



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 2005

No. 83

Senate

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, we celebrate Your presence with us today. Your steadfast love inspires us ever to sing Your praises. Lord, You bless us each day with good things. Because of Your loving kindness, we find safety.

Today, strengthen our Senators with Your might. Give them the wisdom to distinguish between truth and error and the courage to act upon that insight. Use them as Your instruments to relieve the suffering in our world. Open their ears to the cries of our Nation's discarded and dispossessed.

As our lawmakers face great challenges, remind them that they are not alone but are sustained by Your unfailing providence. Remind each of us often that the plans of the diligent lead surely to advantage. We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

Pending:

Wyden/Dorgan amendment No. 792, to provide for the suspension of strategic petroleum reserve acquisitions.

Voinovich amendment No. 799, to make grants and loans to States and other organizations to strengthen the economy, public health, and environment of the United States by reducing emissions from diesel engines.

Martinez (for NELSON of Florida) amendment No. 783, to strike the section providing for a comprehensive inventory of Outer Continental Shelf oil and natural gas resources.

Schumer amendment No. 805, to express the sense of the Senate regarding management of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to lower the burden of gasoline prices on the economy of the United States and circumvent the efforts of OPEC to reap windfall profits.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in a moment we will return to consideration of the pending Energy legislation that we debated last week and this week and will complete later this week. We will resume debate on the amendment of Senator MARTINEZ relating to the inventory of the OSC. The time agreement we reached last night provides for up to 80 minutes of debate before the vote on that amendment, although I do not believe all of that time will be necessary. We would like to begin that vote no later than 11 this morning. We request that Senators come promptly for that vote.

We will be recessing at 11:30 to accommodate the weekly policy luncheons today. At 2:15, when the Senate returns from recess, we will continue through the amendments to the Energy bill. I believe the climate change amendments will be ready later this morning and for debate beginning at 2:15. We would expect votes on those amendments during today's session.

I reiterate that it is my intention to file cloture on this bill later this

evening. That would allow us to continue to consider and dispose of amendments, but it would also assure that we have a glide path to completion of the bill and that we would complete passage of the bill this week. The managers have done tremendous work over the last almost week and a half in moving the process along. I hope we can continue in that respect and finish the bill no later than Thursday or Friday of this week. Thus, we will be having a vote late this morning, and we will in all likelihood be voting on the climate change amendments later this afternoon. In addition, there will be the opportunity for people to come to the Senate floor and offer their amendments.

AMENDMENT NO. 783

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 80 minutes of debate on amendment No. 783.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be equally divided between both sides.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation now? Are we having speeches on the amendment to strike the OCS inventory by Senators MARTINEZ and NELSON and CORZINE; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator would have 8 minutes left.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask to be notified when I have spoken for 5

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6871

minutes. I know Senator CORZINE is coming to speak. If you could let me know when my 5 minutes is up, I would appreciate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The Chair will notify the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am proud to sponsor the Martinez-Nelson-Corzine-Boxer amendment to strike the OCS inventory language from the Energy bill. For millions of Americans living near our coasts, this amendment is arguably the most important we will debate on this bill. We know huge numbers of people live within 50 miles of America's coastlines. Few things are synonymous with California more than the beautiful beaches and the coasts. We have some pictures to show what this means to our children.

This is a scene I remember with my own children and now with my own grandson when he comes to visit California. This is what we think about. The natural beauty that is the California coast helps form our State's identity, as these pictures show. I will show you another one at this time as well. When I look at this, I just think: California.

The coast is a huge reason so many millions of Americans have chosen California as their home. Indeed, out of our 36 million Californians, 21 million Californians live in coastal counties. That is roughly 64 percent of the State's population. And there is a reason for it. This is God's gift to our State and to the people of this country and, frankly, to the people of the world who come to spend time on California's coastline and beaches.

The California coast is home to dozens of threatened and endangered species, including the short-tailed albatross, California Gnatcatcher, sea otters, chinook and coho salmon, steelhead trout, guadalupe fur seal, and several species of whales. Our coast is a true national treasure.

But Californians are not the only people who treasure our coastline. We know that tourists, millions of them, come to our State, generating \$51 billion in annual revenues for our State. The protection of California's coasts, frankly, as much as all the other coasts we will protect, is not just an environmental necessity, it is an economic necessity.

