

I end as I began. If this administration, like previous administrations, respects requests of the Senate, we will immediately move to grant Bolton an up-or-down vote. I stand by that pledge today as I did more than a month ago.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask that I be permitted to speak 1 minute as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRISONER TREATMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I listened with great attention to the minority leader. I want to state to the Senate, as I listened I had one question that went through my mind. I am in no way—I have not been studying Guantanamo, in terms of hearings and the like. But some of our leading officials, in whom I have great confidence—the generals who speak, the Vice President—are asking the question, What would we do with those people, those prisoners?

I guess it would be interesting for those who are very concerned about the issue to think with us a minute. What about the other side? What do they do with their prisoners? They don't have any problems, right? They kill them. We have been watching that. They hold them as hostages, tell the whole world about it, and then the next day they say cut off their heads. That is how they get rid of people who they think are an impediment to what they want to do, those who are fighting their cause.

We don't have that luxury. We pick up these combatants and what do we do with them? What are we going to do with them, I ask rhetorically. We surely are not going to do what they are doing. We have to do something with them and it is not an easy solution. Who wants them? Will we put them out and say go home and then they will be out there killing our men again?

It is a very serious proposition, in terms of the United States of America having a difficult problem here.

I understand my time has elapsed.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 6, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

Pending:

Cantwell amendment No. 784, to improve the energy security of the United States and reduce United States dependence on foreign oil imports by 40 percent by 2025.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. The time has come to move back to this bill. I want to say to Senators it happens frequently, when things are going well, that nobody is very interested in moving along. So we have to push you along by making sure Senators, or their staffs, understand this has to be a day where we get rid of three or four amendments, including a couple of very important ones that are here for the Senate to consider.

There is a pending amendment Senator CANTWELL has before us. We are trying right now to work out a unanimous consent agreement whereby we will move off that amendment and have a time for a vote. Then we will move onto an amendment—we are thinking that will be an amendment by Senator BINGAMAN—with a time agreement, somewhere around 3 hours equally divided. We will share that with Senator BINGAMAN and others.

Then there is a third amendment from our side of the aisle which, for the sake of naming it, we will call the DeWine amendment. It is not necessarily the name, but he is one of the Senators. We know he has an amendment. We hope we can lock that in to follow after the Bingaman amendment. We will agree on the time. Then the DeWine amendment will have a certain amount of time after which it will be ready for a vote.

I am thinking with some degree of certainty we will have three votes. That will take us into the evening. We will have this pending amendment, the Bingaman amendment, that he considers very important on the mandate for renewables across the land, and then we will have a DeWine amendment that has to do with the oil cartel.

I am waiting for those who are putting these numbers together to come here because Senators have to be consulted.

If people wonder why this takes a little bit of time, let me explain. We are agreeing to something, but people in the Senate have to agree. So we are checking with them now. The only other way we could do it, you see, for those who wonder where they are, we could have all Senators down here and say, Do you agree with this or that? But we can't do that, so we have this little time interval where we ask the Senate be put into a quorum call and that is what I was going to ask right now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to speak to the pending amendment, the Cantwell amendment, if it is appropriate, unless the chairman has some other business he wants to raise at this point?

Mr. DOMENICI. I would ask the Senator, if he would, give me a little bit of time before he does that and let me see if we can have a unanimous consent agreement locked in so we have some

idea how much time you will use, or others.

Mr. DURBIN. Maybe I could make an alternative suggestion to the chairman. I will speak until I receive a signal from him that he wants to speak for any reason.

Mr. DOMENICI. If you are so generous, I will listen and when I think I am tired of listening to you, I will put up my hand.

Mr. DURBIN. It will then be a very short speech, I am sure.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection.

Mr. DURBIN. I hate to live under that standard, but I will proceed nevertheless, at my peril, to discuss this bill.

This 800-page bill is our energy bill. We have been working on it for years. No one has worked harder than the Senator from New Mexico. This Republican Senator has joined with the Democratic Senator from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN, and they have produced a bill which in many respects is a good bill. If this bill were presented to me today to vote on, I would vote for it because I think there are so many positives here. It not only is good in itself, it is certainly good in comparison to what the House has produced. The House of Representatives has produced a grab bag of incentives and benefits to energy producers that doesn't get to the heart of the question: What is the best energy policy for America, for our children and grandchildren? What is the long-term view of America, when it comes to energy?

Senator DORGAN of North Dakota asked a question of the administration when they came to testify on this bill. He said, You look forward 30 or 40 years on Social Security and say we have to be prepared. What are you prepared to say will be our energy policy in 30 or 40 years? What should we be aiming for?

The simple answer was they couldn't answer it. They had no long-term energy policy. There is one thing we know will happen, unless we change course from where we are today. Each and every day of every month of every year for at least the next 20 years, we will become more dependent on foreign oil. Today, 58 percent of the oil consumed in the United States comes from overseas. That number has grown dramatically. In 1973, that number was 28 percent. So in 32 years we have more than doubled our dependence on foreign oil. We all need it: to fuel our cars, trucks, businesses—the economy of America. So the obvious question is, Is this something that should concern us? I think it is clear on its face it should.

As we become increasingly dependent on Saudi Arabia, the OPEC cartel, Iraq, Iran, Libya, and so many other countries for our oil sources, frankly, we are surrendering some of our freedom and control of our own future. If we lessen our dependence on their foreign oil, it strengthens our economy. Less money is going overseas to buy oil. More money goes into the United States. There is less dependence on what happens.

Saudi Arabia is a country we ought to take a close look at because we depend on it so much. Saudi Arabia is a royalty. It is a kingdom. It is a government which, on any given day, we are either embracing because they provide us with oil or admonishing because they are doing things as a matter of policy that are inconsistent with American values. How much longer do we want to be joined at the hip with Saudi Arabia? How much longer do we want to wait for these sheiks and princes to decide how much oil they will release from their country and directly impact the cost of gasoline in America?

I think the answer is very clear. The sooner we move toward independence, the more secure America is, the less dependent we are on Saudi Arabia and other countries. The pending amendment by Senator CANTWELL of Washington sets a goal for America. I think it is a goal that can be reached by people of good faith on both sides of the aisle who are prepared to accept the challenge.

Here is the challenge: Can we, over the next 20 years, reduce our dependence on foreign oil by 40 percent? It is a challenge. It is not as great a challenge as putting a man on the Moon, but America did that. It may not be as great a challenge as the Manhattan Project, when President Franklin Roosevelt said develop an atomic bomb that will end World War II, but we did that. I am confident, with the creativity and ingenuity of America, we can meet this challenge—40-percent reduction in dependence on foreign oil over the next 20 years. That is the pending amendment.

You would think most Senators would say: Fine, let's accept the challenge. Let America rise to this challenge and meet it. But sadly, if you listen to the debate, primarily from the other side of the aisle, that is not what we hear. We hear, instead: Oh, this is too big a challenge for America. We can't do that. The technology isn't there. We would have to change the cars we are driving. We would have to challenge Detroit and automobile manufacturers to build more fuel-efficient vehicles. They say that is impossible, America cannot meet that challenge, and they oppose the pending amendment.

I would say from my point of view this should be a bipartisan challenge we all accept. There are people who love their SUVs. I understand that. But I think we can say to Detroit, you can, and we know you can, produce a fuel-efficient vehicle that is safe and meets the needs of America, our families and our businesses. But to continue to build cars larger and heavier, that get fewer and fewer miles per gallon, is to increase our dependence on oil, particularly foreign oil, and our addiction to this source of energy. I think we can do better. I think the amendment offered by Senator CANTWELL of Washington does establish that challenge for us.

I personally believe we should do something about the fuel efficiency of the vehicles we drive. Do you know it has been 20 years since we held Detroit responsible for reducing the amount of fuel that you consume to travel a mile in America? For 20 years we have stepped out of the picture, and what has happened in the meantime? The fuel efficiency of vehicles in America has gone down, down, down. People drive these Hummers. Have you ever seen them? I personally think if you want to drive a Hummer, you ought to join the Army. People want them and get 5 or 6 miles a gallon and Detroit keeps churning out these big, heavy cars.

From my point of view, we ought to step back as a nation and say, isn't it worth something for us to have more fuel-efficient vehicles so we don't get drawn into foreign conflicts over oil? It is more important to me to drive a sensible car and to spare someone's son or daughter from serving in the military in the Middle East in a war. That is not a great sacrifice on my part. And it is certainly a great reward, when we have fewer and fewer times when we are entangled in this Middle East problem that continues today over our sources of oil.

I happen to believe this is a good bill. It can be improved and the Cantwell amendment improves it. There is one provision, only one in 800 pages, which talks about better fuel efficiency in America—or at least reduces our dependence. Let me be more specific: reducing our dependence on foreign oil. There was a provision that was passed by the Senate the last time we debated this bill, 99 to 1. It was overwhelmingly supported. It said, over the next 10 years we will reduce our dependence on foreign oil by 1 million barrels a day. That is a good step in the right direction. The Cantwell amendment takes us a little further and I think is better overall, but I support what is in the bill. Do you know, 2 days ago President Bush and his White House sent us their evaluation of this bill and said if that provision is included in the bill, the President will veto it.

The President will veto it if we embark on a policy of reducing our dependence on oil by 1 million barrels a day over the next 10 years? What are they thinking? How can we be any safer as a nation more dependent on foreign oil? Should not we be accepting this challenge? Why is the Bush White House walking away from it?

Senator DOMENICI, myself, virtually every other Senator, agreed to put this provision in the bill last time. I think it is a good provision this time. Yet the Bush White House is opposed to it.

There is only a certain amount of oil we can drill for around America and around the areas we control to meet our needs. The total world oil supply in the control of the United States is about 3 percent. Yet we use 25 percent of the oil that is consumed each day. If we are going to be realistic, we have to

understand we need more efficient vehicles, more use of alternative fuels such as ethanol and biodiesel, and we need to be looking for ways to reduce the waste of fuel, such as the one included in this bill, and I commend the Senator from New Mexico on this. The provision in your bill which relates to the idling of diesel trucks is a great provision. All of these are sensible moves in the right direction. If they are, why isn't this administration supporting it? Why don't we have a good, strong bipartisan vote not only for that provision but for the Cantwell provision, as well?

Let us accept the challenge. Let us not view that as a negative alternative that America just cannot do it. We can. We have proven it in the past. We can come together and pass this bill on a bipartisan basis.

I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I am greatly rewarded by his patience in allowing me to speak a full 10 or 15 minutes without boiling his bile or whatever might have occurred.

I yield the floor and hope we are moving toward a vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. We are grateful. We will have a unanimous consent to take care of today.

Let me just say briefly, if I were President of the United States—which obviously is beyond the realm of possibility—I would be opposed to this amendment. It is not as if it does nothing to the President. It says, Mr. President, whoever you are—and it obviously will not be this one—tell us how, give us a plan, tell us how you will reduce America's consumption of crude oil by 40 percent by a year certain.

What President would like to do that? What President would think that is a worthwhile effort if he would have to send up some kind of plan at which the whole world would laugh? Our cars would have to be the size of golf carts or we would have to make a breakthrough in the next 10 years, which we have been working on for 40 or 50 years, and we have not made it yet.

The very ones talking about it do not want to even get the oil from ANWR. That is a million of what they are asking for, and it surely would be here by the time their resolution talks about it. What if the President, whoever it is, says: Let's go to ANWR and get a million. Guess what they would say: Destroying the world, getting rid of the environment. But a nice little resolution, nice little bill saying we have a solution to this. We will just be a John F. Kennedy and say our goal is to some way, somehow, cut America's consumption of crude oil from overseas by 40 percent, when it has been going up every year with everything we are trying to do.

In this bill, we are trying what is real. We are challenging all of the technocrats, the technologists, the scientists. We are telling them: Here are resources, find solutions. What superentity would we create in this country and say: Here you are. You are on top

of all this. You prepare this plan. You give it to the President so he can give it to the people. To what end? What would it do? A 40-percent reduction reduces our consumption by 7.2 million barrels. We cannot even get anyone to vote to let America produce 1 million barrels now. If that 1 million would come off 7.2 million barrels, we would still be a huge way away.

Do not misunderstand, this issue is an American issue of high consequence. America is doing everything it can. We did not used to. That is why it is so hard now. We let it get away from us. It will not come back under control with a gaudy, impossible resolution that will sound like somebody has a plan.

I have attempted just to tell the Senate the truth. I have attempted to offer an amendment to this and just up the ante and say if we can do 7.2 million, why don't we do 8.2 or 9.2, and put it in there and say we will vote on a bigger one. Then I thought, maybe I ought to be what I have tried to be on this bill all along, honest and forthright, and as best I could explain to the Senate, we have to do everything we can, with imagination, with vigor, with certainty, with resources, but the kind of things we know we can do, that we know we put our shoulders to it and we work hard.

We are finally coming to the point where Americans do believe it is a big problem. I don't think they are blaming people anymore. It used to be we called the big oil companies up, swear them in under oath—I don't know if the Senator remembers the day we called them up here and had them swear. We said: You are the problem; you are why we are importing all this oil.

Remember those days? They told us everything they could. That hearing went away. What happened? The next year we imported more oil and more oil.

It isn't that the Senator doesn't think we should have an American plan. What we have in this bill is an American plan. Senator BINGAMAN and I and many others have worked hard to put it together. Some people say it does not do enough as it is. I heard some reporters yesterday commenting. I wondered what they were reading. They said: It doesn't do anything for nuclear. It is the most far-reaching pronuclear set of proposals we will have ever before us. The same commentators said it cost too much money. I don't know where they got the numbers. We have not even spent in this bill. We were given a \$2-billion reserve fund. We have not spent all of that yet. I shouldn't have said that because everybody will be down here wanting to spend it, but they have to go through us before they can spend it.

The tax portion is about like the House portion. It is a pretty good bill. It is not a spending bill. When you authorize programs, incidentally, you are not saying we are going to buy them or

pay for them. The distinguished occupant of the Chair knows in agriculture you authorize programs, but you do not expect the appropriations to do exactly what you say. You say: This is a program we would like you to think about. That is what this bill does in terms of authorization. Overall, it is a very good bill.

Is the proposed unanimous consent agreement satisfactory?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent the Cantwell amendment be temporarily set aside. Senator BINGAMAN be recognized in order to offer an amendment regarding RPS; provided further there be 3 hours of debate equally divided in the usual form and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the amendment and that no second-degree amendments be in order to the amendment prior to the vote.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 791

(Purpose: To establish a renewable portfolio standard)

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], for himself, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DORGAN, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. REID, and Mr. SALAZAR, proposes an amendment numbered 791.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this is a proposal that has been offered before in the Senate. This is a proposal that was included in the comprehensive Energy bill we passed in the 107th Congress, again in the bill that was passed in the 108th Congress. It sets a standard referred to, generally, as a renewable portfolio standard. It is essentially a requirement that those producing electricity in the country produce 10 percent of that electricity that they sell by 2020 from renewable sources.

The Senate has approved this proposal again and again. As I indicated, in the 107th Congress, we included such a portfolio standard as part of an Energy bill. We had various votes in the Senate that affirmed the Senate's determination that the standard should not be weakened. In the 108th Congress, there was a letter signed by 53 Senators that went to the chairs of the conference on the Energy bill, H.R. 6. Senate conferees went on to approve

the portfolio standard and pass it on to the House as part of the Senate action.

Now we have the opportunity to renew our support for this proposal to place it in this bill where we can, hopefully, get broad bipartisan support and get it to the President's desk.

There are good reasons for the strong support that we have seen in the Senate. A strong renewable portfolio standard is an essential component of any comprehensive national energy policy—not just an important part of such a strategy but an essential component.

The benefits are clear and they are many. Let me cite the major benefits: This provision would reduce our dependence on traditional, polluting sources of electricity. It would reduce our dependence on foreign energy sources. It would reduce the growing pressure on natural gas as a fuel for the generation of electricity. It would reduce the price of natural gas. It would create new jobs. It would make a start on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. It would increase our energy security and enhance the reliability of the electricity grid.

The renewable portfolio standard that we are offering—and I have various cosponsors—and I hope we have additional cosponsors before this amendment is dealt with—Senator COLEMAN, Senator JEFFORDS, Senator COLLINS, Senator DORGAN, Senator CANTWELL, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator REID, Senator SALAZAR. I believe many other Members in the Senate strongly support this effort.

The RPS we have offered is a flexible and market-driven approach to achieving the various goals I have mentioned at a negligible cost to consumers in this country. According to the Energy Information Administration, the amendment would result in over 350 billion kilowatt hours or 68,000 megawatts of renewable generation between 2008 and 2025. That is enough power generation to supply 56 million U.S. homes. The cost to consumers would be about .18 of a percent or less than one-fifth of 1 percent increase in overall energy prices.

This proposal would require retail sellers of electricity that sell more than 4 million megawatt hours per year to provide 10 percent of that electricity from renewable resources by the year 2020. The requirement would be ramped up in 3-year increments to allow for planning flexibility. The Secretary of Energy would be required to develop a system of credits for renewable generation that could be traded or sold; again, making the program easier to comply with. Utilities could use existing renewable generation to comply with the program or they could comply with the program by buying credits from someone else who is producing renewable energy. New renewable producers could receive the credits to trade or to sell.

The cost of the program to the utilities would be capped by allowing the

Secretary to sell credit at 1.5 cents per kilowatt, adjusted for inflation. As long as the difference between the cost of the renewable generation is less than 1.5 cents per kilowatt hour, the utility could buy or generate renewables. When it reaches or exceeds that price, obviously the cap would kick in, and it would become more cost effective for the utility to go ahead and buy the credits. We also would create a program for the sale of the credits to fund State programs for the development of renewables.

Congress has tried before to spur the development of renewables. In 1978, we passed the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act, PURPA. That bill required utilities to buy renewables if the generators could meet the avoided cost of the utilities. Cogeneration—that is, the combined use of heat for industrial processes and for generation of electricity—was also eligible. That program resulted in a huge growth of cogeneration. Over half of the new generation that came online in the country during the 1980s and 1990s was from that resource.

It did not, however, do much for renewable generation. These technologies have remained at about 2 percent of total electricity supply for decades now. In other words, PURPA did not work to stimulate development of renewables as we had hoped it might.

Let me put up a chart to make the point of this 2 percent figure to give people an idea of what we are dealing with today.

This shows electricity generation by fuel for the period of 1970 through 2025. Of course, some of that is anticipated. This is from the Energy Information Agency which is part of the administration.

You can see that by far the largest percentage of the electricity we produce in this country is produced from coal. That is the case today, in 2005, as shown by this white line on the chart. That has been the case ever since 1970, and that will be the case in the future. That is true regardless of whether this amendment is adopted or is not adopted.

The next source of power, the next fuel for electricity generation is soon to be—right now it is nuclear but it is very soon to be natural gas. You can see a green line there. It is probably a little hard to see against that blue background on the chart, but there is a green line which goes up pretty dramatically in the future. That is a concern I know all of us who have looked at this issue share. We see the price of natural gas going up a significant degree, because we have more and more of our electricity being produced from natural gas. That puts pressure on the price of natural gas. People who are buying natural gas to heat their homes or their businesses see the cost of their utilities going up because of the increased pressure on that price of natural gas coming from the increased demand for natural gas to produce electricity.

You can see the renewables number down here. The renewables is next to the bottom line, and it is bumping along at less than 5 percent. It is down around 2 percent today. It will increase very modestly.

This chart is a chart of how the Energy Information Agency would expect production to occur absent a renewable portfolio standard. What this amendment will try to do is increase somewhat the amount of electricity we are producing from renewables and, by doing so, decrease the amount of electricity we have to produce from natural gas. This is a way to keep down the increasing cost of natural gas, and it is a way to keep down the increasing price of natural gas as well.

Let me talk about some of the criticism that has been made of this amendment and this approach. Critics of the proposal point to a number of concerns they have. The No. 1 criticism I have heard is it costs too much; also, that States are already requiring development of renewables; and, third, some areas do not have readily available renewable resources. Those are the three major criticisms we hear, so let me respond to each of those.

In response to the argument that it costs too much, I will point to a number of studies of this proposal that have been done over the last several years.

In 2003, I asked the Energy Information Agency at the Department of Energy to look at the effect the standard would have. They found our standard would result in 350 billion kilowatt hours of new renewable generation between 2008 and 2025. That would not happen absent the adoption of this provision. They found the cost would be minimal. The report indicated there would be an increase in the cost of electricity of only one-tenth of a cent in 2025 over projected costs. When combined with the reduction in natural gas prices that would be caused by the RPS, total aggregate cost to the consumer on that consumer's energy bill was projected to be less than one-twentieth of 1 percent.

I have asked the EIA to update this analysis with current conditions, and we have their update. They have sent me a letter which I can put in the RECORD. Let me cite the most important parts of it. It says:

Cumulative residential expenditures on electricity from 2005 through 2025 are \$2.5 billion lower while cumulative residential expenditures on natural gas are reduced by \$2.9 billion, or 0.5 percent. Cumulative expenditures for natural gas and electricity by all end-use sectors taken together would decrease by \$22.6 billion.

Now, that is their current estimate of what the effect of this provision would be.

The report also indicates the generation of electricity from natural gas would be 5 percent lower if we adopt this RPS than it would be otherwise. It also projects that total electricity-sector carbon dioxide emissions are re-

duced by 7.5 percent relative to the status quo. They are reduced by 249 million metric tons.

A number of other studies have found positive results, even to the point of reducing overall energy costs. Earlier this year we held a hearing in the Energy Committee on generation portfolios. Dr. Ryan Wiser of Lawrence-Berkeley National Laboratory presented a report that summarized the results of some 15 studies of renewable portfolio standards much like the one we are offering today. All of these studies found that a portfolio standard would reduce natural gas prices. Twelve of the 15 studies projected a net reduction in overall energy bills as a result of the RPS.

The Energy Information Agency report projected that the RPS would lead to a 32-percent lower allowance cost for sulfur dioxide emissions. The cost is not great. So the argument we have heard that this is too expensive a proposition I think does not hold water.

Many have argued that States are implementing renewable portfolio standards and there is no need for a Federal program. It is true that States have taken the lead in pushing for more renewable generation. Eighteen States currently have developed renewable requirements. Three more are soon to begin implementing renewable requirements.

Almost all of these standards are more aggressive than the Federal standard in the amendment I am proposing today. My home State of New Mexico requires 10 percent of electricity produced by utilities in that State to be from renewable sources by the year 2011—not 2020. Mr. President, 2020 is what our amendment calls for. But New Mexico says 2011. California says 20 percent by 2017. Maine requires 30 percent by 2000; Minnesota, 19 percent by 2015.

This will spur the growth of renewables in these regions. There is one thing, however, a State standard will not do. It will not drive a national market for these technologies. If some States have renewable standards and others do not, or if the technologies and requirements vary from State to State, it is impossible for a national market to develop for renewable credits.

This credit trading system is the piece of our proposal that gives the greatest flexibility for compliance. A credit trading system also helps to reduce the cost of compliance by allowing credits for lower cost renewables from one region to be bought by utilities in another region.

Some argue this is a cost shift from the regions without renewable resources to those with renewable resources. I would argue it is a way to spread the cost to all who are seeing the benefits. If States do not have or choose not to develop renewable resources, they still realize the benefits of lower natural gas prices, of lower SO₂ allowances, of lower cost carbon

reductions. It is only fair they share the slight increase in cost for generation of electricity that has created these savings.

The argument that many regions do not have renewable generation resources has also been made. While it is true that the best wind, geothermal, and solar resources are concentrated in Western States, the entire country has extensive biomass potential. We have another chart I want to put up here for people to look at.

As Maine and other States have shown, paper production and agricultural processes are available everywhere. If Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland can implement aggressive standards, then other States can as well.

This chart makes the case very strongly about where these renewable energy resources are available. You can see that solar, of course, is available everywhere but more prominently in the Southwest. That is shown in the upper right-hand part of this chart. Wind resources are not available everywhere but clearly are in many States, and particularly in the West and the Midwest. That is shown on the lower right-hand part of the chart. Geothermal resources are primarily concentrated in the West, but biomass and biofuel resources are everywhere in the country, and are particularly concentrated in the eastern part of the country. So as these technologies develop, as the markets for these technologies develop, there is an ability to produce energy from renewable sources everywhere.

The environmental benefits are clear. The renewable portfolio standard would result, according to the Energy Information Agency, in a 3.6-percent reduction in carbon emissions in the year 2025. This is a reduction of 31 million tons in that year alone. That reduction is the equivalent to planting 27.5 million acres of trees, an area about the size of Pennsylvania. And this is in one single year.

The RPS also benefits the economy by driving job growth. According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, wind turbine construction alone would result in 43,000 new jobs per year on average. An additional 11,200 cumulative long-term jobs would result from the subsequent operations and maintenance of these renewable facilities.

The Regional Economics Applications Laboratory for the Environmental Law and Policy Center found that 68,400 jobs and \$6.7 billion in economic output are a result of renewable energy; wind power creates 22 direct and indirect construction and manufacturing jobs for each megawatt of installed capacity; wind power creates one operation and maintenance job for every 10 megawatts of installed capacity.

A study by the State of Wisconsin found that increased use of renewable energy sources would create three times as many jobs as increased use of

traditional fuels for electricity production. U.S. PIRG reports that building 5,900 megawatts of renewable energy capacity in California would lead to 28,000 yearlong construction jobs and 3,000 operations and maintenance jobs. Over 30 years, these new plants would create 120,000 person hours of employment, four times as many person hours as building 5,900 megawatts of natural gas capacity.

According to the AFL-CIO, an estimated 8,092 jobs would be created over a 10-year period for installation and operations and maintenance of wind power in Nevada, and another 19,000 manufacturing jobs.

Support for this concept and this proposal is strong throughout the country. Recent polls have shown that support. A poll by Mellman Associates found that 70 percent of those surveyed nationwide supported a 20-percent portfolio standard. We are not proposing that aggressive a standard. We are proposing 10 percent by the year 2020, which I pointed out is substantially more modest than most of the States have embraced that have gone this route. These results held about the same in States as diverse as North Dakota, Georgia, Missouri, and Arizona.

Environmental groups from throughout the Nation, from the Sierra Club to the Natural Resources Defense Council, from industrial associations to the renewable trade groups and utilities, have all supported the RPS.

We are trying in this bill to implement a policy to develop an energy future for the Nation that would rely on our own resources, creating energy security for the country; that would provide for cleaner air and water; that would begin to reduce our emissions of carbon dioxide into the air; and that would drive our economy to greater heights. This portfolio standard is a low-cost, effective, market-driven way to accomplish these goals.

Let me put up one other chart before I yield the floor.

There is a chart we have that shows the production-added capacity of wind energy which I wanted to reference. It is entitled "Annual Installed Capacity."

One of the arguments being made against this legislation is, through the Tax Code, we are already providing incentives for utilities to do this. Therefore, something like this is not required.

The truth is, we have had incentives in the Tax Code. Our history of success at getting additional installed capacity through that device has been extremely mixed. We have a tax provision for a year, and then we let it expire. Installation drops off dramatically. We have a tax provision put back in place. The installation of capacity goes up. We let it expire. Unfortunately, that has been the history in this Congress.

I would like to say it is going to be different in the future, but I am not persuaded. What the renewable port-

folio standard will do is to set a long-term path for how we want to proceed and would give utilities and those who are involved in the generation of electricity a clear idea of what is to be expected from them as they go forward. This would have a beneficial effect on the development of these technologies, on bringing the cost of producing power from renewable sources down, and would bring us into line with many of the more industrially advanced countries in the world.

This is a useful provision. It is one that has bipartisan support in the Senate and one we have had the good sense to adopt in the previous two Congresses. I hope we will do that again this year.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

MR. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I remind the Senate that we have an hour and a half on our side. I am in control of the time. I am going to yield control of the time to the junior Senator from Tennessee. He will start and use as much time as he wants. Then I will return and use some. I have put the word out, if anybody else would like to speak in opposition to the Bingaman amendment.

With that understanding, I yield the floor and thank the Senator from Tennessee.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EN-SIGN). The Senator from Tennessee.

MR. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico. While both Senators from New Mexico are in the Chamber, all of us appreciate the way they have brought this extremely important bill together. We know there are a handful of tough issues about which we disagree. Through their leadership, we have a consensus on what is well on its way to being an American Clean Energy Act for 2005, something that will dramatically transform the way we conserve energy, produce energy, and will help us keep our jobs and be more competitive in the world marketplace. That is our goal.

I also believe it will lower natural gas prices. And I thank the chairman and ranking member for their contributions.

At the end of our committee markup, during which the vote was 21 to 1, there were compliments thrown all around. Senator BINGAMAN said he couldn't remember a party-line vote in all the votes that we had, that we were voting based upon our own individual views and our regional differences. Senator CANTWELL said it was not only a clean energy bill, but it was a clean process. But that doesn't mean that when we disagree, we shouldn't disagree. And we have differences of opinion. That is what the Senate is for.

While I respect the other side for what is a high-sounding idea, the idea of a renewable portfolio standard, I believe there is a better way to spend these billions of dollars than the way

suggested by Senator BINGAMAN, if our real goal is to create an adequate supply of low-cost, reliable American-produced energy.

It is always important to start from the proposition that this is a big country and a massive economy. We use 25 percent of all the energy in the world, and we spend about \$2,500 a year per person to produce that. So when we put up a windmill that only blows 20 or 30 or 40 percent of the time, it doesn't matter much in terms of what we do. When we build a new nuclear power plant, which we haven't done since the 1970s, it matters a lot. A windmill would be one of 6,700, but that power plant would be only 1 of 1,300 or 1,400 power plants we have in the country. So it takes quite a bit to affect our energy policy.

There are three reasons I hope my colleagues will vote against the renewable portfolio standard. The first reason is that it is an \$18 billion tax. It is a new \$18 billion rate increase on the electric ratepayers of America. The second reason is it is an increase in subsidy for a number of people, especially wind developers who already include a huge subsidy of a couple billion dollars over the next 5 years, which the Finance Committee has recommended we increase to \$3.3 billion over the next 5 years just for giant windmills. Three, if not technically, it is at least in the spirit of an unfunded Federal mandate, the kind of thing that a lot of us were elected to stop, the idea of coming up with a big idea here in Washington and imposing it on the rest of the country and then sending them the bill.

I was thinking about this: We are all going to be going home in a couple of weeks, having debated the Energy bill and hopefully having passed it, feeling good about it. Our constituents are going to ask: What did you do about high gasoline prices? What did you do about high natural gas prices? What did you do about the possibility of blackouts so my computer wouldn't work and so I wouldn't be safe in my home? What did you do about the fact that China and India and other parts of the world are buying up oil reserves and growing their economies and creating constant pressure on the price of oil? What did you do about that, Senator, while you were in Washington over the last couple of weeks?

