

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

we had a bus retrofit. We are talking about 85 percent reduction. The diesel fuel is fine, but if you do not have the retrofit, it will not give you the desired emissions control.

AMENDMENT NO. 800

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1936 to provide energy tax incentives, and for other purposes)

Mr. DOMENICI. On behalf of the leader, we have cleared the amendment at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside. I further ask that the Grassley-Baucus amendment No. 800 which is at the desk be considered and agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

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

The amendment (No. 800) was agreed to.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I strongly support the Finance Committee's energy tax language.

Why are the incentives proposed in this language so important? First and foremost, they are important because of the energy challenges facing the Nation.

Energy is critical to our Nation's economy and security. Our continuing dependence on foreign oil increasingly threatens our vital national interests.

As the world's demand for oil continues to grow at a record pace, the world's oil producers strain to meet consumption. Today, OPEC is pumping close to full capacity. Even so, refined products remain scarce.

The price of oil has soared to more than \$55 a barrel. The price of gas at the pump is a daily reminder of the scarcity of energy. Increasing energy prices stifle economic growth.

Folks in my home State of Montana are hit hard by rising energy prices. High gas prices particularly hurt folks who have to drive great distances. And high energy prices hurt small businesses, ranchers, and farmers by raising the costs of doing business.

We can do more to provide reliable energy from domestic sources. That is our first challenge.

Our next great energy challenge is to ensure safe, clean, and affordable energy from renewable resources. Energy produced from wind, water, sun, and waste holds great potential. But that energy cannot currently meet our national energy demands. Technology is helping to bridge the gap. But further development requires financial assistance.

The energy tax incentives take an evenhanded approach to an array of promising technologies. We do not yet know which new technologies will prove to be the most effective. As we go forward and provide the needed incentives to develop these new technologies, we also need appropriate cost-benefit assessments to guide future investments.

The energy tax language reflects the incentives endorsed by the Finance Committee last Thursday. These incentives make meaningful progress toward energy independence. They provide a balanced package of targeted incentives directed to renewable energy, traditional energy production, and energy efficiency.

These incentives would encourage new energy production, especially production from renewable sources.

They would encourage the development of new technology.

And they would encourage energy efficiency and conservation.

To encourage production, the tax language provides a uniform 10-year period for claiming production tax credits under section 45 of the Tax Code. This encourages production of electricity from all sources of renewable energy. It would not benefit one technology over another.

In Judith Gap, MT, wind whips across the wheat plains. Wind is a great and promising resource in Montana. But future development of wind projects needs support, like that provided in the tax language.

The tax language recognizes the value of coal and oil to our economy. It provides tax incentives for cleaner-burning coal and much-needed expansion of refinery capacity.

The lack of refinery capacity is driving up the price of oil. And our lack of domestic capacity increases our vulnerabilities. A new refinery has not been built in the U.S. since 1976. The tax language would encourage the development of additional refinery capacity domestically by allowing the development costs to be expensed.

The tax language also rewards energy conservation and efficiency, and encourages the use of clean-fuel vehicles and technologies. It provides an investment tax credit for recycling equipment. These incentives are environmentally responsible. They reduce pollution. And they improve people's health.

The energy tax provisions would make meaningful progress toward energy independence. They are balanced and fair. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield the floor.

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

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF JOHN ROBERT BOLTON TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 103, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John Robert Bolton, of Maryland, to be Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 6 p.m. shall be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, today the Senate again takes up the nomination of John Bolton to be U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. This nomination has traveled a long road. I am hopeful that we can conclude the debate today.

I appreciate that several of my colleagues continue to be dissatisfied that their requests for information have not been granted in their entirety. Under the rules, clearly they can continue to block this nomination as long as 60 Senators do not vote for cloture. Although I acknowledge their deeply held opposition to this nominee, we urgently need an ambassador at the United Nations. A clear majority of Senators is in favor of confirming Secretary Bolton.

The President has stated repeatedly that this is not a casual appointment. He and Secretary Rice want a specific person to do a specific job. They have said that they want John Bolton, an avowed and knowledgeable reformer, to carry out their reform agenda at the United Nations.

Regardless of how each Senator plans to vote today, we should not lose sight of the larger national security issues concerning U.N. reform and international diplomacy that are central to this nomination. We should recall that U.N. reform is an imperative mission of the next ambassador. In fact, on Friday, our colleagues in the House of Representatives passed an extensive U.N. reform bill. This body is also working on various approaches to reform.

In 2005, we may have a unique opportunity to improve the operations of the U.N. The revelations of the oil-for-food scandal and the urgency of strengthening global cooperation to address terrorism, the AIDS crisis, nuclear proliferation, and many other international problems have created momentum in favor of constructive reforms at the U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan has proposed a substantial

reform plan that will provide a platform for reform initiatives and discussions.

Few people in Government have thought more about U.N. reform than John Bolton. He served 4 years as the Assistant Secretary of State overseeing international organizations under the first President Bush. He has written and commented extensively on the subject. During his confirmation hearing, Secretary Bolton demonstrated an impressive command of issues related to the United Nations. Senator BIDEN acknowledged to the nominee at his hearing that, "There is no question you have extensive experience in U.N. affairs." Deputy Secretary Rich Armitage has told reporters: "John Bolton is eminently qualified. He's one of the smartest guys in Washington."

This nomination has gone through many twists and turns. But now we are down to an issue of process. The premise expressed for holding up the nominee is that the Senate has the absolute right as a co-equal branch of Government to information that it requests pertaining to a nominee. Political scientists can debate whether this right actually is absolute, but there is a flaw in this premise as it applies to the Bolton nomination. This is that the Senate, as a body, has not asked for this information. The will of the Senate is expressed by the majority. A majority of Senators have voted to end debate. By that vote, a majority of Senators have said that they have the information they need to make a decision.

