not travel both
And be one traveler, long I stood
And looked down one as far as I could
To where it bent in the undergrowth;
Then took the other, as just as fair,
And having perhaps the better claim,
Because it was grassy and wanted wear;
Though as for that the passing there
Had worn them really about the same,
And both that morning equally lay
In leaves no step had trodden black.
Oh, I kept the first for another day!
Yet knowing how way leads on to way,
I doubted if I should ever come back.
I shall be telling this with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence:
Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference.

PLANNING FOR OUR ENERGY FUTURE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, once again a critical region of the Middle East is engaged in violent clashes. Over the last week, the death toll in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank has risen to 67 lives lost. I know that Prime Minister Ehud Barak and PLO Leader Yasser Arafat made heroic efforts to try to reach a peace agreement these last few months. They even met for part of the time in my own State of West Virginia. With U.S. support and encouragement, the Israelis and Palestinians stood at the brink of a resolution, and they were as close as they have ever been to resolving a very longstanding dispute in that ancient, volatile, and embattled part of our world. Though I hope these two peoples will return to the negotiating table, today that opportunity appears lost.

This disheartening incident again illustrates that the Middle East peace is very fragile and could erupt like flash powder. While Saddam Hussein has been quelled for the time being, the world must always be on the watch. We do not know if the Israelis and Palestinians will reach a peace accord. Americans are affected in many ways. We have security and family interests in this region of the world, and the United States gets much of its energy resources from there as well. The U.S., our European allies, and many other industrial countries are tethered to the Middle Eastern oil chain. If we are ever going to break that stranglehold, then it is time that we take action here at home.

Over the past 18 months, the national average price of gasoline has risen from under \$1 per gallon to \$1.52 per gallon this week. As winter approaches and crude oil inventories remain at record low levels, both gasoline and fuel prices are expected to increase further. Americans are growing increasingly concerned about the seemingly endless volatility in our energy markets.

What we are seeing, Mr. President, in the fluctuation of energy prices is a textbook study of how supply and demand can affect energy prices. First, the Organization of Petroleum Export-

ing Countries agreed last year to reduce crude oil production, thus increasing the cost of producing gasoline. Secondly, gasoline refineries, which had shut down some operations when crude oil prices fell to record lows in 1998, suddenly faced shortages of production capacity to produce gasoline and heating oil when demand spiked earlier this year.

In response, the administration has successfully lobbied for an increase by OPEC in crude oil production over the past year. In March, OPEC's decision to increase crude oil production temporarily reduced the cost of gasoline, but prices increased again going into the summer driving season as demand for gasoline increased. Gasoline prices decreased in late summer, but, as winter approaches and the expected demand for crude oil, heating oil, and gasoline increases, prices could very likely climb again. These are the ups and downs of the energy roller coaster that has taken the American public for a ride.

To make matters worse, this volatility in gasoline prices is occurring as the United States prepares itself for the upcoming Presidential election. This has added fuel to the fire as Members of Congress, the administration, and politicians everywhere position themselves politically to avoid blame for the spike in energy prices. Unfortunately, such positioning is usually accompanied by a myriad of snake-oil remedies and miracle cures that do little more than lull the American public into believing that the problem is being fixed when, in fact, the problem is being exacerbated.

Two weeks ago, the administration announced such a proposal, against the better judgment of the U.S. Treasury Secretary and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, that would authorize the sale of 30 million barrels of crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve over the next month. This is the same petroleum reserve that was created in response to the 1973 Arab oil embargo to store oil in case of a national emergency, such as a war in the Middle East. Like the Army, you hope never to use the reserve. But, if you need to, it should be big enough to do the job.

Yet, the release of oil from this reserve is unlikely to have a significant effect on prices at the pump. The United States consumes approximately 19 million to 20 million barrels of crude oil per day. The administration's proposal would provide for an additional one million barrels per day. Such a small amount of oil is unlikely to have much of an effect on gasoline prices, especially in light of the additional 800,000 barrels per day of crude oil that will be produced by OPEC.

