

the plug; that is, not wanting to go forward on the energy bill unless it authorizes oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

If this is such an important issue, as indicated in this piece in the newspapers, then why hasn't this amendment been offered? As I have indicated, this is, as I have said, I believe the 14th day we have worked on this legislation. These are 14 legislative days. That is a lot of time on a bill. No one has come forward with this amendment we have heard for years is the most important part of this legislation.

Perhaps there has been some focus on the fact that there aren't enough votes to pass this legislation. There is some realization we cannot produce our way out of the problem with petroleum products. Out of the 100 percent of the petroleum reserves in the world today, the United States, including whatever is believed to be in the Arctic, has 3 percent. Mr. President, 97 percent is in other places, such as Venezuela, the North Sea, Great Britain. Two countries have 47 percent of the petroleum reserve: Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

We can't produce our way out of this. I would say, and for the Presiding Officer—I think maybe I can speak for him—maybe what we should try to do is try to figure out a way to use our mass of coal. We have more coal than anyplace in the world. Rather than spending the few dollars we do on clean coal technology, maybe we should declare a war, in effect, and spend a lot of money on clean coal technology because we have lots of coal. But it is polluting and we need to do a better job—make it cleaner.

I would also say that we have, in this bill, tried to develop alternative energy levels. We have struggled to do that, but we need to do that.

Anyway, to think that we can produce our way out of this with petroleum products—we can't do it. The United States has 3 percent of the reserves in the world and we can't do it by production. We tried through increasing the fuel efficiency of vehicles. We didn't get enough votes for that. It is my understanding the Senator from Delaware, Mr. CARPER, is going to come back with an amendment that will revisit that issue. Senator CARPER certainly understands what his amendment is better than I do, but I have spoken to him and he feels his amendment is one that will allow this country to go forward, saving 1 million barrels of oil a day by setting fuel efficiency standards.

So I hope they will allow us to go forward in an orderly process with this legislation, to get a finite list of amendments and complete the legislation this week. We had a good debate on ANWR that took place for a good long day and part of the night. We could dispose of that issue. There are not 60 votes. In fact, I think there would be a real struggle for them to get 50 votes because the ANWR issue will be defeated on a bipartisan basis.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein for not to exceed 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANTITERRORISM INSURANCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is tremendous need in this country to do something with antiterrorism insurance. A group of people just left my office. One man indicated that sitting on his desk is \$2.2 billion worth of loans that he will not initiate because he cannot obtain antiterrorism insurance.

Why don't we pass antiterrorism legislation first thing in the morning or tomorrow afternoon? The reason is simple: some would like to turn this into a debate about comprehensive tort reform. There can be a case made that perhaps some tort reform is needed. I have always believed it should be done on a State-by-State basis, but regardless of how I personally feel about tort reform, or anyone else feels about tort reform, if this issue is so important, the antiterrorism insurance bill should not be turned into a larger debate about comprehensive tort reform.

We should be able to pass an antiterrorism insurance bill today. Addressing this very real problem should be something everyone agrees with. I think we could pass it without even having a vote. People know how important this is. Why do we have to concentrate and try to do comprehensive tort reform on legislation that is not tort reform? If people want tort reform, let them introduce legislation and go through the process. Refer it to the Commerce Committee and the Judiciary Committee, but do it in an orderly process and not on something as important as antiterrorism legislation.

I say to all of my friends and to the people who came to my office today—most of them I never met before—that what they should do is go out to talk to those people who want tort reform legislation and delete it. We need immediate attention to this issue.

I have had the opportunity during the 2 weeks we have been off to talk about some of President Bush's policies. On some I agreed with him and on some I disagreed with him. One thing I agree with him on is that antiterrorism legislation is important. We need to do it quickly. I hope he will weigh in with us and get tort reform out of this.

One other area I agree with him on is foreign policy. We need to do something to get the Middle East crisis resolved. I personally think this administration should have been involved in this much earlier but better late than never. I agree with him that Chairman Arafat has not been candid with the President. The President said he has

not lived up to his word with him. Time and again Chairman Arafat has shown he is not to be trusted. President Clinton offered him the best deal in the world and he walked away from it. He has repeatedly shown that he is willing to say one thing in Arabic and something totally opposite in English. I hope that the Palestinians under his leadership would try to live up to the commitments that he has made. This is a situation we need to have resolved. But I do agree with the President of the United States when he said yesterday that Chairman Arafat has not lived up to what he told the President he was doing. He has not lived up to the trust that the President felt he should have.

Not seeing much going on on the floor, I hope there will be some activity on this energy bill. But it appears to me that there is not going to be any. I say to staff and others who are working on this legislation that I wish they would work to get a finite list of first-degree amendments so we can at least complete that today.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 4 o'clock today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:17 p.m., recessed until 4:01 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LEVIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now leave morning business and proceed to the energy bill.

