

men a great deal. These two gentlemen have to understand that the House legislation would never have passed without their travels around the country daring people not to do something about this. It was because of these two that a cloture motion was signed and filed in the House forcing the House leadership to take up this legislation.

Now there is going to be a lot written about this. There will never be enough positive written about the work you two have done. If you never do another thing legislatively—which you both do a great deal—you have done so much. There are very few people in the history of this country, in my opinion, legislatively, that have done as much as you are about to accomplish when this legislation passes.

I wanted you to be here to tell you how much people will appreciate the fact, even though they may not feel the benefit as some Members here, with the work you have done. It will improve our system of government, and it will put it back, in my opinion, the way it used to be, when people campaigned—instead of going out seeing how much money they could raise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. We thank the Senator from Nevada for his extremely kind words and we thank the majority leader for his firm resolve in a very reasonable timeframe to bring this matter to a conclusion. I also thank the Senator from Nevada for the many hours he has been here with us on this issue. He has been extremely helpful. I look forward to the final stages with the Senator from Nevada and my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Nevada not only for his kind remarks, which may be to some degree undeserved, but his continuous help as we have gone through every conceivable parliamentary obstacle as we moved forward. I am very appreciative of his patience, as well as his kind words.

Perhaps we are entering the last phase. Perhaps not. As the famous philosopher Yogi Berra said: It ain't over until it's over.

I think we have established a scenario which could lead us to a conclusion. I believe, for a period of time, this result may have the beneficial effect that Senator REID predicts.

I yield the floor.

#### NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001—Continued

Mr. REID. For the information of all Senators, Senator DASCHLE has indicated he would like a vote about 4:30 this afternoon. So everyone should arrange their schedules accordingly. This vote is on the Campbell amendment. Senator CAMPBELL has asked for the yeas and nays. They have been ordered.

Unless there is a change by the two managers of the bill, we will have that vote about 4:30 this afternoon. We will have announcements at a later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. What is the pending business?

AMENDMENT NO. 3007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is No. 3007, offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I rise to speak in favor of the amendment of my colleague from Colorado.

Is there a time agreement or allocations on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is none.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I rise to speak in favor of the amendment put forward by my colleague from Colorado, Senator BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, on the vehicle scrap provision that is in the underlying energy bill.

The Senator from Colorado has hit it right. This program is not a good idea. It is not a good idea to put forward Federal funds to purchase used cars as a way of trying to improve fuel efficiency. This is unproven, not wise, and expensive in the process. Plus, by the number of calls and letters we have been getting in my office, a lot of people do not think it is a very bright idea to go with this program. They do not see the benefits. A number of car enthusiasts think this is a program aimed at getting at them.

This provision creates a federally funded program giving grants to States to establish scrappage programs for vehicles 15 years or older or pursue repairs to improve fuel economy. Owners who turn in such vehicles receive a minimum payment and future credit toward purchasing a new vehicle, meeting certain DOE guidelines.

The stated intent is to retire fuel-inefficient vehicles, the first program of its kind. All prior State scrappage programs sought to address poor emissions. The provision requires a vehicle to be scrapped, not stripped for parts.

To make a couple of points, this provision has no guaranteed environmental benefit. Vehicle scrapping requires States neither to determine the fuel efficiency of vehicles being scrapped nor to certify that scrapped vehicles are replaced by more fuel-efficient vehicles. A carowner could scrap an older but more fuel-efficient compact car and replace it with a newer but less fuel-efficient vehicle. While revisions have been made to address this problem, the fundamental issue remains: There is no guarantee that the scrapped car is actually replaced by a more efficient one. That is point one.

Under this provision, cars rarely or never driven, vehicles that have minimal or no impact on overall fuel economy, may be turned into scrap. DOE would be required to pay and give credit to carowners for these cars, although they are just sitting there.

This provision could possibly hurt low- and fixed-income families and in-

dividuals. Even if, as proponents claim, section 822 did improve emissions somewhat, the program will definitely create a burden on the used car market and the low- to middle-income families who buy them.

If the vehicles are scrapped, then their parts are destroyed. A reduced supply of older auto parts translates into an increased demand for these parts, raising the cost for anyone who desires to responsibly maintain his or her older vehicle. Low- and fixed-income car occupiers who cannot afford to purchase a new DOE-approved vehicle are affected. I don't think the authors of this provision desire that sort of feature. That is the likely impact.

If the Department of Energy gets into a State grant program and buys up a bunch of older used cars, it will drive up the market price for the cars. That is not an impact we want on lower or moderate-income families, or families seeking to buy a first-time car for a younger member of the family. They should not be competing against the Government for that car, nor should they compete against the Government for replacement parts for that car because the older vehicles are being scrapped.

Vehicle scrappage hurts small business by encouraging the destruction of older, and in some cases vintage, cars and the parts necessary for maintenance. This provision would have a detrimental effect on the automotive industry on aftersales. After the new car is sold, there is a huge industry that supports the auto industry in the automotive sales after the original sale; 98 percent of that business is comprised of small businesses.

The potential cost of the program to taxpayers is unclear. Certainly the benefits are unclear, but the costs are unclear. This provision states neither how much DOE will pay for each scrapped vehicle nor the value of the credit toward a new vehicle purchase. The State programs do not offer a clear precedent. The State of California Bureau of Automotive Repair pays \$1,000 for each donated car. However, this program addresses the State's poor air quality, not fuel efficiency. Moreover, no State provides interested car donors with credits toward the purchase of new cars. This vehicle scrap program does not meet its own intended goals. It hurts low- and middle-income families who are the predominant buyers of used cars or families buying for first-time car users.

It is the wrong way to dedicate our Federal resources. We all want a better environment, but this is not the way to achieve it. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Campbell amendment to take out this provision.