The underlying bill could very well lead to more offshore oil drilling, could devastate my State and its way of life, and I trust that this bipartisan legislation being offered by Senators MARTINEZ and NELSON will be agreed to because the inventory that is agreed to in this bill could encourage further drilling in the not-so-distant future, putting all of our coasts at risk.

Make no mistake about it. This inventory is not a benign compiling of a grocery list of resources. The inventory proponents would have us believe that, but it is really not benign. The inventory will be conducted using seismic air guns which use explosive blasts to

map rock formations beneath the sea. Sound from these blasts can be detected for thousands of miles, and hundreds of millions of blasts would be required to survey America's Outer Continental Shelf. These seismic blasts have been shown to have major consequences for marine life. So I do not see how it makes sense to say, on the one hand, we are protecting our beautiful coastline with moratoria and then allow the inventory to go forward in these areas.

Most fish use hearing to detect predators, find prey, communicate, and find mates. Loss of hearing can have profound, even fatal effects on our fish.

So why would we take God's precious gift and subject it to this kind of trauma? Frankly, it is wrong. To me, it is almost a moral issue, that we protect the beauty we have been given, this God-given beauty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for another minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mrs. BOXER. Seismic air guns have been shown to result in severely diminished fish catches by so severely startling the fish, they quickly leave the area or descend to the sea floor, seeking shelter from the noise. One study showed that when seismic blasts had been conducted in 1996, catch rates of cod and haddock declined between 45 percent and 70 percent over a 1,400-square-mile area, and 5 days later the catch rate had still not recovered.

I ask for an additional minute on top of my minute to finish.

The fact is, with so many fishery stocks already depleted, should we really do anything else to harm them, and can our fishermen afford the risk?

Marine mammals such as whales also use sound to locate food, avoid predators, care for young, and navigate the oceans. Seismic blasts can interfere with all of these critical activities. Air gun blasts have been observed to affect the feeding behavior of sperm whales in the Gulf of Mexico, migrating bowhead whales in the Beaufort Sea off the Alaskan coast, and harbor porpoises, which appear to be dodging and evading the sounds dozens of miles away from the blasts. Indeed, last year, the International Whaling Commission's Scientific Committee concluded that the increased sound from seismic surveys was cause for serious concern.

Mr. President, I see the Senator from New Jersey is here. We are running out of time, so I am going to wrap this up and cede the rest of the time to the Senator from New Jersey. I hope everyone supports this bipartisan amendment before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 1 minute 5 seconds.

Mr. CORZINE. One minute and 5 seconds? That is the time allotted by the Chair? Let me, then, be brief.

I rise today as a cosponsor in support of the amendment offered by Senators

MARTINEZ and NELSON that will keep the door closed to offshore drilling. The amendment strikes language in the bill that would allow a seismic inventory of all potential oil and natural gas resources in the Outer Continental Shelf, including areas off of the New Jersey coast.

The people of New Jersey strongly oppose allowing such an inventory and I voted against this provision during the committee markup.

New Jersey recognizes that taking inventory of these resources is a step onto a slippery slope toward the eventual drilling off the New Jersey coast; resources that are currently protected by the Outer Continental Shelf, or OCS, moratoria. After all, why would anyone conduct an inventory unless they have the intention to drill if resources are found? "Inventory" is just bureaucratic-speak for an open door to drilling off of our coast.

I have long fought to maintain the bipartisan, two-decades-old moratorium on drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf. Any drilling, or even the threat of drilling, poses a real threat to the New Jersey environment, economy, and way of life. Drilling would leave the New Jersey coast and its waters vulnerable to oil spills, drilling discharges and damage to coastal wetlands.

The environmental effects of an ecological disaster know no State boundaries. Oil spills are not fleeting environmental sound bites. These accidents linger for years, causing sustained environmental harm.

In addition, coastal tourism is our second largest industry. It generates more than \$31 billion in spending, directly and indirectly and supports more than 836,000 jobs; more than 20 percent of total State employment. Coastal tourism in New Jersey generates more than \$16.6 billion in wages and brings in more than \$5.5 billion in tax revenues to the State.

New Jersey already holds its own in supporting energy production and refining. We have three nuclear power plants. We are the East Coast hub for oil refining.

We are growing our energy business, but exploiting our shore is a step we refuse to take.