I wonder if what we really want to say to our friends who elected us when we go back to Tennessee or Nevada or New Mexico is:

I raised your taxes \$18 billion. I put a new \$18 billion charge on your electric bill. That is the first thing I did. The second thing I did was I gave an increased subsidy to people who were already getting a lot of money. Windmill developers are making \$2 billion over the next 5 years just to put up these giant windmills. We gave them another subsidy on top of that. And then the third thing I did was, since we all get smarter when we go to Washington on the airplanes, we decided that despite

the fact that 17 or 18 States are already defining renewable energy sources in their own ways and already trying to meet them and already giving them incentives, we decided we would decide that better. We would decide that from Washington, DC.

While I am not sure about this, at least in earlier versions of the proposal, in a number of cases the credit you got for what you were doing according to your State renewable portfolio standard doesn't count towards your national renewable portfolio standard.

I don't think I want to go home and say to the people of Tennessee that what I did about the growth of China and India and the threat to their jobs and what I did about high gasoline prices and natural gas prices, what I did about blackouts was to add \$18 billion to their electric rates, to give a big subsidy to windmill developers, and to put an unfunded mandate on top of what States ought to be doing for themselves.

There are better ways, if our goal is to produce low-carbon or carbon-free electricity, which is what this debate is really all about. This debate is motivated by those who feel most strongly about global warming and about low-carbon and carbon-free electricity. There is a better way to do that, particularly if we have \$18 billion. I want to talk about that a little more as we go along.

The Senator from New Mexico, as he always does, gave a very careful and well-reasoned explanation of his points of view. His proposal is a little different from his proposal made in 2003. I want to go through why I said what I said and make sure my point of view is understood.

Let me begin with the idea of the \$18 billion. I didn't just pull that out of the air. This is a letter from the Department of Energy in Washington dated June 15, 2005, to Senator BINGAMAN. He quoted some of it. It talks about a number of things. It does talk about some places where in the whole economy there might be some reductions in expenditures as a result of the RPS based on their monitoring. But it also says the following:

From 2005 to 2025, the RPS has a cumulative total cost to the electric power sector of about \$18 billion. . . . This cost includes \$700 million in payments to the Government for compliance credits once the price cap is reached and \$10.7 billion in payments to owners of customer-sited photovoltaics that are eligible for triple credits.

In other words, we are going to spend \$11 billion in payments for solar power.

Let me start by talking about what we mean when we say renewable energy. Some people get confused about ethanol, renewable fuel, and renewable energy. We are not talking about ethanol. We are only talking about renewable energy, making electricity. There are only a handful of ways to do that that make much difference. Senator BINGAMAN has defined those very nar-

rowly. Wind is one, giant windmills. Geothermal is another. That is hot water coming out of the ground to heat your home. Hydropower is one, but we exclude hydropower except for very limited new hydropower in this bill. Solar is another, using the sun. And biomass, putting grass and/or other things into coal plants and burning them is yet another.

Today, all of those renewable fuels produce a little over 2 percent of the electricity. Since the 1970s and 1980s, we tried very hard to encourage more. I can remember President Carter 20 years ago setting a goal of 20 percent of solar energy. In 1992, the wind developers said: We can make wind electricity out of wind, just give us a little bit of money to help get started, and then we will be off on our own. That was 1992.

Billions and billions of dollars later, wind is still not very much because that is not the best way to produce carbon-free electricity for an economy of this size, to compound the problem by putting new taxes and new subsidies on the American people at a time when we are supposed to be talking about lower prices. I haven't heard anybody say: I want higher natural gas prices. I want to pay a higher electric bill.

We are talking about higher prices, 18 billion new dollars on your electric rates. And for what? To build tens of thousands of windmills and to spend nearly \$11 billion producing what will end up being one-fifth of 1 percent of all of the electricity that we will produce. That would be the solar electricity.

I am all for solar power. I have an amendment for solar power with Senator JOHNSON that we introduced as part of the Natural Gas Price Reduction Act. It would spend \$380 million over the next 5 years for businesses and homeowners who want to use solar power. It would help that industry get started and see if it could go on its own without huge higher costs. But this is nearly \$11 billion for solar power to produce one-fifth of 1 percent of all the electricity in the United States.

After solar, tens of thousands of these windmills is the other major expenditure along with biomass. So what we are talking about to begin with is wind and biomass and solar and landfill gas and geothermal, and trying to take that from 2 percent up to 10 percent. To do that, we are going to put an \$18 billion tax increase on.

Now, let's go to the second objection I have. That is the size of the subsidy and the people to whom the subsidy is going. I have been doing a little investigating. It is hard to get these numbers down, to try to see how much money we are spending for this kind of fuel, so I could see if we could better spend it some other way. I have noticed that we are spending about 1 percent of our—we have something called the renewable electricity production tax credit. So far, it has been really a tax credit for windmills because solar

hasn't had the chance to take advantage of it. It pays you 1.8 cents for every kilowatt hour of wind power that you produce.

Now, wind has become—according to many of the utilities who buy and sell wind power—a fairly competitive product where the wind blows. Of course, where it doesn't blow, no amount of subsidy will help it. So we have already committed \$2 billion in our Tax Code over the next 5 years to subsidize wind producers. And the Finance Committee, yesterday, said they want to add a billion to that. The Finance Committee also said they not only want to subsidize the production of the kilowatt hours of power, they want to loan money so developers can build these giant windmills.

Some people may think I am talking about your grandmother's windmill out by the well somewhere pumping the water.

I will have to make one correction in trying to describe these. I have said only one will fit into the second largest football stadium in America in Tennessee. The Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SANTORUM, reminded me that Penn State is larger than the University of Tennessee, and I stand corrected on that. But even at Penn State, and even at the University of Michigan, which is the largest, or the University of Tennessee, which is third largest, just one of these windmills will fit in the stadium. The rotor blades extend from the 10-yard line to the 10-yard line, and it rises twice as high as the skyboxes, and you can see the red lights from 20 miles away on a clear night. These usually come in groups of 10, 20, or 30 windmills.

This proposal would have the effect of increasing the number of these gigantic windmills from about 6,700, which we have in America today, to 45,000. That is the estimate of the Energy Information Administration. Each of these produces about 1 megawatt of power—or to be accurate, is rated to produce about 1 megawatt of power. The wind only blows 20 to 40 percent of the time, so it only produces about a third of a megawatt of power. Also, you have to take into account the fact that since these often are built in remote places or on top of scenic ridges, then you would build large transmission lines through backyards to carry the electricity to places. And you have to take into account the fact that you cannot close down your coal plant and nuclear plant and your natural gas plant when you put up windmills because people don't want to shut off their computers, stop working, or turn off their lights. They have to have their electricity all of the time, and you don't store power from wind in these amounts to use later.

So the idea that the United States of America would look to the future to keep its jobs and competition with Japan, with China, and with India—our country that uses 25 percent of all the energy in the world—by taxing its rate-

payers \$18 billion to build tens of thousands of windmills and, as good as solar power is, to spend \$11 billion on solar power, which will produce one-fifth of 1 percent of all of the electricity we need in this country—I don't believe, respectfully, it is the best way to spend our money.

The third point is this about the States, and the Senator from New Mexico mentioned about what the States are doing. Someone said, "Senator ALEXANDER hasn't gotten over being Governor." Maybe, in a way, I hope I never do because I don't think you automatically get smarter when you fly to Washington, DC. I know the Presiding Officer goes home almost every weekend. You gain a lot of wisdom while you are at home, and not here. To the extent that it is a good idea for electric utilities to begin to use a variety of different renewable sources, I submit that they are already doing it. They are working hard on it. The Governor of California made a major address the other day about the use of solar power in California.

There are 19 States, plus the District of Columbia, that have some form of RPS today. They have all sorts of different approaches to this. Iowa met its standard in 1999. Connecticut increased its standard in 2003. Texas has a well-regarded standard.

They use different definitions of renewable sources of energy. Maine defines renewable to include pulp and paper waste and black liquor. Pennsylvania has a clean energy portfolio standard that includes waste coal. Connecticut includes fuel cells. The Western Governors Association includes clean coal.

I have a number of examples of how, under Senator BINGAMAN's 2003 proposal, which I have studied since his new proposal came just today, which I have not studied as closely, but there were a number of cases where the credits at the local utilities would be received under their State plans, but they would not be allowed under the Federal plan. So we would be saying in Washington, DC, we see that in 19 States you have this idea of more renewable energy, but we are going to do that ourselves. We are going to preempt the field, we are going to set the rules, we are going to define it, and we are going to spend \$18 billion our way instead of your way. I think that is unwise, Mr. President.

So the three arguments that I make against the Senator's amendment are these:

One, it is an \$18 billion new tax on ratepayers to build tens of thousands of windmills and to spend \$11 billion on solar power, which would produce one-fifth of 1 percent of all of the electricity we need by 2025. That is not the wisest use of money, and I don't think that is what we want to say to our constituents when we go home.

Second, it adds an unneeded subsidy, especially to wind developers, who we are giving \$2 billion already over the

next 5 years to build these gigantic windmills, which mars the landscape and only work 20 or 40 percent of the time. The only reason they are being built is because of these huge subsidized incentives.

I predict that if legislation like this passes and we go from 6,700 to 45,000 of these big windmills, you are going to have an uprising in every State of people who don't want to see them and wonder why we are taking \$18 billion away from their electric bills and subsidizing things like this.

Third, I trust the States. Nineteen of the States have an RPS, plus the District of Columbia. These are the green ones on the chart, where you see more capacity for renewable fuel. If you put a 10-percent standard on Louisiana or Arkansas or Florida or Tennessee or Virginia, and we cannot meet that standard, what do we do? Our utility just writes a check to the Government under the RPS. It is a new tax, it is a new rate increase, and that is not the kind of thing we ought to be doing.

What should we be doing? Let me go back to my first chart, and then I will conclude my remarks. I like the direction of our bill as it is. You see, I think what our bill, as written, does—and it hasn't been widely noted, and the Senator mentioned this a while ago—it would transform the way we produce electricity in the United States. If we really want carbon-free air, if we want to meet the Kyoto standards, stop the global warming that people are concerned about, you are not going to do it by building tens of thousands of windmills and spending \$11 billion on solar panels.

Here is how you will do it: conservation and efficiency. The Domenici-Bingaman bill that is here already would save us from building 45 500-megawatt gas plants just because of appliance standards. The hybrid car incentives coming from the Finance Committee will encourage the buying of 300,000 hybrid cars, resulting in more efficiency, less carbon in the air, and encouraging our auto industry to transform, as many of us hope they will do. If we do that, we should spend another \$750 million, not on windmills, but on giving tax incentives to auto plants in the United States that retool to be able to produce hybrid cars. If we give incentives to buy those cars, we want them to be built in Tennessee, Michigan, or elsewhere in this country, not in Yokohama. If we spend a new \$750 million for that purpose, which is a recommendation of the National Commission on Energy Policy, it will help to create 39,000 new automobile jobs in the United States.

Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator SNOWE have a proposal for energy-efficient appliances and buildings. The cost, over 5 years, is \$2 billion. Some of that is in the legislation. But more could be spent on it to great effect. Coal gasification powerplants. We have talked about nuclear, so I will go to nuclear; \$2 billion for deployment of

advanced nuclear power plants. Mr. President, if we want carbon-free air, we know how to get it. We get it from nuclear power. Twenty percent of all of our electricity in this massive economy of ours that uses 25 percent of the energy in the world is from nuclear power today.

So why would we subsidize windmills and solar panels instead of spending \$2 billion on advanced nuclear power plants? France does it. They are 80 percent nuclear. Japan has one new nuclear plant a year. We have not started one since the 1970s, although we have dozens of Navy ships docking at our ports around the country with nuclear reactors that have never had a problem. So \$2 billion for advanced deployment of nuclear power.

Right behind that, waiting in line—and I know both Senators from New Mexico agree with this—is coal gasification in powerplants, along with carbon recapture and sequestration technologies. If this could work, this would back up nuclear power and produce the large amounts of low-carbon or carbon-free energy that not only we need in the United States but that the world needs. If we do it here, they will do it there. If we don't do it, they will not, and they will produce so much pollution and junk in the air that it won't matter what we do because the air will blow around on top of us.

I mentioned solar energy development. I think there should be a substantial increase for solar energy development. The production tax credit, since 1992, has done nothing for solar power. It virtually all goes to wind. But an appropriate amount of money would be, over 5 years, \$380 million. That is even more than the Finance Committee recommended. Under the RPS, we are talking about \$11 billion collected from increased rates and spent to produce one-fifth of 1 percent of the electricity we need in 2025.

Mr. President, I want low-carbon air. I want to transform the way we produce electricity. But I also want lower electric rates. The Tennessee Valley Authority just raised our rates 7 percent. That is a high rate increase. That means there are some manufacturing plants in Tennessee that are going to think twice about whether the jobs stay here or the jobs go somewhere else. If we start putting new taxes and new rate increases on homeowners and manufacturing plants in Tennessee and around this country in order to build tens of thousands of windmills and this extent of solar power, we will not be taking the wisest course.

I suggest we support the bill as it is written, and to the extent we have dollars, let's spend it on hybrid vehicles, auto jobs, energy efficiency, coal gasification, modest, reasonable solar energy, carbon recapture research, advanced nuclear, and cogeneration projects.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I received notice that our Republican leader wishes to speak, he said, at 11:15.

I want to make an observation and see if the Senator from Tennessee will answer it.

The Senator from Tennessee went through all these other ways we could go about cleaning up our air and reducing the carbon emissions. What strikes me is, let's assume we are going to do all those things, because I think we are. I remind the Senator, however, that the \$2 billion in there on nuclear—we should all understand, we can produce nuclear powerplants before that ever happens. That is fourth generation. That is getting ready for hydrogen. That is not charged to this, nor is it going to apply.

Nonetheless, take all the rest. Let's assume we are doing them. The interesting thing about this amendment is, if we were doing them and saving carbon emissions, we do not get any credit for that; am I right? We still are going to have this 10-percent mandate for renewables. So let's assume a State 4 or 5 years from now opens a nuclear powerplant. That is as clean as wind, is it not? It is terrific from the standpoint of emissions, but we still have to do the 10 percent, right, the way this approach is; is that correct?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. And in every respect, a State will not get any credit for the fact they are doing all these things that move in the direction we want because here sits this mandate that says you do this anyway.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is my understanding.

Mr. DOMENICI. I think that is not right, as I look at it. That confounds me as to why that would be the case. We are urging they do the others, but in some cases, they are going to be mandated to spend this rather extraordinary amount. Once the credit is gone, incidentally, this kind of energy is going to be pretty expensive stuff.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is true. In the case of wind power, it was suggested to the Senators in the early nineties, give us a wind power production credit for a few years and then it goes away. If it goes away and it costs more, the ratepayers will end up paying for that higher cost power.

Mr. DOMENICI. The mandate does not go away. Somebody has to produce it and it has to be charged.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is my understanding.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York and I be allowed to enter into a colloquy and that the time not be charged against the pending amendment.

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

(The remarks of Mr. FRIST and Mrs. CLINTON pertaining to the introduction

of S. 1262 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I will take a very few minutes to respond to some of the points that the Senator from Tennessee was making. We are back on the amendment that I have offered for purposes of debate.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator OBAMA be added as a cosponsor to the Bingaman amendment.

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. The first point I would make, in response to the comments of the Senator and my colleague from Tennessee, who has contributed greatly to the development of this overall Energy bill and whose contribution has been very substantial and I very much respect his views, obviously we are in disagreement on this issue, and I will explain some of the reasons why.

First, much of what he said related to big windmills and the fact that this, in his view, is essentially a program that would cause the establishment of more big windmills. He pointed out the reasons why that was unwise.

This amendment is technology neutral. We have been very specific about this. We have said that qualifying renewables include wind, solar, ocean, geothermal, biomass, landfill gas, and incremental hydro power. We have tried to talk about all of the different renewables and make it clear we are not specifying which of these renewables are used by particular utilities to meet this requirement.

It would be up to them, and it would be up to them based on how the various technologies develop. In fact, many utilities have chosen to pursue wind generation because they have found that that was the least costly way to produce energy from renewable sources. Clearly, advances are being made in solar power, advances are being made in biomass, and in various others of these technologies. The purpose of this legislation is to accelerate that.

There is a chart which my colleague from Tennessee put up indicating the other ways in which we are trying to deal with our energy needs in this overall legislation and the other ways in which we are trying to reduce emissions into our atmosphere in this legislation. I agree with all of that. We do have provisions in this legislation to encourage the development of this gas-combined cycle technology and the use of that in our coal-fired powerplants.

I will put up the chart that we had earlier that shows the different sources for our electricity generation as they exist today and as the Energy Information Agency would expect them to exist in the year 2025.

You can see that by far the most significant source of our energy, our electricity generation in this country, is

coal. It has been in the past; it is today; it is going to be in the future. The only question is to what extent does that number, that top line, go up. And, more importantly, to what extent do we see pressure put on natural gas as a source for electricity generation in the future.

But we have provisions in this bill that try to encourage the use of IGCC technology. That is very much in the public interest and I very strongly support that.

We also have provisions in here to encourage more use of nuclear power, more production of electricity from nuclear power. You can see the nuclear line is largely flat coming from today, 2005, out to 2025. It is my hope, just as it is the hope of Senator DOMENICI and I am sure of many on our committee, you will see that line go up somewhat, as companies are able to see the benefits that are provided in this legislation and look at the cost comparisons, that they will choose to put more resources into production of energy from nuclear sources as well. That is very much to be desired.

But to accomplish our goals, our overall goals for this country and our overall goals for our energy legislation, we need to pursue all available resources. That is why I believe it is important we adopt this amendment, to give that extra push for renewables. The chart from the Energy Information Agency projects very little increase in this line down here, this blue line for renewables, without this renewable portfolio standard in place.

I saw the map of the United States the Senator from Tennessee put up, showing the different States that are doing this. All of that is taken into account by the Energy Information Agency. All of those State renewable portfolio standards are taken into account in their determination that there will still be only very modest, if any, increases in the use of renewables over the next 20 years.

What we are trying to do through this renewable portfolio standard is to increase the contribution from renewables somewhat. I am the first to admit we are not going to solve our energy problems with the use of renewables alone. We have to depend on nuclear power. We have to depend on clean coal technologies. We have to depend on progress in all these areas. But the effect of this amendment I have offered is to give some additional impetus to use of renewables.

Let me make a couple of other points which I think bear mentioning at the same time. I think the Senator from Tennessee suggested that—maybe not the amendment that is currently before the Senate but an earlier version, I believe he indicated, would say you don't get credit for what you do to meet your State standard in order to meet this national standard. Let me be clear. That is not the case. I don't think that has ever been the case in any version I have seen of this amend-

ment, but it is certainly not the case in what we are talking about here. In States where there is a renewable portfolio standard in place—and in almost more cases that is a much more aggressive and demanding requirement than anything we are contemplating here—clearly this standard would be met without any difficulty. This is not an incremental standard above what the State requires. This is an effort to require some effort to be made nationwide and hopefully get us to a nationwide market and demand for these technologies that we are promoting as part of this.

The other big point the Senator from Tennessee was making is this \$18 billion cost. He is referring to this letter from the EIA. It does say the cumulative cost to the electric power sector is about \$18 billion.

Three bullet points down in that same summary page, it says the cumulative expenditure for natural gas and electricity by end-use sectors, taken together, decreases by \$22.6 billion.

What it is saying is the effect would be to decrease what they spend on natural gas and electricity by \$22.6 billion at the same time there is the \$18 billion to be shifted over in this area. So clearly the whole idea behind this legislation is that the people who are producing, the companies that are generating electricity in this country, will do less of that through use of natural gas, will invest less in natural gas production facilities, or generating facilities, and will invest more in these other areas. That is the purpose of it. We believe that is a good public purpose, a good purpose for us to be promoting in this legislation.

The final point the Senator was making is this is an unnecessary cost to consumers. That is not what I understand the EIA to be saying. The Energy Information Agency says, in a quote out of their letter to me dated the 15th of June:

Cumulative residential expenditures on electricity from 2005 to 2025 are \$2.7 billion lower, while cumulative residential expenditures on natural gas are reduced by \$2.9 billion.

That is if this amendment is adopted. So the cumulative expenditures for natural gas and electricity by all end users, taken together, will decrease by \$22.6 billion. It is saying, for this 20-year period we are talking about, if we adopt this amendment we will be saving consumers. They, the people who are producing the electricity the consumers are buying, will, in fact, be shifting resources to produce some additional increment of that electricity from these renewable sources rather than from natural gas plants as they otherwise would. But clearly there is a savings here for the consumer, according to the Energy Information Agency, and I think that is clearly to be desired and something we all are hoping will result from this legislation.

Before I yield the floor, let me ask unanimous consent that Senator CLIN-

TON be added as a cosponsor. She is available to speak.

Let me ask Senator DOMENICI, did you want to go back to your side to speak now, or Senator CLINTON would like to speak on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator will be added as a cosponsor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me ask, Senator CLINTON, are you on some kind of time-sensitive schedule? If you are, I will let you go. How long does the Senator wish to speak?

Mrs. CLINTON. For 5 minutes.

Mr. BINGAMAN. We will yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I want to speak strongly in favor of Senator BINGAMAN's renewable portfolio standard amendment. This is a goal-setting amendment that gives us direction and impetus to do what we should be doing. Requiring us to produce 10 percent of our electricity from renewable energy sources in 15 years is something I think is necessary so we begin to change how we do business, how we conserve, what we invest in. This is a major step in the right direction. Although the critics have raised some alarms about this amendment, numerous studies have demonstrated the efficiency and savings that would flow from the adoption of this amendment.

Senator BINGAMAN has spoken at great length about some of these studies. The recent analysis conducted by the Energy Information Agency, provided some very strong support for what Senator BINGAMAN has proposed. In fact, it is the administration's analysis that shows if we passed this national 10-percent renewable portfolio standard with a 2020 deadline on it, we would save residential customers over \$5 billion, we would lower natural gas prices by 6.8 percent, and that would have enormous benefits for our chemical, pharmaceutical, and other industries that rely on natural gas. It would also reduce electric utility carbon dioxide emissions by 7.5 percent.

This does not even take into account all of the benefits that I believe would flow from this amendment. When it comes to renewables, we in the United States need to catch up. We are behind in this effort compared to other countries and we need to spur innovation and creativity.

I also support Senator CANTWELL's amendment. This improves on a provision in the bill that would require the President to develop a plan to save 1 million barrels of oil per day by 2015. That is a laudable provision. Actually it was approved by the Senate 99 to 1, 2 years ago. It is unfortunate the President opposes this provision and has even threatened to veto the Energy bill over it. At a time when oil and gas prices are high, at a time when national security interests clearly dictate that we reduce our dependence on foreign oil, rather than rejecting this provision, we need to go further than we

went with the 99-to-1 vote, and that is exactly what the Cantwell amendment does. It establishes an ambitious goal of reducing by 40 percent the amount of oil the United States is projected to import in 2025.

Finally, we are a can-do nation. We can do this. This is something we should be committed to do. These are goals. These are not enforceable standards, but they spur us, they raise our aspirations, they help us to think more clearly about what we need to do to protect our Nation's economy and security.

I hope the President will relinquish his veto threat and that we will have strong bipartisan support on both the Cantwell and Bingaman amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time remains on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remain 58 minutes on the majority side and 50 minutes on the minority side.

Mr. DOMENICI. I want the Senate to know on our side we do not intend to use as much time as we have, unless other Senators want to speak. Senator ALEXANDER certainly wants some additional time.

Senator BINGAMAN, I don't know if your side needs the whole amount. We are trying to get a unanimous consent agreement shortly.

As the Senator from New York leaves the floor, let me say right at the offset, the Bingaman amendment is not a goal. If it were a goal, that would be something different. It is a mandate. There is a very big difference between a goal and a mandate. This says exactly what each State is compelled to do with reference to the kinds of energies that are described. When you boil it all down, it means "wind" for the time being. It means each State has to have it. And if they do not, they have to pay money to the Secretary of Energy or they have to buy wind-generated electricity from some other State.

While I am on that subject, I would like to put up one little chart. I would like to show this to the Senate. If you look at this map, you can see the white area, in particular the white area down here in the Southeast. The interesting thing is that the white area does not have any source of wind to meet this standard.

It is nice if you are not one of those States. But if you are one of them, it is not very nice because you are sort of wind poor. The other States are wind rich. Under this bill, the States that do not have that have to pay money, either to the States that do produce it for their wind energy or they have to pay money to the Secretary of Energy who uses that for research and technology development in the area of renewables and the like.

We have been on the floor many times when we spoke about issues on coal. I remember when I was a very young Senator, we had a big debate in

the Senate about mandating a certain kind of coal be used. The Senate got very excited and hot about it because we were sort of drawing a line between the States and creating a terrible kind of chasm between the States, saying these States are going to be the "have" States, these States are going to be the "have not" States.

I admit that was a very serious problem, for the clean coal was not going to be used, in spite of it being clean, and the dirty coal was going to be used because we were mandating it. So it was in some ways similar, but it would have been billions upon billions of dollars in the development of resources, so it truly would have divided the country.

This divides us in another way, in a way that I think is not necessary. Let me say from the outset, for those who do not think the Bingaman amendment is the right way to go, they are not coming to the floor in harmony, en masse, saying we do not like wind energy.

Some may, but there are many who think wind energy ought to be developed and we ought to push the frontiers of technology. But no one should think that if we do not adopt the Bingaman amendment, we have a bill that is not going to push the development of renewables. The bill is laden with incentives to produce renewable energy.

As a matter of fact, the tax-writing committee that will bring their bill here shortly, I understand almost all of their allocation of tax reductions, the loss of tax revenues by way of credits or the like, almost all of it will be renewable. As a matter of fact, the very major tax credit that, I might say, is the principal reason wind is being developed at all is extended for 2 years at a very large cost to the taxpayers—maybe \$3 billion or thereabouts.

We are pursuing the development of renewable energy led by wind, which at this point is the principal one unless we consider hydro, and I don't think we are considering hydro in any of this debate. It exists, and it has nothing to do with what we are talking about.

What I am suggesting, if the amendment does not pass, we have not abandoned an American approach to pursuing the technology called renewables led by wind in these United States. What we are trying to say is that one shoe should not fit every State. States that can't do this because of the unfortunate situation of nature—they do not have the wherewithal to produce it, or if they had to produce it, they would produce it in places they would not want to produce it because it would not be consistent with another use of that land that is paramount and has a priority to the development of windmills, such as right down the middle of a national park.

Having said that, another point was made by my distinguished friend from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN, who has been a tremendous partner in this bill. He knows on this issue we do not

agree, but he understands that on 99 percent of this bill, we will fight for it and win and have an energy bill for the first time that has a lot of good, solid things for the country. My good friend Senator BINGAMAN said that other States already have these goals. They set their own requirements—not goals, their own requirements. He used the word that they have done so "aggressively."

I remind the Senator, and I think I am correct, that those States do not use the same formula for what will make up their portfolio of renewables. I submit, if the Senator would like to amend his amendment and allow the myriad kinds of energy production used in other States to meet their current goals or current mandates, that would be a good bill.

For instance, the State of Pennsylvania has a very aggressive plan. If you think "aggressive" means they have a very aggressive wind program that would meet the mandates of this amendment, that is not true. They are using other technologies consistent with their resources, many of which are related to products related to coal. Whatever remains after they use coal is reused, and they produce a clean source of energy that counts toward their goal.

We think nuclear powerplants will be built in the future. It seems it would be appropriate that a State might be given credit for that. We believe there will be very formidable advances in converting coal not only into clean coal but into coal that has the carbon removed that will, indeed, qualify for being as good for cleaning up with reference to the gases we are worried about in global warming as solar. It may end up, and from what I understand, even though it is new technology, it might be cheaper than what we think wind energy will be. It seems to me that is a more sensible approach. Provide a variety, a mix that would make up this 10 percent.

But we should not be causing certain States to pay a very big tax because they cannot produce solar energy. No one calls it a tax, but when someone takes funds out of their consumers' pockets and gives them to some other State, to some other utility in another State, if it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it is a duck. It seems to me that the easiest way to talk about this is that it is a tax. I don't think, when we look at all of that, this is the best way to do it.

I don't say this in any way to belittle those who have pursued this with vigor, who think it is a very good approach. Senator BINGAMAN makes valid arguments. The Senator from Tennessee, particularly in his way of getting to the bottom of things and articulating eloquently about what he has learned, has contributed immensely to learning just what this is all about. As a consequence, I am not at all sure as many people as thought this is a wonderful idea 6 months ago,

if they listen and understand, I am not so sure they would think this particular way to get renewables, led by a renewable called wind, would be the best way to go. I compliment him for that. I am not at all sure enough people are listening if we judge by the attendance in the Senate—and I don't think the people in America should do that. Senators are listening even though they are not here. If we judge on that, of course we will not change any minds.

As I see it, there is good reason to say: Look, we are doing enough right now with this enormous credit. Frankly, I will add to the credit, I will say something that is beyond dispute. We have asked those who gauge and judge, How much wind energy can you produce? What is the maximum that the fabricators of these products, these things you describe, Senator, that someone is building, that we will pay for—someone is making a lot of money on them right now because of the subsidy. How much could we produce per year for the next 2 or 3 years? The answer has come: You can't produce any more than the tax credit will cause you to produce.

Let me put it another way: This mandate has nothing to do with maximizing the production of wind so long as there is a credit. The credit is going to produce it. In a sense, why do you need both? One would say because of the long-term nature of a mandate versus we have 2 years, maybe 3 years of credits. But in America, the way we ought to look at this, you subsidize the technology so everyone involved can get with it and apply this ingenuity called America and do it better. This very large subsidy ought to surely get us in position where we can produce this wind—if that is what we want to do—that we can produce it cheaper, so the incentive is relevant to the next 8 or 10 years in that respect.

We ought to do better. To some extent, having the 10 percent out there and having the credit out there is a disincentive to maximizing innovation. What is the urgency? How are we sensitizing the marketplace to produce more efficient wind? When you give a tax credit and put a mandate on it, it seems to me whoever is doing it can sit around and say: We have a nice thing going, we do not need to change, just keep on.

I thought the idea was to move technology. It could be you are moving other technology besides wind. But there is a long way to go before you get some of that solar onboard. I don't think this will make that move in the next 10 years unless there is a big breakthrough that I don't believe will be caused by this mandate.

I have some other issues I was going to discuss. I will make a point about States that are already doing something. I call to mind Pennsylvania. One would not think of Pennsylvania as being a State with a lot of wind, producing wind energy, yet they are in red

on my chart. That means they have to borrow from my friend, Senator BINGAMAN, an aggressive policy on renewables. But it is not predicated upon the same requirements of this bill. It is not a huge 10-percent wind component. It is made up of other things.

