

Mr. STEVENS. Is the Pastore rule in effect at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, am I not recognized on leader time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is.

Mr. DASCHLE. I appreciate that.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator from South Dakota will further yield for a question, would the Senator from South Dakota indicate what his reaction would be if we learned that in some country overseas they were opening up betting on the assassination of American officials, opening up betting on the possibility that America would be the target of future terrorism? Could the Senator from South Dakota speculate on our reaction if a similar betting scheme were opened in some other country in the world?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will address his questions through the Chair.

Mr. DURBIN. Through the President, I ask whether the Senator from South Dakota would respond.

Mr. DASCHLE. Responding to the Senator, I would simply say where do we limit this? What would prevent somebody from offering a futures market on terrorist acts within the United States on a leader of the United States? If these markets were available to leaders in the Middle East, countries in the Middle East, it doesn't take much of a stretch of the imagination to suggest that perhaps these new investment opportunities on terror for U.S. leaders, U.S. politicians, U.S. locations would be a big part of this market of death in a very short time. Once this is in the marketplace, as we say, there is no telling what the market may do.

This [policyanalysismarket.org](http://policyanalysismarket.org) is something I would encourage my colleagues to check out. It is the most amazing Web site I think I have seen in my life. I just cannot imagine that somebody seriously would propose something as outrageously irresponsible as this.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for one final question?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask through the Chair, it is my understanding from press reports that former Admiral John Poindexter has now been associated with this concepted idea, the same man who was involved in the controversy of Iran-contra and the same individual who, through this same office, suggested a massive intelligence-gathering operation across the United States involving the invasion of medical records, financial records, that was discredited by the administration? Is this the same John Poindexter who was behind this proposed scheme by the administration?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I answer the Senator from Illinois by saying yes, indeed, the same John Poindexter with the checkered past

that we have known him to have is back again. This time [policyanalysismarket.org](http://policyanalysismarket.org) apparently is one of the projects for which he is responsible. This new trade in death is something that I am told he is heading. I am anxious to get more information, of course, from the administration and others about how this individual as well as this Web site came to be.

Just very quickly, this is the Web site the Senator from Illinois cited, the specific possibilities for investment: The King of Jordan overthrown, the price they suggest starts at just 23 cents on that one. Arafat assassinated, that is worth 23 cents as a possibility. The price range may be anywhere from 22 to 33 cents. They expect a volume of 2,333 investors.

We can move to the second chart. This is the actual Web site from DARPA: King of Jordan overthrown, North Korea missile attack, Arafat assassinated. All of these are on the Web site.

Whatever a prospective trader's interest in the web site, the involvement in this group prediction process should prove engaging and may prove profitable.

This is one of the most intriguing parts of their assertion, that these actual investments in these incidences could actually prove to be profitable, as they consider investments in any one of these tragedies. I should say, investing in these incidences for purposes of profit.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am wondering if the distinguished Democratic leader's reaction, when he and I read the front page of the New York Times today, was the same as mine—amazement, bewilderment—when reading on the front of the New York Times: "Pentagon Prepares a Futures Market on Terrorist Attacks"?

The Pentagon office that proposed spying electronically on Americans to monitor potential terrorists has a new experiment. It is an online futures trading market, disclosed today . . . in which anonymous speculators would bet on forecasting terrorist attacks, assassinations, and coups.

Traders bullish on a biological attack on Israel or bearish on the chances of a North Korean missile strike would have the opportunity to bet on the likelihood of such events on a new Internet site established by the . . . [Pentagon].

Did the Senator read that in disbelief?

Mr. DASCHLE. I actually thought it was a hoax. I could not believe that we would actually commit \$8 million to create a Web site that would encourage investors to bet on futures involving terrorist attacks and public assassinations. For the life of me, I cannot believe that we would spend the money this administration has committed for that purpose.

But, as you said, according to the article in the New York Times this morning, that is indeed what has happened. The Web site is up. I encourage my col-

leagues to check [policyanalysismarket.org](http://policyanalysismarket.org) for themselves and consider what this remarkable development may mean for us in public policy and for the safety and security of our country as we consider its ramifications.

I yield the floor.

#### ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003— Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Illinois is seeking to speak on his amendment. Is there a time agreement on that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not.

Mr. STEVENS. I would like to have an opportunity to speak on the Energy bill. I do not want to interfere with the Senator's amendment if we can get it done.

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alaska if he would give me an idea how much time he would like.

Mr. STEVENS. The reverse is true also. I am glad to yield to the Senator if he would consider giving us a time agreement on his amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator from Alaska would like to work with me through the leadership to come up with a time agreement, I will be happy to do that. At this point, with no time agreement, I will yield—without yielding my right to the floor on the amendment—for the Senator to speak on the Energy bill. He certainly has a right to do that. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. STEVENS. I have come to the floor to speak on the bill in general, but I would be happy to have an opportunity to have the Senator from Illinois debate his amendment and have it voted on. As I understood it, that was the plan this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I address the Senator from Nevada. Is it possible to get an agreement on the Durbin amendment?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senator DURBIN has always been agreeable to that. He has indicated he would want probably 45 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Yes.

Mr. REID. And Senator STABENOW may want 10 or 15 minutes. We will check with her. I am sure we can do it within an hour on our side. I would propose that on the Durbin amendment there be 1 hour of debate on our side, that there be no second-degree amendments in order, and we would then vote on or in relation to the Durbin amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. We are trying to work with Senator BINGAMAN on the Durbin amendment and the other CAFE amendment.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from New Mexico that we have seen the proposal. We are not going to agree to the

unanimous consent agreement that was given to me.

Mr. DOMENICI. We don't need a time agreement on Senator DURBIN at this point.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield so I may comment briefly, I think we have tried to be as reasonable as we can on the Durbin amendment, which is the pending amendment. The Senator from Illinois has agreed from the beginning on a time agreement. That still stands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will speak briefly. I hope, however, we can move on to the Durbin amendment as soon as we get a time agreement.

