

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, I want to talk this morning a bit, as we have for some time, about energy. Energy, of course, is something we have talked about for some time—a good long time, as a matter of fact. Our experiences last summer in California emphasized the need for some changes in our energy policy so that we have more stability and reliability in energy. Of course, we also became aware of some of the things we must do in terms of energy, and we have worked on it for a very long time.

Now, since September 11, I think we find some very compelling additional reasons that we need to do some things with energy. Obviously, we have not had an energy policy that we need to have in place over the years, and that is what we are seeking to do—to develop energy policy.

Partly because, I suppose, of the lack of a policy and a real direction where we want to go over time, we have become very dependent on overseas oil sources. We are nearly 60 percent dependent on OPEC and others. So now, in terms of some of the uncertainty in the Middle East and around the world, I think we find ourselves with more concern about where we need to be in terms of energy.

We have at least two compelling reasons, it seems to me, that make energy development and energy security even more important. One is to support our military activities. We have to have the energy to do that. The other is that we are talking about a stimulus for the economy, about building our economy. Obviously, fuel and power and energy are key to that, in whatever means they are used. So I believe we find ourselves now with even more reason to move to developing an energy policy that will ensure we have the energy necessary for all the needs we have.

We have talked before about the need for research so we can find better ways to produce energy, so that we can find better ways to conserve our energy. Those things are possible, and we can do them. We have talked more about how we find diversity in a policy so we don't become dependent on one source of energy—and that we can look toward nuclear—whether it be renewable, gas, or coal, and to have diversity that helps strengthen those sources.

We have talked a good deal about renewables. That is obviously something we need to pursue. Most important of all, I imagine now as we look at where we are, is production. We need to ensure we can have domestic production,

and that we can increase our domestic production, so we become less dependent upon the supply from overseas.

So I believe very strongly that we had compelling reasons to deal with energy before, and certainly September 11 has added to the necessity for us to do that. We have worked hard in the Energy Committee, of which I am a member, to respond. We have had hearings, we had marked up a title in our energy bill, and we are moving forward on that bill that was quite broad.

In the meantime, the House has passed an energy bill which has a good deal of the things in it about which we have talked. So they moved forward with that over in the House. It has great support from labor unions and from many environmentalists, and it certainly has strong support from the administration. That bill is passed and available for us to deal with now.

Unfortunately—or fortunately—there has been some change in what we are doing. The chairman of the committee has indicated that he has been asked to not have any more committee activities, and there will be a bill put together, apparently, by the majority leader to bring before us. Unfortunately, we have talked about this before and have not arrived, I don't believe, at any commitment as to when that will be done and how it will be done. Of course, some have considerable concern that there would not be input from all of the folks in the Senate. There is some concern about that. I believe what we need more than anything is the assurance that there will be an energy bill before we adjourn.

There are a number of things that are very important to us. One is airline security. I think it is very important that we do that. We are also working on changing the rules and the law on terrorism so that our agencies can work more efficiently and our law enforcement and others can do that. We are working on a stimulus for the economy in the Finance Committee, and I think that has to be one of the high-priority items. We need to do our appropriations, which is our normal duty and one that needs to be moving along.

So we have a full plate. But I believe strongly that energy now—particularly because of the threats of the overseas intervention—becomes one of the items we must add to our list to complete. I am hopeful that changes that apparently have been suggested will result in yet some way for us to get on the floor with the issues we think are terribly important for energy—to get the bill out that we can work on so we can develop and have an energy policy that will be supportive of the economy and supportive of our war on terrorism. I think it is necessary we do that.

Madam President, I urge my colleagues to find a way to bring together the needs of this country, supported by the White House, supported by both sides in this body, and already has been supported by the House, and that prior to finishing our work, we complete

work on an energy policy that will meet this country's needs.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SETTING THE AGENDA

Mr. REID. Madam President, I was not fortunate enough to have listened to the entire statement of our friend from Wyoming. I have worked with Senator DASCHLE and Senator BINGAMAN on energy legislation, and no one feels more strongly than Senator DASCHLE, our majority leader, that we need to bring forward legislation at the earliest possible date dealing with the energy problems.

He and Senator BINGAMAN, who is the chairman of the Energy Committee, have worked hard on this, and we will have something as soon as possible.

I have to say, we have been trying to get to airport security for over a week. There have been objections to that. We have had to jump through a series of hoops: A motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed, and now it appears we are going to have to file a motion to invoke cloture on the bill itself. During this time, we could be doing other things. We have tried to move to appropriations bills which have not been considered, and there have been objections to that by the minority.

Senator LEAHY has worked night and day on terrorism and other issues as a result of the events of September 11, and we are still doing just fine with judicial nominations and nominations generally, but that is not good enough for some people. Therefore, they have put a stop on all legislation.

It seems somewhat unusual to me to have the minority saying why aren't we moving legislation when they will not let us move it. We are in the majority. They may not like it. Senator DASCHLE is the majority leader and determines what legislation comes to the floor. They cannot do that anymore. Because they only want energy does not mean that is what they are going to get.

We have many other items, and the majority leader has made a decision on with what we are going to deal. They will not let us do that. We have 13 appropriations bills we have to pass every year. They will not let us get to those bills because they do not believe enough judges are being approved.

At home, I have not had a single person ask me about judges. We have two Nevada judges who are waiting to go through the funnel, and they will get here. Those judges know Senator LEAHY and Senator HATCH are doing

the very best they can on their nominations.

