

the statement that there is no end in sight. To put this in some sort of perspective on a personal level, 80 percent of the Nation's 35,000 laundromats have raised prices in the past year due to high natural gas prices. Folks who have to take their laundry to the corner Sit and Spin are facing, every day, prices that increased over the past several weeks and months and may well increase into the future.

That is why we need to respond and respond expeditiously. If you take it beyond the personal level to the industry level, the U.S. chemical companies are closing plants. They are laying off workers. They are looking to expand their own production, not domestically but expand it abroad, as a result of high prices.

Next year, the United States is expected to import, to bring into this country, approximately \$9 billion more in chemicals than it will export.

American industry is caught between regulations, on the one hand limiting the supply of natural gas, and regulations encouraging its use on the other. The result is rising gas prices with some industries cutting jobs. Again, I want to keep coming back to jobs because it is an Energy bill, an energy security bill, but it is also a jobs bill. We find some of these industries not just cutting jobs but sometimes being priced out altogether. And, of course, consumers are being hit with higher and higher electric bills.

We need to diversify our sources of energy. We must do so in a way that lessens our reliance on foreign sources. So when you summarize and step back, our energy policy should be one that is consistent with our foreign policy; that is, it is independent and it is secure. By increasing America's domestic production of clean coal, of oil and gas, nuclear, ethanol, solar, and other renewable energy sources, we increase not just our energy supply but we increase our national security.

Furthermore, by passing the comprehensive energy package we will be creating jobs; as I mentioned, as many as 500,000 jobs. Indeed, the Alaskan pipeline, for example, will create at least 400,000 jobs alone. The hundreds of millions of dollars that will be invested in research and development of new technologies will not only benefit the environment, which we know will be benefited, but it also will create new jobs in engineering, in math and chemistry, science, physics.

So, in summary, we cannot continue to dither or delay. We need to focus over the next 4 days on this bill, bring amendments to the chairman and ranking member, bring them to the floor for debate so we can vote.

We simply cannot let the behind-the-scenes political maneuvering in any way deny the American people energy that is cleaner, that is more abundant, and, indeed, more secure.

We need to take action this week for the sake of our economy, for our national security, and ultimately, and

what is probably the bottom line, for our fellow Americans who are paying these bills each and every month. It is time to pass an energy policy for the 21st century. I am confident we can do so this week.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting minority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, let the RECORD be spread with the fact that every Democrat in the Senate supports an Energy bill. There is not a single Senator who opposes an Energy bill.

I know that the distinguished majority leader has talked about our having been on this for 16 days—and we have been. But many of them have been extremely short days—Thursday afternoons and Friday mornings; a few days here and a few days there.

I think what we have to be concerned about is not how many days we have spent on it but the question is, Is this bill as good as it should be? I think the answer is a glaring no at this stage.

We have been willing to work with the majority to find consensus on a host of issues. There is not a single Senator on the other side of the aisle who I have worked more closely with than the chairman of the Energy Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico. Not only have I worked with him on the Energy bill but I have worked with him on the Appropriations Committee. He and I have done energy and water bills for years. I have great respect for him. I know how badly he wants an Energy bill. He tells me once or twice a day. I know how important it is for him to move this bill through the Senate. But we can't move a bill through the Senate that doesn't have debate on important issues such as climate change, CAFE, electricity, renewable portfolio standards, and the tax title.

We on this side of the aisle are concerned about jobs. When we look at the last administration and 8 years, President Clinton created 25 million jobs. This administration and this President—as long as we have kept records where we have lost jobs—lost 3 million jobs in the private sector. I think that says it all.

On the Alaskan pipeline issue, I offered that amendment on the floor. That amendment passed. I am glad it did pass. We support that. It is good for the economy. It is good for the security of this Nation to bring that gas from Alaska. We want to do that.

We talked about Medicare legislation and doing that more quickly. Of course, that was bipartisan legislation. It makes it a little easier.

We have a number of northwestern Senators who are desperate to work out something on the electricity title. They could not get a copy of—it is a major title to this legislation—until late Friday night. Some got it but

most didn't get it until yesterday; then to be asked, as we were yesterday, to go right to the electricity title.

