

Rice-Eccles Olympic Stadium, Olympic Village, Ice Sheet at Ogden, IOC Hotel, Snow Basin Resort, Park City Mountain Resort, Deer Valley resort, Utah Olympic Park, Soldier's Hollow, Peaks Ice Arena, E-Center Ice Arena, and Ice Oval at Kearns. There also were special security requirements implemented at the Salt Lake International Airport and Salt Lake City's downtown Washington Square.

Compounding the difficulty of securing such a large and diverse number of venues was the sprawling geographical coverage of the Winter Games. The zone of security stretched for 900 square miles, from Provo to Ogden, providing numerous operational and logistical challenges for the Secret Service.

The security plan was designed and developed to provide the most secure environment for athletes, spectators, and protected venues. There was an airspace security plan to restrict certain aircraft from approaching any protected venue. There was a cyberspace security plan to ensure that no electronic intrusions could disrupt communications and operations. In addition, there was a physical security plan, including remote poststanders, magnetometers, state-of-the-art security cameras, chain-link fences, and electronic sensors.

Notwithstanding all of the technology and electronic monitoring, the foundation of any security plan is the law enforcement personnel implementing it. At the Winter Olympics, over 10,000 federal, state and local law enforcement and public safety officers stood watch around the clock, working in a collective and collaborative effort toward one single goal: to prevent any incidents that could cause harm to athletes or spectators, or create significant disruptions of the Games themselves.

The result of this comprehensive and sweeping security plan was secure surroundings that allowed athletes and spectators alike to enjoy the atmosphere of this international gathering without having to navigate any overly burdensome or time-consuming security checkpoints.

While there were occasional evacuations or disturbances, none of these matters were deemed serious, and there were only a handful of minor arrests during the course of the 17 days of the Games. Although at the close of the Olympics, there were no medals for the Secret Service and its partners in law enforcement and the military, the thousands of men and women who participated in the execution of perhaps the most sophisticated and successful security plan in the Secret Service's 137-year history deserve recognition and gratitude for their tireless efforts and dedication to their critical jobs.

In sum, the Salt Lake City Olympics provided the opportunity to develop and execute a plan to protect a 900 square mile part of this country. I urge that we capture the lessons learned

from this experience and incorporate these lessons into our national security planning process.

Following the great traditions of this country, the success of the 2002 Salt Lake City Winter Olympics was not due to any one individual, but to all who participated. From the spectators at the venues who showed patience, to the athletes who demonstrated the power of sport, to the organizers and protectors who gave us outstanding Games, and finally to the American people, including this Congress, who overwhelmingly supported the Games, we proved to the World that the events of September 11 will not deter this great Nation.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity to thank the staff who worked tirelessly with me on the Olympics: Kristine Iverson, Patricia Knight, Roslyn Trojan, Christopher Campbell, Scott Simpson, Melanie Bowen, Heather Barney, and Christopher Rosche. I also owe a special thanks to Brandon Burgen who made sure I was always where I was supposed to be, and that I was on time. I appreciate everything they did, and am very proud of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED). Under the previous order, the Senator from Vermont is recognized for up to 30 minutes.

NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001—Continued

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, we will have before us over the next several weeks a historic opportunity to change the direction of energy use in this country.

I know you will hear from many of my colleagues that the events of September 11 have changed how we must view energy, and on that point we must all surely agree. An increasing reliance on energy imports from politically unstable areas of the world is not in America's best interests, and we must reassert our dominance over our own energy production and innovation. One of the most important ways to achieve this is to wean ourselves from foreign oil in our transportation sector, and to diversify the energy base for our electricity generation into clean, domestically produced renewable resources.

We have before us a piece of comprehensive energy legislation that quite frankly is one of the best to emerge from this body in some time. Senators DASCHLE and BINGAMAN have brought forward, in their comprehensive amendment to S. 517, legislation that would spur the development of renewable energy resources, that will advance efficiency in our transportation, building and electricity sectors, and that will begin to address global climate change. I support many of the provisions of this legislation, particularly those that encourage the production of renewable energy, and those that provide additional funding for energy assistance to low income households.

As chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, I have considerable interest in several areas within the committee's jurisdiction. These include issues relating to regulation of commercial nuclear power plants, and to air and water quality issues such as global climate change, the use of reformulated fuels, and air emissions from the transportation sector. I support the bill's provisions on efficiency standards for homes, schools, and public buildings, as well as the efficiency standards for appliances and other consumer and commercial products. I also support increased funding for the Low Income Energy Assistance, LIHEAP, program, and for expanded R&D for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting efficiency and renewables. I look forward to inclusion of the tax provisions passed out of the Finance Committee, particularly those provisions which extend and expand the production tax credit for renewables, and provide credit for alternative fuels and alternative fueled vehicles. As chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, I have particular interest in those provisions of the bill which address the protection of our environment through reductions of emissions and pollutants affecting air and water quality.

Earlier this Congress, the EPW Committee reported out S. 950, the Federal Reformulated Fuels Act. This bill provided recognition of the need to reduce MTBE contamination of water supplies and enhance fuel suppliers' flexibility in meeting market demand. We have also recognized the need to grow the renewables share of the transportation fuels market. I commend the leader, Senator DASCHLE, for convening a broad and diverse group of stakeholders to craft an agreement on these issues in the fuels section of S. 517. I support the provisions in the Daschle bill that will raise CAFE standards, a long overdue action that will dramatically decrease the amount of gasoline consumed on our highways.

Both the reformulated fuels and CAFE provisions will benefit the environment, and reduce our dangerous dependence on foreign fuels. I am supportive of the provisions in the Daschle bill that set us on a path to seriously address global climate change. I am however deeply concerned that administration of the greenhouse gas database is not placed with the EPA, the agency most clearly qualified to run this program. No other agency has the experience with air emissions data or capability to run such a program more effectively. The agency already collects detailed carbon dioxide emissions information from the utility sector, and leads the Federal agencies in preparation of the national inventory, pursuant to the Global Climate Protection Act of 1978 and other authorities. Placing this responsibility elsewhere in the Federal bureaucracy seems duplicative and illogical.

As chairman of the Environment Committee, the environmental and

public health impacts of emissions are on the top of my list of concerns. These issues are not directly addressed in S. 517. As this session moves forward, the EPW Committee will be considering legislation that would cap greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector, which is responsible for approximately one-third of U.S. emissions. I support the inclusion in the electricity section of the bill of a net metering standard, which would give consumers credit for their own production of solar or wind energy. I am however concerned that the bill fails to include provisions, either through a public benefits fund or an electric efficiency mandate, to ensure the continuation of programs to encourage electricity efficiency innovations by utilities. Efficiency in electricity generation is a vital component of consuming less fuel, and lack of a provision addressing this issue is a major failing in the legislation. I am also concerned that the definition of biomass in various places in S. 597 does not exclude incineration of municipal solid waste, a process which results in emissions of mercury and sulfur dioxide. Measures which seek to encourage increased use of clean renewable energy should not provide new incentives for incineration of municipal solid waste.

One of the most important aspects of the legislation is its provisions for increasing the use of renewable energy in our nation. Unlike the House bill, Senator DASCHLE's bill includes a renewable portfolio standard which will guarantee that a greater portion of America's electricity needs are met by renewable energy. To date, the administration, like the House, has not endorsed this most basic of concepts, and I strongly commend Senator DASCHLE and Senator BINGAMAN for stepping forward on this crucial issue. This notwithstanding, I cannot support the Daschle renewable portfolio standard. My primary concern with his provision is that it does not go far enough to provide the level of environmental protection and market stimulation that a national renewable portfolio standard should provide.

