

Robb	Sessions	Thompson
Roberts	Shelby	Thurmond
Rockefeller	Smith (NH)	Torricelli
Roth	Smith (OR)	Voinovich
Santorum	Snowe	Warner
Sarbanes	Specter	Wellstone
Schumer	Stevens	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Feinstein	McCain
Lieberman	Thomas

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 109) was passed.

Mr. LOTT. 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. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY ACT OF 2000

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the pending first-degree amendment (No. 4177) to Calendar No. 490, S. 2045, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to H-1B non-immigrant aliens:

Trent Lott, Gordon Smith of Oregon, Judd Gregg, Wayne Allard, Conrad Burns, Craig Thomas, Rick Santorum, Thad Cochran, Bob Smith of New Hampshire, Spencer Abraham, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Connie Mack, George Voinovich, Larry Craig, James Inhofe, and Jeff Sessions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 4177 to S. 2045, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to H-1B non-immigrant aliens, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) would vote "aye."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 92, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 260 Leg.]

YEAS—92

Abraham	Edwards	Lott
Akaka	Enzi	Lugar
Allard	Feingold	Mack
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Baucus	Frist	Mikulski
Bayh	Gorton	Miller
Bennett	Graham	Moynihan
Biden	Gramm	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Reid
Boxer	Gregg	Robb
Breaux	Hagel	Roberts
Brownback	Harkin	Rockefeller
Bryan	Hatch	Roth
Bunning	Helms	Santorum
Burns	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hutchison	Schumer
Campbell	Inhofe	Sessions
Chafee, L.	Inouye	Shelby
Cleland	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kennedy	Snowe
Conrad	Kerrey	Specter
Craig	Kerry	Stevens
Crapo	Kohl	Thompson
Daschle	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Voinovich
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Levin	Wyden
Durbin	Lincoln	

NAYS—3

Hollings	Reed	Wellstone
----------	------	-----------

NOT VOTING—5

Feinstein	McCain	Thomas
Lieberman	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 92, the nays are 3. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, may I ask about the order and the unanimous consent that is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator now has 20 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

OIL CRISIS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have had a series of discussions with my colleagues on the energy crisis in this country.

I think it is fair to make a broad statement relative to the crisis. The crisis is real. We have seen it in our gasoline prices. We saw it last week when oil hit an all-time high of \$37 a barrel—the highest in 10 years. And now we are busy blaming each other for the crisis.

I think it is fair to say that our friends across the aisle have taken credit for the economy because it occurred during the last 7 years. I also think it is fair that our colleagues take credit for the energy crisis that has occurred because they have been here for the last 7 years.

I have talked about the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, what I consider the insignificance of the drawdown, and the signal that it sends to OPEC that, indeed, we are vulnerable at 58-percent dependence on imported oil. That sends a message that we are willing to go into our savings account.

What did we get out of that? We got about a 3- to 4-day supply of heating oil. That is all. We use about a million

barrels of heating oil a day during the winter. That has to be taken out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in crude form—30 million barrels—and transferred to the refineries which are already operating at capacity because we haven't had any new refineries built in this country in the last 15 to 20 years.

This is not the answer.

I am going to talk a little bit about one of the answers that should be considered by this body and has been considered before. In fact, in 1995, the issue of opening up that small area of the Coastal Plain, known as ANWR, came before this body. We supported it. The President vetoed it. If we had taken the action to override that veto of the President, or if the President had supported us, we would know what is in this small area of the Coastal Plain. When I say "small area," I implore my colleagues to reflect on the realities.

Here is Alaska—one-fifth the size of the United States. If you overlay Alaska on the map of the United States, it runs from Canada to Mexico, and Florida to California. The Aleutian Islands go thousands of miles further. There is a very small area near the Canadian border. When I say "small," I mean small in relationship to Alaska with 365 million acres.

But here we have ANWR in a little different proportion. This is where I would implore Members to understand realities. This is 19 million acres. This is the size of the State of South Carolina.

A few of the experts around here have never been there and are never going to go there in spite of our efforts to get them to go up and take a look.

