

wish the U.S. Army a happy 230th birthday.

I yield the floor.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the birthday of the United States Army. The Army celebrates 230 years of service to our great Nation on June 14. On this momentous occasion, I ask that we all pause to pay tribute to the fine men and women of the Army who have served both around the world and at home during the U.S. Army's distinguished history. During the history of the U.S. Army, the battlefield location has changed and the warfighting technology has changed, but the spirit of the men and women of the U.S. Army has remained as consistent as the cause that they fight for—to protect, defend, and promote freedom at home and abroad. The selfless service given by each and every member of the U.S. Army is an inspiration to us all.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, 230 years ago on, June 14, 1775, our Founding Fathers formed the United States Army. The Continental Army emerged in the midst of a war for liberty and freedom.

Today, America's Army, serving worldwide in a global war on terror, is once again deeply engaged in fighting tyranny and ensuring the light of liberty shines around the world. It too is transforming just as it did in 1775.

The Nation stands united on the 230th birthday of the U.S. Army supporting our soldiers deployed around the globe. Each and every one a volunteer, who left behind the comforts of home to serve their fellow citizens and the Nation. Their courage, compassion, and selfless devotion to duty stand as clear examples to all of us and to nations the world over.

The American soldier has always been the centerpiece of the Nation's defense. Today, the focus remains as it always has: every soldier is a link to those past heroes. Moreover, our modern warfighters remain the preeminent land combat force in the world.

From Bunker Hill to New Orleans, from Gettysburg to the Marne, from North Africa and the beaches of Normandy to Inchon and the Ia Drang, from Desert Storm to Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom, the American soldier: brave, professional and determined has taken the field of battle in defense of those who hunger for freedom.

In light of the new threats of this century, the U.S. Army is transforming itself once again to remain on the leading edge of warfighting technology and combat skill. The change from musket to rifle, from horse to motorized vehicle, from aircraft to missiles has in the past 230 years demonstrated the resolve of our Army and its leaders to adapt in the face of change. New units of action, enhanced global mobility, infusion of precision weapons, and the responsiveness found in Army UAVs along with real-time sharing of intelligence and information are the hallmarks of the

U.S. Army today. What will never change is the courage, determination, and professionalism of the ultimate weapon in the Nation's arsenal: the American soldier.

No tribute to our men and women in uniform, whether they are from Alabama or elsewhere, would be complete without mentioning their families. America salutes our military families and the silent burden they bear when their loved ones: husbands and wives, fathers and mothers or sons and daughters are called away to distant shores to defend this great Nation and our way of life. The love and support our soldier's families provide gives each soldier the comfort and respite from the danger and long hours spent away.

As Americans, completing life's daily tasks, we should be ever mindful that the peace and freedom we enjoy in this great Nation were secured time and time again by the valor of countless soldiers serving around the globe over the past 230 years.

From forward positions in Korea to the streets of Baghdad to the mountains of Afghanistan soldiers stand ready at their posts. They continue to guarantee the peace that has been handed down from generation to generation of Americans. We should be proud and humbled by the standards set and the sacrifices borne by these Americans.

Happy 230th Birthday United States Army. May your successes be many and your burdens light. General Patton once said, "Wars may be fought with weapons, but they are won by men. It is the spirit of men who follow and of the man who leads that gains the victory." So it was in Patton's time, so it is today. Ours is the greatest Army ever fielded because of the men and women who wear its uniform make it so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 6

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the ranking member is in the Finance Committee at a very important meeting dealing with CAFTA. He is going to return as soon as the distinguished chairman of the committee makes his opening statement. I ask unanimous consent that the first two amendments in order be the one I would define as the ethanol amendment—I do not know who is going to offer that. Who on your side will offer that, I ask Senator DOMENICI?

Mr. DOMENICI. We think it will be Senator INHOFE, but leave it up to the manager to decide.

Mr. REID. I ask that the next amendment in order be that of Senator CANTWELL of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Reserving the right to object, respectfully, I would request of the Democratic leader, would there be an opportunity

under his unanimous consent request that I be allowed to make an opening statement after the two managers of the bill have made their opening statements?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think that would be totally appropriate. I would ask—the amendments we are talking about would be first-degree amendments.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator to misunderstand, but I am going to object to the request, not because I do not want that to be the order. I would like very much to understand that is probably going to be the order, but I do not want to lock it in that way right now.

What we are going to do, if the distinguished minority leader agrees, is I will make an opening statement. If, in fact, Senator BINGAMAN is ready, somebody will get him here to make his, and then, if the Senator from Florida desires, we will let him proceed. Then we will work with you to get the other two amendments lined up.

The reason I say that, I say to the Senator, is there is going to be a long debate and many amendments with reference to ethanol, and I would like to get it out here and see how it is going. It will be ready pretty soon. Then you will be right after that in order, as we have been discussing. I hope that is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, has the bill been laid down yet?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

#### ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 10 a.m. having arrived, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 6, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6) to ensure jobs for our future with secure, affordable, and reliable energy.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. 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 New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, so the Senate will have an idea what we are trying to do, the first amendment we are trying to offer up is in the process of being completed in a bipartisan manner, the ethanol amendment. We don't know exactly when that will be ready. It looks as though they are working on the last clearances or clarification of words. I was told a while

ago it may be an hour, it may be less. That will give us a chance to speak. In Senator BINGAMAN's absence, we agreed that after our statements, Senator NELSON will speak.