If Members are intent upon exercising their right to filibuster this nominee, they may do so. But they cannot claim that the Senate as an institution is being disadvantaged or denied information it is requesting when at least 57 Senators have supported cloture knowing that invoking it would lead to a final vote. Senate rules give 41 Senators the power to continue debate. But neither a filibuster nor a request from individual Senators counts as an expression of the will of the Senate.

Minds are made up on this nomination, as they have been for weeks. In fact, with few exceptions, minds have been made up on this nominee since before his hearing occurred. Nevertheless, the Foreign Relations Committee conducted an exhaustive investigation. I would remind my colleagues that Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee assented to every single witness that the minority wanted to interview. The cases for and against Secretary Bolton have been made extensively and skillfully. In the context of an 11-week investigation involving 29 witnesses and more than 1,000 pages of documents culminating in 14 hours of floor debate, the remaining process dispute over a small amount of information seems out of proportion. This is particularly the case given that the ostensible purpose of obtaining docu-

ments and interviewing witnesses is to help Senators make up their minds on how to vote.

If we accept the standard that any Senator should get whatever documents requested on any nominee despite the will of the Senate to move forward, then the nomination process has taken on nearly limitless parameters. Nomination investigations should not be without limits. It is easy to say that any inquiry into any suspicion is justified if we are pursuing the truth. But as Senators who are frequently called upon to pass judgment on nominees, we know reality is more complicated than that. We want to ensure that nominees are qualified, skilled, honest and open. Clearly, we should thoroughly examine each nominee's record. But in doing so, we should understand that there can be human and organizational costs if the inquiry is not focused and fair.

I reiterate that the President has tapped Secretary Bolton to undertake an urgent mission. Secretary Bolton has affirmed his commitment to fostering a strong United Nations. He has expressed his intent to work hard to secure greater international support at the U.N. for the national security and foreign policy objectives of the United States. He has stated his belief in decisive American leadership at the U.N. and underscored that an effective United Nations is very much in the interest of U.S. national security. I believe that the President deserves to have his nominee represent him at the United Nations. I urge my colleagues to invoke cloture.

Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I ask unanimous consent that quorum calls be charged equally to both sides.

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

The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I state at the outset that the vote we are about to take is not about John Bolton. The vote we are about to take is about taking a stand—about the Senate taking a stand. The vote is about whether the Senate will allow the President to dictate to a coequal branch of Government how we, the Senate, are to fulfill our constitutional responsibility under the advice and consent clause. It is that basic. I believe it is totally unacceptable for the President of the United States, Democrat or Republican—and both have tried—to dictate to the Senate how he, the President, thinks we should proceed.

The fact that the President of the United States in this case says he does not believe the information we seek is relevant to our fulfilling our constitutional responsibility is somewhat presumptuous, to say the least. I am aware—as we all are on both sides of the aisle—of the sometimes admirable but most times excessive obsession with secrecy on the part of this admin-

istration. But notwithstanding that, we should not forfeit our responsibility in order to accommodate that obsession.

I do not hold John Bolton accountable for this administration's arrogance. John Bolton was gentleman enough to come see me. At the request of the Senator from Arizona, Mr. McCAIN, who contacted me, I said I would be willing to sit with John Bolton last week and speak with him about what we were seeking and why we were seeking it. I did that. As a matter of fact, one of my colleagues, the Senator from Connecticut—although it wasn't his idea, and I caught him on the way to have dinner with his brother—was kind enough to come and sit with me and listen to John Bolton.

I believe Mr. Bolton would be prepared to give us this information. Whether that is true is, quite frankly, irrelevant, because the fact is we both told Mr. Bolton this dispute about the documents is not about him. I say to my colleague from Indiana, this is above his pay grade. He indicated under oath in our committee hearing that he was willing to let all of this information come forward. So I actually went to the extent of sitting with Mr. Bolton and suggesting how, as it related to a matter on which I have been the lead horse—on Syria—we could accommodate an even further narrowing and detailing of the information we are seeking and why.

Last month, after the Senate stood up for itself and rejected cloture on the Bolton nomination, the Democratic leader and I both promised publicly—and today I pledge again—that once the administration provides the information we have requested and information that no one thus far has suggested we are not entitled to—we will agree to vote up or down on the Bolton nomination.

At the outset, it should be emphasized that these are not—and I emphasize "not"—new requests made at the 11th hour to attempt to derail a vote. Nobody is moving goalposts anywhere except closer, not further away.

The committee made these requests, the same two requests, back in April. First, we requested materials relating to testimony on Syria and weapons of mass destruction prepared by Mr. Bolton and/or his staff in the summer and fall of 2003.

We already know from senior CIA officials that Mr. Bolton sought to stretch the intelligence that was available on Syria's WMD program well beyond what the intelligence would support.

We think the documents we are seeking will bolster the case that he repeatedly sought to exaggerate intelligence data. Some who are listening might say: Why is that important? Remember the context in the summer of 2003. In the summer of 2003, there were assertions being made in various press accounts and by some "outside" experts and some positing the possibility that

those weapons of mass destruction that turned out not to exist in Iraq had been smuggled into Syria and that Syria had its own robust weapons of mass destruction program.

Remember, people were speculating about “who is next?” Newspaper headlines and sub-headlines: Is Syria next? Syria was at the top of the list—not the only one on the list. There was speculation, as I said, that the weapons of mass destruction we could not find in Iraq had been smuggled into Syria.

We know, at that same time, the CIA says Mr. Bolton was trying to stretch—stretch—the intelligence case against Syria on weapons of mass destruction.

