

In the case of energy, in the case of cloning, if we don't do it now, we won't be able to do anything until February or March, and this issue will march forward with uncertainty and concern. Senator BROWBACK has been advancing the need for us to take some action to have the moratorium. The House acted months ago, overwhelmingly, in a bipartisan manner. We will have the opportunity to do the same here.

I urge my colleagues to take time tonight and tomorrow and Monday. Let's talk about these two issues. We should not invoke cloture on this amendment. We should have a vote. We should not stop the debate. We should have a vote on the substance itself, and then we could move to the underlying bill and could get it done.

Instead of taking shots at each other, we could actually address three big issues in one swoop. That is why I offered the amendment. It is also to serve notice that if we keep going off track on what we need to do to get out of here, other issues will be brought up.

This is the Senate. Wonderful place that it is, no one person and no one party dictates what we can do. Marvelously, any Senator can offer any amendment on any subject he or she wishes at any time. Lots of times it takes 60 votes, but that is the way it works. Therefore, we will have an opportunity now to have a full debate on energy and on cloning as well as railroad retirement.

I thank the Chair and my colleagues for the opportunity to briefly describe what we are doing. I am sure Senator MURKOWSKI and members of the Energy Committee will be here to describe what is in this energy package. Senator BROWBACK is waiting to describe the details of his moratorium.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have spoken to the minority leader, and I now ask unanimous consent that we go into a period of morning business. We want to be as lenient as we can. I know the Senator from Alaska wants to speak for an extended period of time. Others also want to speak. Therefore, we will have the 10-minute limitation, with the understanding that people can ask unanimous consent to speak for any period of time they want.

Again, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period of morning busi-

ness with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes, and we divide the time, even though it appears that maybe there won't be the need to do that. I ask unanimous consent that we—

Ms. LANDRIEU. Reserving the right to object, would this be OK with the leader? I ask if I may have my 10 minutes starting now if it would be OK with the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. REID. If I may reclaim my time, I think we would be better off not having a 10-minute limitation. I ask unanimous consent that we now go into a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, as Senator LANDRIEU indicated that her children were getting hungry, I suggest the Chair recognize her first.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the request is that we go into a period for morning business with a 10-minute limitation—I will state it again. It is that we go into a period of morning business, that Senator LANDRIEU be recognized for 10 minutes to begin with, and Senators thereafter be limited to 10 minutes, with the understanding that there will be a number of Senators asking for more time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, in order to accommodate Senators, let's be more realistic and make it 15 minutes.

Mr. REID. I have no problem with that.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 3090

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader may turn to the consideration of H.R. 3090 with the consent of the Republican leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

ENERGY SECURITY

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I know the Senator from Kansas is on the floor to speak on several important issues, and the Senator from Alaska will be addressing the Senate later this evening on the important issue of energy security for our Nation. I agree with so many of the points of the Senator from Alaska, as well as the Senator from Mississippi, who has been taking with us this evening on that subject.

I want to talk about a subject that is actually somewhat related. The subject I want to spend a few minutes on tonight is most certainly related to the issue of energy security for our Nation. It is related to the situation that we find ourselves in, combating this new war against terrorism in many dif-

ferent ways and in ways very different than our past conflicts would have us be engaged. Let me just try to bring this into focus.

We have troops in Afghanistan and, luckily and thankfully, and because we have the best equipped, best led, and bravest and most courageous fighting force in the world, we are making extraordinary progress on our front in Afghanistan. You can see the headlines in all of the newspapers that would attest to the great effort that is being made. But we all know, and we are all learning quickly, that this war on terrorism is something we are going to have to fight on many different fronts. One of those fronts is in our own homeland.

We hated to see what happened on September 11, and we were all heart broken and angry and justifiably angry at the devastation and the horrific attack on our Nation.

As I was saying, we now have to fight this war on many different fronts, not just the front in Afghanistan but the front here at home. We were all terribly horrified and righteously angry. We have to turn that righteous anger into concrete steps to protect ourselves in the future. Many of us in our various capacities and many different committees are about doing that. We are stepping up airport security. We are trying to step up the security of our cyberinfrastructure in the Nation. We are looking at ways to set up medical response teams on health care, our public health system. And all of these efforts, if we do them correctly and come up with good policies and funding streams, will most certainly help to protect our Nation against these attacks that, unfortunately, are going to certainly come. Even if we are successful—and we have been—in cornering bin Laden and taking down the Taliban regime and capturing or destroying that particular cell, it is likely, based on everything that we know—not to alarm people or frighten people, but we know that it is likely that there will be future attacks.

