

and concessions at O'Hare, or Soldier Field, or Millennium Park?

Why not learn from Millennium Park and Soldier Field and exempt O'Hare before the Mayor can do it again? We have a competitive bid proposal for concessions and contracts at O'Hare. It is comprehensive. The Daley-Ryan forces are opposing it. I wonder why that might be?

Maybe Mayor Daley should tell us, before the discussion goes any farther, who's going to pour the concrete at O'Hare? Will it be someone who has been lobbying for the expansion at O'Hare? Who will be hired as consultants or so-called "expeditors"? Who will get a cut of the contracts? Will it be Jeremiah Joyce or will it be Oscar D'Angelo? Who is going to get a piece of the action on the insurance? Is it Mickey Segal or is he too hot right now? What about the bonds? Who is going to rake it in there? Is it Baum and Co., and Tony Fratto? And what about the janitorial contracts? Will that be John Duff, Jr. and his sons, the Duffs?

We have a chance to pass a Federal competitive bid provision for O'Hare in the U.S. Senate. If we pass it, it should mean a markedly different way of doing business in Chicago, at least at O'Hare. There are a number of arguments we will make, and precedents we will review. Mr. President, I look forward to the debate and to continuing to work with my colleagues on that issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer, in his capacity as the Senator from West Virginia, suggests the absence of a quorum.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, are we on the energy bill at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has not been laid down yet.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 517, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 517) to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through technology transfer and partnerships for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Daschle/Bingaman further modified amendment No. 2917, in the nature of a substitute.

Dayton/Grassley amendment No. 3008 (to amendment No. 2917), to require that Federal agencies use ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel in areas in which ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel are available.

Landrieu/Kyl amendment No. 3050 (to amendment No. 2917), to increase the transfer capability of electric energy transmission systems through participant-funded investment.

Schumer/Clinton amendment No. 3093 (to amendment No. 2917), to prohibit oil and gas drilling activity in Finger Lakes National Forest, New York.

Dayton amendment No. 3097 (to amendment No. 2917), to require additional findings for FERC approval of an electric utility merger.

Feinstein/Boxer amendment No. 3115 (to amendment No. 2917), to modify the provision relating to the renewable content of motor vehicle fuel to eliminate the required volume of renewable fuel for calendar year 2004.

Murkowski/Breaux/Stevens amendment No. 3132 (to amendment No. 2917), to create jobs for Americans, to reduce dependence on foreign sources of crude oil and energy, to strengthen the economic self determination of the Inupiat Eskimos and to promote national security.

Reid amendment No. 3145 (to amendment No. 3008), to require that Federal agencies use ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel in areas in which ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel are available.

AMENDMENT NO. 3141

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, last week the Senate adopted an amendment that deals with vehicle efficiency. It deals with the issue of fuel cells. I want to describe the amendment, because I think it is a very important amendment.

The amendment directs the Energy Department to develop a program that would create measurable goals and timetables with the aim of putting 100,000 hydrogen fuel cell vehicles on the road by 2010, and 2.5 million by the year 2020, along with the needed hydrogen infrastructure. DOE would have to report annually on its progress toward achieving these goals.

The amendment is designed to have the Department of Energy work with the auto manufacturers to ensure these goals are met. With this amendment, we are sending a strong signal that our goal is to accelerate and enhance the development of fuel cell vehicles and fuel cell technologies with concrete targets and timetables.

I have asked the question with respect to our energy policy, especially with respect to our transportation sector, about whether our policy is going to be "yesterday forever." I have said on previous occasions—and I will say it again—my first car was an antique 1924 Model T Ford that I bought for \$25 as a young kid, and I restored it. It took me a couple of years to restore that old Model T. But a 1924 Model T Ford is fueled exactly the same way as a current model Ford. You drive up to the

gas pump, stick a hose in the tank, and start pumping. Nothing has changed. Nothing has changed in 78 years, and it ought to change.

The issue of how we run our vehicles what kind of engines we use and what kind of fuel we use—we ought to inspire these changes by developing aspirations and national goals with respect to new technologies. I drove a fuel cell car here on the Capitol grounds some months ago. It has essentially a limitless battery that allows you to run the vehicle using this fuel cell. The fuel cell combines hydrogen and oxygen and the only byproduct is water vapor. Fuel cells have the potential to dramatically improve the efficiency of automobiles and dramatically reduce emissions, as opposed to the vehicles that we use now, which have the internal combustion engine we have used for decades after decades.