This impacts a lot more people than what might appear on the surface. It has broad impact for the public. It is not being well-received by the public. We are getting a number of calls and letters in our office saying this is a bad idea for a program. It seems highly

controversial and questionable in its ability to impact in a positive way fuel efficiency. With the lack of support from the public, this provision should be scrapped—not the vehicles.

For that reason, I call on my colleagues to vote for the Campbell amendment.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have spoken to the managers of this legislation and, as a result of that, I ask unanimous consent that at 4:20 p.m. this afternoon there be 10 minutes of debate in relation to Campbell amendment No. 3007, equally divided between Senators CAMPBELL and BINGAMAN prior to the 4:30 vote in relation to the amendment, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to that vote.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to join Senator CAMPBELL in opposing section 822 of S. 517, which is pending. I support the amendment by Senator CAMPBELL to strike that. The section creates a federally funded program requiring States to establish scrappage programs for vehicles 15 years and older, or pays such car owners to improve the fuel economy. Owners who turn in such vehicles receive the minimum payment and a future credit towards purchasing a new vehicle that meets certain DOE guidelines.

The section's stated intent is to retire inefficient vehicles. This is really the first of its kind. All prior State scrappage programs sought to address primarily poor emissions standards.

Who is affected by this? Although section 822 is a voluntary program, everyone who opts in is penalized. A reduced supply of auto parts translates to increased costs to everyone who wants to responsibly maintain their older vehicles. Since section 822 disproportionately impacts or penalizes low-income and fixed-income vehicle owners, car owners who cannot afford to purchase a new Department-of-Energy-approved vehicle are particularly affected by the increased costs of parts as they translate to increased maintenance as the car grows older.

Section 822 would have a detrimental impact on small businesses. Mr. President, 98 percent of the aftermarket parts industry are really small businesses. Some people would refer to them as car yards, yards and so forth. But particularly for young people growing up and people on modest income, that is where they get their parts.

Section 822 does not require States to determine the fuel efficiency of vehi-

cles being scrapped, where scrapped vehicles are being replaced by more fuel-efficient vehicles. A car owner could scrap an older but more fuel-efficient compact car and replace it with a newer but less fuel-efficient vehicle.

Section 822 would require the Department of Energy to give credit to car owners who turn in cars that are rarely or never driven—vehicles that have minimal or no impact on overall fuel economy.

Further, this section requires the States to create a program that provides public notification of the intent to scrap and allow the salvage of "valuable parts" from the vehicle without providing for the costs or the regulation of this operation; determines the registration, operational status, and repair needs of vehicles as well as the dissemination of funds for these procedures; and provides reports on the program's fuel efficiency to the DOE.

Since we have spent a good deal of time here on safety and costs, what about the cost? We don't know what the cost to the taxpayer will be.

Section 822 requires all U.S. taxpayers to pay for some to purchase new cars. It does not state how much the DOE will pay for the vehicle or the value of the credit towards the purchase of the new vehicle.

No State currently provides new car buyers with "credits" towards the purchase of new cars. Since there is no precedent concerning "credits" and section 822 provides no guidance, no one knows the total cost to the U.S. taxpayers.

Section 822 would establish the voluntary repair programs for vehicles without detailing guidelines or costs of those repairs.

I am told there are over 38 million cars 15 years old or older on the roads right now. Current State programs currently pay \$1,000 for each donated car. This translates into at least \$38 billion in potential Department of Energy costs for scrappage payments alone and does not include repair or purchase incentive costs included in the provisions of this section.

As Citizens Against Government Waste states:

This provision has all the symptoms of developing into a costly government program that can be handled far more efficiently and inexpensively by the private sector.

What we have here is an effort to take the older cars that are paid for off the road—not because of concern over emissions but rather a concern over taking away parts availability of these cars as a consequence of removing them from the highways.

A lot of collectors and others who want to have good used cars clearly look upon this as an intrusion of the Federal Government into their own privacy which they treasure.

I support the amendment by Senator CAMPBELL, which is section 822 of the bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I think this energy bill is critically important. The whole question of how we consume and produce energy in relationship to the environment is critically important, especially in my State of Minnesota at the other end of the pipeline where we import our oil in barrels and natural gas, and we export our dollars.

I will be in the Chamber talking about energy policy a lot, especially as we focus on renewables and clean fuel.

I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry: Mr. President, are we still on the bill and on an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on the energy bill and on amendment No. 3007 by Senator CAMPBELL.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have no amendment to offer at this time, but I ask unanimous consent that I be given up to 7 minutes as in morning business for some comments on the economy, which is indirectly related to the energy bill.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair and thank the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I was in the office when the electricity portion was discussed. First, I compliment the staffs who worked so hard to reach an accord, Senator BINGAMAN and his staff, our staff. The adoption of the bipartisan package of amendments was a good, encouraging start in this long process to resolve the electricity issue. I have long advocated moving forward to promote competition in the electric power industry. Competition certainly benefits consumers, increases supply, helps reduce the cost of power.

I have long promoted the three guiding principles for good electric legislation: To deregulate where we can, streamline where we can, and not interfere with the States protecting retail customers.

It would be appropriate to basically underline what we have been able to accomplish. I also thank a number of my colleagues. Senator CRAIG THOMAS, particularly, had the initiative under the leadership's guidance to coordinate this for the minority. I want to take a few minutes to recognize what we were able to do from what the underlying bill addressed.

Under section 202, mergers, there was a concern. The concern was that it would be a major expansion of FERC

authority over traditional State matters with no time limit on FERC review and action. By this bipartisan effort, we were able to come up with a solution. The solution reduces the expansion of FERC authority, raises the threshold for FERC review of asset sales from \$1 million to \$10 million, excludes from FERC review acquisition of generation that is under State jurisdiction, and establishes procedures for expedited action on merger applications.

