

view them as high-quality recreation areas and high-quality fisheries, most assuredly, abundant power producing facilities.

As was true over 80 years ago when Congress passed Part 1 of the Federal Power Act, what we are striving for in this bill is to create the balance necessary to assure that all of those 296 projects, where necessary, and where they fit, can continue to operate and operate in a productive fashion for the sake of our country.

Let me talk about a couple of other items that are important. One is nuclear. For 20 years someone has said to this country that electrical generation by nuclear energy or nuclear fission was wrong, that it was dangerous. Yet the nuclear facilities we have, have gone on operating uninterruptedly. They have been retrofitted and modernized. They have continued to produce. They make up nearly 20 percent of the total electrical base of our country.

During the last period of high electrical prices, they became the least cost economic producers. They were the base load that fueled the country, that assured that we would have the high-quality power we have. All of a sudden there is a new respect for electrical energy produced by nuclear power facilities.

We had a problem with the waste stream, the fuel rods that came out of the reactors, how they got handled, how they were stored, and did they get reused. We debated for nearly a decade and we assessed, by a tax, the rate-payers of those utilities that were producing with nuclear, a tax to fund a waste system, a waste management system.

Just a year ago, in the Senate we finally confirmed part of the process of licensing a facility out in Nevada known as Yucca Mountain for the storage of high-level waste. The Daschle-Bingaman bill we debated this last year was a bill that called for much investment in research and development in our Nation's energy solutions but dealt very little in this area. So much of the research done over the last several years to get us to a point where we could begin to consider as a nation bringing more nuclear energy back into production has been at work, and it has been at work in a laboratory in Idaho, the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory.

In this bill, for the first time, we speak about a new generation of nuclear generation—we call it generation 4—passive reactor systems, much safer, even than those that have been extraordinarily safe through the decades. And at a time when we agree, and I hope collectively as a nation, that we are handling the waste stream and managing it in the appropriate fashion, if we really want abundant clean air in the growth rate of that, 45 percent over decades to come, an ever increasing portion of our electrical production needs to come from nuclear generation.

We think it is now time for this country to explore the new research and development, the new reactor designs that are safer, cleaner, in the sense of their engineering, in the sense of their capacity to deal with problems that might occur, although our history with nuclear reactors in this country has been one of safeness, but one of expert management. Why? Because this Government, this Senate, years ago, created a Nuclear Regulatory Commission and managed it in a comprehensive and sensible way.

There are a good many other issues about which I can talk. My colleague from West Virginia and I teamed up some years ago, along with our colleague from Nebraska, to say that if there was going to be climate change legislation that dealt with the emission of greenhouse gases, that we and the rest of the world must come together to do it. Our country should not penalize its economy or its industries by attempting to march down that road alone. We could accomplish it and not destroy our economy if we would work innovatively to bring on the new technologies to the marketplace of power in a way that made sense.

That is what this bill, S. 14, is all about. It is all about new technologies. It is all about producing an abundance of energy for our Nation that is clean and ever increasingly cleaner than the past. It is about clean air. It is about a recognition that if there is a change in our climate, that is a product of ever-increasing greenhouse gases in the world, we want to do our part. But we are not going to deny ourselves and our economy and our workforce the ability to produce by simply shutting down; that we are smart enough through our technology and utilization of other forms of resources that we can generate an abundance of power and still be pragmatic and work through our problems with climate change.

Our country needs a national energy policy. It needs to get back into the business of producing energy. It needs to fill the market basket of energy, full of all types of energy. Wind? Yes. In this bill and its companion tax bill we incentivize wind farmers and the use of the new turbines in the production of electrical power through wind. What about photovoltaics or the sun? We incentivize that.

We have not, through this legislation, denied any element of the marketplace or any area of technology access to the production of electrical energy or the supply of energy for our country. Our country and our economy runs on energy. Every moment of the day we use more energy on a per capita basis than any other nation in the world. It is not by accident that we are the richest nation in the world. I say that with great pride. We have worked hard over the years. We have relied on the free market system. We have relied on a government that has been reasonable and moderate in its regulations and balanced in how it applies those

regulations to all forms of the producing entities of our economy. And we have always based that on an adequate and abundant and a relatively inexpensive supply of energy.