The point of my short presentation today is to simply say that we are not sure where these attacks will be aimed. We never imagined that a group of people, with three of our own airplanes filled with fuel, would take down some of the most important buildings in this Nation. So we have to think: What might the next attack be? What could possibly come at us?

There are so many things that could happen that we have to be smart and strategic about how we spend our resources.

One of the issues that I am going to argue for a few minutes on the floor today is some of the critical infrastructure in our Nation—some of it is rail, some transportation issues, such as highways and tunnels, some of it is critical infrastructure protecting our nuclear powerplants, our electric grid, our cyberinfrastructure that we now rely on to run so much of our communications, transportation, health care

systems, et cetera. We can't do all of it at once, but we can most certainly begin taking some steps.

I think we need to identify where we can—whether we do it in the supplemental bill or in the energy bill, or whether we do it in the stimulus package—some projects that are worth giving some attention to in the event that there would be some effort to cut our resources. One of those resources is energy.

Let me be very clear. In Louisiana, there are many critical highways, as there are in many States. There is a highway that is of critical importance not just to our State but to the whole Nation. It doesn't look like much because it is a small highway. Right now, it is a two-lane highway. I will show you a picture of it in a moment. It is Louisiana 1. I think it is called LA-1. It is rightfully named because it is the one highway in Louisiana, and perhaps in the Nation, that we rely on so heavily for our oil and gas production in this Nation.

Oil and gas production takes place, as you know, primarily off the southern shore of our Nation, off the coast of Texas and Mississippi and Louisiana and Alabama, primarily.

We get 18 percent of our imported oil off of the loop facility, which is right off the coast of Louisiana and down this highway, which I am going to show a picture of in a minute. One can see clearly from this picture there are a thousand trucks a day on this highway on a regular day. This is not a fancy highway. It is a small highway. It runs from Port Fourchon all the way up to the 90 loop. There are a thousand trucks a day that bring pipes, supplies, men, women, equipment, and engineering services to produce oil and gas in the Gulf of Mexico that help this Nation to be secure every day.

So when people walk into this Chamber or they walk into their building at Cisco or IBM or eBay or whether they walk into Shaw Enterprises or any number of the shipbuilders in Louisiana and they turn the lights on, lights come on. When they fire up those plants, that energy runs. This energy comes, in large measure, off the coasts of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas. This highway is the highway that is the bridge to Port Fourchon, where these trucks and this equipment are located.

Even in a slight rain this highway goes under water. Imagine if there was any kind of purposeful attack on the infrastructure with some minor effort. This highway in the shape that it is in and the condition that it is in could cause a major disruption in energy flows to the United States.

The Gulf of Mexico has 20,000 miles of the most extensive network of offshore oil and gas pipelines in the world. There is only 2,000 miles from the east coast to the west coast, approximately, as the crow flies, in the Nation. Ten times the amount of the length of our country are the miles of pipeline that

come out of Louisiana to bring oil and gas to the rest of the Nation.

This highway is the only way one could basically get to the point where this oil and gas comes off of our shore. The loop facility is the only offshore oil terminal in the country. There are not three. There are not four. There is one. It is the loop facility, and it is just a few miles off the shore of Louisiana. The only way to get to the loop facility, other than helicopter or ship, is to come down this highway to Port Fourchon, at the end of Louisiana, and to get to the loop facility, where 18 percent of our imported oil comes into the Nation. It comes up through the pipes and again all the supplies for the coast come through this highway.

It is time that this highway be designated as a special highway for the Nation, a high priority corridor for this Nation. There are such designations in the Transportation bill for many of our highways, and I am sure every Senator could stand up and claim there are at least one or two highways in their States that are particularly important, whether it be for trade or for commerce. We could say that, too, about all of our highways, particularly for I-10, that is connecting Houston in the southern part of the State; I-49 that is now going to be a trade route hopefully to Canada and down through Louisiana; I-20 that connects our State, of course, east and west to other parts of the United States. But clearly LA-1, which is primarily responsible to help this Nation keep its oil and gas supply not only operating but in a vigorous, robust manner to supply the rest of the Nation, deserves to have a special designation.

I am requesting by the amendment I am offering to the Transportation bill to get Louisiana-1 designated as a high-impact corridor so we can be in line for appropriations to change this from a two-lane highway to a four-lane highway to give it some of the protections a highway of this magnitude deserves.

Let me show what happens when there is a turnover of an 18-wheeler, one of the thousands that are in this lane. The traffic is backed up for hours. There is no way around it. The services to the rigs out in the gulf are basically shut down for all practical purposes. If one cannot get to the port, they cannot basically get service to the rigs or the supplies or the pipes that are needed.

