

the purposes of this Act, and is made available upon the Secretary and the management entity completing a cooperative agreement.

(b) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$1,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act for any fiscal year after the first year. Not more than \$10,000,000, in the aggregate, may be appropriated for the Heritage Area.

(c) MATCHING FUNDS.—Federal funding provided under this Act shall be matched at least 25 percent by other funds or in-kind services.

(d) SUNSET PROVISION.—The Secretary may not make any grant or provide any assistance under this Act beyond 15 years from the date that the Secretary and management entity complete a cooperative agreement.

NATIONAL VETERANS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 304, which was reported by the Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 304) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the development of educational programs on veterans' contributions to the country and the designation of the week that includes Veterans Day as "National Veterans Awareness Week" for the presentation of such educational programs.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed, the amendment to the title be agreed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statement relating to this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 304) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 304

Whereas tens of millions of Americans have served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the past century;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of Americans have given their lives while serving in the Armed Forces during the past century;

Whereas the contributions and sacrifices of the men and women who served in the Armed Forces have been vital in maintaining our freedoms and way of life;

Whereas the advent of the all-volunteer Armed Forces has resulted in a sharp decline in the number of individuals and families who have had any personal connection with the Armed Forces;

Whereas this reduction in familiarity with the Armed Forces has resulted in a marked decrease in the awareness by young people of the nature and importance of the accomplishments of those who have served in our Armed Forces, despite the current educational efforts of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the veterans service organizations; and

Whereas our system of civilian control of the Armed Forces makes it essential that

the country's future leaders understand the history of military action and the contributions and sacrifices of those who conduct such actions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Secretary of Education should work with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Veterans Day National Committee, and the veterans service organizations to encourage, prepare, and disseminate educational materials and activities for elementary and secondary school students aimed at increasing awareness of the contributions of veterans to the prosperity and freedoms enjoyed by United States citizens;

(2) the week that includes Veterans Day be designated as "National Veterans Awareness Week" for the purpose of presenting such materials and activities; and

(3) the President should issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate educational activities.

The title was amended so as to read:

Resolution Expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the development of educational programs on veterans' contributions to the country and the designation of the week of November 5, 2000, as "National Veterans Awareness Week" for the presentation of such educational programs.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2000

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until the hour of 9:30 in the morning on Tuesday, September 26. 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 consideration of the H-1B visa bill as under the previous order.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Further, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled cloture vote occur at 10:15 on Tuesday morning with the time prior to the vote divided as ordered previously.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I ask unanimous consent that second-degree amendments may be filed at the desk up to 10:15 in the morning under the terms of rule XXII.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will begin 45 minutes of debate on the H-1B visa bill at 9:30 tomorrow morning. Following that debate, at 10:15

a.m., the Senate will proceed to a cloture vote on the pending amendment to the H-1B legislation. If cloture is invoked, the Senate will continue debate on the amendment. If cloture is not invoked, the Senate is expected to resume debate on the motion to proceed to S. 2557, the National Energy Security Act of 2000.

Also this week, the Senate is expected to take up any appropriations conference reports available for action.

Mr. SESSIONS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for approximately 10 to 15 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 10 to 15 minutes.

ENERGY PRICES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we are now dealing with a very important issue to the future of our country; and that is the price of energy; oil and gas, gasoline, and home heating fuel prices. They have been going up at a dramatic rate.

This is not a surprise. This is an event predicted and warned about by Members of this Congress for years, including Senator MURKOWSKI, who chairs the Energy Committee. I have talked about it for the last 3 or 4 years that I have been in this Senate.

This is what the issue is about. By allowing our domestic energy production to decline steadily, we have less and less ability to control prices in the world market, and, in fact, we become more and more vulnerable to price increases and production reductions by the OPEC oil cartel—that group of nations centered in the Middle East that get together to fix prices by manipulating production levels.

We now find ourselves in a very serious predicament. It is not a predicament that a simple release of a little oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is going to help. It threatens our economy in the long term.

Kofi Annan, Secretary General of the U.N., just wrote an editorial that I saw over the weekend. He has predicted that the poorer nations, the developing nations, will be hurt more by rising energy prices than the wealthy nations, but he does not dispute that wealthy nations will also be damaged.

