

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_x, no NO_x. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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

side, and we are in total agreement with the majority and recommend acceptance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 3010 and 3011), en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as we come close to the hour of 5 o'clock, I am not sure just what the remainder of the schedule is. I think we anticipate tomorrow morning starting on renewables.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, my understanding is that we will spend several hours tomorrow, at least, dealing with a couple of issues related to electricity restructuring. One is a reliability amendment that we expect to have offered. I believe Senator THOMAS is planning to offer that amendment. We will have debate and a vote.

Then I intend to offer an amendment on a renewable portfolio standard, which will then be followed by a proposal by Senator JEFFORDS. And then probably also there will be a proposal by Senator KYL. We will deal with, hopefully, those three proposals, including the issue of a renewable portfolio standard. After that, I don't know what the business will be.

Mr. REID. If my friend will yield?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. REID. If I could just make this comment, I think the two managers have a great plan: in the morning come in and work on the Thomas legislation. It is my understanding that he does not want a time set. I think that is appropriate because there may be other issues that come up.

But I would hope that we could—if we come in, say, at 9:30—complete action on that by 12:15 or thereabouts, because every Thursday we have the policy luncheons, so we do not have votes from 12:30 to 2.

We could do that and then move to the Bingaman amendment. Senator JEFFORDS said he would agree to an hour and 15 minutes. So that would be 2½ hours, if all that time were used.

I would hope, I say to the manager, my friend from Alaska, that we could get Senator KYL to agree on a time for his amendment tonight, so when we do the wrap-up we could have it set that whenever we finish the reliability amendment—that is the Thomas amendment—we could immediately go into the mechanics set up for the Bingaman amendment, the Jeffords amendment, and the Kyl amendment, and have an end for that.

It seems it should not be difficult for people to agree for times on that be-

cause, if Senator KYL's amendment is adopted, then it wipes out everything in front of it anyway. So I hope Senator KYL can give us some time tonight so we can complete action on this matter tomorrow.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. If I may respond to the majority whip, I am in complete agreement. We do not have a time agreement yet among ourselves. I assume the leadership will set the time for us to come in. But I encourage Senators on our side to be prepared on reliability, which, as the majority whip indicated, will be offered by Senator THOMAS in the morning.

I also encourage all Members on our side, if they have other amendments they intend to offer, I would like to get the amendments in so we can anticipate what we will have before us. I would be willing at some point in time to agree to a list of amendments that have been brought in by a certain time, let's say, prior to the end of this week, something of that nature. But we can pursue that.

But I do agree with the majority whip that we should move along. The renewable portfolio, as the Senator indicated, probably will take some time. So I would be happy to work towards some time agreements as we proceed tomorrow.

Mr. REID. If I could propound a unanimous consent request, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, when we resume consideration of the energy bill, at approximately 9:30 a.m., immediately following the prayer and the Pledge of Allegiance, Senator THOMAS be recognized to offer his reliability amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Reserving the right to object, in fairness to Senator THOMAS, we have not had a chance to contact him as to whether it would be 9:30 or 10 o'clock, but I am not going to object.

Mr. REID. We will protect him until he gets here.

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

Mr. REID. We will attempt to work with the managers to see if we can work out something for this evening on time for renewability. If we can, it is the plan of the two managers that after completing the Thomas amendment we will move to Bingaman, Jeffords, and then Kyl.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it would be inappropriate if I let a day go by when I did not remind my colleagues that there was some significance as to what we did during the day.

Today, there has been a good deal of conversation that, indeed, we could make up by CAFE savings what we would generate by opening ANWR. The Senate, in its action—you notice I did not reflect on wisdom—basically precluded that, at least for the time being until we go to conference.

Also, the issue of the pickup truck, I think, spoke for a majority concerning safety issues.

I wouldn't be surprised before we are out of here if we also have an amendment that addresses the Suburbans and SUVs relative to safety.

The point I would like to leave with Members today is that we are rapidly diminishing excuses for not opening up ANWR and recognizing that, indeed, the argument that previously prevailed that we can simply make this up on CAFE standards is clearly not in the interest of a majority of the Senate, primarily for the reason of safety associated with Americans, and children in particular, and the advantages of a heavier car moving our children around.

As we look at alternatives, I remind my colleagues who are in objection to opening ANWR that they do bear responsibility for coming up with alternatives that are realistic. Certainly from our side, ANWR is realistic. And the probability of a major discovery is second to none from the standpoint of the geology of North America.

I think I have said enough for today. Anything I would say further would be repetition of what I have said time and time again. In an effort to relieve my colleague from New Mexico and the staff and the Presiding Officer, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, just to indicate to my colleague from Alaska, my interpretation of what occurred today is perhaps somewhat different than his. My own view is we made some substantial progress in getting agreement on provisions related to electricity restructuring; that is, the package of amendments Senator THOMAS proposed and that we agreed to was a very good effort on the part of our staff, the Republican staff, Senator THOMAS's staff, various people who have been working very hard on that set of issues.

My own view is, the bill was substantially weakened by the two votes we had related to CAFE standards in particular. Clearly, the Senate was not willing to step up and ensure any kind of significant increased efficiency in the transportation sector in the coming years. That, to me, is a disappointment, a weakening of the bill.

I don't see the logic that my colleague from Alaska seems to read into everything: The lack of wisdom of the Senate in the area of CAFE standards should justify additional lack of wisdom in the area of opening ANWR to drilling. But that is a debate for another time.