I hesitate to actually give this speech. Frankly, I hope no terrorist is watching because it would be so easy in some ways to disrupt the supply of the oil to this Nation, but one thing September 11 has to teach us is putting some of our resources into building up the critical infrastructure in this Nation so we are not so vulnerable. I wanted to give this speech because I would feel terrible if something happened and people said: Well, Mary, you did not tell anybody about this highway and, after all, it is not a major interstate and we did not know about it.

So I want to give my colleagues fair warning there is a little highway in Louisiana. It only has two lanes, but it has a thousand trucks a day that are bringing supplies and equipment to the offshore of this Nation that helps turn on lights in every schoolhouse and hospital and office building and run factories from Louisiana to Illinois and from Maine to California. If we cannot find a few million dollars in these trillions of dollars of budget to help us improve this highway so we can withstand a natural occurrence of a hurricane or a man-made attack that we would be better equipped to handle than what we have now, then I do not want to be held responsible for not bringing this into the light.

I have been in this Chamber many times talking about all the critical infrastructure around our Nation. I have several bills and amendments to try to direct some of our resources to fund those projects, but this one comes to mind as one of the most important we should address. I urge my colleagues to look carefully at our needs for LA-1 to help us to direct through any of the bills that are moving forward. I am prepared to stay in this Chamber and to come back many times until we can get some relief to get some funding for Highway 1. I should also mention I-49 and I-10 which handle the bulk of our domestic production.

Production in the United States of America is basically limited to this area of the country. There is virtually no production off the eastern shore, as the Senator from Alaska will say in his speech later tonight. There is virtually no production going off of the eastern shore. All of the offshore oil and gas production is coming off of this part of the gulf.

So the infrastructure, for the Port of New Orleans, for the Port of Mobile, for the Port of Galveston, for the I-10 corridor that links basically Houston and New Orleans into Florida, is critical for the development and the spreading of the gas and the oil that comes off of the gulf to the different parts of the Nation.

Finally, we are not complaining about producing the oil and gas. We recognize it brings jobs and wealth to our State. While others do not want production, we want production that is environmentally responsible. We are happy with the jobs and the wealth that it creates. I need to say, though, we are not creating the wealth and the jobs and the energy for our State. We are creating it for the entire Nation. So it is only right, it is only fitting, that some of the taxes that are paid by the oil companies from this exact production would come back to help us reinvest in Highway 1, in I-49, in I-10, in I-69, because it is those roads that support the oil and gas drilling.

I thank my colleague from Alaska for yielding to me. He knows this subject in many ways even better than I know the subject. He has been in the Senate longer than I have, but it is so obvious

to some of us that we have to dedicate some resources to protecting the critical infrastructure of this Nation. This is at least one highway that deserves to be No. 1, as its title would suggest. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I wish to enter a short colloquy with my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana, and ask her if the anticipated opening of ANWR would not require construction of 19 double hull tankers, some of which would be constructed in her State, from Mississippi or Alabama, costing about \$4 billion? I think we have several of those ships underway now, creating 5,000 jobs each for 17 years. These are figures that have been released to me by the American Petroleum Institute, estimating that 19 new double hull tankers of a millennium class will be needed if ANWR is open. The assumption is that ANWR will produce 10.3 billion barrels of oil. That is about what has come out of Prudhoe Bay, for a 60-year production life, and the new tankers would be needed because the old North Slope tankers are being phased out in their entirety by the year 2015. That is when the double hull requirements come into effect.

There would be more jobs created because the Jones Act requires that the American oil be transported in U.S.-flagged vessels, built in U.S. shipyards, with U.S. crew, transported within the United States, which is from Alaska and the west coast, which he agreed, according to API's analysis, assuming ANWR passes, it will include any ban on ANWR oil being exported outside the United States. It also assumes that ANWR oil will be transported by tankers to refineries primarily in Washington, California, and Hawaii.

I would like the Senator's confirmation on the estimate it would pump almost \$4 billion into the economy, create 2000 construction jobs in the U.S. shipbuilding industry, some perhaps in the State of Washington, and approximately 3,000 other jobs. They predict this will compute to approximately 90,000 job years by estimating it will take approximately 17 years to build all the 19 ships at almost 5,000 jobs each year. The prediction is one ship must be built each year in order to coincide with the schedule of retired existing tankers.