This increase in fuel costs amounts to a tax on the American people. It comes right out of their pocket every time they go to the gas station.

Now we have this "bold" plan of the Gore-Clinton administration to release 30 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. This is supposed to be a solution to this problem, it is supposed to really help. But what this recent action really amounts to, is

closing the barn door after the horse is out.

Releasing 30 million barrels of oil will meet no more than 1½ days demand for energy in America. We consume nearly 20 million barrels of oil per day in this country. A 30-million barrel release will not affect, in any significant way, the problems we are facing. That is a fact.

Oil demand is not elastic. That is the crux of this problem. People have to have it. If you are traveling to work in your automobile—and there is no other way to get to work for an overwhelming number of American citizens, students, workers, and kids going to school—you must use gasoline and pay the price it costs.

So the way this thing has worked is this: The OPEC nations over the years saw economies around the world steadily strengthening. Third World nations, began using more automobiles and electricity, increasing demand for oil, using more energy. We salute them for that. The life span for people in countries that have readily available electricity and energy is almost one-half longer than for those in countries that do not have it. We ought to celebrate poor countries being able to improve their standard of living. But as they improve their standard of living, their demand for energy increases. It is happening more and more around the world, and we should be happy quality of life is improving for third world nations. But as demand increased, oil prices remained at a steady rate for a significant period, then OPEC withdrew its production.

You have to understand, it does not take much of a difference in production to spike the price. That is exactly what happened. They cut production below the world demand. To get the oil and gasoline that people around the world needed, they were willing to pay a higher price. They had to pay a higher price to fill up their gas tank. People could not stop buying gas when the price went from \$1 to \$1.50 to \$1.80. They had to keep buying gas, just as all of us do in this country today. So the shortfall does not have to be large to give them that kind of manipulative power over the price.

This Administration has blamed the oil industry. I have no doubt that if the oil industry could make a few cents more per gallon, they would try to do so at any point in time. But let's remember, a little over a year ago, in my State of Alabama, you could buy gasoline for \$1 a gallon. Of that \$1 of gasoline you bought, 40 cents of it was tax. So really you were paying only 60 cents for a gallon of gas, less than a gallon of water.

That gasoline was probably produced somewhere in Saudi Arabia, refined, and shipped here in ships on which they spend billions to keep as safe as they possibly can. It is transported, 24 hours a day, to gas stations around the country. You take a gas pump nozzle, put it in the receptacle, and the gas

goes into your tank. Nobody ever doubts the quality of the gasoline or likely gives much thought to where it came from. It is a remarkable thing that the oil industry can do that. Does anybody think a Government agency could do that? No, sir.

So what happened? When OPEC cut their production, it spiked the world price—and they have a world market for oil—a barrel of oil which was selling for \$13, \$12, has now hit \$36 a barrel and it may be going higher because of price manipulation.

The price has gone up 50, 60, 70 cents a gallon. What does that really mean? It is not like an American tax on gasoline where we take that 40 cents with which to build roads and other things. It is a tax by OPEC on us. Foreign countries that are supplying us their oil are in effect charging us 40, 50 cents more for a gallon of gas which every American is paying. It is a drain on the wealth of this country. It threatens our economic vitality and growth.

You may say: "Jeff, why didn't we do a better job of producing oil?" There are some who say this administration has no energy policy. I don't agree. It has a policy. It is a no-growth, no-production policy. It has been that policy for the last 7½ years. If AL GORE is elected President, it will continue, and you ain't seen nothing yet when it comes to the price for fuel in this country. That is a plain fact.

We have tremendous reserves in Alaska for example. We voted on this floor—and the vote was vetoed by the administration—to produce oil and gas from the tremendous ANWR reserves. Oh, they said, it is a pristine area, and America will be polluted. The fact is, there are oil wells all around this country. People live right next to them. Oil wells do not pollute. But despite this plain fact, the Administration refused to allow production.

It has been reported, the ANWR reserves could be safely produced in an area less than the size of Dulles Airport serving the Washington, DC area. We would not destroy the Alaskan environment as we produce oil and gas there. Unfortunately, this administration would rather us pay Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the sheiks for it rather than produce it in our own country, keeping the wealth here.