There are three amendments pending. I think without any question we can have a vote on CAFE by 10:45 or 11 o'clock, according to how much time the opposition takes on it. I think we can do that quickly. We have discussed it with Senators LEVIN and STABENOW. Of course, there are others on the majority side who joined with these Senators on another CAFE amendment. That should take a very short period of time—I would say an hour or something like that, I would estimate.

Then we have to figure out some way as to what will be done with the Campbell amendment. Then there is nothing to stop us from going to the electricity title. There will be some debate on that. It is an extremely important issue for us.

As I said, I have the highest respect and regard for my friend from New Mexico, the senior Senator.

I don't see how we can do this bill this week. We are going to try. It is not as if this is some guerrilla attack. We have been saying all along that we need more time than this to complete the bill.

But on this side of the aisle, we recognize the importance of this legislation. We want to do what we can but there are certain issues that require debate and deliberation. We are going to make sure it takes place. If we have to stay in through next week, we have to stay in through next week. But there are issues that are so important to this country that we have to make sure that whatever bill comes out is the best bill we can get.

RESERVATION OF LEADERSHIP TIME

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

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 14, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 14) to enhance the energy security of the United States, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Campbell amendment No. 886, to replace "tribal consortia" with "tribal energy resource development organizations."

Durbin amendment No. 1384, to amend title 49, United States Code, to improve the system for enhancing automobile fuel efficiency.

Durbin modified amendment No. 1385, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to provide additional tax incentives for enhancing motor vehicle fuel efficiency.

Bond modified amendment No. 1386, to impose additional requirements for improving automobile fuel economy and reducing vehicle emissions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, just briefly, I wish to respond because I can tell both in opening and closing the Senate each day that we are going to come down to this same sort of dialog of our side of the aisle wants to move this bill through and the Democrats, or the other side of the aisle, are saying we are not slow walking this and we need more time. There is going to be sort of the setup at the end of the week with the other side saying we just haven't had enough time.

I want to make it clear to my colleagues that for the last month this bill came before the Senate 16 days. This is the 16th day on the bill. We are going to spend every day this week on it. These are not new issues. These are issues that we debated, that we talked about, that we hashed and rehashed last year. Indeed, it was 7 weeks and 24 days, and the issues are essentially the same issues.

In this Congress, we have gone through the committee itself, and it came to the floor on May 6. We spent 16 days on it. We are going to spend the next 4 days.

When I hear these statements either from the Democratic leader last night or the potential of a charge at the end of the week that, Well, Democrats just didn't want to finish the bill—those are the Democratic leader's words—I am beginning to think there is some delaying, there is some slow walking. I say that because I set up this schedule a long time ago. We are now early in the week for this final week being spent on the bill.

Yesterday we had the other side of the aisle objecting to setting aside CAFE and laying down the electricity bill. Yet we just had the assistant Democratic leader and the Democratic leader last night say, Well, we just got it on Friday.

The whole point of laying it down yesterday was so we could look at it, so we could debate it, and so we could talk about it. Yet we spent all day yesterday—or they spent all day—objecting to laying it down and to setting other amendments aside.

It is too early to get into this sort of finger pointing back and forth. But I can tell from the Democratic leader's statements—no, we are not slow walking it, that you are going to accuse us of slow walking it—all I can say is that it is early enough in the week, and if we stay focused and if we expeditiously and systematically address the issues, we can complete this bill.

I encourage both sides of the aisle to allow the managers to deal with these amendments and organize in a systematic way so we can debate. It is our No. 1 priority this week so that we can do what the American people deserve, we can pass a bill which has been adequately debated and appropriately amended and which fulfills what both sides of the aisle want to do; that is, to develop good energy policy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I just wanted to respond briefly to the comments made by the distinguished majority leader.

I, again, will publicly affirm what I have said to him privately—that we are more than ready to grind out amendments and work through the many contentious issues. I listed them last night. He knows very well what those issues are.

We have a very controversial electricity title that was redrafted. Once the bill was reported out of committee, for whatever reason, the majority decided they didn't like the electricity title and redrafted an entirely different electricity title that we had not seen until Friday. So we were not able to examine it for purposes of consideration of amendments and other issues until this weekend.

But we also have the question of nuclear licensing, the conservation questions which we have talked about, the renewable portfolio standards, and a number of issues that hopefully we can address in addition to the electricity matter. The tax title has yet to come up.