This is not just an issue for my State. Protecting the moratoria on drilling is important to maintaining the integrity of the coastline of the United States. Allowing drilling in anyone area affects all the surrounding areas. Tides move across State borders. Fisheries and fish do not recognize State borders. This issue affects us all, and we must protect the integrity of the moratoria at all costs.

The inventory is not only dangerous because it starts us on the slippery slope towards drilling, but also because the methods used to conduct the inventory, including seismic surveys, can disrupt marine ecosystems and damage our local fisheries.

Dr. Chris Clark, Director of the Bioacoustics Research Program at Cornell

University, has called seismic testing "the most severe acoustic insult to the marine environment . . . short of naval warfare." The impulses from the explosive shock waves used have been shown to cause harm to many species of marine life and have been equated with exploratory dynamite. It is not only dangerous but also costly. The inventory is estimated to cost U.S. taxpayers \$1 billion.

There is no need to conduct an invasive, environmentally harmful inventory when the Minerals Management Service already provides an estimate of oil and natural gas reserves in the Outer Continental Shelf.

The MMS estimate is noninvasive and does not harm the environment. So I say to my colleagues, we have no need for a seismic inventory—we already know about the resources off our shores.

According to the most recent study, the resources are few and far between. In fact, the MMS estimated that the Atlantic contains only eight percent of the Nation's undiscovered natural gas. In addition, in 2000, the MMS estimated the entire Mid-Atlantic region only contains 196 million barrels of oil, enough to last the country barely 10 days.

Why would any east coast State want to risk their coastal economies for another inventory when we already know what's out there? Ten days worth of oil will do nothing to reduce U.S. dependence on foreign oil.

This administration already has a reputation for threatening the moratoria. On May 31, 2001, the Minerals Management Service released a request for proposals to conduct a study of the environmental impacts of drilling in the Atlantic. The stated purpose of the study was to examine "areas with some reservoir potential, for example off the coast of New Jersey, and in the area formerly known as the Manteo Unit off North Carolina . . . in anticipation of managing the exploitation of potential and proven reserves."

Allow me to repeat that last part. The study was "in anticipation of managing the exploitation of potential and proven reserves."

Needless to say, the request created quite an uproar in my State. One local headline read, "Specter of drilling offshore is back, angering Jersey." New Jerseyans were outraged, as were the members of the New Jersey delegation here in Washington. My colleagues and I urged the administration to rescind the request, and were successful. But the threat still lingers, and this inventory will be the beginning of the unraveling of the moratoria and the eventual drilling off the New Jersey shores.

Past congresses and Presidents have ruled out Atlantic drilling for years, and we are not going to allow it now. American taxpayers should not have to pay for studies that amount to nothing more than oil industry fantasies.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment so that we can protect our

Nation's precious coastlines and ocean waters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTINEZ. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Carolina 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, since 1993 a moratorium has been in place on oil and gas exploration off the coast of North Carolina, thus protecting vital coastal areas from drilling. This moratorium has provided a much needed boost to our coastal economy and my entire State.

Each year, thousands of families flock to North Carolina beaches to enjoy the sun, dip in the cool waters, and spend time with family and friends. Visitors provide much needed tourism dollars that create and sustain jobs. This moratorium has worked.

Only 2 years ago, I helped lead the successful effort to stop an attempt to lift the moratorium on oil and gas exploration off the coast of North Carolina and many other States. Yet here we are, once again, confronting the same proposal to undermine the moratorium and open new areas of the Outer Continental Shelf to oil and gas development.

I am proud to join a bipartisan group of my colleagues in offering an amendment to strike a provision in the Energy bill that exposes currently restricted environmentally sensitive coastal areas to oil and gas exploration. I especially thank my friend and colleague, Senator MEL MARTINEZ, for his true leadership on this issue in his first year in the Senate.

There is no question that now more than ever we must work to end our dependence on foreign oil. But we cannot do so by ignoring the wishes and economic needs of the majority of the people of North Carolina and many other coastal States that oppose this exploration. Exploring off our coast would endanger North Carolina's booming tourism industry, a true economic engine of my State. According to the North Carolina Department of Commerce, tourism is one of North Carolina's largest industries, supporting nearly 183,000 jobs. Tourism remains strong despite declines in other important North Carolina industries, such as textiles, furniture manufacturing, and fiber optics.