Secondly, under section 203, the market-based rates, there was a concern that it gave FERC broad authority to take "any action"—that startled a lot of people—any action to initiate unjust rates, including divestiture and mandatory RTO participation. It specified six specific factors FERC must use when granting/revoking market-based rates which possibly intrude on State rate-making.

Again, the question was the broad authority to take any action. What we did in the solution was FERC can only fix the rate itself, if found to be unjust. And the six specific criteria modified to be three general criteria that FERC can use if FERC considers them to be relevant. So we took the authority from any action and conditioned it. If they found it to be unjust, then they have the authority to fix it.

The other one in section 204, refund effective date: The concern was the provision created an open-ended period for FERC to act to establish a "refund effective date." Refunds, of course, might never go into effect. The solution was: Restore existing law which provides a 5-month window for FERC to establish the refund effective date.

Section 205, transmission interconnections: The concern there was whether it gave FERC authority on own motion to order construction of transmission and sale of electricity. It didn't have to be requested by a third party.

Eliminated protections in existing law—Bonneville, for example—and their retail wheeling issue: A solution to that was to strike section 205 entirely. We eliminated that concern.

Section 209, access to transmission by intermittent generators: The concern there was: Gave transmission subsidies to "intermittent" generators; created a presumption that intermittent generators do not create any reliability problem; did not allow utilities to recover all costs of transmitting electricity for intermittent generators. The solution: Eliminate transmission subsidies; eliminate presumption on reliability; ensure that utilities recover all transmission costs.

The next section was 241, real-time pricing: The concerns: Did not include time of use metering. The solution was: Add time of use metering.

Section 245, net metering: The concern there was: Establishing a Federal net metering program that preempted 35 existing State net metering programs. The solution was: Convert

PURPA section 111(d) requirement that State PUCs and nonregulated utilities consider the Federal standard.

Section 256, State authority: The concerns there were: Preempted State consumer protection laws and regulations to the extent they are inconsistent with FTC regulations. The solution was: Eliminate preemption.

Section 263: The concern is: Required the Federal Government to purchase renewable power—regardless of the cost. That was somewhat contentious. The DOD needs to spend money on the war—not renewables. The solution was: "Best efforts" only to purchase renewable power.

So we went from a mandate requiring the Federal Government to purchase renewable power, regardless of the cost, to a solution that was to use the best efforts only to purchase renewable power.

I thought that explanation was in order because there are a lot of terms and technology involved here. I think it is meaningful that we have a solution and we have a bipartisan agreement.

I thank my colleague, the Senator from New Mexico, and others who were active in this, including the professional staff who worked so hard to achieve it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2995

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thought I would take a moment to speak about an amendment that has already been accepted. I was very proud to offer this amendment along with Senator DOMENICI and Senator CRAIG yesterday. I thank the chairman for his leadership in this effort. Because the time was short yesterday and we really did not get to present the amendment, I thought I would say a few words about it while we have time pending a vote.

This amendment by Senator DOMENICI, Senator CRAIG, and myself says will contribute to the strengthening of this bill.

It says that as we develop our nuclear reactors in the future, they will be designed with new technologies that look very promising, not only to make our nuclear industry more powerful and more effective, but also to create the opportunity to produce hydrogen which can help us in meeting our energy needs.

I will explain for the record why this is so important.

As most Members know, nuclear energy now provides one-fifth of all the electric power used in this country. I do not think that is clear to everyone

in the United States. Some people think we have shut our nuclear industry down or that we have shut our nuclear powerplants down. That is not true. The truth is, 20 percent of the power we use in this Nation is generated by nuclear energy.

Nuclear power produces energy without compromising air quality and without dangerous reliance on fuel exports from politically unstable regions of the world.

When we look a few years into the future, the projected demand for increased electric power is staggering. That is one of the reasons we are considering this legislation: because the demand for power and the demand for energy is far outpacing our ability to produce it. Because we have different views about production, we have conflicting views about conservation; that does not mean the demand, or the challenge, is going to go away.

It means we have to work harder to find solutions, and this is one solution. According to the Energy Information Administration, by the year 2020 the U.S. will need, under current trends, 400,000 megawatts of additional electric power capacity. That is the equivalent of 400 new coal plants or gas-fired plants to be built in this country before the year 2020.

I am in no way opposed to burning coal. We are doing it in a much cleaner and better way for our environment. I am obviously not opposed to domestic natural gas production or imported natural gas. That also meets our new environmental standards. We have to meet some of this demand, but for environmental and energy security reasons we cannot completely rely on these sources.

Just to maintain the existing proportion of nonemitting nuclear power in our energy mix, we will have to construct 50 nuclear plants. So we have to build more nuclear powerplants, and our amendment helps to build them in the right ways.

It is clear to this Senator that the environmental and energy security benefits of nuclear power are so compelling that not only must we ensure the continued operation of our existing plants, but we must also encourage the construction of new plants in this country to help meet this extraordinary demand.

Let me be very clear, when push comes to shove, we have a very short list of energy options for the foreseeable future: oil, natural gas, coal, nuclear, hydropower, conservation, and renewables such as solar and wind. All of these have substantial roles to play in our future energy mix, but none of these by themselves is enough to address the huge demand that is facing us.

Again, that is one of the compelling reasons, if not the principal reason, that we are fighting to shape an energy bill that will meet this demand. Why? Because it is important our economy continue to grow so we can be not only

the great military power we are, but the greatest economic power as well.