I wish we had the capacity to build the ships in our State of Alaska, but that is not the case and will not be the case. However, Louisiana has been prominent in its shipbuilding and supply of various resources for Alaska's oil development.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator for that inquiry. As he knows, and I completely agree, more production in the continental United States and Alaska is definitely a step we should take to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and to increase job opportunities here in our own country. Particu-

larly at this critical time, not only is it part of our overall energy strategy but now it is part of our security strategy for homeland defense and homeland security to reduce our dependence on oil and gas, liquefied natural gas that may come from other sources.

We are very proud of the shipbuilding we do in Louisiana and the engineering and the construction of the landforms and infrastructure that make it possible to drill in extraordinary conditions, in very deep water, leaving a minimal footprint. In days past, there were terrible environmental consequences to drilling. We simply did not have the know-how or the technology to handle some of the negative environmental impacts. That has changed dramatically over the last few years. While there is risk associated with every human activity, we have minimized the risk to the environment in tremendous ways.

The Senator knows we build some tremendous ships and off- and onshore oil and gas equipment in Louisiana. We agree the production numbers need to get up.

For the record, the Senator from Alaska should know that one-fifth of the entire Nation's energy supply depends on LA-1 and its connection to Port Fourchon. The Department of Interior mineral management identifies Port Fourchon as the focal point of deep water activity in the gulf. There is perhaps a deep water or perhaps a focal point in Alaska. I am not familiar with that focal point, but in Louisiana it is Port Fourchon. Eighty-five percent of the deepwater drilling rigs, working in the gulf, are supported by Port Fourchon. We have a highway that is not worth skating down, let alone with the 1,000 18-wheelers a day trying to supply the Nation with the energy it needs to operate.

I look forward to working with the Senator as we try to improve and increase production. I see the Senator from Hawaii on the floor. He has been an outstanding spokesman of conserving where we can. It will be a combination of strong conservation measures and alternative energy and more production in Alaska and all the States, and in many places in the lower 48.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I have appreciated the good relationship between our two States.

Madam President, this is a fairly significant moment from the standpoint of those interested in passing a comprehensive energy bill. We have that bill, finally, on the floor of the Senate this evening. Procedurally, Senator DASCHLE has offered a substitute amendment. Senator LOTT offered a second-degree that adds the provisions of energy, as well as cloning. At 5 p.m. Monday there will be a vote on cloture on the Lott amendment. The significance of this is clear to those who said we never bring up energy for a vote, are never able to resolve the merits of

whether or not the President's request that we pass a comprehensive energy policy will become a reality.

I rise today to say that that time has come. Today it is a reality. I hope in the coming debate we can separate much of the fiction that has been associated with this issue.

I rise today in support of the amendment to the underlying legislation offered by Senator LOTT. Division A through G of the amendment will provide a balanced and comprehensive energy policy to guide this Nation into the future.

Where does the American public stand? I have the results of a poll recently done by the IPSOS-Reid Corporation, with offices in Washington, New York, Toronto, Minneapolis, Vancouver, San Francisco, Montreal, Ottawa, Winnipeg, and Calgary. It is a public opinion poll on energy issues. It was not done last year; it was done in November.

Let me share, with you the results of this poll. This independent and objective poll, conducted by a highly respected research firm, clearly shows that Americans place a high priority of passing an energy bill. The highlights are enlightening because 95 percent of Americans say Federal action on energy is important. That doesn't surprise me.

Continuing, 72 percent of Americans say passing an energy bill is a higher priority than any other action Congress might take. I hope that message is loud and clear. Again, 72 percent say energy is a higher priority than any other action Congress could take. That includes campaign finance reform, railroad retirement, stimulus.

Continuing, 73 percent of Americans say Congress should make the energy bill part of President Bush's stimulus plan. Surprisingly enough, 67 percent say exploration of new energy sources in the United States, including Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, is a convincing reason to support passing an energy policy bill.

We have a significant portion of America's public saying we should go ahead and pass an energy bill. That is what is before the Senate, H.R. 4. That bill passed the House of Representatives. Clearly, the House has done its job. Now it is up to the Senate to do its job.

We have heard from our President many times, indicating that:

We need the energy, we need the jobs, we need a comprehensive energy bill from the Senate. This plan increases our energy independence and therefore our national security.

The Secretary of Energy:

We need an energy-security policy and we need it soon.

Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Anthony Principi:

We are engaged in mortal combat with an enemy who wants to see us fail in securing an energy policy.

The Secretary of Labor, Elaine Chao:

The President's plan will create literally thousands of new jobs that will be needed to

dramatically expand America's capacity for energy production.

Let's look at those who have gone overseas and fought wars over oil—the American Legion:

The development of America's domestic energy resources is vital to our national security.

That is what they wrote to Senator DASCHLE.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars:

Keeping in mind the horrific event of September 11 and mindful of the threats we are facing, we strongly believe that the development of America's domestic energy resources is a vital national security priority.

