

Hussein. He is at war with the United States. We were repeatedly told this."

Still, the political situation Saddam Hussein finds himself in today—in light of the example of decisive U.S. military action in Afghanistan—may not be as conducive to a strike at the U.S. as it was when Shahab says he first heard of the plan to blow up a U.S. warship. In recent months, Boyne notes, Iraq has engaged in a region-wide charm offensive to portray itself as a victim, and to build Arab and European support against any U.S. attack. Baghdad is even pursuing warmer ties with Kuwait (at the Arab League summit last week) and with Iran, in an attempt to gain mileage from Iran's anger at being listed as part of Washington's "axis of evil."

While the Bush administration focuses on Iraq's apparent pursuit of weapons of mass destruction—in the absence of UN weapons inspectors, who were kicked out in 1998—clues to Iraq's true role may lie in the credibility of the 29-year-old smuggler from Ahvaz.

Why is he talking now? "Afghanistan is finished, so now I feel free to speak," says Shahab, who was given the name Mohamed Jawad by accomplices in Afghanistan. Asked if he fears the wrath of senior members of the regime in Baghdad, who still hold power, Shahab replies: "I lost everything. For many years I worked with assassinations and killing—it doesn't make a difference to me."

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, yesterday major oil producers in Venezuela went on strike. Between Venezuela and Iraq, nearly 30 percent of our oil imports are at risk. And that is nearly 12 million barrels today.

We also learned that Saddam Hussein has indicated a payment to the families of the Palestinian suicide bombers of roughly \$25,000. Previously it was around \$10,000. That is a terrible incentive for terrorism. One has to wonder where he gets the cash. But you don't have to wonder very long because of the \$4-plus billion that the United States paid Saddam Hussein last year for oil.

The Senate needs to remember that Saddam is much more than just a member of the axis of evil. He is an energy partner of the United States.

We now understand that Iraq, Libya, and Iran have called for an OPEC oil embargo—an event that could cripple the world economy.

With each passing hour, the Mideast grows more unstable, and the future grows more uncertain. With each passing day, the United States grows more dependent on foreign sources of energy.

What does tomorrow hold? More chaos and more bloodshed. The United States has a role and an obligation to help lead the region to peace. I applaud the President for sending Secretary Powell to personally supervise these efforts. But now more than ever we should turn our attention to here at home. We need to look at the realities of how we are going to meet our energy needs with or without the Mideast.

Given the choice, will we choose to keep us dependent on foreign oil or will we choose solutions found here at home to lessen our dependence on imported oil, solutions within our borders free from the chaos and uncertainty in the Mideast?

I go back to 1995. If the Senate passed an amendment in the omnibus bill that would have allowed the opening of ANWR, where would we be today? We would be in production. We would be generating at least a million barrels more from domestic sources, eliminating at least a million barrels from imports. Unfortunately, our former President vetoed that bill.

The energy bill before us is one on which we spent nearly 3 weeks. There is some criticism for the delay, but I remind my colleagues that we are taking on an extremely difficult and divisive issue and dealing with it on the floor of the Senate as opposed to the committee process. Since the debate started on this issue, we have disposed of 49 amendments—21 offered by Republicans and 28 by Democrats. Working with my good friend, Senator BINGAMAN, I think we have moved in a responsible manner.

That total, I might add, does not include the two amendments dealing with judicial nominees, or several amendments that have been dealt with off the floor. We have dealt with extremely difficult amendments, including CAFE, and specifically whether Congress should decide on new vehicle standards or leave that decision to experts; whether Congress should impose a renewable portfolio standard on some electric producers or leave the decision on appropriate standards to the States; whether the Federal Government should continue the liability protection on nuclear powerplants—that is the Price-Anderson amendment—the issue of reliability, and how best to ensure reliability on our electricity grid; ethanol; and whether to create a reasonable fuel requirement.

But there are still significant issues left to decide. We need to close out the issues dealing with electricity. We need to reach some agreement on the climate change provision in the bill. Of course, we must address the tax provisions for renewable conservation, alternative fuel efficiency and production. We must decide how best to increase our domestic production of energy sources since there are no real production provisions in the Daschle substitute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has used 10 minutes.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until the hour of 11:30 today.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for another 5 minutes to finish my statement.

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

#### MOVING ON THE ENERGY BILL

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, although we have some significant issues left to decide, we need to close out electricity, climate change, tax provisions, and increasing our domestic production.

As I stated in my opening statement, because of the manner in which this legislation has come before the Senate, we have been forced to consider the measure without the benefit of the committee deliberation and action that ordinarily would accompany a bill of this nature. We have had difficult and divisive issues that should and could have been worked out in committee. It is debated here in this Chamber. It is not a question of laying blame on one or the other. The point is, we have to move on from where we are. This bill can only be resolved by the amendment process.

Recently, we have seen statements that the Republicans were stalling this bill because we had not offered an ANWR amendment. It is my intention to offer an ANWR amendment this week. I regret that some on the other side believe there have been delays. But I believe the Feinstein amendment is pending today. Of course, I anticipate that we will proceed and there will be an objection to moving off of it for any other reason. I have always believed the best way to move important legislation is to work through the less controversial issues first and then address the more difficult.

I remind my colleagues that it was the majority leader, not the Senator from Alaska, who decided to spend the entire first day of the debate on various amendment provisions. We saw those amendments which would not necessarily have been resolved with any significant advancing of the process. But, nevertheless, I will not belabor the manner in which this bill has moved forward. We have seen an extremely difficult process on both sides of the aisle in trying to balance a comprehensive and bipartisan bill that balances production, efficiencies, alternative fuels, and conservation.

The problems associated again with the movement of the bill probably need a little identification as we work through the process.

There were no committee reports or committee-approved texts for anyone to work from. The substitute that was brought about by the majority leader was kind of a moving target, and continued to be modified even after introduction. Even with that, we still deal with moving targets.

The renewable portfolio amendment offered by the manager on the other side changed so many times before introduction that the majority whip didn't really know—and I didn't know—whether we were talking about a standard of 8 or 10 percent or whatever. That does not form a basis for any kind of debate, and seriously complicates the ability of Members to draft amendments or know what they are voting on.