The Syrian documents may also raise questions as to whether Mr. Bolton, when he raised his hand and swore to tell the truth and nothing but the truth, in fact may not have done that because he told the Foreign Relations Committee that he was not in any way personally involved in preparing that testimony. The documents we seek would determine whether that was true or not. It may be true, but the documents will tell us.

Second, we have requested access to 10 National Security Agency intercepts. That means conversations picked up between a foreigner and an American, where they may have relevance to an intelligence inquiry and where the name of the foreigner is always listed, but it says speaking to “an American,” or an American representing an American entity.

Mr. Bolton acknowledged, under oath, that he had sought—which is not unusual in the sense that it has never happened, but it is noteworthy—he sought the identities of the Americans listed in 10 different intercepts.

When I asked him why he did that, he said intellectual curiosity and for context. It is not a surprise to say—and I am not revealing anything confidential; I have not seen those intercepts—that there have been assertions made by some to Members of the Senate and the staff members of the Senate that Mr. Bolton was seeking the names of these individuals for purposes of his intramural fights that were going on within the administration about the direction of American foreign policy. These requests resulted in Mr. Bolton being given the names of 19 different individuals. Nineteen identities of Americans or American companies were on those intercepts.

Mr. Bolton has seen these intercepts. Mr. Bolton’s staff has seen some of these intercepts, but not a single Senator has seen the identities of any of these Americans listed on the intercepts.

I might note, parenthetically, we suggested—I was reluctant to do it, but I agreed with the leader of my committee—that we would yield that responsibility to the chairman and vice chair of the Intelligence Committee. Later, the majority leader, in a genuine effort to try to resolve this issue, asked me what was needed. I said he

should ask for the names—not the chairman—he should ask for the names. He said he did, and he said they would not give him the names either.

It has been alleged, as I said, that Mr. Bolton has been spying on rivals within the bureaucracy, both inferior and superior to him. While I doubt this, as I said publicly before, we have a duty to be sure that he did not misuse this data.

The administration has argued that the Syrian testimony material is not relevant to our inquiry. I simply leave it by saying that is an outrageous assertion. The administration may not decide what the Senate needs in reviewing a nomination unless it claims Executive privilege or a constitutional prohibition of a violation of separation of power. As my grandfather and later my mother would say: Who died and left them boss? No rationale has been given for the testimony.

Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President: How much time have I consumed?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority has just under 18 minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I have two colleagues who wish to speak. I will be brief. We have narrowed the request of the documents. We narrowed them on several different occasions. I am grateful to Chairman ROBERTS and Director Negroponte for accepting the principle that they can cross-check names on the list we have with the list of names on the intercepts. But I hope everyone understands, as my friend from Connecticut will probably speak to, that in offering to provide a list of names, we were trying to make it easier. We were not trying to move the goalposts; we were trying to make it closer for them.

The bottom line is, it is very easy to get this resolved. It is not inappropriate for me to say that I had a very good conversation not only with Mr. Bolton but with Mr. Card, who indicated he was sure we could resolve the Syrian piece of this. I indicated from the beginning that was not sufficient. We had two requests for good reason: One relating to intercepts and one relating to the Syrian matter. The Syrian matter is within striking distance of being resolved. I said in good faith to him: Do not resolve that if you think that resolves the matter, unless you are ready to resolve the matter of the issue relating to Mr. Bolton and the intercepts.

Absent that material being made available, I urge my colleagues to reject cloture in the hope that the administration will finally step up to its constitutional responsibility of providing this information to us.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of the time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of actually voting on John Bolton’s nomination. I listened to my colleague’s arguments, and I listened to the studious and accurate

statement of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee regarding this long-debated, long-considered nomination.

The Senate has had this nomination for 5 months. Ambassador to the United Nations is a very important post. In fact, it is a very important position at this particular time, as democracy is on the march, as freedom is on the march throughout the world, whether in Lebanon, Iraq, Afghanistan, or elsewhere.

It is important also to note that even the United Nations recognizes that it is time for reform. It is vitally important that the taxpayers of this country, who put in \$2 billion every year into the United Nations, ought to have a man such as John Bolton leading our efforts. John Bolton is a reformer, and that is why the President nominated him.

The President was elected by the people of this country. A President needs to have the men and women he desires to effectuate his goals, his policies, and to keep the promises he made to the people of this country.

This nomination has been held up through obstructionist tactics. I am hopeful that my colleagues will review the thorough and extensive vetting process. I am hoping that they will actually take off their political blinders and look at this nomination, look at the record of performance, and look at all the evidence, all the charges, all the refutations, and look at the facts regarding Mr. Bolton.

I think it is highly irresponsible for the Senate to keep obstructing reform of the United Nations. And, Mr. President, that is what is happening. This obstruction of John Bolton’s nomination, while a political effort, I suppose, in some people’s point of view, clearly could be characterized as obstructing reform of the United Nations. Until we have our ambassador there with the strength and the support of the Senate and the people of this country, we do not have someone arguing for the American taxpayers, arguing for accountability, trying to stop the waste, the fraud, and the corruption in the United Nations.

We have gone through every germane argument and stretched allegation against John Bolton. Instead of talking about reforming the United Nations, we have been on a fishing expedition. Every time on this fishing expedition we end up seeing a dry hole.

First, there was concern about his general views in saying the United Nations needed to be reformed. Then the opposition recognized: Gosh, the American people also think the United Nations needs reforming.

Then there was a great fixation and focus on the drafting of speeches. And wasn’t that very interesting, how speeches are crafted?

Then there was a worry about the sensibilities of some people being offended by John Bolton.

Then there was a worry about a woman—I forgot where it was,

Kazakhstan or Moscow—that was refuted as not being a fact.