If we look at each of these States in red and ask which States are meeting this goal in an aggressive manner, and then come to the Senate floor and say how each State is doing it, and then say, Why don't we let any State that wants to do it in all of these ways and meet it—all we have said is if the State is doing it, they get credit. That is what the sponsor says. But we have not said if they do it differently than this in the future, they get credit, as I understand it.

If we have another red State added up here—and I don't think the red and the blue of the last election has anything to do with this map; we don't have blue up there; we have red and white—but if we added more reds before we had this bill, it would not be all wind or renewables as prescribed by this bill. It would be whatever they find meets their test of renewable energy. It seems to me that kind of flexibility would be much better.

What we have is an attempt to saddle the industry and consumers with a hefty price tag to support a limited set of renewable resources.

According to the Department of Energy, only 2.2 percent of total U.S. electricity generation in 2003 was comprised of non-hydro renewable energy sources such as geothermal, photovoltaic, solar thermal, biomass, municipal solid waste and wind plants. This is so despite years of government subsidies and programs to encourage renewable energy.

Of this 2.2 percent total, 44 percent came from biomass generation (mostly at industrial facilities), 26 percent came from municipal solid waste, 16 percent from geothermal waste, 13 percent from wind, and 1 percent from solar technologies.

The RPS focuses on that 2.2 percent of our generation, mandates an increase to 10 percent and essentially imposes a 1.5 cent per kilowatt hour tax on an increasing percentage of each year's retail sales of electricity.

If electric utilities do not build new renewable facilities and have to purchase all their credits from the federal government to meet the RPS mandate, the total cost of the inflation-adjusted RPS proposal is an estimated \$190.8 billion in nominal dollars.

That is a worst case scenario estimation, but we must consider that risk when we are deciding whether this gamble on renewable resource mandate is the right thing to do. This proposal is a gamble not worth taking.

Mandating a Federal Renewable Portfolio Standard is an ill advised means of achieving increased renewable resource use.

Any effort to legislate on renewable generation requires realistic targets

and due deference to States' rights to make decisions suited to best serve their citizens' needs.

The proposed Federal Renewable Portfolio Standard fails to recognize these principles.

States should definitely encourage their electric utilities to offer retail customers electricity from green energy to the extent it is available and encourage investment in renewable development. Most importantly, States should be afforded the right to develop their own RPS approaches without Federal interference.

States are best able to determine appropriate fuel types, societal costs, consumer protections, and requirements to meet Federal and State environmental regulations.

Today, 19 States and the District of Columbia have their own RPS programs. Others should be afforded the same right to develop an RPS without Federal interference.

The proposed RPS amendment penalizes those States that have already acted to establish a renewable program by requiring them to replace their State program with a new Federal program.

This amendment rewards certain regions at the expense of others. Solar has limited application east of the Mississippi, wind almost no application in the southeast, and virtually all geothermal is located in the West.

We cannot ignore the reality that utilities in some regions cannot meet a renewable mandate because they are not blessed with ample renewable resources.

To ignore this would be to require these to buy credits, forcing many consumers to pay for power they never receive, and would result in massive interregional cash transfers.

Utilities that do not have access to new renewable assets will wind up paying 1.5 cents per kilowatt hour and receive no power—their customers will pay a tax with no benefit and this could have significant costs to establishing competitive markets and to low income consumers where such markets do not exist.

Each State should decide for itself and its own residents the optimal mix of renewable and alternative energy sources.

I certainly advocate state policy makers coordinating choices to maximize regional efficiencies, but I do not support instituting a one-size-fits-all national plan.

States have historically had control over the fuel choices and resource development decisions. Past federal endeavors to meddle in fuel choice mandates have resulted in disasters.

Any effort to legislate on Renewable Portfolio Standards requires due deference to States' rights to make decisions suited to best serve their citizens' needs. This amendment fails to provide that deference.

Another problem with this RPS amendment is that it mandates an arbitrary quota for some renewable energy resources without any justification as to why only a limited set of renewable resources are included as eligible.

At a hearing held by the Energy Committee in March 2005, Dr. Nogee with the Union of Concerned Scientists was asked a Question about the effect an RPM on production from wind power. He explained that 2/3 of the RPS requirements would likely be met by new wind generation. Mandating mostly wind power when wind power is not mostly available around the country is poor public policy.

Some claim that an RPS would help address emission problems. I don't think that the goal of this RPS amendment is to help lower emissions at all.

If the RPS was truly a device to help lower emissions, why shouldn't companies receive credits for environmental improvement expenditures, like pollution control equipment. The proposed amendment does not include such credit.

If cleaner energy was truly the goal of the RPS amendment, why isn't coal gasification technology or nuclear power credited?

The Energy Information Administration has noted that an RPS will "have little impact on sulfur dioxide, SO₂ or nitrogen oxide, NO₂, emission levels."

If the goal of the RPS was to lower emissions, then a broader array of our renewable technologies—particularly clean coal and nuclear—should have been included in the category of resources.

For similar reasons, I don't think that the RPS can be legitimately justified as a means to help diversify our fuel needs or reduce dependence on foreign resources. If that were the case, a greater diversity of renewable resources should have been included in the category of resources.

More effective and efficient solutions to this problem are available. In response to concerns with over dependence on foreign resources, we should focus our efforts on:

Nuclear power—which is one of our cleanest fuel resources;

Oil and natural gas from Alaska and other regions of the United States;

Coal of which we have abundant reserves; and

New hydroelectric generation—which have zero emissions.

If renewable resources are to become a greater contributor to our power sector, then competitive market forces should be allowed to operate. In order to facilitate the necessary competition, transmission must be available.

One of the barriers to entry for renewable development is the lack of transmission capacity to transmit electricity generated from remote areas long distances.

Before mandating fuel choice, we need to address the real need for improved transmission capacity. A num-

ber of the electricity title's provisions are directed at accomplishing this goal.

Renewable energy should be encouraged in a reasonable, effective manner. To that end, there are already extensive Federal and State subsidies in place as well as tax credits that I support.

We all support renewables—what we should not support is Federal command and control of the market in the guise of help for renewables. Would Senator CRAIG desire to speak on this issue before we vote?

Mr. CRAIG. I am happy to speak.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield to Senator CRAIG to manage time, and then when he leaves, he will give that to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to Senator JEFFORDS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent to deliver my remarks from my seat.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today I speak on Senator BINGAMAN's amendment to set a national goal to obtain 10 percent of our Nation's electricity from renewable resources. I support this idea. In fact, I have filed an amendment to go one step further—requiring 20 percent renewables by the year 2020.

America needs a national commitment to encourage clean domestic sources of renewable energy. I have been in the Congress for 30 years. I have seen the Nation make tremendous advances in areas ranging from medicine to the Internet. I have even witnessed the Red Sox win the World Series. Yet the Nation literally remains dependent on many of the same powerplants that operated when I first was elected to Congress in 1974.

When I think of the next 30 years, I envision an America where clean domestic renewable energy sources are an integral part of our Nation's electricity generation. As the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, obtaining 10 percent of our country's electricity from a renewable energy represents the modest end of what we could achieve. Let me offer three reasons I believe the Nation's commitment to encourage renewable power is needed.

First, renewable power would help consumers by reducing electricity prices. According to data provided by the Bush administration's Energy Department, a renewables requirement would lower consumer energy costs by the year 2020.

The second reason is the benefit to public health and the environment. A renewables requirement would dramatically reduce carbon emissions from powerplants. It would significantly also reduce emissions of sulfur and nitrogen oxides. These pollutants

contaminate our water, cause smog and acid rain, and contribute to respiratory illnesses.

Third, a renewable electricity standard would enhance our energy independence and our national security by diversifying our energy supply. As we increase our reliance on natural gas, much of the demand may have to be met by liquefied natural gas shipped to the United States from other countries. It is unthinkable that we should sink to a greater reliance on foreign fuel imports when we have abundant, inexhaustible renewable energy here.

Currently, renewable energy accounts for a little over 2 percent of U.S. electricity generation. But the United States has the technical capacity to generate 4.5 times its current electricity needs from renewable energy resources. The potential is there, but we have to give it the assistance of market incentives, as we have traditionally done for our more established fuel sources.

I urge my colleagues to again demonstrate our strong commitment to renewables and support the Bingaman amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). Who yields time?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. President, in speaking to the Bingaman amendment, I believe renewable energy resources are an important part of our energy mix. I do not think any of us could argue they are not. I also believe all consumers should have the opportunity to purchase green power if they so choose.

But I must tell you, I strongly oppose including a nationwide mandatory renewable portfolio standard in this Energy bill. Adoption of this amendment, in my opinion, would increase consumer electrical bills at a time when we are trying to do just the opposite by the very legislation that is on the floor. This would have a particularly negative consequence for those who can least afford it, such as the working poor and the elderly living on fixed incomes.

For many regions of the country not blessed with renewable energy wealth, or resources, this RPS mandate would essentially result in a huge wealth transfer payment from consumers to the Federal Government or to renewable energy generators located in other areas of the country. In essence, if you say to all States, you have to meet this standard, and you by your physical presence on the globe cannot, you are not blessed with wind—and later on I will show this is dominantly for that purpose—then you will pay the price.

Adoption of this amendment would conflict with the RPS programs that have already been adopted in the way that we like good energy policy to evolve; that is, within the State and within the State structure. Twenty States already have developed renewable resource policies and implemented

timetables. This amendment ignores those States' programs; in other words, it says: Oh, well, if it fits there, it fits everywhere.

We have simply known in our country for a long time that energy has a State, if not regional, character. While there is some national value in tying it all together, the regional character of our energy production is still very real today and my guess is will be tomorrow.

The national Energy Information Administration estimates that wind energy would benefit most by the RPS mandate. In an analysis performed in 2003, EIA projected that wind energy would provide 141 billion kilowatt hours of generation by 2020. EIA's cost estimates for an RPS are heavily dependent on wind energy being built.

I would point out that a wind resource map prepared by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory graphically demonstrates that the entire southeastern region of the country has virtually no wind potential. Large areas of the upper Midwest have marginal wind potential, unless those States plan to build wind farms in the Great Lakes.

EIA's wind energy projection seems wildly, even naively, optimistic to me. Why? Because a wind turbine is just as vulnerable as any other energy facility to a localized disease in our country called "NIMBYISM," or "Not In My Back Yard" syndrome.

And the fewer wind projects that are built, the more the RPS mandate ends up being just a new Federal energy tax that consumers will pay on traditional sources of energy, such as nuclear, coal, and natural gas.

Dollars will just be transferred from consumers' pockets to the U.S. Department of Energy to buy renewable energy credits so utilities can meet these RPS standards.

Even self-proclaimed environmentalists fall victim to NIMBYISM when the plans call for wind turbines to be built in their back yard. Apparently, wind turbines are fine in theory as long as the alleged proponents cannot see them.

Let's look at what has really happened when wind developers announced plans to build wind energy facilities.

Nantucket Sound: A wind energy firm announced plans to install 130 wind turbines, spaced one-third to one-half mile apart, more than 6 miles off the coast of Hyannis in Nantucket Sound. This project has been in the works for several years. The Massachusetts energy facilities siting board, in May, finally approved construction of two 18-mile transmission cables that would link the wind turbines to the shore.

The wind farms would provide Cape Codders with roughly 75 percent of their energy and New England with about 1.8 percent of its total energy needs. The power would come without air emissions or using a single barrel of Middle East oil.

You would think, with that kind of glowing announcement, the environmentalists would strongly support that approach. The answer is quite obvious—they do not. Many of them are up in arms organizing and moving against this very proposed idea. A coalition has been formed waging very expensive campaigns to stop the wind farm project. They are talking about it as if it were an "Exxon Valdez" crisis or disaster because of what it would do to the character of Nantucket Sound. "Not in my back yard."

Well, then, let's go to Vermont. A possible Vermont wind farm located on the mountaintops around East Haven is drawing local opposition. A "large, diverse, well-organized citizens group" is fighting the project and doesn't believe that wind energy has a place in Vermont. Well, wait a moment. Vermont is one of the most environmentally pure States in the Nation, by their own admission. And yet wind is supposed to be the most environmentally benign form of energy production. The "Montpelier Times" reported on the East Haven wind farm's future. Vermonters are saying it loudly and saying it clearly: Wind turbines have no place in Vermont.

Well, let's go to Maine. How about Maine? A 29-turbine wind energy project proposed for western Maine is being strongly opposed, again, by the environmental community of Maine. They are saying it will destroy the vistas of the Appalachian Trail. The project would be built 10 miles away from it. It is going to take a few roads and power lines. You have to have a road to get the turbine in place, and you have to have a power line to get the power away from the turbine. No, no. The park manager of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail wrote to a Maine newspaper that the project "would be an 'in your face' facility for long stretches of the Appalachian Trail...."

The debate goes on. But in Maine they are saying, as they said in Massachusetts and as they said in Vermont: Not in my back yard.

Well, let's go to Virginia, then. How about Highland County in Virginia? They are strongly opposing a wind turbine project 3 years after it was proposed. The project proposes construction of 18 to 20 wind turbines. More than 500 people attended a May hearing on the project. About two-thirds of the Highland County residents signed a petition against the project.

Again, that dreaded disease of NIMBYISM has struck in the heart of Virginia. "Not in my back yard. No. Somewhere else. Not in my back yard."

But what does the amendment do? It says that it better be in everybody's back yard or you are going to get taxed for it so it can be built somewhere else.

In Kansas, landowners and environmental groups bitterly fought construction of a wind farm. This is in the Flint Hills region of Kansas. The area is the largest surviving vestige of the

tall prairie grass. I did not know that wind turbines would hurt prairie grass, but it does. Of course, the tall-grass prairies out there, without question, are a beautiful piece of nature. I do not deny that, as no one should.

Work began on the \$190-million project in May of 2005, despite ongoing opposition. An environmental activist said:

It's not a time for celebration, but a time for folks to redouble their efforts to protect the remaining Flint Hills.

And so on goes the article from the "Kansas City Star."

What is the conclusion one can draw from the opposition that is now mounting against those very large turbines? The Senator from Tennessee has been so clear in explaining what these turbines are all about. For those of you who do not understand the visualness of the large German turbine, step outside, walk out to First Street, and look back at the Capitol building. Look at the top of the Statue of Freedom, and then visually come all the way down to ground level. That is about tip to tip on the large turbines. That is just about how big they are, about 300 feet tip to tip. So they have high visibility because you have to get them up above the ground, on a large tower, and fit them into the airstream.

That is why people are reacting today. Yet we know that this RPS standard is dominantly a wind standard. That is how you get there—because we are not going to build any more large power dams in Idaho. Some would even deny that hydro is a renewable resource. We know we are not going to do much more geothermal because not all States are blessed with the dynamics of geothermal energy. My State has a little of that. Dominantly, what we are talking about is wind, and some photovoltaic, although wind is by far more advanced in its engineering and its development.

As these stories and experiences make clear, wind energy facilities are no more immune to NIMBYISM and the syndrome and that lethal virus than any other item when it comes to disturbing the character or the uniqueness of one's personal surroundings. It is how we believe. It is the character of our own local community. So when many over the years have said, "Oh, but this is the most benign of all energy production, this fits our environmental portfolio," we are finding it is quite the opposite. Really, nothing fits some people's portfolio when it comes to energy production.

If wind farms are OK as long as they are built somewhere else, then where are the right places? Where are all these wind turbines going to go to be built that EIA assumes are going to be built under an RPS mandate? Will wind turbines be built in remote areas of the country without enough transmission capacity to move the power to where the consumer is? More than likely. Texas has a State RPS program, and a lot of wind capacity has been built in

that State. Unfortunately, about 1,000 megawatts of wind capacity was built in west Texas on the wrong side of a transmission constraint. Got the turbines, can produce the power, can't transmit it to where the people are. As a result, a lot of that wind power has been stranded.

The regional coordinator responsible for maintaining reliability of the Texas transmission grid has stated that "the sparse transmission system in the area has required almost daily limits on the output of this [wind] resource to keep within transmission operating limits."

Maybe we can build all of the wind power we need in North Dakota. It has been called the Saudi Arabia of wind potential. I know the Senators of that State are strong supporters of this RPS mandate. Unfortunately, according to the North American Electric Reliability Council, the reliability region in which North Dakota is located is monitoring 31 transmission constraints already within the grid of that region.

The NERC 2005 Summer Assessment Report states that "these constraints can limit [power] imports and exports," and the story goes on.

Now you can see why I suggest—and I hope many support the idea—that States do it on their own as it fits their needs. But when we create a national mandate on a renewable portfolio, and it is restrictive to the character of the region or the capacity of the region, we are taxing one area against another. That simply is not good public policy. I don't think it ever takes us where we want to go.

What we crafted in our Energy and Natural Resources Committee and is now on the Senate floor as a very important piece of legislation took into consideration all of what we thought was important and right. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation. I hope the amendment that I have spoken to—and that others are speaking to—will be rejected by the Senate. It simply does not fit. It will not bring us where all of us want to go, and that is to greater sources, cleaner sources, reliable sources, a mix of sources, in our energy production for this country. I hope my colleagues will reject the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Colorado, Mr. SALAZAR.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator BINGAMAN's amendment, the renewable energy standard or, as we have come to know it, the renewable portfolio standard. When we consider the imperative with which we deal today in the Senate, we are talking about whether we can get the United States to energy independence, whether we can set America free from being held hostage to the importation of foreign oil from Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia, from those places in the world where for 30 years their stranglehold on America has continued

to increase day by day with no end in sight. Energy independence at the end of the day is what we should have a bipartisan consensus on with respect to this legislation.

The legislation which has been prepared by the Energy Committee came together in that kind of a bipartisan fashion, led by Senator DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN. It is a good piece of legislation that we can improve on. I believe the RPS proposed by Senator BINGAMAN, which would require that 10 percent of our electric generation come from renewable sources by 2020, is a very modest goal for us to have. Indeed, the experts around this country who talk to us about energy say if we have the will and the courage, we could get up to a much higher amount than 10 percent by 2020. They will tell you that we could get to 40 percent within probably 15 years, 20 years, to 2025. So the proposal that is currently being considered under this amendment is a modest proposal that moves us in the right direction.

In my own State of Colorado, in this last election in 2004, there was a proposal considered by the voters of our State. That proposal on an RPS was adopted by an overwhelming majority of the people of Colorado. What it requires us to do is to get to a point where we have produced 15 percent of our energy by the year 2020. Fifteen percent of the energy of Colorado will come from renewable sources by the year 2020. The Bingaman amendment has a more modest goal at only 10 percent by 2020.

If we can do that amount of renewable energy and meet that standard in my State by 2015, there is no doubt that we can do that with the amendment that Senator BINGAMAN has offered. My view is that setting America free from its overdependence on Saudi and Venezuelan oil is an imperative for our Nation. We must first conserve and increase efficiency, we must invest in renewable energy resources, we must develop new technologies, and we must pursue a balanced approach to developing domestic energy. This bill does much of that. The amendment that is currently on the floor of the Senate will help us move even further forward on those goals.

The oil savings provision that is already in the Senate Energy bill represents an important, if modest, goal for achieving some measure of independence from foreign oil. But it is, frankly, not enough. I am encouraged by the strong show of support for the Cantwell amendment to raise that bar even further. I am proud to be a co-sponsor of her amendment. I believe we need to do more to achieve oil energy savings. But the grave problems we face with respect to long-term domestic supplies of oil are only part of the story. Even if domestic reserves of oil and other fossil fuels were limitless, the way we use hydrocarbons is jeopardizing our way of life. Sooner or later—and I prefer sooner—the people

of our great country must embrace the energy challenges of the 21st century and figure out how to produce clean and abundant energy from domestic sources that do not produce carbon or other greenhouse gases and that do not involve recurring problems of intermittent supply from politically unstable and overly hostile regions of the world.

Although we have been encouraging progress in the development of new carbon-free technologies, there is still a lot of work for us to do. Earlier this year I visited the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Golden, CO, and saw some of the cutting-edge technologies that the scientists there have advanced with respect to wind energy. I saw solar energy collection cells that could double as 20-year roofing shingles and some of the most advanced solar technologies America has developed. Today we produce only about 8 percent of our electric power needs from renewable energy sources, and most of that—approximately three-fourths of the total or 6 percent—comes from hydropower. By contrast, the two most common sources of renewable—solar energy and wind power—account for less than 1 percent of the total electric power.

Why do these sources of renewable energy account for such a small fraction of our electric energy needs, even after three decades of effort? There are at least three reasons to that question. The first is technological, and the second is economic. Both of those are closely related. As new energy technologies have advanced and solar panels and wind turbines have become more efficient, the relative cost of generating electric power from these energy sources has declined. Despite these impressive growth rates, however, and despite decades of research and development, these new energy technologies still suffer from serious engineering and economic drawbacks. Hydrogen fuel cells, despite their promise, are still many times more expensive than an internal combustion engine, and they will require several more decades of research and development to be competitive.

Likewise solar power, even after three decades of research and development, still costs five times as much as coal-fired power. Moreover, there are inherent limits in the quality of the energy these new energy technologies can produce. They are intermittent sources of energy, and they are not always located near a load source. Therefore, investment in transmission infrastructure and advances in control technologies are necessary before renewable energy sources can provide a dominant share of the future energy mix.

The third reason that alternative energy sources claim such a tiny fraction of the energy market is political. We can change that today. Alternative sources of energy must compete in an energy market dominated by hydrocarbons and the industries that profit from those hydrocarbons. I introduced

legislation that would begin to level the playing field and provide tax and other incentives for renewable energy sources. Today the Finance Committee is marking up its tax title which will extend the production tax credit for certain renewable energy sources. Those incentives are extremely important for these relatively immature power industries.

Americans across the country recognize that renewable energy is an important part of our future, and they recognize that Government should be doing more to promote this type of energy. I stand with Americans who have that point of view.

On Tuesday, the White House released a statement that they do not support any kind of renewable portfolio standard. Here is one case where the President and I differ in a fundamental way. I believe the Energy bill should be a way to move us away from foreign oil, away from pollution and towards independence. I do not understand the reason the President is on the other side of this issue. The United States needs to take substantial steps forward with renewable energy. Colorado and all of the West is positioned to be America's innovation hub of the future. That is why the Federal standard of renewable energy development, which Senator BINGAMAN has proposed, is so important. Investing in these nascent technologies now will significantly improve our ability to produce energy from renewable resources.

But it is just as important for the U.S. Congress to establish a Federal standard, an achievable goal of producing a minimum amount of electric power from renewable energy sources, to establish uniform national goals and an active credit trading market based on those goals.

Other benefits of Senator BINGAMAN's renewable energy standard are the following: A standard similar to Colorado's 10 percent by 2015 is aggressive enough to stimulate the market and produce widespread and rural economic benefits. Secondly, a 10-percent RPS by 2020 will help reduce natural gas prices by reducing demand for electricity generated from natural gas powerplants. Studies show that consumers will save \$9.1 billion on their natural gas bills and \$4.4 billion on their electricity bills between now and 2020, for a total savings of \$13.5 billion. And third, renewable energy technologies create more jobs, nearly twice as many as in traditional fossil fuel industries. The Bingaman amendment would create about 58,000 new jobs a year for America.

This kind of commonsense approach is something that the American people expect of all of us.

Let me say two final things with respect to the RPS. First, it is going to create a problem for industry and for this Nation to have a haphazard patch of RPSs around the States as they are adopted State by State. Therefore, it would make more sense to have a national standard so that industry can

recognize it has to live up to one standard.

Finally, I suggest that to make renewable energy a significant part of our energy portfolio is something that makes common sense because of the national economic security issues that we face, because of the economic opportunities that it will bring to rural America, and because of the fact that we need to deal with this issue that is creating so many problems for us around the world, especially with over-reliance on oil from the Middle East.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINEZ). Who yields time?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I will defer to Senator DOMENICI if he wants to do something at this point.

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes. This has been cleared with both sides.

I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 today, the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the Cantwell amendment, which will be modified with the changes that are at the desk, which we have seen. I further ask that following that vote, the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the Bingaman amendment; provided further, that no second-degree amendments be in order to either amendment prior to the votes; and finally, prior to the vote on the Cantwell amendment, there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

Before the Chair rules, I note that there is no provision for wrap-up debate on the Bingaman amendment.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, we would like 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote on the Bingaman amendment. I guess there is no need for 2 minutes before Cantwell because they have a period of time before theirs, but 2 minutes equally divided would be appreciated.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask that that be added to the unanimous consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to Senator DORGAN from North Dakota.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, first I thank Senator BINGAMAN for this amendment. I support the amendment. It advances, improves and strengthens the underlying energy bill. I know that the term "renewable portfolio standard"—we have talked about that—is not necessarily something everybody understands. Much of what we do in the Senate sounds like a foreign language. Renewable portfolio standard. I think what this is is an American-made amendment, a home-grown energy amendment. It says what we ought to do is take charge and decide we are going to move in a different direction.

My colleague said, and other colleagues have said, yes, we are going to

continue to use coal, oil and natural gas, and I support that. We must continue to use fossil fuels. We also need to understand that we are increasingly dependent upon a supply of oil that comes from under the sands of the Middle East. A very small part of this world has an inventory of a very substantial part of the oil resources that exist in the world. To be hopelessly addicted to that oil—foreign sources of oil—makes no sense. So as we developed a new energy bill, I think we did an excellent job in the Energy Committee. I have complimented Senator DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN at some length about that. We have produced a bipartisan piece of legislation and brought it to the floor.

During the debate in committee, we recognized that we would reserve this amendment for the floor of the Senate and debate it here on the floor. Again, I call this the home-grown energy, or an American-made energy amendment.

Let me use a picture to make a point. This happens to be a photograph of a wind turbine just south of Minot, ND. There are actually two wind turbines that sit on a hill south of Minot. North Dakota is a wonderful State. I am enormously proud to represent North Dakota. We happen to be fiftieth in the 50 States in native forest lands. Translated, we are dead last in trees. It is a great State. We happen to be dead last in trees. We put up a wind turbine here and there, and we like it because we are also a State that has more wind than almost any State in the Nation. We are dead last in trees, but we are first in wind—some say especially when I am at home on the weekends.

The Department of Energy says that North Dakota, among all of the States, is the "Saudi Arabia of wind." We have more potential to develop wind energy than anywhere in America. So this wind turbine is south of Minot, ND. I happen to have had a role in this wind turbine because we on the Appropriations Committee put money in for the air base to buy green power. Eight air bases are buying green power. Two of these wind turbines went up, and they are supplying wind energy to an air base. Incidentally, these turbines are named. The two south of Minot are Willy and Wally. I am not able to determine at first glance whether this is Willy or Wally. They are essentially twins. We care a lot about them and this turbine is an example of the new technology—much more efficient technology—by which you can take energy from the wind and turn it into electricity.

In the long term, I think we will be able to take energy from that wind, through these turbines, and turn it into electricity, and through the process of electrolysis, separate hydrogen from water and produce hydrogen for hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles. What a wonderful thing for this country. Then we won't be quite so addicted to oil from Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Venezuela, or Kuwait. Maybe we can shed that addiction.

As we begin to talk about energy in the future, we have all talked about natural gas and the increased use of natural gas as a result of both our country and industry wanting to have cleaner burning fuels. Now we are realizing that we don't have enough natural gas to keep up with demand. So now we are beginning to talk about how much natural gas we will import into this country. The demand for natural gas continues to increase rather substantially. We are talking about new terminals for LNG and how much LNG we will import into this country to keep pace with our need.

Isn't that moving in exactly the same direction as we find ourselves now with oil? Should we not, with just as much aggressiveness, decide we want to change the whole construct of our energy mix, to the extent we can? The answer should be yes. That is why a home-grown energy amendment makes a lot of sense.

As I said yesterday, I understand there will be opposition to every proposition that changes the way we currently do things. I understand that. "It won't work, can't work, bad idea." The fact is, this amendment asks the question, will we begin to take control ourselves? Will we take control?

This is a very simple proposition—in fact, milder than some. It says, of the electricity we produce in this country, 10 percent of it should come from renewable sources. This is not a giant lift.

I understand there are some in the electric utility industry, and others, who feel this should not happen. They don't want this. They believe it is an intrusion. But I also understand we are trying to march toward a different energy future. We are trying to push a bit, trying to stretch a bit to see if we cannot remove this hopeless addiction to foreign sources of energy. That is the basis of this amendment.

My colleague from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN, is going to describe information about what this amendment, if we pass it, will mean in terms of the use of fossil fuels versus the use of renewable sources of energy, what it means in costs, and what it means in the reduction of energy dependency that now exists. I think this is not only a win-win, but a win-win-win amendment for everybody. So what we are trying to do is harness energy we can produce.

Using 100 kilowatt hours of wind power each month is the equivalent of planting one-half acre of trees, or not driving 2,400 miles. Think of that. Put up a turbine—by the way, I understand the turbines didn't use to be so efficient. We had to have much more of a boost and incentive. Now they are highly efficient. Put up one of these turbines and use the wind to produce electricity. Use the wind to turn that turbine, and from it produce the electricity. And 100 kilowatt hours—incidentally, this is probably 10 times that; this is about a megawatt. But 100 kilo-

watt hours is the equivalent of planting a half acre of trees or not driving 2,400 miles. That is the savings in energy.

This amendment will also reduce electric sector carbon dioxide emissions by 7.5 percent. That is a great result also, because we are going to have other debates on the floor of the Senate about global warming, about CO₂, about all of these related issues.

This amendment moves us in the right direction in several areas. It makes a lot of sense. I hope at the end of this discussion we will have sent a message to the country and to the world that, while this is a good bill that came out of committee, we have improved it. This amendment moves us well down the road to a substantial improvement with respect to our energy future.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we will have other debates of consequence on these issues. Yesterday, we had a big idea, which said let's reduce our dependency on foreign oil by 40 percent in the next 20 years. We had people stand up and say, oh, my gosh, we cannot do that; what are you thinking about?

We went to the Moon in 10 years. If we can go to the Moon in 10 years, we ought to be able to find a way to reduce our hopeless addiction to foreign oil in 20 years. Of course we can do that. I am tired of the can't-doers around here. Let's have some of the can-doers decide to affect the destiny of this country's energy future. Our country's economic future, our children's ability to find jobs, our economy's ability to expand, and our ability to remain a world economic power depends on energy. When the tank runs dry, this economy goes belly up.

This amendment describes an opportunity for us to move in a slightly different direction—toward home-grown energy, American made—believing in ourselves, taking control and taking charge. I support this amendment. I hope the Senate will give it very broad support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am tempted to ask why we should have to raise electric rates in Tennessee to build windmills in North Dakota, even as much as they like them. I would prefer to send every single one of these gigantic public nuisances to North Dakota if they want them. What I object to is raising our electric rates to build them. That is what we are doing. I want to go back over carefully what Senator BINGAMAN said earlier about the letter, describing his proposal.