We can decide that the debate will be a debate about our energy supply, as it has always been. That has been the energy debate we have had for a long while and will be again 25 and 50 years from now, unless we decide to create national aspirations and goals for new technologies.

I believe we ought to do that with respect to automobiles. Our transportation sector consumes the largest amount of energy in our society: about 40 percent of the oil products our Nation consumes each year, or nearly 8 billion barrels of oil each day. In 2001, we imported about 53 to 57 percent of our energy from abroad. That is expected to increase, according to the Energy Information Administration.

So the question is, What do we do about that? Some say we should just adopt CAFE standards. Others say let's develop new technologies. Others say let's not do anything at all. Let's let the marketplace decide who buys what, when, and why.

I think this country ought to encourage the development and the capability to move to a new technology. The Ford Motor Company representative stated that alternative fuel technology has the potential to significantly improve the fuel economy of vehicles, which could reduce U.S. dependence on imported oil, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and save consumers substantial money at the pump.

Most major automakers are racing to produce prototype fuel cell vehicles. DaimlerChrysler has been talking about this now for several years. They plan to have a fuel cell car in production by the year 2004. California has a Clean Air Act requirement that will ensure that many fuel cell vehicles are going to be on the road. By next year—2003—2 percent of California's vehicles have to be zero-emission vehicles, and around 10 percent of its vehicles must be zero-emission vehicles by 2018. That means California could have nearly 40,000 or 50,000 fuel cell cars on the road by the next decade.

The amendment I offered is supported by the Alliance to Save Energy

and United Technologies. Senators CANTWELL, BAYH, REID of Nevada, DODD, LIEBERMAN, and HARKIN all co-sponsored my amendment. The amendment was adopted last week. I think most Members of the Senate want to move, using new technology, to new opportunities and new goals for our country's future.

Fuel cells are expected to achieve energy efficiencies of 40 to 45 percent, and possibly much higher. After a century of constant improvements, the internal combustion engine converts, on average, about 19 percent of the energy and gasoline to turn the wheels of an automobile—19 percent. Fuel cells are expected to achieve efficiencies double that: 40 to 45 percent at least.

I think that as we debate this energy bill there is much, perhaps, that will persuade some that it is worthless. There is much in it that will persuade others it has great merit. There are a fair number of amendments that we have produced in the many weeks this bill has been on the floor of the Senate—thanks to the patience of Senator BINGAMAN, who I know wanted it completed much earlier—but there are many amendments that have been added to a pretty sound piece of legislation, in the first instance, that I think will commend this legislation to the Congress as a whole and to the American people as moving toward a solution.

Finally, when the Energy Department testified before our Energy Committee, I asked the representatives of the U.S. Department of Energy what goals they have for 25 and 50 years from now for our country's energy supply and energy use. We talk a great deal about what is going to happen 25 and 50 years from now with respect to Social Security and Medicare. What about with respect to energy use and energy supply, do we have goals there? The answer is, no, we do not. There are no such goals.

We ought to develop those goals, in my judgment. That is the purpose of this amendment dealing with new vehicle technology, and specifically with fuel cells.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 3239

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senators BROWNBACK and CORZINE have offered an amendment No. 3239 to the underlying bill which replaces the mandatory greenhouse gas reporting requirement in the underlying bill with a "hard trigger." That means emissions reporting will continue to be voluntary for at least the next 5 years, but if voluntary reports don't add up to at least 60 percent of total emissions at the end of 5 years, then mandatory reporting will be triggered.

I think this is a sound approach. I applaud the Senators for working together to come up with a reasonable compromise between voluntary and mandatory.

This amendment is an important step forward in promoting the development

of emissions trading markets and market-based programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

I also note that it is my belief, if cloture is invoked on this underlying bill, that this amendment will be in order.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will ask to submit an amendment to the pending business which is the energy bill.

As we have seen over the past several days as the Senate has considered a variety of amendments to the energy bill, energy is not a subject which can be taken up in isolation. It is such a pervasive fact of our existence that it necessarily has significant impacts on other important considerations. Two of those are our environment and other aspects of our economy beyond energy itself.