You can't slow walk a bill that has not been pending. And it has not been pending. We have urged our colleagues to bring the bill to the floor so we could walk through these issues one by one and address them constructively. For good reason, yesterday we were not able to come to the bill, in part because the two managers, out of necessity, had to be in New Mexico.

So we are prepared to deal with the Durbin amendment and then the Levin amendment. I know the Campbell amendment is pending after that. If we could dispose of that, there is no reason whatsoever we could not go to the electricity title and begin debating that and consider amendments to the electricity title.

So I will certainly again offer my cooperation to the distinguished majority leader in an effort to begin addressing these issues. But I wish it were the beginning of this work period rather than the end. I would feel a lot more confident about our ability to complete our work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, before the distinguished minority leader leaves the floor, might I say we, too, are prepared to move quickly to the Durbin amendment. Senator BINGAMAN and I are writing up a list we would agree on as to how we would proceed the next couple days. The problem is, the pending amendment is the Campbell amendment on Indians, and we were going to ask if we could set it aside so we could proceed with Durbin and then proceed with the subsequent amendment on automobiles which is just pending, and right on down—we have a list—including getting the amendment on electricity offered today for debate.

But there is an objection to our proceeding. So that means we probably will have to take one of two actions: either put the electricity amendment on the Indian amendment, which I do not like, or we do the Indian amendment first. I don't know if we can do that. So it is too bad. Whoever is objecting, it would be good if they would not object to just setting the Indian amendment aside. It is being worked on. It is not a game breaker; it is just a question that there are now people who want to work it out as compared with fighting over it.

Senator BINGAMAN is here. I think he wishes to speak.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, if I might respond quickly to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, I simply say that however he wants to address the Campbell amendment managerially is his decision. I think it is important to dispose of it. You have plenty of options. Even though we have a finite list of amendments, you can easily bring it back if it is in other forms and address it later on to clear the path, if you wish, to bring up the electricity title. So whether or not there are objections to setting it aside should not be an impediment. There ought to be ways in which to address it, and I know he will find one. Again, I will work with him to see if that can be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I agree with the points made by the minority leader and Senator DOMENICI as well. Let me just suggest, though, that I know Senator DURBIN is here ready to debate his amendment, on which we hope we can get a vote this morning.

I think we could go ahead with that debate and then possibly even go ahead with some debate on the Bond-Levin issue while we are trying to clear any objections on this side. The hope is then we would be able to vote on one or both of those amendments before we go to the discussion about the Priscilla Owen nomination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I think the minority leader has convinced me, and his suggestion was a good one. I withdraw the Campbell amendment provided he has the right to offer it at a later date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there an objection?

Mr. REID. Objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, under the present parliamentary situation, of course, it takes consent to withdraw because we have a finite list of amendments. We have at least one Senator here whom we have to protect. As a result of that, I object.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thought the other side said I could dispose of it however I would like so we

could get on with the business. I just tried to do that.

Mr. REID. But of course, Mr. President, we have two amendments ahead of that. It is not parliamentary procedure that is proper at this stage. When we get to the Campbell amendment, the distinguished Democratic leader said the Senator would have to do what he wanted in that regard. We stand on that.

Mr. DOMENICI. We can't proceed with any of the other amendments.

Mr. REID. But even at that time, even if the other two amendments were gone, the alternatives are, as the Senator said, second-degreeing the amendment or disposing of it with a motion to table or some other thing. But just to agree to withdraw it, I am not in a position to do that right now.

Mr. DOMENICI. We would like to proceed with the CAFE amendment at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator will suspend, the Chair informs the Senator from New Mexico, the finite list requires that the amendment must be disposed of. It cannot be withdrawn except by unanimous consent.

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to Senator DURBIN, would you like to then proceed for a few minutes on your amendment?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I had the floor, and I will yield in just 1 second. I would also say, so there is not a problem in the future, I don't think you can amend the Campbell amendment with an electricity title under the rules that are now before the Senate. I would just alert Senators to that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I think the Senator from New Mexico had the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. We will get to that.

Senator BINGAMAN wants some time to speak to a Senator. So I ask Senator DURBIN, how much time would you like to speak on your amendment?

Mr. DURBIN. I am prepared to move to my amendment. It is my understanding that the minority leader may be seeking the floor. If he is, I will certainly yield to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator yielding. I will not take a lot of time now.