Mr. President, one of the basic goals of the Energy bill, as our leader has indicated, is job creation. According to the estimates that I have, based upon the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the natural gas pipeline project to bring Alaska's natural gas to market would create as many as 400,000 job years. There have been various press releases issued in that regard. The more conservative estimates by the Energy Committee staff put the number at 118,000. Even those figures include: 1,650 welders and helpers; 2,000 operators; 135 surveyors; 1,250 laborers; 755 teamsters; 418 inspectors; 90 UT technicians; and 170 salaried foremen. Beyond that are both manufacturing jobs and infrastructure jobs, including airstrip improvements at 5 airports.

Additionally, the project will require an enormous number of buses, loaders, and automatic welders. We will need 440 sidebooms, 225 other sidebooms, 18 trenchers, 250 backhoes, 236 large dozers, 125 stringing tractors, and 1,300 pickup trucks.

I have come to the floor to raise my voice in support of this Energy bill and to urge the Senate to complete it. I commend Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN and their staffs for their efforts so far. This Energy bill is an important step toward a comprehensive and balanced national energy policy. It contains many important provisions designed to ensure our energy security.

The most important of those, to me, is the authorization for a natural gas pipeline from the North Slope of Alaska connecting through Canada to what we call the Lower 48.

As we are all aware, our country faces a natural gas crisis. The leader spoke of that this morning, and I want to emphasize the importance of his remarks. In the last 10 years, demand for natural gas has increased by 19 percent. It is projected to grow over 50 percent in the next quarter century. Absent a new supply of natural gas, a gap of 15 billion cubic feet per day or 6 trillion cubic feet per year is likely in the next decade.

High natural gas prices have severely impacted our industries and our consumers and are hindering our economic recovery.

The fertilizer industry alone has seen its current operating capacity in the

United States for ammonia plants drop to 60 to 65 percent of former capacity. High gas prices are responsible for the closure of almost 20 percent of the nitrogen fertilizer capacity.

This has severely impacted our farmers. They are now paying \$350 per ton for fertilizer, more than twice what they paid last year.

Our chemical industry has been similarly affected as high gas prices continue to affect its market share, which again threatens millions of existing jobs.

The chemical industry employs more than 1 million Americans, with 5 million Americans working at jobs dependent upon that chemical industry. Millions of Americans are depending upon our ability to maintain an adequate supply of gas. Our constituents are also feeling the pressure from natural gas prices. Sixty million households in this country use natural gas.

In 1999, their average gas bill was \$534. In 2001, the average gas bill was \$750. This year, the average gas bill for American consumers at home will be \$915—almost double what it was in 1999, Mr. President.

Given these disturbing facts and the negative impacts high gas prices are having on the Nation as a whole, I urge the Senate to act quickly to address this situation. This Energy bill must pass this year. It must be passed by the Senate now before we go on recess so a final conference package can be voted on in the fall.

The Energy Committee has taken the first step towards addressing this situation by including authorization for the Alaskan gas pipeline. The pipeline is vitally important to preventing an even more serious natural gas crisis in the future.

The gas pipeline will increase our supplies. Alaska's gas alone would meet approximately 10 percent of our country's natural gas needs, which means 4 billion to 6 billion cubic feet per day. It will decrease our dependency on foreign gas and imports of liquefied natural gas. It will generate over \$40 billion in revenues for the Federal Government. It will create the jobs I outlined earlier.

I do hope the Senate will focus on the jobs created by the Energy bill and particularly the Alaska natural gas pipeline. The gas pipeline translates into 7,000 construction jobs, thousands of manufacturing jobs necessary to create equipment, and thousands of infrastructure jobs.

In addition to the authorization language, the Finance Committee has provided a fiscal incentive package to ensure the pipeline can begin delivering gas as quickly as possible. I will discuss the fiscal package once the energy tax provisions are introduced. We are working with the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee to assure that those provision meet all the objectives of assuring financing for this enormous project.

I urge the Senate to consider that this is gas that was produced alongside

oil at Prudhoe Bay, almost 13 billion barrels of oil to date. As that oil was produced, natural gas was pumped to the surface as well. This gas was then separated from the oil and reinjected into the ground. This is not gas we have to look for; we know where it is. This is 35 trillion cubic feet of gas that is stored beneath Prudhoe Bay.

I point out to the Senate that 35 trillion cubic feet of gas is merely what has already been produced. The North Slope of Alaska has an abundant supply of gas, which has the potential to produce around 100 trillion cubic feet of gas. The Alaska gas pipeline project must begin so that we can start tapping into Alaska's gas reserves. No one is drilling gas wells in my State now because there is no transportation mechanism for gas. The known reserves of natural gas will be produceable as soon as there is a transportation mechanism to bring it to market. This pipeline will be that transportation mechanism to bring Alaska's gas to the Lower 48.

Nothing is more important to our Nation right now in terms of our economy than reassuring our people that we will have the natural gas supplies we need for the future. The Alaska natural gas pipeline can do it. It will help to fill the gap for the immediate future once it is constructed, and the benefits of the Alaska pipeline will have lasting effects on our Nation.

It will take a long time to construct the pipeline. We estimate it will be 2012 or 2013 before that gas actually gets to market. But once it gets to market, it will be competing with new liquefied natural gas that will be coming from foreign sources.

It is estimated that eventually we will import about 6 percent of our gas supplies in LNG. The counterweight to LNG is Alaska's gas. There is no other source in the United States with such an enormous amount of gas.

I urge us to move swiftly on this bill, and I will do anything I can to help accelerate the decisions on this bill. Again, I congratulate the two Senators from New Mexico for what they have done so far. I wish we could get together on a bipartisan basis and come up with a substitute. We ought to find some way to resolve these differences. The country needs this energy, and my State and the country need this project. I urge Senators to consider what we have to do to get this Energy bill passed as quickly as possible and that it contain the legislative authorization that is now in the bill and the tax provisions necessary to get the pipeline built.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we are preparing a unanimous consent request with reference to CAFE that has a reasonable chance. I wish to say to everyone, the distinguished Senator from Alaska just suggested that we attempt to get this bill completed, suggesting that we sit down and try to

find some alternative. In this Senator's humble opinion, there are ample votes to get the pending bill passed. Individual Senators, justifiably, have reason for delay. That is their business, and they are going to do just that.