While nationwide the tourism volume increased by less than 1 percent after the tragedy of September 11, North Carolina saw a 3-percent increase in its visitors, a real testament to the draw of our coastal areas. Last year, some 49 million visitors traveled to North Carolina making it the eighth most popular State tourist destination in the country. Tourists spent \$13.2 billion across the State, generating more than \$1.1 billion in Federal revenue and over \$1.1 billion in State and local tax revenue.

We have been told not to worry, all their talking about is an inventory. But there are two problems with this argument. The experts say inventorying itself will damage these environmentally sensitive areas. And why would we inventory an area we do not plan to later drill? The proposed inventory would be harmful to marine habitat and the fishing industry because it requires seismic surveys involving repetitive explosions in the water that send loud acoustic pulses through the water and into the sea floor. Scientists are concerned that these sounds kill fish and disturb whales, causing whales to swim onto the beach and die.

Advocates for an inventory label it solely as information gathering. But we already know where resources are located along our coast from data gathered by the Department of the Interior. Why, then, should our State be asked to risk environmental damage to our coastal areas for resources that are under moratoria and not even accessible for development? The potential physical price of exploration and subsequent drilling, polluted beaches, disrupted marine ecosystems, lost tourism, speaks to the heart of the issue. Any exploration off our coast is bad for tourism and is bad for North Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes from Senator NELSON's time.

Mr. DOMENICI. This time agreement, if I were to ask to yield additional time beyond that which we have for Senators, what would I be moving up against in terms of putting the Senate in some kind of a problem?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have a vote scheduled at 11 o'clock and a recess at 11:30.

Mr. DOMENICI. How many more Senators are supposed to speak on this issue?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six.

Mr. DOMENICI. Each of them have how much time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Each have 7 minutes 50 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am sorry, Senator.

Mrs. DOLE. I understand Senator NELSON is willing to yield 4 minutes of his time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent it be in order that Senator NELSON yield 4 minutes.

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

The Senator is recognized.

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, as an editorial in the Charlotte Observer on March 31 of this year explains, a drilling accident threatens everything North Carolinians hold dear about the coast—the beaches, the ocean water, the thin fish and shell fish, the pelicans and pipers, the marsh grass and live oaks.

Allowing drilling off the coast of the Carolinas, in an area of the Atlantic that has some of the roughest weather in the world, is foolish. I agree, indeed, it would be foolish. It is detrimental to

those who live, work, and visit our coastal communities. It is detrimental to my entire State.

In conclusion, let me wrap up quickly and say, once again, the majority of folks in North Carolina are opposed to this drilling. That is why I am again proud to be a strong voice for my State in fighting any effort to open up the Outer Continental Shelf to oil and gas exploration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to address the Senator for 30 seconds without being charged.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, my fellow Senators, we have heard the Chair announce we will have a vote that is set. The Senators have time to speak, so they should get down here and speak. We have Senator LANDRIEU, Senator BINGAMAN, the distinguished majority leader—although he can take time off his own time.

For any who have remaining time agreed to, it would serve their purpose if they would use their time because the time will run against them. I am not going to yield. I have only 7½ or 8 minutes in opposition. I cannot yield.

I yield the floor.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise as a cosponsor of the Nelson-Martinez amendment, which would remove from the energy bill language that threatens decades-old Congressional and Executive Branch protections of sensitive coastal areas.

Protecting our Nation's fragile coasts is vitally important to my State's economy. On the west coast of Washington, the livelihoods of many rural communities depend on fishing, tourism, and shellfish farming. These multi-million dollar industries depend on clean water and pristine coastlines.

In addition, the U.S. has entered into numerous treaties with coastal Indian tribes. Many of these treaties guarantee tribal fishing and shellfishing harvesting rights. We cannot set in motion a process that could damage these tribes' ways of life, or allow any potential abrogation of our Nation's trust responsibilities.

Over the last several years, Washington State has been a leader in protecting sensitive marine areas. We worked closely with the National Atmospheric and Oceanic Administration to establish the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, which encompasses most of the waters off of the northwest coast of Washington. The sanctuary is home to hundreds of species including marine mammals.

These mammals include the majestic Orca whale, whose 20 percent population decline over the past decade triggered a depleted listing under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and may lead to a threatened listing under the Endangered Species Act. I am very

concerned that the exploratory activities allowed under the Senate Energy Bill could further harm this important symbol of the Northwest.