The one thing we can be sure about, regarding the Bingaman proposal, is it is a multibillion dollar increase in electric rates on the bills of most Americans. Surely in Tennessee it will be, be-

cause here we are, referring to this map. Senator DOMENICI pointed out the white area on the map. The prior Presiding Officer is from South Carolina and the present Presiding Officer is from Florida. They find themselves here in the white area. There is no wind down there. Now, it is true that under the Bingaman amendment, they might try to make enough electricity from solar or from geothermal or from biomass. But what the letter says is two things. The letter from the Energy Department describing the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico says it will cost an \$18 billion increase in electric rates between now and 2025 in order to start making our electricity out of this limited number of ways that we call renewable energy, instead of the way we normally would do it. And if we are not able to do it—if in Tennessee, Florida, or South Carolina we cannot meet the 10 percent with big windmills or solar or biomass or landfill gas or geothermal, then we write a check to the Government. So we pay a tax or we raise our rates or we do both.

Now, the Senator from New Mexico did correctly go back to the letter of June 15 and point out I had said that the letter from the Department of Energy says that, over 20 years, the cumulative total cost of the electric power sector is about \$18 billion for this amendment.

We have been having a big argument down here about the Clean Air Act, whether to take the President's version or, say, the Carper version, which I co-sponsored. According to the Environmental Protection Agency analysis, the difference is a \$5 billion effect on the economy, and everybody was shooting off rockets about that. This is \$18 billion.

But the Senator from New Mexico said keep reading the letter. It says:

... cumulative expenditures for natural gas and electricity by all end-use sectors taken together decrease by \$22 billion.

That would look like the net increase was almost nothing.

The problem with that is that assumes the price of natural gas is \$5. That also looks at the year 2020. If you go out to 2025 with no RPS, according to the Energy Information Administration, the cost of natural gas is \$4.79 and the cost with RPS is \$4.79.

What I am saying is, I do not believe we can count on a reduction in the price of natural gas to \$5 to offset this \$18 billion increase in our electric rates that this amendment will produce.

The Senator from New Mexico is perfectly entitled to say: If you do not believe their estimates about natural gas, why do you believe their estimates about the increase in the cost of electricity? And he would have a point. But I think the one thing we can be sure of about the new mandate of the Senator from New Mexico is that it is a multi-billion-dollar rate increase of some number.

We do know in the area where the Senator from Florida lives and where I

live, if the utilities produce what they are more likely to produce, they will produce electricity using nuclear power, which is carbon free, and coal. I am told that today the cost of nuclear, after it is built, is 1 cent per kilowatt hour, coal is 2 cents, natural gas is 4.8 cents, and wind is 4.8 cents, and these preferred methods in the Bingaman legislation all cost more. In other words, this is an order to Tennessee and Florida to not do what we would normally do but do this limited number of renewable fuels and, in the process, pay for it with a big increase in our electric rates.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has just announced it is considering a 7-percent rate increase. I recruited a lot of automobile plants to Tennessee. I know that aluminum is made from electricity, an electrolysis process. If these electric rates go up too much, those jobs go overseas. They will be gone by 2020 and 2025 if we put in an \$18 billion increase on electric rates.

You may assume that natural gas will go down to \$5 a unit. It is \$7 today. Or it might not go down to \$5 a unit. But it looks to me, under this mandate, the only way electric rates can go is up.

Also, the EIA letter says there is no appreciable decrease in NO_x to clean the air, no appreciable decrease in sulfur dioxide to clean the air, and the price of natural gas does not go down. By the year 2025, according to the Energy Information Administration, the price of natural gas is \$4.79, with an RPS or without it.

What we have before us is a proposal to select out a very few nice sounding ideas and say let's charge the ratepayers of America \$18 billion to put them in and hope the price of natural gas goes down over 20 years to offset it. That is what we are saying. We are assuming during all that time there is no growth in nuclear power.

Why would we be over here even talking about spending \$18 billion to create tens of thousands of new gigantic windmills to run the American economy and spending \$11 billion to produce by 2025 one-fifth of 1 percent of our total electricity in solar? That is what this would do. Why don't we do something that we know would create large amounts of carbon-free electricity?

I can go to that list. We know that nuclear power produces 70 percent of our carbon-free electricity. For those who care about global warming—and I am one Senator who does—I do not want to rely on windmills and solar energy that produces one-fifth of 1 percent of our total needs to get us where we need to go in terms of carbon-free energy.

So why don't we take this money, if we have it, and accelerate advanced nuclear powerplants, accelerate carbon recapture and sequestration, spend a reasonable amount on solar, accelerate coal gasification powerplants, accelerate conservation and energy efficiency. That is the way you have car-

bon-free air—conservation, nuclear power, coal gasification, and carbon sequestration, not tens of thousands of windmills.

I am not anxious to go home to Tennessee and say: We are worried about the Japanese, the Chinese, and the Indians taking our jobs and buying up the oil reserves, we are worried about our clean air, gasoline prices are high, natural gas prices are at a record high, and our solution: tens of thousands of windmills.

The Senator from New Mexico said there are many things that can be done, but the EIA letter which he cites has an estimate of what the effect of this mandate would be. It could be more or less, but this is what it says. It says we will have 35,100 new gigantic wind mills. That is a lot. We have 6,700 today, and we will have 35,000 new wind mills.

Let me take an example of these wind turbines. There is one new nuclear powerplant being opened in America today and that is at Browns Ferry. It is about 2,000 megawatts. If you had 2,000 1-megawatt wind turbines, that would spread over an area two times the size of the City of Knoxville, TN. But 2,000 would not produce the same energy you get from that one nuclear powerplant because wind turbines only work 20 to 40 percent of the time, so you have to have 4,000. So it is an area two or three times the size of Knoxville, TN, and you do not even get to close the nuclear powerplant because people want their electricity all the time, not just when the wind blows.

The Senator from North Dakota mentioned he had gotten a nice subsidy for his two big wind turbines in North Dakota. Well, that is terrific. So now they have three subsidies to build these two giant windmills. We committed \$2 billion of taxpayers' money—that is such a preposterous number for this purpose, I can barely speak it—\$2 billion of taxpayer money over the next 5 years for windmills. The Finance Committee suggested another billion. This mandate would, by causing those who cannot produce enough wind to write a check to the Government, be yet another subsidy, and if you know the Senator from North Dakota, you can get a third subsidy to build windmills.

Why don't we get the same amount of interest in conservation, nuclear power, coal gasification, and carbon sequestration and really clean up the air?

There is one last point I would like to make, and I will be through. The Senator from Idaho talked about the landscape a little bit. I think solar power is terrific. I have an amendment with the Senator from South Dakota to expand solar-produced power. Production tax credits have gone all to wind and left out solar power. Biomass has a great future.

I guess beauty is in the eye of the beholder, but I had always thought that the great American outdoors was one of the most essential parts of our character.

Egypt has its pyramids, Italy has its art, England has its history, and we have the great American outdoors. I do not think it is right for us to subsidize the building of these gigantic machines which are twice as tall as a football stadium and extend from 10-yard line to 10-yard line that can be seen for 20 miles away and destroy the American landscape when there is no real purpose for it. At the same time, we have unreasonable, massive subsidies to the developers to do it.

I hope we will defeat this amendment, and that is a part of the reason. I will not be through looking at these subsidies for wind power before we get through. I do not think any of us should be embarrassed that it is not right to destroy and scar the American landscape by building these what I believe are public nuisances when instead we could be producing carbon-free energy by conservation, nuclear power, coal gasification, and carbon sequestration.

This is an \$18 billion increase to the ratepayers of America. Maybe you believe that the lower price of natural gas in 20 years will make up for that. I would not count on it.

REGIONAL CAPACITY

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, energy diversification is important to the future of our country; and for that reason, the distinguished ranking member of the Energy Committee has proposed an amendment to require 10 percent of our electricity to be produced from renewable resources by 2020. However, for those regions of the country that do not have the capacity to greatly increase renewable resources in their State, a financial hardship may result through no fault of their own. My State of Florida is one of the States that will have difficulty meeting the standards because the geological, climatic and topographical conditions make it impossible to harness certain forms of renewable energy like wind and hydropower. Furthermore, the Energy Information Administration concludes that Florida's energy technical potential for renewable energy is 8 percent. Currently, Florida has 1.8 percent in existing renewables; and more than 50 percent of that 1.8 percent comes from municipal solid waste, a form of renewable energy not included in the definition of "new renewable energy" in the ranking member's amendment. For these reasons, I have expressed my concerns to Senator BINGAMAN. While I remain supportive of expanding the use of renewable energy supplies, I would prefer an approach that recognizes the regional differences in the ability of States to meet a renewable portfolio standard. An RPS standard cannot be rigid, it must be flexible.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I appreciate the concerns of my colleague from Florida. As you know, I continue to push for a renewable portfolio standard because the increased use of renewables can ease natural gas price volatility and

decrease our dependence on fossil fuels and foreign imports. Having said that, differences do exist from region to region and State to State with regard to renewable energy potential. I would like to extend an offer to Senator NELSON of Florida to work in conference to find a method that will enable a renewable standard to accomplish the goal of increasing renewables while recognizing the legitimate differences among States. I acknowledge that municipal solid waste plays a large role in Florida's renewable potential and I would be willing to recognize that potential as part of our discussions in the conference. I believe we can find a way to help each State include a renewable standard as part of their overall energy production, and I am committed to working with Senator NELSON to accomplish this.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I want to thank Senator BINGAMAN for his work on this energy bill and his commitment to work in conference to address my concerns with the renewable energy standard specifically. I look forward to working together on this important provision.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to amendment No. 791, Senator BINGAMAN's amendment which would require a mandatory renewable portfolio standard, or "RPS."

I am a big supporter of new, clean forms of energy. I am convinced that we cannot become energy independent without making renewable energy resources an important part of our energy mix.

I also believe that each region of the country has something to offer to meet this country's clean energy needs, but what each region has to offer is not the same. For that simple reason, I oppose including a nationwide, mandatory renewable portfolio standard in this energy bill.

In particular, for many regions of the country not blessed with renewable energy resources, this RPS mandate would essentially result in a huge wealth transfer payment from consumers to the Federal Government or to renewable energy generators located in other areas of the country. The amendment ignores the reality that some regions of the country simply do not have the amount of renewable resources demanded by this amendment.

The leading advocate for wind power, the American Wind Energy Association, lists my home State of Missouri as the 20th best state for wind energy potential. That would seem to imply that Missouri would have no trouble meeting a 10 percent RPS with wind energy.

However, the detailed studies done by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory show that the wind Missouri does have is of insufficient power and consistency for utility grade wind turbine applications. In other words, the utilities in Missouri cannot build windmills in the State to meet an RPS. There's just no wind to make them turn.

Missouri is not the only State that finds itself unable to use wind, the one renewable resource that RPS proponents do not dispute is central to meeting the proposed requirement. The wind resource map prepared by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory graphically demonstrates that the entire southeastern region of the country has virtually no wind potential. Those States are even worse off than Missouri. Moreover, large areas of the upper midwest have marginal wind potential, unless those States plan to build wind farms in the Great Lakes, and I don't think any of us expect that to happen.

So if not wind, what else might be used? The proposed amendment lists a limited number of forms of renewable energy that meet the requirement—solar, wind, geothermal energy, ocean energy, biomass, landfill gas, or incremental hydropower.

My State has just a little bit of hydropower. However, under Mr. BINGAMAN's proposal, existing hydropower, though clearly a renewable resource and one of the very cleanest and cheapest sources of electricity, inexplicably does not count. All of the hydropower in the Pacific Northwest also does not count under this proposal.

My State also has a generator that burns tire chips. Every tire that is burned to make electricity is one less that will be tossed into our overburdened landfills. That is certainly something we should encourage, but are tires considered renewable? I do not see us driving cars without tires anytime soon. Nevertheless, tire chips do not count, either.

The National Renewable Energy Laboratory has also found that Missouri does not have utility-scale geothermal, solar, or fuelwood biomass resources, either. So what do I tell my homestate utilities that they should use to meet this RPS requirement?

This morning, Sen. BINGAMAN acknowledged that many States do not have access to the best renewable resources. He recognized that wind, solar, and geothermal resources are generally concentrated in western States. These are the major sources of clean, renewable power. He suggested that, no matter, another renewable—biomass—is available in every State. What he did not tell you, however, is that you can not just toss switchgrass or other biomass into a boiler and churn out electricity.

Biomass is not generally used to make electricity today, and its use is not without substantial costs. It must be thoroughly dried before burning. That requires lots of space and energy for drying and, obviously, it can not be stored outside in a heap like coal. Building a drying and storage facility to process and store the mountain of biomass it would take to meet an RPS requirement would cost a lot of money. There would also be quite a cost to gather and transport these materials from the hundreds of acres it would

take to grow sufficient biomass just to equal a couple of tons of coal. Plus, there is a substantial cost to consumers for utilities to modify their boilers to co-fire or blend biomass fuel. And, on top of this, burning biomass may leave the utilities with additional cost to comply with the Clean Air Act.

Proponents of a mandatory RPS say, "Just buy wind power from wind generators in other States." Sounds easy enough, but how do we get that power to the State? Wind turbines obviously have to be built where the wind is. These locations are usually remote and far from our cities where the electricity is most needed. In most every instance, there is insufficient transmission capacity to move that power to where it is needed. And at \$1 to \$3 million a mile, new transmission does not come cheaply, nor is it easy to get all of the necessary approvals to get it built. So I am not ready to say I can count on economically transmitting wind power to Missouri, if at all.

Moreover, wind turbines are just as susceptible to fierce local opposition as any other energy facility proposed near population centers. Senator ALEXANDER has highlighted how large and intrusive each of these modern wind turbines are. And while one on the horizon may be interesting, it will take hundreds of them on that horizon to meet a 10 percent RPS requirement. I do not know that this is how any of us want to meet our Nation's energy needs, if we can even get that many wind turbines built.

What is the result if this wind energy does not get built or can not be delivered? This RPS amendment will end up being nothing more than a new energy tax on consumers who depend on traditional fuels for their electricity. Higher energy costs, particularly those that result in a wealth transfer payment from our constituents to the Department of Energy, is not good energy policy.

Utilities in my State already voluntarily offer the green power that they have available to their customers if they prefer to buy green. They are adding wind generators where they can—For example, Kansas City Power and Light is adding up to 200 megawatts of wind power in Kansas. This is about as much as they have found feasible to produce there. But this does not even come close to meeting a 10-percent RPS requirement.

According to EIA, total electricity sold in 2002 by the Missouri utilities that would have to meet the proposed RPS was 47,378,256 megawatt-hours, meaning Missouri utilities would have to produce 4.7 million megawatt-hours of renewable electricity, and this amount will only grow, as electricity demand has increased in recent years by nearly 5 percent.

KCP&L's 200 megawatts of wind energy capacity will translate into no more than 584,000 megawatt-hours of wind energy, assuming the energy is available $\frac{1}{3}$ of all hours of the year, far

short of the 4.7 million megawatt-hours that a 10-percent RPS requirement would demand. Even on a capacity rather than energy basis, the 200 megawatts would only equate to 5 percent of KCP&L's current generating capacity of 4,000 megawatts.

KCP&L estimates that to meet the RPS requirement it would face with wind energy, it would need as much as 450 megawatts of wind. This equates to about 297 wind turbines, each of which needs at least 60 acres of land, meaning it would take upwards of 18,000 acres of land to meet the RPS requirement. KCP&L estimates the total cost of complying with the RPS proposal to be between \$400 and \$500 million. And that's just one utility that serves just a portion of Missouri.

Today, the cost of all types of energy is at unacceptably high levels. Adoption of this amendment would increase consumers' electric bills, since if a utility cannot meet the standard, it would have to buy credits at 1.5 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Missouri's average retail rate for electricity is around 6 cents per kilowatt-hour, making the RPS amount to a 25-percent increase in cost to Missouri customers for this portion of their electricity needs. This would have particularly negative consequences for those who can least afford it, such as the working poor and the elderly living on fixed incomes.

This is just a wealth transfer from States with little renewable resources to those with a lot. We do not do this for any other source of electricity—States with low cost coal or hydro-power do not subsidize States that rely on higher cost fuels such as natural gas. Why should we have some States subsidize others to promote a selective fuel for producing electricity? At 1.5 cents per kilowatt-hour, this could cost Missouri consumers as much as \$71 million a year.

Such a large sum of money would be better spent in shoring up our Nation's transmission grid or pursuing other clean energy sources. Missouri utilities are voluntarily spending hundreds of millions of dollars pursuing clean coal technology to take advantage of the natural resource that is readily and economically available to Missouri, just as other States are doing what they can with the resources they have available, whether that is coal, natural gas, wind, biomass or other forms of energy such as nuclear.

Utilities are also spending hundreds of millions of dollars to retrofit their plants to remove NO_x, SO₂, and mercury from emissions, and may be subject to CO₂ reductions as well. KCP&L alone is spending \$280 million to meet emission reduction goals.

Adding a tax to support renewables in other regions of the country is an excessive burden on this critical industry that needs to be focusing capital resources on improving the transmission grid to increase reliability. This transmission investment is needed

to improve the existing grid, not to extend the grid to remote locations where wind turbines must be placed, far from where the electricity is used.

States that have renewable resources in sufficient quantity have already moved ahead and adopted renewable portfolio standards tailored to the resources of the State. Not surprisingly, adoption of this amendment would conflict with the RPS programs adopted by 20 States that have different eligible renewable resources and implement timetables.

Even some of these States with their own RPS will not be able to meet this mandatory proposal. Of the 20 States with portfolio requirements, only 13 of them have set a standard high enough to meet the proposed 10-percent Federal standard by 2020. Some of 13 that meet the 10-percent threshold may still fail simply because their definition of renewable energy doesn't meet what would be the national standard definition. They, like other States coming up short will be subject to what amounts to a Federally-mandated energy tax.

I believe that, if we want to encourage renewable energy, and we do, a better way of doing it, particularly for wind, is through stable tax credits. Stable tax credits are the better solution to encourage renewables. A greater need for wind developers than the RPS is the certainty of a production tax credit that doesn't annually disappear and reappear. Extending this credit from an annual credit to 5 or 10 years would make wind competitive in areas of the country where it is viable and wanted. An RPS does not make wind competitive in the marketplace; it just raises the cost of electricity to consumers, who are already paying too much for energy. This is not good energy policy.

I urge the Senate to reject this amendment.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, many people think only of wind turbines when renewable sources of energy are discussed. However, I see great potential for Kansas and our nation in the production of renewable energy from biomass sources. We have the technology to produce electricity from grass, hay, wood, livestock manure and many other bio-based sources that the State of Kansas has in abundance. This would not only provide a new market for many of our farmers to access, but would lead to a better environment for all of us by finding beneficial uses for many of these waste products.

I believe the Flint Hills to be the most environmentally significant treasure the state of Kansas has to offer. It's paramount that we protect this native land from unsightly development that will ruin this treasure for future generations of Kansans. Therefore, with my vote for a nation renewable portfolio standard, I urge the State to protect Flint Hills from wind turbine development and focus on producing renewable electricity from biomass sources. It is good for our farm-

ers, it is good for the environment and it is good for Kansans.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I agree that clean, renewable energy technologies are an important part of a program to achieve our national energy and environmental goals. However, I do not believe that a Federal renewable portfolio standard achieves this objective.

Twenty-three States have already adopted renewable technology standards and have committed resources to find cleaner and more efficient technologies to meet their energy needs. For example, Arizona is in the process of increasing its renewable target to 15 percent by 2020, exceeding the proposed Federal standard in the amendment. I expect that Arizona will implement its program in a manner that makes the most of the State's solar potential in the long-term.

I do not believe that the proposed Federal standard would help Arizona or any other State fully achieve their clean energy and efficiency goals. I also understand that the penalty for noncompliance with the proposed Federal standard is significantly lower than the incremental cost of bringing renewables on line. While I do not believe the intent of this amendment is to impose an energy tax on consumers, I think that could be the economic reality in many circumstances.

My colleague from Tennessee has argued persuasively that this Federal RPS is primarily a wind-power bill. I was interested to read in a fact sheet from the Union of Concerned Scientists that, to achieve this 10-percent Federal RPS, we would need to build almost 55,000 new wind turbines. That is an enormous number. I suspect that the potential adverse environmental effect such a massive construction project have not been studied. In fact, it has already been suggested that in the rush to take advantage of the current tax credit for wind generation analyses of potential long-term consequences have been neglected.

I am not opposed to wind-power, but I have heard from utilities in my own State that a Federal mandate of this sort is largely a requirement to import wind, since Arizona has very limited wind resources. We are already providing substantial subsidies for wind-power and the energy tax title will provide more. I question why we need to subsidize wind to the practical exclusion of other renewables.

The need for energy sustainability and cost-effectiveness does influence my opposition to this amendment. What we need to do, what we must do, is enact a mandatory cap and trade program for greenhouse gas reduction and let the market drive the technology. A Federal RPS would stand in sharp contrast to the market-based solutions in the Climate Stewardship and Innovation Act, which Senator LIEBERMAN and I introduced last month. That legislation would promote clean and efficient energy technologies

without relying solely on taxpayer subsidies or choosing particular technologies over others. That is the vision I have for our energy future—a clean, efficient and innovative mix of technologies that benefit all Americans.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN. This amendment is a breath of fresh air in a bill that is filled with many stale concepts regarding our approach to this Nation's energy policy. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this amendment.

Producing a significant amount of our electricity from renewable sources is not a concept for the future. It is a real possibility that exists today using solar, wind, tidal, gas from landfills, and biomass. In fact, 19 States around the country are using these renewable source of energy to steer their States towards a future of clean, sustainable energy use.

In my State of Illinois and in many other States, enacting this standard is a no-brainer. This winter, Illinois Governor Blagojevich announced a plan to adopt a renewable portfolio standard requiring Illinois electric utilities to provide 8 percent renewable energy as part of their overall power mix by 2012. This bold vision will make Illinois the second biggest wind power State in the country by 2012. The city of Chicago also has a strong commitment to using renewable sources of energy and is already planning to surpass a 10 percent contribution from renewables in its electricity stream and achieve a 20 percent goal.

In the 18 other States where renewable portfolio standards have been successfully adopted, innovations in electricity generation have flourished at virtually no cost to the consumer. Just imagine what would happen to this industry of the future if we enacted a Federal standard. And, here is the best news: According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, a 10 percent renewable portfolio standard on the Federal level would not add a single penny to consumers' bills.

Introducing renewable electricity into the mix of electricity generation also brings us a measure of physical security. By creating geographically dispersed sources of energy generation, we are providing ourselves with greater electricity security by providing smaller targets and reducing the transport of combustible materials. This is smart policy at a time when we must be vigilant about homeland security.

Our country's demand for electricity is expected to continue growing for decades to come. Enacting a renewable portfolio standard ensures that clean technologies will help us meet that enlarged demand, while not offsetting the importance of investing in clean technologies in other energy production methods, especially coal. Coal will undoubtedly play a large role in our energy portfolio for years to come, and I look forward to a vigorous debate on how we can best assist the utility in-

dustry in employing clean coal technologies.

Abraham Lincoln once said: "I am a firm believer in the people. If given the truth, they can be depended upon to meet any national crises. The great point is to bring them the real facts." The real facts are that without forward-thinking amendments such as this one, the energy bill is not going to bring us independence from the 20th century mindset of energy production. Let us give the American public this tool so they too can rise to meet this national energy crisis before it gets worse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am informed that the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Washington want to interrupt the remainder of our debate on the Bingaman amendment in order to discuss and do a modification of the Cantwell amendment. I ask unanimous consent that they be yielded whatever time they need to accomplish that and it not count against the Bingaman amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 784, AS MODIFIED

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and I call up amendment No. 784 and send a modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 784), as modified, is as follows:

Beginning on page 120, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 122, line 14, and insert the following:

SEC. 151. REDUCTION OF DEPENDENCE ON IMPORTED PETROLEUM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) based on the reports of the Energy Information Administration entitled "Annual Energy Outlook 2005" and "May 2005 Monthly Energy Review"—

(A) during the period beginning January 1, 2005, and ending April 30, 2005, the United States imported an estimated average of 13,056,000 barrels of oil per day; and

(B) the United States is projected to import 19,110,000 barrels of oil per day in 2025;

(2) technology solutions already exist to dramatically increase the productivity of the United States energy supply;

(3) energy efficiency and conservation measures can improve the economic competitiveness of the United States and lessen energy costs for families in the United States;

(4) United States dependence on foreign energy imports leaves the United States vulnerable to energy supply shocks and reliant on the willingness of other countries to provide sufficient supplies of oil;

(5) while only 3 percent of proven oil reserves are located in territory controlled by the United States, advances in fossil fuel extraction techniques and technologies could increase United States energy supplies; and

(6) reducing energy consumption also benefits the United States by lowering the environmental impacts associated with fossil fuel use.

(b) GOAL.—It is a goal of the United States to reduce by 40 percent the amount of foreign oil projected to be imported during calendar year 2025 in the reference case contained in the report of the Energy Information Administration entitled "Annual Energy Outlook 2005".

(c) MEASURES TO REDUCE IMPORT DEPENDENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the President shall—

(A) develop and implement measures to reduce dependence on foreign petroleum imports of the United States by reducing petroleum in end-uses throughout the economy of the United States sufficient to reduce total demand for petroleum in the United States by 1,000,000 barrels per day from the amount projected for calendar year 2015; and

(B)(i) subject to clause (ii), develop and implement measures to reduce dependence on foreign petroleum imports of the United States by reducing petroleum in end-uses throughout the economy of the United States sufficient to reduce total demand for petroleum in the United States by 7,640,000 barrels per day from the amount projected for calendar year 2025.

(ii) If the President determines that there are insufficient legal authorities to achieve the target for calendar year 2025 in clause (i), the President shall develop and implement measures that will reduce dependence on foreign petroleum imports of the United States by reducing petroleum in end-uses throughout the economy of the United States to the maximum extent practicable and shall submit to Congress proposed legislation or other recommendations to achieve the target.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In developing measures under paragraph (1), the President shall—

(A) ensure continued reliable and affordable energy for the United States, consistent with the creation of jobs and economic growth and maintaining the international competitiveness of United States businesses, including the manufacturing sector; and

(B) implement measures under paragraph (1) under existing authorities of the appropriate Federal agencies, as determined by the President.

(3) PROJECTIONS.—The projections for total demand for petroleum in the United States under paragraph (1) shall be those contained in the Reference Case in the report of the Energy Information Administration entitled "Annual Energy Outlook 2005".

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report, based on the most recent edition of the Annual Energy Outlook published by the Energy Information Administration, assessing the progress made by the United States toward the goal of reducing dependence on imported petroleum sources by 2025.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) identify the status of efforts to meet the goal described in subsection (b);

(B) assess the effectiveness of any measure implemented under subsection (c) during the previous fiscal year in meeting the goal described in subsection (b); and

(C) describe plans to develop additional measures to meet the goal.

(e) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section precludes the President from requesting additional authorities to achieve the targets in subsection (c).

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Michigan has

given a great deal of thought to this issue and to the modified amendment, and I yield the floor to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I thank our friend from Washington for making this modification. This is a very important modification from my perspective. But for this modification, the language of the amendment would propose that the goals that are set forth—which are only goals but nonetheless they are goals—would need to be achieved by implementing measures “under existing authorities of the Federal agencies.”

That is the language which is in 151(c)(2)(B) of the amendment. That is lines 8 and 9 on page 4 of the amendment.

Now, that is very problematic language and unacceptable language because if we are going to achieve the goals that are set forth, if we have any chance of doing so, it would have to be with significant changes in our authorities—for instance, in the tax incentives which would be so essential in order to achieve a reduction in imports of oil. There is no way I can see or that many others can see that we could achieve the kinds of reductions that are hoped for without significant tax incentives being put into the law—tax incentives that do not now exist.

There are some existing authorities and some existing tax incentives, but they do not come close to what they must be if we are going to reduce the amount of imported oil that we use. So it is important to me that the existing authorities language either be removed or superseded in this amendment so that the President could seek and we could grant, if we so chose, new authority, additional authorities, new tax incentives, for instance, to move to new technologies. That is the effect of the modification to the amendment that was sent to the desk, which reads:

Nothing in this section precludes the President from requesting additional authorities to achieve the targets in subsection (c).

So that change seems to be very essential since there is no practical way that these goals can be met, in my book—either the short-term goals of one million barrels per day or the long-term goals of 7.64 million barrels per day—unless there are changes in our tax structure and the other authorities that we provide in the executive branch. This savings clause now makes it clear that both as to the short-term and the long-term goal for savings, there is not a limit in the amendment to using existing authorities but rather additional authorities can be sought by the President.

I thank the Senator from Washington for making that change. In the colloquy between myself and the Senator from Washington, it makes clear that the amendment does not assume or require changes in technologies or CAFE standards or anything else. It is tech-

nology neutral. According to this colloquy, the amendment does not assume or propose an increase in CAFE standards. All of the other potential changes, technologically, that could help get us to where we want to go, including diesel technologies that are so important, hybrid technologies, hydrogen technologies—it does not put those specific technologies in place, either requiring them or, of course, not precluding them because this is technology neutral. That becomes critically important because, again, without those technologies there is no way we can achieve these goals. But there is no effort in this amendment to identify the specific technologies or the mechanisms by which these goals would be achieved. Particularly important, obviously, is the language that states that the amendment does not assume or propose an increase in CAFE standards, and another part of the colloquy makes it clear that the amendment neither assumes nor proposes regulatory changes to the CAFE system and that is not part of this amendment.

So the colloquy will speak for itself. It is a lot longer than I have just summarized, but it is a very significant colloquy to me in terms of what the amendment does and what it does not do.

I thank the Senator from Washington for working out this colloquy with me.

MODIFICATION OF CANTWELL AMENDMENT 784

Mr. LEVIN. The amendment sets a goal for a savings of 7.6 million barrels of oil by 2025. Are there assumptions made by the amendment?

Ms. CANTWELL. This amendment is technology-neutral. It simply lays out a vision that the United States should attempt to achieve over the course of the next 20 years. The only assumption underlying this amendment is that the United States has the ingenuity and innovative spirit to reverse the rising trend of American dependence on foreign oil imports. Today, foreign oil constitutes approximately 58 percent of our domestic supply, a figure that is projected to reach 68 percent by 2025. Because of the nature of world oil markets and the geologic fact that two-thirds of global reserves are located in the Middle East, the United States is on track to become increasingly dependent on OPEC to fuel our economy; and will be competing with developing nations such as China for access to these oil supplies. Because of the economic and national security implications of foreign oil dependence, this amendment simply states that it is in the national interest of the United States to attempt to curb our appetite for imported oil. The underlying bill provides a number of tools to help this country achieve the goal established by my amendment, and there are many potential pathways to its attainment. However, none of them are specifically assumed by the Cantwell amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the amendment assume an increase in CAFE standards?