The question is how long will they delay and to what end. There is no question that the Senator is correct with respect to natural gas. There are even other provisions with reference to natural gas. But the issue now is to get an agreement where we can have some votes.

It appears to me that we are now close to getting something done on CAFE. There are two very important CAFE amendments. We are trying to get them written up where we will get them scheduled for debate and votes shortly after the recess this afternoon, after which the pending amendment will obviously be the Campbell amendment, and we will attempt to dispose of that amendment. Then we are free to move with dispatch, I say to the Senator from Alaska.

I wonder if we are pretty close to getting a unanimous consent request?

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes, I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. REID. Perhaps Senator DURBIN can start his debate, and as soon as the unanimous consent request is prepared, perhaps he will yield the floor so the Senator may put the request to the Chair.

Mr. DOMENICI. Might we count his time now? I have no objection. He is going to get some time in the unanimous consent request. I ask that whatever time he uses now be counted.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. DURBIN. I have been here an hour trying to begin the debate. I have tried to cooperate completely. I ask the Senator from New Mexico if he will give me assurance that I will get an up-or-down vote on my amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. He will. Did the Senator ask for an up-or-down vote on his amendment?

Mr. DURBIN. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I cannot give the Senator that assurance. It is not totally up to me. If it was up to me, it would be all right. It is not up to me.

Mr. DURBIN. Will it be included in the unanimous consent request?

Mr. DOMENICI. It is not included.

Mr. DURBIN. It could be.

Mr. REID. The unanimous consent request says "on or in relation" to the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes, "on or in relation."

Mr. DURBIN. I know where that is headed. I will proceed to engage in a debate on this amendment if no one else is seeking recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DOMENICI. I agree. The Senator can have an up-or-down vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. REID. And as to Senator DOMENICI's request, Senator DURBIN's time will be counted against the time in the order; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I understand my amendment is not pending, although it has been offered and set aside. I would like to address that amendment and engage in some explanation for my colleagues so they can understand what will be voted on shortly by the Senate.

I hold in my hand S. 14, and it is the bill that has been prepared, with long hours of work by the Senator from New Mexico and many others, to address the energy security of the United States of America. I suggest that if one visits the State of Nevada or the State of New Mexico or my home State of Illinois and asks the average person on the street, If the Senate is serious about energy security, should they consider the fuel efficiency and fuel economy of the cars and trucks that we drive, the answer would be universally yes because people intuitively know we are dependent on overseas oil to power our cars and trucks, and that, of course, is expensive not only in terms of dollar amounts but in terms of our political commitment to Saudi Arabia and other countries.

If we are talking about America's energy security, most Americans believe S. 14 would include provisions that lead to more fuel efficiency and more fuel economy of America's cars and trucks. But the sad report for the American people is this: They are wrong.

S. 14 includes no provisions requiring that automobile manufacturers provide us more fuel-efficient cars in the future. So how can it be a serious energy proposal? How can we talk about our energy security if we ignore the obvious?

Let's take a look for a moment at what we face. The vast majority of oil reserves in the world, according to this chart, are in the Middle East. In terms of the billions of barrels of oil, there are 677 billion barrels of oil in the Middle East. There is no other part of the world that can even come close in terms of its potential for providing oil. The closest I guess would be South and Central America with some 86 billion and then, of course, North America, some 76 billion. But the reserve of oil in the world, outside of the Middle East, pales in comparison.

That is important for us to consider because we in the United States and in Canada are the largest global consumers in the world of oil per capita. These 1999 figures show of what I am speaking. In the United States and Canada, we consumed 3 gallons of oil for every man, woman, and child every day in 1999. That is 3 gallons a day.

Let's look at other industrialized countries. It is 1.3 gallons per capita in other industrialized countries.

The world average was about half a gallon. So we have a voracious appetite for oil that we do not own.

When we are talking about energy security, we have to wonder how this bill, S. 14, can honestly address energy security without addressing the obvious—that unless and until we are less dependent on foreign oil to sustain our lives and our economy, how in the world can we reach energy security?

The obvious question is, What are we doing with all of this oil? Well, intuitively we know the answer, but this chart tells us with specifics: U.S. oil demand by sector, over a 50-year period of time.

What we will find is this: Cars, SUVs, minivans, pickup trucks, and other vehicles account for 40 percent of U.S. oil consumption; and the transportation sector in total, 60 percent. They own the oil. We consume it in quantities unparalleled in the world. We consume it to power our vehicles.

Stick with me because I think this takes us to the end point and why the Durbin amendment really gets to the heart of energy security.

The amendment which I have proposed would save a cumulative amount of 123 billion gallons of oil by 2015.

Now, some have said there are other ways to do this; we do not have to ask for Detroit or any automobile manufacturers to do anything responsible for fuel efficiency and fuel economy. We can ignore that. Let the market work. We continue to have bigger, heavier, less fuel efficient vehicles. Just ignore it. There are other ways out. There is an easy way to deal with it.

What is the easy way that opponents of my amendment are proposing? Take a look at it. One of them is, let's go drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Take a refuge created by President Eisenhower in the 1950s, that is supposed to be protected, and open it up for oil exploration. They say: If we just open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, we do not have to worry about cars, trucks, and fuel efficiency. There is so much oil up there, we just do not have to sweat it. So give a little. Compromise this national wildlife refuge. Let oil companies come in and make a few bucks and future generations are going to be in a much better position.

Look at the facts. Look at the comparison. Look at what the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will save for us, or at least produce for us, in terms of billions of gallons of gasoline over a 17-year period of time. The number is down here and it shows, I think conclusively, that we are dealing with a very small amount that would come out of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; in fact, less than a tenth of what we would derive if we set about a sensible national energy policy calling for more fuel efficient cars and trucks.