Congress took responsible action. In this area, they created a refuge of 9 million acres in permanent status. They made another withdrawal—only they put it in a wilderness in permanent status with 78.5 million acres, leaving what three called the 1002 area, which is 1½ million acres.

That is this Coastal Plain. That is what we are talking about.

This general area up here—Kaktovik—is a little Eskimo village in the middle of ANWR.

They say this is the "Serengeti." There is a village in it. There are radar sites in it. To suggest it has never been touched is misleading.

Think for a moment. Much has been made of the crude oil prices dropping \$2 a barrel when the President tapped the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and released 30 million barrels of oil.

While I believe the price drop will only be temporary, I ask my fellow Senators what the price of crude oil would be today if the President had not vetoed opening up ANWR 6 years ago. It would have been at least \$10 less because we would have had another million-barrel-a-day supply on hand.

What would prices be if OPEC and the world knew that potentially 1 to 2 million barrels a day of new oil was coming out of the ANWR Coastal Plain, and not only for 3 or 4 or 15 days, but for decades?

Let me try to belie the myth of what is in ANWR in relationship to Prudhoe Bay. This area of Prudhoe Bay has been supplying this Nation with nearly 25 percent of its crude oil for almost two decades—2½ decades.

We built an 800-mile pipeline with the capacity of over 2 million barrels. Today, that pipeline is flowing at 1 million barrels with the decline of Prudhoe Bay.

You might not like oil fields but Prudhoe Bay is the finest oil field in the world, bar none. I defy anybody to go up there and compare it with other oil fields. The environmental sensitivity is unique because we have to live by rules and regulations.

The point I want to make is when Prudhoe Bay was developed and this pipeline was built at a cost of roughly \$6.5 billion to nearly \$7 billion, the estimate of what we would get out of the oil field was 9 billion barrels.

Here we are 23 or 24 years later, and we have gotten over 12 billion barrels. It is still pumping at better than 1 million barrels a day.

The estimates up here range from a low of 5.7 billion to a high of 16 billion barrels—16 billion barrels. What does that equate to? It is kind of in the eye of the beholder. Some say it would be a 200-day supply—a 200-day supply of America's oil needs. They are basing their estimates on old data of 3.2 billion barrels in ANWR, ignoring the most recent estimates by the U.S. Geological Survey that there is a 5 percent chance of 16 billion barrels—that is at the high end with a mean estimate of 10.3 billion barrels. That is the average. For the sake of conversation, we might as well say a 10.3 billion barrel average.

Under this argument, Prudhoe Bay, the largest oil field in the United States, has only a 600-day supply. That is assuming all oil stops flowing from all other places, and we have no other source of oil other than Alaska. So those arguments don't hold water.

But the Wilderness Society and the Sierra Club say it is only a 200-day supply. It is only this, or it is only that; and using that logic, the SPR is only a 15-day supply, in theory.

Let's make sure we keep this discussion where it belongs.

To give you some idea, in this 1002 area, in comparison to an eastern seaboard State, let's take the State of Vermont, and say that there are absolutely no other sources for oil in the entire Coastal Plain. If this 1002 area was designated to fulfill Vermont's needs, that 200-day supply is enough to heat homes and run equipment all over Vermont for the next 197 years. So don't tell me that is insignificant. For New Hampshire, for example, it would be 107 years.

The U.S. Geological Survey says that it would replace all of our imports from Saudi Arabia for 11 years.

If it contains the maximum estimate of recoverable oil, it would replace all of our imports from Saudi Arabia for 30 years.

If the Arctic Coastal Plain could produce just 600,000 barrels a day, the most conservative estimate—more likely it would produce 2 million barrels a day—the area would be among the top 13 countries in the world; just this area in terms of crude oil production.

At 2 million barrels a day, the Coastal Plain of ANWR itself would be among the top eight oil-producing nations in the world. I am sick and tired of hearing irresponsible statements from the environmental groups that are lying to the American people.

We had a little discussion the other day on the floor. One of my colleagues from Illinois said he ran into a CEO of a major oil company of Chicago—he didn't identify who he was—and asked him how important ANWR was to the future of the petroleum industry. The man from the company said from his point of view it was nonsense, there are plenty of sources of oil in the United States that are not environmentally dangerous.