Mr. President, I think the most important thing to start with here is that this bill before us cleared the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, after years of stalemate, by a rather incredible vote of 21 to 1. Some would think perhaps that doesn't mean a great deal. But to the Senator from New Mexico, as chairman of this committee, I think it is very important. I think it means that, for once, Republicans and Democrats have seen an American problem of real significance and have tried very, very hard to see if they could cooperate at every level, with every amendment, and give everybody a chance to argue, present, win, lose, and produce a bill.

I will start by saying that is one of the big differences between why we are here today and what we are here about. I think it means that eventually the American people and their great concern finally bubbles up, and I hope partisanship disappears and we try to get a bill. Partisanship might not be over because when you get to the floor, there is still a chance to be partisan, and that is all right. The thing is, we want very much—and I use "we" because I speak for my friend, Senator BINGAMAN—to get a bill. That means the Senate is going to have a lot of time but perhaps not as much as last time or the time before, when we had literally hundreds of amendments left when we finished debate. And only through good fortune were we able to go to conference, in a very unordinary way, and we lost on the floor for reasons that the Chair and others understand.

Having said that, let me say there is no question that this great country, with this rather fantastic economy, with its leadership role in terms of security, is in a position where we need a bill that enhances America's energy supply, maximizes conservation, and that produces clean energy. So what we are talking about is an American Clean Energy Act that will produce security of supply, affordability and, ultimately, national security and prosperity.

It sounds as though that is a rather auspicious hope for a bill, and I am not here saying everything about it is perfect, nor am I saying some could not find ways to criticize it and say that perhaps it could be done a better way. But remember, we are in the Senate, where Senators have to get a chance to work their will, where there is a myriad of ideas about how America should move through this very, very difficult time.

I want to say right up front that I wish we were here saying we could go back 25 years and make some big changes so we were not having such a serious problem with reference to crude oil and the requirement that we import

so much. Of that importation, a huge amount, 75 percent, goes to transportation. Americans should know that means automobiles, that means SUVs, trucks, and everything that has to do with moving us around. We decided years ago that cheap oil, even if it came from overseas, should come to America and feed this desire for prosperity and mobility and transportation, which was one of our ways of providing our freedom. Now, 25 to 30 years later, we are in one gigantic bind, in that we cannot produce enough oil to meet this need.

As a matter of fact, today, as we stand here, the United States has diminished regularly its ability to produce the quantity of oil that it produces so that in the world we are no longer a major producer; we are No. 6. If you look out in the world, we are the sixth largest producer—and fading. There is nothing we can do about it, in terms of gigantic steps forward. We can, and this bill attempts to, enhance our ability to produce oil on American soil, where oil exists. We attempt to create a better format for permitting and drilling and acquiring American oil, and then, as an aside, there will be a major debate later—not on this bill—as to what we do, if anything, with the oil of America that is in Alaska, which we frequently call and discuss as "ANWR".

Nonetheless, in this bill, we have tried, with a degree of reasonableness, to say we are going to insist that we save 1 million barrels of oil a year, as far as what we use, by saying to the President: You use whatever means at your disposal to save a million barrels. And we give him that authority. Anybody who thinks we can do way more than that—I hope everybody understands that that is a discussion that doesn't have a great deal of merit, and it is beyond the realm of the responsible and reality.

Having said that, in addition to that 1 million barrels, this bill is laden with opportunities for additional savings because we are promoting hybrid cars, and I am sure the tax bill, which would be attached to this, will further enhance the use of hybrid cars, which is a great energy saver.

In addition, while some are critical, we will produce a very major ethanol bill before we are finished. The finishing touches are being put on it now. That particular bill will say to America, produce the maximum amount of ethanol, and ethanol will be used to mix with derivatives of crude oil and, yes, indeed, that will have a tremendous impact on how much oil we have to import from overseas from foreign countries. I will get to the specifics on that shortly.

At the same time, that particular aspect of the bill produces a lot of jobs. As a matter of fact, as I spoke of this bill at the inception and I spoke about prosperity, I spoke about security, I should have said to Americans it also will produce jobs because, with an

abundance of energy, we are more competitive; with an abundance of alternative sources of energy, we get stronger in terms of our ability to compete, which means this is a jobs bill.

So it is a jobs bill, a security bill, a clean air bill, and a clean energy bill. Add all of that up, it is a tremendous step forward for the United States.

I will speak for a minute about one of the most important commodities that we use in the United States: it is that marvelous product called natural gas. We are very grateful and fortunate in America that we do produce a lot of our own natural gas, but I regret to say that we have begun to use it in such abundance because we started about 8, 9, or 10 years ago putting natural gas in all of our new electric powerplants.

Understand that powerplants in America and in the world produce electricity that goes into a grid that is distributed out. If anyone is wondering how important it is, turn on the lights, and that is electricity that came from some far away power company. In the United States, powerplants receive their basic energizing from a number of sources. Currently, 20.5 percent of America's energy comes from nuclear power. We have not built a new nuclear power plant in almost two decades. Energy from nuclear power is undergoing a renaissance. It is beginning to percolate up as something that many more people think is a real, bona fide source of electricity and energy for the future.