Then there was a concern about a speech that John Bolton gave where he said that North Korea was a repressive dictatorship and that it was a hellish nightmare to live in North Korea. That was supposedly terrible for him to say, when in fact that is a pretty good description of North Korea.

Then there were worries about Great Britain and what John Bolton might have done with Great Britain. Within hours our British friends said: No, we had no problems whatsoever.

Then the other side said: We want a list of names; we want to see a cross-check, that request got to Senator ROBERTS and Senator ROCKEFELLER, the chair and cochair on the Intelligence Committee.

Then there were a few names cross-checked. There was nothing new there. What comes up? Now we want 3 dozen names cross-checked as the fishing expedition continues.

Now there is a fixation, an interest in the crafting of testimony or a speech dealing with Syria.

It is just going to continue and continue. It does not matter what the answers are. It does not matter what the truth is. It does not matter about the facts. What they want to do, unfortunately, is ignore the dire need for reform in the United Nations. The opposition seems to want to completely ignore John Bolton's qualifications and outstanding record of performance for the people of this country.

John Bolton has played a significant role in negotiating a number of treaties that will result in reducing nuclear weapons, or keeping them from falling into the hands of rogue nations and terrorist organizations. His work on the Moscow Treaty will reduce by two-thirds operationally deployed nuclear weapons in both the United States and Russia.

John Bolton also led the U.S. negotiations to develop President Bush's Proliferation Security Initiative, which garnered the support of 60 countries. This Proliferation Security Initiative is an important security measure to stop the shipment of weapons of mass destruction, their delivery systems, and related materials worldwide.

John Bolton also helped create the global partnership at the G8 summit, which doubled the size of the non-proliferation effort in the former Soviet Union. By committing our G8 partners to match the \$1 billion-per-year cooperative threat reduction of the United States, or as we call it here, the Nunn-Lugar program. John Bolton also has proven that he can work well within the United Nations. He has previously served as Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations, where he worked intensively on U.N. issues, including the repealing of the offensive United Nations resolution which equated Zionism to racism. That is one of the reasons B'nai Brith supports his nomination.

John Bolton has the knowledge, the skills, the principles, and the experience to be an exceptional ambassador to the United Nations. He has the right, steady, and strong principles to lead the U.S. mission at a time when the United Nations is in desperate need of reform.

I believe the people of America do not want a lapdog as our ambassador to the United Nations, they want a watchdog. They want to make sure the billions of dollars we are sending to the United Nations is actually helping advance freedom; helping to build representative, fair, just, and free systems in countries that have long been repressed. It is absolutely absurd and farcical that countries such as Syria, Zimbabwe, or other repressive regimes are on the Human Rights Commission. Even the United Nations recognizes they need reform. So that is why the President has sent forth an individual, John Bolton, to bring this organization into account and reform it.

Whether it is fraud or corruption, this country does not think the United Nations ought to be placating or rewarding dictators and oppressive tyrants. We have heard many absurd arguments since the President has sent John Bolton's nomination to the Senate 5 months ago. What my colleagues will see as they look at each and every one of these charges as the process has dragged on, is that they are wild, they are unsubstantiated, or they have been proven false. Some claims against Mr. Bolton have even been retracted.

This nomination has been considered for a long time. Throughout, new charges have been made, and each time they do not stand up when placed in the accurate context or studied fully. They have been shown to be misleading, exaggerated, false, or irrelevant.

This is the definition of a fishing expedition, and its sole goal is to bring down a nominee because of differing policy views. Many of those are leading very articulately, even if I disagree with them, on the Bolton nomination. The five leading most senior members of the Foreign Relations Committee, who talked about speeches and offending sensibilities of people, they all were against Mr. Bolton in 2001 before any of these accusations arose. So this is just a continuation of that opposition.

I hope Senators the other side of the aisle who are refusing to bring this issue to a close would note what Chairman ROBERTS noted, that they seem to be intent on preserving John Bolton's nomination as a way to embarrass our President.

The President was elected by the people of America. It is logical and it is important that our CEO, our President, be accorded the ability to bring in and to lead our efforts consistent with his principles, with people who are loyal to those views, and who will effectuate those goals.

There is little question that one of the most fair chairmen in this entire

Senate is the Senator from Indiana, Mr. LUGAR. He has negotiated in good faith on this issue. Unfortunately, time after time some on the other side keep moving the goalpost. I know they do not like that term, but every time there is something answered, every time this gets ready for a vote, there is always a new allegation, a new request, something else to delay a vote on this nomination. Obstruction in this case, as in many others, has gone on for too long. It is time to vote on John Bolton's nomination. The continued delaying tactics can only be viewed as obstructionism for petty partisan reasons.

This nomination has received inordinate scrutiny and review. Yet opponents of voting up or down continue to demand even more information. This position has been vacant for 5 months, we need to have a conclusion. Mr. Bolton has an exemplary career in public service. The extensive oversight that the Senate has undertaken in considering this nomination means that Senators ought to have the guts to get out of these cushy seats and vote yes or vote no. Anyone who votes to continue to obstruct this nomination can be fairly characterized as delaying and obstructing the much needed, reforms in the United Nations. And it is also contrary to the will of the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I will cast my vote today in opposition to ending the debate on the nomination of John Bolton to be the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

I am distressed the administration has not provided the Congress with the documents it has requested that are essential for judging the quality of Mr. Bolton's performance in his past positions. When the President sends the Congress a request for approval of a nominee for a top position, the President must be prepared to assist Congress in a thorough inspection of that individual's prior Government service. Withholding information needed by Congress, even classified information that can be handled in a secure fashion, is detrimental to the successful functioning of our Government. The administration's full cooperation with Congress is not optional, but essential.