Ms. CANTWELL. This amendment neither assumes nor proposes an increase in CAFE standards. In fact, some have erroneously concluded that increasing CAFE standards is the only means of achieving the goal established by the Cantwell amendment. Multiple analyses by national security-related organizations and others have concluded that increasing CAFE standards is not necessary to attain savings of 7.6 million barrels of oil a day by 2025. In addition, it is important to note that some have circulated erroneous estimates of CAFE standard increases necessary to achieve the goal in the Cantwell amendment, attributed to the Energy Information Administration, EIA. The staff of the EIA has said that these flawed estimates have no grounds in analyses performed by the EIA.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the amendment assume an increase in ethanol production and use?

Ms. CANTWELL. Because the amendment is technology-neutral and simply lays out a vision, accelerated ethanol production and use is not specifically assumed. However, there is no question that biofuels can play an important role in achieving the goal established by the Cantwell amendment, by displacing imported petroleum-based products with domestic fuel derived from plant matter. In fact, it has been estimated that increased domestic biofuels production can contribute more than half of the oil savings goal established by the Cantwell amendment. It is also worth noting that the underlying bill contains important provisions that will help accelerate the production of ethanol and other alternative fuels, including provisions I authored that would provide incentives, research, development and demonstration of processes to produce ethanol from cellulosic sources. While not specifically prescribed by the Cantwell energy security amendment, these measures would assist substantially in achieving the amendment's goal.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the amendment assume an increase in use of biodiesel fuels and technology?

Ms. CANTWELL. Again, increased use of biodiesel fuels and technology is not specifically assumed by the Cantwell amendment. However, these fuels can also help achieve the amendment's goal. It is worth noting that one of the barriers to achieving cost-effective biodiesel production is increasing the diversity of feedstocks from which biodiesel can be economically produced. The key to unlocking the potential of biodiesel is performing the research, development and demonstration of new technologies that will allow the co-production of biodiesel fuel and value-added bioproducts that lower overall costs. I was proud to add specific provisions to this underlying legislation that authorize an Advanced Biofuels Technology program, designed to accelerate the development of these processes. Again, while one of the potential

tools the U.S. can use to achieve the goal, additional biodiesel production is not explicitly assumed by the Cantwell amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the amendment assume an increase in the use of diesel engine technology?

Ms. CANTWELL. While advances in diesel engine technology are another potential tool for accelerating oil savings, they are not specifically assumed nor mandated by the Cantwell amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the amendment assume a major increase in the use of hybrid electric vehicle technology?

Ms. CANTWELL. Because the amendment lays out a vision rather than mandating specific measures, increased hybrid use is not specifically assumed. However, some have estimated that growth in the hybrid vehicle market can achieve oil savings of up to 2 million barrels a day by 2015, 10 years before the Cantwell amendment's ultimate goal. Taken together, biofuels production and growth in the market for hybrid vehicles could provide more than two-thirds of the energy security goal established by the Cantwell amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the amendment assume a major shift to use of renewable hydrogen and fuel cell vehicles?

Ms. CANTWELL. There is no question that hydrogen provides another potential pathway to achieving substantial oil savings in the United States. However, because the technology remains at a relatively early stage in its development, no specific estimates exist for the economic and energy efficiencies this technology may provide. It is not specifically assumed by the Cantwell amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the amendment assume an increase in tax incentives to encourage use of advance technologies?

Ms. CANTWELL. Certainly, tax incentives can help spur the development of markets for advanced technologies, and help expand the choices available to American consumers. But these are not specified or assumed within the Cantwell amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the amendment assume regulatory changes in how the CAFE system works?

Ms. CANTWELL. The amendment neither assumes nor proposes regulatory changes to the CAFE system. I view the debate regarding the efficacy of the existing CAFE program as beyond the scope of this amendment, which lays out a national vision for reducing American dependence on foreign oil imports. Certainly any changes to the CAFE system's regulatory regime would require additional legislative action, action that is not assumed in the Cantwell amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the amendment assume regulatory changes that would allow for greater use of diesel technology?

Ms. CANTWELL. Certainly other nations have begun the transition to more wide-spread use of diesel tech-

nology, and initiatives or programs in this regard may ultimately be consistent with the Cantwell amendment. But they are neither specifically assumed nor required.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the amendment assume the Congress will provide other new authorities to the President?

Ms. CANTWELL. The Cantwell amendment establishes a national goal. As such, it directs the President to design and implement measures designed to help achieve the goal, and assumes that, if the President deems his existing authorities insufficient, he will propose to Congress legislation or recommendations that would help achieve the amendment's energy security target. At that time, it would be up to Congress to consider the merits of the President's proposals, via the typical legislative process.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the amendment assume that there are adequate "existing authorities of appropriate Federal agencies" to meet the goal of saving 7.64 million barrels of oil per day by 2025?

Ms. CANTWELL. The amendment assumes that the President has at his disposal adequate authority to develop and implement measures that will help achieve the goal of reducing imports on foreign oil. However, the amendment is technology-neutral and establishes a 20-year vision. As such, it is difficult to predict with any specificity what direction new technologies may take, and whether issues may arise that require additional legislation or Congressional action. For example, if biofuels begin to displace a significantly larger portion of petroleum-based fuels in the United States, certain infrastructure-related barriers may arise that require additional authority or Congressional action. Similarly, there are certain to be issues associated with infrastructure, interoperability and international technology standards associated with the development of hydrogen fuel cells. Because the Cantwell amendment is a call to accelerate the development of alternatives to petroleum-based fuel, yet does not purport to choose technology winners and losers, it is premature to speculate on whether additional authorities or Congressional action may be required. However, it does assume that proposals to expand the range of tools available to the President to achieve the Cantwell amendment's goal would be considered through the normal channels of Congressional debate and approval.

Mr. LEVIN. Does this amendment set a goal of reducing imported oil or reducing overall use of fossil fuel?

Ms. CANTWELL. The goal of this amendment is to reduce our foreign oil imports and exposure to the uncertainties of world oil markets. Because of the geologic realities of the way in which oil reserves are distributed across the globe, continued increased demand for oil will result in a growing dependence on imports. While the U.S. is situated on just 3 percent of the

world's reserves, the Middle East is home to two-thirds, with a full quarter located in just one country, Saudi Arabia. In order to curb our growing reliance on imports, it is thus necessary to reduce demand for petroleum itself, across all sectors of the economy.

Mr. LEVIN. To achieve the one million barrels of oil a day in savings required by 2015, must the President use existing authorities, or can the President seek additional authority?

Ms. CANTWELL. There is nothing in this amendment that precludes the President from requesting additional legal authority to achieve the target for 2015. Certainly, any legislative proposal or recommendations from the President would be considered by Congress, through the typical legislative process. Rather, the provision in (c)(2)(B) is intended to make clear that this amendment, on its face, does not grant the President any broad, new additional authorities not previously contemplated.

Mr. LEVIN. If the President can seek additional authority to meet the requirement to save 1 million barrels of oil a day, would the Senator be willing to modify the amendment to make that clear?

Ms. CANTWELL. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask how much time remains on the Bingaman amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has just under 23 minutes. The majority side has 10 minutes 40 seconds.

AMENDMENT NO. 791

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I will take part of the time remaining for me to respond to a few of the points made by my good friend from Tennessee and clarify the effect of this amendment as best we understand it. Contrary to what a person might believe by listening to a lot of the debate today, this is not an amendment just about windmills. This is an amendment about trying to stimulate the development of a range of technologies, solar technologies, biomass technologies, wind technologies, clearly, and get the cost of producing electricity from those different technologies down to a more reasonable level. That is the purpose of the legislation.

My good friend from Tennessee says that in his opinion, based on his understanding of the position the Energy Information Agency has taken, this would result in an increase in electricity rates, or electric rates. He reads their analysis and their recent report in a totally different way than I do. It is very clear this does not cause an increase in electricity rates. It causes a decrease. It is clear it does not cause an increase in gas prices. It causes a decrease. It is clear it does not cost the electric power sector more. It costs the electric power sector less than it otherwise would be spending.

Let me talk about this \$18 billion he continues to refer to. It does say in

their report that from 2005 to 2025, the renewable portfolio standard has a cumulative total cost to the electric power sector of about \$18 billion. Now, that is true. Then it goes down a couple of sentences further on. It says, the cumulative expenditures for natural gas and electricity by all end user sectors taken together will decrease by \$22.6 billion. So what it is basically saying is if this amendment is adopted, which I hope very much it will be, there will, in fact, have to be more investment by the utility sector, by the electric power generation companies, in these alternative fuel generation technologies, these alternative energy sources. But it will be more than offset by what they save in fossil fuels and what they save in investment in those other areas.

As far as rates are concerned, it is very clear in this language, and I will read this again. It says: "Compared to the reference case." That means with the amendment. It says: "The cumulative residential expenditures on electricity from 2005 to 2025 are \$2.7 billion lower"—that is with the amendment—"while the cumulative residential expenditures on natural gas are \$2.9 billion lower with the amendment."

Residential expenditures it is talking about. These are the ratepayers that we all represent in our individual States. They are saying that, if this amendment is adopted, it is going to be cheaper for them to pay their gas bills, cheaper for them to pay their electricity bills in the future because, frankly, this will take some of the pressure off the price of natural gas. That is very much to be desired.

Let me read further from their report. They say: "The increase in renewable generation"—which is contemplated by this amendment—"will lead to lower coal and natural gas generation. By 2025, coal generation is reduced by almost 9 percent, natural gas generation reduced by over 5 percent from their respective reference case levels." That is from the level that it would be if we didn't adopt this amendment.

So in my view, this is a very substantial improvement. This legislation, this amendment will be a substantial improvement to the underlying bill which I think is a very good bill. I do not disagree with anything the Senator from Tennessee said about the advisability and desirability of seeing more nuclear power generated in our country, the advisability and desirability of seeing cleaner technologies used in coal production. All of that is in the underlying bill. What this amendment says is let's give an extra impetus to renewable power so that we can get all of the benefit from renewable power that it is reasonable for us to achieve over the next couple of decades.

That is exactly the purpose of the amendment. I think that is what the effect of the amendment will be. We have had the good fortune of passing this amendment before in the Senate. I

hope very much we can pass it again this time. It will strengthen the bill, it will persuade the American people that we are trying to move this country in a different direction, as far as its energy future is concerned.

We are not satisfied with just saying that current technologies are adequate. We are not satisfied with saying the current mix of energy sources is adequate. We are trying to get back to more use of American ingenuity and creativity to produce energy that we do not have to import from somewhere else in the world.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment. We will have a chance to summarize very briefly the reasons for the amendment. I will have a chance, and my colleague from Tennessee will have a chance, to argue the other side of that argument before we have the vote. As I understand our agreement now, the Senator from Washington is going to have an opportunity to once again argue the merits of her amendment. That vote will occur, I believe, at 2:15. Then, after that, we will have the vote on this RPS.

With that, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 784

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his fine amendment. I would like to take a minute to state that I am a co-sponsor of the Bingaman amendment and very much believe in the renewable portfolio standard for our electricity grid. I guess if you looked at the Northwest, particularly Washington State, you would say we are already using 80 percent renewable energy because 80 percent of our electricity grid is provided by our hydro system. So we, in the Northwest, are very big believers in renewable power.

But we also believe in the other technology that is in the underlying amendment and in the underlying bill that will help us support renewable technologies. We have a lot of wind farms. We have had a lot of discussion out here on the floor this morning about wind energy. We, in Washington State, are already employing wind energy in a variety of locations in our State and getting great response. In some areas, it is some of the best job growth we have had in rural communities. Farmers love it because, aside from providing an agricultural product, they get a second source of revenue from their land by having agriculture and wind technology on their farms. It works very well for our farmers, and the combination of hydro and wind technology works very well for Washington state and the Northwest.

But we also have solar power. We are about to have one of the first demonstrations of wave power. We, in the Northwest, are using all sorts of renewable technology to meet these goals.

Certainly, I want to endorse this particular amendment as a great step forward, saying we can do more with renewable technology.

I would like to turn to the Cantwell amendment, on which we are going to have a vote I believe at 2:15, and summarize, for my colleagues who might have missed yesterday's discussion, a few points I think are important as we talk about our reliance on imported oil and the fact we want to diversify.

In the New York Times, there was an article about OPEC and their increases in quotas for various OPEC countries. It is interesting, and every day Americans want to know what is going to happen with oil futures and gas prices. You look to find out what OPEC is doing. This article, I think, brings up the very point we were trying to make yesterday; that is, that China's demand for oil continues to grow. In fact, this article says that global oil consumption climbed 2.4 or 2.5 million barrels a day in 2004, the fastest growth rate since 1978. That is world demand for energy increasing. Basically, that was a result of China's increasing energy consumption. We know what the trends are, and we know what the challenges are that are facing us.

I found it interesting, too, that the New York Times article talked about how OPEC was actually concerned that alternative fuels might affect their future price of product. They are almost telling us, yes, they are a little concerned about competition from alternative fuels.

I welcome that. I think it is about time that America make an investment in alternative fuels and about time we give consumers a choice when it comes to the demand and supply of oil in the future and not continue to be held hostage by foreign governments.

I would like to review for my colleagues what exactly the Cantwell amendment does because it is so important that we understand what the underlying bill does and what our challenges are as a country going forward.

In 1973, we were importing only 28 percent of our demand—our U.S. demand—for oil. We were importing 28 percent of what we used as a country.

Today, 2004, we are at 58 percent, a huge jump, a huge dependency by the United States on a foreign source to provide us an oil supply.

When I look at the countries involved and I look at the instability in the Middle East, I don't want to be 58 percent reliant on foreign sources of oil. I want American ingenuity to be a driver in what we can provide to the American people in driving down the cost of energy.

If we do nothing, in 2025, the United States will be importing 68 percent; nearly 70 percent of our oil supply will come from abroad. Who in their right mind thinks that 70-percent dependence on foreign oil is wise economically, to our national security, or internationally as we have to deal with international competition? Why would

we want to be almost 70-percent reliant on foreign entities for something that is the backbone of our economy—energy?

I am offering a simple amendment. My amendment simply says by 2025, instead of being reliant on foreign sources for 68 percent of our supply, we bring that down to 56 percent. That is not much of a change. We are at 58 percent today, and we want to go down to 56 percent. That is a modest goal.

It is hard to achieve because our amendment assumes the growth and demand that will happen as our Nation grows. That is why we have to assume in 2025 we will be at 68 percent, and we want to see a serious reduction. That is the way my amendment is crafted.

The underlying bill says we are currently at 58 percent and let's reduce our consumption of foreign oil by 1 million barrels a day. One million barrels a day by 2015 still has us importing 60 percent of our supply from foreign sources. In 2015, instead of consuming 58 percent of our oil supply from foreign sources, we would be at 60 percent. The underlying goal in the bill does nothing to get us off our overreliance on foreign oil. It is the status quo and a bump in an increase. It is too timid in responding to what has been a gouging of the American consumer on gas prices.

This debate we have just had for the last couple of hours is interesting because a lot of my colleagues have said they refuse to support a mandate. They do not want to have a mandate in this bill. I am not proposing a mandate. It is interesting: Some Members do not support mandates. They do not even support goals. The American people deserve, on something as important as our national security and economic livelihood, to have this Senate, in transportation and energy policy, set a goal to get off our overdependence on foreign oil. Are my colleagues just giving lip service to this idea of a goal of getting off overdependence on foreign oil? Or are we willing to set a goal and do something about it?

I have pointed out that the goals we have are doable. My amendment does not say specifically how or what the mandate is. We have simply said, that from various studies, we know we can get the savings my amendment calls for in a goal. Here are a variety of sources: Fuel efficiency for tires and motor oil. The encouragement of a biofuels industry. A big chunk of this comes from alternative fuels. That is why OPEC, in today's paper, says they are very concerned about this because they know it is competition. They realize it is competition. Why don't we realize it is competition and ensure we get about making an alternative product?

Other countries certainly have this idea. One is Brazil and based on their overdependence on foreign oil they came to the same conclusions. They did not want to be in the same boat we are in today. In 1975, they were import-

ing 80 percent of their fuel supply from foreign sources. They made a decision that was too much for them, both economically—I don't know if there are security issues—but economically they thought that was not wise so they started a process of taking steps. In 1990, they almost cut that in half. By 2003, they were down to importing only 11 percent of their fuel supply. Next year, they might achieve the great milestone of not only becoming self-sufficient but actually becoming an exporter of fuel to other countries.

They have done this because they made an investment in ethanol. They made decisions about their transportation sector so they could run on biofuel products. They have changed the economic picture of their country.

Is there something Brazil possesses that the United States cannot achieve? Are they smarter than we are? Do they have greater political will than we do? Do they have more consumers holding their politicians accountable than we do? What Brazil showed is they have a resolve because of their own national interests to get off the foreign addiction to oil. I applaud them for that.

They are only one-eighth the size of our economy, but they are proven to be smart enough to figure out how to make sugar-based ethanol in a cost-productive way, so efficient they can send it to the United States cheaper than we can produce it to the degree that some of my colleagues want to put a tax on it so that it is on a more level playing field with what sugar-based ethanol in the United States costs. To me, the Brazilians have come up with something.

I ask my colleagues, if you do not want mandates and you do not want goals and you do not want to get off our overdependence on foreign oil by setting a milestone or coming up with a goal or statement, what is it that you do want to do? The underlying bill increases our dependence by 2015 on foreign oil to 60 percent. We are at 58 percent today. It increases it to 60 percent. So we have accomplished nothing in the goal in the underlying bill.

I would like to set, primarily for international reasons, a goal to get off our dependence on foreign oil because these are our suppliers. These are the countries where the majority of U.S. oil supply comes from: Saudi Arabia sits on the largest percentage of oil reserves in the world today. I wish geography and geology had been kinder to the United States and that we sat on more than 3 percent of oil reserves. But we don't. We do not have that product. We have a very small percentage of the world reserve for oil. That is a fact of life. These are the countries and this is the State ownership of companies that are part of OPEC and have the oil supply of the future.

I didn't expect I would be in the Senate agreeing with George Shultz and James Woolsey and a bunch of neoconservatives who were espousing ideas about our national security, but I

actually do agree with them that reducing our dependence on foreign oil should be a national priority and a national goal. That is why we have crafted this amendment this way.

We simply want to say to our colleagues and to the President of the United States that we believe increasing our consumption of foreign products as a way to support our economy is not a wise decision, given what growth and demand and oil prices are going to be. Yesterday, the market closed at \$56.20 for oil. Economists at various Wall Street firms are saying we could easily see an oil spike of \$100 a barrel. They say that oil futures have a fear premium on them; that is, there has been lots of discussion about how the price of oil futures is basically impacting the price of oil on a day-to-day basis. That is right, the speculative market about energy futures in oil basically causes the price at the pump today to increase. I find that unfortunate because the speculative price of oil futures takes into consideration those nine countries I mentioned, the fact that you could have a terrorist attack, the fact that you could have unrest in a region and that somehow supply would be diminished, thus affecting the price of oil futures.

Economists and people on Wall Street—Goldman Sachs and others—basically say there is a fear premium on the price of oil futures; that is, we are paying more for oil because we are paying for the uncertainty and the instability in the political and geographic region where oil exists. That is what I am supposed to tell Washington State residents as to why they pay some of the highest gas prices in the country? That is why they should pay almost \$2.30 a gallon for gasoline? That is why I should tell people they have lost their pensions in the airline industry because the airline industry has not passed on the high fuel costs? That is what I am supposed to tell the farmers who cannot keep their farms running because of high fuel costs, or somebody who has lost their job in a transportation-sensitive industry. I am supposed to tell them that I am going to continue to put an energy goal in legislation that makes us more dependent on foreign oil than we are today?

No. We want to reverse the trend. That is what the Cantwell amendment does. It is not a mandate. It is a goal. It says that instead of being more dependent on foreign oil in 2015, as the underlying bill directs us, let's become less dependent. Let's go from 58 percent, where we are today, down to 56.5 percent. It is a goal we can achieve. It is a goal I am willing to set as a legislator for our country because I believe in the ingenuity of Americans to achieve this goal.

There is nothing the country of Brazil can do that the United States cannot do. I guarantee you that if we set our resolve to do it as a nation, we will achieve this goal as well. The reason why we, as a government entity,

need to set this goal is because the private sector is going to diversify at its own darn pace; that is, the oil companies will decide what their investment in new technology and alternative fuels is at their own pace, their own wishes, their own response to their corporate shareholders, not at the interest of individual consumers who are getting strangled by the high cost of gasoline.

It is our job to set this goal and that is why we are on the Senate floor today. We are here to say we agree with the American farmers that they can produce a biofuel product in the future that can be competitive, that we agree with neoconservatives that the security risk of being 70 percent dependent on foreign oil is too great a security risk for our Nation, that we agree with technology and research experts that American ingenuity can get us to this 56.5-percent goal.

I ask my colleagues, what is wrong with setting this goal? Let's not continue to give lip service to a goal of getting off our foreign dependence and then do nothing about it in a legislative proposal. Let's show the American people we are concerned about the economic hardship they are facing and that we believe in American ingenuity. We believe in our farmers. We believe in our technology leaders. We believe that we, as a country, can achieve this great goal. If the last generation of Americans were smart enough to put a man on the Moon in a decade, this generation of Americans ought to be smart enough to reach this goal. I ask my colleagues to have the courage to set it in a piece of legislation as a mark for us to achieve.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I understand—because of certain committee meetings and time considerations—that we have been asked to extend the time in which there will be a vote. So I ask unanimous consent that the time of 2:15 be extended until 2:30 on a vote on the two amendments that are on the floor and that time be equally divided between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I am not objecting, but I am just asking for the yeas and nays on my amendment. I think moving to 2:30 is fine, given the markup.

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

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Chair.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am sure many people have been following closely the debate on the Energy bill, an 800-page bill that is trying to set the energy policy for America. It is an important piece of legislation we have debated for several years. It has so many different sections involved in all the aspects of energy. It has as its goal making certain that America has enough energy to fuel its economy, making certain that we use that energy in a responsible fashion so it does not create pollution that would cause environmental harm. These are some of the basic elements of what we are trying to achieve here.

But the pending amendment we have before us comes to a basic conclusion that I think most Americans agree with. America cannot be a safer and more secure nation in the future if we are more dependent on foreign oil. The more we have to depend on Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and other countries to send their oil to us, the less secure we are. The more independent we are in terms of our own energy needs and production, the stronger we are as a nation.

In 1973, we imported 28 percent of the oil we consumed. Today, 32 years later, we are importing 58 percent, more than double. We are that much more dependent on foreign countries to provide us with oil, which means two obvious things. If the OPEC cartel should decide they want to restrict the oil they will produce, prices will go up in the United States. Reduce the supply, and if demand stays the same, the price goes up. It is a basic law of economics. And they have done it. You have seen it at the gas pump.

When the OPEC cartel sits down and tries to figure out "How can we make the maximum profit?" they do not shed tears for American families and consumers and businesses. They try to figure out how they can make the maximum profit on the oil they have in the ground. They have the vast majority of the oil resources in the world today.

The second thing we know is that if you want to strike a crushing blow at the American economy, you may consider attacking the United States, but it may be a lot simpler to attack our oil supplies coming into the United States. If, God forbid, they could interrupt those oil supplies coming into the United States, it would really create a dangerous situation.

So the more dependent we are on that foreign oil, the less secure we are when it comes to the price of energy and the availability of energy. You would think that one of the things we would try to do as part of a national energy policy is to think ahead 10 years, 20 years, "How can we reduce

our dependence on foreign oil?" since most people agree that would be a good thing.

Well, there is one provision in the bill which suggests that over the next 10 years we would reduce our demand for foreign oil by 1 million barrels a day.

That is about 6 or 7 percent of the total amount that is being consumed each day in the United States, but it is a step forward over the next 10 years. It is something the Senate agreed on 99 to 1. So over 10 years we will think of strategies which will reduce our dependence on foreign oil at least a million barrels a day. That is in the bill. It is a good provision.

Two days ago, President Bush sent a letter to us and said: You keep that provision in the bill, and I will veto the bill. Stop and think: Why? Why wouldn't the President want us to move as a national goal to reducing our dependence on foreign oil? It makes no sense. It is a tax on our economy. It is a question of national security. But, in fact, that is what the White House said. If you put a provision in here to reduce our dependence on foreign oil by 1 million barrels a day over the next 10 years, I will veto the bill.

I don't understand. In fact, I think the President has it exactly wrong. We should be even more ambitious and more innovative in our view toward this challenge.

Senator CANTWELL has an amendment now pending that will be voted on soon. Her amendment says: Keep to that goal over the next 10 years, but over 20 years, let us reduce our dependence on foreign oil by 40 percent of what we anticipate. So what does it mean? Fifty-eight percent of the oil we use is imported. If we do nothing, in 20 years, it will be 68 percent. More than two-thirds of the oil we use will come from overseas. If we adopt the Cantwell amendment, it will go down to 56 percent of the oil we use in 20 years being imported. It is still a lot. But keep in mind, the economy is going to grow. Energy needs are going to grow. We are going to find ways to work together to reduce dependence on foreign oil.

I would think most families and people who think about our environment and think about our economy would applaud the idea of setting this as a national goal, a challenge to the President, to Congress, and to the American people: Find ways to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. It will make us stronger as a nation. It will make our economy stronger. Instead of sending billions of dollars overseas to the Saudi oil princes, the money comes into the United States for investment in our own economy, building businesses, helping people prosper and create jobs.

Sadly, there is resistance to this amendment, the idea of setting this goal. There are those who say: Don't set any goals. Leave it alone. Don't touch it.

How could you possibly draw that conclusion from the current situation?

Left untouched, we will continue to be dependent on foreign oil and our economy will suffer.

How do you reach a goal of reducing dependence on foreign oil by 40 percent over the next 20 years? There is a variety of ways. There are ways within this bill to do it—some large, some small. Some have to do with the most basic thing, the tires on our automobiles. Replacement tires give more fuel efficiency and reduce the oil consumption and the gasoline consumption. Idling trucks—have you ever gone by a truck-stop? They are all over my State of Illinois. There are lines and lines of these tractors with trailers behind them with the engines running constantly, around the clock, idling engines burning up oil just to keep that engine alive and ready to perform when the driver comes out and is ready to go. There is a provision in this bill that talks about smarter ways to do that. Is there a way to use an electric engine to keep that tractor in a position where it can go into service and not be burning all this fuel while the driver is in eating dinner, for example?

These are simple things which, when added up over the course of our economy, lead to dramatic improvements. There are many ways to address this. They come down to three basic things we can do. First is conservation. I just gave you two examples of conservation, the ways to reduce the use of energy and still get as much performance as we want from the vehicles we use and the vehicles we drive. The second is alternative fuels. What can we use instead of the oil that now is being imported, 58 percent of it from overseas? This bill talks about it. It talks about ethanol. What is ethanol? An alcohol fuel is made from things such as corn and cellulose that can, in fact, create more independence in our economy.

Senator CANTWELL tells the story that the nation of Brazil, 10 or 20 years ago, imported 80 percent of its oil and said as a nation: We can't continue to prosper if we are so dependent on imported oil. They set out on a national goal of reducing dependence on foreign oil. They are now down to 11 percent. They have done it. They are choosing alcohol fuels. That is included in this bill, the concept of alcohol fuels. It can be done. So alternative fuels—ethanol, biodiesel—are practical alternatives to importing more oil.

The third, of course, is to find environmentally responsible ways for more exploration. There is a limit to where that will take us. The United States owns about 3 percent of the known oil resources in the world. We consume 25 percent of the oil that is consumed each day. So even if we were able in an environmentally responsible way to take every drop of oil out of the ground, you could see it is not going to sustain our economy. We are going to be dependent on foreign sources.

Despite this challenge and despite the obvious ways to meet it in this bill, there are some who have come to the

floor—on the other side of the aisle, particularly—and have argued against setting this goal of lessening our over-dependence on foreign oil. One of the arguments they make is: If you do this, you are going to have to have more fuel-efficient cars and trucks, as if that is something that should be avoided in America. Why would we avoid that?

Take a look at Ford Motor Company. They had a huge advertising drive to tell us about their new Ford Escape hybrid. They had so many requests to buy that car, they couldn't make it fast enough. I think Ford produced about 20,000. There were some 50,000 people who wanted to buy it. They liked the idea, a small SUV that has an electric engine as part of it that is going to get better gas mileage. Ford was moving in the right direction. I know about this because my wife and I decided to buy one. We like it. I wish it got better mileage than it does, but we didn't make any great sacrifice in our way of life. We maybe spent a couple extra thousand dollars to buy it. Yet we have a more environmentally responsible, energy-responsible vehicle.

The other side of the aisle argues we shouldn't even suggest to American consumers to change their buying habits. I will bet if Detroit or any other company started producing more and more energy-efficient vehicles, more and more Americans would be interested, not only because it reduces the cost at the gas station, but because it is good for the environment. Why wouldn't you want to do that? Why would you want to knowingly drive something that is more polluting and uses more energy or more gasoline?

The American consumers would, in fact, gravitate toward those automobiles as they did toward the Ford Escape hybrid. They like the idea. It is a good concept. The other side says: You don't want to tell people they can't buy whatever they want to buy. If they want to buy the heaviest, least fuel-efficient SUVs, you can't stand in their way. I suppose that is true, but we will pay a price for it. By buying and driving inefficient vehicles over and over, it not only costs more at the pump and makes our country more dependent, it draws us into the Middle Eastern problems. Witness 150,000 American soldiers now risking their lives today in that part of the world.

Moving toward more efficient vehicles is a good thing economically. It is certainly a good thing from a security viewpoint. It is a good thing in terms of our future as a nation.

I believe we are up to the challenge. Most of the critics of the Cantwell amendment say it just can't be done. Don't challenge America. America can't rise to the challenge. We can't possibly in 20 years figure out a way to do this. Those naysayers have no place in the American tradition. We have risen to the challenge time and again. When President Franklin Roosevelt needed an atomic bomb to end World War II, he created the Manhattan

project and got the job done. When John Kennedy came to the Presidency in 1960, he said: We will put a man on the Moon. And in 9 years, it happened. He challenged America, and we rose to the challenge. We can rise to the challenge, and we must. Otherwise, we will continue to be dependent on foreign sources of oil.

When I consider some of the challenges we face, I look at the loss of jobs. It troubles me. In the State of Illinois, 400,000 or 500,000 manufacturing jobs in the last several years have been lost. I don't know if these jobs are ever coming back. I have been to Galesburg and places around our State where good-paying jobs have disappeared. A lot of them have gone to China. China has one of the fastest growing economies in the world.

We just had a little presentation in the other room. The CEO of General Electric Energy was there. He said China is in a position to dominate the world energy scene over the next 10 years, that in 10 years China will have 30 percent of the electric generating capacity in the world. China's economy is no longer a closed, backward, Communist economy. It is an exploding, expanding economy that is taking jobs away from the United States.