They say: "Some of that Alaskan oil is sold to Japan". Economically that does not make any difference. When you sell it to Japan, you get money from Japan. You can buy it from Saudi Arabia, or wherever you buy it from—Venezuela. It makes no difference in economic terms.

That is a bogus argument, as any person who thinks about it would understand. The more we produce here, the less wealth of our Nation is transferred outside our Nation.

Fundamentally, this increase in prices was not driven so much by supply and demand. It was driven by a cartel. If this administration wants to address antitrust crimes, maybe they

ought to worry less about Microsoft and worry more about this cartel that has come together to drive up energy prices. They have driven it up through political means.

We, as American citizens, need to ask our Government: What political means are you using, Mr. Clinton, to overcome this threat? What are you proposing, Mr. Gore, to overcome that? Windmills? Eliminate the internal combustion engine? Is that your proposal? Are we going to use solar energy production?

I support various alternatives. I voted for ethanol. I voted for a pilot program to determine whether a switch grass could be utilized to produce energy, and it has potential. I supported the advanced vehicle technology programs and renewable energy research. But these technologies are a drop in the bucket compared to what we need to deal with our energy demands in this Nation.

Think about what we are doing. We are seeing major impacts on American consumers. If a family had an average monthly bill for gasoline of \$60, when that gallon of gasoline went from \$1 to \$1.50, that means that the bill per month went from \$60 to \$90, a \$30-a-month after tax draw on that family's budget for no other reason than an increase in gasoline prices. If the bill was \$100 a month, and many families will pay more than that, it has become \$150. It is a \$50-a-month draw on their budget.

This is a matter of great national importance. It need not happen. The experts are in agreement. There are sufficient energy reserves in our country to increase the supply and meet demand. Our government could drive down these prices. But we have to have an administration that believes in producing oil and gas, not an administration that is systematically, repeatedly blocking attempts at more production.

For example, there is a procedure used in my home State of Alabama called hydraulic fracturing. It is used in the production of coalbed methane. In some areas, coal may not be of sufficient quality and quantity to mine, but it does have methane in it. What has been discovered is that you can drill into the coal and produce methane from it with almost no disruption of the environment.

Methane is one of the cleanest burning fossil fuels we can have. It is far better for the environment than many competing fuels. Production of coalbed methane is something we ought to encourage. Hydraulic fracturing of coalbeds has never caused a single case of underground drinking water contamination. In fact, for years, the EPA did not bother to regulate it. Then somebody filed a lawsuit. Because the use of this technology for coalbed methane production is relatively new, Congress had never addressed it. The lawsuit argued that pumping water into the ground needed to be regulated in the same way as injecting hazardous waste

into the ground because there was no other statutory framework to apply. This has caused coalbed methane producers to go through all kinds of extensive regulatory procedures and generally depressed coalbed methane production activities. The EPA never really wanted to regulate, and in fact, argued that hydraulic fracturing did not need to be regulated at the federal level because it had caused no environmental problems and the state programs were working well. Unfortunately, the court ruled against the EPA because the law which governs this activity was written at a time this activity barely existed. I have introduced legislation which would allow the states to continue their successful regulatory programs. Yet we have been unable to get the kind of support from the administration and the EPA that would allow us to produce this clean form of gas all across America. It would be good for our country. That is an example of the no growth, no production policy of the administration.

We have taken out of the mix, the possibility of drilling in so many of our western lands that are Government owned. There are huge areas out there with very large reserves of gas and oil. Yet, this administration has systematically blocked production. They have vetoed legislation—which we almost overrode—to keep us from drilling in ANWR. They have refused to drill off the coast of California. They have refused to drill and are proposing to limit drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. In fact, Vice President GORE recently, stated he favored no more drilling in the Gulf of Mexico and in fact would limit, perhaps, leases that had already been let.

That is a big deal. Electric energy in America is being produced more and more through the use of natural gas. In addition to home heating, it is being increasingly used to generate electricity. It is generating it far cleaner than most any other source of energy. Almost every new electric-generating plant in this country has been designed to use natural gas. It comes through pipelines. Most of it is coming out of the Gulf of Mexico. There are huge reserves off the gulf coast of my home State of Alabama and throughout the gulf area. That ought to be produced.