Nuclear power is perhaps unique in this list in that there is a large potential for expansion in the relatively near term with little downside in terms of environmental damage or an increase in our reliance on foreign sources. Furthermore, as many Members are aware, there is an exciting next generation of nuclear reactors being developed which take a good product and make it even better.

These reactors, which should be available by the end of this decade, are meltdown proof, substantially more efficient than the old generation, produce less high-level waste, and are more proliferation resistant than existing reactors. That, in this post-September 11 day and age, is a goal we need to be mindful of. We need to be mindful that this material in the wrong hands could cause a lot of trouble, a lot of destruction, and that is why this new design is exciting.

Indeed, one of these designs, the gas turbine modular helium reactor, is even designed to be built underground and therefore better suited to the threats that now present themselves post-September 11.

The Federal Government should work closely with the nuclear industry and with our utilities to see that these new reactors live up to the claims being made about them and that they are brought to market as soon as possible.

Let me turn now to another aspect with which our amendment attempts to address. We have spent a great deal of time this morning speaking about the transportation sector, CAFE standards, and what can we do to make our transportation sector more efficient. All of those are very important issues. But one of the most interesting solutions that might be found as we develop a new generation of nuclear powerplants is the byproduct of these new plants—hydrogen.

The administration recently announced some interesting facts regarding the development of a new generation of hydrogen-powered car. They call it the freedom car. But we should be mindful that we could call it the freedom truck, the freedom bus. This is not only about cars.

Every Member probably realizes the importance of ultimately changing the coinage of the energy and transportation sector from oil to something else. Although we are an oil- and gas-producing State, and I am proud of the oil and gas that we produce, we know even in Louisiana that the future calls for a greater mix, and the new nuclear reactors could really be what we need in terms of freeing ourselves from imported oil.

Our recent engagement in the Middle East and the festering instabilities there, make it very clear the sooner we wean ourselves from imported oil the better. Hydrogen, either through direct combustion or through fuel cells,

seems to have all the hallmarks of an ideal, non-polluting fuel for transportation that might ultimately supplant imported oil. However, the President's announcement and much of the subsequent excitement seems to miss one very important question: Where are we going to get the hydrogen in the quantities necessary to fuel the cars or trucks or buses on our Nation's highways in the future?

Please remember that hydrogen is not an energy source. Hydrogen is an energy carrier. It must be produced by either splitting water or reforming fossil fuels. Right now, industrial scale quantities of hydrogen are produced from natural gas or other fossil fuels, but it does not make sense from an environmental or energy security point of view to produce hydrogen from fossil fuels. What progress would we be making if we go down that road?

So what is the alternative? Fortunately, nuclear power is offering to us an alternative, a very promising way to produce large amounts of hydrogen required to move towards a hydrogen economy in the relatively near term.

The more promising way to produce hydrogen is to utilize the next generation of nuclear reactors that operate at much higher temperatures. The higher temperatures of these reactors make possible a process called thermochemical water splitting. The process has received only minor research dollars in this country but has received substantial research dollars in funding from other parts of the world, including Japan.

Thermochemical water splitting is very promising as it is environmentally benign and has a very high rate of efficiency. Indeed, it is up to 50 percent more efficient in converting the heat of a reactor into hydrogen energy.

The amendment we have offered and that has been accepted recognizes the importance of developing a next generation of reactors that is safer, more economical, more proliferation resistant, and creates less waste. It also recognizes the importance of developing hydrogen production capabilities with the next generation of nuclear reactors.

The promise of a hydrogen-based transportation sector is indeed very exciting. As the chairman has pointed out on numerous occasions, it is the transportation sector demand that is driving our dangerous and unwise, in my opinion, reliance on foreign oil imports. We must begin to free ourselves from that relationship, and this amendment, with the underlying technology, gives us a real opportunity, not in 50 years, not in 20 years, but within the next few years, in this decade, to begin exploring new technologies that keep our environment clean, that give us the freedom we deserve and we expect, and also is well within our economic means of achieving.

It is very exciting, but unless we plant the seeds of a realistic means of

producing the large scale amounts of hydrogen required, this dream will never be realized. Based on the acceptance of this amendment, I think the Senate has decided that the next generation of nuclear powerplants we are going to have to build in this Nation anyway could provide that answer.

It has been a great pleasure working on this amendment with my colleagues and being part of this energy debate.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, let me congratulate my colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana, on her amendment. I think the realization of what the advanced technology would mean, particularly on high-level nuclear waste in recovery of hydrogen for a number of purposes, including fuel cells and others, is something that would tend to focus in on high-level waste, and would have a potential value there that may lead us to recognize it is not sufficient to just concentrate on burying this waste.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is 10 minutes of debate on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. Who yields time?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. If I may have 1 minute to compliment the Senator from Louisiana.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I will take it off of our time.

I commend the Senator for her recognition of the value of high-level nuclear waste and the utilization of it.

I also commend the Senator from Louisiana on her bioenergy amendment, which we have accepted. This amendment expands the authorization for bioenergy research to include biochemical processes that can create certain replacements. There is promising research in these areas. It is wise to continue to work on this. We support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana for these two amendments. I am a co-sponsor of both. On a bigger scale than that, we are both from oil and gas States. Yet the Senator has taken a position that it is not just oil and gas that make up the future for the United States. We have to look at a variety of alternatives.

The Senator has done a superb job working on nuclear issues. The two proposed amendments on nuclear are clearly relevant. We are moving ahead in those areas in the appropriations process. The Senator will have the assurance that both are covered by appropriations if, indeed, Senator BINGAMAN and the others bring it back from conference with the amendments.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I appreciate those remarks. The Senator from New Mexico has been an extraordinary leader in this field of nuclear energy.