There are two things we ought to think about: The Chinese have fuel efficiency standards for their vehicles higher than the United States.

They know they don't have the energy in their own country. They are trying to find the most fuel-efficient vehicles to move their economy forward and they are thinking about the future. Are we? Is the United States thinking about the future and the cost of fuel inefficiency, or the cost of dependence upon foreign oil?

The second point is this. If we are in a position of competing with China for foreign oil, since they have to import it, too, what happens when there is more competition for a limited supply? The price goes up. So \$50 a barrel oil today may be \$100 a barrel 5 or 10 years from now. Look at what \$50 a barrel oil has meant to you and your family and our economy. Filled up lately? Taken a look at what it costs? It has gone up dramatically in a short period of time to fill your car or truck. Talk about the airlines and their future lately? The cost of aviation fuel has gone up so dramatically that a lot of airlines are in bankruptcy, or facing it. That is at \$50 a barrel. What happens when we reach \$100 a barrel? What will it mean to the future of these same companies?

If we don't take a serious look at our energy future, sadly, we are going to leave ourselves vulnerable to competition from China, with higher costs for the basics to keep moving. Senator CANTWELL's amendment is a challenge, but one we should accept. As this President ends his term in office, another President of his party or another party will come in and see the same national goal: Reduce our dependence on foreign oil. It will call for work and

dedication. We have risen to that challenge time and time again. There is no reason we cannot rise to it today.

I impress upon my colleagues the absolute necessity to reduce America's dependence on foreign oil. This is not an issue of whether we can, this is something we must do. It is imperative we impress upon America that setting a national goal of reducing our dependence upon foreign oil is a national priority and in the best interests of the American people. I believe when we send a signal we are serious about changing the future and the track we are on, people will join us in that effort. The best and brightest minds in our country will rise to the challenge.

When we go back to our States and constituents and they ask what we have done in Washington to address the growing threat to our oil supply posed by the emerging markets in China and India, and the high gasoline prices, we can take pride in the fact that the Cantwell amendment says we are charting a new course for our Nation's future. Opponents have argued we cannot do it, we don't have the smarts or the technology; they wring their hands and curse the darkness and say, "This is the way it is always going to be. We will be just more dependent upon foreign oil, so be prepared for it."

I disagree. There is technology available today, let alone advancements that may come over the next 20 years, that can move us forward on this goal. We, as leaders in this country, must signal that we won't let the future of America fall into the hands of foreign governments that own the oil supply of this world. Many of these governments are politically unstable and they don't promote the same values we do in the United States. The uncertainty of that alliance for our future oil should be enough to give us pause.

Security experts, economists, foreign policy experts, and scientists recognize that the terrorist organizations want to target the United States, that they can target the supply of our energy and threaten our economy. This is an amendment about national security, economic security, and the belief that America, with the right leadership and vision, will rise to the challenge, as we have so often done in the past.

We can use American ingenuity, innovation, and genius to reduce the growing stranglehold the foreign governments that are supplying oil to the United States have on America's future. I encourage colleagues on both sides to embrace this challenge. Don't run from it, don't be afraid of it. It is about the future of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I am glad I stayed on the floor because I was a little dismayed when I heard Senator CANTWELL describe her amendment. Senator DURBIN helped to clear it up for me in the fact that if we cut trucks

off at the truckstop and if all the American people take the tires that are on their car now and we change those to new tires, we can eliminate a million barrels of oil. It is incredibly easy. It is unrealistic, but if you hear it portrayed, it is portrayed as something that is easy to accomplish.

I rise in opposition to the Senator's amendment because I believe one of the responsibilities we have as Members of the Senate is to, in fact, pass legislation that is reasonable for the American people, legislation that is technologically possible to achieve—even if we stretch technology and we push technology, and even if we were to create a "Manhattan Energy project." The reality is that some of the same individuals who stand in this chamber and claim this is easily achievable are the same ones who for the last decade have blocked domestic exploration, which is crucial to less reliance on foreign oil.

I believe every American agrees with me that we want to become less reliant on imported oil, but it is not just for national security, it is for job security. When we talk about policies on this floor that affect the cost of manufacturers in a global marketplace, we are talking about the jobs our constituents have, about the manufacturers who used to compete domestically within North Carolina or within the Southeast, or within this country, and now compete with people they will never meet. Of this year's group of graduates from college, 20 percent of them will compete for a job with somebody they will never meet and who will never live in this country because technology allows us to do it. It will be incredible when technology gets to that point, that it won't take government pushing it and saying implement it; it will implement itself because it brings efficiencies and savings to the marketplace naturally.

I think, as the occupant of the chair does, as we have gone through the creation of this energy bill, we have pushed technology and we have brought those minds into the committee in a bipartisan way and said: "Tell us where this can go over the next decade." We have truly tried in this legislation to create a blueprint for the American people and for the American economy, one that makes predictable what energy costs will be and how it will affect our competitiveness in this country and internationally. At the end of the day, if we do anything that forces American business to be at a competitive disadvantage, we have done a disservice to the American worker, who is the recipient of that business.

We need to vote against the Cantwell amendment. We need to tell the American people we have an energy policy. And if we believe that policy will lead us down the road to new technologies this year, next year, 10 years from now, it may be that 20 years from now we are all driving hybrid cars. I happen to

believe that technology will make the hybrid car, 20 years from now, probably obsolete; there will be a new technology out there. But I am confident of one thing: You cannot push the mileage standards of automobiles further than where technology will allow; that for every place you surge and you try to reach a little too far, you cause, in fact, an unintended consequence on the other side.

We will also have an opportunity to vote on Senator BINGAMAN's amendment on a renewable portfolio standard, one I know the Senator from New Mexico is passionate about.

I want to correct something that Senator CANTWELL said. She said—and she is from Washington—that hydroelectric power makes up a majority of their electricity generation today, and she is right. The unfortunate thing is, hydroelectric power is not considered a renewable source of electricity unless it is new hydro.

It is incredible, the history we have in this country of hydroelectric generation, but we do not consider that to be a "renewable source of electricity." The only way hydro would qualify under a renewable portfolio standard is if it is new hydroelectric generation.

For those of us in the Southeast of the United States who for years have used electricity generated by hydro plants to compliment our coal-fired generation facilities or our nuclear facilities or our gas-fired facilities, we have understood for some time what made up a portfolio, and we assumed part of it was made up of what we considered to be renewable-hydroelectric power.

At 50 years old and now in my 11th year in Congress, I am reminded that hydroelectric power is not renewable, that water is not a renewable substance.

It is crazy it is not included. If we did include hydroelectric generation, North Carolina would in all likelihood hit the 10 percent mandate required in this amendment. I believe the Presiding Officer would hit the 10 percent possibly in Tennessee today. But the reality is we are being asked to accept a renewable portfolio standard that does not even include the generation of electricity with hydro. It does not require that rural electric cooperatives that generate electricity participate in the renewable portfolio standard. Electric co-ops account for a sizeable amount of the electricity generated in this country on an annual basis, but they are not included. We just want to place it on the backs of the ratepayers of investor-owned utilities.

I happen to come from a State that is rich with investor-owned utilities, but it is rich in electric co-ops and municipal power, probably richer than any State in the country. I defend them, but I do not believe if we put a burden like this on the ratepayers of the investor-owned utilities that we should leave anybody out and say they should be unaffected.

The fact is, what they have tried to do is put the cost of the renewable portfolio standard on the backs of one slice of electric generation, and that is the ratepayers of investor-owned utilities. They know if it extended to electric co-ops, there would be no way for this amendment to pass. There would be opposition on both sides of the aisle, on every level of our desks to this amendment.

The fact is, today we are here because we need to defeat the Bingaman amendment for a renewable portfolio standard, but we also need to defeat the Cantwell amendment. She said it is not a mandate but a goal, a goal that we cannot achieve today based upon available technology and one we ought not put into this bill, in fact, because it is unachievable.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL. I am proud to be submitting this amendment.

Forty-four years ago, John F. Kennedy challenged America to put a man on the moon by the end of the 1960s. A bipartisan coalition in Congress joined with Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon to make this goal a reality.

Today, we are considering a similarly bold challenge to the Nation—to reduce America's dependence on foreign oil by 40 percent by the year 2025. This challenge is no less important, no less laudable, and no less worthy of bipartisan support. Presidential leadership, and national commitment.

The bill before us purports to offer a comprehensive energy solution for the future. But, as currently drafted, the bill does nothing more than lead us down the same dangerous and unsustainable path that we have been traveling for the last several decades. Unless we draw the line now, outlining a bold change in course, with time enough to prepare, we will see the United States in 2025 even more tethered to foreign oil, and even more subject to economic shocks, than the United States of 2005. Unless we reverse course, we will continue putting our economic well-being and national security at the mercy of unstable foreign governments.

Some will argue that the goals in this amendment are unrealistic and unattainable. I do not agree with these naysayers. When President Kennedy announced his challenge in 1961, he said the following: "This decision demands a major national commitment of scientific and technical manpower, materiel and facilities, and the possibility of their diversion from other important activities where they are already thinly spread. It means a degree of dedication, organization and discipline which have not always characterized our research and development efforts."

Likewise, meeting the requirements of the Senator's amendment will require a similar commitment. But I be-

lieve the task before us is much simpler than the one that faced President Kennedy, because we already know how to decrease our reliance on foreign oil. A smart energy policy that focuses on a greater commitment to technology, including hybrid and hydrogen fuel cell technology, renewable fuels, and greater efficiency can take us a long way, if not the entire way, to the goal proposed by the Senator from Washington.

As difficult as it may be, we must try to meet the goal set forth in this amendment. We would be far worse off as a country if we just threw up our hands and admitted defeat.

The people I meet on my travels around Illinois are ready for the challenge. They are tired of giving their hard-earned dollars to foreign governments in the form of record-high gasoline prices. They are tired of seeing their foreign policy being influenced by America's insatiable need for Middle East oil. They are looking to their leaders in Washington for innovative leadership. If we lay down the challenge in this amendment, I have every reason to believe that the American people will rise up to meet it—much like they met a similar challenge 40 years ago.

In 1962, President Kennedy traveled to Rice University to speak about the challenge that he had laid down the year before. He stated: "Surely the opening vistas of space promise high costs and hardships as well as high reward. So it is not surprising that some would have us stay where we are a little longer, to rest, to wait. But this city of Houston, this State of Texas, this country of the U.S. was not built by those who waited and rested and wished to look behind them."

When it comes to our energy policy, we are long past the point of waiting and resting and looking behind us. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I would like to briefly explain why I support Senator CANTWELL's oil savings amendment to H.R. 6, the Energy bill.

First, Senator CANTWELL's amendment sets a goal for the United States of reducing our dependence on foreign sources of oil by 4 percent by 2025. I do not understand how anyone could argue that it is not in this Nation's best interests to increase our domestic energy security and reduce our dependence on unreliable and undemocratic regimes abroad. We all like to talk about energy independence, but our efforts in that direction are lacking, as evidenced by the rapid growth in our dependence on oil imports that is projected to continue well into the future. I think Senator CANTWELL's amendment sets a worthy target that we can all work together to achieve.

Second, we—the world's greatest economy—can certainly achieve this goal in a way that not only reduces our reliance on foreign oil but spurs new innovation and economic growth, with-

out penalizing any sector of our economy. This amendment is not a backdoor effort to dramatically increase Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards, which I would not support. As modified it allows the President the flexibility to achieve the oil savings goal with existing authorities, or with new authorities that he or she requests from the Congress. Thus, the goal could be reached through a variety of means, including increased investments and incentives for hybrid vehicles and other transportation technologies or increased use of biofuels like ethanol and biodiesel.

Additionally, if the President is having difficulty reaching the goal, he or she need only reduce our dependence on foreign oil to the maximum extent practicable, and must ensure reliable and affordable energy for the country, and maintain a healthy economy with strong job growth.

This is a fair and sensible amendment, and I support it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I support the goals for reducing this Nation's dependence on foreign oil that are embodied in the Cantwell amendment. We need to strive for energy independence, and I believe it is important to take bold steps toward reducing our oil consumption. Our policies have long ignored the problem of U.S. dependence on foreign oil, and we remain as vulnerable to oil supply disruptions today as we have been for decades. Taking the steps necessary to reduce our dependence on foreign oil is a critical objective for this country.

I have long supported a broad array of Federal efforts to meet this objective. I believe that we need a long-term, comprehensive energy plan, and I have supported initiatives that will increase our domestic energy supplies in a responsible manner and provide consumers with affordable and reliable energy. There are many provisions included in this bill that will help take important steps in this direction—particularly those provisions of this bill that address energy efficiency and renewable energy and will lead us toward greater uses of alternative fuels such as ethanol and biodiesel.

I have also long advocated Federal efforts that will lead to revolutionary breakthroughs in automotive technology. As many of my colleagues have said, we need a level of leadership similar to the effort of a previous generation to put a man on the moon. I believe we need our own moon shot in the area of automotive technology to develop alternatives to petroleum and to make more efficient use of all forms of energy.

We need a significantly larger effort than anything on the drawing boards. We need to put greater Federal resources into work on breakthrough technologies—such as hybrid technologies, advanced batteries, advanced clean diesel, and fuel cells—that will provide potentially dramatic increases in vehicle fuel economy and help us

move toward making this Nation less dependent on foreign oil and reducing our emissions of greenhouse gases.

Federal Government investment is also essential not only in research and development but as a mechanism to push the market toward greater use and acceptance of advanced technologies. For example, expanding the requirements for the Federal Government to purchase advanced technology vehicles will help provide a market for advanced technologies. We also must have far greater tax incentives for advanced technologies than have been proposed to date.

I believe the goals for reducing our dependence on foreign oil in the Cantwell amendment can be met by taking bold actions in the areas I have mentioned and without relying on increases in Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards. Higher CAFE standards will not produce real results—they will only exacerbate the inherent discriminatory features in the CAFE system that give an unfair competitive advantage to foreign auto manufacturers and have contributed to the loss of manufacturing jobs in this country. Senator CANTWELL and the sponsors of this amendment have assured the Senate and her amendment was modified so that there are no policy assumptions in this amendment that will increase CAFE standards. The goals of this amendment are laudable, and since they are simply goals—which after the modification can be achieved with new authorities, tax incentives for instance, and do not rely on use of existing authorities—I can now support the amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I strongly support the objective of Senator CANTWELL's amendment. It is difficult to disagree with legislation that proposes to achieve the important goal of reducing our dependence on foreign oil. Unfortunately, the amendment is an exercise in setting expectations without establishing how they will be met. As such, I cannot support it.

The job of Congress is not only to determine policy objectives, but also to establish the means to achieving such goals in a manner that best serves the public interest. While this amendment sets aggressive goals for cutting America's dependence on foreign oil, it places the total burden on the President and the administration to develop and implement the measures to reduce our dependence without one iota of guidance as to how this reduction should occur. Frankly, that is both a risky and an irresponsible proposition.

What if this or any future President were to decide to meet this amendment's targets by drilling in ANWR, or by raising gasoline taxes? This amendment does not speak to those policy options, and—as shown by the examples I have set forth—the end of reducing our dependence on foreign oil does not necessarily justify the means. Instead of relying on wishful thinking and trust that the executive branch will do the

right thing, we should consider and approve commonsense policies that will make our Nation more energy efficient, less dependent on foreign oil, and more competitive in the global energy market, and that will effectively address global warming.

The national energy policy that we establish in this Congress will deeply impact our security, economy, and our environment. Even though we agree on goals, we cannot in good faith transfer all responsibility for determining how to achieve them to the executive branch. That is a dereliction of our duty as Senators—a duty that I take seriously and will not relinquish merely to show that I support the laudable goal of reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I support the Cantwell energy security amendment, which would set a national goal of reducing projected imports of foreign oil by 40 percent by 2025 in the United States.

I strongly believe we must be more proactive in reducing our dependence on foreign oil, and Senator CANTWELL's amendment is a great start to accomplishing that goal. The current path we are on is detrimental to numerous facets of our economy, environment and national security. This is due to the ongoing instability in the Middle East, which is where the vast majority of our oil comes from, and coupled with the environmental problems associated with the use of fossil fuels. At present, petroleum imports account for fully one-half of our national oil use and one-third of our trade deficit. In addition, the use of oil and other fossil fuels contributes to global climate change, air pollution, and acid rain.

In order to achieve this ambitious plan we will have to implement many comprehensive energy saving policies. Many people believe this amendment down the road could raise fuel efficiency standards on automobiles. There are many energy policies we need to pursue to achieve this ambitious goal. In the past I have not supported raising CAFE standards and I do not believe this amendment would require such a change. In order to make this plan successful we need to support the development of alternative energy, such as ethanol, hybrid vehicle technology and others.

I have long believed that our Nation must implement a sensible national energy policy which emphasizes greater energy conservation and efficiency, as well as the development of renewable resources. Simply put, we cannot continue to rely on imported oil to meet such a large part of our Nation's energy needs and that is why I support Senator CANTWELL's amendment to the energy bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

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

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

Mr. DODD. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DODD are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time is controlled by the majority.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the only time remaining is that of the majority. Is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will use leader time or, if no one is going to use their time, I will just use whatever is available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. REID. If someone from the majority wants to speak, I will be happy to put the vote over for a few minutes for whatever few minutes I use.

I, first, want to thank Senator BINGAMAN for his leadership on the renewable energy issue. He has always been there. It is also important to mention Senator JEFFORDS. Senator JEFFORDS has been so stalwart. I remember an Energy and Water bill that Senator DOMENICI and I did in years past. We did not put enough renewable in there and Senator JEFFORDS brought amendments to the floor and fought us on this on the Senate floor. He has been a stalwart.

In this particular instance, the leader has been Senator BINGAMAN, and I appreciate very much the work he has done.

There is no question in my mind that we must harness the brilliance of the Sun, the strength of the wind, and the heat of the Earth to provide renewable energy for our Nation. There are many reasons our Nation needs to develop more renewable energy. It can power our homes and businesses without polluting the air we breath or the water we drink. Renewable energy will protect consumers from wild price swings by providing steady, reliable sources of energy. There is a reason we call the famous geothermal geyser Old Faithful, and that is because renewable energy is as old as the wind, as durable as the Sun, and as constant as the Earth.

Renewable energy will bolster our national security because it is made in the USA. The supply cannot be manipulated by any foreign power. Scientists have said, for example, the Nevada Test Site where we have detonated about 1,000 nuclear weapons, one could have solar power that would supply the whole Nation with electricity.

We do not have that, of course. We have no solar energy at the Nevada

Test Site, but it is an example of what can be done.

Finally, renewable energy creates jobs, often in rural areas that need them the most. Nevada is a perfect example. Most of our geothermal energy is in rural Nevada. The steam has been coming from the ground in those places since man started coming there. When the pioneers came across Nevada, one of the places they would come after leaving the area that is now Utah is this dry, parched desert. The first thing they would see is water in a place near Gerlach, NV. The first few pioneers, immigrants, and their animals went into that water. They did not do that very often. They could not do it because it would kill them. It was boiling water. As thirsty as they were, they would have to siphon the water down and cool it.

It is still there, the same hot water, the same steam coming from areas around Gerlach. There is tremendous potential for renewable energy. In 2002 and 2003, the Senate passed the renewable energy electricity standard requiring that 10 percent of the electricity sold by utilities be generated from renewable energy sources. We should do no less this year. It would be even better if we could match our friends in Europe and achieve 20 percent.

Other nations have been developing renewable energy resources at a much faster rate than the United States. In 1990, America produced 90 percent of the world's wind power. Today, it is less than 25 percent. Germany now has the lead in wind energy; Japan in solar energy. We have an opportunity to regain the position as a world leader in renewable energy. In the United States today we get about 2 percent of our electricity from renewable energy sources, such as wind, solar, geothermal, and biomass. That is a paltry sum. The potential is there for a much greater supply.

The renewable electricity standard and the production tax credit are critical to growth of renewable energy in America. The State of Nevada is blessed with enough geothermal energy to generate one-third of the needs of Nevada today, but geothermal supply is only about 2 percent of our power. I am happy that Nevada has adopted one of the most aggressive renewable portfolio standards in the Nation. We set a goal of generating 15 percent of our electricity with renewable energy by the year 2013. Our legislature is to be commended. They did that 2 years ago.

Developing these resources will protect our environment, will help consumers, and will create jobs in our State. If Nevada can meet its renewable energy goal of 15 percent by 2013, then the Nation certainly should be able to meet a goal of 10 percent by 2020.

Many States are blessed with abundant supplies of renewable energy resources. Twenty-one States have already adopted renewable electricity standards. If we consider environ-

mental and health effects, the real costs of energy become more apparent, and we see the renewable energy is a winner. A national renewable electricity standard by 2020 will also spur nearly \$80 billion in new capital investment and \$5 billion in new property tax revenues to communities.

Let's never lose sight of the fact that renewable energy sources are domestic sources of energy and using them instead of foreign sources contributes to our energy security.

I urge my colleagues, both the majority and minority, to vote for the Bingaman amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I yield back all remaining time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 140 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Akaka	Durbin	Mikulski
Baucus	Feingold	Murray
Bayh	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Inouye	Obama
Boxer	Jeffords	Pryor
Byrd	Johnson	Reed
Cantwell	Kennedy	Reid
Carper	Kerry	Rockefeller
Chafee	Kohl	Salazar
Clinton	Landrieu	Sarbanes
Conrad	Lautenberg	Schumer
Corzine	Leahy	Snowe
Dayton	Levin	Specter
Dodd	Lieberman	Wyden
Dorgan	Lincoln	

NAYS—53

Alexander	DeWine	McCain
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Allen	Domenici	Murkowski
Bennett	Ensign	Roberts
Bond	Enzi	Santorum
Brownback	Frist	Sessions
Bunning	Graham	Shelby
Burns	Grassley	Smith
Burr	Gregg	Stabenow
Chambliss	Hagel	Stevens
Coburn	Hatch	Sununu
Cochran	Hutchison	Talent
Coleman	Inhofe	Thomas
Collins	Isakson	Thune
Cornyn	Kyl	Vitter
Craig	Lott	Voinovich
Crapo	Lugar	Warner
DeMint	Martinez	

The amendment (No. 784), as modified, was rejected.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CRAIG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 791

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry: What is the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). There are 2 minutes evenly divided on the Bingaman amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, when I go home on the Fourth of July and my constituents ask what I did about high natural gas prices, high gasoline prices, about our competition with China and Japan and India to keep our jobs, I am going to tell them I voted no on the Bingaman amendment to order utilities to make 10 percent of their energy from a limited number of renewable fuels, because it is an \$18 billion electric rate increase over 20 years. At a time of high natural gas prices, high gasoline prices, the last thing we should do is an \$18 billion electric rate increase over 20 years.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico will tell us that it will be offset by natural gas reductions, but that is only if there is a \$5 natural gas rate in 2025. One thing we know is, it is a big electric rate increase when we should be reducing prices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this is an amendment which says utilities that produce electricity in this country by the year 2020 should ensure that up to 10 percent of their electricity comes from renewable sources. It doesn't specify which renewable sources. It gives them a variety of choices. According to the Energy Information Agency, the \$18 billion is more than offset by the savings these utilities will get by not having to invest in additional traditional sources of generation. This will result in a reduction in electricity rates and a reduction in gas rates, according to our own Department of Energy. I believe this is good legislation. I hope my colleagues will support it. It will strengthen this bill and give us a much better energy bill to take to conference.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator SNOWE of Maine be added as a co-sponsor to the amendment.

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

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 791.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 141 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Akaka	Corzine	Kerry
Baucus	Dayton	Kohl
Bayh	Dodd	Landrieu
Biden	Dorgan	Lautenberg
Bingaman	Durbin	Leahy
Boxer	Ensign	Levin
Brownback	Feingold	Lieberman
Cantwell	Feinstein	Lincoln
Carper	Grassley	Mikulski
Chafee	Harkin	Murray
Clinton	Inouye	Nelson (FL)
Coleman	Jeffords	Obama
Collins	Johnson	Pryor
Cornyn	Kennedy	Reed

Reid	Schumer	Stabenow
Rockefeller	Smith	Wyden
Salazar	Snowe	
Sarbanes	Specter	
NAYS—48		
Alexander	DeWine	McCain
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Allen	Domenici	Murkowski
Bennett	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Frist	Roberts
Bunning	Graham	Santorum
Burns	Gregg	Sessions
Burr	Hagel	Shelby
Byrd	Hatch	Stevens
Chambliss	Hutchison	Sununu
Coburn	Inhofe	Talent
Cochran	Isakson	Thomas
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Craig	Lott	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Voinovich
DeMint	Martinez	Warner

The amendment (No. 791) was agreed to.

Mr. DORGAN. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Are we, under regular order, scheduled to move on to another amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending at this time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Georgia would like to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from New Mexico. For that purpose, I yield to the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise in hope that the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the Senator from New Mexico, will engage in a colloquy with myself, as well as Senator SMITH of Oregon, regarding some concerns we have about the renewable portfolio standard amendment.

While I support the development of renewable energy and other clean energy resources, I believe that each region of the country has the ability to develop these resources in a variety of ways. In fact, at least 21 States already have a State RPS, and many other States have programs to promote renewable energy, all of this being accomplished without a Federal mandate.

The problem with the RPS amendment is that it imposes a one-size-fits-all mandate on the whole country without regard for whether the requirement is technologically or economically feasible. Not every State or region has the same amount of renewable energy available to comply with the rigid 10-percent RPS mandate the amendment would impose. As a result, utilities in States that do not have enough renewable energy will need to comply with the RPS mandate by purchasing credits at a cost of 1½ cents per kilowatt hour. Mr. President, 1½ cents may not sound like a lot of money, but when it is multiplied by

the number of kilowatts needed to comply with a 10-percent RPS by 2020, it can add up to billions of dollars—billions of dollars in what should be called a tax on consumers. I call it a tax because that is essentially what it is. It is dollars that will come out of the pockets of consumers and go straight to the Federal Government. That makes no sense at all.

If the Government wants more renewable energy, it does not make sense to take billions of dollars away from consumers in a region simply because they do not have access to adequate renewable resources at a reasonable cost.

If there must be an RPS provision in this Energy bill—and I do not believe it is necessary—it must, at a minimum, allow more flexibility for each State and region.

I ask that the distinguished chairman commit to work with me in the conference to modify the provision to allow greater flexibility and to protect consumers from unnecessary cost increases. In particular, I ask that we work together to address the regional issues inherent in any such provision and ensure that States that do not have the technological capabilities to comply with the RPS mandate are not penalized. I note that even many supporters of a Federal RPS mandate recognize the need for State-by-State flexibility.

The Senator from Oregon does have a comment relative to this issue, and I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his comments. He reflects well the views of his State and the region.

Those of us, such as myself, who voted for this RPS standard understand the regional differences. In my view, an important purpose of an RPS is to diversify the Nation's energy supply. I understand that different States have different resources. For that reason, I believe it is appropriate to provide for greater flexibility for the States.

I would like to work with the Senator from Georgia and the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee to make appropriate modifications to the provision.

I yield back to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his comments. Again, I strongly oppose the RPS, but if there must be one in the Energy bill, I ask the distinguished chairman if he will commit to work with the Senator from Oregon and myself in conference to make these modifications to the provision to ensure that the RPS promotes renewable energy where it is most needed without harming consumers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, might I respond by saying to the distin-

guished Senator from Georgia and the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I would be delighted to work with them and, obviously, with other members of the conference in an effort to do what I can to ensure that each State is treated fairly and that none are penalized by an overly rigid mandate.

I am fully aware of the disparity between States, and I say to the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oregon that their States were on the map showing they are the have-not States in terms of wind. They have a lot of other items with which they can meet a standard. Renewable is going to be the test here, and it is going to be difficult.

The Senate has spoken—close vote. We will do what we can in conference. The Senator understands there is no such provision in the House bill. We will do our best to see what we can do to recognize the Senator's position and yet recognize the closeness of the vote and the very severe repercussions on some States.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I thank the chairman for his comments, and I look forward to working with him.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today with a profound sense of optimism and appreciation. We have not enacted a comprehensive energy bill since 1992. Many programs need reauthorization and many need revision. Programs and demonstrations must be updated to today's and tomorrow's energy parameters.

I have long said that the Nation needs a comprehensive blueprint for an energy policy that will take us in advanced directions, away from dependence on declining reserves of fossil fuel and foreign sources of oil. We need a policy which will reconcile growth and energy conservation in our transportation, manufacturing, utility, and consumer sectors across the Nation. We need to bring down the high costs of electricity and gasoline for the country, particularly in my State of Hawaii, and pursue greater energy independence from petroleum products. S. 10, the Energy Policy Act of 2005, provides the best opportunity that I have seen in years.

As a senior member of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, I am familiar with cutting-edge technologies and approaches to generating energy. I was closely involved in crafting several parts of this energy bill—legislation that contains three bills that I have introduced, and a hydrogen title that was crafted with the leadership of Senators DORGAN, GRAHAM, and myself as members of the Senate Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Caucus. I have contributed to comprehensive energy bills in 2002 and in 2003.

I wish to thank both Senators from New Mexico for their leadership and hard work in bridging many regional

differences in this comprehensive bill, while still keeping in mind the overall vision for an energy bill. The Energy Committee, under the leadership of Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN, held a series of structured hearings that were informational briefings from a broad spectrum of industry, environmental groups, non-profits, and small businesses. Senator DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN are to be commended for keeping an open mind about the potential for new energy sources and a balance of renewable and fossil fuels, science and research and development. In sum, this is a balanced energy bill.

The energy policies that we address in this legislation cover a vast range of authorities and a patchwork of unruly regional alliances. This translates to an enormous challenge, and I appreciate Senator DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN's hard work and the work of their staffs. I want to compliment them on crafting an energy bill that will help the Nation as well as States with special "off-grid" energy needs such as Alaska, my state of Hawaii, and insular territories and commonwealths.

I support this bill and voted for it in our Committee. The bill is well-balanced between renewable energy production, energy efficiency provisions, oil and gas technologies, electricity provisions, and alternate and visionary sources of energy such as hydrogen. The bill invests in the Nation's Research and Development for energy technologies, something that we must continue doing to remain leaders in the world, as global demand for energy increases. The last title of the bill, Title Fourteen, provides much-needed incentives for innovative technologies, through loan guarantees for new energy facilities and projects.

I greatly appreciate the inclusion of title VIII, the Hydrogen title. I am an original cosponsor of S. 665, the Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technology Act of 2005, and worked with Senators DORGAN, GRAHAM, and other members of the Hydrogen Caucus to craft this bill, which is included in S. 10. The bill reauthorizes and amends the Spark M. Matsunaga Hydrogen Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1990, which has been the basic authority for Federal hydrogen programs for the last 20 years. Reauthorization of the Matsunaga Act is badly needed and I have been working toward that goal for several years. The bill provides for robust R&D for hydrogen fuel cells. It includes a provision to enhance sources of renewable fuels and biofuels for hydrogen production among its R&D priorities, which is very important for isolated areas such as Pacific islands and rural areas across the Nation.

