

sure, if I know him, he is going to be talking about energy policy. There is not a chance we can do any energy legislation until we finish our appropriations bills. Senator DASCHLE has said he will at the earliest possible time move to energy, but we cannot do that until we finish our appropriations work. We have conferences we have to complete. We have bills we have to pass.

We have some complicated bills. We have the Defense appropriations bill, Labor-HHS. When they come to the floor, we cannot finish those in an hour. These are very difficult bills involving billions and billions of dollars. All we are saying to those who are holding this legislation up because of judges: Let us do our work.

We have matched circuit judges who were approved during the first Clinton administration. We can prove anything with statistics. They can prove anything with statistics; we can prove anything with statistics.

All I am saying is, as a matter of common sense, let us move forward on appropriations bills. There is a time and a place for everything. I do not think this is the time to hold up legislation because we are not moving enough judges. We are moving judges. As I said before, we are moving all the judges we can clear. We could have held those back, but we are not doing that. We are moving forward. This is not the time to horse trade on judges. This is the time to keep our Government open and running, not on a week-to-week basis, but get it done for the next year.

The public deserves to see stability and responsiveness from its elected leaders. Passing appropriations bills in an orderly manner sends just that message.

I hope we can move forward with other appropriations bills. We could finish foreign operations maybe tonight or tomorrow. Certainly we should move forward. We have to do an agricultural appropriations bill. We have many people coming from the heartland of this country who are extremely desperate to get a new agricultural bill. We cannot do that until we finish the appropriations bills.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield to my friend from North Dakota for a question.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada talks about the importance of moving the appropriations bills. I observe the deadline for the appropriations bills was October 1. The deadline was October 1, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking member have done everything humanly possible to try to move these bills, and yet we discover we cannot even get past the motion to proceed on an appropriations bill, which is just unthinkable to me.

Is it not the case we had to break a filibuster on the motion to proceed not

just on appropriations bills but even on the aviation security bill and the bill before that?

This is not a time to be having filibusters on motions to proceed. Will the Senator from Nevada agree with that?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent to have time to answer my friend's question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time?

Mr. REID. Two minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. REID. I also express my appreciation to my friend from Alaska for allowing me to proceed.

I say to my friend from North Dakota, the distinguished Senator, this is not the time to play legislative games. Yes, it is true that to move forward on airport security we had to break a filibuster. Hard to believe, but that is true.

I stated, before the Senator arrived, that I believe the majority has set an example of bipartisanship. Senator DASCHLE has gone out of his way to work with the President of the United States. They have developed a very fine relationship. They talk several times a day on this country's business. I think the very least we could do is move forward on the appropriations bills.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one additional question?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DORGAN. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, let me say there is no more bipartisan committee in the Congress than the Senate Appropriations Committee. These are Republicans and Democrats working together in a very significant way. It is completely bipartisan in its culture, and I am proud to be a part of that.

I am proud to be on the Appropriations Committee. It is just disappointing that the appropriations bills Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS have helped us fashion can now not be brought to the floor because of people blocking the motion to proceed. That does not serve the Senate's interests, and it does not serve the country's interests. My hope is those who are blocking this will decide that they should step aside and allow us to do the Appropriations Committee's work. It is very important we do that. It is important for us, and it is certainly important for the country.

I appreciate the Senator from Nevada yielding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

FIELD TESTS CONFIRM PRESENCE OF ANTHRAX

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I will use some of my leader time. I think this is an appropriate time to inform

my colleagues about the events of the day, and I want to take just a couple of minutes to do so at this time.

At about 10:15 this morning, a member of my staff opened an envelope. It became clear from the very beginning that the envelope contained a suspicious substance. My office notified the Capitol Police and the Capitol physician, who responded almost instantaneously. The tests were taken immediately. They call them field tests. Two field tests were taken on the scene. Both tests confirmed the substance was anthrax. I say "confirmed" advisedly because a far more sophisticated test is underway. We will not have that information available for approximately 24 hours.