Where? Where? We can't drill off the Pacific coast. We can't drill off the Atlantic coast. We can't drill offshore. We can only drill down in the gulf, and now the Vice President wants to cancel leases down there.

He further said he believes, and the man from Illinois agreed, we don't have to turn to a wildlife refuge to start drilling oil in the Arctic nor do we have to drill offshore.

If we are not going to drill offshore, where are we going to drill? They won't let drilling occur in the Overthrust Belt. Mr. President, 64 percent has been ruled out—Wyoming, Colorado, Montana—to any exploration.

The idea that these people don't identify where we are going to drill, but are just opposed to it, is absolutely irresponsible. As a consequence of not knowing whether we have this oil or not, we are not doing a responsible thing in addressing whether we can count on this as another Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

I have a presentation that I hope will catch some of the attention of Members because there is an old saying from some of the environmental groups: For Heaven's sake, there is 95 percent of the coastal plain that is already open for oil and gas development.

Here is a picture of the coastal plain. It is important that the public understand this: 95 percent is not open. Here is Canada. Here is the ANWR area, 19 million acres, the coastal plain. This area is not open. It is open in this general area. Then we have the National Petroleum Reserve. This area is closed—this little bit of white area. From Barrow to Point Hope is closed. I repeat, 95 percent isn't open.

The Administration prides itself on saying we have been responsible in opening up areas of the National Petroleum Reserve, which is an old naval petroleum reserve. A reserve is there for an emergency. We don't know what is there. The areas that the oil company

wanted to go in and bid Federal leases, the Department of Interior wouldn't make available. They made a few, it is a promising start, but let's open up a petroleum reserve and find out whether we have the petroleum there. They won't do that. They won't support us in opening up ANWR.

Only 14 percent of Alaska's coastal lands are open to oil and gas exploration. Those are facts. I defy the environmental community, the Sierra Club, or the Wilderness Society to counter those statements. The breakdown: Prudhoe region, 14 percent; ANWR coastal plain, 11 percent; ANWR wilderness, 5 percent; naval petroleum, 52 percent; and Western North Slope, State, native private land, 18 percent. Ninety-five percent is not open.

I am looking at "The Scoop on Oil," Community News Line, Scripps News Service, written obviously by the environmental community. It says "And yet oil spills in Prudhoe Bay average 500 a year."

They don't amount to 500 spills a year. They amount to 17,000 spills a year—I see that has the attention of the Presiding Officer—because in Prudhoe Bay they don't mention they have to report all spills of any non-naturally occurring substance, whether a spill of fresh water, a half cup of lubricating oil, or a more significant spill. The vast majority of spills at Prudhoe Bay have been fresh and salt water use in conditioning on the ice roads and pads—not of chemicals or oil.

In 1993, the worst year in the past decade for spills at Prudhoe Bay, there were 160 reported spills involving nearly 60,000 gallons of material but only 2 spills involving oil. Those are the facts. And all 10 gallons went into secondary containment structures and were easily cleaned.

Prudhoe Bay is the cleanest industrial zone in America. America should understand this. What the environmental community has done is found a cause, a cause for membership dollars. Our energy policy today in this country is directed not by our energy needs but by the direction of the environmental community. They accept no responsibility for the pickle we are in with this energy crisis. This administration has not fostered any domestic exploration program of any magnitude in this country, as I have indicated, whether it be the Overthrust Belt or elsewhere. They have limited excess activity to the Gulf of Mexico. They have prohibited exploration in the high Arctic, as I have indicated.

They have moved off oil and said: No more nuclear; we won't address nuclear waste. My good friend from Nevada and I have had spirited debate, but we are not expanding nuclear energy because we cannot address what to do with the waste. Twenty percent of our power comes from nuclear. We have not built a new coal-fired plant since the mid-1990s. You cannot get a permit. We are talking of taking down hydro dams because of the environmentalists, but

there is a tradeoff, as the occupant of the Chair from Oregon knows—putting the traffic off the barges on to the highways. There is a tradeoff.