In addition to the R&D section, the bill includes hydrogen fuel cell demonstration programs for vehicles and for national parks, remote island areas, and on Indian tribal land. The bill authorizes system demonstrations, including distributed energy systems

that incorporate renewable hydrogen production and off-grid electricity production. In other words, the bill includes a broad range of hydrogen energy applications that will reach out to rural communities and lower income families, hospitals, military facilities—not solely vehicle applications and infrastructure. It recognizes the importance of developing hydrogen from renewable sources and demonstration projects for stationary and distributed energy systems in remote areas and islands.

I am pleased that the bill contains my request for an energy study in Hawaii. I thank Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN for including my bill, S. 436, the Hawaii Energy Study bill. Hawaii is uniquely dependent on crude oil for its energy sources. Before we invest in a different energy mix and infrastructure, we need to make transparent all the dynamics between fuels, generating electricity, and the consequences of the directions we choose.

The bill directs the Secretary of Energy to assess the short- and long-term prospects of oil supply disruptions and price volatility and their impacts on Hawaii, and to assess the economic relationship between oil-fired generation of electricity from residual fuel and refined products consumed for transportation needs of Hawaii. In Hawaii, the costs of gasoline, electricity, and jet fuel are intertwined in an intricate relationship, because they all come from the same feedstock, and changes in the use of one can potentially drive consumer prices up or down.

Although we approved an ethanol title yesterday, I would like to add a few words on the topic of the ethanol mandate. First, I would like to extend my appreciation to Senators TALENT and JOHNSON, and their staff, who have shown great leadership in working with committee members to understand the challenges that States face with a Federal ethanol mandate. I am particularly sensitive to States' needs with respect to renewable fuels and renewable energy. In Hawaii and other remote areas we lack the ability to produce ethanol. We would like to have that ability to free us from importing ethanol and the rising price of crude oil.

Hawaii has had the highest gasoline prices in the Nation over the last 10 years. We also have a State mandate to use ethanol, enacted last year and due to go into effect in spring of 2006. Our State ethanol mandate is driven by the desire to increase the use of biomass, increase the renewable content in our transportation fuels, and decrease the imports of crude oil to Hawaii. These are all good goals. Our sugar interests and ethanol producers are struggling to put facilities into place to produce ethanol because we need to meet our State mandate.

This is why Senator INOUYE and I greatly appreciate the inclusion of cellulosic and sugar cane-to-ethanol provisions in this bill. The demonstration provisions will greatly assist us in

reaching our ethanol goals in the State.

We also need a loan guarantee program to help our producers. The loan guarantee program in the amendment we adopted is more restrictive than the one approved and reported by the Energy Committee. Hawaii's ethanol facilities are projected to produce between 7 and 15 million gallons of ethanol and the market in Hawaii is about 45 million gallons. Hawaii has an independent market and a State requirement for ethanol. Our plants will be smaller than in other States and would greatly benefit from a loan guarantee program for smaller producers. This is very important to my State and I look forward to working with my colleagues to further address this issue in conference.

In other titles of the Energy bill, I am pleased that title VI, Nuclear Matters, includes provisions of a bill I introduced earlier this year, S. 979, to require the Department of Energy to provide for a facility for the safe storage of greater-than-class-C radioactive waste. Radioactive sealed sources, which can be used to create a "dirty bomb," are all around us and pose a great risk. The administration must take action to ensure the control and safe disposal of those sources.

The energy bill also includes S. 711, a bill I introduced with Senator MURKOWSKI to reauthorize the methane hydrates program at the Department of Energy. Hydrates are important—the U.S. has enormous hydrate resources, perhaps as much as a quarter of the world's gas hydrates. As increased demand draws down natural gas reserves, we must look to additional sources, such as hydrates, for the future. The bill includes a robust methane hydrates program that includes the recommendations of the National Research Council's study on the program and future of methane hydrates.

We still have much work ahead of us. The bill does not include fuel economy standards which significantly increase the fuel efficiency of automobiles and are a vital component of a comprehensive energy policy. The American people want to spend less money on gasoline, be less dependent on foreign oil, address the issue of climate change, and breathe cleaner air. Strong fuel economy standards help provide some solutions. Also the bill does not address the growing emissions of carbon dioxide, which are radically changing the world around us. I am hopeful we will address these matters on the floor and I look forward to the debate.

Again, I appreciate and commend my colleagues Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN on the bipartisan nature of this bill and the process by which it was developed.

AMENDMENT NO. 794

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator BINGAMAN, I send a managers' amendment to the desk. It has been agreed to on both sides, is predominantly technical, and

has been agreed to by anyone who has any interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 794.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 10, strike lines 5 through 8 and insert the following:

(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1065 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(B) INCLUSION.—The term “institution of higher education” includes an organization that—

(i) is organized, and at all times thereafter operated, exclusively for the benefit of, to perform the functions of, or to carry out the functions of 1 or more organizations referred to in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) is operated, supervised, or controlled by or in connection with 1 or more of those organizations.

On page 121, lines 9 and 10, strike “subsection (a)” and insert “paragraph (1)”.

On page 223, line 16, strike “date of enactment of this Act” and insert “effective date of this section”.

On page 225, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on October 1, 2006.

On page 451, line 8, insert “manufacturability,” after “electronic controls”.

On page 452, strike lines 8 and 9 and insert the following:

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Task Force shall be

On page 452, line 15, strike “members” and insert “Federal employees”.

On page 452, strike lines 18 through 21.

On page 478, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 916. BUILDING STANDARDS.

(a) DEFINITION OF HIGH PERFORMANCE BUILDING.—In this section, the term “high performance building” means a building that integrates and optimizes energy efficiency, durability, life-cycle performance, and occupant productivity.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the National Institute of Building Sciences to—

(1) conduct an assessment (in cooperation with industry, standards development organizations, and other entities, as appropriate) of whether the current voluntary consensus standards and rating systems for high performance buildings are consistent with the research, development and demonstration activities of the Department;

(2) determine if additional research is required, based on the findings of the assessment; and,

(3) recommend steps for the Secretary to accelerate the development of voluntary consensus-based standards for high performance buildings that are based on the findings of the assessment.

(c) GRANT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Consistent with subsection (b), the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), and the amendments made by that Act, the Secretary shall establish a grant and technical assistance program to support the development of voluntary consensus-based standards for high performance buildings.

On page 497, line 13, strike “using thermochemical processes”.

On page 505, line 23, strike “proton exchange membrane”.

On page 742, line 8, strike “Power” and insert “Energy Regulatory”.

On page 755, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 1329. OVERALL EMPLOYMENT IN A HYDROGEN ECONOMY.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a study of the likely effects of a transition to a hydrogen economy on overall employment in the United States.

(2) CONTENTS.—In completing the study, the Secretary shall take into consideration—

(A) the replacement effects of new goods and services;

(B) international competition;

(C) workforce training requirements;

(D) multiple possible fuel cycles, including usage of raw materials;

(E) rates of market penetration of technologies; and

(F) regional variations based on geography.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study under subsection (a).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 794) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I would like to begin my remarks by thanking Chairman DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN, the ranking member, as well as their staffs, for the hard work and excellent effort they have made in preparing an energy bill. Their leadership has allowed the Senate to come together on a comprehensive energy policy that is of paramount importance to our Nation’s future security and economic interests. While there are provisions in this bill about which I am troubled, I did vote for it in committee and would like very much to do so here on the floor. But there are some reservations I have. There are some things that were omitted, some that have actually been included and others that might be included about which I would like to speak, one in particular is one of great importance to the State of New Jersey.

I see my esteemed colleague Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG here as well. He will be speaking about this issue. That is the threat of oil and gas drilling off the coast of southern New Jersey’s 127 miles of shore.

All of you heard Senators NELSON and MARTINEZ speak on the floor earlier this week about Florida’s treasured coast and how important it is to Florida’s environment and economy that its coast be protected from any weakening of the moratoria on drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf. My colleagues from Florida should take every step necessary to protect their beaches and coastal waters. As a Senator from a coastal State where tourism is the second largest industry, I think Senator LAUTENBERG and I also want to

take every step necessary to protect the New Jersey shore from any effort to weaken the longstanding, bipartisan moratorium that exists on drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf.

As I understand it, the chairman and ranking member have both agreed to oppose any amendments that open up the OCS moratoria on submerged lands off of Florida’s coast. I am, of course, pleased that recognition was taken in that instance. But it is a bit disconcerting that the rest of the moratoria on offshore drilling was not addressed. Many OCS areas still seem vulnerable to something that could destroy that moratoria, and that is a problem. It is a problem for the State of New Jersey. I think it is for many, if not all, of the other coastal States that are protected by the moratoria.

This has been a priority of mine since I have been in the Senate. Along with Senator LAUTENBERG, I introduced the Clean Ocean and Safe Tourism Anti-Drilling Act in the 107th, 108th, and 109th Congresses. This bill would make permanent the moratoria on drilling in the Mid- and North Atlantic Planning Areas, as opposed to having it be an issue that is dealt with year to year in the appropriations process or by Executive order.

I know, with certainty, the people of New Jersey—I mean with certainty—do not want to see oil and gas rigs off their coast. The Jersey Shore is one of the fastest growing parts of the State of New Jersey. It is in the most densely populated State already. The New Jersey shore is one of those things that defines our State. We want to maintain the beauty and cleanliness of our beaches as well as protect our fishing grounds as they make up a huge portion of our State’s revenue.

The New Jersey Department of Commerce calculates that tourism in our State generates more than \$31 billion in spending. Almost all of that is focused on our shore. It directly and indirectly supports 836,000 jobs, more than 20 percent of the total State employment. In addition, it generates about \$16.6 billion in wages and \$5.5 billion in tax revenues for the State. It is a big deal for us, a very big deal. If we are going to take a risk with our shoreline, we must first look at the cost-benefit analysis.

Any threat of drilling, any threat to New Jersey’s environment and economy compel me to stand here and make sure people understand how important it is to us.

New Jersey is not alone in this. This is something that people recognize up and down the eastern seaboard and on the western coast.

New Jersey is already a State that is carrying a heavy load in terms of supporting the energy production needs and the refining needs of this Nation. We have three nuclear powerplants. We export energy. We have many traditional powerplants, and support siting of an LNG terminal. We are also a

place that has been supportive of alternative energy. We are moving in the direction toward all of those things that promote efficiency. New Jersey is the east coast hub for oil refining, for the chemical industry. We are doing our part in growing and sustaining the Nation's energy resources.

But risking and exploiting our shore, to do that is a step too far. I repeat, it is a step too far, risking what I think no one else would do if it were related to their economy, their people's quality of life, their people's needs.

I am not the only Senator who has concerns about amendments to this bill that will weaken the moratorium. I have been in contact with a number of coastal State Senators. We will have a letter that speaks against any changes to the current OCS moratoria. My concern about some of the provisions of the bill, including the inventory provision, are reinforced by some of the rumblings I hear about trying to move further in opening up this Outer Continental Shelf.

I fear we are on a slippery slope that would lead to eventual drilling off the New Jersey coast, which is of great concern and will lead to the kinds of actions that can stand in the way of the overall bill. It will not be just a New Jersey issue; it will be a broader issue.

Given the minimal benefit of offshore drilling—at least based on the science that has been applied to this issue—I don't see the need to be threatening over 800,000 jobs and the state revenues I mentioned earlier for what the Minerals Management Service (MMS) estimated in 2000 to be roughly 196 million barrels of oil off our coast. That, by the way, is enough to fuel this country's needs for only 10 days. The MMS also estimated a mean of only 2.7 trillion cubic feet of natural gas for the entire Mid-Atlantic region. Compare that to areas already open to drilling in the Gulf—not those adjacent to Florida—that contain 18.9 billion barrels of oil and 258 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

I don't know what kind of cost-benefit analysis is being taken to be pushing forward with this offshore inventory, when the studies have already shown the great capacity of one area versus what is expected to be found off of New Jersey's coast.

We want to protect this moratoria. It is an issue I take very seriously. We hear there is the potential for weakening the moratoria in another way by providing for potential amendments that allow States to opt out of the moratoria and possibly even revenue-sharing amendments that would encourage states to opt out of the moratoria. Allowing States to opt out would be detrimental to States' neighbors. This is an argument long understood and argued by Florida. New Jersey's coastline, obviously, is very close to other States. Tides move across state borders and fisheries don't recognize state borders. One State's choice could end up being detrimental to another.

We have ample reason to say that coastal states ought to be concerned about this issue. In fact, we have, for planning purposes, divided up the country into planning areas. The Mid-Atlantic and the North Atlantic OCS Planning Areas, which extend from North Carolina to Maine, is of most concern to New Jersey. But I understand the same arguments from everyone else in every other planning area. Water does not recognize the borders we have established in a political contest. We need to protect the offshore moratoria so that we can protect our beaches and our shores as we go forward.

Mr. President I have here a bipartisan, bicameral "Dear Colleague" letter from almost every member of the New Jersey Congressional Delegation that expresses the concern of those who represent New Jersey that this moratoria be sustained. I also have a bipartisan letter signed by over 100 Members of the House of Representatives, both sides of the aisle, stating their strong support for the legislative moratoria on activity in submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf. I ask unanimous consent that these two letters be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, June 15, 2005.

Hon. PETER DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MEMBER: We are writing to express our strong opposition to any amendment to the Senate Energy bill that would weaken or destroy the 24-year moratoria on drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS).

As we understand, you have agreed not to vote for any amendments that alter the current OCS moratoria with respect to submerged lands off of Florida's coast.

While we believe that the current OCS moratoria off the Florida's coast should be protected, we are deeply concerned that this agreement leaves the coasts of our states vulnerable to amendments that would weaken the moratoria off other areas of the Outer Continental Shelf.

As senators of coastal states whose environment and economies would be in serious danger should the OCS moratoria be weakened in any way, we will oppose any provision that would threaten the moratoria, including, but not limited to amendments allowing states of opt out of the OCS moratoria or provide for revenue-sharing as an incentive for states to opt out of the moratoria.

We are likewise your commitment to oppose any amendments that endanger the moratoria on one oil and gas leases in the entire Outer Continental Shelf. As you know, Congress has infused language protecting the current OCS moratoria in annual appropriations bills since 1982. In addition, President George H.W. Bush declared a leasing moratorium on many OCS areas and President Clinton issued a memorandum to the Secretary of the Interior that extended the moratorium through 2012 and included additional OCS areas.

Given this history, any change to the moratoria will be a dramatic change in policy. It is our hope that this important bill will not get bogged down by this issue, but without assurances that you would oppose any amendments that would undermine the current moratoria, we will be forced to use all procedural tactics to protect our precious resources.

We hope we will be able to work together with you to resolve this issue.

Sincerely,
Jon S. Corzine, Paul Sarbanes, John F. Kerry, Dianne Feinstein, Patty Murray, Frank R. Lautenberg, Edward M. Kennedy, Barbara Boxer, and Ron Wyden.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2005.

Hon. CHARLES TAYLOR,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior and Environment, Committee on Appropriations, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. NORM DICKS,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Interior and Environment, Committee on Appropriations, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TAYLOR AND RANKING MEMBER DICKS: We are writing to express our strong support for the longstanding bipartisan legislative moratorium on new mineral leasing activity on submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). We are deeply appreciative of the leadership your Subcommittee has shown on this issue over the years and hope to work with you this year to continue this vital protection.

The legislative moratorium language prohibits the use of federal funds for offshore leasing, pre-leasing and other oil and gas drilling-related activities in moratoria areas, enhancing protection of those areas from offshore oil and gas development. As you know, in 1990 President George H.W. Bush signed an executive memorandum placing a ten-year moratorium on new leasing on the OCS. In 1998, this moratorium was renewed by President Bill Clinton and extended until 2012. As you know, President George W. Bush endorsed the moratorium in his 2006 budget. These actions have all been met with public acclaim and as necessary steps to preserve the economic and environmental value of our nation's coasts.

With a renewed interest in developing natural gas and oil on the OCS, we believe it is again imperative for Congress to reaffirm its authority on this issue. Therefore, we respectfully urge you to include the OCS moratorium language in the fiscal year 2006 Interior and Environment Appropriations legislation. Specifically, we ask you to use the language in Sections 107, 108 and 109, Division E, Department of the Interior and Related Agencies of the fiscal year 2005 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 108-447). These sections restrict oil and gas activities within the OCS in the Georges Bank-North Atlantic planning area, Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic planning area, Eastern Gulf of Mexico planning area, Northern, Southern, and Central California planning areas, and Washington and Oregon planning area.

Once again, we encourage the Subcommittee to support these important provisions, which represent over 20 years of bipartisan agreement on the importance of protecting the environmentally and economically valuable coastal areas of the United States. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,
Members of the House of Representatives:
Lois Capps, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Jeff Miller, Jim Davis, Michael

Michaud, Madeleine Bordallo, Ginny Brown-Waite, Jay Inslee, Frank LoBiondo, Rob Simmons, Mark Foley, Jim Langevin, Ed Case, Jim McGovern, Sherrod Brown, Chris Smith, Dennis Cardoza, Frank Pallone, Jr., G.K. Butterfield, Tom Feeney.

Pete Stark, Robert Wexler, Anna Eshoo, Zoe Lofgren, Katherine Harris, Jerry Nadler, Carolyn Maloney, Alcee Hastings, Mike Honda, Hilda Solis, Grace Napolitano, Mark Kennedy, Brian Baird, Susan Davis, Sam Farr, Clay Shaw, Christopher Shays, Rush Holt, Betty McCollum, Ellen Tauscher.

Barbara Lee, Dennis Moore, Raul Grijalva, Chris Van Hollen, Rahm Emanuel, Nick Rahall, Loretta Sanchez, Tom Allen, Anthony Weiner, Jan Schakowsky, Brad Sherman, Jim McDermott, Kendrick Meek, Bob Etheridge, Dale Kildee, George Miller, Donald Payne, Tom Lantos, Earl Blumenauer, Maxine Waters.

Wayne Gilchrest, Rosa DeLauro, Nancy Pelosi, Richard Neal, Dennis Kucinich, Ed Markey, Henry Waxman, Michael McNulty, Michael Bilirakis, Jane Harman, Bart Stupak, Robert Menendez, Barney Frank, Lynn Woolsey, Luis Gutierrez, Jim Saxton, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, William Delahunt, Peter DeFazio, Mike Thompson, Juanita Millender-McDonald.

David Wu, Carolyn Maloney, Bob Filner, Mario Diaz-Balart, Robert Andrews, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Xavier Becerra, Howard Berman, Walter Jones, Connie Mack, Diane Watson, Doris Matsui, Linda Sánchez, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Ric Keller, Adam Schiff, Corrine Brown, Jim Costa, Joe Baca, Bill Pascrell, and Eliot Engel.

Mr. CORZINE. This is a big deal for the State of New Jersey. It is for anyone who is exposed to the coast and has a tremendous amount of industry and tourism that is the livelihood of those individuals who live near the shore. We can avoid the conflict as it relates to the overall energy policy. But it is the responsibility of those who are to defend the interests of our State, to stand up firmly to protect our economy, to protect our environment, to protect our quality of life. We do not need this conflict with regard to this bill.

I hope my colleagues will keep that in mind in the days ahead. Otherwise, there will be those who have to fight in ways that are not our preferred approach especially when we would like to get a bipartisan energy bill to go forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, first let me say to my friend and colleague from New Jersey how much I admire his commitment to our State and to the things that protect our environment and our well-being. I am very proud of Senator CORZINE. I have mixed feelings about whether I want him to win the race in New Jersey because it is nice to have a hometown boy around.

I join Senator CORZINE in this attempt to protect our State from being affected by drilling for oil off our shore line. When I was a boy, I had occasion to spend time at the New Jersey shore.

It was, for me, a matter of almost paradigmatic value to be able to get to that shore and never think about whether we were going to step on plastics, needles, oil spills, or anything like that. It was so much a part of our culture that to change it in any way that we do not have to is an act of poor judgment.

The top of the list, as far as we are concerned, is the New Jersey shore. We call it “the shore.” In the summertime, few things are better than a day at the beach, watching your children or your grandchildren play in the surf or go out on a fishing boat or learn something about marine life. We have seen times when a spill occurs how it spoils an entire area.

We are at a time now where in desperation we are searching for ways to make up for our profligate use of oil. We are looking around, trying to find ways to substitute for the bad judgment we used for so many years, for letting it go, for not requiring cars to meet standards for oil consumption or gas consumption.

Hurting our environment, having oil ruin our most delicate and precious resources. It is just not right.

If one wants to fish or walk along the boardwalk, those from New Jersey go to the shore. If you want an evening’s recreation, you go to the shore. It is nearby. It is part of our life. It is part of what we think of as the periphery of our State: 127 miles of shore line, the major economic engine for New Jersey.

Tourism, as we heard from my colleague, is a \$30-billion industry and supports hundreds of thousands of jobs. Seventy percent of all the State’s tourism revenues originate at the shores. Our shores are very important to us. But it goes beyond the economy. It goes beyond all kinds of things that one might think. When you look at the marine ecology, when you see what happens with clam beds or shellfish beds, we cannot fish them any more because of contamination, because of toxins. Those affect our everyday lives.

For 35 States in this country, the coast is at our door, the shore is right there for us—for 35 coastal States. Of course, it includes the States in the Great Lakes area. They too have an interest in protecting their waters. So when anyone proposes something that could put our shores at risk, we take it very seriously.

Of course, that brings us to the bill we are currently considering. There has been a great deal of discussion about violating our longstanding prohibition against offshore drilling by allowing States to opt out of the moratorium. Now, what would that mean? We recently had a spill in the Delaware River. Did it do more damage to New Jersey than it did to Pennsylvania or Delaware? It damaged all of them. Oceans know no boundaries, unless we put up a seawall that extends beyond the borders of our State way out into the ocean and say: OK, you can drill on that side but not the other.

I see the majority leader and Democratic leader looking at me so wist-

fully, and I wonder if it is in admiration or whether it is something else they had in mind.

Mr. REID. Admiration.

Mr. FRIST. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we will have a very short colloquy here as to what to expect over the next several days. It will take 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. President, Senators have been asking about the schedule for the afternoon, tomorrow, and Monday. First of all, let me congratulate the chairman and ranking member. We are making good progress. The fact that we do not have a lot of amendments flowing out tonight or a lot of requests even for tomorrow or Monday is a good sign. That, coupled with the fact we made substantial progress, leaves me very optimistic. We dealt with ethanol and oil consumption. So we are making progress.

I will come back to what we are going to have to do next week. We will remain in session this afternoon for Members to offer additional energy-related amendments. However, if the amendment requires a rollcall vote, we would order that for next week because of the schedule of tomorrow. We will have no further rollcall votes today. After our business today, we will return to the bill on Monday.

I do want to continue to rely on the continued efforts of our colleagues to come forward and offer amendments now. They have the opportunity this afternoon, early into the evening, and throughout Monday.

I do want to put our colleagues on notice that if it looks as though there is any question about finishing this bill Thursday or Friday of next week—I have told Senators on our side of the aisle to expect votes on Friday, but we are going to complete this bill next week. If there is any question about that, I do want to put our colleagues on notice that I likely will file cloture on Wednesday. And that is not even a veiled threat at all, but it demonstrates the importance on behalf of our leadership, working with the Democratic leader, that we need to move ahead now and that we will finish this bill next week.

Finally, it is also our intention on the Bolton nomination to reconsider the cloture vote on Monday evening. I mentioned earlier that we might do that today, but discussions have continued, constructive discussions have continued over the course of yesterday and over the course of today, and that being the case, we have elected to have that vote on Monday evening. That vote will likely occur—I have not talked specifically with the Democratic leader—around 6 o’clock. Therefore, Senators should be present for that important vote.

Let me turn to the Democratic leader. I would ask if he concurs that we must finish this bill next week. And that is why, indeed, I mentioned we

may have to file cloture, if we do not make continued progress.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the two managers of the bill are here. They are ready to take amendments. All amendments cannot be offered next week. When we come to these bills, it is always: I am not quite ready; I will do it tomorrow or next week. That time has arrived. We have worked through some very difficult amendments this week—three extremely difficult amendments. They are disposed of now. They were complicated. They were difficult in the eyes of many.

As I see it, Mr. Leader, I think the big issue left, in major scope, is the global warming issue. A number of Senators on both sides are concerned about this. I would hope that an amendment would be offered Monday when we come in, debate this however long it takes, within a reasonable period of time, and dispose of it, maybe Tuesday. I just think it is time we move on.

I think what the majority leader has outlined, in consultation with me, is extremely good; that we are going to finish this bill next week. And no one has been jammed on time. It has been a hard week also because there have been funerals and events that have taken some of our time, but we have worked our way through that.

I think it would be good for the country that they see we are now legislating. We have had a number of problems earlier in the year. Those are over. And now the leader has said he wishes to pass a couple of appropriations bills before we leave in August. That would set a good tone. The Appropriations Committee met today. That work has been done. The bill is ready to bring to the floor.

So I hope we can move forward. There is a tentative agreement—it is not finalized in any written form yet, but I have worked with the distinguished majority leader now for a couple weeks. There is an issue that is before the country, and that is stem cell research. We are going to try to work out something on that so we do not have a bunch of side issues coming up on the legislation we have. We have had a number of important meetings, and I think we are at a point soon where we can arrive at some way to dispose of this at a time certain.

We have other issues that we have talked about—the Hawaiian issue and China. These are all in the RECORD that we have to bring those up at a specified time. So we have our plates full. And I would acknowledge we probably might have to do some of this next Friday.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I thank the Democratic leader. I believe it is pretty clear in terms of the plans: No more rollcall votes today. We will have a pro forma session tomorrow. We expect people to continue today to offer amendments and to bring them forward on Monday as well.

We will have a rollcall vote on the Bolton nomination, to reconsider the

cloture vote on the Bolton nomination, at 6 o'clock on Monday. We will complete the Energy bill next week. And then we will turn to the appropriations bills, as we had planned.

Mr. REID. If the Senator will yield, I also think if cloture is going to be filed on this bill, it would be on a bipartisan basis. I think you would have an equal number of Democrats and Republicans signing that cloture motion. And I think that it is really important for this body that we do that on occasion.

Mr. FRIST. That is the cloture motion—

Mr. REID. On the Energy bill.

Mr. FRIST. On the Energy bill.

Mr. President, we yield the floor and do thank our distinguished colleague from New Jersey for his consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the point I was making just a few minutes ago was that we ought not permit States to opt out of this moratorium, this prohibition against offshore drilling because what happens in a neighboring State, whether it is Delaware or Maryland or New York State or Connecticut or Massachusetts, affects what happens in my State very often. The same is true on the Pacific side of things. The same is true for the Gulf of Mexico. You cannot simply say: Let a State do the drilling. They may be more interested in the income than in the protection of the environment. But we are not. I can't emphasize strongly enough the importance of protecting the sensitive marine areas off the New Jersey coast and other coastal States.

For more than two decades, both Democratic and Republican administrations have respected the moratorium on leasing and preleasing activities on the Outer Continental Shelf. But now we are talking about doing away with this protection. It would be foolish and shortsighted. One only needs to look at the list of accidents at sea and see what happened to neighboring States or neighboring communities not at all connected to the place where the accident happened. We just ought not permit it.

The Department of Interior's Minerals Management Service estimated in the year 2000 that the waters off New Jersey might hold enough oil to supply the country with 10 days of oil. What does it mean in the scheme of things? Ten days of oil and run the risk of destroying marine life and a culture that is associated with coastal States? It is a part of our lives. Heaven forbid that it changes from being part of our daily lives.

Do we want to risk hundreds of thousands of jobs for 10 days? I don't think so. Do we want to risk changing the culture of our society, our coastal society? I don't think so.

The people of my State and the residents of all coastal States do not want oil and gas rigs marring their treasured beaches and fishing grounds. The occu-

pant of the Chair, coming from a beautiful coastal State, tiny though it is, but so much dependent on the sound and the ocean, I am sure understands the risks of having oil rigs out there that could damage the culture of the State as well as the marine life and the ecology. We don't want that to happen. I don't mean to speak for the Presiding Officer, but I know that Rhode Island has similar problems to States such as New Jersey.

Drilling poses serious threats to our environment and to our economy. Drilling requires onshore infrastructure that can harm sensitive coastal zones. The massive amounts of mud it displaces when drills go down into the earth must be dumped somewhere else. The constant risk of oil spills cannot be minimized.

I was chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee of Appropriations about 15 years ago when the Exxon Valdez ran aground. Because I had Coast Guard in my subcommittee, I took the opportunity to get up to the place where the vessel was floundering within 3 days after it ran aground. It was in some way kind of a mystical allure. You could see the sheen on the water, and it spread with all of its color but all of its menace at the same time. I saw brave people from our Department of Interior and Fish and Wildlife getting off on these tiny islands with helicopters and small boats and taking the birds out and fish and trying to clean them up one by one wherever they could. It was devastating. I visited there at that time. I find out that today, 16 years later, that disaster is still taking a toll on the environment.

When I take my grandchildren to the beach, I don't want them to discover oil underneath a rock, as one still does in the area where the Exxon Valdez ran aground. I don't want them to see birds or mammals sickened by their inability to breathe properly as a result of a coating of oil. I don't want to hear about the coral destruction that provides the nutritional base for our fish and marine life.

The Exxon Valdez spill was one of the largest oil spills we have suffered, and it was only one of many. According to the Department of Interior, 3 million gallons of oil spilled from offshore operations in 73 incidents between 1980 and 1999. It is an average of about four incidents a year, more than 40,000 gallons of oil per spill. That is more than enough oil to ruin a beach town's tourist season for years to come.

We cannot afford to damage our shorelines—and we should not be asked to do it—or the marine life that inhabits our coastal waters. Nature has been good to us. It supplies us with the seas and the water and the land and the mountains. We ought to try as much as possible to keep that intact.

Ending the moratorium in any State completely undercuts the position our Nation has upheld for many decades. It clearly undercuts the stated wishes of coastal States that would incur the

greatest damage. The United States needs new sources of energy. I agree with that. But where have we been in these past years as the consumption of oil increased? Buying it from people who aren't even friends of ours, but who are always asking us to protect them in moments of trouble. And some of those states we know have been accused of and it has been established that they support terrorists who fight against us. Did that cause us to say: Hey, we ought to change things? No. It didn't. We simply said: Get bigger cars and use more gas and let the devil take the high road. It ought not be that way. The United States needs new sources of energy.