But what is worse is that this sort of intervention in the domestic energy market, which may seem simple, could actually be self defeating. If refiners expect more oil to be released from the reserve, these shrewd businessmen may

hold off on buying more crude oil to produce gasoline and heating oil until the price of crude oil decreases, which would make it more profitable to them, not to mention the oil companies that have posted strong profits this year. Similarly, OPEC could easily offset any benefits from the release of crude oil from the reserve by reducing its own production by an equal amount.

So, I am not sure that Americans should breathe a collective sigh of relief at this announcement regarding releases from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. It might be good public relations but not a good faith effort to reduce prices. A similar "fix all, miracle cure" was offered this spring in response to high oil prices. Some Members of Congress proposed reducing the federal excise tax on gasoline in order to reduce prices at the pump. In their rush to score political points, the proposal was brought to the Senate floor for a vote twice in April—once as an amendment to the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution and again as a free-standing bill. Both times, a sensible majority in the Senate voted not to repeal the gasoline tax by substantial majorities. I am proud that so many of my colleagues refused to swallow this patent nostrum, realizing that first, the savings from the excise tax repeal would not filter down to the consumer, and, second, that a reduction in the excise tax would have a significantly negative effect on the highway trust fund. Presumably, the sponsors of this dangerous proposition were going to provide tax relief to these oil and gas companies and delay highway projects just to make a political point. It is time to get beyond this campaign hysteria and last-minute gimmickery. These current concerns are really just symptoms of a larger problem.

Mr. President, I would also be remiss if I did not raise disturbing evidence that oil companies are sending our own oil overseas. On average, 50,000 to 90,000 barrels of oil per day have been exported to the Asian Pacific Region from Alaska's Northern Slope after an export ban was lifted in 1995. This output equaled about 27 million barrels in 1999. Why are we exporting oil from Alaska to countries like South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, and China when we face shortages at home? Are the same voices advocating for increased production in Alaska also supporting the export of oil overseas while simultaneously criticizing the recent release from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve? These voices are singing the siren song for increased oil company profits, not the hallelujah chorus of relief for the average American.

So here we are today caught in a black hole that will do little to move us down the road toward developing a sustainable energy policy. Just last week, a motion was made to proceed to S. 2557. I believe that we should be deliberating proposals on energy security. I also believe that we should not forget that there are other measures

out there that should be given equal attention. While this bill may have some valid energy policy provisions, so do many other proposals. I note for the record, that Senator DASCHLE began an effort over two years ago to construct an energy security package. This effort, which I have cosponsored, addresses a number of important energy resources and industries. If Senators wish to support greater energy independence and encourage cleaner, more efficient technologies, then I urge them to also look at S. 2904, the Energy Security Tax and Policy Act of 2000.

We need to be talking about very complicated and critical energy matters, asking what role and responsibility we all must play. What is OPEC doing? What are the oil and gas companies doing? What is the administration doing? What is Congress doing? What are we doing individually?

My call for a comprehensive national energy policy is longstanding. On May 14, 1984, I took to the Floor with a warning that America should not be so dependent on Persian Gulf oil. At that time, the Reagan Administration was trying to eliminate the Department of Energy and its many energy programs. I argued that this was a wrongheaded approach and that short-term budget concerns should not dominate longer-term national security interests. At that time, I said: "Our energy security rests upon our military might, not upon our natural resources, nor our technological genius."

In another floor statement from August 6, 1987, I noted how the Reagan administration was continuing to undercut funding for the fossil, renewable, and synthetic fuels programs. That administration had slashed spending for energy conservation programs and vetoed legislation to provide for emergency preparedness and national appliance efficiency standards. Additionally, the Reagan administration was even balking at filling—not using—but filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. In reviewing that August 1987 speech, I warned:

Why must the energy security of the United States be protected first with guns and not with brains or our homegrown natural resources? . . . The Reagan Administration's destruction of the Nation's long-term energy policies—policies that have been developed and promoted by every Administration since President Nixon—is imperiling America's energy security.

What can Congress do to find some common ground? Energy security and energy independence are a critical national, in fact, a critical international issue. Congress should find beneficial proposals and move forward on passing legislation in the 107th Congress that will get the job done. We should be looking at a variety of opportunities.

