

In the case of energy, in the case of cloning, if we don't do it now, we won't be able to do anything until February or March, and this issue will march forward with uncertainty and concern. Senator BROWBACK has been advancing the need for us to take some action to have the moratorium. The House acted months ago, overwhelmingly, in a bipartisan manner. We will have the opportunity to do the same here.

I urge my colleagues to take time tonight and tomorrow and Monday. Let's talk about these two issues. We should not invoke cloture on this amendment. We should have a vote. We should not stop the debate. We should have a vote on the substance itself, and then we could move to the underlying bill and could get it done.

Instead of taking shots at each other, we could actually address three big issues in one swoop. That is why I offered the amendment. It is also to serve notice that if we keep going off track on what we need to do to get out of here, other issues will be brought up.

This is the Senate. Wonderful place that it is, no one person and no one party dictates what we can do. Marvelously, any Senator can offer any amendment on any subject he or she wishes at any time. Lots of times it takes 60 votes, but that is the way it works. Therefore, we will have an opportunity now to have a full debate on energy and on cloning as well as railroad retirement.

I thank the Chair and my colleagues for the opportunity to briefly describe what we are doing. I am sure Senator MURKOWSKI and members of the Energy Committee will be here to describe what is in this energy package. Senator BROWBACK is waiting to describe the details of his moratorium.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have spoken to the minority leader, and I now ask unanimous consent that we go into a period of morning business. We want to be as lenient as we can. I know the Senator from Alaska wants to speak for an extended period of time. Others also want to speak. Therefore, we will have the 10-minute limitation, with the understanding that people can ask unanimous consent to speak for any period of time they want.

Again, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period of morning busi-

ness with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes, and we divide the time, even though it appears that maybe there won't be the need to do that. I ask unanimous consent that we—

Ms. LANDRIEU. Reserving the right to object, would this be OK with the leader? I ask if I may have my 10 minutes starting now if it would be OK with the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. REID. If I may reclaim my time, I think we would be better off not having a 10-minute limitation. I ask unanimous consent that we now go into a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, as Senator LANDRIEU indicated that her children were getting hungry, I suggest the Chair recognize her first.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the request is that we go into a period for morning business with a 10-minute limitation—I will state it again. It is that we go into a period of morning business, that Senator LANDRIEU be recognized for 10 minutes to begin with, and Senators thereafter be limited to 10 minutes, with the understanding that there will be a number of Senators asking for more time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, in order to accommodate Senators, let's be more realistic and make it 15 minutes.

Mr. REID. I have no problem with that.

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

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 3090

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader may turn to the consideration of H.R. 3090 with the consent of the Republican leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

#### ENERGY SECURITY

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I know the Senator from Kansas is on the floor to speak on several important issues, and the Senator from Alaska will be addressing the Senate later this evening on the important issue of energy security for our Nation. I agree with so many of the points of the Senator from Alaska, as well as the Senator from Mississippi, who has been taking with us this evening on that subject.

I want to talk about a subject that is actually somewhat related. The subject I want to spend a few minutes on tonight is most certainly related to the issue of energy security for our Nation. It is related to the situation that we find ourselves in, combating this new war against terrorism in many dif-

ferent ways and in ways very different than our past conflicts would have us be engaged. Let me just try to bring this into focus.

We have troops in Afghanistan and, luckily and thankfully, and because we have the best equipped, best led, and bravest and most courageous fighting force in the world, we are making extraordinary progress on our front in Afghanistan. You can see the headlines in all of the newspapers that would attest to the great effort that is being made. But we all know, and we are all learning quickly, that this war on terrorism is something we are going to have to fight on many different fronts. One of those fronts is in our own homeland.

We hated to see what happened on September 11, and we were all heart broken and angry and justifiably angry at the devastation and the horrific attack on our Nation.

As I was saying, we now have to fight this war on many different fronts, not just the front in Afghanistan but the front here at home. We were all terribly horrified and righteously angry. We have to turn that righteous anger into concrete steps to protect ourselves in the future. Many of us in our various capacities and many different committees are about doing that. We are stepping up airport security. We are trying to step up the security of our cyberinfrastructure in the Nation. We are looking at ways to set up medical response teams on health care, our public health system. And all of these efforts, if we do them correctly and come up with good policies and funding streams, will most certainly help to protect our Nation against these attacks that, unfortunately, are going to certainly come. Even if we are successful—and we have been—in cornering bin Laden and taking down the Taliban regime and capturing or destroying that particular cell, it is likely, based on everything that we know—not to alarm people or frighten people, but we know that it is likely that there will be future attacks.

The point of my short presentation today is to simply say that we are not sure where these attacks will be aimed. We never imagined that a group of people, with three of our own airplanes filled with fuel, would take down some of the most important buildings in this Nation. So we have to think: What might the next attack be? What could possibly come at us?

There are so many things that could happen that we have to be smart and strategic about how we spend our resources.

One of the issues that I am going to argue for a few minutes on the floor today is some of the critical infrastructure in our Nation—some of it is rail, some transportation issues, such as highways and tunnels, some of it is critical infrastructure protecting our nuclear powerplants, our electric grid, our cyberinfrastructure that we now rely on to run so much of our communications, transportation, health care