I compliment the industry. The Senator from New Mexico understands that the oil and gas industry has been, in the last couple of years, broadening its horizons and outlook in welcoming these new sources of energy. They are turning themselves from oil companies to energy companies, from gas companies to energy companies, opening up possibilities for new sources of energy.

I commend the industry and hope this bill that Senator DOMENICI has worked on so hard will compliment the work in the private sector to help this country get to the freedom we need from imported sources so we can set our own destiny.

I am proud to be a sponsor of this amendment and others like it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I compliment the Senator from Louisiana also for her amendment earlier agreed to. We worked hard with her and her staff to be sure this amendment could be included in the bill. I am glad it is in the bill.

What is the regular order?

AMENDMENT NO. 3007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a vote at 4:30 with respect to the Campbell amendment.

Mr. BINGAMAN. How much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes thirty seconds on the Senator's time and 2 minutes for the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I yield the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Senator SMITH of New Hampshire added as a cosponsor of this amendment, and I yield myself the remainder of the time.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Colleagues, section 822 is a bad idea. Under section 822, we are going to allow the DOE to give grants to take 15-year-old, and possibly more, fuel-efficient cars, which would rarely be driven, off the highways and then turn around and offer another grant of taxpayer-funded money to people who want to purchase a new car which may be less fuel efficient than the ones to be taken off the highway and will probably be driven more because they are newer.

How do we sell that under the guise of fuel efficiency? States have the ability to have scrappage programs—many do. Some offer between \$1,000 and \$2,000 per car to be scrapped. In the suggested grant to take older cars out of circulation, if one-fourth of the 38 million cars 15 years or older were funded, it would cost taxpayers \$19 billion. Maybe I am missing something, but I did hear we have lost our huge surplus of last year and may, in fact, be in deficit this year. It seems to me we have a better

place to use our money. This is not the time to spend \$19 billion.

The authors of the section 822 say it is voluntary, but who will turn down a potential \$1,000 to turn in an old car and another \$1,000 of taxpayer money to buy a new one when someone else is paying?

I ask my colleagues to vote down section 822 at 4:30.

As Senators, we have an obligation to make decisions based on information. Here, the authors of section 822 are asking you to make a decision based on no information because no studies or hearings were ever held that would legitimize the Federal subsidization of car scrappage programs.

Again, the authors of 822 argue that compelling states to establish scrappage and repair programs to get older cars off the road is a voluntary program. Further, they argue that some states already have scrappage programs.

Well, if States want scrappage programs then they should be able to establish their own—why should the Federal Government have any role in that which States can do already do?

Furthermore, the authors of section 822's reliance on some states choosing to establish scrappage program is misleading. Current state programs seek to address poor emissions quality, a serious health concern.

Section 822 assumes that older cars have poor fuel efficiency and creates an expensive carrot and stick approach to compel states and individuals to participate in a completely new and untested program.

In any event section 822 does not provide any means testing ensuring that only fuel inefficient vehicles are scrapped. Therefore, a 1986 Ford Escort getting 41 city miles per gallon would be treated the same as a Cadillac Seville of the same year that gets a mere 17 miles per gallon. The only qualifying criteria would be that they are both 1986 automobiles.

The authors of section 822 state that no one is penalized, that only individuals choosing to participate would be affected. Yet, the truth is that everyone is captured by this program.

The reduced supply of car parts translates to increased costs for low and fixed income people who cannot afford to buy a federal government subsidized, DOE approved vehicle.

Further, there are 38 million cars that could be affected. If just one quarter of those owners chose to get \$1,000 for scrapping their car, and then another tax payer subsidized \$1,000 credit to buy a new DOE approved vehicle, the total cost to all U.S. taxpayers, whether they "volunteer" to participate or not, would be \$19 billion.

Well, that seems to be a lot of money—that's because it is. I would have my friends note that at no time did the authors of section 822 state that this provision would not be terribly expensive. They didn't defend their measure as fiscally responsible because they don't know if it is or not.

The authors argue that they "fixed" their provision by requiring the states to hold a public notification of the intent to scrap vehicles and then provide for parts salvage. How will a state possibly manage that, and what will it cost the federal government? Again, we don't know.

A few short hours ago, my friend Senator BINGAMAN stated, "I don't see why it is in the public interest to strike a provision that enables the Secretary of Transportation to pursue this to the extent that the Appropriations Committee puts funds in to support the program." Normally, we know how much money something costs before we buy it.

I ask you not to buy this ill conceived Federal subsidization scrappage program of old cars and welfare for the wealthy. Section 822 will hurt the most vulnerable of our citizens, hurt small businesses, and hurt U.S. taxpayers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, first, as I indicated, I am disappointed the Senator from Colorado felt obligated to offer this amendment. Having heard his concerns and the concerns of others, I urge all Senators to support his amendment. My view is this is not an amendment that justifies having a vote on the Senate floor, but he is insisting on one, so evidently we will go through it and have a rollcall vote and bring all Senators to the floor to vote for the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGAMAN. I yield the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If our colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not need a recorded vote, we do not, either. If he is willing to accept this amendment, I am sure the minority would, too, and I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the recorded vote.

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, before we do the voice vote, which I gather is what the Senator from Colorado would like on his amendment, let me read some provisions or sections of a letter we received from the Automotive Service Association.

This is a letter to Senator DASCHLE, dated February 25, an organization with 15,000 members nationwide. It has 300 members in Colorado, my colleague's home State. It says:

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: I want to thank you for your efforts on behalf of the automotive aftermarket in the development of Senate Bill 517, the energy policies act of 2002.

The Automotive Service Association is the largest and the oldest trade association representing independent automotive repair facilities in the United States. . . .