I am well aware that the occupant of the chair, the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire, is a staunch proponent of nuclear power. I recall vividly his father, who had been Governor of the granite State many years ago, discussing with this Senator way before people were talking about it that we ought to move ahead with nuclear power. That is one source.

This bill, in a number of ways—and when the tax bill is finished and gets before us, that will finish the requirements—will push us in the direction of saying let us move ahead with nuclear power, provided we follow all of the rules, regulations, and laws because we have concluded that it is as safe, if not safer, than any other source of energy.

In addition, this bill would be a producer of clean energy. Nuclear is one of them. Secondly, we are a country while on the one hand not so blessed because we use so much crude oil and do not have enough, we are a country that is laden with coal. Right now the largest source of electricity produced in America comes from coal.

In numerous ways, this bill is a boost and sends a real powerful signal that we want to invest in new technology to produce clean coal for clean powerplants. We even provide incentives for the production of new coal transformation plants where we will begin to produce clean energy and capture the carbon that is one of the negative aspects of burning coal today.

Harkening back to natural gas, this bill does another very important thing.

We must bring down over time, if we can, the price of natural gas. People wonder what we can do in other areas, but natural gas is a feedstock in America. It is fertilizer, it is jobs, it is agriculture, it is the feedstock for many other products in our country. I believe we are paying the highest price in the world today for natural gas.

In this bill, we provide for a better way to site and locate liquefied natural gas—commonly called LNG—ports in the United States. We say they cannot be delayed indefinitely. If they are safe, then the Federal Government ultimately can get involved and see that we do them. It is important that we do that.

I did not mention everything. There are so many other aspects of this bill, but I want to talk about conservation because there are some who do not think conservation is the kind of thing that is important in an energy bill. It is vitally important, and I compliment those who have pursued it with vigor, led by my good friend, Senator BINGAMAN, who has pursued conservation for a long time.

This bill has very major conservation aspects. The amount of conservation that will be forthcoming in this bill is astounding. From what we understand, this bill will give us an opportunity, with reference to the use of energy from powerplants, to have the equivalent, if I am correct, of 50 powerplants of 1,000 megawatts over time. Just think of that. That is rather major. We could go on and talk about many other aspects, but Senator BINGAMAN will talk about the bill from his vantage point.

I close by saying that renewables are important. This bill recognizes renewables in many aspects and ways. Clearly, we promote fuel cells. We fund it. We encourage its research. Clearly, it is an energy source of the future. It will be part of making us more independent and clearly help us even in our transportation problems with reference to fuel.

Likewise, there is a section of this bill that I believe is about as innovative as anything we have done, and it has to do with incentives for building new and innovative sources of energy. In this bill, we call that title incentives. What we have done in the bill is provided for a new way for the United States, through the Secretary of Energy, to make decisions about new technology applied to pilot projects that might be built in various kinds of new technological breakthrough activities. It will be a provision that will be known as the loan guarantee provision, but it is different in that whoever applies will pay the risk insurance costs, and then they will borrow on an 80/20 basis. That means the U.S. Treasury should come through this with no actual cost to the Government.

According to our budget provisions and the law that provides for loan guarantees, it will not cost the Treasury and will be a very big source of new

and exciting applications for the United States of new innovation, which among all the things we have mentioned—the breakthroughs in coal gasification, the breakthroughs in many other areas of technology—are really going to be important in making America more secure, producing more jobs, producing a society that indeed continues to be prosperous. So this is a bill that has great efficiency and conservation built in.

On the electric front, I mentioned production of electricity, but I also want to remind everybody this bill also should provide for a framework where we will not have blackouts in the future. That is an easy one to remember. Even the young people here remember blackouts because they just occurred a while ago.

We have a reliability section which everybody in the business says is high time we have because everyone will have the same reliability standards, and we hope blackouts will become a thing of the past.

I mentioned ethanol. I note there is one of the strongest proponents of ethanol on the floor, and I say to the distinguished Senator, I hope we get a good ethanol bill. Thanks to his efforts and many others, we should get one that produces literally thousands of jobs, billions of gallons of gasoline, and millions of barrels of oil saved from overseas.

When we add that all together, the hybrid cars that will be produced—and I just heard the other day that if we continue to stimulate the purchase of hybrids, and if indeed they are produced as they have been, and if American manufacturers will get to where they are producing them so that it is not just Japanese hybrids, we should have in the not too distant future the equivalent of a million cars a year that would be hybrids. That will be a huge saver along with the other things that we are doing.

I want to add two things that are not in this bill that are very important to our future. Separate and apart, as everybody remembers, we produced a proposal that should bring natural gas down from Alaska into Chicago, a huge pipeline, one of America's major construction projects. I do not want to overstate the case because it is not in this bill, but what we are trying to say is everything put together, this is where we are going. When that is completed, there will be a huge new supply of natural gas coming into our country, along with what we are discussing in this bill regarding other fronts. I will not give the details of what the ethanol provisions will do for our country, but it is obvious that will be discussed many times over.