Fortunately, our Nation has many energy sources that are vastly underutilized. One of those sources for finding our way out of this mess is to continue to invest in alternative methods for producing energy in universities and research institutes. We can bolster our Nation's energy security without drilling offshore. A day at the beach should mean fun, clean water, natural beauty, not oil slicks or drilling rigs. We need to keep the existing prohibition on offshore drilling in place. That is what Senator CORZINE and Senator BILL NELSON and other Senators from coastal States and I intend to do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Energy bill. Before starting my remarks, I want to once again thank Senator DOMENICI and Ranking Member BINGAMAN for their excellent work on this bill for the last 5 months. It is a source of great pride for me to see my two neighbors from the South, from the Land of Enchantment, working so well together on such an important issue.

I also want to reiterate my thanks to their key staff, Alex Flint, Judy Pensabene, Lisa Epifani, Bob Simon, and Sam Fowler. Without the work of the staff, we would not have gotten to the point in this legislation where we are today.

I also want to congratulate Senator BINGAMAN and his staff on their successful inclusion of the RPS amendment. They have done this Nation a great favor.

The Nation has a real problem. When I look at the issues that face America today, I believe the two most significant domestic issues facing America, America's families and America's businesses are health care and the energy crisis of America. Today, this Chamber is addressing the challenge of energy.

The problem can be described in lots of different ways, but it is, in fact, an

emergency. In the 1970s, our Nation imported about one-third of our oil needs. Many of us still remember then-President Jimmy Carter talking about the OPEC oil embargo and talking about the energy independence of America being the moral equivalent of war. Yet, since that time during the last 30 years, we have seen continuing reliance and dependence on foreign oil so that today 58 percent of the oil we need is being imported. By 2020, we will be importing 70 percent more of our oil. America today consumes one-quarter of the world's oil supplies but has only 3 percent of the global reserves. Currently, OPEC member countries produce about 40 percent of the world's oil and hold 80 percent of the proven global reserves, and 85 percent of those reserves are in the greater Middle East, including countries that are not particularly friendly to the United States: Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia.

Twenty-two percent of the world's oil is in the hands of state sponsors of terrorism and under U.S./U.N. sanctions, and only 9 percent of the world's oil is in the hands of countries ranked "free."

We are importing more oil at a time when other growing nations continue to increase their imports of oil, including China, which is exponentially increasing its oil demand and imports. China's oil imports were up 30 percent from the previous year, making it the world's No. 2 petroleum consumer only after the United States, and there is no end in sight in terms of how this nation of 1.3 billion people will continue to import oil from other places around the world.

Experts predict China's large and rapidly growing demand for oil will have serious implications for United States oil prices and supplies. Fully one-quarter of the U.S. trade deficit today is associated with oil imports, and as we have continued to grow on our overreliance on foreign oil, it is incredible for me to take a look at the statistics with respect to American vehicles. American vehicles today get fewer miles per gallon than they did in 1988.

What that tells us is this Nation has not taken the energy crisis we currently have in a series enough fashion. It is an imperative for us to do so, and this energy bill we are considering today in the Senate is part of our response to try to make sure we live up to the challenges we face in America today.

In my view, the answer to the energy crisis we face is that we must do everything we can to set America free from its overdependence on the importation of foreign oil. Indeed, leading American conservatives and progressive organizations, both Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike, have come forward with a concern about the security and economic implications of America's growing dependence on foreign oil. These groups have formed a coalition called Set America Free. We

should embrace the Set America Free agenda as an imperative for America for energy independence and security.

Since most of the oil and the overwhelming source of known oil reserves lie in one specific region of the world, the Middle East, our national security is held hostage to the whims of despotic or increasingly unstable regions. Ominously, the money we pay for foreign oil helps pay for the activities of extremists and terrorists who hate the United States and the West in general. We need only to recall the horrors of 9/11 to know this hatred is real. Even worse, the money pit grows deeper because as the world consumes more oil, that oil becomes more expensive and the money that keeps some of those regimes in place gets more and more concentrated. So America is held hostage in a tighter and tighter grip. There is only one way for us to fix this. America must embrace an imperative of energy independence and security. We have to set America free.

This energy bill, which is a bipartisan bill, is a good first step. This energy bill that is before the Senate takes some very important steps: an important step in energy conservation, which means we will do more with what we have; an important step in embracing a new ethic of renewable energy for the 21st century, which will help us grow our own energy resources in our country; an important step in developing new technologies that will help us address the energy demands of our Nation and, also importantly, balanced development of existing fuel supplies. These are important steps to lead us to the goal of energy independence and security.

I want to review each of those steps briefly. First, conservation. Energy efficiency is the cheapest, cleanest, and quickest way for our country to extend its energy supplies and to begin to tackle the alarming increases in energy prices we have witnessed in the past few years.

This is far cheaper than any other form of energy, and for a good reason. Energy efficiency is not subject to transmission losses, and it is not subject to fluctuations in the price of fossil fuels or the availability of a renewable resource.

The Energy bill contains a number of very good provisions for conservation. It establishes requirements for energy and water savings in congressional buildings so that we in Congress can tell the rest of the Nation that we also will walk the walk on conservation. It establishes new conservation goals on energy measurement and accountability standards for Federal buildings and agencies all over the country. This is significant, for one of the Nation's largest if not the largest landlords is the Federal Government.

It extends the energy savings performance contracts, ESPCs, for 10 years. These contracts are an excellent mechanism by which the Federal Government is guaranteed to save money

and save energy, savings that can be passed on directly to the taxpayers of America.

The program provides private financing of energy-saving improvements for Federal buildings.

The Senate Energy bill also authorizes or extends energy assistance for State programs, such as weatherization assistance, energy-efficient appliance rebate programs, and grants to States and local governments to create more energy-efficient buildings.

The Senate Energy bill also sets energy efficiency standards for exit signs, for lamps, certain transformers, traffic signals, heaters, lamps, refrigerators and freezers, air conditioners, washing machines, dehumidifiers, commercial ice makers, pedestrian signals, mercury vapor light ballasts, and pre-rinse spray valves. The energy portions of this legislation are a strong indication of the direction in which this country has to head, and that is to be more efficient with the fuel resources that are available for us.

Second, renewable energy—renewable energy is a great opportunity for the United States of America in the 21st century. Nothing is more important in this bill than its call for increased use of renewable energy. I am particularly proud of the people of Lamar, CO. Their efforts to produce clean, renewable energy are a great service to the entire Front Range of Colorado. The efforts in Lamar literally keep the lights on.

This morning, in our Denver Post in Colorado, they talked about the town's efforts to make their voices heard on the Senate floor. I assure you, Mr. President, and all of the people in Lamar, we hear you, and we thank you for your support for renewable energy.

The Energy bill directs the Secretary of Energy to compile a detailed inventory of the Nation's renewable energy resources and also establishes a renewable fuels standard. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the renewable fuels standard provision of the Senate Energy bill.

This amendment calls for 8 billion gallons of ethanol and biodiesel to be produced in America by 2012. This amendment is good for America and good for the environment.

Growing our own transportation fuels directly reduces our dependence on foreign oil. It not only reduces our dependence on foreign oil now, it promises to reduce our imports even more in the near future. The production and use of 8 billion gallons of ethanol and biodiesel by 2012 will displace more than 2 billion barrels of crude oil, and it will reduce the outflow of dollars to foreign oil producers by more than \$60 billion.

An important provision of this renewable fuel standard is that it provides incentives for the development of cellulosic ethanol. Current methods of producing ethanol have an energy return of about 35 percent, but cellulosic ethanol, which will soon become economically feasible, will provide as

much as 500 percent energy return. And once we are at that point, we will be on the edge of a brand new frontier for domestic biofuel production.

Finally, ethanol and biodiesel are good for the environment. Net carbon dioxide emissions from biofuels are lower than from fossil fuels, because the carbon released during combustion was taken out of the air by the agricultural crops in the first place.

Ethanol and biodiesel are both young industries in Colorado, but I believe that these biofuels are essential to our energy future, and the farmers of Colorado believe that they are a key component of that future. And truth be told, I simply like the idea of growing and harvesting our transportation fuels. It seems to me that this is a true way forward for America.

Third, Technology. The energy bill also includes provisions for the development of Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle plants—IGCC, commonly referred to as gasification. Using this technology, we can extract energy from coal in a much more environmentally responsible way than the pulverized coal plants in use today. IGCC significantly reduces mercury, sulfur, and nitrogen oxide pollution. It uses our most abundant natural resource—coal. And it can be used to fake a synthetic natural gas, which means coal can help drive down the price of natural gas. IGCC can also be used to make fertilizer—fertilizer is normally made from natural gas. The fertilizer industry has been shutting its doors in America, and fertilizer prices have been going up ever since our natural gas prices became so high. IGCC also offers modest gains in efficiency today, and the potential for great gains tomorrow. I think that the steps the energy bill takes towards developing IGCC are good ones. And it comes at a crucial time.

Although the bill contains good provisions to move forward with gasification for electrical energy production, it does not yet have the necessary incentives for reducing gasoline consumption by motor vehicles.

There are about 800 million cars in active use worldwide. By 2050, as cars become more common in China and India, it will be 3.25 billion.

In America alone, two-thirds of U.S. oil consumption is due to the transportation sector.

These two facts alone tell us that we need greater fuel economy.

I do not believe we are doing enough to promote vehicle fuel economy.

The Energy Future Coalition and Set America Free are promoting the idea of a plug-in, hybrid car that gets 500 miles per gallon. Unless you are a multimillionaire, I imagine you—most consumers in America—would go for cars that can go 70, 100—500 miles on a gallon of gas. As revolutionary as it sounds, consider that a significant portion of American driving is done over short distances to and from the store or to and from work. With shorter trips

powered purely by electrical batteries, the amount of gasoline conserved in America would increase significantly.

This kind of out-of-the-box thinking, combined with solid technological underpinnings, is exactly what America needs to move us forward.

Already a hybrid plug-in car has been demonstrated at over 100 miles per gallon, nearly 4 times our current national fuel economy. Five hundred miles per gallon is a lofty goal, no doubt. But only by setting high standards can we achieve great results and see progress soar.

Let me address balanced development and non-traditional sources of energy in the bill. To pursue energy independence, we must also work to develop our own natural resources. But this development must be done in a balanced and responsible way.

Over the past 2 decades the Rocky Mountain West, including my State of Colorado, has experienced an incredible boom in natural gas exploration and production. This activity has been centered in Western Colorado, also known as the Western Slope.

The exploration and production taking place on the Western Slope is on public lands as well as private lands. With over 60 drilling rigs operating in our state this month—as many as Wyoming—there is tremendous pressure on our local land and communities.

Responsible development, balanced development, means that some places are simply not appropriate for drilling or exploration. Some places are too pristine to allow the potential environmental damage that comes with fossil fuel development. In Colorado, we have the unique Roan plateau, and I do not believe the top of the Plateau should be opened for drilling.

Colorado is also home to the world's best deposits of Oil Shale from which unconventional oil can be derived. Estimates are that over one trillion barrels of unconventional oil could be recovered from the oil shale in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Even a fraction of that amount would be an important contribution to what must be a national priority: lessening our dependence on foreign oil.

Oil shale development has failed in the past due to technical, environmental and economic problems. If we are to successfully develop oil shale we must follow the principle of sustainability; a marathon, not a sprint. Sustainability will focus on the long-term development of oil shale. The development must take place in cooperation with States and local communities. The development must be based on sound economics. We must make sure we have developed oil shale in an environmentally responsible manner.

I am cautiously optimistic that the future of oil shale will include its contribution to lessening the dangerous dependence of the United States on foreign oil. If we do not rise to meet this opportunity, we will only have ourselves to blame when in the years

ahead we look back and wonder what we might have done better to set America free.

There is a component of the energy challenge we face which must be addressed and on which there will be further dialog in this Senate in the days ahead, and that is the issue of climate change. Climate change is happening. The scientists of America agree that climate change is here and that we must address it. The business community of America comes together with companies such as DuPont and GE. They say we must address this issue. As we move forward in the days ahead to complete our work on the energy legislation, it is my hope that we include provisions that address the issue of carbon emissions and global warming.

In conclusion, let me say that when I think back to the greatest generation of time, just like many of my colleagues in this Senate, I think back to my father and my mother, part of that "greatest generation" of World War II, where they knew that anything was possible in America and no challenge was too high or too steep to climb as an American nation. That was truly the unique spirit of the American people.

Today, when we face the crisis we are in with our overdependence on foreign oil and our energy crisis, it requires the same kind of spirit we saw in that generation of World War II. It requires the kind of leadership and courage we saw with people such as Abraham Lincoln, who staked the life of the Nation over the Civil War and resulted in the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments and forever changed our Nation. It requires the leadership and vision and courage of someone such as Franklin Roosevelt, who could lead us through the Depression and prepare us to win World War II. It requires the leadership of people such as John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who said that we could reach the Moon and we could do it within 10 years. That is the kind of boldness we need in this energy legislation to make sure we get rid of our overdependence on foreign oil and that we set America free, not only for our generation but for generations to come.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Colorado for his remarks on energy and for his work on the Energy Committee this year.

The Senator from Colorado is new to the Senate. I have not been here that long myself, but it is refreshing to see him here. I loved it when someone asked, How long have you been in the United States—12 generations or 13?

Mr. SALAZAR. We were here before the United States was here, so 407 years ago.

Mr. ALEXANDER. So he has the longest lineage—his family does, I believe—of anyone in the territory we now call the United States of America.

He has made a terrific contribution on energy. I appreciate his remarks.

We have come a long way in our work on energy over the last couple of years, and while we still have some important differences of opinion—we saw some of those expressed today—they are differences of emphasis, important differences of emphasis. I don't want to minimize that. For my part, I see us moving toward a different way of thinking about how we produce energy in this country. We have gone from having the lowest natural gas prices in the world to the highest. Gasoline prices are too high. We see that despite all of our efforts to reduce our use of oil, we are still importing more oil than we should. So we need to do things differently.

My formula for doing that is largely representative of the bill that was reported 21 to 1. First, conservation and efficiency. I heard the Senator talk about that. Second, new supplies of natural gas, as well as oil try to get the price of natural gas down for farmers, for homeowners, and for businesses. To do that, unfortunately, we will have to import liquefied natural gas for the next few years. Otherwise, we will be exporting jobs. We can either import some gas or export the jobs, one or the other—that is going to be our choice—so we have an adequate and substantial supply of low-cost American-produced clean energy. We then need to aggressively move on nuclear power, and we aggressively need to—and I believe there is a consensus on this—we aggressively need to explore the best technology for clean coal gasification and to make that work best to see if we can find a way to capture the carbon that is produced and put it in the ground. If we are able to do that, we then will have enough clean energy to run this economy and keep our jobs here as well as set an environmentally good example for the rest of the world. I hope that is the path we are on.

I salute the Senator for his contributions.

Mr. SALAZAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Of course.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I wish to provide a note of commendation for the junior Senator from Tennessee. We have long known his work as Governor of Tennessee, where he worked hard on behalf of land and water issues. It was through his leadership and the leadership of both Democrat and Republican colleagues on the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee that we were able to accomplish what is only seldom done in Washington, DC; that is, the production of a bipartisan piece of legislation that is a very good beginning for energy policy framework for the 21st century. I acknowledge the great contributions to that effort on the part of Senator ALEXANDER and all the members of the Energy Committee.

I thank the Senator.
I yield the floor.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I first thank Chairman DOMENICI and the ranking member, Senator BINGAMAN, as well as both of their staffs on the Energy Committee for all of their hard work on preparing an energy bill. Their leadership has allowed the Senate to come together to develop a comprehensive energy policy that is paramount to our Nation's future national and economic security.

With reservation on some issues, I supported the Energy Committee bill.

I rise today to speak about one of those particular issues—one of great importance to the people of New Jersey—the threat of oil and gas drilling off the coast of New Jersey's 127 miles of shore.

All of my colleagues heard Senator NELSON and Senator MARTINEZ speak on the floor this week about Florida's treasured coasts and how important it is to Florida's environment and economy that its coasts be protected from any weakening of the moratoria on drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf.

My colleagues from Florida should take every step necessary to protect their beaches and coastal waters. As a Senator from a coastal State where tourism is the second largest industry, I, too, will take every step necessary to protect the Jersey shore from any effort to weaken the longstanding bipartisan moratoria on drilling in the OCS.

As I understand it, the chairman and ranking member have both agreed to oppose any amendments that would open up the OCS moratoria in the submerged lands off of Florida's coast.

I am, of course, opposed to any such exemptions from the moratoria, so I am pleased that both Senator DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN have also taken that position.

That being said, I find it more than a little disconcerting that the rest of the moratoria on the OCS still remain vulnerable to similar amendments that seek to weaken or destroy the moratoria.

As you may know, protecting the OCS moratoria has been a priority of mine since my tenure began in the Senate.

Along with Senator LAUTENBERG, I introduced the Clean Ocean and Safe Tourism Anti Drilling Act, COAST, in the 107th, 108th and 109th Congresses. This bill would make permanent the moratoria on OCS drilling in the Mid- and North Atlantic planning areas.

I know with certainty the people of New Jersey do not want to see oil and gas rigs off of our coast. As one of the fastest growing regions in the most densely populated State in the country, the New Jersey shore relies on the beauty and cleanliness of its beaches and the protection of its fishing grounds for a huge part of our State's revenue.

The New Jersey Department of Commerce calculates tourism alone generates more than \$31 billion in spending, directly and indirectly supports more than 836,000 jobs, more than 20

percent of total State employment, generates more than \$16.6 billion in wages, and brings in more than \$5.5 billion in tax revenues to the State.

Any drilling or even the threat of drilling poses a real threat to New Jersey's environment, economy, and way of life. Remember, New Jersey is a State that already holds its own in supporting energy production and refining for the Nation.

We have three nuclear power plants, many traditional power plants, support siting of an LNG terminal, and we are debating wind alternatives. And New Jersey is the East Coast hub for oil refining. We are growing our energy businesses. But risking and exploiting our shore is a step too far.

I am not the only Senator who has concerns about the amendments to this energy bill that would weaken the OCS moratoria. I have been in contact with many coastal State Senators who agree that this bill must not include any provisions that undermine the moratoria.

My concern is reinforced by the inventory provision already included in the underlying bill. I am strongly opposed to this provision and voted against it during committee markup.

I consider this provision a step onto a slippery slope toward the eventual drilling off the New Jersey coast and other areas currently under the OCS moratoria and possibly exposing our beaches and fisheries to unnecessary risks from adjacent locals.

Give the minimal benefit and significant downside of drilling off the coast of New Jersey, I do not believe it is worth threatening over 800,000 New Jersey jobs to recover what the Minerals Management Service estimated in 2000 to be 196 million barrels of oil, only enough to last the country barely 10 days and 2.7 trillion cubic feet of natural gas for the entire Mid-Atlantic region.

This level of estimated production can in no way be justified.

In comparison, areas off the Gulf of Mexico already open to drilling contain 18.9 billion barrels of oil and 258.3 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

There are other amendments being floated about which cause even greater concerns with regard to weakening the moratoria. One of these potential amendments would allow States to opt out of the moratoria.

Allowing States to opt out of the moratoria could be detrimental to a State's neighbors—an issue Florida has long understood and argued.

New Jersey's coastline is very close in proximity to other States' coasts.

Tides move across State borders. Fisheries and fish don't recognize State borders. New Jerseyans have more than ample reason to be concerned if a nearby State decided to opt out of the moratoria and allow drilling off its coast.

As you can see, we appear dangerously close to the beginning of the breakup of the OCS moratoria. This should not occur, and I am prepared to fight any amendment promoting a

weakening of the moratoria. These actions are as threatening to New Jersey's economy as killing ethanol is for corn growing States.

I am also prepared to fight any amendment that would provide a revenue-sharing incentive for States to opt out of the moratoria. There is much that is good in this bill and many good amendments to be considered, especially those offered by Senator CANTWELL and Senator BINGAMAN.

I have a bipartisan, bicameral Dear Colleague letter from the New Jersey delegation expressing our concern with the inventory included in this bill, as well as these moratoria-threatening amendments I have been discussing. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 13, 2005

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We are writing to express our strong opposition to a provision in the Senate Energy Bill that directs the Department of Interior to inventory all potential oil and natural gas resources in the entire Outer Continental Shelf, including areas off of the New Jersey coast.

This provision runs directly counter to language that Congress has included annually in appropriations bills to prevent leasing, pre-leasing, and related activities in most areas of the Outer Continental Shelf.

Since 1982, a statutory moratorium on leasing activities in most Outer Continental Shelf, OCS, areas has been included annually in Interior Appropriations acts. In addition, President George H.W. Bush declared a leasing moratorium on many OCS areas on June 26, 1990 under Section 12 of the OCS Lands Act. On June 12, 1998, President Clinton used the same authority to issue a memorandum to the Secretary of the Interior that extended the moratorium through 2012 and included additional OCS areas.

In addition, this provision in the Energy Bill would allow the use of seismic surveys, dart core sampling, and other exploration technologies, all of which would leave these areas vulnerable to oil spills, drilling discharges and damage to coastal wetlands.

The people of New Jersey, and other residents of States along the Atlantic Coast, do not want oil or gas rigs anywhere near their treasured beaches and fishing grounds. Such drilling poses serious threats not only to our environment, but to our economy, which depends heavily on tourism along our shore. Coastal tourism is New Jersey's second-largest industry, and the New Jersey Shore is one of the fastest-growing regions in the country. According to the New Jersey Department of Commerce, tourism in the Garden State generates more than \$31 billion in spending, directly and indirectly supports more than 836,000 jobs, more than 20 percent of total state employment, generates more than \$16.6 billion in wages, and brings in more than \$5.5 billion in tax revenues to the state.

Considering the minimal benefit and significant downside of drilling off the coast of New Jersey, we do not believe it is worth threatening over 800,000 New Jersey jobs to recover what the Minerals Management Service (MMS) estimated in 2000 to be 196 million barrels of oil, only enough to last the country barely ten days. The MMS also estimated a mean of only 2.7 trillion cubic feet of natural gas for the entire Mid-Atlantic region. In comparison, areas of the Gulf of

Mexico already open to drilling contain 18.9 billion-barrels of oil and 258.3 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

In addition, we will also work to fight against any provision that would allow states to opt out of the OCS moratorium. If a state chooses to opt out of the moratorium, it would be impossible for nearby states to protect their coasts from accidents that could happen as a result of drilling.

We will take every step to oppose any provision that would weaken the OCS moratorium. We ask you to join us in our effort to protect our nation's precious coastlines, marine ecosystems and ocean waters.

Sincerely,

Jon Corzine, Frank B. Lautenberg, Frank Pallone, Jr., Frank A. LoBiondo, Jim Saxton, Robert Menendez, Donald M. Payne, Steven R. Rothman, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Robert E. Andrews, Rush Holt, Chris Smith, Mike Ferguson, and R.P. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I am also circulating a letter that has already been signed by many coastal Senators and I expect will be signed by additional Senators that expresses our firm resolve that any amendments that threaten the OCS moratoria in any way is unacceptable.

Finally, I have a bipartisan letter here signed by over 100 Members of the House of Representatives stating their strong support for the current legislative moratorium on new mineral leasing activity on submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2005

Hon. CHARLES TAYLOR,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior and Environment, Committee on Appropriations, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC

Hon. NORM DICKS,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Interior and Environment, Committee on Appropriations, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC

DEAR CHAIRMAN TAYLOR AND RANKING MEMBER DICKS: We are writing to express our strong support for the longstanding bipartisan legislative moratorium on new mineral leasing activity on submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). We are deeply appreciative of the leadership your Subcommittee has shown on this issue over the years and hope to work with you this year to continue this vital protection.

The legislative moratorium language prohibits the use of federal funds for offshore leasing, pre-leasing and other oil and gas drilling-related activities in moratoria areas, enhancing protection of these areas from offshore oil and gas development. As you know, in 1990 President George H.W. Bush signed an executive memorandum placing a ten-year moratorium on new leasing on the OCS. In 1998, this moratorium was renewed by President Bill Clinton and extended until 2012. As you know, President George W. Bush endorsed the moratorium in his 2006 budget. These actions have all been met with public acclaim and as necessary steps to preserve the economic and environmental value of our nation's coasts.

With a renewed interest in developing natural gas and oil on the OCS, we believe it is again imperative for Congress to reaffirm its

authority on this issue. Therefore, we respectfully urge you to include the OCS moratorium language in the fiscal year 2006 Interior and Environment Appropriations legislation. Specifically, we ask you to use the language in Sections 107, 108 and 109, Division E, Department of the Interior and Related Agencies of the fiscal year 2005 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 108-447). These sections restrict oil and gas activities within the OCS in the Georges Bank-North Atlantic planning area, Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic planning area, Eastern Gulf of Mexico planning area, Northern, Southern and Central California planning areas, and Washington and Oregon planning area.

Once again, we encourage the Subcommittee to support these important provisions, which represent over 20 years of bipartisan agreement on the importance of protecting the environmentally and economically valuable coastal areas of the United States. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Lois Capps, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Jeff Miller, Jim Davis, Michael Michaud, Madeleine Bordallo, Ginny Brown-Waite, Jay Inslee, Frank LoBiondo, Rob Simmons, Mark Foley, Jim Langevin, Ed Case, Jim McGovern, Sherrod Brown, Chris Smith, Dennis Cardoza, Frank Pallone, Jr., G.K. Butterfield, Tom Feeney.

Pete Stark, Robert Wexler, Anna Eshoo, Zoe Lofgren, Katherine Harris, Jerry Nadler, Carolyn Maloney, Alcee Hastings, Mike Honda, Hilda Solis, Grace Napolitano, Mark Kennedy, Brian Baird, Susan Davis, Sam Farr, Clay Shaw, Christopher Shays, Rush Holt, Betty McCollum, Ellen Tauscher.

Barbara Lee, Dennis Moore, Raúl Grijalva, Chris Van Hollen, Rahm Emanuel, Nick Rahall, Loretta Sánchez, Tom Allen, Anthony Weiner, Jan Schakowsky, Brad Sherman, Jim McDermott, Kendrick Meek, Bob Etheridge, Dale Kildee, George Miller, Donald Payne, Tom Lantos, Earl Blumenauer, Maxine Waters.

Wayne Gilchrest, Rosa DeLauro, Nancy Pelosi, Richard Neal, Dennis Kucinich, Ed Markey, Henry Waxman, Michael McNulty, Michael Bilirakis, Jane Harman, Bart Stupak, Robert Menendez, Barney Frank, Lynn Woolsey, Luis Gutierrez, Jim Saxton, Lehtinen, William Delahunt, Peter DeFazio, Mike Thompson,

Juanita Millender-McDonald, David Wu, Carolyn Maloney, Bob Filner, Mario Diaz-Balart, Robert Andrews, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Xavier Becerra, Howard Berman, Walter Jones, Connie Mack, Rep. Diane Watson, Doris Matsui, Linda Sánchez, Debbie Wasserman-Schultz, Ric Keller, Adam Schiff, Corrine Brown, Jim Costa, Joe Baca, Bill Pascrell, and Eliot Engel.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, these letters indicate the bipartisan, bicameral support to protect the current OCS moratoria. Moving in the direction of ending the moratoria will bring unnecessary opposition to the overall objective.

Residents of coastal States should not have to fear the specter of oil rigs off their beaches. Again, I thank the Chair and ranking member for their leadership on the bill, and I look forward to working with them. I hope they will join me in protecting our precious coastlines.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted after I speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. I also ask unanimous consent that I may bring in a few boxes of regulations about which I am going to speak on higher education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. ALEXANDER pertaining to the introduction of S. 1261 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

WOMEN IN IRAN

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, a big event is taking place in another country tomorrow. The Iranian elections are going to take place for the presidency and leadership in Iran. This is a bogus election. The people of Iran are not having a fair choice. A number of people are calling for a boycott of elections in Iran, which is unusual for us but not for them, because the whole slate of those who have been nominated has been selected by the ruling council of Iran.

If you were even going to be on the ballot, you had to have been selected by the ruling council. So there may be eight people running for president; some have dropped out, others added in. They all had to be appointed, actually, to be candidates.

I wanted to draw this point to the body that there is not just a nuclear crisis going on in Iran; there is a human crisis that is taking place in that country. These elections that will be reported on are not elections. They are appointments that are taking place. It is in many respects a fairly porous society, and yet there are severe restrictions placed on freedom of speech, on press, assembly, association, and religion.

The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom has concluded that "the government of Iran engages in or tolerates systematic, ongoing, and egregious violations of religious freedom, including prolonged detention and executions based primarily or entirely upon religion of the accused." I just met with members of the Ba'hai faith who talked about the severe persecution of the Ba'hai in Iran.

But the specific item I wanted to point out even prior to this election is the gender apartheid that takes place in Iran. I received this recently from the Alliance for Iranian Women.

The State Department has reported that the testimony of a woman in Iran is worth half that of a man in court. The blood money paid to the family of

a female crime victim is half the sum paid for a man. A married woman must obtain the written consent of her husband before traveling outside the country.

In his book, Ayatollah Khomeini requires that young girls should be married before they reach the age of puberty. A woman does not have the right to divorce her husband, but a man can divorce his wife anytime he wishes and without her knowledge. A man is allowed to marry four wives and have as many temporary wives as he wants and may end the contract at any time with a temporary wife on a temporary marriage. Temporary marriage is often viewed as the Islamic Republic's way of sanctioning male promiscuity outside of marriage. Mothers do not get custody of their children when husbands divorce them. A widow does not get the custody of her children after the death of her husband. The children will be given to the parental grandparents, and the mother has no right to visitation. If the husband has no family, the mullah of the community takes custody of the child. Daughters get half the inheritance than that of their sons.

I point this gender apartheid out because when I heard about it, I was stunned. I wanted other Members of the body to realize this is taking place.

The greater focus of what is taking place in Iran has been primarily on nuclear weapons development. But there is a humanitarian and a human crisis and certainly a human rights crisis in that country.

I have come here shortly before the Iranian presidential elections. These elections hold no hope of change for the people of Iran. They are elections that will be boycotted and protested, and they are elections that have been manipulated by the supreme leader and the council of guardians. Just last week women in Iran staged a sit-in to protest the disqualification of women from running in the elections.

The people of Iran want change. That change will not come through these elections. But it will come through internal, strong demonstrations, and it will come through strong international support for the very people who protest and boycott these elections.

Iran has a young and vibrant base that, with the support of the international community, could promote major change in Iran and the region. I encourage the Iranian-American community to unite, build strong coalitions to further promote democracy and fundamental respect for human rights in Iran. I encourage this body to support democracy building, civil society building in and for Iran.

I encourage other Members to continue to speak up on behalf of the oppressed in Iran and voice strong support for the people who so desperately want to see democracy flourish.

This is a key issue and a timely one. These elections are taking place soon. People need to know this is a bogus set of elections.