If we take no hydro, no coal, no nuclear, no more imports of oil, where does it go? It goes to natural gas. What about natural gas, the cleanest fuel? Ten months ago, it was \$2.16 per 1,000 cubic feet; deliveries in November of \$5.42—more than double. Where are we going for energy? We are going to natural gas. That is the next train wreck coming in this country. It will be severe. Fifty percent of the homes in this country heat by natural gas—56 million homes. Heating bills are going to be 40-percent higher in the Midwest this winter. We have a different problem on the east coast where we don't have natural gas. The train wreck is coming.

When I hear these ludicrous statements, this thing is garbage, it is totally inaccurate. It says:

The oil industry's definition of "environmentally sensitive" also differs quite radically from yours and mine. How can thousands of caribou, polar grizzly bear, eagles, birds and other species who survive in what has been dubbed "America's Serengeti". . . .

If you haven't been up there, this coastal plain is pretty much the same all over. It is beautiful, it is unique. But it has some activity with the villages and the radar sites, and you wouldn't know where you were along this coastal plain because it is all the same.

They talk about dozens of oil fields. They say the road and pipelines would stop the movement of wildlife from one part of the habitat to another, toxic waste would leak. Let me show something about the wildlife up here: This is Prudhoe Bay, and this is the wildlife. These are not stuffed dummies, these are live caribou. They are wandering around because nobody is shooting them. Nobody is running them down with snow machines. This is Prudhoe Bay. We can do this in other areas of Alaska.

According to the Wilderness Society, rivers, streambeds, key habitat for wildlife, will be stripped by millions of tons of gravel roads. Let me show a little bit about the technology today because it is different. America should wake up and recognize this. This is a drill pad in the Arctic today. There are no gravel roads. We have ice and snow 9 months of the year. This is an ice road. That is the well.

Let me show the same place in the summertime, during the short summer, which is 2½ months or thereabouts. This is after moving the rig. There is the Christmas tree; there is the tundra. Do you see any marks? Do you see any gravel roads? Do you see pipelines? No, we have the technology, we can do it right. We could if the environmental community would meet its responsibilities. As we look for sources of energy, particularly oil, do we want to get it from the rain forests of Colombia where nobody gives a rat's concern

about the environment? They just want the oil and to get it at any price, lay a pipeline anywhere.

Do you want to do it right here at home? I think it is time to come to grips with these folks and ask them to stand behind their assertions. They talk about millions of piles of gravel. We don't have to do that anymore. They are talking about the living quarters of thousands of workers and air pollution and death for the stunning animals. They talk about the polar bear. The polar bear don't den on land, they den on the ice.

I could go right down the list and state what is wrong with this thing. It is irresponsible. They finish by saying it is a 90-day supply of oil. That is just not accurate. It is not factual. The reality is, if given the opportunity, we can turn this country around, keep these jobs home.

I am going to tell you, one of the problems, of course, is with our refining capacity because we are going to have to increase that. The assertion is that some of these refineries were closed prior to the Clinton-Gore administration. That is fine. But what have we done to increase the refining capacity? Refining capacity has increased by less than 1 percent while demand has increased 14 percent in this country. What are the causes of price hikes? Let's go to EPA. We have nine geographical regions in this country that require reformulated gas. I am not going to question the merits of that, but I can tell you the same gas in Springfield, IL, can't be used in Chicago. It costs more. Is it necessary? I don't know, but it costs more because you have to batch it.

We have talked about President Clinton's veto of ANWR 6 years ago, and what it would do. We are addressing the national security of this country as we look at depleting our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. It amazes me that nobody is upset about our increased dependence on oil from Iraq, 750,000 barrels a day. Saddam Hussein finishes every speech: "Death to Israel." If there was ever a threat to Israel's national security, it is Saddam Hussein. He is developing a missile capability, biological capability—what is it for? Well, it is not for good things.