TRADING IN DEATH

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I come to the floor in part to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the New York Times this morning. The article is entitled "Pentagon Prepares A Futures Market On Terror Attacks."

The article reports that the Bush administration is prepared to spend \$8 million on a program that actually encourages betting on the probability of future terrorist attacks. I am really amazed. This fits in that category: "We are not making this up."

You ask whether there are traders or traitors—T-R-A-D-E-R-S or T-R-A-I-T-

O-R-S. As we understand it, even terrorists would be allowed to bet on the likelihood of future terrorist attacks.

This program could provide an incentive, actually, to commit acts of terrorism. We are asking the administration this morning to renounce this plan to trade in death. The administration should issue a public apology, especially to the families of the victims of September 11. This is just wrong: The Pentagon calls its latest idea a new way of predicting events and part of its search for the "broadest possible set of new ways to prevent terrorist attacks." I don't know how one can possibly use the marketplace for that purpose.

The initiative, which is called the Policy Analysis Market, is to begin registering up to 1,000 traders on Friday. It is the latest in a series of projects advanced by DARPA, a Pentagon unit that has run into a great deal of controversy over other issues.

But I must say, this is perhaps the most irresponsible, outrageous, and poorly thought out of anything I have heard the administration propose to date. For the life of me, I cannot believe anybody would seriously propose that we trade in death, that we set up a futures market on when, as the Web site proposed, the King of Jordan could be overthrown, when a leader would be assassinated, when a terrorist attack would occur. Most traders try to influence their investments. How long would it be before you saw traders investing in a way that would bring about the desired result?

I hope the administration will explain what it is they had in mind, why they are doing this, why we are investing taxpayer dollars in the probability of future terrorist attacks.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask the Senator from South Dakota, our distinguished minority leader, is it not true that those who find your statement incredulous can log on to policymarketanalysis.com and find this proposal from the Department of Defense to create some sort of investment speculation in the possibility of assassination and terrorism? Is that not a fact?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator from Illinois has exactly stated the fact. Policymarket.com can be called up on your Web site today. The Web site can be called up on the Internet and you can see for yourself.

Mr. DURBIN. In fairness to the Senator, I think the reference is policyanalysis.com.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator please address through the Chair? The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. I believe the Senator from South Dakota has the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. I sought recognition and the Chair recognized me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well. I thought the Senator yielded to the Senator from Nevada. The minority leader has the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. If the minority leader would further yield, through the Chair, is it not true that the site referenced here is policyanalysis.com, for those who question whether what you are saying is accurate?

Mr. DASCHLE. That is correct. I don't have the Internet reference in front of me.

Mr. DURBIN. Is it not also, I say through the Chair, that the administration is proposing spending \$8 million of taxpayer money through the year 2005 in creating this marketplace to trade in speculation about assassination and terrorism, \$8 million over the next several years?

Mr. DASCHLE. It is my understanding they are actually encouraging investors to trade in this terrorist probability or possibility. Their view is that somehow, by those who invest, in watching or monitoring those who invest, they can better determine where this terrorist attack may occur. What they don't fail to appreciate is that investors try to make good on their investments. So would it not stand to reason that once this investment was made and the market moved in the direction of assassinating a given leader, indeed, that would be the ultimate outcome?

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator would further yield for a question, is it not true that on their Web site yesterday they put up some hypothetical things that people could invest in, questions as to whether, for example, Mr. Arafat, with the Palestinian Authority, would be assassinated, whether North Korea would launch a missile attack, whether the King of Jordan would be overthrown, and whether Israel would be attacked with bioterrorism weapons? Weren't these some of the items on which the Department of Defense was suggesting we start opening speculation and investment and betting by people around the world, including possible terrorists? Wasn't this on the Web site yesterday and removed today?

Mr. DASCHLE. Each of the items that the Senator from Illinois has reported were on the Web site yesterday: When the first biological attack would occur in Israel, when the King of Jordan might be assassinated. Each of these were listed as possible investment opportunities. Of course, our distinguished colleagues—I cite them for their efforts, Senators WYDEN and DORGAN—called attention to these particularly unusual investments, and they were pulled from the Web site once the fact that these were listed was made public.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator would further yield, I would ask the Senator from South Dakota to reflect on the reaction of the United States and the Congress—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENSIGN). The Senator will suspend.