

cabin, I do not open that door. So everybody will know that, hereafter, no matter if they are hijacking a plane to run it into the Golden Gate bridge, or into a building, or into the Sears Tower, or anyplace else—they are picking out all kinds of targets in people's minds—airplane hijackings are not going to happen; that is done with.

We have to move along to protect other terrorist targets, because that is how the terrorist's mind moves. They can maybe get 100 trying to wrestle the plane down. I don't believe they can get the plane down. Once the pilot hears a disturbance, yes, people can be hurt, someone can be killed, but he immediately knows his orders. Rather than open the door and say, "Do you want to go to Cuba? Let's go!"—no; now the doors stay closed, and he immediately lands the plane. He wires ahead, and the FBI and security is there to take charge. They are not going to get very far trying to hijack the plane.

Having taken these preventive steps, the Israelis knew, almost proof positive, when the plane that came out of Israel and went down with an explosion over the Black Sea, that a bomb had not been put on that plane. You have to go through those parameters of defense, of security and safety, in Israel. There is no way to get a bomb on the plane unless you have the pilots and everybody conspiring together.

That is not going to happen. The security system that we have set up and planned to pay for was approved by whom? By the pilots. We have their official approval of our approach in this particular bill. The flight attendants approved of it, and begged for it. The executives of the airlines are for it. The municipal associations, the tourism associations—I am getting boiled up.

We have held this bill up on the floor for 1 week on the motion to proceed. Why? On account of procedural Mickey Mouse nonsense, or—there is no better word—constipation. Everybody wants to add this or that measure onto it. We have to get Amtrak. No. We have to get benefits. No. We have to have a stimulus bill. No. We have to get this. Sure, let's take care of all those issues, but in order.

It is unforgivable to stand around here now for a week just on a motion to proceed. Objection just occurred when the distinguished ranking member of the committee and chief cosponsor said let's move to it, debate it, and listen and learn about these amendments, and vote them up or down; that is all. But we apparently have a minority. I am ready to vote, because I think I have some votes. Being in the minority does not surprise me, with all the undercurrents and the lobbying going on by the contractors. We read in Roll Call yesterday that when I am talking on the floor to an empty Senate, the lobbyists are back talking on individual treatment to the Senators.

Should I have to go around and call on the 99 other Senators and explain

this bill to them and get past the lobbyists? What has the Government come to in a time of crisis? Let's move on. Don't wait until 5 o'clock and maybe then file some amendments and maybe have some more cloture and some more delay.

This bill, from its origin, should not have been called airline safety but airline stimulus. Ironically, this crowd will go forward with any kind of stimulus.

We are under limited time. We are on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is informed that his 1 hour of closure has expired.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent that I continue with an additional hour from any other Senator, that I proceed for another few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I will conclude with a thought I just expressed about stimulus.

This measure would stimulate the airline industry—exactly what we are trying to do all over America. When you get people traveling, when you get them on the airlines, when you get them in the hotels, when you get New York going again, and when you get all of these other places back to normalcy, the best way to stimulate the airlines is to get safety for them.

What the bureaucracy has done up here with the procedural hangups is to give \$15 billion to keep the airlines alive and then guarantee that they go broke by not giving them the safety and, therefore, ensure that the traveling public is not on the planes.

This is the best way I know of to not just stimulate the airlines and air travel but to stimulate the economy. Please come forward. Let's move on this particular bill.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Alaska for indulging me the extra moments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

#### DEVELOPING A BALANCED ENERGY POLICY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I will try to be brief to accommodate my colleagues who are seeking recognition.

I would like to call attention to a release that came out of the majority and the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator JEFF BINGAMAN, indicating that at the request of the majority leader, Senator DASCHLE, the chairman of the Energy Committee, Senator BINGAMAN, suspend any further markup of energy legislation for this session of Congress. I emphasize "this session of Congress." That sounds pretty definitive to me. Instead, I quote the release:

The chairman will propose comprehensive and balanced energy legislation that can be added—

I emphasize "can be added." It doesn't say "will be added;" it says "can be added"—

by the majority leader to the Senate Calendar for potential action—

It doesn't say "action;" it says "potential action."