That is in a letter to Senator DASCHLE.

The American Veterans Association:

As you know, our current reliance on foreign oil leaves the United States vulnerable to the whim of individual oil-exporting companies, many existing in the unpredictable and highly dangerous Persian Gulf. . . . [We] firmly believe that we cannot wait for the next crisis before we act.

A letter to Senator DASCHLE.

The Vietnam Veterans Institute:

War and international terrorism have again brought into sharp focus the heavy reliance of the U.S. on imported oil. During these times of crises, such reliance threatens our national security and economic well being. . . . It is important that we develop domestic sources of oil.

Another letter to Senator DASCHLE.

The Catholic War Veterans of America participated.

How about organized labor? This issue, our energy security, is expressed first by the Seafarers International Union, from Terry Turner, the executive director:

At a time when the economy is faltering, working men and women all over the country would clearly benefit from the much-needed investment in energy development, storage, and transmission.

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Jerry Hood:

America has gone too long without a solid energy plan. When energy costs rise, working families are the first to feel the pinch. The Senate should follow the example passed by the House and ease their burden by sending the President supply-based energy legislation to sign.

The Maritime Laborers Union participated in numerous press conferences; the Operating Engineers, Plumbers and Pipefitters Union; the Carpenters and Joiners Union.

We have a significant group of America's organized labor in support of this because this is truly a jobs bill, much of which could be done without any cost to the taxpayer.

We are talking about stimulus. Let me just indicate what opening ANWR would do as a stimulus to the economy. It would create about 250,000 jobs. Those are direct jobs. The number of secondary jobs—making pipe, making valves—is anybody's guess. Some have come up with as high as 700,000 jobs associated with developing it.

What is the other stimulus? This is Federal land. As a consequence, the Federal Government would lease the

land under a bidding process. It is estimated to generate about \$3 billion in Federal funding coming into the general fund.

If one considers the number of jobs, the revenue, and the reality that it will not cost the taxpayer one red cent, it is pretty hard to find a better stimulus. If you or anyone else in this body can identify a single more beneficial stimulus than opening ANWR, I would like to know what it is.

The Hispanic community, the Latin American Management Association, has written:

As we head into the winter season in a time of war, these worries multiply. The possibility of terrorist attacks on oil fields or transportation in the Mideast are very real. This would force energy prices to skyrocket and immediately impact the most vulnerable families across the country.

That is by the Latin American Management Association. They fear bin Laden will disrupt, perhaps, the refining or pipelines either in Saudi Arabia or initiate some terrorist action in the Straits of Hormuz, which would cut off our supply.

We have the Latino Coalition:

The Senate must act on comprehensive energy legislation before adjourning. Not addressing this issue immediately is both irresponsible and dangerous to America as a nation and particularly to Hispanics as a community. America must increase the level of domestic production so we can reduce our dependency on foreign oil.

It is signed by Robert Despoda, the president of the Latino Coalition.

The U.S. Mexico Chamber of Commerce:

We urge the Senate leadership, both Democrats and Republicans, to pass comprehensive energy legislation before adjourning. This is not a partisan issue. Millions of needy Hispanic families need your support now. History would not treat inaction kindly, and neither would Hispanic voters next year around.

It is signed by Mario Rodriguez, Hispanic Business Roundtable President.

The seniors organizations have spoken out. The group 60 Plus, which I might add I have joined at some time:

It's time the Senate leadership quit demagoguing and come to grips with the energy legislation they bottled up. Our economy depends in no minor way on the passage of an energy plan. Much more important, our security depends on it.

It is signed by Roger Zion, chairman, 60 Plus.

The Seniors Coalition participated in support—the United Seniors Association.

I ask unanimous consent for another 5 minutes and I am going to yield to some of my colleagues.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The Jewish organizations have come aboard. I ask unanimous consent that their letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONFERENCE OF PRESIDENTS OF
MAJOR AMERICAN JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS,

New York, NY, November 16, 2001

Hon. FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
U.S. Senate, HSOB,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: The conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations at its general meeting on November 14th unanimously supported a resolution calling on Congress to act expeditiously to pass the energy bill that will serve to lessen our dependence on foreign sources of oil. We believe that this important legislation has, in addition, to the economic impact, significant security implications. We hope that Congress will move quickly to pass this vital measure.

We look forward to continuing to work with you and your colleagues on this and other matters of importance to our country.

MORTIMER B. ZUCKERMAN,
Chairman.

