

know the Senator can appreciate the day we are celebrating today, which is Take Our Daughters and Sons to Work Day. We have literally hundreds of young people who are in the Chamber today. They have been around the Senate and the House celebrating this very special day, seeing their parents at work in the Senate and in the Capitol, not only as elected officials but as the staffers and support staff.

I have 20 young ladies with me today, nieces and friends from Louisiana, from Alabama, and from the Washington area. I am going to submit all of their names for the RECORD to show that they spent a day working in the Senate with me and with some of the other Senators and have seen firsthand the work that goes on.

I want to acknowledge MS Magazine Foundation that started Take Our Daughters and Sons to Work Day to thank them for organizing this effort where there are thousands, maybe perhaps millions, of young people who have taken a day out of their school work to go to the various places where Americans are working to contribute to making this country of ours a better country and this world a better place.

As we celebrate Earth Day today, which is also very important as we focus on the environment, I wanted to acknowledge this day. I thank my friend from New Mexico for giving me this time and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of these young ladies and thank them for being a part of this special day and taking their time to come and learn about the workings of the Senate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From St. Richards School: Mary Claire Logue and Catherine Logue, Monroe, LA; from St. Dominic School: Erica Sensenbrenner, New Orleans, LA; from St Ignatius School: Lindsey Seiter, Mobile, AL; from Tchefuncte Middle School: Lauren Cook, New Orleans, LA; from Louise McGehee School: Meredith Chehardy, New Orleans, LA; from Spring Hill Elementary School: Caroline Hudson, Washington, DC; from Georgetown Day: Rachel Jerome, Washington, DC; from Georgetown Day: Hayley Gray, McLean, VA; from St Scholastica Academy Trinity School: Gabrielle Klein and Stephanie Harkness, Mandeville, LA; from Our Lady of the Lake School: Elise Ganacheaux, New Orleans, LA; from St. Catherine of Sienna School: Sarah Parent, New Orleans, LA; from Isidore Newman School: Jordan Warshauer, New Orleans, LA; from Louise McGehee School: Carol Irene Gelderman, New Orleans, LA; from Louise McGehee School: Catherine Cochran, New Orleans, LA; from Jackson Academy: Storey Wilson, Baton Rouge, LA; from Bradley Hills Elementary: Hannah Sherman, Bethesda, MD; from Pyle Middle School: Casey Thevenot, Washington, DC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

DOMESTIC NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have up to 10 minutes, but I do not believe I will use that, if anybody is wondering.

I rise to speak about a disaster that has occurred within the last 24 hours in the country of North Korea. We now have on the wire service recognition of the fact that there was a train wreck in North Korea where two trains ran into each other. It appears that between 1,000 and 3,000 people were killed. One report says 1,000 and another report says 3,000. In the meantime, the North Koreans have cut off the telephone lines to the area and have closed the border, so considering the nature of the country, I do not know when we will find out how many.

The reason I rose to talk about it is because the substances that we have been told were in those trains do not come close to the explosive power of liquefied natural gas. They are some kind of a liquefied petroleum and another product like propane, and it must have been sufficient power for this to ignite and blow up.

Why would I bring this subject up on the Senate floor? Well, I say to my colleagues, the Nation we live in has been on such an absurd path with reference to diversifying our energy resources that we are currently thinking about using liquefied natural gas in large quantities to take the place of natural gas, which is getting higher and higher in demand and less and less in terms of supply. I believe we ought to get on with producing as much natural gas from our own sources as possible. I believe the natural gas from the State of Alaska ought to be brought on board and we ought to help pay for the pipeline which will be the largest and most expensive construction job in our history, but it will transport voluminous quantities of natural gas and it will be ours. It will not be liquefied natural gas from Algeria, Tunisia, or wherever it comes from.

We are inviting the opposite. We are inviting States, principally in the eastern part of the United States—at least it is not the West or the South again. But I would like to make sure other parts of the country understand that if they have been holding out and not wanting us to get this energy bill passed because they think this is some easier way—like we can solve this with wind instead of natural gas—you know it just is not true. We cannot produce enough wind energy to take the place of the natural gas shortage we are going to have if we don't get on with producing it as fast as we can, in as large quantities as we can, and from safe sources, safe in terms of reliability and safe in terms of the environment.