Your revised Section 832, Assistance for State Programs to Retire Fuel-Inefficient Motor Vehicles, includes both a repair and recycling facilities. This assists mechanical and coalition repair facilities. Quite frankly, many of these older vehicles would not receive fuel-efficiency related repairs without

some incentive. This legislation will provide the opportunity for these vehicles to receive the necessary maintenance.

Allowing the salvage of valuable parts enhances competition in the parts marketplace as well as makes sense for the environment.

We appreciate the efforts that you and Chairman Jeff Bingaman have made to alleviate many of the concerns our industry has had with this legislation. We support the bill and look forward to a continued working relationship with you and your staff.

ASA is contacting automotive repairers in South Dakota and New Mexico to inform them of your efforts.

Signed by Robert Redding, Jr., on behalf of the Automotive Service Association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent this entire letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I believe this is good public policy to enact, along the lines we have talked about here. But since my colleague and others have indicated concern about including it in the energy bill, I have no problem with it being deleted.

I urge all Senators to support the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

AUTOMOTIVE SERVICE ASSOCIATION,  
Bedford, TX, February 25, 2002.

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

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: I want to thank you for your efforts on behalf of the automotive aftermarket in the development of Senate Bill 517, the Energy Policy Act of 2002.

The Automotive Service Association is the largest and oldest trade association representing independent automotive repair facilities in the United States. These collision, mechanical and transmission small business members are located in all fifty states and several foreign countries.

Your revised Section 832, Assistance for State Programs to Retire Fuel-Inefficient Motor Vehicles, includes both a repair and recycling option. This assists mechanical and collision repair facilities. Quite frankly, many of these older vehicles would not receive fuel-efficiency related repairs without some incentive. This legislation will provide the opportunity for these vehicles to receive the necessary maintenance.

Allowing the salvage of valuable parts enhances competition in the parts marketplace as well as makes sense for the environment.

We appreciate the efforts you and Chairman Jeff Bingaman have made to alleviate many of the concerns our industry has had with this legislation. We support the bill and look forward to a continued working relationship with you and your staff.

ASA is contacting automotive repairers in South Dakota and New Mexico to inform them of your efforts.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. REDDING, Jr.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time and urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield back his time?

Mr. BINGAMAN. I yield all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3007) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3009

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have an amendment with reference to an Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research. I send it to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) proposes an amendment numbered 3009.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish an Office within the Department of Energy to explore alternative management strategies for spent nuclear fuel)

On page 123, after line 17, insert the following:

#### SEC. 514. OFFICE OF SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL RESEARCH.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) before the Federal Government takes any irreversible action relating to the disposal of spent nuclear fuel, Congress must determine whether the spent fuel in the repository should be treated as waste subject to permanent burial or should be considered an energy resource that is needed to meet future energy requirements; and

(2) national policy on spent nuclear fuel may evolve with time as improved technologies for spent fuel are developed or as national energy needs evolve.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR.—The term “Associate Director” means the Associate Director of the Office.

(2) OFFICE.—The term “Office” means the Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research within the Office of Nuclear Energy Science and Technology of the Department of Energy.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research within the Office of Nuclear Energy Science and Technology of the Department of Energy.

(d) HEAD OF OFFICE.—The Office shall be headed by the Associate Director, who shall be a member of the Senior Executive Service appointed by the Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy Science and Technology, and compensated at a rate determined by applicable law.

(e) DUTIES OF THE ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Associate Director shall be responsible for carrying out an integrated research, development, and demonstration program on technologies for treatment, recycling, and disposal of high-level nuclear radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel, subject to the general supervision of the Secretary.

(2) PARTICIPATION.—The Associate Director shall coordinate the participation of national laboratories, universities, the com-

mercial nuclear industry, and other organizations in the investigation of technologies for the treatment, recycling, and disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste.

(3) ACTIVITIES.—The Associate Director shall—

(A) develop a research plan to provide recommendations by 2015;

(B) identify promising technologies for the treatment, recycling, and disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste;

(C) conduct research and development activities for promising technologies;

(D) ensure that all activities include as key objectives minimization of proliferation concerns and risk to the health of the general public or site workers, as well as development of cost-effective technologies;

(E) require research on both reactor- and accelerator-based transmutation systems;

(F) require research on advanced processing and separations;

(G) include participation of international collaborators in research efforts, and provide funding to a collaborator that brings unique capabilities not available in the United States if the country in which the collaborator is located is unable to provide for their support; and

(H) ensure that research efforts are coordinated with research on advanced fuel cycles and reactors conducted by the Office of Nuclear Energy Science and Technology.

(f) GRANT AND CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may make grants, or enter into contracts, for the purposes of the research projects and activities described in this section.

(g) REPORT.—The Associate Director shall annually submit to Congress a report on the activities and expenditures of the Office that describes the progress being made in achieving the objectives of this section.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I introduce an amendment creating a new DOE Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research. This new Office would organize a research program to explore new, improved national strategies for spent nuclear fuel.

Spent fuel has immense energy potential—that we are simply tossing away with our focus only on a permanent repository. We could be recycling that spent fuel back into civilian fuel and extracting additional energy. We could follow the examples of France, the U.K., and Japan in reprocessing the fuel to not only extract more energy, but also to reduce the volume and toxicity of the final waste forms.

It is too bad we did not start with this emphasis and organization within the last 15 or 20 years. But we were on a path that said under no conditions would we do this. We thought it would add to the nonproliferation potential. We thought we would set an example and nobody would do it, so we would not produce any additional plutonium.

What happened is we stayed in our rut, thinking it was going to be worldwide, while other countries decided ours was a rather imprudent policy and they have proceeded. I just enumerated the countries that have done that.