There are those who argue that a mere inventory of off-shore oil and gas supplies would do no harm. But I would ask my colleagues to consider emerging scientific evidence related to seismic technology used to conduct these surveys. Studies have suggested that these techniques are more invasive than originally believed—particularly when it comes to their acoustic disruption of marine ecosystems. Potential interference with the sensory capacities of marine mammals may jeopardize fundamental activities such as foraging for food, avoiding predators, and caring for young.

Moreover, many coastal residents of my State still shudder when they recall the thick carpets of oil, hundreds of dead birds, and great shards of oil-blackened timber that followed a 1989 oil spill off Grays Harbor. That disaster stained over 300 miles of coastline. An oil well blow out could be many times worse.

While some argue that this is simply a study, my response is that we should not spend millions of taxpayer dollars to study something we know we do not want to do. My constituents have told me they will not accept drilling rigs off the coast of communities like Willapa Bay, Neah Bay, or the mouth of the Columbia River.

There is an important question here. Where is it appropriate to drill, and where is it inappropriate? I agree with many of the Senators who have cited our Nation's growing need for more natural gas supplies. While I fully recognize this challenge, according to the EIA and MMS, the potential supplies off the coast of Washington are dwarfed by at least 32 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that we know already exists in Alaskan fields.

That is gas that is currently being pumped back into the ground, and it is the reason we need to expedite the construction of a pipeline from Alaska's North Slope to the lower 48 States. Building this pipeline would provide years of domestic gas supply, create thousands of jobs, and provide a huge opportunity for the steel industry.

The Pew Oceans Commission has highlighted the fragility of our oceans and coastal resources and recommended we look at our oceans in a holistic manner—not through the narrow lens of oil and gas production but to look at the overall benefits provided by the oceans.

I think the commission's findings confirm the need to reject any provision that moves us towards future oil and gas drilling in National Marine Sanctuaries or off the coasts of protected federally owned national parks and wildlife refuges.

I encourage my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

I thank the Senators from Florida for their leadership on this important issue.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues from Florida, Senator NELSON and Senator MARTINEZ, as a cosponsor of their amendment to strike the OCS inventory language from the Energy bill.

I want to commend Senator DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN for working hard to craft a bipartisan bill, but I have a number of concerns with it, including the OCS inventory language.

Since 1982, Congress and the Executive branch have prohibited new off-shore leases in the OCS. The moratoria began with California and was expanded to include the rest of the west coast, Georges Bank, New England, the mid-Atlantic, part of the eastern Gulf, and portions of Alaska. Both President George H. W. Bush and President Clinton upheld the OCS moratoria.

Let us be very clear. While an inventory sounds benign, it is a costly endeavor that will cause irreparable harm to our coastal waters and set us on a slippery slope to drilling and exploration in these environmentally sensitive areas. Why else would the Federal Government propose to spend nearly \$1 billion to conduct seismic drilling activities if it did not intend to go forward with further coastal exploration? To suggest otherwise strains credulity. Further, nowhere in the underlying bill does it say how the Federal Government is going to pay for this \$1 billion inventory. I contend that there are better ways to invest \$1 billion—health care, education, infrastructure improvements, energy efficient technology, and renewable resources come immediately to mind, than on a misguided attempt to open our coastal areas to oil and gas exploration.

As I mentioned, conducting an inventory would entail seismic drilling that would have a ripple effect up and down our coastline. We already know that this type of activity has a devastating impact on marine life, including whales.

I am concerned that any seismic drilling or other similar activities along the North Atlantic and mid-Atlantic coast would have a tremendous negative impact on the health and well-being of Long Island Sound and the coastal areas of Connecticut.

Long Island Sound is an estuary of national significance with not one, but two openings to the sea. It is bordered by Connecticut and New York, running 110 miles long and 21 miles across at its widest. More than 8 million people live and vacation on or around Long Island Sound. Connecticut and New York have already spent millions of dollars and dedicated millions more to restore the health of the Long Island Sound ecosystem. A healthy habitat ensures a prosperous recreational and commercial fishing industry, boating, swimming, and an overall thriving tourism industry. Long Island Sound provides an economic benefit of more than \$5 billion to the regional economy.

Therefore, I am deeply concerned that any attempt to inventory the OCS

or begin future oil and gas exploration in the Atlantic would cause irreparable harm to Long Island Sound and the State of Connecticut. I therefore strongly support the Nelson-Martinez amendment and urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for 2 minutes of the allotted time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, an issue not discussed so far in this debate is the fact that we tried mightily to find a reasonable compromise that would allow for there to be exploratory inventorying of those areas which wanted it, while allowing States like Florida to opt out of such an inventory.