S. 597, Senator DASCHLE's bill, contains a renewable portfolio standard requiring the generation of 10 percent of renewable energy electricity by the year 2020. While moving in the right direction, this will not provide the level of investment and growth achievable by my amendment. We must be aggressive in finding alternatives to fuels that pollute, or present unacceptable security risks. I will be introducing an amendment today that will ensure that by the year 2020, 20 percent of the electricity Americans use will be supplied by clean and safe renewable energy from wind, solar, biomass or geothermal sources.

The United States today relies heavily on coal, nuclear power, and natural gas to generate its electricity. Yet the United States is also blessed with an abundance of renewable energy re-

sources including wind power, intense solar energy, vast sources of biomass, and geothermal energy. These renewable energy resources do not pollute, they need not be bought from foreign markets, they do not leave behind piles of toxic wastes, and they will not run out.

Because renewable energy has been with us forever, we tend to disregard it. We tend to think of it as too simplistic to meet our modern energy needs. Like this windmill pictured from the old American West, we tend to think of wind, and other forms of renewable energy as quaint, but outdated vestiges of our past. We could not be more wrong. According to the U.S. Department of Energy wind energy has been the fastest growing source of electricity generation in the world in the 1990s.

Today, the U.S. wind industry generates about 3.5 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity each year, enough to meet the annual electricity needs of 1 million people. The costs of wind energy in the United States has dropped more than 80 percent in the past two decades, with today's prices being competitive with electricity being delivered by fossil and other fuels. As you can see in this picture of a modern windmill farm in Texas, times have changed. In Texas alone, wind power generation has more than doubled in the past three years, and estimates are that up to 1,000 megawatts of new renewable energy capacity will be operating by the end of this year. This jump is attributed in large part to a State renewable energy standard signed into law by Governor Bush in 1999.

Throughout the country, utilities are installing wind turbines and other renewable energy facilities as customer demand for clean energy grows, and costs drop.

These pictures illustrate but a few examples, such as this wind farm in Colorado; or the Northern States Power wind farm in Minnesota; the Vansycle Ridge wind farm in Oregon; this wind facility providing electricity to the people of Traverse City, MI.

Wind production can be especially beneficial in rural and remote areas, as we can see by this wind turbine in remote Kotzebue, AK, which displaces diesel fuel generation.

Geothermal, biomass and solar are also making increasing contributions to local and regional electricity generation. This Nevada geothermal power plant produces electricity for 100,000 people. This geothermal facility in California has produced the energy equivalent of over 250 million barrels of oil, and currently provides electricity to over one million people. This geothermal plant in Hawaii provides electricity for 60,000 people. This modern complex in Louisville, KY is heated and cooled by geothermal heat pumps.

Energy produced from biomass has the potential to account for almost as much renewable energy electricity production as wind. Here a biomass facil-

ity in Shasta County, CA converts wood wastes into electricity. This tractor is harvesting switchgrass in Charlington Valley, IA where farmers planted over 4,000 acres of switchgrass, which when burned will generate a continuing 35 megawatt flow of clean burning energy. If successful the project will be scaled up to 50,000 acres and involve 200 to 500 farmers. This bio-energy plant in Fayetteville, AR is testing new bioconversion processes. This photovoltaic charging station in Tampa, FL recharges batteries for hybrid electric vehicles, then contribute excess generated power back to the electric grid. This cattle rancher in Idaho uses wind energy to power his home and ranch under a program sponsored by the Idaho Power Company. This shows the solar array at BP Solarex headquarters in Frederick, MD. BP solar, a subsidiary of BP International, is a leading world developer of photovoltaic technology, with offices and manufacturing sites around the world. This solar concentration system at Sandia National Laboratory in New Mexico produces utility grade electric power.

Despite these exciting advances in U.S. renewable energy, the United States and American businesses still lag far behind advances being made in Europe and the rest of the world. Compared to the roughly 1 million American homes that are served by renewable energy, installed international wind capacity is enough to satisfy the electricity needs of 23 million people. The U.S. wind industry is actively seeking to utilize marketing opportunities outside the United States.

According to the U.S. Department of Energy's National Wind Technology Center, these prospective wind energy markets could translate into several billion dollars in sales for the U.S. wind industry. U.S. firms have already installed turbines in Canada, The Netherlands, Mexico, South America, Spain, Ukraine, and the United Kingdom. Nonetheless, 90 percent of the world's wind turbine manufacturers are European, with a combined annual turnover of more than one billion Euros.

These potential markets are only likely to increase. As the European Wind Energy Association states:

Whereas the cost of most forms of energy are bound to rise with time, the costs of wind energy are actually coming down.

Offshore European wind projects at various stages in the pipeline amount to more than 5,000 megawatts. Even accounting for the understandable enthusiasm of those in the industry, it is clear that both the international and American wind energy markets have the potential for great expansion.

The faster expansion in international markets is due in great measure to governmental policies that favor such expansion. As the U.S. Department of Energy states,

Wind energy is the fastest growing source of electricity generation in the world in the 1990's. However, the majority of growth has

been in Europe, where government policies and high conventional energy costs favor the use of wind energy.

Even with advances to date, American renewables still account for little more than 2 percent of total U.S. electricity production. There is more than enough room for them in the U.S. energy market. The United States is the world's largest single energy market, representing more than 25 percent of world energy consumption.

The real question is the extent to which we in this country will take advantage of our abundant renewable resources, and the assistance we will be willing to provide our American companies in competing in this market. Are we going to allow American companies to miss the boat? Is the United States going to lag behind while the rest of the world makes investments, develops infrastructure and outpaces us in the profitable manufacture and production of renewable technologies? Will we once more, as we are now for fossil fuels, be dependent on other nations for the means to provide our domestic energy, but this time because the technology and manufacture of renewable energy rests largely in other countries?

My amendment would provide an important step in providing market strength to U.S. renewable industries. It would create a renewable portfolio standard under which utilities would be required to gradually increase the amount of electricity from renewable energy resources sold to consumers, starting at 5 percent by 2005, and leveling out at 20 percent in 2020. This will be achieved by a system of renewable energy credits, that electric retailers can either generate themselves, or buy from someone else who has generated electricity from a renewable resource.

Those selling tradeable credits to the retailers need not themselves be connected into the grid. So long as someone has generated electricity from a listed renewable energy resource, and either used it himself or sold it to someone else to use, he can sell the credit to a retail electric supplier. My amendment would allow credits from existing renewable energy production, thereby encouraging expansion of existing facilities as well as creation of new sources of renewable energy. It would be hydropower neutral in that it would require the use of renewable energy credits to offset only production of non-hydropower electricity sold by the retailer. It would define renewable energy to include wind, solar, geothermal, landfill gas, certain biomass, and incremental hydropower added by increasing efficiency. It would not include industries which generate substantial amounts of pollution such as incineration of municipal solid waste, as renewable energy for which credits could be obtained.

This flexible, market-driven system, will help reduce market barriers for renewable energy, and stimulate domestic investment in new renewable en-

ergy throughout the nation. It will allow our companies to grow domestically, and establish sufficient stability to compete successfully in the world market. It will encourage the successful, long-term integration of these important renewable technologies into the energy sector, and will help grow the U.S. renewable energy industry into a world leader of renewable energy technology. My amendment will be good for the environment. It will improve air quality, by reducing use of fossil fuels which produce nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, and mercury emissions. These harmful pollutants are linked to smog, acid rain, respiratory illness, and water contamination.