MALCOLM HOENLEIN,
Executive Vice Chairman.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, in their conference, at a general meeting of November 14:

. . . unanimously supported a resolution calling on Congress to act expeditiously to pass the energy bill that will serve to lessen our dependence on foreign sources of oil.

That was in a letter to Senator DASCHLE.

The Zionist Organizations of America say in their letter:

At a time when our Nation is at war against international terrorism, it is more important than ever that we work quickly to free ourselves of dependence on oil produced by extremist dictators.

Further, they say on behalf of that organization, which is the oldest and one of the largest Zionist movements in the State:

We are writing to express our strong support for your efforts to make our country less dependent on foreign oil sources by developing the oil resources in Alaska's national wildlife refuge.

So there you have a fair segment of Americans represented through these organizations.

Then we go to American business, the National Black Chamber of Commerce:

Our growing membership reflects the opinion of more and more Americans all across the political spectrum that we must act now to lessen our dependence on foreign energy sources by addressing the nation's long-neglected energy needs.

It is signed by Harry Alford, president and CEO.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce—Bruce Josten, executive vice president, U.S. Chamber:

The events of the last month lend a new urgency to our efforts to increase domestic energy supplies and modernize our nation's energy infrastructure.

And the National Association of Manufacturers:

The House of Representatives has answered the President's call. It has taken our obvious energy needs into account—along with concerns of many interest groups—and produced reasonable and comprehensive legislation that will help provide stable energy prices and long-term confidence in our economy.

But the Senate is dragging its feet. Some seem willing to let politics stop the will of the majority that wants to move forward with comprehensive energy legislation this year. In light of current economic conditions and on behalf of NAM's 14,000 members, I strongly urge Sen. Daschle to move an energy bill to the floor without further delay. It is high time to put the national interest ahead of parochial political interests.

It is signed by Michael Baroody, National Association of Manufacturers.

Last, the Alliance for Energy and Economic Growth.

They indicate, representing 1,100 businesses, large and small, and over 1 million employees:

All of the members of the Alliance enthusiastically welcome the President's strong appeal for action on a national energy policy. We are also committed to work with Senate Majority Leader Daschle to move forward in a spirit of bipartisanship with comprehensive, national energy legislation.

The Alliance spokesman is Bruce Josten.

That completes my comments to some extent. I will not tax the Presiding Officer further at this time. I will take a little break.

But I think it is important that we all listen carefully to these groups. They are sending a message to the Senate to get on with its obligation to move an energy bill. We have that energy bill here in the Chamber. It is the pending business for the first time in several years.

I think it is very important that we look at the political ramifications associated. We have elections coming up. We have a great deal of unknown exposures relative to the instability in the Mideast.

I remind my colleagues that in about 1973 we had the Arab oil embargo, and the gas lines were around the block. The public was blaming everybody. They were outraged and inconvenienced. Just one terrorist act could bring that situation back.

Some say it will take time. In 1995, this body passed a bill. It included ANWR. The President vetoed it. Had he not vetoed it, we would very possibly have oil flowing from ANWR today and oil coming down in new U.S. ships. But that was the loss of yesterday which is reflected in the vulnerability of our country today.

I urge my colleagues to think seriously before voting Monday about what you are voting for. Are you voting to be responsive to America's somewhat extreme environmental community that has used their ANWR issue as a cash cow to generate revenue and funding for their organizations? When this passes, they will move on to something else. You might say I am perhaps being overly critical. I have seen their actions. I know what this issue means to them. It gives them a cause.

Members are going to have to determine whether it will be a responsive vote for the environmental groups that oppose this effort or a responsive vote to do what is right for America at a time when we are not only at war but

we are having a recession in this country.

Indeed, this energy bill would be a significant economic stimulus and would dramatically help remove our dependence on imported oil—particularly at a time when we are contemplating moves in the Mideast, and our dependence on Saddam Hussein's oil is over a million barrels a day. Yet at the same time we are enforcing a no-fly zone. In enforcing that no-fly zone, we are probably using his oil in our aircraft to take out his targets, and he is using our money to pay his Republican Guards and to develop weapons capability. We already lost two U.S. seamen the other day when that tanker sunk.

My time has expired. I defer to the next Senator seeking recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I rise to speak in favor of the pending business, which is the amendment put forward by Senator LOTT containing the energy bill of Senator MURKOWSKI and a number of other Members in a bipartisan fashion.

It also contains a 6-month moratorium on the issue of human cloning. That is the pending business. We are in morning business. I want to speak to that particular issue, the pending business itself.

I think the Senator from Alaska has adequately and very well described the need for an energy bill and what is in that energy package. He has been very aggressive in expressing the need to do that. I wholeheartedly agree with what he is saying. We need an energy bill. We need an energy package, and we need less energy dependence.