I can get it now. It will reduce crude oil imports by 2 billion barrels and reduce the outflow of dollars to foreign oil producers by \$64 billion. It will create 234,000 new jobs. It will add \$200 billion to the GDP between 2005 and 2012, and it will create \$6 billion in new in-

vestment, much to go to States that are currently called rural States that truly need the economic development that will come with it.

Actually, because it is agricultural products and because of the add-on that will occur in the development of ethanol, U.S. household incomes could, indeed, go up substantially overall, as much as \$43 billion.

This bill has provisions and ideas that came from every Senator. Senator BINGAMAN remembers on his side of the aisle four or five Senators have major provisions they got in this bill. Senator BINGAMAN and I negotiated out a number that were his ideas. I worked hard on the nuclear section. As I said, I think this bill, with the tax provisions, is going to cause a renaissance in nuclear power. In fact, I believe it is fair to say we will have a nuclear powerplant started in this country, ground turned, within 5 years—and I think that is the outside.

Three consortia applied for pre-permitting under our rather new law for the expeditious handling of nuclear power permits. I mean expeditious only in that they will not have to stop over so many times. It will be clearly reviewed and have to meet standards, but they will not stop six or eight times from the construction until the end.

And we do provide some assurance to those who will fund those powerplants that they will not get stuck midway through construction; that they will be able to complete the powerplants.

I hope I have not neglected important issues, but the most important is we have done our very best to get a bipartisan bill. We have done our very best to send the right kind of messages to the world that, if we get this, America is alive in terms of our energy security, our jobs for the future, our competitiveness and reduction in the costs of some of the major basic energy sources, and, yes, cleaner air, cleaner coal—cleaner electricity production. If you add it up, it is truly an American Clean Energy Act.

With that, I understand my fellow colleague from New Mexico would like to give his statement on the bill and I yield at this time.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOMENICI. Please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Could the distinguished chairman or ranking member of the committee inform the Senator from Florida at what point—maybe after the caucus lunch—we will be able to huddle up to finalize the suggested colloquy that we have been discussing?

Mr. DOMENICI. The time got away. It is almost 12.

How long will my colleague take?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I should not take more than 15 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Unless there is something intervening, the Senator can speak right after that.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the Chairman, but I was asking a different question. I was wondering when we would be able to have some substantive discussion on a future colloquy that we would have on the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. We all agreed that the next issue, the next item is going to be an amendment on ethanol. It is being gotten ready. We would take it up, but you understand when you do ethanol it is not one person, it is both sides of the aisle and 10 or 15 Senators. They are almost finished. That will be the next item.

If you are referring to a colloquy with respect to coastal offshore drilling, we are working on something with you and Senator MARTINEZ, both sides, and I don't know when we will have that ready. It is being worked on right now. But this side does not have any desire to delay that. We have to bring Senator LANDRIEU and other Senators in on that—Senator VITTER—and we will do that as soon as we can, I assure you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me first congratulate our chairman, Senator DOMENICI, on successfully bringing this bill through the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and to the Senate floor. As he indicated, the vote to report the bill from committee was 21 to 1—nearly unanimous. That vote is a testament, not only to what is contained in the bill but also to the process he followed when moving the bill to the Senate floor.

It has been over 4 years since President Bush released his energy policy plan. I believe President Bush was right to want to fashion a comprehensive energy policy for the Nation. President Clinton had such a policy document put together by a task force under Secretary of Energy Federico Pena. The first President Bush also had a national energy strategy document that was put together by then-Secretary of Energy James Watkins, after numerous public hearings around the country.

The fact that three successive Presidents have seen the need for comprehensive energy policy illustrates an important fact; that is, a good energy policy does not happen automatically. Energy markets are not inherently free markets and the short-term thinking that drives much corporate behavior in America is often mismatched to the long-term energy needs of the country.

As one example, if you look at the utility sector, you can see that our generation mix in recent years has strongly skewed toward new plants based on natural gas. But we now find that our long-term supply picture for natural gas cannot accommodate this additional demand without significant increases in price for all gas consumers.

Energy policy is something that requires intentional forethought and

planning. I remember former Chairman Bob Galvin of Motorola saying at one point that there are certain things a country needs to set out to do on purpose. I believe, along with my colleagues on the Democratic side, a good, comprehensive energy policy is one of those things. I believe what we should try to do on purpose can be summarized under four basic principles.

The first principle is that we need to increase our supplies of energy from all available sources. Every potential source of energy will be required in order to meet our energy needs in the future. We need to make sure that resources that have not yet been as extensively developed as they might otherwise be, such as renewable energy, get the policy assist they need to make their maximum contribution.

The second principle is we need to ensure that the energy we do produce is transported as effectively as possible and is consumed as efficiently as possible. Our national energy system depends on a critical infrastructure of ports and pipelines and transmission wires and other modes of moving energy from one place to another. Building and maintaining that infrastructure is difficult and it is expensive. We need to make sure we have policies so consumers are not hurt by price spikes and other problems caused by bottlenecks in the energy system.

Once energy reaches its point of end use, it is important that it not be wasted. Improving the efficiency of energy use in appliances, in commercial equipment, in industrial processes, and in transportation will lead to two important goals: lowering the price for all energy users and less strain on our energy infrastructure.