If Mr. Bolton's nomination comes to the full Senate for a vote, I plan to vote no. I do not oppose him because of his skeptical view of the UN. I do not oppose him because he believes the UN should be reformed. If the President wants to change U.S. policy toward the UN, he has the right to choose an ambassador who will attempt to do so. The Congress should evaluate that nominee on his or her ability to do the job for which the individual has been selected.

I am opposing Mr. Bolton because his past record leads me to believe he does not have the skills to do the job of Ambassador to the UN. As the second-ranking foreign policy job in any administration, it is very important that

this job be done right. My review of his prior experience leads me to conclude that Mr. Bolton is not a man who builds consensus, who appreciates consensus, or who abides by consensus. No matter what one thinks of the UN's performance, or how its functionality and mission ought to be reformed, one must be able to build support among our allies in order to effect change. As we have seen, nothing is accomplished at the UN by banging one's shoe on the podium. The work of the UN requires respect for national differences, searching for common ground, and development of consensus on what actions must be taken. It would be irresponsible to approve a UN ambassador who is not capable of performing these tasks.

The record shows that on occasion when his personal beliefs clashed with administration policy, Mr. Bolton has not hesitated to take matters into his own hands, to misuse secret materials, to threaten Federal employees with personal retribution and to endanger national security in order to advance his own view of a situation. This is not who we should be sending to the UN as our chief representative. We can, and we must, do better by an institution that should be an important part of a successful American foreign policy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. BIDEN. I yield 6 minutes on my time, and I am told the distinguished Senator from California has 5 minutes of leader time. I yield to the Senator from California.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware has 16 minutes in total remaining.

Mr. BIDEN. Yes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time is equally divided until 6. Extending the time past 6 would take a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BOXER. Senator REID gave me 5 minutes of his leader time, and I ask unanimous consent that I might add that to my 6 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. I yield 6 minutes on my time to the distinguished Senator from California.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I think we need to take a deep breath and a reality check. All this talk from Senator ALLEN about how obstructionist the Democrats are being—now, here is the truth: The Republicans run the Foreign Relations Committee. They did not even have the votes to vote John Bolton out of that committee and bring it to the floor with a positive recommendation.

This is a very divisive and controversial nomination. Since 1945, the Senate

has confirmed 24 men and women to serve as U.N. ambassador. Never before has any President of either party made such a divisive and controversial nomination. In 60 years, only two nominees have had a single Senator cast a "no" vote against them. Andrew Young was one. He was confirmed 89 to 3 in 1977, and Richard Holbrooke was confirmed 81 to 16 in 1999. Every other time the nominee has been approved unanimously. I long for those days.

This is a President who said he wanted to be a uniter, not a divider. Yet in light of all the controversy, he sticks with this nominee. The fact is, 102 former diplomats, both Republican and Democrat, signed a letter opposing John Bolton. They wrote that his past activities and statements indicate conclusively that he is the wrong man for this position at a time when the U.N. is entering a critically important phase of democratic reforms.

Senator VOINOVICH said it well, and he is a Republican. He is a member of the committee. He said: Frankly, I am concerned that Mr. Bolton would make it more difficult for us to achieve the badly needed reforms we need.

John Bolton has said that there is no United Nations. He has said if the U.N. Secretariat Building in New York lost 10 floors, it would not make a bit of difference. How does someone with that attitude get the respect required to bring the reforms?

As we know, today is not about whether Senators should vote for or against John Bolton. Today is a different vote. It is a vote as to whether the Senate deserves, on behalf of the American people, to get the information that Senators BIDEN and DODD have taken the lead in asking for. By the way, Senator LUGAR, at one point in time, had signed some of those letters requesting the information.

Why is this important? It is important because every Senator is going to decide whether to vote up or down on Mr. Bolton. We need to know what this information will show. Yes, as Senator BIDEN has said, we get the information, we schedule a vote. But we will look at the information. What if the information shows that, in fact, John Bolton was trying to spy on other Americans with whom he had an ax to grind? What if the information shows that John Bolton did not tell the truth to the committee and that he had written a speech about Syria which was misleading and which could have, in many ways, made that drumbeat for war against Syria much louder than it was?

There is a third piece of information that Senators DODD and BIDEN did not think was that important, but I still think is important and we have asked for, which is the fact that Mr. Bolton has an assistant, someone he has hired, who has outside clients so that while he, Mr. Matthew Friedman, is getting paid with taxpayer dollars, he has outside clients.

Who are these outside clients? We cannot find out. We called Mr. Fried-

man's office. The secretary answered. This is a private office, his private business, and she said: Oh, yes, he is here. He will be right with you.

Then, upon finding out it was my office, suddenly Mr. Friedman was nowhere to be found and has not returned the call.

I represent the largest State in the Union. Believe me, it is a diverse State. We have conservatives and liberals and everything in between. We have every political party represented there, and many independent voters. But they all want me to be able to make an informed decision. This information is very important. Therefore, I think today's vote is crucial.

There is one more point I would like to make.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 1 minute.

Mrs. BOXER. This is the point. When we had the whole debate over a judge a long time ago, a judge named Richard Paez, at that time Dr. FRIST, Senator FRIST supported the filibuster against Judge Paez. What he said in explaining his vote was it is totally appropriate to have a cloture vote—as we are going to do today—when you are seeking information. That is totally appropriate.

I have the exact quote here, and I would like to read it. He said:

Cloture, to get more information, is legitimate.

I agree with Senator FRIST. It is legitimate to hold out on an up-or-down vote, to stand up for the rights of the American people and the information they deserve to have through us.

I thank Senator DODD and Senator BIDEN for their leadership, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of the time under my control to the Senator from Connecticut.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Delaware, as well as my colleague from California for her comments. Let me say to the distinguished chairman of our committee, I know this has been a long ordeal, now going up to 2 months that this nomination has been before us. No one, except possibly the chairman of the committee, would like this matter to be terminated sooner rather than later more than I would. I am sure the Senator from Delaware feels similarly, as I know my colleague from California does as well.