NHTSA, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, has a proposal that would save 20 billion gallons of gas, and that is a good idea, but that again is just a fraction of what we can do if we address the obvious: The fuel economy of the cars we drive.

A lot of people have said: We can invent our way out of this problem. We do not have to sweat it in terms of demanding from Detroit and other automobile manufacturers that they come up with better cars and trucks. Let them continue to sell these behemoths on the road that have terrible fuel economy and eventually we are going to invent our way out of the problem.

Well, would that that were true. In this situation, when we take a look at the proposals for fuel cell vehicles, one of the things we have heard about is hydrogen power. I support that. I think the President's research is a good idea. But even if it is successful, in a matter of 12 years it could save us less than 10 billion gallons of gasoline. That is less than a tenth of what my amendment would achieve.

What about the consumers? I have heard Senators say: We have no right to dictate to American consumers what they want, what they prefer. We should let the consumers have what they want. Let the market govern.

I will tell my colleagues what consumers have said. An annual survey by J.D. Power and Associates found that fuel consumption was the second most common driver complaint industry-wide.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a unanimous consent request, I ask that Senator DOMENICI now be recognized to offer a unanimous consent agreement.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak in relation to amendments Nos. 1384 and 1386: Senator LEVIN, 10 minutes; Senator BOND, 10 minutes; Senator LOTT, 10 minutes, to follow Senator DURBIN; Senator STABENOW, 10 minutes; Senator LAUTENBERG, 10 minutes; Senator DURBIN, 40 minutes; Senator BINGAMAN, 5 minutes; Senator DOMENICI, 5 minutes. Further, that the Bond amendment be amended with a Bingaman second-degree amendment which is at the desk and has been agreed to by both sides. Further, I ask unanimous consent that following the use or yielding back of the time, the votes occur on the Durbin amendment No. 1384, to be followed by a vote in relation to the Bond amendment No. 1386, as amended, at a time determined by the majority leader after consultation with the Democratic leader, and that there be no second-degree amendments in order to the amendments prior to the votes in relation to the amendments.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that the distinguished chairman of the committee modify his amendment to allow

Senator BINGAMAN 5 minutes to speak after Senator LOTT on the Levin amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, only to clarify where I am with my 40 minutes, I do not know how much time I have consumed. I inquire of the Chair how much time I have consumed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has consumed 8½ minutes.

Mr. REID. Nothing happens until 11:15, and then we go to a judge. So the Senator has plenty of time to speak.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator. I have no objection to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from New Mexico?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2738 AND H.R. 2739

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, with the concurrence of the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2738 and H.R. 2739, en bloc, under the following conditions for debate only: Senators GRASSLEY, 45; BAUCUS, 45; HOLLINGS, 60; DASCHLE, 30; JEFFORDS, 60; SESSIONS in control of 45; HATCH, 15; STEVENS, 15; CORNYN, 15; FEINSTEIN, 60. I further ask that upon the use or yielding back of the time, the bills be read a third time and the Senate immediately proceed to a Senate resolution regarding immigration provisions included in the Singapore and Chile free trade agreements; the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; provided, further, that the Senate then proceed to a vote on passage of the Singapore free trade agreement followed by a vote on passage of the Chile free trade agreement, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished manager of the bill if he would modify the agreement to allow Senator HARKIN 30 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. On the unanimous consent I just read?

Mr. REID. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection.

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

Is there objection to the original unanimous consent request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Before we proceed to Senator DURBIN, I say to all the Senators, so there will be no misunderstanding, we are going to dispose of the CAFE amendments this afternoon. That means that the next amendment which will be before us is the amendment regarding Indians. If there con-

tinues to be objection that we cannot set it aside, we will vote either on it or in relation to it immediately following disposition of the CAFE amendments. It is the intention of the manager that that occur, after which time it is the intention of the manager to proceed to lay before the Senate the electricity amendment which has been in the hands of Senators for almost 4 days now.

I thank everyone for their cooperation thus far. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Chair be kind enough to notify me after I have used 25 minutes of the 40 minutes I have allocated under the unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will do so.

Mr. DURBIN. Going back to the point I was making about more fuel efficient vehicles, a lot of people say if we are going to have more fuel efficient vehicles, they are going to cost more and they have to add things to these vehicles that will be expensive to consumers. But they fail to account for several things. One is that a more fuel efficient vehicle costs more money to operate. If it costs \$1,200—and that is the estimate from the National Academy of Sciences—to put on the new fuel-saving technology, over the life of the car that same consumer will save \$2,000 in terms of the gasoline they have to buy.

Arguing that this is a consumer burden is plain wrong. In fact, most consumers are concerned about fuel economy; unfortunately, the Senate is not. The Senate has taken the position, which unfortunately major automobile manufacturers in this country espouse, that we should not be concerned about fuel efficiency and fuel economy.

As a person who makes a point of trying always to buy American vehicles and having done that all my life, it is becoming increasingly apparent that Detroit is falling further and further behind when it comes to new, environmentally responsible technology to deal with fuel efficiency.

What we have with the Levin-Bond amendment is a concession to the fact that Detroit continues to fail, Detroit continues to come in second when we deal with new technology. I am concerned about that. Our American automobile industry is critically important to our economy.

As a person who wants to buy American as often as possible, I look at this and say we have to do better. This Energy bill before the Senate does not challenge the automobile industry to do better at all. It basically says we are going to include language which does not place any burden on the automobile manufacturing industry or anyone else. We are going to ignore the CAFE standards and basically allow what is currently existing to continue indefinitely. That is energy security? I don't think so.

One of the concerns I have is the impact on pollution by automobile emissions. The United States produces a third of the greenhouse gases emitted from automobiles worldwide. Out of all of the emissions from automobiles in the world, the United States is responsible for one-third of the pollution. These greenhouse gases affect agriculture, public health, the economy, our sea levels and shore lines. The greatest impact is at the North and South Pole.