The third principle of a good, comprehensive energy policy is that we need to make sure it meshes well with other important national policies. It is especially important the energy policy have good synergy with environmental policy. Nowhere is this more clear, in my view, than in the case of global warming. Mr. President, 98 percent of the carbon dioxide produced in the United States is associated somehow with energy production and use. We cannot afford an energy policy that does not take into account environmental and climate impact, just as we cannot afford to have a climate policy that ignores energy impacts.

Finally, because we rely heavily on market forces and signals to shape our energy choices, we need to be sure that we have energy markets that are transparent and that are fair to consumers. I believe when we have competitive energy markets that work fairly, everyone in the energy chain, from the producer to the consumer, benefits.

As the California electricity crisis a few years ago showed—and not just the California crisis but the crisis that afflicted most of the west coast—when energy markets are not structured properly, when those markets allow for hidden and manipulative practices, great economic damage can be done.

These four principles are the foundation I hope we have before us in this energy bill that is coming to the Senate for consideration. I believe the Senate will ultimately be judged in the area of energy policy, first by whether our bill makes a concrete difference in bringing new energy resources and technologies into the mix; second, by whether we make sure that we use advanced technology to save as much energy as possible; third, by our ability to protect the environment and respond to challenges such as global warming; and, finally, by our ability to shape energy markets for the future that protect and empower consumers.

At the beginning of the markup of the bill in the Energy Committee, I expressed my appreciation to my colleague, Senator DOMENICI, for the way he and his staff had worked with Democratic Members and staff in preparing for the markup. I told him that he deserved great credit for a good start, and I looked forward to working with him to see if we could have a similarly good finish in the committee.

We had a very good finish in the committee. We are now having a good start on the Senate floor. This bill is a good starting point, but there are several important issues with which we need to deal in the full Senate that we were not able to address in committee. Three of these issues deal with providing more certainty to all those associated with our energy system so that they can make rational investments in the energy technologies of the future.

First, we need to provide renewable energy with a more certain place in our future. Renewable energy provides nowhere near the contribution to our energy mix today that it could or that it should. In the last Congress, we expanded the scope of production tax credits for renewable energy, but these tax credits expire after only a very short time. Thus, they do not provide the needed long-term market signals. I believe we need to supplement these tax credits with a long-term national renewable electricity standard. By having a clear, certain requirement that 10 percent of all electricity generation comes from renewables in the year 2020, we would give industry the certainty it needs to successfully undertake new projects to improve the diversity of our electricity generation mix and to relieve some of the pressure that is leading to high natural gas prices.

Second, we need to deal responsibly with global warming. The electric industry and many other sectors of our economy are gripped with uncertainty about the future of carbon-based energy and products in a world that is increasingly concerned about global warming. There is a need for certainty about the regulatory framework that would be in effect regarding future investments to ameliorate the threat of global warming. Under our current voluntary approach to the problem we will likely never see these new investments,

not because they are not needed but because the economic picture is so clouded.

Third, we need more clarity on how we plan to deal with our dependence on foreign oil. We need to see if we can spur additional petroleum production in a way that is environmentally responsible, and we need to see if we can find ways to use less oil in the American economy. If we can trim the growth in our national demand for oil, we will relieve both our dependence on imports and the pressure on our national infrastructure of oil terminals and pipelines and refineries, all of which are operating near their capacity today.

An energy bill is a place for clear purposes. I hope that when the full Senate has completed its consideration of this measure, it will have expressed a willingness to take clear and forceful new action to ensure that our energy future is clean and abundant and affordable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I will address some initial comments to both the chairman and the ranking member of the committee. Senator BINGAMAN and the chairman of the committee, Senator DOMENICI, have been very kind as we have discussed what is in the interests of my State and other coastal States. I will lay out my case. I want everyone to understand this is the initial laying out of the case. I hope the version I will give, over the next 15 or 20 minutes, will be the only speech I have to give on the subject of oil drilling off the coast of Florida. I hope we are not going to have to address this issue. I hope I will not have to address this because somebody—a Member of this Senate—will not be coming forth with an amendment to change the existing moratorium on oil drilling off the Outer Continental Shelf.

The United States is depicted on this map in green; the Outer Continental Shelf area subject to the moratorium is off the Pacific coast from Washington in the North down to the southern end of California; on the Atlantic coast, off the tip of Maine all the way down to Florida; and the Outer Continental Shelf off of the gulf coast of Florida. This area depicted in blue is where there are existing, active leases for oil and gas drilling off of the coast of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas.

A better description of this is depicted in this map. Before I get to the details, I hope this Senator from Florida and this Senator's colleague from Florida, Senator MARTINEZ, do not have to give lengthy speeches. We are prepared to utilize the rules of the Senate in order to keep this moratorium in place. It is not only the Senators from Florida who are interested in this, but the Senators from Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia,

Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, New York, and all the way up into New England, as well as the Senators from California, Oregon, and Washington State.

There are a lot of Senators who, particularly when the geology shows there is not much oil and gas, have other interests we have to face in a tradeoff. What are those? In Florida, obviously, it is the extraordinary \$50-billion-a-year tourism industry, as evidenced by some of the most pristine beaches in the world which spawn a major part of the attraction to our guests that come to Florida to enjoy this kind of environment. Or this kind of environment: An extraordinary place of clear water, of beautiful beach sand—places that people love to come to for vacation and to enjoy the bounty of our extraordinary nature in our State.