The amendment I am offering today is intended to give to oil and gas companies, which currently hold leases for development in the eastern Gulf of Mexico planning area, an option. This would provide to these companies a voluntary option to trade those existing leases for credits of an equivalent value. These credits could be used toward royalty payments and rental fees.

I have been working with mineral policy experts, representatives from the oil industry, and concerned citizens over the past several months to try to develop a process that is reasonable, flexible, and mutually beneficial. I believe this amendment captures all of those qualities.

First, the amendment is reasonable because it gives to oil companies the voluntary option as to whether they wish to continue to pursue the development of the leases they have acquired—in many cases a considerable period of time in the past—or whether they would like to exchange those leases for credits which could be used to pay other costs the oil companies owe the Federal Government in the form of royalties or rentals. These credits take into account the amount the oil and gas company paid for the original lease and expenditures for exploration on those leases.

Second, the amendment is flexible. It would require the Secretary of the Interior to offer this lease-for-credit program to all of the companies that would be covered by the amendment, those that have leases in the eastern planning area, except for those that are currently in the process of application for a drilling permit, and the companies that voluntarily choose to participate in this program would receive credits which can be used effective in the year 2012. The value of these cred-

its would take into account inflation for the period between the time the credits were issued and the time in which the credits were submitted for redemption. There also is a provision for added flexibility to give the companies the ability to initiate the lease-for-credit process and not necessarily have to wait for the Secretary of the Interior to do so.

Third, the amendment is beneficial because it provides a win-win-win situation for the current leaseholders, for the environment and the economy, and for the Nation as a whole.

It provides to the oil and gas companies an option that will give them value for leases in which today they have substantial cost but in many cases limited prospects of deriving a benefit.

It will be beneficial to the environment and the economy of the eastern Gulf of Mexico planning area. This is an area which is peculiarly dependent upon the quality of its water and the attractiveness of its coastal areas for its economic well-being.

In my State of Florida, tourism is the leading business, and of all the reasons that people come to our State, consistently our coastal areas have been listed as the No. 1 attraction. They also are a part of our fundamental culture. They are to our State and to other areas in the eastern planning region what, for instance, the Platte River would be in Nebraska or the Rocky Mountains in Colorado. They help define what kind of place, what kind of people we are. They are a critical part of our environment, as witness the fact that the Federal Government, through the Coastal Zone Management Act, has made the protection of our coastal zones a national priority.

The benefit to the Nation as a whole is seen by a precedent which has already occurred. During the administration of the first President Bush, there was concern about the potential adverse effects of a similar set of leases which covered approximately 600 square miles in the area south of the 26th latitude—the 26th latitude runs east and west, more or less, at the line of Naples to Fort Lauderdale—and that the development of those leases over that large 600-square-mile expanse could represent a serious threat to places such as Everglades National Park, the Dry Tortugas National Park, and the National Marine Sanctuary that protects the coral reefs of the Florida Keys. Therefore, under the leadership of the first President Bush, an effort was initiated to reacquire those 600 square miles of leases.

This became embroiled in litigation. It took almost 8 years to resolve the matter. But in the final instance, in 1995, those 600 square miles of leases were terminated. A fair compensation was arranged with the previous leaseholders, and the Nation benefited because some of its most valuable treasures were no longer subject to that vulnerability.

I believe the same win-win-win arrangement will be possible through this approach. It would be very appropriate that the now second President Bush, who as a candidate for President indicated his sensitivity to the importance of the coast, the environment, and the economic relationship of those in my State and in the eastern Gulf of Mexico planning area and indicated that he would use his influence to provide protection—there is no better form of protection that can be provided than that which is sought by this amendment and that which was achieved by his father's efforts in the area south of the 26th latitude.

There have been some who have suggested that these are in some way selfish moves and motivated by a desire for self-protection; that every part of the country which is a user of energy, which means every part of the country, should also be a supplier of energy; and that no part of the country should be off limits to make that contribution.

That is a fundamental misunderstanding of what the United States of America is. The United States of America is a republic of 50 States that have given to the central government certain powers to be administered under the laws that we and our colleagues in the House of Representatives pass.

The United States of America represents a common destiny, but each State has different things to contribute to that common destiny. As an example, our State provides over half the national supply of phosphate, a critical mineral, particularly for agriculture and for industrial activities. It is an activity which has been environmentally difficult for our State. I think maybe we are doing a better job today than we did in previous times. But we accept that as part of our contribution to the Nation. Nature happened to put a lot of the world's phosphate in what is now the State of Florida.