We are going to hear more about this. I am sorry that I come to the Senate floor with such drastic statements about energy and the destruction of people and property because of this collision involving energy sources. But I can tell you, what the Committee on

Energy and Natural Resources has been suggesting we do is so much less risky than this, this fuel that exploded, that I almost wonder what it is going to take to bring us to our senses.

There are Northern and Eastern States saying, once they hear about LNG, they don't want it either. But I can tell you, there is not going to be any gas for parts of our country and it is not going to be imported from the West to the East; it is going to be brought to where it is needed. We are going to see people who are now talking with permittees who want to build plants, refineries, bases where you can harbor and hold liquefied natural gas.

Unless one of those trains had LNG, and I don't think it did, we haven't seen anything yet. If you killed 1,000 and wounded 1,000 and blew up a town with two trains running into each other and one of them was not LNG, then whatever we know about will be less volatile than LNG. So we could be looking at a more disastrous situation.

I also suggest while we are talking about terrorism, just think of that. If we have to bring in shipload after shipload of natural gas, just think of what we are going to have to do to make sure it is not part of a terrorist plan to blow up part of our country.

I for one hope we don't have to bring very much in, but I am sure, with what has been going on—and I am sure the occupant of the chair shares my concern—we ought to be very careful. We ought to take on the issue of, can we get some nuclear powerplants built in a safer way than in the past? Can we produce some truly clean coal-burning plants? We can bring solar, wind, and geothermal on. We can give them subsidies, all that are in this bill which we will not bring up today.

I think for those who are looking at that terrible country, terrible in terms of the nature of the existence of the people in North Korea, we can do nothing but shake our heads in fear and trepidation. I just finished reading a book about North Korea. As a Senator from a free country, to just read what is going on in that country just scares me to death. How the people can be so ravaged, so disgraced as human beings by that regime, and then to have something like this happen to them makes me terribly unhappy to be part of leadership in this world, that we can still let that eyesore of terrible proportions exist. Here is another one—3,000 people. Just absolutely pathetic.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. REID pertaining to the introduction of S. 2336 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

IRAQ

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, like all of my colleagues, I went back home during the Easter recess and listened to the feelings of Oregonians. It is clearly on the minds of the people of my State and much of the country the circumstance we find ourselves in Iraq. I thought I would come and share some of my perspective on where America is, as this one Senator sees it, in the war on terrorism.

I shared these feelings with many of my constituents. I wanted to share them with the Senate today as my reflections on the week I have just had.

When I first came to the Senate 7 years ago, I was privileged to spend my first term as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I came to the Senate with many preconceived views about the values of many of our alliances and our involvement in all kinds of international architecture—the United Nations, NATO, and many treaties. I have been an advocate of these institutions and treaties on many occasions. But I find myself now in a position where I am questioning some of my earlier positions, based upon my experience as a Senator.

My questioning first began when I watched with dismay the U.N. essentially stand by as nearly 1 million Rwandans were hacked to death.

I watched with further dismay when approximately a quarter of a million Bosnian Muslims were murdered in cold blood by Mr. Milosevic and his minions, and I wondered why they couldn't do anything?

I remember the occasion when a number of us were invited to meet with President Clinton as our European allies were pleading with the President to intervene with them as Europeans to help stop genocide on Europe's backdoor. I remember saying to the President: Mr. President, I think stopping genocide is a value that I share with the international community, it certainly is and ought to be an American value. So, Mr. President, you have my support, but I urge you to seek a resolution from the Security Council so we go in with the "legitimacy" of the United Nations.

He said to me: Senator, I can't because I have been promised a U.N. resolution to intervene to stop genocide in Kosovo would be vetoed by the Russians and the Chinese.

President Clinton believed that was a value high enough that nobody ought

to veto it, and America's hand should not be held back by such a veto. I could not have agreed with him more.