Let me offer one example from the recent past. Several weeks ago, while the Senate was debating the bill to grant China permanent normal trade relations, I offered an amendment to increase the use of American-made

clean energy technologies in China. No Senator argued against this amendment on its merits. I believe that if a proposal like this were offered on another bill, then it could very likely have passed by an overwhelming margin and would be a win-win-win opportunity for business, labor, and the environment. I say to my colleagues, knowing that a multi-trillion dollar clean energy and environmental infrastructure market will be exploding in the coming decades, we should be taking every opportunity to promote market-based initiatives to deploy these American-made clean energy technologies at home and export these same technologies to developing countries as soon as possible.

Still, I realize that an effective energy strategy will require much debate and a good bit of negotiation. This is not something that can be resolved by depending on any one approach, technology, or resource. There are many serious questions that must be examined when considering our energy choices. We must consider the pros and cons of each of our energy resources and ask the following questions. With regard to oil and natural gas, how can the U.S. decrease its dependence on foreign producers by increasing domestic production while also ensuring that environmental protection and conservation are promoted? Regarding nuclear energy, is it possible for the U.S. to continue utilizing our existing nuclear energy facilities while also finding a workable solution to the problem of nuclear waste? Can the U.S. find ways to decrease the price for renewable technologies like wind, solar, geothermal, and biomass in a very competitive energy market? Is it possible to reconcile the conflicts regarding hydroelectric power and sustainable fisheries? How can the U.S. continue to use coal while ensuring that the air and water are made even cleaner? Finally, how can American businesses and individuals use all of these energy resources more wisely and find ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions? No one industry, no one resource, no one technology, no one approach is going to provide that one silver bullet to fix our energy security problems!

Our long-term energy security interest goes far beyond the current price hikes in gasoline, diesel, home heating oil, or electricity. I fear that, as a nation, we are falling asleep at the wheel. We need policies that buffer our economy and our people from decisions made by foreign suppliers. It is time to focus on increased research and development into advanced technologies, energy efficiency and conservation measures, and market-based incentives to rapidly move these advanced technologies and conservation measures from the lab to the field. I believe that a comprehensive national energy strategy can do all of this and incorporate a strong environmental strategy as well.

Therefore, what would a comprehensive national energy strategy include?

Let me suggest a framework that I believe would help Congress craft such an energy policy. We must look at developing all of our energy resource sectors—fossil, nuclear, and renewables. A comprehensive plan must include improved measures for all of the major energy consuming sectors—the transportation, manufacturing, residential, and commercial sectors. A national energy plan needs to address the development and the conservation of our resources. It does no good to be producing more of our energy at home if we are not making further progress to conserve energy as well, especially in a growing economy. We need to develop an effective pipeline for the development of more advanced energy technologies. This will demand that more money and effort must be devoted to research and development, demonstration, and, ultimately, deployment in the market place. This energy strategy must be sound economically and environmentally. We must examine actions that can be taken now as well as actions for the long-term. Finally, while taking these steps domestically, we should also be finding ways that we can increase the export of American-made clean energy technologies to other countries that need these technologies just as much as we do.

As many of my colleagues know, I have been working for many years to provide funding for a range of clean energy technologies. I note that two of these 21st century clean energy technologies, the Clean Coal and fuel cell programs, are being centered at our nation's newest national laboratory, the National Energy Technology Laboratory in Morgantown, WV and Pittsburgh, PA and I believe that Congress should continue to support critical efforts like these in the future.

These are 21st century clean energy technologies—not because this is the 21st century, it is not, until next year. But we are talking about technologies that extend into the future.

These technologies are essential for growing our economy while also ensuring that environmental improvements, energy security, public health, and air and water quality are met. I have been working for 15 years on the Clean Coal Technology Program, and I believe that it is possible to bring together several complementary and mutually beneficial proposals. Let me outline a framework for coal and Clean Coal Technologies that I believe should be included in an energy security bill in the 107th Congress. This package must be bipartisan, and I look forward to working with my Democratic and Republican colleagues who have supported this effort like Senator DASCHLE, Senator MCCONNELL, and others.