I do hope my colleague from Alaska will offer his ANWR amendment at the earliest possible date. Clearly, we cannot move to complete action on this bill until that much awaited event occurs. We have been hearing about his proposal on ANWR for many months. We have had the opportunity now to

have it offered for the last week and a half. We hope very much soon that will happen.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would certainly concur with my colleague that we have made significant progress, particularly on that portion covering electricity. I remind my colleague that the transit of people, goods, and services utilizes not electricity but oil. We are somewhat extraordinary in this country inasmuch as we are about 3 percent of the population, and we use about 25 percent of the energy and contribute about a third of the gross world product. We are pretty efficient, but nevertheless, we don't move in and out of Washington, DC, by hot air. Somebody has to take the oil, whether it be oil coming from Saddam Hussein, refine it, put it in the airplanes.

Until we find another alternative, we are going to either have to make a choice of increasing our dependence on imported sources such as Iraq or have the alternative of developing resources here at home and preserving U.S. jobs and the U.S. economy rather than exporting our dollars overseas. I hope the wisdom of the Senate will prevail when we get to the ANWR amendment.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LANDRIEU). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I wish to speak about the Middle East because the news from the Israeli and the Palestinian territory grows dimmer and deadlier by the day.

Terrorist attacks and reprisal raids have now merged into continuous carnage that looks increasingly indistinguishable from all-out war. The Israelis and the Palestinians are being drawn into a horrific cycle of revenge.

Frankly, I think an eye for an eye and pain inflicted upon pain extended into the future will be an ever-wider river of blood that will be spilled. I wonder how wide the river of blood has to be before we get back to some kind of political settlement—some kind of

political process. There is no future as I look at the status quo extended into the future—not for the people of Israel and not for the Palestinians.

Let me start out on a personal note. I have used this example several times while talking to other Minnesotans and people I met with here in DC as well.

I was at a gathering where I was in a fairly sharp debate with some citizens who were talking to me about what they consider to be the unfairness and the wrongness of Israeli policies towards the Palestinian people. In this discussion, I turned to them and said: Listen, you have a right to make the critique you are making. But I have not heard you express any indignation whatsoever about the Palestinian suicide bombers going to an Israeli teenager pizza parlor with fragmentation bombs and cluster bombs trying to basically murder as many Israeli teenagers as possible. I don't mind your critique of some of Sharon's policies. I have questions about some of them. But where is your indignation and your anger about the murder of Israeli teenagers? I condemn that. I condemn the deliberate targeting of innocent people and the murder of innocent people. As Camus said, murder is never legitimate.

Frankly, some of Arafat's comments have become increasingly militant in the last several days. I certainly question some of his leadership. His statements in the last several days—and, maybe even more importantly, some of the actions taken by Arafat's people—give me pause.

But, by the same token, I want to be really clear about this. I think it is really important that we have Tony Zinni in the Middle East. I think it is critically important that our country play a positive role. I think it is critically important, as the administration has made clear—I said this to Secretary Bill Burton as well—that we make it clear to the extremists that Zinni is not leaving on the basis of a terrorist act here, there, or somewhere else. We are engaged.

Frankly, the only future is a political settlement. Senator Mitchell was right. The Mitchell report I think lays out a brilliant framework—if we can just somehow get there again.

I don't come to the floor with clear answers as to what to do, but I do know that an eye for an eye and the increasing cycle of violence takes us nowhere good—not for the Israelis, not for the Palestinians, not for our country, and not for the world in which we live.

I do not know. I think there are many questions that can be raised about Crown Prince Abdullah's proposal and where Saudi Arabia is going. I myself have questions about some of the proposals. But, by the same token, at least there is some hope here. We shall see what happens at this Arab summit conference.

We really need to be talking—on the part of Saudi Arabia and other countries—about the full normalization of

relations with Israel. They cannot back down from that. That is the very essence of where we have to go. I am concerned that some of the Arab countries seem to be backing down from that.

But I do not believe this proposal should be ruled out. I do not believe a proposal that at least attempts to move us towards some kind of negotiation and some kind of a peace process should be ruled out. Not all of it will be acceptable. I can tell you that right now. But I certainly would like to see the American Government in particular somehow play a role in moving from what has become an ever-growing cycle of violence and loss of life of innocent people to some kind of framework for negotiation and a political settlement.

Ultimately, the truth of the matter is that I am an American Jew. I am the son of a Jewish immigrant who fled from persecution in Ukraine. And then his family moved to Russia. At the age of 17, he fled to our country. I will be clear. I speak out of love for Israel. And Israel as a country will exist. The security of Israel and the need of Israel have to be met.

It is also true that the Palestinian people will have their own nation. Palestinians and Israelis have to live next to one another, and they will have to respect one another. That will happen. My only question is, How much wider a river of blood has to be spilled before we get back to where we all know we need to go? So I want to, I guess in a way, applaud the administration, applaud Secretary Powell for sending Tony Zinni there.

I simply say that we need to be engaged. Our Government can play a decisive, critical, and positive role. And we must do so.

HELPING THE HELPLESS

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I rise to express my puzzlement, my dismay, as to why, as soon as possible, we can't do a better job of helping people who are faced with some very compelling problems, very compelling needs.

What I am getting at is very simple. And maybe this all becomes part of the budget resolution. I know the ranking member of the Budget Committee is in the Chamber.

I was on the Iron Range in Minnesota. These are people who have been spat out of the economy. They are tacomite workers. Royal TV has pulled the plug. Others are going into bankruptcy. But I thought the discussion would be about pensions, and that is part of what people are worried about. It is not just Enron.

But I met more workers who were in their late fifties—57, 58 years old—mainly men, some women; and they were all saying the same thing: "I had a bout with cancer," or, "I had a heart attack and I can't get any coverage anywhere." They are terrified. They have no health care coverage. The