Scientists predict, for example, that many species will be threatened because of the greenhouse gases that are aggravated and exacerbated by the emissions from the tailpipes of our cars and trucks. That is a reality.

It is not just a question of lessening our dependence on foreign oil but a question of environmental responsibility. Let me give one illustration. When I was a young boy growing up in East St. Louis, IL, one of the biggest treats in my life was to go over to the St. Louis zoo. I would stand there watching the polar bears until my mom and dad finally said we had to go home. I got the biggest kick out of that as a kid. A lot of children around America look at polar bears—the big, huge, lumbering white bears in zoos—and think, what a magnificent creature. The sad reality is if we do not get honest about the environment and the destruction of the environment for which we are responsible, this species of animal will be threatened.

Scientists say if the most optimistic scenario should evolve, the polar bears will not be extinct for 100 years. It means that though your children may see them during their lifetime, their children will not. Others say, no, 50 years. If that is true, if in 50 years polar bears will be extinct because of the pollution coming out of tailpipes of our cars, because of the refusal of the Senate to accept the responsibility to reduce automobile emissions, to reduce the use of fuel, if that happens in 50 years, you can say to your children and grandchildren today, go to the zoo and look closely because this animal will not be here for your children to see. There is no way.

Do we want that burden? Do we want to accept that burden in the name of not pushing the automobile companies to make more fuel-efficient vehicles? That is what this vote comes down to.

From my point of view it is very simple and very sad. We sometimes have a responsibility to make tough decisions in the Senate. We have a responsibility to say to these big multinational corporations that produce these automobiles: You have to do better. You have to do better so the United States is not dependent on foreign oil, so we have true energy security and reduce the environmental degradation and damage of air pollution. We have to accept that responsibility. If we don't, who will? Do you expect the marketplace to answer this? The marketplace will answer this by eliminating this

species from the Earth. That is how the marketplace will answer.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. I take this opportunity to tell the Senator from Illinois through the Chair that this is the most important amendment dealing with the environment that will be offered all year. I was asked in a television interview yesterday what I believed was the most important environmental issue facing America today. I said fuel efficiency of automobiles. There is not a close second.

I believe in the Clean Air Act, clean water, endangered species, historical preservation, and there is not an issue that is more important to the people of America and to the world than fuel efficiency of these cars and trucks in America today.

I want the record to be spread with the fact that the Senator from Illinois has offered, in my opinion, the most important environmental amendment that could be offered this Congress. I give the Senator my support.

I know what the vote was previously on this issue. We will probably lose this, which is too bad. The majority of the people in America support this amendment. The majority of people in America support this legislation. The Senate does not. That is too bad. On this issue we are not reflecting the will of the American people.

Does the Senator acknowledge that?

Mr. DURBIN. I agree with the Senator. So does the League of Conservation Voters, an organization in Washington that looks for important environmental votes. They said the Durbin amendment is a critical vote on the scorecards of Senators across the United States because it gets to the basics: Do you care about the future? Do you care about the responsibilities of American consumers and American producers of automobiles to make a better car and a better truck? If you do not care, then you want the current situation to continue.

Remember the history. If you reflect on the history, where did we come up with the word "cafe"? How was this created? It was created by a law in this Chamber in 1975 which said to automobile manufacturers: You have to do better; 14 miles a gallon is sinful. It will make us more dependent on foreign oil and it will pollute the environment. You must produce a more efficient car.

The chorus from Detroit and other automobile manufacturers could be heard all over the Chamber. They said the opponents of this amendment are saying it is technically impossible to make more fuel-efficient cars. It cannot be done.

Second, go ahead and make more fuel-efficient cars; they will not be as safe. We guarantee it. We will be riding around in these flimsy cars that are so light that lives will be lost right and left.

Third, they said: This is a job killer. More fuel efficiency for cars in America means we are going to ship American automobile manufacturing jobs overseas.

Those are the same three arguments they are making today. The Senate ignored them in 1975. The Senate said to the special interest groups: You are wrong. America's national interests demand we pass this bill. And we did.

As a result of passing that bill, we increased the fuel efficiency of America's vehicles from 14 miles a gallon to 27.5 miles a gallon in 10 years by Government mandate from a law we passed.

Is America a better place as a result? You bet. We have less air pollution; we did not sacrifice automobile safety; and we still have a vibrant automobile manufacturing industry.

To suggest we are going to kill jobs because we want cars that are more fuel efficient is, frankly, to wave the white flag and say Americans are not smart enough. We cannot figure this out.

Why is it, time and again, when it comes to fuel-efficient vehicles, automobile manufacturers from other countries seem to have it figured out? Look at these hybrid vehicles. Gasoline-electric hybrid vehicles have great potential. Is it as embarrassing to my colleagues in the Senate as it is to me that the first two companies to produce these vehicles were Toyota and Honda? Where was Ford? Where was General Motors? Where was Daimler-Chrysler? Why do we always have to come in second when it comes to this technology? Is it that our people are not smart enough? I don't buy that. What is lacking is leadership, leadership in the American automobile industry and leadership in the Senate.

My colleagues will come to the Senate today and say 40 miles a gallon on our cars in 12 years cannot be done. If it is going to be done, you are going to condemn soccer moms and their kids to driving back and forth in cars that are death traps.

Listen, another thing that is wrong with the Durbin amendment, you will hear, is it is going to cost us jobs to America. That is the same story, the same argument we heard 28 years ago, the same tired old arguments that give up and give in instead of showing real leadership as this amendment demands that we do.

I say to my colleagues in the Senate, for goodness' sake, don't take the telephone calls from the special interest groups for a few hours. Listen to your heart and your mind and understand where the American people are.

Yesterday I was in the south suburbs of Chicago, Palos Heights. A woman came up to me who appeared to be a soccer mom. She stopped by the Dominick's food store, and I saw her as she walked by. She knew about this amendment, and she said: "Thank you for doing this. We have to do something about these gas guzzlers."

She knows, as we know, that no individual consumer can change this. Unless we show leadership, Detroit is going to continue to make the most fuel inefficient vehicles, put them on the highway, creating more pollution, more dependence on foreign oil, and ultimately destroying the environment of the Earth on which we live.