That, of course, is one reason we do not want oil rigs out there. We do not want oil rigs because of the chance of despoiling that environment. Think of the Senators from Georgia. They have a place called Sea Island. They have a place called Jekyll Island. They have a National Park in a place called Cumberland Island. Beautiful beaches.

Imagine the Senators from South Carolina looking at the extraordinary part of the economy of their State that comes in from those beautiful beaches they have. Myrtle Beach is an example.

Or look at the Senators from North Carolina, the extraordinary beauty they have. Guests to their State, including their own citizens, want to go to beaches like that.

Oil rigs off the beaches are not compatible with keeping a site like that or like that. But there are many more reasons I will get into. I hope this is the only speech I will have to make. I take the chairman and the ranking member at their word, that they have, in fact, been dealing with me in good faith. We are trying to work out the language of a colloquy that assures the Senators from these coastal States that the leadership of the committee handling the bill before the Senate would not support a lifting of the moratorium that allows the drilling.

However, it is particularly important to me and to Senator MARTINEZ from the State of Florida because the place the administration wants to drill is a place called Lease Sale 181, a place drawn back years ago, including about 6 million acres. In 2001, along with then-Senator GRAHAM, this Senator from Florida, the Governor of Florida, the Governor negotiated a line that is the Alabama-Florida line, an imaginary line due south from the border of Alabama and Florida, near Perdido Key, and that there would not be any part of that lease sale that would be agreed to.

Thus, as to that 6 million acres in Lease Sale 181, 4 years ago in 2001, what was agreed was there would be approximately 1.5 million acres offered for lease but this would be off the coast of Alabama, not off the coast of Florida. Since then, that 1.5 million acres has

been offered for lease and that is proceeding through exploratory wells. However, it is not off of Florida.

Why are these coastal Senators so exercised, especially the two Senators from Florida? Because the administration wants to expand now into the rest of that 4.5 million acres that begins what we see as an inevitable march toward the coast of Florida. That was not the agreement in 2001. But the administration is now trying to change that agreement.

That is where we are prepared, as the Senators from Florida, to take our stand and not allow additional drilling.

I return to where I started. I hope this is the only major speech I have to make in the Senate on the discussion of the Energy bill, other than other amendments I am involved in. This Senator and his colleague, Senator MARTINEZ, are prepared to use the rules of the Senate—including extended debate, if necessary—in order to prevent drilling off the coast of Florida.

It is instructive to look at the entire Gulf of Mexico on this map generated by the Minerals Management Service, MMS, that shows in green the active oil and gas leases. As this shows, clearly, they are west of the State of Florida. There is a reason for that. The reason, primarily, is that the geology shows this is where the oil and gas is located. We can see by the darkness of the green that a lot of that is right off the coast of the State of Louisiana.

There is also a reason we do not see this area with active leasing off the coast of Florida. Because where there were leases, they have been bought back, either under agreements with the administration and the Governor of Florida, as in the case of the Destin Dome, which is right here off Pensacola and Fort Walton—although there are two tracks or blocks there that are still available for lease after the year 2012.

There is a reason why we do not see any here. All of those leases off the southwest coast of Florida have been bought back under the administration of the previous President Bush.

There is another reason we do not see any, and that is because of the geology. They have done a bunch of test wells in the eastern gulf and they have come up dry.

And there are more reasons. In the course of my explaining all of these reasons, let me say this is not the first time this Senator has been involved in trying to keep drilling off the coast of Florida. When this Senator was a Member of the House of Representatives, in the middle 1980s, representing a district that included east central Florida—Orlando, Cape Canaveral, my hometown of Melbourne, this general area of the east coast of Florida—there was a Secretary of the Interior named James Watt, under President Reagan, who was bound and determined he was going to offer for sale leases for oil and gas drilling from Cape Hatteras, NC, all the way south to Fort Pierce, FL. This

Senator, then a member of the House of Representatives, went to work to defeat it, and defeated it in the Appropriations Committee of the House.

But 2 years later, under the next Secretary of the Interior named Don Hodell, they came back with the same plan in the mid-1980s. At that point, they were bound and determined they were going to start drilling. They were going to start drilling off the coast of the State of the Presiding Officer sitting in the chair of the President of the Senate right now. They were going to drill all the way down to Fort Pierce. We finally beat it but it was a tough fight.

But the way we did it was we explained that you simply cannot have oil and gas rigs out in the Atlantic where you are dropping the solid rocket boosters from the space shuttle and where you are dropping the first stages of the expendable booster rockets coming out of the Cape Canaveral Air Force Station.

A major national asset: our Eastern Test Range, where we fire our rockets into equatorial orbit and where, in our manned space program, likewise, we are launching the space shuttle into equatorial orbit.

Well, we have a similar reason now of why we want to keep oil and gas rigs on the surface of the Gulf of Mexico because one of the major national assets of the United States is called restricted airspace. It is where we train our military pilots. We have—this area here is just the State of Florida, but the State of Florida is so key, off of the northeast coast of Florida and off of the State of Georgia—restricted airspace, but particularly here in the Eglin Gulf Test and Training Range, which you can see, as depicted by the white on the map, is almost the entire eastern section of the Gulf of Mexico.