As we entered into those negotiations, it was unfortunate we were not able to seek common ground or find a way in which we could resolve it. The unfortunate issue arises that it is difficult to draw these State boundaries in a way that allows Florida to protect not only its coast but those that are adjacent to neighboring States. So as we went through this exercise, it was unfortunate we could not find that reasonable common ground that would have allowed us to reach a compromise.

Unfortunately, now Florida is in the peculiar position, as is North Carolina, that we have no option but to object to the entirety of this provision in the bill in order to protect Florida from the exploration or the inventorying. There is no question that inventorying is a precursor to drilling, to exploration.

In Florida, we have had for many years a moratorium on drilling. This moratorium will extend until the year 2012. It is a moratorium that has been not only observed but it has been implemented by President Bush, President Clinton, as well as by our current President. So there has been a compact, an understanding, a reasoned understanding that Floridians do not want this taking place off their shores—just as North Carolinians do not want it. We should have the opportunity not to interfere in our own States' coastline if we do not wish to have it.

Right now, we would have no such option. There would be no opportunity to opt out, and we would have only to acquiesce to inventorying off the shores of Florida which, frankly, cannot be drilled upon because of the current and pending moratorium.

How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired. Who yields time?

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I understand, according to the unanimous consent agreement, I now have 10 minutes to speak in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 7 minutes 15 seconds.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you, Mr. President. I will take all 7 minutes 15 seconds to talk about this important amendment.

I do so much respect a lot of what has been said on the floor of the Senate by my colleagues from Florida and New Jersey about their feelings about offshore drilling. Of course, we have different feelings about that in Louisiana, and our experience leads us to different conclusions. But that is not really the subject of this amendment, which is why I have come to the floor to speak in opposition to this amendment.

This is not a drilling amendment. This is a security amendment. This is a good stewardship amendment. This is a commonsense amendment. The people of the United States—all 240-plus million people who live in this Nation—depend on us—us right here—to give them good information about their country, about their land, about their water, about their oceans, about their resources. They depend on us to tell them the truth, not to hide things from them, not to pretend we have things when we do not or say we do not have things when we do.

That is all the amendment the Senators from New Mexico—both Senators, the chairman and the ranking member—have put in the underlying bill, with support from Democrats and Republicans, with a good vote from Republicans and Democrats on the committee, to put in this bill simply a direction for our agency, the Minerals Management Service of the Department of Interior, to do an inventory so the American public can understand how much oil, how much gas, how many other resources we might have on the Outer Continental Shelf.

No. 1, this is not a small piece of land or territory. It is 200 miles basically out from our coast, a ring around the Nation. If you took the OCS, which is 1.67 billion acres of land, and laid it over the map of the United States, it would be from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Coast. It is a huge asset owned not by the Senators, not by the House of Representatives, not by the Governors, it is owned by the American people. They have a right to know what resources are there for them should they need them, should they want to use them as good stewards—not as exploiters, not as destroyers, but as good stewards.

We are engaged in a war. We have had a strike against this Nation from terrorists who have all sorts of vile intentions against our Nation.

The price of oil is at \$58 a barrel this week. Gas is at a record high. We do not know when or if there will be another terrorist attack, but in the event there is some problem—more problems than we have today because we have some, obviously—when the country may have to draw on resources on the Outer Continental Shelf—it may either be because of an emergency or because of economic necessity—we most certainly would like to know what is

there so we can make a good decision. That is basically all this underlying bill does.

So I know my colleagues have different views about drilling and where drilling should be and whether we should drill, but this is not the amendment. This is not the attack point. You would want to talk about drilling when we get to it. This is about an inventory, a resource assessment of what is owned by the American people for their deliberate thought about what should be done either now or in the short-term future or in the long-term future of this Nation.

I urge all of us to vote against this amendment that would strip out this commonsense approach to letting the American people know what they own so they can make, and we all can make, good decisions about whether to use those resources, when to use those resources, or decide never to tap into those resources. But those good, commonsense decisions cannot even be made unless we know what we have.