I don't think I am overstating the case—not at all. When 60 percent of the oil we import into America goes into our transportation, I believe I am understating the case. You cannot have a serious bill about America's energy security, or any serious legislation that considers the impact of energy on the environment, and ignore this issue. Ignore it we have.

The Landrieu amendment, which I supported, is a good idea. It is a study. It is an important message. It has no teeth, no enforcement. The same thing is true on the Levin-Bond amendment. It is an amendment that, in name, says we are concerned about this but, in fact, creates no responsibility on the automobile industry to do anything.

We can do things. The technology is within our grasp. What we need is the leadership in the Senate. My amendment would say we have to improve the fuel efficiency of cars and SUVs, minivans and crossover utility vehicles, to 40 miles a gallon by the year 2015; to require pickup trucks and vans to achieve a CAFE standard of 27.5 miles per gallon by the same year.

It changes the definition of passenger vehicle. That has been one of the most egregious violations of the original intent of the CAFE law that has occurred. You know these huge monster vehicles called Hummers, Humvees, and the like. Take a look at those and realize for a minute they are exempt from the CAFE law.

Take a look at these massive SUVs and realize we create tax incentives for businesses to buy the most fuel inefficient cars in America. I have a tax amendment, which will not be part of the amendment I offer this morning, but it goes after this tax policy which encourages the worst instead of the best.

The argument was made here, as I said earlier, that this technology is so expensive, it is going to cost \$1,200 a car.

Forgive me; I have been buying cars recently. Cars are pretty expensive nowadays, and \$20,000 and up, I guess, is average. Mr. President, \$1,200 on that cost at the front end, if you are going to save \$2,000 in gasoline over the life of the vehicle, is certainly not too much to ask.

In terms of losing jobs, the Union of Concerned Scientists say the opponents of this amendment have it all wrong. The opponents say, if we talk about new technology and American leadership, we are going to lose jobs. Just the opposite occurs. We are going to be creating jobs to create this new technology. We will be reducing the cost of business. The businesses that are de-

pendent on cars and trucks with better fuel efficiency will have lower costs, lower input costs, will be more productive and more competitive. But the opponents just don't see it. They have tunnel vision. What they see are these massive SUVs getting bigger and bigger and the American consumers having no alternative but to buy.

Many have said the Durbin amendment is not necessary. I would say the Landrieu measure includes no new authorities to help reach oil savings goals and no enforcement mechanisms to ensure that the requirement be fulfilled.

The Levin-Bond amendment, they say, is based on sound science. But I would say the contrary is true. In 2002, the National Academy of Sciences found that existing and emerging technologies—existing and emerging technologies—could improve fuel efficiency of a light truck 50 percent to 65 percent; the fuel efficiency of cars 40 to 60 percent.

The people who oppose this amendment ignore the reality. This technology is within our grasp. But, sadly, what we have found over and over again is that Detroit and other automobile manufacturers do not believe they have any obligation to offer it.

The Levin-Bond amendment does not require an increase in fuel efficiency. It delays the job, passes the buck to NHTSA. It adds new roadblocks to NHTSA's decisionmaking process. NHTSA has failed to make any meaningful increase to fuel economy for 10 years. The record is there. We know if you hand this over to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, you are not going to get fuel efficiency for a decade. Its latest increase of 1.5 miles per gallon to light trucks is almost laughable, to think that is the best they can do considering that the standards for light trucks were last changed 18 years ago.

So if every 18 years we are going to increase the efficiency of vehicles in America by 1.5 miles a gallon, how long do you think we will be dependent on foreign oil? The answer is obvious: Forever.

We are addressing fuel efficiency through the President's hydrogen fuel cell initiative. I support that. But that certainly is not the total answer.

I say to my colleagues, there are people in the business of selling cars. There are people in the business of buying cars. There are consumers across America who are going to ask one basic question: Is S. 14 for real? It is not for real if we do not include any provisions requiring more fuel efficiency and more fuel economy of our vehicles.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 25 minutes.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask that I be notified when I have used 7 minutes of my time. I intend to yield the remaining 3 minutes to my colleague from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be notified.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I think Senators are all aware, now, that if you are serious about doing something positive regarding fuel efficiency and safety standards but avoiding something negative for jobs, safety, and consumer choice impact, you should vote yes on the Levin-Bond CAFE amendment to the pending Energy bill.

I am only going to make this speech one time, not three times as those on the other side do, as we drag it out. I want to point out, again, a similar amendment was agreed to last year on a vote of 62 to 38, supported on both sides of the aisle.

As I said on the floor a few days ago, Members supported our amendment because they knew then and I hope they know now that setting fuel economy standards is complicated. Future standards should be based on sound science and take into account important criteria: Jobs, technology, consumer choice, and many others, but also safety—safety which has been compromised by the politically set lower CAFE standards of the past. They should not be based on the political numbers. I urge my colleagues to oppose the higher, politically set CAFE numbers included in the Durbin and Feinstein amendments.

There are a lot of people who are very strongly supportive of the Bond-Levin amendment—farmers, union members, soccer moms, small businesses. The United Auto Workers wrote to us specifically urging defeat of the Durbin and Feinstein bills. The Chamber of Commerce also did. Not often do you see the UAW and Chamber teamed up, in opposition, but the people who have proposed these unreasonable standards have managed to achieve it.

I spent a lot of time on this floor talking about the impact of excessive CAFE standards, and I think it is important to talk about the hard industry data, economic impact, and the National Academy of Sciences report. After listening to the debate of the last few years, it is clear there are many myths.

The first myth is automakers take advantage of an SUV loophole. Fact: During the creation of the program in 1975, Congress recognized, because of their utility, different standards should be set for light trucks and passenger cars. While light trucks feature more amenities than their predecessors and provide more than 50 percent better fuel economy than their 1970 counterparts, they remain fundamentally trucks. They satisfy consumer needs for safety, passenger cargo space, towing ability, and off-road capability.