If we move soon to address the issue of mass destruction in Iraq, we are going to be in far worse shape if Iraq starts cutting down their oil and not making it available to the United States. If some other countries follow suit, then that means we are going to feel a great pinch. Even though we are doing the right things to address the weapons of mass destruction, we are going to feel a real pinch if they cut down on oil supplies when we have such an international dependence on oil from the Middle East in particular.

I think what the Senator is putting forward for reducing our energy dependence abroad—particularly from the Persian Gulf—and having our energy sources here is a valuable thing, a necessary thing, and something we need to do today. We need to get it addressed today. I applaud the Senator from Alaska. That is why I am a co-sponsor of the amendment which is the pending business on the floor.

CLONING

The issue I wish to address specifically is another issue of great concern and immediacy. It needs to be addressed. I think the world was shocked when they read the papers Sunday about the first human clone. It is something that was theoretical and something that was talked about. It

was something in the movies. Now there is a "Star Wars" movie coming out this year called "The Clone Wars." It has been something everybody has been discussing.

I think people were shocked when they read this headline about the first human clone. It isn't something that happened in Europe or South Africa. It was in the United States of America.

People were looking at this and saying: I thought this was in a theoretical mode. I didn't realize we were actually at a point of cloning humans.

The House of Representatives passed a bill to address this issue, saying we should not be cloning humans. The President addressed this issue and said: Send me a bill to ban human cloning; I don't think this is something we should be doing.

The Senate is the only body of the three that has not addressed the issue yet.

In the underlying amendment today on the issue of cloning is a 6-month moratorium. It is not a complete ban. It is a 6-month moratorium on all cloning to say time out. Let's hold up just a little bit while we start catching up philosophically and thoughtfully in this body on what is taking place on human cloning in the United States of America today—not tomorrow, not next month—that we need to address this before we get more stories such as this or we start seeing the face of a child appearing before this body takes its position on addressing the issue of human cloning. Presently, this country has not addressed it.

You can clone in this country, if you choose to do so, even though I have a list of other countries that have acted on this issue. Twenty-eight other countries or bodies such as the European Parliament have already acted on the issue of human cloning. We have not. The Senate has not yet acted on this. Twenty-eight other mostly developed countries have already acted on this issue in some way or another.

What does the public say about it? I want to read from today's Roll Call magazine on page 10 about the issue of cloning. There was a poll of the American public. This is in today's Roll Call magazine, November 29. It says:

The majority of Americans clearly remain opposed to cloning, with 87 percent telling ABC News interviewers in early August that cloning humans should be illegal. Respondents were told the following about therapeutic cloning:

There is a debate going on about that. I am opposed to reproductive cloning. Some people are saying they want to try to do therapeutic cloning, which I think is a misnomer of the highest order. Therapeutic cloning is where you create a human clone. You grow it for a period to two weeks. You kill it. It is certainly not therapeutic to clone. You harvest the cells out of that for some supposed research or other benefit for another individual. That is so-called therapeutic cloning. I call it destructive cloning. Some call it therapeutic.

Let's see what the respondents said. This is how the question was put forth:

Some scientists want to use human cloning for medical treatments. They would produce a fertilized egg, or human embryo, that's an exact genetic copy of a person, and then take cells from this embryo to provide medical treatments for that person. Supporters say this could lead to medical breakthroughs. Opponents say it could lead to the creation of a cloned person because someone could take an embryo that was cloned for medical treatments and use it to produce a child.

That was the question. That is the way it was phrased on therapeutic cloning. It might produce medical breakthroughs but also a reproductive clone.

How did the people respond to the question?

Sixty-three percent said therapeutic cloning should be illegal and 33 percent held the opposing view.

Even framed on just the issue of therapeutic cloning, 63 percent say: No, I don't want to do that. I don't want us to go there. Yet we continued to dawdle in this body. We did not take up the issue. We would not hear it or bring it up on the floor until now. It is the pending business with a 6-month moratorium. It is not a complete ban. It is a complete ban for the 6 months. But after that, this would sunset.

I think this is a very prudent move that this body should take in addressing this highly controversial, highly problematic and monumental bioethical issue. Our Nation is currently wrestling with monumental bioethical issues. As I mentioned, the House of Representatives has dealt with this issue. They have passed a ban on human cloning with a 100-vote margin. The President keeps calling for it. This body has not acted.

On these bioethical issues, many of which I have raised on the floor previously—and I am going to keep raising in the future—we need to debate all these issues, but we need to act now to have a moratorium on human cloning so the Senate can properly debate the issue and hopefully resolve it in the coming 2 or 3 months. That is what we are asking for in the underlying amendment.