The good leadership of both Senators from New Mexico is leading us to give the American people a full accounting. I come to the Senate floor this morning to say that I strongly support this underlying measure, and I thank them for their leadership. I urge my colleagues on the Democratic side, as well as my Republican colleagues, to hold to this commonsense inventory of our Outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following data be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVENTORY/SEISMIC

Conducting seismic surveys would provide MMS with a valuable tool to help predict where resources may lie beneath the ocean floor and help inform the American public as to the nature and value of these resources. The inventory language does not eliminate existing moratoria or expand OCS access and the seismic surveys described in the inventory language do not constitute "actual exploration."

Industry has co-existed with the marine environment for decades. In the Gulf of Mexico, new marine ecosystems have been created—and are thriving—as a result of offshore operations. Scientific research has not shown that seismic activities harm sperm whales or other marine mammal species. In its 2004 report, "Marine Mammal Populations and Ocean Noise—Determining when Noise Causes Biologically Significant Effects", the National Research Council concluded that "no scientific studies have conclusively demonstrated a link between exposure to sound and adverse effects on a marine mammal population."

However, MMS has implemented general instructions, including mitigation measures in deepwater, to minimize any possible effects of seismic surveys on marine species. Some of these measures include placement of trained visual observers on seismic vessels; immediate shutdown if a whale is sighted within the vicinity of seismic sources; and start-up procedures that require the immediate vicinity to be clear of any animals before activities can proceed.

Annual appropriations moratoria, not cost, have prohibited MMS from conducting any

leasing or related activities in these areas for decades. Any costs must be weighed against the benefits to the nation of understanding the value and nature of its offshore resources.

Under the OCS Lands Act, Congress found a serious lack of adequate basic energy information regarding OCS resources and an urgent need for this information. Congress noted that this information is "essential to the national security of the United States" and directed the Secretary of the Interior to maintain an inventory of the Nation's OCS undiscovered energy resources as well as its discovered reserves. Using sophisticated seismic technologies is key to ensuring accurate resource estimates.

EFFECTS OF SEISMIC SURVEYS ON WHALES AND DOLPHINS

1. Environmental groups suggest sounds from seismic surveys are a big problem for whales and dolphins.

This allegation is not supported by the science:

Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment (November, 2004). Geological and Geophysical Exploration for Mineral Resources on the Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf;

U.S. Department of Interior—Minerals Management Service (MMS 2004-054). Conclusions: Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI);

Marine Mammal Populations and Ocean Noise—Determining when Noise Causes Biologically Significant Effects 2004 National Research Council: "No scientific studies have conclusively demonstrated a link between exposure to sound and adverse effects on a marine mammal population."

This allegation is not supported by global experience:

No physical harm to whales or dolphins has ever been seen or shown as a result of industry seismic operations.

2. Significant effort is made to ensure seismic operations do not cause harm.

Careful assessment of the environment and possible impacts from seismic operations are undertaken in advance of operations.

A balanced, protective approach is applied when science cannot provide certainty.

As an example, operational modifications are made to provide added protection: Monitoring for the presence of animals of concern; Shutdown or no start-up when they are too close; Slow, gradual ramp-up of operations just in case.

More aggressive operational modifications are made when warranted (e.g. operating in more sensitive areas).

3. Industry continues to spend millions of dollars annually on research in this area: Base line biological knowledge; Accurate assessment of potential impacts; Improving operational modifications.

4. Concern for whales and dolphins should be focused on the true threat: fishing by-catch mortalities (deaths from entanglement in nets and other fishing gear).

WWF just issued an estimate of daily mortality due to fishing by-catch (June 9, 2005 press release): "Almost 1,000 whales, dolphins and porpoises die every day in nets and fishing gear. Some species are being pushed to the brink of extinction." www.cetaceanbycatch.org

WILL SEISMIC SURVEYS HARM RIGHT AND HUMPBACK WHALES?

If environmental groups say no to a limited lifting of the moratoria off the Eastern Seaboard because it is home to endangered Right and Humpback Whales, the following points should be considered in the debate:

The biggest threat to both are from ship strikes and entanglement in fishing gear, not sounds from seismic exploration.

The seasonal migration of both species is well known and documented (they go south for the winter).