Based upon the preliminary tests, members of my staff most directly involved were tested and given an antibiotic. The office was quarantined, and all mail from our office was returned. I immediately contacted the other leaders to inform them of the incident.

The President happened to be calling at that point, and I informed him as well. I say the antibiotic is so effective it is 100-percent successful in killing the bacteria once that bacteria has been released. So we are supremely confident of our ability to deal with circumstances such as this.

I must compliment the Sergeant at Arms, the Capitol Police, and our Capitol physician for their extraordinary response, organizationally and medically. I am very grateful to all of those who have been involved so far.

The office has been quarantined and will not be open for several days as the office cleanup takes place. We have asked that all offices return all mail, and that is being done this afternoon. We will have meetings in our caucuses tomorrow wherein we will hear from the Sergeant at Arms, the Capitol Police, the Capitol physician, and others who will brief us about the specific ramifications of incidents such as this.

I will say, however—it is very important to me, and I have talked to Senator LOTT and to many of my colleagues—this Senate and this institution will not stop. We will not cease our business. We will continue to work.

I am confident we can put in place practices that will minimize the exposure to any danger our staff may have to endure. I am especially confident about our ability to respond as we have today.

So our work will continue. We will be in session tomorrow. I hope all offices will conduct their business as we would expect them to conduct it, with the exception of my office, until the inspection and the investigation and the cleanup can take place.

I also want to express my heartfelt sympathy to my staff for what they have had to endure. I have been in contact with many of the families of my staff throughout the day, and while this has been an extraordinary experience for each of them, I am proud of the way they have handled themselves.

I am proud of the attitude they bring even now to their work and to their mission, and I am especially proud of the fact that under these circumstances they have been so responsive, courageous, and upbeat.

I simply want to encourage all colleagues to continue to conduct their work with the knowledge that we are taking every step and we will take additional steps as we become more aware of what can be done in a preventive way to deal with these circumstances in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

In regard to the comments by the majority leader, when I left my office we had found a very strange envelope, which appeared with no postage, that was apparently left in the office with no identification. We contacted the Capitol Police and were advised there would be someone on the scene very soon.

When I left the office, the police were in the office. They were waiting for the specialist to come over to identify the particular envelope. We were advised at that time we were No. 12 on the list of official notices that had been given to the Capitol Police relative to strange, unidentified postal packages or letters that have come in.

I wish to emphasize we have no indication of what was in this particular article. It was not mailed. It did not have stamps. Nevertheless, I think it represents the precautions that are necessary to be taken.

Again, I do not want to alarm anyone, but I commend the Capitol Police for the manner in which they came on the scene with instructions. I think all offices received instructions today on how to handle mail.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 15 minutes.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I listened very carefully to the comments from the majority whip relative to the next business at hand, the foreign operations appropriations bill and the issue of holding that up because of judges. It is my understanding that there are 52 judges in committee. Currently, 8 have been passed out of committee. It seems the committees could work more expeditiously to get the judges out of committee so we can address them. I understand 12½ percent of all Federal judicial positions are open at this time. As I indicated, there are 52 pending nominations with only 8 confirmations.

The reality is the committees have a lot of work to do. I encourage, as a consequence of that, they be expeditious

so we can get on with the business at hand.

HOMELAND ENERGY SECURITY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I will be speaking each day this week on the issue of homeland energy security. I have come before the Senate on many occasions to discuss our needs for national energy in this country, some form of a national energy policy. I think my colleagues' focus for the most part is on the issue of opening and exploring that small sliver of the 19 million acres known as ANWR, an area the size of the State of South Carolina. This is a sliver because it represents roughly 1.5 million acres open for exploration that only Congress can allow, and the realization in the House-passed bill that there was only an authorization of 2000 acres, not much bigger than a small farm. This is the issue of opening up ANWR in my State of Alaska.