This is an urgent issue. As reported in today's Washington Post, a study recently published in the Journal of the American Medical Association concludes that long-term exposure to fine particles of air pollution from coal-fired powerplants, factories, and diesel trucks increases an individual's risk of dying from lung cancer by 12 percent.

This is particularly important to my home State of Vermont. We in the Northeast live downwind from virtually the entire nation. The prevailing wind patterns bring ozone-causing nitrogen oxide straight to our front door.

There are days I can stand on Mount Mansfield, and not be able to make out the water tower on Mount Elmore barely 20 miles away.

My amendment would cut carbon dioxide emissions, a major contributor to global warming, by almost 19 percent, or 137 million metric tons by 2020. The Daschle 10-percent standard would achieve only a 7-percent reduction, or 56 million metric tons.

A 20-percent renewable energy standard that stimulates investment in renewable energy will be good for our economy. It will create thousands of new, high quality jobs and bring significant new investment to rural communities. It will create an estimated \$80 million in new capitol investment here at home and create new opportunities in the manufacturing and high-tech sectors. The market demand for renewable energy will also bring jobs to rural areas, where it is estimated that wind energy alone could provide \$1.2 billion in new income for farmers, ranchers and rural landowners, and \$5 billion in new property tax revenues to communities.

My amendment will advance national security. Renewable energy technologies will reduce dependence on fossil fuels, alleviating pressure on those markets. Because they are domestically produced, they will reduce our vulnerability to foreign threats. Because they are distributed in nature, they will reduce our reliance on centralized resources and the vulnerability of our energy infrastructure to terrorist attack.

Following the attacks of September 11, we can no longer afford to take this responsibility lightly.

Mr. President, on September 19, James Woolsey, former Director of the

CIA, Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Robert C. McFarlane, former National Security Advisor to President Reagan, sent a letter to myself and other Members of this body urging in the strongest terms that we take immediate action to address our energy security. Among other recommendations, they state that they "urge the Energy Committee to immediately adopt the Renewable Portfolio Standard. . . ."

I ask unanimous consent that this letter, signed by all three, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEPTEMBER 19, 2001.

Senators THOMAS A. DASCHLE, TOM HARKIN, ROBERT C. BYRD, CARL LEVIN, JEFF BINGAMAN, JAMES S. JEFFORDS, MAX BAUCUS, JOSEPH R. BIDEN JR., TRENT LOTT, RICHARD LUGAR, TED STEVENS, JOHN W. WARNER, FRANK H. MURKOWSKI, ROBERT C. SMITH, CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, JESSE HELMS.

DEAR SENATORS: Americans are aware of the enormous and complicated tasks ahead in dealing with the consequences of the unprecedented September 11th attack against our nation.

There are many corrective actions that require lead-times that could be months or even years. But, there are actions that can and must be taken now. One of those critical actions is to advance America's energy security. The Congress will soon act on that issue.

It is not enough just to ensure uninterrupted supplies of transportation fuels and electricity. We must also act to advance the security of those supplies, and the nation's ability to meet its needs in all corners of the country at all times. Our refineries, pipelines and electrical grid are highly vulnerable to conventional military, nuclear and terrorist attacks.

Disbursed, renewable and domestic supplies of fuels and electricity, such as energy produced naturally from wind, solar, geothermal, incremental hydro, and agricultural biomass, address those challenges. Fortunately, technologies to deliver these supplies have been advancing steadily since the Middle East fired its first warning shot over our bow in 1973. They are now ready to be brought, full force, into service.

But, while the U.S. Government has committed intellectual and monetary resources to developing these technologies, the status quo marketplace is unwilling to accommodate these new supplies of disbursed and renewable fuels and electricity. Speedy action by the Administration and the Congress is critical to establish the regulatory and tax conditions for these renewable resources to rapidly reach their potential.

Fortunately, such actions are under consideration by the Energy, Environment, and Finance Committees. We urge the Energy Committee to immediately adopt the Renewable Portfolio Standard (for electricity) as well as provisions to ensure ready interconnection access to the electric grid, and cost-shared funds to the state public benefit funds to continue essential support for emerging technologies and the provisions of electricity to the truly needy. We urge the Environment Committee to immediately adopt the Renewable Fuels Standard in conjunction with measures to deal with environmental issues. Finally, we urge the Finance Committee to immediately adopt residential solar credits and renewable energy production tax credits, including a provision for

fuels (liquid, gaseous and solid fuels), or their Btu equivalent, similar to the fuel provision tax credit made available in Section 29 of the Internal Revenue Code.

These actions will also develop new industries and jobs, strengthen communities, enhance the environment, and assist in the stabilization of greenhouse gases. On the transportation fuels issue, ethanol, biodiesel and other biofuels will slow the flow of dollars to the Middle East, where too many of those dollars have been used to buy weapons and fund terrorist activities.

Consequently, we also recommend a major and concerted effort to assemble the talent and resources needed to launch a "Liberty Ship" type program to convert agricultural wastes and cellulosic biomass into biofuels, biochemicals and bioelectricity. The technology to do so is in place; all that is lacking is the political will to deploy it.

Sincerely yours,

R. JAMES WOOLSEY,
Former Director, Central Intelligence.

ROBERT C. MCFARLANE,
Former National Security Advisory to President Reagan.

ADMIRAL THOMAS H. MOORER USN (RET),
Former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. JEFFORDS. A 20-percent renewable energy standard by 2020 is affordable. The Department of Energy's information administration found a 20-percent renewable energy standard by 2020 would result in only modest increases in consumer electricity bills of up to 4 percent as compared to prices if no renewable energy standard were imposed.

Polls have indicated Americans are willing to accept such moderate price increases in exchange for the benefits derived from the greater renewable energy production.

These same EIA studies showed that while households will experience modest increases in electric bills, a 20-percent renewable energy standard will actually reduce overall energy costs, which include the costs attributable to home heating and commercial and industrial energy consumption by approximately 0.1 percent by the year 2020.

With these very modest costs, the provisions in my amendment will increase renewable energy production by a total of roughly 2 million megawatts. Higher numbers are distinctly possible. In the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, for example, if every new home built in California subdivisions each year had photovoltaic energy roofs similar to the ones shown in this chart, they would produce the equivalent of a major 400- to 500-megawatt powerplant every year.

This amendment is the right thing to do. It is supported by the Consumers Union, the Consumer Federation of America, along with hundreds of businesses, associations, labor and consumer advocacy groups, environmental groups, faith-based organizations, academies, and local communities.

I ask unanimous consent a list of approximately 450 groups and individuals

supporting my amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUPPORTERS OF A 20% BY 2020 NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY STANDARD ASSOCIATIONS

American Bioenergy Association, American Corn Growers Association, American Corn Growers Foundation, American Lung Association of Colorado, American Lung Association of Houston, American Lung Association of Maine, American Solar Energy Society, American Wind Energy Association, Angus Duncan, President, Bonneville Environmental Foundation, California Wind Energy Association, CalSEIA (California Solar Energy Industries Association), Clean Fuels Development Coalition, Clean Fuels Foundation, Colorado Renewable Energy Society.

Foundation for Communities & Environment, Heartland Renewable Energy Society, Heartland Solar Energy Industries Association, Illinois Solar Energy Association, Iowa Renewable Energy Association, Maine Nurses Association, Midwest Renewable Energy Association, Minnesota Farmers Union, Minnesota Renewable Energy Society, Inc., Missouri Native Plant Society, Nebraska Farmers Union, North American Butterfly Association, Northern Great Plains Inc., Rose Foundation for Communities and the Environment, South Dakota Farmers Union, Texas Solar Energy Society.