As a consequence of that, we are seeing our Nation's increased reliance on crude oil and refined product, increased vulnerability to supply interruptions, and we are pulling down our reserves, and the administration says it is doing something about it. But I would like to know what. It vetoed ANWR, the opening of ANWR. It says we will get a little bit out of SPR. It says we have a problem here, we have a problem there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent for another 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, here are the Iraqi oil exports into the

United States. They have gone up. Let me show some more charts because pictures are worth a thousand words. People say we have to concern ourselves with the issue of the porcupine caribou herd. This is ANWR, Canada. This is the Demster Highway. These are oil wells drilled in Canada. These in the light color were drilled. They didn't find any oil, but this is the route of the caribou. They have gone through this area. They cross the Demster Highway with no problem at all. The caribou calve—where do they calve? Sometimes they calve in ANWR, sometimes they do not. We are not going to have any oil development in the summertime in the calving area.

This is what it is like over in Iraq. This is what it was like during the Persian Gulf war. There we are trying to clean up the mess caused by Saddam Hussein. That is the guy we are helping to support today, now with biological capabilities.

There are a couple of more points I wish to make. Talk about compatibility, here is something I think is fairly compatible. This shows a couple of guys out for a walk—3 bears. Why are they walking on the pipeline? The pipeline is warm. This is in the Prudhoe Bay oil field. Nobody is shooting those guys. They are happy. They walk over.

I can remember 15 years ago when they said: You build that pipeline and you are going to cut the State in half. The caribou, the moose will never go over from the other side. It just did not happen. It will not happen because these guys are compatible with the environment, as long as you don't harm them, chase them, run them down and so forth.

We have a lot of things going here, given the opportunity. If these Members would go back, if you will, to your environmental critics and say: What do you suggest? Can American technology overcome, if you will, our environmental obligation? Can we open up this area safely? Do we have the science and technology? There is nothing to suggest that we do not have that capability.

This is where we are getting our oil from now, with no environmental conscience about how they are getting it out of the ground. That is irresponsible on their part.

I am going to leave you with one thought. Here are the people with whom I am concerned. Those are the people who live in my State. This is in a small village. These are the kids walking down the street. It is snowing, it is cold, it is tough. It is a tough environment.

One of my friends, Oliver Leavitt, spoke about life in Barrow. That is at the top of the world, right up here. You can't go any further north or you fall off the top. He said I could come to the DIA school to keep warm because the first thing I did every morning was go out on the beach and pick up the driftwood. Of course, there are no trees. The driftwood has to come down the river.

Jacob Adams said:

I love life in the Arctic but it's harsh, expensive, and for many, short. My people want decent homes, electricity and education. We do not want to be undisturbed. Undisturbed means abandoned. It means sod huts and deprivation.

The native people of the Coastal Plain are asking for the same right of the Audubon Society of Louisiana, the same right this administration itself is supporting in the Russian Arctic Circle, and the same right the Gwich'ins had in 1984 when they offered to lease their lands.

The oil companies should have bought it. There just wasn't any oil there.

I recognize the public policy debate about this issue is complex and will involve issues at the heart of the extreme environmental agenda which is driving our energy policy. It certainly is not relieving it.

At the same time, I think the issue can be framed simply as: Is it better to give the Inupiat people, the people of the Arctic, this right?

These people live up here. This is an Eskimo village. There is the village. Do you want to give them the right, while promoting a strong domestic energy policy that safeguards our environment and our national security, rather than rely on the likes of Saddam Hussein to supply the energy?

The answer in my mind is clear, as well as in the minds of the Alaskans.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if I may, I have been asked to announce speeches and I have just concluded one. On behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent, following the remarks of the majority leader, Senator FEINGOLD be recognized for up to 25 minutes as in morning business, to be followed by Senator SESSIONS, under the previous order, to be followed by Senator GRAHAM for up to 20 minutes in morning business.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Senator FEINGOLD be allowed to continue until the Senator arrives on the floor.

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

H-1B VISAS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the Senate has just concluded its fourth vote in favor of the bill expanding H-1B visas that America grants each year to people from other countries to work in certain specialty occupations. I supported the bill on each of these votes.

But I rise today to express how strongly I oppose the manner in which the majority leader has sought to constrain this debate. I oppose the way in which the majority leader sought, on that bill, as with so many others, to prevent Senators from offering amend-

ments. And I oppose the majority leader's effort to stifle debate by repeatedly filing cloture on the bill.