But there is an important issue before this body that transcends the nomination of the individual before us. That is whether as an institution we have a right to certain information pertaining to the matter before us. Certainly the matter that we have requested—Senator BIDEN has and I have—regarding this nomination is directly on point when it comes to the qualities of this nominee.

For nearly a month since our May 26th cloture vote on this nomination, the administration has stonewalled our efforts to get the additional information we believe the Senate should have to make an informed judgment on this nomination.

Senator BIDEN and I have attempted to reach an accommodation with the administration on the two areas of our inquiry—draft testimony and related documents concerning Syria's weapons of mass destruction capabilities and the nineteen names contained in ten National Security Agency intercepts which Mr. Bolton requested and was provided during his tenure as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security. Senator BIDEN has narrowed the scope of his request related to Syria. I have offered to submit a list of names of concern related to the NSA intercepts to be cross checked by director Negroponte against the list of names provided to Mr. Bolton.

I am very puzzled, Mr. President, by the intransigent position that the administration has taken, particularly with respect to the intercept matter.

If the intercepts are "pure vanilla" as our colleague, Senator ROBERTS, has described them, then why does the administration continue to withhold the information from the Senate?

The answer is we don't know.

Was Mr. Bolton using the information from the intercepts to track what other officials were doing in policy areas he disagreed with?

Or was he simply utilizing the information in the normal course of carrying out his responsibilities?

Again, we don't know.

Under ordinary circumstances, I would not be inquiring whether a State Department official had sought access to sensitive intelligence for anything other than official purposes.

But we know from the Foreign Relations Committee investigation of this nominee—from interviews of individuals who served with Mr. Bolton in the Bush administration—that Mr. Bolton's conduct while at the State Department was anything but ordinary.

We learned how Mr. Bolton harnessed an abusive management style to attempt to alter intelligence judgments and to stifle the consideration of alternative policy options—all in furtherance of his own personal ideological agenda.

According to a story that appeared in today's Washington Post, we now know that Mr. Bolton's machinations weren't limited to Cuba or Syria weapons of mass destruction. It would seem he was the "Mr. No" of the Department on a wide variety of policy initiatives, acting as a major roadblock to progress on such important initiatives as U.S.-Russian cooperative nuclear threat reduction.

Mr. Bolton has done a disservice to the Bush administration and to the American people by putting his agenda ahead of the interests of the administration and the American people.

It is not only that he had his own agenda that is problematic. It is the manner in which he sought to advance that agenda by imposing his judgments on members of the intelligence community and threatening to destroy the careers of those with the temerity to resist his demands to alter their intelligence judgments.

In so doing, he breached the firewall between intelligence and policy which must be sacrosanct to protect U.S. foreign policy and national security interests.

That is not to say there should not be a vibrant and healthy disagreement where one exists. There ought to be, in fact, more disagreements where these matters have caused friction. But the idea that you would allow that friction, those disagreements to transcend the firewall where you would then seek to have people dismissed from their jobs because you disagreed with their conclusions, that goes too far. Mr. Bolton went to far and for those reasons, in my view, does not deserve to be the confirmed nominee as ambassador to the United Nations. That fact is painfully clear to all Americans following the serious and dangerous intelligence failures related to Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.

We know that Mr. Bolton's efforts to manipulate intelligence wasn't some anomaly because he was having a bad day. The entire intelligence community knew of his reputation.

We were fortunate to have individuals, like Dean Hutchings, Chairman of the National Intelligence Council from 2003-2005, who disapproved of and resisted Bolton's efforts to cherry pick intelligence.

We also know that Mr. Bolton needed adult supervision to ensure that his speeches and testimony were consistent with administration policy. Deputy Secretary Armitage took it upon himself to personally oversee all of Mr. Bolton's public pronouncements to ensure that he stayed on the reservation.

Is this really the kind of performance we want to reward by confirming this individual to the position of United States Representative to the United Nations?

Is Mr. Bolton the kind of individual who we can trust to carry out the United States agenda at the United Nations at this critical juncture?

I think not.

We all know that these are difficult times. Our responsibilities in Iraq and Afghanistan are significant and costly. Other challenges to international peace and stability loom large on the horizon: Iran, North Korea, Middle East Peace. Humanitarian crises in Africa and Asia cry out for attention.

The United States can not solve all these problems unilaterally. We need international assistance and cooperation to address them. And the logical focal point for developing that international support is the United Nations.

But international support will not automatically be forthcoming.

It will take real leadership at the United Nations to build the case for such cooperation. That United States leadership must necessarily be embodied in the individual that serves as the United States Ambassador to the United Nations. Based on what I know today about Mr. Bolton, I believe he is incapable of demonstrating that kind of leadership.

The United States Ambassador to the United Nations is an important position. The individual who assumes this position is necessarily the face of our country before the United Nations.

For all of the reasons I have cited—Mr. Bolton's management style, his attack on the intelligence community, his tunnel vision, his lack of diplomatic temperament—I do not believe that he is the man to be that face at the United Nations.

I hope that when it comes time for an up or down vote on Mr. Bolton that my colleagues will join me in opposing this nominee.

But this afternoon's vote is about who determines how the Senate will discharge its constitutional duties related to nominations. Will the executive branch tell this body what is relevant or not relevant with respect to its deliberations on nominations? Or will the Senate make that determination?

If you believe as I do that the Senate is entitled to access to information that is so clearly relevant in the case of the Bolton nomination, then I would respectfully ask you to join Senator BIDEN and me in voting against cloture.