BUSINESS

AMECO, Antares Group, Applied Agricultural Technologies, Inc., Aqua Sun International, ASE Americas, Astropower, Atlantic Renewable Energy Corporation, Automated Power Exchange, Biofine, Biorefiner, Bob Lawrence and Associates, BP Solar, BZ Products, Inc., Calpine Corporation, Cape Wind Associates, Capital Sun Group, Ltd., Cargill Dow, Carson Solar, Inc., Clean Edge, Inc., Colorado Energy Group, Inc.

Communications Consortium Media Center, EAPC Architects Engineers, Eco Energies Inc., Endless Energy Corporation, Energy Management Inc., Energyscapes, ENTECH Engineering, Environmental Services, Inc., Field and Forest Company, FlexEnergy, Future Energy Resources Corporation, Genencor International, GreenLine Paper Co., Inc., The Hamilton Group, Heliotronics, Inc., The Hender Law Firm, Hurshtown Alternative Power, Microgy Cogeneration Systems, Inc., Micropower Corporation, Midwest Solar Solution.

Millenium Energy LLC, Moose, Inc., Mountain Energy Consulting, Ozark Solar, People's Power and Light, Pioneer Forest, Potomac Resources, Inc., Powerlight Corporation, Power Shift, Pure Energy Corporation, Renewable Energy Corporation, Limited, Sealaska Corporation, Sea Solar Power International LLC, Sol-Air Company, Solar Energy Corporation, Solar-Fit, Solar King Supply, Inc., Solar Plexus, Solar Services, Inc., Solar Works, Inc., Spire Corporation, The Stella Group, Ltd., Sun Power Electric, Sun Systems, Inc., SUN Utility Network, Trans-Pacific Geothermal Corporation, Veizades and Associates, Vermont Energy Investment Corporation, Wisconsin Energy Conservation Corporation.

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

AFSCME (District Council 47), SEIU #199, Maine Labor Group on Health, Communications Workers of America.

ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

20/20 Vision, A World Institute for a Sustainable Humanity, Abalone Alliance Safe Energy Clearinghouse, Action for a Clean

Environment, Alabama Environmental Council, Alaska Coalition of Missouri, Alaska Coalition of Pennsylvania, Alaska Wilderness League, Alliance for Affordable Energy, Alliance for Sustainability, Alliance for Sustainable Communities, Alliance for the Wild Rockies, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, American Lands Alliance, American Oceans Campaign, American Public Information on the Environment, Chairton Valley RC&D (Iowa), Citizens Action coalition of Indiana, Citizen Action of Illinois, Citizens for Quality Drinking Water, Clean Air—Cool Planet, Clean Power Campaign, Clean Air Council, Clean Water Action, Clean Water Action Alliance of Michigan, Clean Water Action Alliance of Minnesota, Clean Water Action Alliance of North Dakota, Clean Water Action Alliance of Rhode Island.

Climate Action Now, Climate Solutions, Cloud Forest Institute, Coalition for Clean and Affordable Energy, Coal River Mountain Watch, Coastal Georgia Center for Sustainable Development, Colorado Environmental Coalition, Communities for Responsible Energy, Communities United for Responsible Energy, Connecticut Citizen Action Group, CTPIRG (Connecticut Public Interest Research Group), Dakota Resource Council, Defenders of Wildlife, Don't Waste Connecticut, Earth Action Network, Earth Care, Earth Day Coalition, Earth Day New York, Earth Justice Legal Defense Fund, Ecology Center of Southern California, Ecological Health Organization, Endangered Habitats League, Environmental Advocates of New York, Environmental Background Information Center, Environmental Defense, Environmental Defense Center, Environmental and Energy Study Institute.

American Rivers, Americans for a Safe Future, Anacostia Watershed Society, Arizona Audubon Council, Arizona Solar Action Network, Asian Pacific Environmental Network, Blue Heron Environmental Network, Bluewater Network, Bolingbrook Earth Watch, CALPIRG (California Public Interest Research Group), California Global Warming Campaign, California League of Conservation Voters, Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies, Center for Environmental Citizenship, Center for International Environmental Law, Center for Resources Solutions, Environmental Health Coalition, Environmental Health Watch, Environmental Law and Policy Center, Environmental League of Massachusetts, Environmental Awareness Committee, SE Iowa Synod, Florida League of Conservation Voters, Florida PIRG (Florida Public Interest Research Group), Friends of the Earth, Friends of the Moshassuck River, Friends of the River, Galveston-Houston Association for Smog Prevention, Georgia Audubon Society.

Georgians for Transportation Alternatives, Global Green, USA, Global Possibilities, Global Response, Global Exchange, Grand Canyon Trust, Great Basin Mine Watch, Greater Tucson Coalition for Solar Energy, Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Greenhouse Network, GreenPeace, Gulf Restoration Network, Heartland Operation to Protect the Environment, Hoosier Environmental Council, Illinois Audubon Society, Illinois PIRG (Illinois Public Interest Research Group), Illinois Student Environmental Network, Institute for Environmental Policy and Implementation, Iowa Citizen Action Network, Iowa Environmental Council, Iowa PIRG (Iowa Public Interest Research Group), Iowa Policy Project, Iowa SEED Coalition, Izaak Walton League of America, Izaak Walton League, Ohio Division, Kyoto Now!, Land and Water Fund of the Rockies.

League of Conservation Voters, League of Conservation Voters Education Fund,

Leopold Group of the Iowa Chapter of the Sierra Club, Louisiana Audubon Society, Maryland Public Interest Research Group, Massachusetts Climate Action Network, MASSPIRG (MA Public Interest Research Group), Michael Fields Agricultural Institute, Mid-Nebraska Pride, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy, Minnesota PIRG (MN Public Interest Research Group), Minnesotans for an Energy-Efficient Economy, The Minnesota Project, Missouri PIRG (Missouri Public Interest Research Group), Missouri Coalition for the Environment, MTPIRG (Montana Public Interest Research Group), Montana Environmental Information Center, MORE (Missouri Renewable Energy), National Audubon Society, National Environmental Coalition of Native Americans, National Environmental Trust, National Parks Conservation Association, National Wildlife Federation, Native American Rights Fund, Natural Resource Defense Council, NHPiRG (New Hampshire Public Interest Research Group).

New Jersey Environmental Lobby, NMPIRG (New Mexico Public Interest Research Group), New Mexico Wilderness Association, New Uses Council, NCPIRG (North Carolina Public Interest Research Group), Northwest Energy Coalition, Northwest SEED—Sustainable Energy for Economic Development, Nuclear Energy Information Service, Nuclear Information Resource Services, The Ocean Conservancy, Ohio Environmental Council, OHPIRG (Ohio Public Interest Research Group), Oregon Environmental Council, OSPiRG (Oregon State Public Interest Research Group), Pace Energy Project, PennPIRG (Pennsylvania Public Interest Research Group), Pennsylvania Environmental Network, People's Action for Clean Energy, Prairie Rivers Network, Rainforest Action Network, Redwood Alliance, RENEW Wisconsin, Renewable Northwest Project, Safe Energy Communication Council, St. Louis Audubon Society, Scenic America, Sierra Club, Sierra Club Rhode Island Chapter.