I would like to take this opportunity to address some of the profound moral issues that this Nation is going to need to wrestle with and the Senate is going to need to wrestle with for us to deal with the issue of human cloning.

Human cloning demands the public's attention, in part, because it implicitly revolves around the meaning of human dignity, around the meaning of human life, and the inalienable rights that belong to every person. Should a clone belong to someone or should a clone not belong to someone? I think we ought to resolve that issue before it starts being forced upon us by private companies creating clones.

Some will argue that the issue simply needs to be studied before any research begins, a notion which does not respect the rights of the clone. Some people say: Let's just create a group of

clones out there, and let's see and let's research and let it evolve.

Shouldn't we fundamentally deal with the issue first about what is a clone? Is it the property of somebody who created it? Is it a person? It is genetically identical to the person from whom it was created. It is physically identical. Is this a person or is this a piece of property?

We should be debating that ahead of them being out there in the public. Should we allow people to create clones of themselves for spare body parts? That would be down the road a longways, but people are thinking about those sorts of things now. We now have the creation of the first human clone.

I think clearly we should err on the side of caution at this point in time. We should call a timeout. We should have a 6-month moratorium so we can all sit down and think about this.

This is not going to kill the research into helpful areas of research. Some people looking at this are saying: OK. They are confusing it with embryonic stem cell research, which I personally have a deep problem with because you are destroying an embryo to create that research. But this moratorium does not apply to embryonic stem cell research. That is going on. There is even Federal funding for some embryonic stem cell research, as the President outlined in an August speech with the NIH, much with which I continue to disagree.

I think we ought to focus on the adult stem cell. Be that as it may, the embryonic stem cell work is going on and would not be affected by this moratorium.

What this moratorium goes at is saying: Do not create human clones for any purposes. Do not create that. After a period of 6 months it expires.

So for those purposes, I think this is an entirely appropriate issue for us to push the pause button. The alternative of this is for us to do nothing. But if we do nothing, if we do not put a pause on this, you are going to see a lot more headlines such as the one shown on this magazine. You are going to see a lot more human clones or you are going to hear about them being implanted in women once they get to the point where the technology is such that that can take place. You are going to see all that taking place and this body will not have even spoken. We will not have said, yes, we agree or we disagree. The President has spoken and the House has spoken, but we will not have even said, OK, we agree we should or we disagree. We will not have done anything.

That is why I plead with the sponsors of the bill that we should take up this particular issue. We would allow this amendment that has the important energy language in it for energy security that contains the important moratorium on human cloning. And that would be allowed to be voted on by this body. We would not have a cloture vote that rules out the vote on these two

imminently important issues that need to come before this body at this particular time.

So I plead with my colleagues, do not vote on a procedure that knocks off these two very important issues. Let us have a vote on these two issues.

We are going to be in town. We should take up these very important issues that are of immediate importance and need to be considered. I look forward to discussing this further with my colleagues as we get a chance to bring this amendment up for a vote.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). The Senator from Ohio.

AN ENERGY POLICY AS STIMULUS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the amendment to the underlying bill before the Senate.

I think the Senator from Kansas has spoken eloquently on the need to pass a moratorium on human cloning. It is interesting to note that about 80 percent of the people in this great Nation agree with that. It is also interesting to note that the other portion of the amendment calling for an energy policy for this country is also supported by about 80 percent of the people in this country. Although I do not ordinarily pay that much attention to polls, I say, in this case, the polls reflect good public policy for the United States of America.

Mr. President, with all the debate that has been going on in this body and throughout the Nation as to whether or not we actually need a stimulus bill, I reiterate my view that, yes, we do need a stimulus bill.

It is important that we pass a bill from several points of view.

Psychologically, the American people need a stimulus bill. For all the talk over the last couple of months about how much we need a stimulus bill, the public has now grown to expect we will pass a stimulus bill. I think that has been taken into consideration in the decisions the American public has been making. They see it as a positive measure, one that will bring us out of our economic doldrums and put things back on track.

As my colleagues know, the National Bureau of Economic Research reported earlier this week what many of us knew; and that is, our country is in recession. The people in my State of Ohio have known that since last year.

We need to spark our economy by getting businesses to boost investment. We need a stimulus package to help raise consumer confidence and get the American people spending again. As you know, consumer spending makes up two-thirds of our economy. We have to get buying. That is what we need to do: We have to get buying.

We need an economic stimulus bill that will put money in people's pockets, one that will restore consumer confidence, give businesses the money