Senator LOTT's bill, S. 2557, has requested a report from the Department of Energy regarding coal and the development of an effective research, development, and demonstration program. I agree it is time to do a more com-

prehensive study of Clean Coal Technologies. Among other steps, the Department of Energy should work with the private sector on a study to find ways for achieving higher performance goals and should recommend a road map for the development of these new technologies. The Congress should also consider authorizing additional funding to carry out a more advanced research, development, and demonstration program to achieve these ends. I will certainly put my shoulder to the appropriations wheel in an effort to assist in this regard.

A comprehensive energy package should also include a provision to promote the commercialization of Clean Coal Technologies, similar to that included in S. 2904. This provision, which I and other Senators support, would help to establish incentives to increase the deployment of these advanced Clean Coal Technologies now and in the future.

Finally, it is time that the U.S. turn its attention to the current fleet of coal-fired power plants. These coal-fired powerplants generate approximately 56 percent of our Nation's electricity and are the work horses of our electric generating capacity.

Up here is part of the work. Take a look at the lights in the ceiling. When the curtains of night fall, look at the lights at the top of the Capitol and across both sides of the Capitol, and pause to think that those lights are burning because coal is still being mined.

It is time that we examine market-based incentives to make emission reductions and efficiency improvements for the existing fleet of coal-fired electric power generation.

I believe that Americans witnessed a healthy discussion about our Nation's energy security at Tuesday night's presidential debate between Vice President GORE and Governor Bush. Both candidates put forward their views on how the U.S. can effectively develop a comprehensive national energy policy. Each candidate made what I believe signify complementary goals regarding a comprehensive energy policy. Principally, Governor Bush expressed his belief that the U.S. should take additional steps to increase the availability of our domestic energy resources, and Vice President GORE asserted that the U.S. should also find ways to decrease our energy consumption. Additionally, and particularly, I welcome the comments by both Presidential candidates regarding clean coal technologies.

I have to say that this present administration and some of the budgets that have come to the Hill have sought to defer funding on clean coal technology, and even this year sought to rescind some of the money. That is going in the wrong direction.

The Vice President, in his September 14, 2000, letter to United Mine Workers President Cecil Roberts remarked, "I strongly support accelerating the development and deployment of tech-

nologies that will allow us to use coal in cleaner and more efficient ways." Following his announced support for clean coal technologies at a campaign stop in Huntington, WV a day before, Governor Bush also voiced his support at the debate by saying, "I want to develop the coal resources in America and have clean coal technologies." Responding to those comments by Governor Bush, Vice President GORE said, "I strongly support new investments in clean coal technology." I am heartened by the comments of both candidates, and I hope that the next administration will be a strong advocate for the increased research and development, demonstration, and deployment of these clean coal technologies in the coming years. The next administration has an obligation to follow through on those commitments to help America's coal miners, develop our own resources and technologies, and to deploy these clean coal technologies in the market at home and abroad. If we want to have a national energy strategy, then we must sit down together and put all of our interests on the table.

I heard a great deal of talk by both Presidential candidates in that debate about what each is going to do. Each is going to do this and each is going to do that, and this is going to happen and that is going to happen. Very little mention was made in that debate about Congress.

Congress has to be a partner in carrying out whatever plans the winning candidate may have in this respect and in other respects. So don't leave out Congress, my friends. Congress is very much a partner. I hope both candidates will recognize that in their future debates. They will think of Congress because it takes help from Congress, because Congress is made up of the elected representatives of the people. You have to have Congress on your side, whoever becomes President. We will sit down together and put all of our interests on the table.

We should judge the success of our energy strategy by how it affects the average person. How will it benefit farmers, coal miners, home owners, and truck drivers? We need to help create more jobs and an even stronger economy and ensure that the U.S. does not quiver each time that OPEC tries to flex its muscles. We must not allow ourselves to be swayed by the winds of the current political movement. The American people are not fools. They realize that last-minute, short-term, quick-fix solutions do little to address the underlying problem: the need for comprehensive national energy policy. It is my hope that Congress will begin to take a serious look at energy security legislation in the 107th Congress. Mr. President, I stand ready to meet these challenges.

ON THE RETIREMENT OF SENATOR CONNIE MACK

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Florida, CONNIE