Sierra Club Rocky Mountain Chapter, Sky Island Alliance, South Carolina Coastal Conservation League, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, Southwest Energy Efficiency Project, Southwest Environmental Center, Sustainable Energy and Economic Development Coalition, Texas Campaign for the Environment, Texas SEED Coalition, Toxics Action Center, Tulane Free the Planet!, Union of Concerned Scientists, USPIRG (U.S. Public Interest Research Group), Utahns for an Energy Efficient Economy, VPIRG (Vermont Public Interest Research Group), WAPIRG (Washington Public Interest Research Group), WISPIRG (Wisconsin Public Interest Research Group), Western Nebraska Resources Council, Western Organization of Resource Councils, West Virginia Highlands Conservancy, West Virginia Rivers Coalition, West Virginia Sierra Club, West Virginia Trout Unlimited, Wheeling (WV) Environmentalists, The Wilderness Society, Wildlife Action, Windustry Project, Wisconsin's Environmental Decade, Women for Sustainable Technologies, Women's Health & Environmental Network, World Wildlife Fund.

CONSUMER ORGANIZATIONS

Citizens Action Coalition of Indiana, Citizens for Consumer Justice, Citizen Power, Citizens Protecting Ohio, Consumer Federation of America, Consumers Union, Foundation for Taxpayer & Consumer Rights, Massachusetts Energy Consumers Alliance, Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy, Pressure Point, Southern Arizona Alliance for Economic Justice, The Utility Reform Network, Westchester People's Action Coalition, West Virginia Citizen Action Group.

FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life, Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life of Southern California, Commission on Religion in Appalachia, DFW Disciples Peace Fellowship, Earth Ministries, Eco Justice Ministries, Episcopal Diocese of Missouri, Episcopal Power and Light, First Presbyterian Church of Kirkwood, Interfaith Center for Peace and Justice, Interfaith Global Climate Change Coalition of WV, Lutheran Campus Ministry, Maine Interfaith Climate Change Initiative, National Coalition of Jewish Women of Los Angeles, New Mexico Council of Churches, North Highland Assembly of God, Inc., Pennsylvania Central Conference United Church of Christ, Pennsylvania Council of Churches, Philadelphia Coalition on the Environment in Jewish Life, Southern California Ecumenical Council, Temple Emanu-El, (Dallas, Texas), United Methodist General Board of Church and Society, United Methodists—Iowa Conference, Board of Church and Society, Yellow Springs (OH) Unitarian Universalist Church.

ACADEMICS, DOCTORS, POLITICIANS & OTHER INDIVIDUALS

Dr. Paul Arnold, Biology Dept., Young Harris College, Dr. J.R. Bak, University of Washington, Dr. Douglas Bachtel, Institute of Ecology, University of Georgia, Dr. Sarah Badran, University of Southern California, Dr. Ray Barber, Chair, Division of Science & Mathematics, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Dr. David Bechler, Department of Biology, Valdosta State University, Dr. Linda Bell, Department of Women Studies, Georgia State University, Dr. Dianne Benjamin, Assistant Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Missouri—Kansas City, Dr. Brad Bergstrom, Department of Biology, Valdosta State University, Dr. Ross Bowers, Program Director Respiratory Therapy Program, Armstrong Atlantic State University, Lon Burman, Texas Representative (District 90), Dudley J. Burton Ph.D., P.E., Professor, Baylor University, Linda Calvert, Director—New Orleans Mayor's Office of Environmental Affairs, Dr. Richard Coles, Professor of Ecology, Washington University, Antony Cooper, Assistant Professor of Biology, University of Missouri—Kansas City, Douglas Crawford, Associate Professor of Biology, University of Missouri—Kansas City, Dr. Ben Dennis, Professor of Economics, University of the Pacific, Dr. Alexander Dent, Indiana University, Paul R. Epstein, M.D., Center for Health and the Global Environment, Harvard Medical School, Dr. Lyle Fagnan, Oregon Health and Science University, Alan Fantel, University of Washington, Todd Forman, M.D., University of Southern California, Edward Gogol, Associate Professor of Biology, University of Missouri—Kansas City, Dr. Gary Goldbaum, King County Hospital, Dr. Brenda Hull, Dept. of Biology, Young Harris College, Mark Jacobson, Associate Professor, Stanford University Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, Stephen J. Jay M.D., Indiana University.

Dr. Sandra Juul, University of Washington, Daniel M. Kammen, Director, Renewable and Appropriate Energy Laboratory, Dennis H. Knight, Professor Emeritus, University of Wyoming, Randy Korotev, Professor of Earth & Planetary Sciences, Washington University, Dr. Margaret Lieb, University of Southern California, Dr. Lee March, Department of Political Science, Young Harris College, Dr. Diana Matesic, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Mercer University, Dr. J.A.P. McCrary, Department of Natural Resources, Albany State College, Dr. Kent Montgomery, Department of Astrology, Young Harris College, Richard B. Norgaard, Professor of Energy and Re-

sources, UC Berkeley, Margie Oleksiak, Research Associate, University of Missouri—Kansas City, Richard Ottinger, Dean Emeritus, Pace Law School, Dr. Thomas Michael Power, Professor and Chair, Economics Department, University of Montana, Don Preister, Nebraska State Senator, Dr. Ron Pulliam, Institute of Ecology, University of Georgia, Dr. Richard Rich, Professor and Chair, Institute for Environmental and Energy Studies, UVA, Dr. Gary Rischitelli, Center for Research in Occupational and Environmental Toxicology, Michael Rosenzweig, Professor of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, University of Arizona, Stephen Ruoss, M.D., Stanford University, Dr. Arnold Schecter, Professor, School of Public Health at Dallas, Everett Shock, Professor of Earth & Planetary Sciences, Washington University, Leonard Stitelman, Ph.D., Professor, School of Public Administration, University of New Mexico, Larry Waldman, Ph.D., Department of Economics, University of New Mexico.

OTHER GROUPS

American Lands, Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest, Audubon's Appleton-Whittle Research Ranch, Better World Group, Bicycle Coalition of Maine, Center for Energy & Environmental Policy (University of Delaware), Center for Rural Affairs, Charleston Bicycle Advocacy Group, Childhood Lead Action Project, Citizens for Missouri's Children, Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future, City of Creve Coeur (MO) Recycling & Environment Committee, Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities in Illinois, Coalition to Advance Sustainable Technology, Collaborative Center for Justice, Inc., Common Cause, Concerned Citizens of Roane, Calhoun, and Gilmer Counties, WV, Concerned Citizens of Jefferson County, GA, Democratic Party of Dallas, TX, Development Center for Alternative Technologies, Downwinders at Risk.

Education for Sustainable Living, Emerald Resources Solutions, Environmental and Human Health, Inc., Friends of Merrymeeting Bay, Full Circle Environmental, Green Party of Lancaster County, PA, Green Party of York County, PA, Hispanic Political Action Committee, Indian-American Political Forum of Connecticut, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, Intertribal Council on Utility Policy, Jobs with Justice, Dallas TX, Kansas Rural Center, Keystone Action Network, Local Power, Louisiana Bucket Brigade, Loyola University Enviro Action, Maine Center for Economic Policy, McKeever Institute of Economic Policy Analysis, Minuteman Media.

Missouri Botanical Garden, MoveOn.org, National Educational Resource Center, Inc., Nebraska Farmers Union, Ohio Family Farm Coalition, Oil and Gas Accountability Project, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Maine Chapter, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Philadelphia, Physicians for Social Responsibility of South Carolina, Project Underground, Public Allies, Santee-Nacoochee Community Association, Scenic Missouri, Living Resource Center, Sierra Students at West Virginia University, Southwest Research Information Center, Springfield (IL) Urban League, State University of New York (SUNY), Students Against Violating the Earth, Sunrise Sustainable Resources Group, Texas Black Bass Unlimited, Webster Groves Nature Study Society, Western Colorado Congress.

Mr. JEFFORDS. My standard is achievable. To date, 12 States have successfully enacted renewable standards, several of which exceed the 20 percent by 2020 standard of my amendment.