Near those phosphate mines is also grown over half the citrus that is consumed in the United States. That is a product that has great nutritional and health value. It requires a combination of climate and soil type that is uniquely found in Florida; therefore, we produce a lot of citrus.

We also, during the winter months, provide a substantial percentage of all the fresh fruits and vegetables consumed in the eastern U.S. We are a major fisheries State. We are the largest State for tourism, and we have the highest percentage of Americans who move to retire to someplace other than where they had lived. Florida receives more of those retirees than any other State. So we make a substantial number of contributions to America.

On the other side, we don't have much energy. Historically, we have not been a site where a significant amount of oil, gas, coal, or other major energy sources have been found. We even have difficulty with things that people find. Surprisingly, we are not a particularly

good State for wind power because the winds are not reliable enough to convert it into commercial applications.

We are also a State which has not benefited by the industrial revolution, as most other States have. We were a State that did not have the essential qualities that the industrial revolution required. Energy access to certain raw materials, such as iron ore, cheap transportation systems in proximity to markets—none of those were true in Florida in the 19th century. Therefore, we largely were passed over in the industrial revolution.

So every State has its own strengths, weaknesses, and contributions. I believe one of the synergies which makes America a great place is that we recognize that and, collectively, we have almost a bounty of everything that humans would like to have. It just happens to be distributed over a continental landmass of the United States of America.

What Florida has particularly contributed, and what the eastern planning area of the Gulf of Mexico includes, is beautiful waters, pristine beaches, areas that contribute substantially to the economy, while at the same time protecting the environment. The principal threat to that environment today is the potential of developing inappropriate oil and gas production, and that we might suffer some accident that would result in damage to those critically important parts of our State.

This amendment I am offering, I believe, stands the test of being fair to all parties—fair to the oil and gas companies by giving them a voluntary election, a means by which they can recapture past expenses in the form of credits that they can use for required future expenses, balanced insofar as protecting the economy and the environment of the eastern Gulf of Mexico, and will meet the same kind of national standards as the first President George Bush did when he led the way to eliminate 600 square miles of oil and gas leases off the Florida Keys and the southwest coast of my State.

This is an opportunity that I hope we will grasp as part of this energy bill. I recognize there are, in a parliamentary sense, other amendments that will be considered prior to this. We will be taking a vote tomorrow on a cloture motion, which could further affect the procedure for consideration of amendments. But I am committed that the Congress will have an opportunity to consider this approach, which I think brings such value and security to our Nation and to our future environment and economy.

I appreciate this opportunity to outline this proposal. At the appropriate time, I look forward to calling this amendment before the Senate.

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.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill S. 517.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business and that Senators be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

PROSPECTS FOR PEACE

• Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, now that Secretary of State Colin Powell has concluded his recent diplomatic mission to Israel and the Middle East, I would like to take this opportunity to reflect on recent events in the region. There are many opinions about the most effective approach to the current crisis, but I believe the Bush administration's renewed emphasis on ending the violence and reaching a negotiated settlement is a positive development.

As America properly takes steps to defend our Nation's vital economic and security interests in the region, though, we must be mindful that Israel is a sovereign nation with a responsibility to defend the safety and security of its citizens. After suffering dozens of deadly attacks aimed at innocent civilians during the last 18 months, I believe Israel has every right to take steps, including military action, to neutralize Palestinian terrorists that Yasser Arafat and the PLO have been unable or unwilling to detain. I would expect no less from our Nation and it is unfair to ask any less from Israel. The United States endured some international criticism for our anti-terrorism campaign in Afghanistan and I would expect a special empathy by the U.S. Government toward Israel as it faces similar criticism today.

I am optimistic that the current military operation in the West Bank will curb the violence so that the peace process can proceed in a meaningful way. To achieve a final settlement, all interested parties will be required to make painful and difficult choices in the weeks and months ahead. I believe Israel has demonstrated its willingness and ability over time to live up to its commitments and responsibilities to exist peacefully with its neighbors.

Unfortunately, the lack of leadership and vision exhibited by the Palestinian Authority in recent years has, in my estimation, prevented the Palestinian people from achieving liberation and attaining the hopes and dreams they