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

NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I call for the regular order relating to the Feinstein amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 3079 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2989

(Purpose: To provide a substitute)

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for himself and Mr. CRAPO, proposes an amendment numbered 3079 to amendment No. 2989.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have offered this amendment. I wish to make a brief statement in regard thereto. But my friend, the minority assistant leader, is in the Chamber. We have some business we would like to transact.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent we now go off of the amendment I have offered and proceed to a period of morning business.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 3210

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 252, H.R. 3210, the Terrorism Risk Protection Act; that the only amendment in order be a Dodd-Sarbanes-Schumer substitute amendment; that the amendment be agreed to, the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and any statements thereon be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. NICKLES. Reserving the right to object—and I may not object—I just need another second to see what we are doing.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senator from Alaska be recognized to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

U.S. OIL SECURITY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I heard my good friend from Nevada make a statement earlier today concerning our delay in getting around to producing an ANWR amendment. Let me assure

the Senator, we do have an ANWR amendment, and we will present it as soon as it is finalized, as it is taking some time.

I have come to the Senate Chamber right now, though, to make some remarks about Iraq. I am certain that everyone in the Senate knows that Iraq has announced today it will suspend its oil exports for the next 30 days.

Libya and Iran have immediately expressed support for that action and warned they will follow suit if other Arab oil-producing countries also curtailed their shipments of oil. In other words, we are on the verge of another embargo.

Without any question about it, we have now seen that Iraq is using oil as a weapon to deal with our policies with regard to the Middle East.

During the year 2001, the United States imported nearly 287 million barrels of oil from Iraq.

I have in the Chamber a chart that shows where those 287.3 million barrels of oil went throughout our Nation.

The average price of crude oil in 2001 was \$22.93 per barrel. That means, with simple arithmetic, the United States paid Iraq \$6.58 billion for its oil last year.

The Deputy Prime Minister of Iraq confirmed last week that Saddam Hussein has paid \$25,000 to the families of each of the Palestinian suicide bombers. Let's think of that again. Iraq alone has paid to the families of the suicide bombers in Palestine \$25,000 per incident. In other words, we are paying that. We are giving Iraq the cash to reward those who are committing suicide while bombing innocent people in Israel.

Furthermore, I want the Senate to know that today Venezuela announced a multiday strike at the Government-owned oil-producing facilities. Venezuela is one of the top three suppliers of oil to the United States.

This morning, the President expressed his concern that increased gasoline prices would slow down our economic recovery. There is no question about that.

Recently, the U.S. News & World Report has changed its editorial policy concerning ANWR. I want to call the attention of the Senate to an article entitled, "A Waste of Energy?" on page 25 of the U.S. News & World Report of April 1. It is a very interesting article when one considers the past editorial policy of that great national magazine.

Make no mistake about it, we are very close to a vote that would be quite similar to the one that took place when Alaska finally obtained permission to go ahead with the oil pipeline. At that time, however—and I say this respectfully—even though the then-majority leader, Mike Mansfield, opposed our amendment, even though the committee chairman, Senator Jackson, opposed our amendment, no filibuster was threatened, no filibuster took place in consideration of the oil pipeline amendment. Why? Because we all

knew then, as we all should know now, that oil is a matter of national security.

As we proceed this week, we will bring out proof of the statesmen who have led this country since the 1940s. Each and every one has said oil is a matter of national security. Yet we are facing the prospect that the ANWR amendment, when we offer it, is going to be facing a filibuster—again, with due respect—led by the majority leader and the majority side of the Senate.

There should never be—there should never be—a filibuster against a matter of national security. I really believe that before we are through, before this week is out, the American citizens are going to be demanding there be an up-or-down vote on the ANWR amendment and no filibuster. And if, God forbid, by Thursday or Friday of this week we have a full-blown embargo, and we have the gas lines we all remember from the 1970s, I do hope we will understand this bill has to be considered, the ANWR amendment adopted, and the bill sent to the President as soon as possible.

If we had been permitted to proceed with ANWR as we sought to proceed when President George Bush, the 41st President of the United States, requested Congress to allow us to proceed, we would have ANWR oil on line now.

During the height of the Persian Gulf war, 2.1 million barrels of oil a day were sent down the Alaska oil pipeline. When I was there last week, I was told it was 925,000 barrels a day. Where are we getting the balance of the oil? We are currently getting it from Iraq. And now it is going to be shut down.

I have asked the oil industry to tell us whether it is possible that they might proceed to produce in an uneconomic manner to refill that barrel, if this shortage continues. There is oil in northern Alaska now that could fill that barrel, but it would be uneconomic to produce it at the rates that would be required because the reserves are not that great anymore without our opportunity to drill in the area known as ANWR, which is part of the 1.5-million acre tract that was set aside in 1980 by an amendment sponsored by Senator Jackson and Senator Tsongas for oil and gas exploration. I will be going into that at length this week, too.

They promised me and committed to me that one of the things they would go along with, if we would finally approve the so-called ANILCA, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, was that 1.5 million acres in the Arctic would be left available for oil and gas exploration. I will produce the letters that were exchanged by those two Senators with all of the Senate, and the comments they made at the time. I will even show you a photograph of Senator Jackson, Senator Tsongas, and I standing there at the passage of the bill in which the promise was made that oil and gas exploration