States and utilities, recognizing the cost and environmental benefits of clean energy, are setting goals similar to mine for their use of renewable energy. Governor Pataki of New York, for example, recently ordered all agencies in the State of New York to produce 10 percent of their electricity from renewable energy sources by 2005 and 20 percent by 2010.

While good as far as it goes, Senator DASCHLE's amendment would result in about half of the renewable energy generation that would be achieved under my amendment. Yet a 20-percent standard by 2020 is reasonable, achievable, and will provide for the important capital investment, market security, and environmental benefits for which we should be aiming.

We have an obligation to act now to take the actions needed to secure clean, domestically produced, reliable sources of energy. We must not lag behind the weak standards or no standards at all.

I urge my colleagues to vote for me in favor of this amendment.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has approximately 7½ minutes.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Let me share my long-term interest in this matter. I came into the Congress in 1975. In that year, this Nation was in terrible shape. The oil from the Mideast had been interdicted. We had long lines of cars, and everybody was in dire straits. A number of us at that time formed a coalition to do something about energy. The reason I bring it up is that much of what we are talking about today is much of what was proposed.

First, Norm Mineta, then in the House with John Blanchard of Michigan and me, introduced the wind energy bill. It passed. We drew lots as to how it would be named. It turned out to be Blanchard's bill. That was a major move forward in wind energy.

Photovoltaics was another great interest of mine. I have a fond memory of the coalition we put together at that time. We had over 80 members of the energy coalition, the solar coalition as it was called. So I went on to the House floor to offer an amendment. The amendment would have taken a large step forward in solar energy.

The chairman of the subcommittee came to me and said: Son, you do not offer amendments to appropriations bills unless you check with me first. He said: Come in and I will see if I can get you a couple of million dollars for this project.

I said: I am sorry, but I cannot do that.

He said: Why can't you?

I said: Because I have 80 cosponsors.

He said: You have 80 cosponsors?

Yes.

Well, I guess we are going to have to battle it out.

And we did. It passed, although they cut part of it off for other solar energy. So that was the beginning of the

photovoltaics industry in the United States. It was a proud moment, and it was a fun one to look back upon, especially as to the shock on the chairman's face when I told him how many cosponsors we had.

At that time also, we went on to form the Alliance to Save Energy, which included myself, and at that time it was JEFF BINGAMAN and the Senator from Illinois who were with us on that issue, and that has proved to be a very interesting and excellent benefit to our energy situation. Chuck Percy was the Senator's name.

I commend JEFF BINGAMAN, who is in the Chamber with me, for his work over those years. Together we are still working as hard as we can to do what we can about the energy situation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Mr. FEINGOLD are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am delighted that we are into the energy package. We have been talking now for some time, of course, about an energy policy in this country. The President has talked about it for a very long time. He has put forth, with the help of the Vice President, an energy policy. So I am pleased that we are into that, and I hope we continue to work on it until we are able to successfully put together a bill that will meet our collective notions.

I ask unanimous consent several letters I received this morning be printed in the RECORD. This one comes from the Vietnam Veterans Institute. These are all directed to Senator DASCHLE in support of the energy program.

This one is from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, also voicing their support for energy policy. This one comes from the AMVETS, this one from the Catholic War Veterans, and this one from the American Legion.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM VETERANS INSTITUTE,

March 5, 2002.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: As the Chairman and Founder of the Vietnam Veterans Institute, I write today out of a sense of urgency concerning our national security as it re-

lates to our energy supply. Veterans groups with a combined membership of nearly 5 million support the President's energy bill. I am proud to be joined by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, and the Catholic War Veterans of the USA.

I respectfully urge you to pass the President's energy bill, H.R. 4, and the provisions it contains. Further, I agree with the President, who during the State of the Union address, said "We must act, first and foremost, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans." He went on to say that we must continue at home and abroad with the same spirit of cooperation. I believe it is imperative to our national security that we stand together as Americans. Make no mistake, responsible exploration of ANWR is a matter of national security.

You have expressed concern with ANWR, stating that an energy plan should not include opening wilderness areas to oil drilling. Senator, do you know that exploration is already taking place in wildlife refuges in 13 states, including Senator Blanche Lambert Lincoln's state of Arkansas and in North Dakota, Senator Kent Conrad's state? It is important to note that in all of those wilderness areas, there has been no harm to the wildlife caused by the exploration in any of those states.

It is crucial for the American public to have the facts. And if the truth is told, the American public will learn that the native peoples of Alaska who actually live in the affected area are 100% supportive of exploration of ANWR—and do not believe it will be any threat to the environment. Why is it that we are not willing to let the people who live there decide their future and the future of their lands?

The native peoples of Alaska who have opposed ANWR do not live in the affected area and have leased their own lands for oil exploration. I do not know if this has ever been reported. I believe the American public has the right to know.

Please pass the President's energy bill and help us rebuild America!

With the support of our members,

J. ELTON YATES,
Chairman and Founder.

—
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
October 29, 2001.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: The 2.7 million members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary supports H.R. 4, the "Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001" or SAFE Act of 2001. We applaud the House of Representatives for its bipartisan work in addressing our energy vulnerability by passing H.R. 4. We believe the Senate should consider and vote on H.R. 4 so that our nation has an energy plan for the future and can move forward quickly with a comprehensive plan to develop our domestic energy resources.

Keeping in mind the horrific events 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. We need to take steps to reverse our growing dependence on Middle East oil as quickly as possible. By passing H.R. 4, the Senate will be supporting our troops serving in combat on Operation Enduring Freedom, the American people, and our national security with a comprehensive energy legislation that is desperately needed to diversify the energy for our country and chart a course for the future.

The VFW strongly urges the Senate to consider and vote on H.R. 4 as passed in the House in this session of Congress.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. WALLACE,
Executive Director.

—
AMERICAN VETERANS,
Lanham, MD, March 6, 2002.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: AMVETS urges your favorable consideration of H.R. 4, the Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001.

As you know, our current reliance on foreign oil leaves the United States vulnerable to the whim of individual oil-exporting countries, many existing in the unpredictable and highly dangerous Persian Gulf. And it cannot be overstated that energy supplies touch nearly every aspect of our lives from our economy to our national security.

H.R. 4, as approved by the House, is a critical part of an overall policy America requires to promote dependable, affordable, and environmentally sound production and distribution of energy for the future. We cannot wait for the next crisis before we act.

Thank you for your service in the United States Senate and please remember that this issue is vital to our nation's security and the brave men and women who serve in the Armed Forces.

Sincerely,

RICHARD A. JONES,
National Legislative Director.

—
CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
March 5, 2002.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: We write today on behalf of our membership to encourage you to pass the President's energy bill, H.R. 4. We support this bill because we believe our national security demands that America be less dependent on foreign oil producers.

The September 11th attacks on democracy have expedited the need for increased oil self-sufficiency. Reliance on other countries, especially during these times of war and international terrorism, threatens our national security and economic well-being.

The Catholic War Veterans of the USA respectfully urge you to support the provisions contained in the House passed version of the "Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001." The legislation is a major step toward achieving energy independence and ensuring our national security.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH SATRIANO,
National First Vice Commander.

—
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, March 5, 2002.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: On behalf of the 2.8 million members of the American Legion, I urge you to support a comprehensive energy policy that will improve the nation's energy independence and strengthen national security.

War and international terrorism have brought into sharp focus the heavy reliance of the United States on imported oil. During times of crisis, such reliance threatens the nation's security and economic well being. The import of more than 55 percent of the nation's petroleum from foreign countries further compounds our foreign trade balance. This is a time when the country's energy de-

mands continue unabated. It is important that we develop additional reliable sources of domestic oil.