I support continued progress at Yucca Mountain and appreciate the President's decision to move ahead toward licensing of it as our Nation's first permanent repository for high



level waste. But, I have frequently suggested that our single-minded focus on this "solution" for spent fuel does not serve our Nation well. It is simply not obvious that permanent disposal of spent fuel is in the best interests of all our citizens. It's even less obvious to me that we should equate the terms "spent fuel" and "waste."

Since Yucca Mountain can't accommodate all the spent fuel from our current generation of nuclear plants, we clearly either need a better solution or more repositories. Given the level of local public support enjoyed by Yucca Mountain, I don't think any of us should relish the prospect of creating more Yucca Mountains.

Depending on our future demands and options for electricity, we may need to recover the tremendous energy that remains in spent fuel. And strong public opposition to disposal of spent fuel, with its long-term radio toxicity, may preclude use of repositories that simply accept and permanently store spent fuel.

If the research program led by this new office is successful, we can recover the residual energy in spent fuel. And we could produce a final waste form that is no more toxic, after a few hundred years, than the original uranium ore. I was very pleased that the President specifically endorsed these studies of reprocessing and transmutation in the national energy policy.

I am well aware that reprocessing is not viewed as economically practical now, because of today's very low uranium prices. Furthermore, I fully recognize that it must only be done with careful attention to proliferation issues. But I submit that the U.S. should be prepared for a future evaluation that may determine that we are too hasty today to treat spent fuel as waste, and that instead we should have been viewing it as an energy resource for future generations.

We do not have the knowledge today to make this decision. This amendment establishes a research program to evaluate options to provide real data for such a future decision.

This research program would have other benefits. We may want to reduce the toxicity of materials in any repository to address public concerns. Or we may find we need another repository in the future, and want to incorporate advanced technologies into the final waste products at that time. We could, for example, decide that we want to maximize the storage potential of a future repository, and that would require some treatment of the spent fuel before final disposition.

This amendment requires that a range of advanced approaches for spent fuel be studied with the new Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research. It encourages the Department to seek international cooperation. I know, based on personal contacts, that France, Russia, and Japan are eager to join with us in an international study of spent fuel options.

It requires that we focus on research programs that minimize proliferation and health risks from the spent fuel. And it requires that we study the economic implications of each technology.

With this new Office and its research program, the United States will be prepared, some years in the future, to make the most intelligent decision regarding the future of nuclear energy as one of our major power sources. Maybe at that time, we'll have other better energy alternatives and decide that we can move away from nuclear power. Or we may find that we need nuclear energy to continue and even expand its current contribution to our nation's power grid. In any case, this research will provide the framework to guide Congress in these future decisions.

Mr. President, while I have the floor, I also want to speak briefly to three other amendments on nuclear energy issues, presented by my colleagues, Ms. LANDRIEU and Mr. CRAIG. I greatly appreciate their interest in this important technology. I strongly support these additional amendments and am a cosponsor of each one.

Ms. LANDRIEU has two amendments. One notes the important role that hydrogen may play in future transportation strategies for the nation, either directly as a fuel or in fuel cells. Either of these approaches could lead to a transportation sector that is virtually emission free. This is a great vision, but it depends on, among several challenges, identification of a cheap reliable supply of hydrogen.

Hydrogen can either be made from water using electricity, or from several chemical processes involving heat. Senator LANDRIEU's amendment asks that the Nuclear Energy Research Initiative specifically explore the use of nuclear reactors for hydrogen production.

Reactors are well suited to such a challenge. They could supply electricity in off-peak hours. Or, some types of advanced reactors would provide an ample heat resource. In fact, in Japan, their research on one form of advanced reactor is focused on hydrogen production.

Her second amendment encourages the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to explore licensing issues, which may arise with advanced reactor designs. Her legislation would allow the NRC to pursue this research without tapping income collected from licensees, through use of appropriated funds. This is a good idea, and one that is already encouraged in the appropriations process.

Mr. CRAIG's nuclear energy amendment authorizes the Nuclear Power 2010 program, as proposed by the Administration to begin in fiscal year 2003. This builds on and expands the work pursued in the Nuclear Energy Technology Program that has been funded for the last two years.

Under this new program the DOE would seek industrial proposals for joint venture teams to participate, in-

cluding development of business arrangements for building and operating new plants in the United States. I appreciate that it would pursue development of the two most promising classes of advanced reactors, either water- or gas-cooled systems.

Mr. CRAIG's inclusion of international collaboration is also critical, just as I want to encourage such participation in development of improved strategies for spent fuel. Many countries have strong nuclear energy programs, we can achieve mutual goals faster and cheaper if we work together, just as is now happening with the ten-nation effort toward the Generation IV reactor.

I share the vision of Mr. CRAIG that the Nuclear Power 2010 program will result in a new reactor in this country in the next decade. That will be an important step in demonstrating to our citizens and to the world that the United States is not going to be left by the wayside while other countries pursue this vital energy source.

Tomorrow or next week, whichever is most accommodating, I will take the floor and tell the American people what is in this bill regarding the future for nuclear energy. Many things have already been adopted and put in the bill by the sponsors, but we now have, with this amendment before the Senate or put in the bill, all of the amendments that Senators who have been following and working in this area thought were important to its future. They will now be encapsulated in this with the adoption of this, which is our last one.

#### NUCLEAR WASTE

Mr. REID. I want to confirm that acceptance of this amendment does not create any opportunity to discuss nuclear waste issues in conference.

Mr. DOMENICI. I agree with the Senator's view. I will be a conferee on this bill. I assure the Senator that I will resist any attempt to open the conference to discussion of waste issues. I would also like to note that, as stated in the amendment, the national laboratories will play strong roles in this work. In fact, from our positions on the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee on Appropriations, let's work together to ensure their participation.