When the gas prices go up 10 or 12 cents a gallon at the pump, that is several dollars, for every time the car is filled up, that is spent on energy and denied to the breakfast table of the family or to the disposable income of the family or to the college trust fund of the family or any of the things for which the American family wants to use their collective resources.

We ought to work constantly as a government and as a Senate to make sure those kinds of spikes or run-ups in price do not happen, whether it is at the pump or at the electrical meter or anywhere else in our society. We can do that with the passage of this legislation by the recognition that government can play a role in the assistance of the production of an abundant supply of energy to our country. S. 14 just has not happened. S. 14 is a demand of the marketplace of our country saying: Supply us with an abundant supply of energy, and we will produce for you and for generations to come untold wealth and the American dream.

I am proud of that. I am proud of our history. I trust this Senate, over the course of the next several weeks in debating this legislation, will in the end have one important goal in mind: That is to pass a national energy policy for our country that recognizes now and in the future that the basis of this great country's strength and its wealth is the ability to consume clean, high-quality energy at reasonable prices.

That is what S. 14 is all about. That is why we have worked as hard as we have, and I applaud Senator DOMENICI for his effort in the production of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

A TROUBLING SPEECH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in my 50 years as a Member of Congress, I have had the privilege to witness the defining rhetorical moments of a number of American Presidents. I have listened spellbound to the soaring oratory of John Kennedy and Ronald Reagan. I have listened grimly to the painful soul-searching of Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon.

Presidential speeches are an important marker of any President's legacy. These are the tangible moments that history seizes upon and records for posterity. For this reason, I was deeply troubled by both the content and the context of President Bush's remarks to the American people last week marking the end of the combat phase of the war in Iraq. As I watched the President's fighter jet swoop down onto the deck of the aircraft carrier *Abraham Lincoln*, I could not help but contrast the reported simple dignity of President Lincoln at Gettysburg with the

flamboyant showmanship of President Bush aboard the USS *Abraham Lincoln*.

President Bush's address to the American people announcing combat victory in Iraq deserved to be marked with solemnity, not extravagance; with gratitude to God, not self-congratulatory gestures. American blood has been shed on foreign soil in defense of the President's policies. This is not some made-for-TV backdrop for a campaign commercial. This is real life, and real lives have been lost. To me, it is an affront to the Americans killed or injured in Iraq for the President to exploit the trappings of war for the momentary spectacle of a speech. I do not begrudge his salute to America's warriors aboard the carrier *Lincoln*, for they have performed bravely and skillfully, as have their countrymen still in Iraq, but I do question the motives of a deskbound President who assumes the garb of a warrior for the purposes of a speech.

As I watched the President's speech before the great banner proclaiming "Mission Accomplished," I could not help but be reminded of the tobacco barns of my youth, which served as country road advertising backdrops for the slogans of chewing tobacco purveyors. I am loath to think of an aircraft carrier being used as an advertising backdrop for a Presidential political slogan, and yet that is what I saw.

What I heard the President say also disturbed me. It may make for grand theater to describe Saddam Hussein as an ally of al-Qaida or to characterize the fall of Baghdad as a victory in the war on terror, but stirring rhetoric does not necessarily reflect sobering reality. Not one of the 19 September 11th hijackers was an Iraqi. In fact, there is not a shred of evidence to link the September 11 attack—at least as of this date—on the United States to Iraq. There is no doubt in my mind that Saddam Hussein was an evil despot who brought great suffering to the Iraqi people, and there is no doubt in my mind that he encouraged and rewarded acts of terrorism against Israel. But his crimes are not those of Osama bin Laden, and bringing Saddam Hussein to justice will not bring justice to the victims of 9/11. The United States has made great progress in its efforts to disrupt and destroy the al-Qaida terror network. We can take solace and satisfaction in that fact. We should not risk tarnishing those very real accomplishments by trumpeting victory in Iraq as a victory over Osama bin Laden.