The American Legion understands the sacrifices being made by the men and women in uniform. The members of America's all-volunteer force have been tasked with the demanding mission of combating terrorism worldwide and strengthening our homeland security. In addition to active-duty forces, seventy-six thousand National Guard and Reserve members have put their lives on hold and left their families, following the terrorists' acts of September 11. Now, it is the duty of a grateful nation to ensure these brave men and women have the resources that they need to successfully carry out that mission.

The development of America's domestic energy resources is vital to national security. The American Legion respectfully urges you to support the provisions contained in the House-passed version of the "Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001."

I thank you for considering our view on this critical national security issue.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. SANTOS,
National Commander.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we had a meeting this morning with the veterans. Over the last several months we have had a number of press conferences and meetings with all kinds of different interests in this country that support us doing something, in a balanced way, about energy policy. We have heard from agriculture, the Farm Bureau, the Farmers' Union. Of course, the labor unions have been very much in support of what is there so we can get on with energy production. We have had small businesses. We have had Native Alaskans here and the veterans associations.

I have been impressed with the breadth of support for an energy policy. I think it indicates in some ways the depth of involvement, how this touches everyone in this country, having an affordable, adequate energy supply, and doing it in a balanced way. It touches everyone's life.

Unfortunately, in terms of moving on something, when last year we were having all the problems in California, of course, the shortage of electricity and the high prices, and gasoline prices were very high, there was great interest in it. Now gasoline prices are down. The California crisis is over. But I hope we do not lose our intensity, knowing that is not going to last unless we have a policy that leads us in the direction, in the future, of having an adequate domestic supply so we are not 60-percent dependent on foreign imports.

Beginning to move towards more diversity in energy certainly ought to be part of our plan. We ought to do that. In a balanced bill, we will have research money to be able to look for new sources of energy, to have clean coal research so we can use those resources more thoroughly, and we should have renewables. All of us are interested in that.

At the same time, we have to do something about production. I guess that is my main criticism of the bill before us, that it leans so much toward

conservation and renewables, but it does not take into account what our needs are going to be in the next number of years. If nothing else, we have to look at a balanced energy policy that recognizes that we have to modernize and increase conservation, we have to modernize and expand our infrastructure, we have to have diversity in our supplies, and we have to improve environmental protection—among other things.

We have spent a good deal of time on transportation of electric energy. It is also true of gas and oil, but you can generate all the electricity of the world right here, and if you don't have a way to get it to the market, then you have not accomplished your goals. We need to do something dramatic in this whole area of transportation of electricity. We need to build a network. We have an interstate grid that moves wholesale power, and hopefully we would have regional transportation organizations, RTOs, along there to take it into areas—run by the States. These are things that are pretty much accepted as being necessary ingredients as we move forward with an energy bill.

One of the things that is troublesome—I happen to be on the Energy Committee—is the process that has brought us here. The committee did not have an opportunity to deal with these difficult and detailed questions. That should be done at least initially in committees. We did not do that. The majority leader determined to take the bill out of the committee and bring it here to do this. It has been changed several times since we have been on the floor. That makes it difficult to deal with the details of an energy bill.

Every amendment that comes up here is going to have to be dealt with in such detail, you would think, my gosh, that is the kind of thing that ought to be done in committee. But given the situation, the fact that the majority leader chose to do it that way—I happen to think it is a flawed process—nevertheless we are here. We have had no hearings, no markups, so we are going to be trying to do some of those things.

We will be dealing right now with an amendment having to do with a \$20 billion pipeline from Alaska which never had a hearing, never had an opportunity to find out the facts. That is not a good way to legislate.

We will be pushing forward on those issues. I am hopeful that we can move forward. I am hopeful we will have an opportunity to deal with some of the difficult issues such as CAFE standards. I don't think anybody would argue with the idea that we would like to have vehicles that do what we need to do with better mileage. But we cannot be unrealistic, moving it over in just several years, given the costs associated with that—particularly to those who live in the West.

Live where I live and look on the road and you seldom see anything except a pickup and an SUV. I realized

part of the reason for that when I was there. I would never have gotten out of my driveway without a four-wheel drive.

This is realism. This is the way it is. We can make some changes, but we can't substitute those future movements for where we need to be now.

With regard to the security of this country, military security, terrorism—these things require that we have an adequate supply of energy. Much of it comes from the Middle East. Because we are having the problems we are having over there—and foreseeably we will be having them for some time—we have to do more.

I live in a part of the country where we are one of the large energy producers in this Nation. We are the highest producer of coal. We have large reserves of gas, methane gas, and oil. But much of it is very difficult. We need to have access to public lands, among other things. We need to be able to utilize those resources in an environmentally sound way. We have done that and can do that.

So I think the idea that somehow we can substitute production with some kind of renewables or some kind of scientific process that we do not even have before us is a little bit of dreamland, I am afraid.

I am hopeful we can move forward and be realistic in what we do. We ought to have an opportunity, certainly, to be able to deal with these issues in a way in which everyone gets an opportunity to have amendments and to get something together that will be generally acceptable to all of us.

As I said, I come from a State that is rich in resources. We have very high coal and oil and gas reserves. We also have an adequate supply—sometimes overadequate supply—of wind. We can convert some of that into electricity, of course. We should, indeed, do it.

We need a realistic policy that encourages fuel diversity, that utilizes all of our domestic resources in a very broad way, that takes economic and environmental factors into account. In relation to economic factors, we need to be realistic about what we are going to do. We need to provide a cleaner and more secure energy future. We need an overall energy strategy that increases conservation and energy efficiency and boosts supply and promotes alternative energy. I think we can do that.

Some of what I hear in this Chamber, however, would indicate that we do not need to worry about increasing our gas and oil supply because we are going to take care of it with renewables or with raising the standards in mileage. Fine, but you are not going to do that immediately. There is no way. I hope we are realistic enough to deal with it.

One of the areas, of course, that is going to be very controversial is ANWR. We will all have to deal with that and see if we can't determine what the real impact is. I have been to Prudhoe Bay and out in that area par-

ticularly. I have seen the work they are doing there now, which, by the way, is very impressive. I have a little idea of what the wildlife refuge looks like.

Sometimes we hear in this Chamber it would be a brandnew idea to have production on a wildlife refuge. It is not a new idea. It is done on a number of wildlife refuges now. The proposition is to have a very small footprint to be able to have a rather large impact. That is the kind of coming together there has been that makes that a possibility, that makes it a necessity, as a matter of fact, to do something there.

We need to move forward with coal. We need to move forward with nuclear. We can do that. We can get more clean coal technology. That is our greatest reserve of energy for the future.

Everyone in this country is affected by electricity, its availability and price. So this isn't just theoretical; this is something that really impacts everyone very directly.

One of the issues we have to understand as thoroughly as we can is technology breakthrough. We need incentives for that, but they do not happen overnight. You cannot just regulate that they are going to do that. They don't just happen. That is not the way it is. Furthermore, it takes away the choices we have, where we ought to be able to do some things by incentive which I think are very possible. I am hopeful we can move forward through our differences and have legislation that will work.

One of the areas that some of us have been working on, and I suspect will continue to work on for some time, is the electric component. Again, there have been debates and discussions about this. The House bill currently does not have an electric title. But there are a number of issues, certainly, that most people would agree need to be reviewed and that we need to do some things in the electric area. We have an opportunity to deal with some of those issues.

One of them is reliability. We have talked about reliability for a very long time. We talked about it in great detail during the time we were having difficulty in California. We really have not done a great deal about that, but we have an opportunity to do so.