Second myth: Only Congress can increase CAFE standards. The other side has floated the old canard that our amendment ignores CAFE standards.

Fact No. 1, the Bond-Levin amendment requires increasing CAFE standards to the maximum extent feasible as far as the technology will permit.

Fact No. 2, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has the authority and expertise to change fuel economy regulations, and a few months ago it announced the biggest increase in 20 years in CAFE levels for light trucks and SUVs. The agency has already announced its intention to set new CAFE standards starting in 2008.

The difference is they are going to use science and technology and not force the use of smaller cars that kill people on the road more frequently.

Another myth is that automakers need to use more technology in their vehicles to increase full economy.

Fact: The auto industry utilizes world-class technology across product lines. The average automobile contains 40 to 50 microprocessors and has far more power than the computers used for the Apollo mission to the Moon. Engineers and scientists for the big three domestic manufacturers and their international competitors have focused on developments in advanced technology to produce cleaner, more full-efficient vehicles along with a host of safety advancements.

In addition, my colleague from Illinois has said the National Academy of Sciences has a huge number that can be achieved. If you will read that NAS study, I ask my colleagues to focus on the part of the NAS report which states "The committee cannot emphasize strong enough that the cost-efficient fuel economy levels are not recommended CAFE goals"—not recommended CAFE goals.

Let us stick with science.

Proponents of higher CAFE standards try to avoid any discussion of the job impact or just dismiss concerns as overreacting. But we have heard, as I have said, from union officials, technical experts, plant managers, local dealers, and small businesses. They tell me the only way for manufacturers to meet these unrealistic political numbers is to cut back significantly on producing light trucks, minivans, and SUVs, or to make them significantly smaller.

Look at this. This is a picture of a Ford F-250 series pickup truck. It is a workhorse. You buy this truck because you have a job to do, whether it is farming, construction, hauling, or any number of other legitimate needs. It weighs somewhere between 8,500 pounds gross vehicle weight or less than 10,000. It is currently not covered by CAFE as it is configured to do more than haul people. Under the Durbin proposal, these vehicles would be swept into the CAFE program to the detriment of everybody. They would become CAFE-constrained with several bad outcomes.

First, you tell this rancher or farmer that he will need to get a golf cart with a little wagon to carry one bale of hay at a time or you tell other farmers, ranchers, and construction workers they won't be able to buy these vehicles, and then you explain to the workers in the automobile industry how they will have jobs.

Did you know the average compensation by employees in the auto industry was \$69,500 in 2001? This figure is 60-percent higher than the average U.S. job. Those would be the jobs we would lose because they could no longer make this machine.

Furthermore, as I have stated before, mandating politically set CAFE standards in the past has led to reduced weight, which, according to the National Academy of Sciences in the year they studied it, killed between 1,300 and 2,600 people a year on the road. That is roughly 2,000 people a year.

These are reasons to support the Bond-Levin amendment.

I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for yielding.

We have six production facilities in Missouri that make vehicles. In Kansas City, they make the F-series truck for Ford, and the Escape. In St. Louis, they make the Dodge Ram and the Mercury Mountaineer. There are 36,000 jobs in Missouri that are directly dependent on auto manufacturing, and 220,000 jobs that are indirectly dependent on auto manufacturing.

The proposal before the Senate would require an immediate and substantial increase in CAFE standards which would increase the cost of those vehicles by anywhere from \$3,000 to \$5,000 and would mean, in short, that sales would go down and thousands and thousands of people in Missouri would be out of a job. It would be a disaster for them.

These are jobs that pay \$50,000, \$60,000, or \$70,000 a year. These are jobs that mean kids can go to school and families can take vacations.

That is what we are talking about. This is not theory. This is not abstraction for them. It is bad enough when we try to help people get jobs and preserve their jobs and we fail because of extreme philosophies or partisanship or personalities or whatever. It is worse when we do something that actually takes their jobs away from them. They ought to be able to expect this Government is going to try to help them get jobs and preserve jobs. At a minimum, we ought not to pass legislation that takes it away from them.

I know this isn't going to happen. The Union of Concerned Scientists says the technology is available to do this without costing any jobs. That is a great comfort for my people back in Missouri who are trying to come out of a recession.

Maybe we can forgive them for being concerned and not trusting the Union of Concerned Scientists when the people who make the cars—the auto manufacturers—say they can't do it. The engineers who design the cars say they can't do it. The unions that produce the cars say they can't do it. I hope we will forgive my people back home in Missouri who depend on these jobs for being a little bit concerned.

I presided over the House while we were debating the measure to explore for oil in ANWR, which I think is related to this a little bit. A lot of folks who didn't want to explore for oil in ANWR wouldn't accept the fact we have the technology available today to do that without affecting the environment. They said we can't take that chance because it might adversely affect the caribou. It might be bad for the tundra in ANWR. Many of the same people who are advocating this big increase in CAFE standards said the technology is not available and we can't do it. They weren't going to take a chance when what was at stake was the caribou or the tundra. But they are willing to take a chance when what is at stake is somebody else's job in Missouri.

I thank the Chair. I will look forward to having a little more time later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I think I have 10 minutes under the reservation. I would like to reserve 2 minutes of that time so Senator BOND can close when the debate is finished on this side.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could, just for a matter of parliamentary procedure, at 11:15 we consider the judges. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi be allowed to complete his statement before we start with the judgeship. It would be 3 minutes later. Is that what the Senator wants?

Mr. LOTT. That would be much appreciated.

Mr. REID. We would extend consideration of the judgeship for 3 minutes.

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: It is my understanding that I have been given 10 minutes. Is that right?

Mr. REID. Yes but not now. We are going to the judge at 11:15. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I will speak more later on about the bill itself in general terms. But for 3 years the Senate has been trying to come to an agreement on legislation that could get through the conference and be sent to the President so we will have a national energy policy. I believe this is a very important issue for the future of this country. If we don't have a national energy policy and if we don't deal with these many areas of concern, the day will come when the lack of a national energy policy will cause national security or economic problems for this country. We could see that even this coming winter as we see a declining availability of natural gas.