I certainly have the highest respect for the majority leader. I notice that this is very carefully worded. It says that it "can be added;" it doesn't say "will." Not that there is a proposed action but "potential action."

Very frankly, that is not good enough for me. I will ask the majority leader to specifically respond as to whether or not he intends to develop a balanced energy bill. I question the word "balanced" because that means no input from the minority, no input from the Republicans, an effort to circumvent the committee of jurisdiction, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, of which I am the ranking member. I question how it could be balanced.

So I urge the leader to address specifically whether he will take up and introduce an energy bill, and whether or not it will be placed on the calendar, and whether or not we will have sufficient time to offer amendments on the issue of fairness and equity in the contribution of the minority.

I would also add, the reason for this action, apparently, is twofold. One is the question of jurisdiction. In other words, there are other committees involved. There is the Committee on Finance, on which I serve, relative to tax implications associated with an energy bill. And as you tax forgiveness, accelerated depreciation, here is obviously the role of the Committee on Environment and Public Works in certain areas—perhaps the Committee on the Judiciary. But clearly, the majority of the jurisdiction is within the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

We have been working a long time on this. We began and introduced a bill early in the session, early in February, as a matter of fact. We have been working with Senator BINGAMAN on his comprehensive bill. We were committed to try to report out, tomorrow, Senator BINGAMAN's expedited bill on energy infrastructure, which I support.

I do not know the rationale. I can only assume that perhaps the leadership thought there was not the votes in the committee to block certain amendments that might come up or perhaps the majority thought there is not the support in the Chamber to stop an energy bill.

I think it is interesting to note that the public polling indicates about two-thirds of the individuals polled nationwide support an energy bill; polling on the contentious issue of ANWR is about 64 to 36 in favor.

So as we address what is behind this shroud of sudden reluctance to pursue an energy bill, one can only deduce that perhaps they did not want to give the President a victory. The President,

as we know, presented an energy package very early, an energy task force report, and it worked to try to get that through.

We have held numerous hearings. We have had hundreds of witnesses. We are about at the altar, so to speak, and suddenly the rug has been pulled out from under the authorizing committee.

Another point that was brought up is that this might be contentious; there might be differences of opinion. That is what the amendment process is all about. We need a vote. We need a vote, an up-down vote on an energy package. We need an up-down vote, in a democratic manner, on the proposed amendments that would be offered.

So I would first encourage the majority leader to reconsider his action and let the committee do its work and report out a bill and schedule it for action on the floor. If he does not, I would ask that he consider giving us the assurance that his bill will go on the calendar prior to adjournment; that we will have time to take up amendments and debate it in its entirety.

Mr. President, I am going to conclude my remarks—and I see another Senator seeking recognition—but I will be directing further remarks later on tying in, if you will, how terrorism is funded, and the realization that written statements from bin Laden, who we all agree is the perpetrator, to a large degree, behind much of the terrorism, are directly related to his appeal to many of the Muslims relative to the issue of our increased dependence on Mideast oil and his belief that the United States owes Muslims \$36 trillion as a payback for “the biggest theft in history,” and that is the purchase of cheap oil from the Persian Gulf.

Bin Laden claims that the United States has carried out “the biggest theft in history” by buying oil from Persian Gulf countries at low prices. According to bin Laden, a barrel of oil today should sell for \$144. And based on that calculation, he said the Americans have stolen \$36 trillion from Muslims; and they owe each member of the Muslim faith \$30,000.

There might be some motivation there, but there is certainly a communication of consideration.

I yield the floor and thank my colleague who is seeking recognition, the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business and that my time will count against cloture.