As a Republican, I voted with President Clinton consistently in our efforts to bail out our European friends in Kosovo to stop genocide. I am proud of those votes. I am proud of President Clinton for that. But I left the experience scratching my head about the United Nations and its role in the security architecture of our planet and particularly my country.

Then after 9/11, I heard lots of great speeches and then began to become aware of lots of wonderful resolutions and was so disappointed that there was no resolve in the resolutions; that it ended at words.

Now we find ourselves confronted with an investigation in the United Nations in which an oil for food program is going to be revealed to all the world as a monstrous corruption. It would be better titled a "Fraud for Food Program." I wonder how well served we are by a Security Council that would tolerate such a thing.

I am not suggesting we withdraw from the United Nations, but I am telling you I believe we should question that is the place we go for legitimacy. I have concluded that the U.N. can do a few things well. Mr. Brahimi's efforts are to be applauded and gratitude expressed, but, frankly, to go there for legitimacy, as some suggest, I think is very misplaced because we cannot get legitimacy from the kind of corruption that has been engaged in the United Nations in its "Fraud for Food Program."

What happened here, as Mr. Volcker will soon reveal to the world, is a system of price fixing, price kiting, skimming, bribes, paybacks in which the United Nations bureaucracy, or at least some members of it, were deeply complicit. What Saddam Hussein got out of that, according to the Washington Post, was \$4 billion. According to the New York Times, it is \$10 billion. According to other estimates, it could run as high as \$100 billion. Somewhere in that range the truth will be found.

What did he do with the billions, whether it is 4 or 100? He went about systematically rebuilding his murderous machine to buy weapons and palaces and to exterminate about 400,000 Shiite Muslims. Then I wonder why it is we are going to the U.N. for resolutions for legitimacy.

I tell you these things because, frankly, I was astounded when our friend and colleague, the Democratic presumptive nominee for President, was on "Meet the Press." When asked what was the first thing he would do, he said: I will go back to the U.N.

I remember Dwight Eisenhower, when he became the Republican nominee, we were in trouble in Korea. He said: I will go to Korea. And JOHN KERRY is essentially saying: I will go to Paris. For what? Legitimacy? International involvement? We have gone to

the U.N. and gotten 17 resolutions. Apparently, another is needed? For what? Legitimacy?

We are going to get people to sanction what we are doing when we will soon learn who was on the take and providing the money that Saddam Hussein used for palaces, weapons, and mass murder.

I hope JOHN KERRY runs his new ad in Oregon a lot because he repeats his "Meet the Press" statement in a slightly different version. He says: The first thing I will do is internationalize this. I will go to the international community.

I want the people of Oregon to know how vacuous a statement that is. I want my friend from Massachusetts to know I don't want the international community defending my family and my country. I know the American people want a sense of how do we get out of this because we don't want an open-ended commitment.

I hear it said by some of our European friends: You did it for oil. I tell the American people, if we had done it for oil, we would have invaded Venezuela. There is a lot of oil there, and they have no military. We did it for values. We did it because we believed in a post-9/11 world that Saddam Hussein was part and parcel of the war on terrorism. We believed, like all the other intelligence communities in the world, that he had weapons of mass destruction because he had declared them but not disclosed them. That is why Bill Clinton bombed Saddam Hussein for 4 days and nights in 1998. That is why this place, the United States Senate, under the direction and urging of Bill Clinton, passed a resolution calling for regime change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAL-ENT). The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for another 5 minutes.

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

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, we passed the resolution on regime change. In a post-9/11 world, with that intelligence that we had from President Clinton's administration and with that belief that he was a clear and growing danger to this country, and for all the reasons which President Bush has articulated, we did what President Clinton said we would ultimately have to do: Change that regime.

I tell you, my belief is that those who would say the war on terrorism is here, but Saddam Hussein is somehow exempted from that, are engaging in a theory because the truth is, he was, by every measure, a central financier and tormenter of terrorism. Ask the Israelis.

Where did Hamas get its money? There is a way out. There is a deadline that is drawing out of the shadows all those who want to compete for power. A lot of poison is being drained out of