By the way, it is inexcusable that we are having a national gas shortage. It is because of our policies. That led to

this shortage. If we don't have an adequate supply, it will affect the economy across the board. It is already affecting the chemical industry in my State, and the fertilizer industry. It is going to affect people's quality of life. This is so important. We need the whole package. We need more production. We need new technology. We need clean coal technology. That is just one example. We need more conservation of a responsible nature. We need to look at alternative fuels. I think a lot of these alternative fuels are, quite frankly, not very legitimate. But it is legitimate to try to find alternative fuels.

I urge my colleagues, let us work together. Let us get this done, get it into conference, and let us produce a national energy policy.

I think this issue is more important than any issue Congress is considering at this time. It is urgent that we get this work done.

I wanted to speak in support of the Bond-Levin amendment. I know very good work has been done on this amendment. I worked last year with Senator BOND and Senator LEVIN. They have given a lot of thought to how this should be designed. It bases decisions on these CAFE standards on science and solid data. I believe this idea of just plucking a number out of the air and saying that number is achievable is irresponsible. It may not even be achievable. Based on what? It makes somebody feel good? And what about the choices for the American people? What about the sacrifices in safety that we are asking them to make?

When you just pick a number, such as 32 miles per gallon or 37 miles per gallon, I don't think that is a wise decision, unless it has been based on thorough study and solid data. Of course, the organization to make that determination is the NHTSA. They have the expertise to analyze the numbers and consider all that should be involved, including the jobs that might be affected, the technology, how this improved fuel efficiency could be obtained, and, yes, safety. There are proposals out there which would adversely affect all these areas, including jobs, employment, consumer choice, and safety.

The National Academy of Sciences CAFE report declared there will be more deaths and injuries if fuel economy standards are raised too fast without proper consideration given to how that is being done and what impact it might have.

This amendment is supported by a broad coalition: labor, the UAW, the AFL-CIO, the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Farm Bureau, automobile dealers, and over 40 other organizations. That ought to tell you something. That type of broad support indicates that people are concerned about what might be done with this CAFE standard.

Yes, we should continue to work to improve fuel efficiency. We should have

incentives to move in that direction. But I am very worried we are going to cause some real damage. What about the choice made by Americans? This is still America, isn't it?

Is the Federal Government going to mandate that every driver drive an automobile like the one in this picture? Last year, I talked about the "purple people eater." Shown in this picture is a version of the "purple people eater." That might be fine around town in Washington, DC, but I can tell you, on some of the back roads in my State of Mississippi that will get you killed. That is not practical and people will not choose to drive it. They want an SUV or they want a pickup truck. And they don't want to be penalized by the Federal Government saying to them: You have to do this. And, by the way, if you don't do this, we will make you pay some kind of a price. This is ridiculous.

In my own case, my family is growing. We have our children and grandchildren. It is a wonderful deal. Then, in August, when we take our annual family vacation, I have a choice. I can have a bigger automobile with the three seats in it, where we can securely carefully fasten our grandchildren in these safety seats. We can take two automobiles, each being an SUV, or we can take three automobiles. Now, how much fuel is saved? And how much safety is given up?

Mr. President, this is ridiculous. It continues to be. It was last year. The American people are speaking with their choices. They are voting with their feet and their cash. They can buy these more fuel-efficient automobiles, but they are not doing it.

What percent is actually buying these smaller automobiles? I think, any way you slice it, not more than 14 percent. The American people are making other choices.

So I think what we are doing is very important. I think there are a lot of very substantive issues involved, and the least of which is not the American people's choices.

I do not think we should be forced to drive that automobile shown in the picture. I don't know who makes that automobile. I don't know where it is made, but it is probably reposing somewhere in France or Germany. I like the bigger vehicle shown in the picture behind it.

The American people have a need for vans or SUVs or pickup trucks. I understand there is going to be an amendment offered that will pick on particularly light trucks. Goodness gracious, light trucks use less fuel. Why pick on a light truck versus a heavy truck? This makes no sense.

I oppose the amendment that is going to be advocated by Senator MCCAIN and, I think, Senator FEINSTEIN. I oppose the Durbin amendment.

This amendment by BOND and LEVIN is bipartisan. It makes common sense. It moves us in the right direction. But it is based on commonsense science and

solid data. So I urge that we adopt this amendment, and let's leave the choice in the hands of the American people and not have the "Grand Poobah Government" tell us what we have to do in one more area. Don't make the American people drive this little grunt of a car shown here.

Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Missouri, keeping in mind that Senator BOND would have 2 minutes to close at the end of the debate on this section, I believe.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I doubt I will use the full 3½ minutes. It is just that I ran out of time before when I was in the middle of ranting and raving on this subject. I would hate to close my remarks on that tone, anyway.

Let me explain to the Senate why this is so important to me personally. I recently visited the Kansas City Ford plant where they make the new Ford 150 truck. It is a triumph of American engineering and the productivity of American workers.

The workers there are proud of that truck. And they should be proud of it. It means many people will be able to travel in this country safely and with comfort. I drive an SUV. I don't drive it because I am trying to hurt the environment or affect our energy independence. I drive it because we have small children. I used to drive a hatchback, but if we got in an accident in that hatchback, it would fold up like an accordion. That is why I drive an SUV. That is why millions of people do.

The Senator from Mississippi is right to say it is wrong to disparage these vehicles. People who make these vehicles in Missouri and around the country are proud of what they do. They are satisfied with their jobs. Let's not gamble with their jobs. We are trying to come out of a recession. We are trying to create jobs in this country.

Vote for the Bond-Levin amendment. It is a good, modern amendment and moves us forward. It protects people's jobs. I urge the Senate to support the amendment.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding me a few extra minutes. I yield back whatever time remains.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF PRISCILLA RICHMAN OWEN, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT—Resumed

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, there will now be 1 hour of debate equally divided between the Senator from Utah, Mr.