But this vote isn't just about the nomination of Mr. Bolton, it is also about setting a precedent for future requests by the Senate of the executive on a whole host of other issues that may come before us—in this administration and in future administrations.

For that reason I strongly urge all of our colleagues to support us in sending the right signal to the administration by voting no on cloture when it occurs at 6 p.m.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, having listened to my Democrat colleagues discuss the Bolton nomination last week, I very briefly come to the floor to set the record straight.

The plain, simple truth is that some on the other side of the aisle are obstructing a highly qualified nominee and, I believe, by not allowing him to

assume this position yet, are doing harm to our country. I say that because John Bolton has a long record of successfully serving his country. He has been confirmed by this body no fewer than four times.

We have had 12 hours of committee hearings, 23 meetings with Senators, 31 interviews conducted by the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and 157 questions for the record submitted by members of the committee. The committee has had nearly 500 pages of documents from State and USAID. After reviewing thousands of pages of material, the intelligence community has provided over 125 pages of documents to the Foreign Relations Committee. The nominee has had 2 days of floor debate. The list goes on and on.

The chair and vice chair of the Intelligence Committee have both reviewed the NSA intercepts. Both have concluded that there is nothing there of concern.

I am satisfied with their conclusions, and I am satisfied that the prerogatives of the Senate have been respected.

I have been more than willing to try and reach a fair accommodation with Senators DODD and BIDEN, but the goal posts keep moving from a handful of names to now, three dozen. What is going on here looks and smells like a fishing expedition.

I supported Senator ROBERTS' initiative last week to strike a compromise. It made sense. It fairly and appropriately allowed the Director of National Intelligence to review names.

The names Senator ROBERTS vetted with the DNI were taken straight from the minority report of the Foreign Relations Committee. They are also names of persons that were raised by Senator DODD and Senator BIDEN during committee hearings and deliberations.

The fact that none of these names was in any of the 10 intercepts confirms what Senator ROBERTS and Senator ROCKEFELLER have said previously. John Bolton did nothing improper in requesting these intercepts, and there is no reason for concern.

Last week, Senator DODD and Senator BIDEN stated again that they wanted to see earlier drafts of Secretary Bolton's 2003 Syria testimony before the House.

I don't believe those documents are necessary, because what really matters is the final draft.

That said, I have been working with the White House to make this happen, and to give Senator DODD and Senator BIDEN a chance to review these documents.

What is important is to get this process moving, to give John Bolton a fair up-or-down vote, and to get our Ambassador to the U.N.

We will find out today if that will happen and if Members will do what is right for our country or if pointless obstruction will continue to stymie the

process and damage America's foreign affairs.

The United States has not had an ambassador at the U.N. for over 5 months now. It is time to stop the grandstanding and give this nominee a vote.

John Bolton is a smart, principled, and straightforward man who will effectively articulate the President's policies on the world stage.

We need a person with Under Secretary Bolton's proven track record of determination and success to cut through the thick and tangled bureaucracy that has mired the United Nations in scandal and inefficiency.

It is no accident that polling shows that most Americans have a dim view of the United Nations. In recent months, we have seen multiple negative reports about the world body.

We now know that Saddam Hussein stole an estimated \$10 billion through the Oil-for-Food Program. The U.N. official who ran the operation stands accused of taking kickbacks, along with other officials.

Last month, the head of the Iraq Survey Group told the Council on Foreign Relations that as a result of the Oil-for-Food corruption, Saddam came to believe he could divide the U.N. Security Council and bring an end to sanctions.

He did divide us, but he didn't stop us.

The U.N. failed to stop the genocide in Rwanda in the 1990s. The U.N. now seems to be repeating that mistake in Darfur.

In the Congo, there are numerous allegations that U.N. peacekeepers have committed sexual abuse against the innocent, female war victims they were sent to protect.

Meanwhile, the U.N.'s Human Rights Commission, which is charged with protecting our human rights, includes such human rights abusers as Libya, Cuba, Zimbabwe, and Sudan.

These failures are very real and very discouraging. They can be measured in lives lost and billions of dollars stolen. And they can be measured in the sinking regard for an organization that should be held in some esteem.

America sends the United Nations \$2 billion per year. Our contribution makes up 22 percent of its budget. We provide an even larger percentage for peacekeeping and other U.N. activities. It is no surprise that Americans are calling out for reform.

John Bolton is the President's choice to lead that effort. He possesses deep and extensive knowledge of the United Nations and has, for many years, been committed to its reform.

Under Secretary Bolton has the confidence of the President and the Secretary of State, and it is to them he will directly report.

As Senator LUGAR has pointed out, Under Secretary Bolton has served 4 years in a key position that technically outranks the post for which he is now being considered.

This is a critical time for the United States and for the world. Because of the President's vision and commitment, democracy is on the march around the globe. The United Nations can and should play a central role in advancing these developments.

I believe in the U.N.'s potential if it is reformed and more rightly focused. It has been an important forum for peace and dialogue. And, like the President, I believe that an effective United Nations is in America's interest.

As we all know, there has been one cloture vote. Tonight, in a few minutes, we will have that second cloture vote.

Mr. President, John Bolton is the right man to represent us in the United Nations. He is a straight shooter, a man of integrity. He is exactly what we need at this time in the United Nations. He is exactly what the United Nations needs from us. A vote for John Bolton is a vote for change there. A vote for John Bolton is a vote for reform there. We have had dilatory tactics and obstructionism that has been thinly veiled in words of "Senate prerogative." John Bolton deserves a vote, and the American people deserve a strong, principled voice in the United Nations.

Mr. President, I encourage our colleagues to vote for cloture tonight because John Bolton deserves an up-or-down vote as the nominee to the United Nations ambassadorship.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has expired.

Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the failed cloture vote on this nomination is agreed to, the motion to reconsider the failed cloture vote is agreed to, and the Senate will proceed to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Executive Calendar No. 103:

William Frist, Richard Lugar, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, Mitch McConnell, Jeff Sessions, Wayne Allard, Jon Kyl, Jim DeMint, David Vitter, Richard Shelby, Lindsey Graham, John Ensign, Pete Domenici, Robert Bennett, Mel Martinez, George Allen.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on Executive Calendar No. 103, the nomination of John Robert Bolton, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. The following Senators were necessarily absent: the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 142 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Dole	McCain
Allard	Domenici	McConnell
Allen	Ensign	Murkowski
Bennett	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Frist	Pryor
Brownback	Graham	Roberts
Bunning	Grassley	Santorum
Burr	Gregg	Sessions
Chafee	Hagel	Shelby
Chambliss	Hatch	Smith
Coburn	Hutchison	Snowe
Cochran	Inhofe	Specter
Collins	Isakson	Stevens
Cornyn	Kyl	Sununu
Craig	Landrieu	Talent
Crapo	Lott	Thomas
DeMint	Lugar	Vitter
DeWine	Martinez	Warner

NAYS—38

Akaka	Dodd	Murray
Baucus	Dorgan	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Durbin	Obama
Biden	Feinstein	Reed
Bingaman	Harkin	Reid
Boxer	Inouye	Rockefeller
Byrd	Jeffords	Salazar
Cantwell	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Carper	Lautenberg	Schumer
Clinton	Leahy	Stabenow
Conrad	Lieberman	Voinovich
Corzine	Lincoln	Wyden
Dayton	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—8

Burns	Johnson	Levin
Coleman	Kerry	Thune
Feingold	Kohl	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 38. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

---

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

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

---

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005—  
Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

AMENDMENT NO. 799

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is No. 799, the Voinovich amendment.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, is it in order to ask unanimous consent to lay aside the pending amendment for the purpose of speaking on an amendment that will be offered by Senator MARTINEZ?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may ask that consent.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I will certainly be willing to have my colleague from Florida speak. I ask unanimous consent that I speak after the Senator from Florida, Mr. MARTINEZ, who will offer the amendment.

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

The Senator from Florida.

AMENDMENT NO. 783

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 783.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is set aside. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. MARTINEZ], for Mr. NELSON of Florida, for himself, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CORZINE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. DOLE, and Mr. BURR, proposes an amendment numbered 783.

(Purpose: To strike the section providing for a comprehensive inventory of outer Continental Shelf oil and natural gas resources)

Beginning on page 264, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 265, line 12.

Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity that the chairman, Senator DOMENICI, the ranking member, Senator BINGAMAN, and other members have given me to work on this important piece of legislation.

I came late to the work of this committee on this bill, having joined the Senate just this year. Much of the work had previously been done.

As the chairman himself has said, this bill will make a real difference in America's energy landscape.

I must tell my colleagues that I want to vote for this bill. I think it contains a lot of what this Nation needs.

I have grave reservations about one particular provision that calls for an inventory of the resources off this Nation's outer continental shelf.

It is for this reason that I rise today to oppose the inventory, offer an amendment to strike the inventory language, and ask for the support of my colleagues. The inventory language is opposed by both Senators from Florida and a number of coastal State Senators because it opens the door to the development of offshore drilling.

In my State of Florida, such an inventory off our coastlines would take place entirely within a Federal moratorium that bans offshore drilling.

I oppose the inventory because it encroaches on an area off of Florida's coast that we expect will remain under that drilling ban in perpetuity.

My colleagues should be aware that this proposed inventory will cost in ex-

cess of a billion dollars and the result will tell us much of what we already know.

I am asking my colleagues to strike the proposed inventory language contained in this bill and protect the rights of States that have no interest in drilling off their shores.

This provision offered by my colleague, Mr. Senator LANDRIEU of Louisiana, proposes to require a “seismic survey inventory” of all outer continental shelf areas, including within sensitive coastal waters long-protected from all such invasive activities by the 24-year bipartisan congressional moratorium.

I opposed this amendment in committee because it contains something we in Florida don't want and it opens the door to a number of problems, environmental problems, economic problems, and unnecessary challenges for our military.

Why would we inventory an area where we are never going to drill?

The inventory is a huge problem for Florida. It tantalizes pro-drilling interests. It basically puts the State at risk.

I have received assurances from my friends on the other side of this issue that States such as Florida, States that do not want drilling on their coast, will not have to do it. Fine. That is Florida's position.

I can clearly state that we do not want drilling now, and I do not see a scenario anywhere on the horizon where we would change that position. So why, given our objection to drilling, would we spend the resources, more than a billion dollars, and damage the environment in the eastern planning zone to do this inventory? I would also say to my colleagues that an inventory is not a benign thing.

Seismic surveys involve extensive acoustic disruption to marine ecosystems and fisheries. Recent scientific studies have documented previously-unknown impacts from the millions of high-intensity airgun impulses used in such inventories. These sudden, repetitive explosions bring about a potential for harm that is simply too great.

Seismic surveys are an invasive procedure, inappropriate for sensitive marine areas and economically important fishing grounds.

And if one looks at the cost of this inventory, the Minerals Management Service reports that using the most up-to-date technology to perform an inventory of this magnitude will cost between \$75 million and \$125 million for each frontier planning area. Nowhere in this legislation can I find a section that suggests how we recoup the cost of such an inventory.

So I ask my colleagues to strike the inventory. Going forward will encroach upon our coastal waters, waters covered by a drilling ban, and would do little more than act as enticement to oil companies that want our drilling moratorium lifted.

Last year, more than 74 million people visited Florida to enjoy its coastline, its wonderful climate, its excellent fishing. Families return year after