Through his extreme use of cloture and of filling the amendment tree, I'm afraid the majority leader has reduced the Senate to a shadow of its proper self. And the result has been a Senate whose legislative accomplishments are as insubstantial as a shadow. This body cannot long exist as merely a shadow Senate.

Yesterday, as he brushed aside calls that the Senate vote on minimum wage or a patient's bill of rights, the majority leader complained that the Senate had already voted on those matters. But the Senate has, as yet, failed to enact those matters, and the people who sent us here have a right to hold Senators accountable.

And what's more, by blocking amendments, the majority leader has also blocked Senate consideration and votes on a number of issues that have been the subject of no votes in the Senate this year. Let me take a few moments to address two of them, the reform of soft money in political campaigns, and the indefensible practice of racial profiling.

Let me begin my discussion of these two items that the Senate was not allowed to take up—campaign finance and racial profiling—by discussing how those matters relate to what the Senate did take up—the H-1B visa bill.

The proponents of the H-1B bill characterize it as a necessity for our high tech future. It is both more and less than that.

But in a sense, the high-tech industry is certainly a large part of the reason why the Senate considered H-1B legislation these past two weeks. I would assert, that there is a high degree of correlation between the items that come up on the floor of the United States Senate and the items advocated by the moneyed interests that make large contributions to political campaigns.

American Business for Legal Immigration, a coalition which formed to fight for an increase in H-1B visas, offers a glimpse of the financial might behind proponents of H-1Bs. As I've said, I am not opposed to raising the level of H-1B visas. But I do think it's appropriate, from time to time, when the weight of campaign contributions appears to warp the legislative process, to call the Bankroll to highlight what wealthy interests seeking to influence this debate have given to parties and candidates.

ABLI is chock full of big political donors, Mr. President, and not just from one industry, but from several different industries that have an interest in bringing more high-tech workers into the U.S. I'll just give my colleagues a quick sampling of ABLI's membership and what they have given so far in this election cycle. All the donors I'm about to mention are companies that rank among the top employers of H-1B workers in the U.S., according to the

Immigration and Naturalization Service.

These figures are through at least the first 15 months of the election cycle, and in some cases include contributions given more recently in the cycle:

Price Waterhouse Coopers, the accounting and consulting firm, has given more than \$297,000 in soft money to the parties and more than \$606,000 in PAC money candidates so far in this election cycle.

Telecommunications giant Motorola and its executives have given more than \$70,000 in soft money and more than \$177,000 in PAC money during the period.

And of course ABLI is comprised of giants in the software industry, who have also joined in the political money game.

The software company Oracle and its executives have given more than \$536,000 in soft money during the period, and its PAC has given \$45,000 to federal candidates.

Executives of Cisco Systems have given more than \$372,000 in soft money since the beginning of this election cycle.

And Microsoft gave very generously during the period, with more than \$1.7 million in soft money and more than half a million in PAC money.

But I should also point out, Mr. President, that the lobbying on this issue is hardly one sided.

Many unions are lobbying against it, including the Communication Workers of America, which gave \$1.9 million in soft money during the period, including two donations of a quarter of a million dollars last year. And CWA's PAC gave more than \$960,000 to candidates during the period.

The lobbying group Federation for American Immigration Reform, or "FAIR," has lobbied furiously against this bill with a print, radio and television campaign, which has cost somewhere between \$500,000 and \$1 million, according to an estimate in Roll Call.

This is standard procedure these days for wealthy interests—you have to pay to play on the field of politics. You have got to pony up for quarter-million dollar soft money contributions and half-million dollar issue ad campaigns, and anyone who cannot afford the price of admission is going to be left out in the cold.

Thus, I believe that campaign finance is very much tied up in why the Senate considered the H-1B bill these past two weeks. I believe that campaign finance is very much tied up in why the Senate considered the H-1B bill under the tortured circumstances that it did. This is just another reason why I believe that this Senate must consider and vote on amendments that deal with campaign finance reform.

The momentum is building on campaign finance reform. In recent days, more and more candidates have offered to swear off soft money and have called for commitments from their opponents