There is always talk about energy proficiency. Isn't it funny they always bring up ANWR? That seems to be the button on the pin they are always concerned about—ANWR. Madam President, this situation is one with which we have to be very careful. Just last week somebody with a rifle shot some holes through a pipeline in Alaska, and 250,000 gallons of fuel spilled before they could stop the leakage. That was just one man. I do not know if he was target practicing or shooting at caribou. I do not know what he was doing, but with a rifle he put holes through that pipe.

The energy situation is very complicated. The majority leader has indicated time and time again he is aware of that and wants to work on this. I wish the minority would let the legislation that is important pass. We need to do something about airport security. We need to do something about terrorism. We need to do something about many other things that they will not let us get to. We are in the majority now. The majority leader has the right and the ability to set the agenda for this Senate.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. THOMAS. The idea of being able to object is not a brand new idea. It was exercised by you when you were in the minority; isn't that true?

Mr. REID. I am sorry, I could not hear the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. The idea that we in the minority ought to be involved is something we learned from you when you were in the minority. So it is not a brand new idea. When the majority brings bills forward, they need to work with everyone here so we can pass something.

I am just surprised at what the Senator said, that this is a brand new idea.

Mr. REID. I do not recall, I say to my friend from Wyoming, talking about a brand new idea. I was in the minority for a number of years in my present position and worked very closely with Senator LOTT in moving legislation. I worked very hard in moving legislation, and we did not hold up legislation based on judges. We did not do that. We felt we were treated unfairly. I think the last administration certainly did not get the judges who were in the pipeline who should have been confirmed. But we said early on this is not payback time; we are going to move them as quickly as we can, and we have. We have moved out scores of nominations that President Bush felt he needed. We moved scores.

Somebody on the side of the Senator from Wyoming—I do not know who it is; even if I did, I would not announce it here—believes we are not moving enough judges through.

I say to my friend from Wyoming, we did not do that. We did not hold up leg-

islation based upon judges. On a comparative basis, we had a right to do so, but I felt, and Senator DASCHLE felt as minority leader, that we had an obligation to move legislation.

We worked extremely hard to move appropriations bills. We worked extremely hard to move legislation that the majority then felt was important. We had very little downtime as a result of objections from our side. We made sure there were not even long periods of time when there were quorum calls.

I say to my friend, I did not use the term it was a new idea. I am just saying what is happening is unfair. We have been trying to move to this legislation dealing with airport security for more than a week, and we are a long ways from being able to do it now if colleagues make us jump through all the hoops.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that. I agree with the Senator that we need to move forward. Another point. When there are bills with a special purpose, such as airport security, and provisions are added that have nothing to do with it, when you are in the minority, you have to have some opportunity to participate in the decision. I say to the Senator from Nevada that it is the leadership's role to find some compromise so we can move forward. I know the Senator has done that, and I admire what the Senator is doing.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, I appreciate his presence in the Chamber and attempting to work with us. On airport security, there are three problems that can be resolved in a matter of a few hours: No. 1, there are some who believe not only is airport security important but also that there be security on our passenger trains.

There are also those who believe we should protect workers who have been displaced as a result of these terrible acts on September 11. We should be able to work our way through that. We should bring these issues up, vote, and go to something else.

I say to my friend from Wyoming, I had a number of meetings yesterday with Senator LOTT in the presence, of course, of Senator DASCHLE, and he is attempting to help us work through some of this. I appreciate that very much.

Maybe today we can do something on terrorism. It would be helpful if we could get that out of the way. There are things about which I feel strongly. I had a Republican in the House today tell me: Did I hear you right when you said you think the things we do in this bill should not be sunsetted?

I said: You heard me right. If it is good now, it will be good later.

They asked me if I believed, for example, if there should be roving wiretaps on terrorists. I said to a friend, a Member of the House from Connecticut: Yes, I do. There are some basic items in this antiterrorism legislation we need to do, I say to my friend from Wyoming. I hope we can work that out before the day is through.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope so as well. One other observation: We have these items now that are of such high priority that have to do with security, and I think we need to be very watchful that we do not find ourselves using security as a vehicle for doing some things that have very little attachment to security.

I thank the Senator for his response.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I speak not only as part of the Republican leadership in the Senate but as a member of the Energy Committee, a committee on which I have served for the 11 years I have been in the Senate. During those 11 years, I have had the opportunity to serve under three Presidents. For 8 of those years, I served under a Democrat President. During that time, he, I, his administration, and certainly all Members, attempted to shape a national energy policy for our country that never really got accomplished. During that time, we continued to grow very rapidly as a nation. We continued to consume up to a 2½ to 3 percent increase in energy each year, although our country was only producing a 1½ percent increase of total need.

Of course, we know what happened as a result of that timeframe over the last 8½ years: We grew increasingly dependent upon foreign sources of energy for our existence, at least in oil. Our infrastructure grew older, our transmission lines and pipelines; our ability to generate electrical energy did not increase very rapidly. But workers found the demand of the new high-tech economy even required greater abundances of electricity and energy than we originally suspected.

It is why it became an issue in the last presidential campaign and it is why this President, George Bush, immediately developed a national energy task force to begin to work on a national energy policy. They completed their work and sent their information to the Hill.

While that has been going on, the Energy Committee, now chaired by Senator BINGAMAN, once chaired by Senator FRANK MURKOWSKI of Alaska, has been working on a national energy policy. We have spent the last 3½ to 4