We are going to have to make some choices about the way we handle these matters. Quite frankly, we have been through this for some time. We have been through it in terms of reregulation and deregulation.

I thought we had come to the conclusion that those things that are clearly interstate could fairly well be defined and those things that clearly belong on the national level with FERC could fairly well be defined, that those things that have to do with retail and distribution and the unbundled distribution of electricity to homes and businesses within the State would be done by the State. Certainly, that is the way I believe it ought to be done. Having

had a little bit of experience and background in the electric business through the rural electrics, I really think that is the way it ought to be. The needs you have in Pennsylvania and the needs you have in Wyoming are sometimes not the same. So we need to have some flexibility to do that. I am hopeful we will.

This bill, as presented to us now, is really heavy on FERC. It gives FERC all the decisionmaking authority in almost every aspect of electricity. Many of us do not believe that is the way we ought to proceed. Many of us believe we can fix that. There needs to be some overall jurisdiction, of course, with FERC, which is the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, but there are also opportunities for the North American Reliability Council, for Governors, and others.

As a matter of fact, the Western Governors have put forth very detailed ideas of what they would like to do. I happen to agree generally with what they are doing.

So I hope we can deal with this language and deal with how we can best establish a reliable distribution and generation system.

Things have changed. It was not many years ago when you had an electric system, you had the service area, and whoever had that service area generated the electricity they needed. So it was sort of self-confined.

Now we find ourselves more or less deregulated in the generation aspect of it. You have many private market generators that are dealing in it by selling to the distributors. So you have to move it. That is some competition there. I think it can work.

We have to recognize times have changed and we have to do the same thing.

I think we have some unrealistic demands for renewables in this bill. We ought to be moving on renewables, but the idea to put in the bill that it is going to be this percentage or this many tons or this many kilowatt hours by renewables I don't think is a realistic way to do that. We ought to offer incentives, that type of thing. But to put those numbers in there, and say this is the way it is going to be, I think is unrealistic.

We have a number of areas in which we could modify what FERC's authorities are going to be in terms of some things that could better be done on the State level. There are a number of things in the bill that preempt States' rights. I think most of us, or many of us at least, are not of the mind that that is the way we ought to do that.

The Daschle bill basically gives FERC exclusive authority over reliability. It has a renewable portfolio mandate, billions of dollars in consumer cost. It has FERC authority over State matters. It does not need to be that way.

So I think we are in the process of developing a number of amendments which we hope to file and offer as we go

forward, particularly in this area. I am sure there will be many amendments in other areas as well which is proper, particularly since we didn't have committee involvement. We are really doing committee work now on the floor, and that will take some time and effort, but it is necessary in order for us to come out of here with a bill that can be accepted by the Senate, can go to a conference committee, can come out and be accepted by the President.

We have a real challenge before us. I look forward to it and hope we can stick with this issue until it is finished and not come back to campaign finance or something in the middle. We ought to stay with it and keep working, keep as open as we can to other people's ideas, recognizing that it is going to take a long time. But the way it has been brought to us, it has to take a long time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARNAHAN). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, my understanding of the status of business is that we are still considering the amendment Senator DASCHLE offered earlier, of which I am a cosponsor, along with Senators REID and MURKOWSKI and others. That amendment is still pending and is being considered for possible second-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I have also been informed by the floor manager for the majority it is his intention that the Senate will go into recess at 1:30 to allow Senators to attend a briefing Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld is going to conduct for Senators from 1:30 to 2:30. Then we would be back at the same place we are now. That is for the information of Senators.

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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, Secretary Rumsfeld will be here in less than 15 minutes. We believe all Senators should have the opportunity to attend that briefing. I checked with both leaders. They agree. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess until 2:30 today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:16 p.m., recessed until 2:30 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CARPER.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senator LIEBERMAN is here to give an opening statement on the bill. Following his statement, we understand that Senator NICKLES will be here to give a statement. We are working our way through the statements. This is such an important bill. There are a number of Senators who have strong feelings about it, and they wish to lay out their view of what the energy policy in this country should be.

While it may appear that we are not making a lot of headway, I personally think we are making great progress. There is an amendment now pending. Senator MURKOWSKI is contemplating a second-degree amendment to the underlying Daschle amendment. If, in fact, he does offer it, and it is about what I have learned, I think we will accept that and have a vote on the amendment—not because we are concerned about where the votes are, as the measure will receive virtually every vote but we want the first amendment to come out recognizing the importance of Alaska and the southern pipeline and know that when it goes to conference, we hope there is close to unanimous support of the Senate on this measure.

Senator MURKOWSKI has indicated he is ready with an amendment. We will be ready to work on that. We hope to complete all of the statements today and have a vote on the underlying Daschle amendment. If Senator MURKOWSKI wants a vote on the second degree, we would be happy to do that also and move to whatever Senator MURKOWSKI wants to offer.

I ask unanimous consent that following the statement of the Senator from Connecticut, Senator NICKLES be recognized to offer an opening statement regarding this bill.

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

The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, the Senate has begun a very important debate in the last few days on our national energy policy. This is a debate that will literally affect the lives and the quality of the lives of every single American, as well as affect our national security, our independence in carrying out our foreign and defense policies, and the quality of the environment and the natural resources from which we derive such pleasure as Americans. So this is a very important and timely debate.

It has been 10 years since we last passed major energy legislation. We are starting with a bill hundreds of pages long, and hundreds—or at least 100—amendments may find their way onto it. We are going to be debating some very big opportunities and some very big problems, as well as many other smaller issues associated with the bill.

I saw Senator BINGAMAN on the floor. I congratulate him and Senator DASCHLE for their superb leadership, along with that of the occupant of the chair, in developing the energy legislation that we are debating.

The bill before us out of the Energy Committee coordinates the work of many of the committees of the Senate, including the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee which I am privileged to chair, which has contributed a section of this bill. Senator BINGAMAN and Senator DASCHLE have brought before us a very well-balanced national energy policy, which does have some incentives for the development of remaining energy resources in the United States, but makes a turn and acknowledges and acts on the acknowledgment that our energy future is in new technologies being applied to create new sources of energy-efficient, environmentally protected sources of energy. Of course, that will include renewables as well.

Mr. President, this great country became an industrial power for many reasons, including, of course, the skills and ingenuity of our people. But the availability of inexpensive and abundant sources of energy also contributed to the remarkable growth and success of the American economy during the industrial age.

Prior to the mechanization of our society, we relied on wood, water, and horses for much of our energy need. "King Coal" powered the early part of our industrial development and still plays a critical role. Hopefully, it will continue, with the application of new technologies, to play a critical role in generating electricity for our homes, schools, offices, and our factories.

From the time oil was discovered in Pennsylvania in 1859, the petroleum industry has grown enormously—at first, displacing whale oil for lighting and, eventually, powering the world's transportation systems. Enormous deposits of oil spurred development of oil fields in many parts of our country, including Texas, Oklahoma, and California. The 1930s witnessed the enormous expansion of hydropower in various parts of our country, including, of course, the Tennessee Valley and the northwest section of America. In the middle part of the 20th century, we began to harness the atom and develop nuclear power, which was going to be, in the view of many at that time, "too cheap to meter." In other words, it would be so inexpensive you would not even be able to keep track of it to base costing on.

Nuclear power continues to be a significant part of our energy mix. In a State like mine, it is most significant. We have two plants up and operating that have been decommissioned. I hope we can find a way forward to build a next generation of safe nuclear powerplants.

The oil price shocks of the 1970s brought home to us our dependence on foreign markets for oil, on which so