Why is this a major national asset? Because it is hard to create restricted airspace in order to train our military pilots. When Vieques closed down—that was the little island off of the eastern end of Puerto Rico where the Navy trained its pilots, all for the Atlantic region—when that was shut down because of the government and the people of Puerto Rico wanting it shut down, where do you think most of that training had to come? It had to come right here, and it is operating out of these military facilities all along the panhandle.

It includes ranges actually in the State of Florida. But with the advance of technology, computers can now create virtual battlefields on the surface of the ocean—in this case, the surface of the Gulf of Mexico—in which these pilots can then train for their missions.

Ladies and gentlemen, you cannot be training by dropping your ordnance in an area of the Gulf of Mexico where there are oil and gas rigs. You cannot have coordinated training exercises with the Navy on the ocean surface, the Navy underwater, and the Navy in the air, if you are having to deal with

oil rigs. So it is another reason we simply have to have other considerations when the administration says they want to come in with lease sale 181, which is a place, almost in the middle of this Eglin Gulf Test and Training Range.

By the way, why is it that most of the Navy concentrated student pilot training is now at Pensacola Naval Air Station and Whiting Field? Why is it that the joint service fighter, the F-35, training for all branches of the service is being done at Eglin? And why is the training for the new stealth fighter, the F-22, being done at Tyndall Air Force Base? Why? Because they have plenty of restricted airspace in which to train. So that is another reason we do not want to have oil rigs off the coast of Florida.

In the lengthier version of my remarks, which I hope I do not have to give, I can give you additional reasons why we do not want it. I can show you all kinds of pictures that are imprinted in our memories of what oil does to a beach, of what oil does to sea life and waterfowl, and of what oil does in spills that are trying to be contained and yet going out of control.

In the lengthier version of these remarks that I hope I do not have to give, I can show you plenty of pictures that are not the kind of pictures that any one of us coastal State Senators who now have a moratorium on oil and gas production want to have—none of us. Yet it is real. The possibility is there.

So what we are facing is a situation that if we cannot get agreement from the chairman and the ranking member that they will oppose a change in the moratorium on this oil and gas drilling off the coast of and on the Outer Continental Shelf, we have no choice but to use the tools available to us in the Senate rules to prolong debate and to utilize various parliamentary procedures in which to get our point across.

I do not think that is going to be necessary because of the good will of the chairman and the ranking member. As I speak, there are negotiations going on with our staffs in order to come to an agreement on colloquy language between Senator MARTINEZ and me and the chairman and the ranking member stating that they would oppose any of these amendments that would allow this expansion of drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf and lease sale 181, which is off the coast of Florida.

Mr. President, there is another reason; that is, Florida is this unique environment where all the forces of nature come together along our coast. If it is not the barrier islands that have the beautiful, pristine beaches that you have seen in these pictures, it is the parts of Florida that are the critically delicate estuaries and mangroves such as in the Big Bend of Florida and down south of Marco Island in this incredible area of mangroves called the 10,000 Islands that is so absolutely necessary as a part of the ending of the sheet flow of

water that is called the River of Grass, known as the Everglades of Florida—a unique environmental feature in the world itself.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I will yield to the chairman. You caught me in midsentence. I was about to talk about the fragility of the Keys of Florida, but I want to yield to my chairman because he is such a great chairman and he is such a good friend.

Mr. DOMENICI. Go ahead, Senator.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. No, I want to yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator. I was just wondering, we understand your genuine concern. You are going to have plenty of opportunity as this bill moves along to make sure that your State is protected. What I would like to do, since we are going to have to go out because of your caucus—we do not have ours today—I wonder if you might consider making this first statement of yours kind of abbreviated so Senator DORGAN could have a little opportunity before we break. Then we would take our break, and, hopefully, we would have ethanol ready. You would not lose anything, obviously. The floor is going to be open to you, and you can state what you wish to state beyond what you have spoken here today.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Well, of course I want to work with the chairman. Over the weekend, this Senator sprained a muscle in his right leg, and the last thing he wants to do is have to stand on his feet with this injured leg for hours and hours. So I want to work in good faith with the Senator from New Mexico in working out the colloquy. This Senator would clearly want that colloquy to come sooner rather than later, as soon as our staffs finish it.

I, of course, will yield for Senator DORGAN to make his statement, since we are going out in just a few minutes.

I will just conclude by saying, I don't think there are many Americans who do not know the beauty and the fragility of the Florida Keys and the coral reefs there. That is another one of the reasons we have to be so sensitive about drilling off the coast of Florida.

So at the chairman's request, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate, the distinguished junior Senator from Florida, Mr. MARTINEZ, has spoken with this chairman on numerous occasions about this issue. He continues to be as concerned as Senator NELSON about this issue. We are working with him—I am not sure how it is all going to turn out in terms of a colloquy, but we do not intend to do anything to harm Florida. We have already told everybody that. It is very hard to make broad-based commitments in advance, and it is not just up to me. There are other Senators, including Senator BINGAMAN. But we are doing our best.

I want everybody to understand that both Senators are working very hard at this.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to members of staff who will be listed hereinafter. They are members of the committee who will have to spend time, from time to time, on the floor. And I ask unanimous consent that their names be printed in the RECORD.