I thank Senator BINGAMAN in advance of agreeing to this for his help on it, for what he has done in the bill with reference to not only the Price-Anderson, which he took the lead on even though it was not his amendment, but all the other provisions he has put in that will create a level playing field and modernize Americans' ability to utilize nuclear power if they choose, since it will not pollute the environment and can be part of a national program to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me say with the colloquy my colleague from New Mexico has entered into the

RECORD between himself and Senator REID, I think all concerns that have been raised on our side are resolved. There is no objection to the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3009) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment by the senior Senator from New Mexico. I appreciate the junior Senator's acceptance of it.

The amendment, as noted, establishes an Office of Spent Fuel within the Department of Energy. It is important that Congress address the range of alternatives to deal with spent fuel from nuclear reactors. This amendment goes a long way to accomplish that.

I have served here 21 years with Senator DOMENICI. He has been a tireless advocate of pursuing the advancement of nuclear energy. Last year he introduced S. 472, which is a comprehensive energy bill and nuclear bill, and the committee held several hearings. He understands we must have a diverse and responsible energy mix if we ever hope to reduce our dependence significantly on Saddam Hussein and his oil.

Currently, nuclear energy provides 20 percent of the electricity in this country. It is taken for granted by many. It is a clean, nonemitting generation and produces no greenhouse gases, no SO<sub>x</sub>, no NO<sub>x</sub>. There are 103 operating reactors in 31 States.

Senator DOMENICI's Office of Spent Fuel is an important part of the future of nuclear energy in this country, and we must deal with the issue of spent fuel. This will require research on all fronts.

The language of the amendment was part of S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Act amendments that passed the Senate in the last Congress. The office would examine the treatment, recycling, and disposal of high-level reactive wastes and spent fuel, and consequently I strongly urge its support. I thank the Members for the adoption of this amendment.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk again about two

nominees, Mr. Emil Frankel, to be Assistant Secretary of Transportation, and Jeffrey Shane, to be Associate Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

I, again, urge the holds that are being placed on these nominations to move forward. It is been 3 months since they were reported unanimously out of the Commerce Committee.

I know both individuals and they are highly qualified. Both of them are nominated for very important jobs in the Department of Transportation. All of us know, in light of the events of September 11, that these jobs are vital to America's security.

I said earlier in my remarks that I had not put a hold on a nominee. What I meant to say—and I would like to correct the record at this time—is that I have put holds on nominees, but I have never done so anonymously. I have stood up and said that I had holds on nominees. On the holds I have put on over the years, I have been here and stated my reasons why. I have not done so anonymously.

I hope the unnamed Member or Members who have a hold on Mr. Shane and Mr. Frankel will come forward. So, I hope, again, that the Senate will consider these two highly qualified nominees. If there are areas that are not related to these nominees, as far as transportation is concerned, I will be pleased to work with any Member to try to get those concerns satisfied.

Again, I would like to correct the record when I stated earlier that I had never put a hold on a nominee. I have never anonymously put a hold on a nominee. And I have forced votes on other nominees as well.

I hope the holds on Mr. Frankel and Mr. Shane will be removed soon. We are in danger of losing those individuals because, understandably, after a period of 3 months, they have to get on with their lives. And that certainly is understandable.

So I hope we will move forward with their nominations soon and the holds will be lifted. Again, I stand ready to work with any Member who has a hold on their nominations if there is any way we can resolve any problems that they might have.

I also state that I never put a hold on a nominee because there was some unrelated issue. I put holds on nominees in the past because I did not think they were qualified, and I stated so.

So I hope that clarifies the record on that. But that does not detract from the fact—whether I ever did or did not—that these are two qualified nominees. It has now been over 3 months since they were reported out of the Commerce Committee and they deserve to have the opportunity to serve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

#### NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001—Continued

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3010 AND 3011, EN BLOC, TO  
AMENDMENT NO. 2917

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk and ask that they be considered en bloc and adopted en bloc. I believe they have been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside.

The clerk will report the amendments.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] proposes amendments numbered 3010 and 3011 en bloc to amendment No. 2917.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments, en bloc, are as follows:

##### AMENDMENT NO. 3010

(Purpose: To include biobased polymers and chemicals in the biofuels program)

On page 405, strike line 16 and all that follows through line 23, and insert the following:

(6) BIOFUELS.—The goal of the biofuels program shall be to develop, in partnership with industry—

(A) advanced biochemical and thermochemical conversion technologies capable of making liquid and gaseous fuels from cellulosic feedstocks that are price-competitive with gasoline or diesel in either internal combustion engines or fuel cell vehicles by 2010; and

(B) advanced biotechnology processes capable of making biofuels, biobased polymers, and chemicals, with particular emphasis on the development of biorefineries that use enzyme based processing systems.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term "cellulosic feedstock" means any portion of a food crop not normally used in food production or any non-food crop grown for the purpose of producing biomass feedstock.

##### AMENDMENT NO. 3011

(Purpose: To direct the Secretary of Energy to study designs for high temperature hydrogen-producing nuclear reactors)

On page 443, strike lines 21 through page 444, line 2 and insert the following:

(2) examine—

(A) advanced proliferation-resistant and passively safe reactor designs;

(B) new reactor designs with higher efficiency, lower cost, and improved safety;

(C) in coordination with activities carried out under the amendments made by section 1223, designs for a high temperature reactor capable of producing large-scale quantities of hydrogen using thermo-chemical processes;

(D) proliferation-resistant and high-burn-up nuclear fuels;

(E) minimization of generation of radioactive materials;

(F) improved nuclear waste management technologies; and

(G) improved instrumentation science;

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, the amendments have been cleared on this