It is unbelievable that we would not produce that clean natural gas, but instead continue to import our oil from the Middle East and allow a huge tax to be levied on American citizens by the OPEC cartel members. It makes no sense at all. As anybody who has been here knows, they know what the policy is. The policy of the extreme no-growth people in America is to drive up the price of gasoline. They figure if they drive it up high enough, you will have to ride your bicycle to work, I suppose. But most people don't live a few blocks or miles from work. A lot of people are elderly. A lot of people have children to take to school, and they have to take things with them when they go to work. They have errands to run and

family obligations to meet. They cannot use bicycles or rely on windmills to do their work.

That is the policy of this administration, to drive up energy costs. That is the only way you can see it. Systematically, they have blocked effort after effort after effort to allow this country to increase production. We have to change that. Our current energy problems will only get worse if we do not.

We have tremendous energy reserves in America. If we insist on sound environmental protection but not excessive regulation, if we make sure that production in areas such as ANWR in Alaska is conducted as previous Alaskan oil and gas production has been conducted we can make great strides in controlling our energy prices. The Trans-Alaskan Pipeline, has been delivering oil for two decades now and has had a minimal impact on the environment and not destroyed anything. The caribou are still there. The tundra has not melted. America has benefited from the Trans-Alaskan Pipeline and the energy that has been produced there. We certainly cannot stop producing oil and gas in the Gulf of Mexico, as the Vice President has proposed. That idea is stunning. It is a radical proposal. It is a threat to our future. We cannot allow it.

We cannot assume, we cannot take for granted one moment the belief that this release of a supply equal to 1½ day's demand is going to deal with our long-term problem. We have an administration that is cheerfully accepting, increased prices American must pay for energy. Those prices are going to continue to increase unless we do something about it. It does not take a huge increase in supply to help better balance demand and supply. So if we can begin to make even modest progress toward increasing our domestic supply, I think we can begin to see the price fall in a relatively short term. However, we cannot do it with the kinds of no-growth policies this administration is talking about.

I do believe in improving the environment. I support the policies that do so. I support research in many alternative energy sources and hope we will see some break throughs. I hope we will continue to develop technologies to increase the quality of the energy sources, which could make the use of energy cleaner and more efficient. I think these are good prudent steps to take.

But with the world demand we are facing, these efforts have not yet led to a big step—a good step, but not a big step. We are going to see increased demand in the United States and around the world. The experts tell us there is energy here in the United States. We need to be able to produce it and not continue to allow the wealth of this Nation to be transferred across the ocean to a few nations that were lucky enough to be founded on pools of oil.

That must remain our goal. That is what I and others will continue to work for in this Congress.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

ENERGY CRISIS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I join my colleague from Alabama in noting that what the President is doing on SPR, in my view, is a diversion. It is not solving the fundamental problem we have with the energy supply in this country—either the refining capacity that has been limited, as the Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI, has spoken of, or the supply of the raw resource, about which the Senator from Alaska and others have spoken. We need to be able to get access to that, and this administration has stopped that from taking place. They stopped it from taking place on our shores and stopped an expansion of biomass, biofuels, and ethanol production. They have not been supportive of expansion there as well. They stopped expansion in places such as in Central Asia, in which I have done a fair amount of work. There are large reserves of hydrocarbons and oil and gas there. They have done nothing to bring this online. Yet countries in that region of the world—many of which most people haven't heard of—have, I believe, the third largest pool of hydrocarbons in the world. They are seeking ways to get it out to the West in an oil and gas pipeline. This administration hasn't done anything to get that started.

So here we are today with high fuel prices, with no end in sight. Despite the President's diversion by using SPR and the misuse of this program—the way it was set up at least, the fundamental problem remains. We have to deal with the supply issue, and this administration hasn't done that. I applaud my colleague from Alabama for addressing that issue.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Yes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, the Senator has been here, as I have, for nearly 4 years now. I want to just ask him this: Has Senator MURKOWSKI, who chairs the Energy Committee, and others in this Congress, been warning for years about this, saying that we were denied American production, that it was going to come back to haunt us and prices would go up and it would drain our wealth? Have they been urging this administration for years to deal with it and support some production?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Absolutely. He has been stating that for a long period of time. The administration, each step along the way, has continued to thwart, stall, and say things that were positive but with no action. That is what I have seen taking place in pushing for marginal well tax credits for