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

The list of names is as follows:

Karen Billups, Colin Hayes, Lisa Epifani, Kelly Donnelly, John Peschke, Frank Macchiarola, Frank Gladics, Dick Bouts, Carole McGuire, Marnie Funk, Kathryn Clay, Josh Johnson, Clint Williamson, and Amy Millet.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of fellows and interns of the Democratic staff of the Finance Committee be allowed on the Senate floor for the duration of the debate on the Energy Bill.

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

The list is as follows:

Brian Townsend, Cuong Huynh, Richard Litsey, Jorlie Cruz, Mary Baker, Stuart Sirkin, Andrea Porter, Ashley Sparano, Drew Blewett, Jake Kuipers, Rob Grayson, Katherine Bitz, Danny Shervin, Paul Turner, Heather O'Loughlin, Julie Golden, Julie Straus, and Adam Elkington.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator, Mr. DORGAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my understanding is the Senate is about to go out for the caucus on our side. It is customarily held on Tuesdays. My thought is, perhaps when we come back—I believe at 2:15, by previous consent; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DORGAN. I am wondering if it might be appropriate for me to be recognized at 2:15 for 15 minutes. Then, at that point, Senator DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN will proceed with whatever agreement they are going to have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOMENICI. There is no objection, as long as it is understood I have the floor when we return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous consent request would be that Senator DORGAN—

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator from New Mexico would have the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. At 2:30.

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN. I would start at 2:15. That is my request.

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

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I heard the statement by my colleague from Florida. He is aggressive and persua-

sive. I must say, in the committee we have already had some of these discussions by some who would want to open the Outer Continental Shelf and have more drilling and have a State election and so on. We already had some of that discussion, and I do not know whether anybody can agree in advance to prohibit amendments. You cannot agree to that, certainly, or agree to oppose amendments you do not know exist.

But I would say to the Senator from Florida, I do not think there is a ghost of a chance of us finishing this energy bill and having it carry some new mandate for Outer Continental Shelf production. That is just not going to happen, in my judgment. I think the reason it is not going to happen, at least in part, is for the reasons my colleague from Florida has described with his charts of what it would do to Florida. And it also relates to some concerns in other areas as well dealing with the Outer Continental Shelf and areas that have been set aside.

I just want to say, I understand the presentation. I did not mean to be here to interrupt it. I would like to make a general statement at 2:15 about the bill which, incidentally, I think is an excellent bill. It is the best energy bill we have brought to the Senate for several decades, in my judgment. I am going to support a couple of additions to it here and there. We have not done the energy independence approach, what is called the renewable portfolio standard. We will do that and some other things.

I am proud of this bill. This is a bipartisan effort, which is unusual in the Senate. I hope this starts a new habit. This legislation moves this country in the right direction in a significant way. Acknowledging the concern of my colleague from Florida, when the dust settles, I think he will understand that the battle he wages is one he will win because I don't believe the Senate is going to add the concerns he expresses about Outer Continental Shelf production.

I am pleased to come back at 2:15 and make a more general statement. I thank my colleagues from Florida and New Mexico.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005—  
Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that I will be recognized for the first 15 minutes and at 2:30, I believe, Senator DOMENICI will be recognized; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, yes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to make a brief opening comment about the Energy bill on the floor of the Senate.

First, I think the product of the Energy Committee is a bill that advances this country's interests. I think the work done by Senator DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN is quite extraordinary. At a time when there is so much partisanship and division and so much difficulty in getting together, this bill was the product of two Senators—coincidentally, from the same State—who decided to write a bipartisan bill. So the result was a vote in the committee of 21 to 1 for this Energy bill.

I think the bill is progressive and strong and advances our country's interests. First, I wanted to say thanks to both of them. I think what we have is a good bill. I am going to vote for some amendments that I think will strengthen it. Such as one we did not include in committee that would move us toward energy independence by requiring 10 percent of the electricity to be produced from renewable sources of energy. We call that a renewable portfolio standard. That needs to be in the bill. I will vote for an amendment to deal with that. There are other issues as well that would advance us toward greater energy independence that I will support.

The question for us is how do we remove for America the addiction to foreign sources of oil? If I were to have a barrel of oil on the floor of the Senate—and we use over 20 million of them every single day—and that barrel of oil were transparent, you would find out the first 40 percent of that barrel was oil we produced in this country, and the next 60 percent is oil we get elsewhere. From where does it come? It comes from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq, Venezuela—very troubled parts of the world. We are hopelessly and dangerously addicted to oil from troubled parts of the world. God forbid, tomorrow morning a terrorist would interrupt the supply of oil coming into this country. Our economy—the American economy—would be in deep trouble.

I remember listening and watching the Indianapolis 500 this year, as I have done ever since I was a young boy. This year was different because a woman was a race car driver, Danica Patrick, who drove her race car 220 miles an hour. I believe it was seven or eight or nine laps from the end of the race, and guess who was winning. The only woman who was racing in the Indianapolis 500; this young 23-year-old woman was leading the race. But they worried she was going to run out of fuel because she had not had a pit stop, and they worried she would not make it to the end. So she had to back off a little, worried about running out of gas. I think she took fourth place in the Indianapolis 500, and she captured the hearts of the country. We are going to hear a lot about her.