We are reminded in the gospel of Saint Luke, "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required." Surely the same can be said of any American President. We expect—nay, demand—that our leaders be scrupulous in the truth and faithful to the facts. We do not seek theatrics or hyperbole. We do not require the stage management of our victories. The men and women of the United States military are to be saluted for their valor

and sacrifice in Iraq. Their heroics and quiet resolve speak for themselves. The prowess and professionalism of America's military forces do not need to be embellished by the gaudy excesses of a political campaign.

War is not theater, and victory is not a campaign slogan. I join with the President and all Americans in expressing heartfelt thanks and gratitude to our men and women in uniform for their service to our country, and for the sacrifices that they have made on our behalf. But on this point I differ with the President: I believe that our military forces deserve to be treated with respect and dignity, and not used as stage props to embellish a Presidential speech.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003— Continued

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. DOLE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Today the Senate continues a process that began almost 2 years ago. At that time, the Senate Energy Committee held and completed the first of several planned mark-up dates with the goal of putting together a comprehensive energy bill. After a number of postponements due to circumstances beyond our control, we engaged in 2 months of debate on the Senate floor last spring and produced a bill by a vote of 88 to 11.

Unfortunately, the House and Senate were unable to resolve their differences in a conference so we find ourselves once again tasked with the formidable challenge of developing an energy policy for the Nation.

I am pleased to report that after 2 weeks of mark-ups under the leadership of Chairman DOMENICI and the ranking member, Senator BINGAMAN, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee has lived up to its duty by reporting a comprehensive energy bill to the Senate for consideration.

So, the challenge of completing a comprehensive energy bill is once again before the Senate. There are likely to be additional obstacles before us along the way. The question is can we overcome them to complete our duty? It was Woodrow Wilson who once said:

The only use of an obstacle is to be overcome. All that an obstacle does with brave men is, not to frighten them, but to challenge them.

So the challenge is now before us.

This legislation does an excellent job of utilizing the variety of energy op-

tions available to the country particularly from a production standpoint. It is up to the full Senate to balance this with some meaningful conservation measures.

We had a number of hearings in the Energy Committee earlier this year to address the volatility we face in the price and supply of both oil and gas. Since we import 60 percent of the oil we consume, the price of oil is often at the mercy of world events such as the political turmoil in other countries—Venezuela and Nigeria—that we rely on for imports. We can and should produce more at home but must simply acknowledge that reducing the amount of oil we consume has to be part of the equation.

On the other hand, the natural gas market is quite a different picture.

Our country currently produces 84 percent of the natural gas we consume. However, there is a gap looming on the horizon. The energy information forecasts that the demand for natural gas will increase by 30 percent in the United States over the next 15 years, with supplies available to meet 70 percent of this need.

The facts are clear: our natural gas market is in a state of transition. Industries across the country that rely on natural gas as feedstock such as the chemical and fertilizer industries are confronted with high prices which is translating into the loss of jobs. We need to act now.

Most of the natural gas supply sources that have been offered as solutions, such as the natural gas pipeline from Alaska, are medium to long term options. However, in the bill before us today there is a provision which is one of the few, if only, short term options, we really have to affect the market. This provision builds on a recent rule proposed by the department of Interior providing incentives for deep gas production from wells in shallow water areas that have already been leased. Given the projections for potential supply in these areas, the opportunity to deliver significant new natural gas production to the market in order to stabilize prices is simply too good an opportunity to pass up.

Another significant program authorized in the oil and gas title of this bill would take the step of recognizing, for the first time, the impacts to oil-and-gas-producing states such as Alaska, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama, from the development that takes place on the outer continental shelf off of their respective coastlines.

With less and less areas available for production, and the deepwaters of the gulf of Mexico still a hotspot for the foreseeable future, it is time for Congress and the Federal Government to recognize the importance of the development that has been occurring and continues to take place off the shores of Louisiana and Texas and compensate those States for their role in providing the Nation's energy supply.

If our policy in this country is going to continue to defer to a State's wishes