Last spring, for example, Senator BREAU and I proposed a comprehensive bipartisan energy policy with some 300 pages. All that most people focused on was the two pages remitted to opening ANWR. I am a man of few words. It is fair to say some of the radical environmental groups have used ANWR as a cash cow in that they have milked it for all it is worth from the standpoint of membership and dollars. It is a great issue because it is far away—the American people cannot see for themselves and understand and appreciate the dimension, size, and magnitude nor the response we had in producing Prudhoe Bay, which could be transferred to the ANWR area.

ANWR will be opened. The radical environmental groups will move on to another issue in the course of future action. Nevertheless, this discussion is not just about ANWR. I am not in favor of opening ANWR simply because it is the right thing to do for my State or it is the right thing to do for the Nation. My concern with our increasing dependence on unstable sources of energy is not a smokescreen for narrow political gain. I am in fear of opening ANWR simply as an integral part of our overall energy strategy, a policy balance between production and conservation.

I was pleased to note the President's remarks a few days ago when he commented: There are two other aspects of a good, strong, economic stimulus package, one of which is trade promotion authority, and the other is an energy bill. Now there was a good energy bill passed out of the House of Representatives, and the reason it passed is because Members of both parties understood an energy bill was not only good for jobs or stimulus, it is important for our national security to have a good energy policy.

I urge the Senate to listen to the will of the Senators and move a bill that will help Americans find work and also make it easier for all of us around this

table to protect the security of the country. The less dependent we are on foreign sources of crude oil, the more secure we are at home. We have spent a lot of time talking about homeland security. An integral piece of homeland security is energy independence, and I will ask the Senate to respond to the call to get an energy bill moving.

The facts speak for themselves. In 1973, we were 37 percent dependent on foreign oil and the Arab oil embargo brought us to our knees. How quickly we forget about gas lines around the block. In 1991, we fought a war with Iraq largely over oil. We spent billions and billions of dollars to keep Saddam Hussein in check largely in order to keep a stable source of supply coming from the Persian Gulf.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from October 11 in the Washington Post by Robert Samuelson.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 11, 2001]

NOW DO WE GET SERIOUS ON OIL?

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

If politics is the art of the possible, then things ought to be possible now that weren't before Sept. 11. Or perhaps not. For three decades, Americans have only haphazardly tried to fortify themselves against a catastrophic cutoff of oil from the Middle East, which accounts for about a third of world production and two-thirds of known reserves. Little seems to have changed in the past month, although the terrorism highlighted our vulnerability. Oil is barely part of the discussion.

Over the past 30 years, we have suffered Middle East supply disruptions caused by the Yom Kippur War of 1973, the fall of the shah of Iran in 1979 and Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990. We have fought one war for access to oil—the Persian Gulf War. How many times do we have to be hit before we pay attention? No one can foresee what might lead to a huge supply shutdown or whether the present attack on Afghanistan might trigger disastrous changes. A collapse of the Saudi regime? A change in its policy? Massive sabotage of pipelines? Another Arab-Israeli war? Take your pick.

Even if we avoid trouble now, the threat will remain. In 2000 the United States imported 53 percent of its oil; almost a quarter of that came from the Persian Gulf. Weaning ourselves from Middle Eastern oil would still leave us vulnerable, because much of the rest of the industrial world—Europe, Japan, Asia—needs it. Without it, the world economy would collapse. Of course, countries that have oil can't benefit from it unless they sell it. The trouble is they can sell it on their terms, which might include a large measure of political or economic blackmail.

They, too, run a risk. Oil extortion might provoke a massive military response. It is precisely because the hazards are so acute and unpredictable for both sides that Persian Gulf suppliers have recently tried to separate politics from oil decisions. (Indeed, prices have dropped since the terrorist attacks.) But in the Middle East, logic is no defense against instability. We need to make it harder for them to use the oil weapon and take steps to protect ourselves if it is used.

The outlines of a program are clear:

Raise CAFE ("corporate average fuel economy") standards. America's cars and light