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

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, as it turns out, I am pleased to be speaking immediately after the Senator from Alaska and thank him for the sentiments he shared with all of us. It is not the first time we have heard these sentiments, but it is a message he has delivered consistently.

I have been in this body less than a year, as a new Member of the Senate. I came to the Senate as an old Governor, as did the Presiding Officer. And we, as Governors, tend to be more anxious to get things done. We are not so much interested in rhetoric, not so much interested in symbolism; we want results. We are not interested in process. We want product.

Before I ever got into politics, before I moved to Delaware, I was a naval flight officer. I finished up my tour of duty in 1973. I moved to Delaware to go to the University of Delaware Business School on the GI bill.

One of my first memories being in Delaware, 28 years ago, literally this month, was sitting in line to buy gasoline for my car because we were in the midst of an energy crisis—embargo—at the time and it was tough to buy gasoline.

I thought, 28 years ago, we needed an energy policy for our country. Twenty-eight years later, we still need an energy policy for our country. We did not have one then; and we do not have one now.

We have learned a number of difficult lessons coming out of the tragic events of September 11, but, for me, one of them is that, more than ever, we need a comprehensive energy policy that will reduce our reliance on foreign oil, that will enable us to provide more energy from within our own country—some of it from corn that is grown in Indiana, some of it from soybeans that are raised in Delaware, some of it from wind, and even some that is harvested from the Sun. We should seek energy from a variety of sources, as well as from the over 500 years of coal beneath the ground of this country, and from nuclear powerplants that provide roughly 20 percent of the electricity in this country.

And in addition to producing new energy sources, we need to conserve energy. There is so much we can do to conserve energy, and not just with moving from internal combustion engines in our cars, trucks, and vans to hybrid-powered vehicles, to eventually, this decade, fuel cells. We can literally go out today and buy, off the shelf, air-conditioners that use half the electricity that most of the air-conditioners in our homes use. The same is true for the furnaces that will warm our homes this winter.

The question before us now is, How do we proceed to an energy bill? How do we take it up? I have been urging my leadership, for months now, to take up an energy bill. My guess is, before I finish, my leader will regret having ever put me on the Energy Committee, but I want us to debate and report to this body, and to debate in this Chamber, an energy bill. I want to have a chance to do it this month. I want us to have a chance to vote up or down on Senator MURKOWSKI’s proposal of opening up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I want us to have a chance to vote on a whole host of other issues.

But I want us to debate them, and vote on them, and move on. I do not want the debate to be, in what form do we bring the bill to the floor? Do we go through the Energy Committee? Do we then go through the Finance Committee, and then the Environment and Commerce Committees because they have jurisdiction over different parts of the bill.

I want to get the bill to the floor. And as we do, I want to make sure that the Senator from Alaska, the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Indiana, and others, have every opportunity to amend that bill in ways that are germane to the legislation that is before us. Debate them, vote them up or down, and move on.

As it turns out, there is probably a lot more on this front that we agree on than we disagree on. One of the ways to find that out for sure is to have the debate.

I pledge to my colleague from Alaska and my colleague from Indiana to do my dead-level best within the Democratic caucus, within the Energy Committee itself, and with my own leadership to make sure we have the opportunity to have fair and open debate on the amendments and a policy that we can then work out with the House and send something to the President to sign.

We may actually have a chance of coming closer to producing a comprehensive energy policy by taking the approach Senator DASCHLE has now suggested. We may actually have a better chance of getting to the debate and the adoption of an energy bill than we would have had if we had gone to regular order. I was not so sure of that 24 hours ago, but having thought it through, I think we may enhance the chances for those of us who want a comprehensive energy policy.

I ask all of my colleagues to work across the aisle, within the committees of jurisdiction, and in the Chamber, and have a good debate this month or next month and be ready to cast the tough votes and to move on.

I yield the floor and 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. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for 5 minutes.

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

#### ANWR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I call attention to some of the comments made in this Chamber earlier today relative to the issue of taking up a national energy security bill before this