Seismic operations can easily be conducted in the seasons when the animals are away.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I yield back the floor but reserve my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Time is equally charged to both sides if no one yields time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I assume the time is going to be charged proportionately against all the remaining speakers?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time will be equally charged against each side if no one yields time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Do we need a quorum call for that to occur?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. That occurs without a quorum call.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOMENICI). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have been yielded 4 minutes of Senator BINGAMAN's time.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, we are talking today about whether to find out how much natural gas we have offshore. Let me try to put that in personal terms. In the mountains of east Tennessee, we have a company, Tennessee Eastman. Mr. President, 10,000, 12,000 jobs are there. They have been good-paying jobs for several generations. They make chemicals at Eastman Chemical. Their raw material is natural gas. The cost of that gas has gone from the lowest in the world to the highest in the world. If it stays that way, those jobs will not be in Tennessee; they will be moving overseas.

There are 1 million blue-collar manufacturing jobs in America in the chemical industry that depend on natural gas for a raw material. We must lower the price of natural gas. We can do it by conservation. That is in the Domenici-Bingaman bill we are considering. We can do it by nuclear power, which we need to accelerate. Support for that is in the Domenici bill. We can do it someday, we hope, by coal gasification.

But right now we have \$7 gas, the highest in the industrial world, we are building all our new powerplants for natural gas, and we are refusing to find out how much natural gas we have offshore to supply more and reduce the price. So we have farmers who are taking a pay cut, homeowners who cannot heat and cool their homes, we have blue-collar workers across this country who are going to have their jobs shifted overseas, and what we are saying is we do not even want to know how much gas we have.

We can have a later debate about whether to give more States the option, as Texas does, as Louisiana does, as Alabama does, to drill for oil and

gas. You can do it today 20 miles offshore. You will never see it. It is environmentally clean. That is not the debate here today.

The debate today—and the Presiding Officer brought it up last year—if we are in a crisis on natural gas, if we have jobs moving overseas, why don't we want to know how much natural gas we have?

So I hope we will oppose this amendment and support the Domenici-Bingaman legislation, which puts us on a path toward a low-carbon production of energy plan for our future. It is an essential part of that. I hope we defeat the amendment and support the Domenici-Bingaman legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment to strike the Outer Continental Shelf inventory provision. During committee consideration of the bill, I supported adding this provision which requires a comprehensive survey of OCS oil and gas resources. I continue to support the provision. These resources belong to the entire Nation. I believe it is useful for us to know the extent of the oil and gas resources underlying the OCS.

It is important to note what the underlying provision does not do. The provision does not modify or rescind any moratorium. The provision does not allow drilling in any area that is covered by a moratorium. The provision does, however, provide for the development of important data and information about our energy resources. The language in the bill is identical to a provision that was approved in the Energy Committee during the last Congress, and the Senate rejected efforts to strike the language then. I hope we will have the same outcome on this issue in this Congress.

I oppose the amendment. I encourage my colleagues to oppose it as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I appreciate the support of Senator BINGAMAN.

The Energy and Natural Resources Committee included the language which is going to be stricken if the amendment passes. I urge the Senate not to strike the language. All Americans today are looking at the gas pump. They are seeing the price. The average price in the United States is \$2.13. That means something. They go home and they wonder about it. They ask questions: What are we going to do about it?

Americans should know that not at the gas pump but out there across the land there is another phenomenon occurring. That is the terrific increase in the price of natural gas, this marvelous product that years ago we didn't think we had very much of, and then we started finding it. All of a sudden we

thought we had an amount which we would never run out of. So we started putting it in the big powerplants because it is clean. We pumped it in by the trillions of cubic feet to produce electricity.

Now, all of a sudden the price is going up because demand has gone up dramatically. It has increased 300 percent in a short period of time. It is predicted, if something doesn't happen, the price could go as high as \$13; today it is only \$7. It was at one time down in the neighborhood of \$1.50 or \$2. That means if it continues to go up, we will have no fertilizer business in America. We will have no chemical business in America. Natural gas, which we use in our powerplants, will begin to run out. We are using it for all kinds of purposes. Then we will understand. We don't understand it right now.

All we are saying is, America, out there in the ocean, 200 miles, you can put these drilling platforms—I flew out and landed on one—you can put them out there. People have seen them on television. They are absolutely tremendous technological feats. There is no pollution. Nothing happens except 10 or 12 wells are drilled, this valuable resource that we own comes up, and we use it.

We thought it was very important for our citizens to know how much natural gas or crude oil exists out there. Nothing is going to happen to the States. Nothing is being changed versus the States. The moratoria exist. If we brought a moratoria amendment up here and said, lift the moratorium on Florida, it would lose. The bill would die. A filibuster would occur.

We are not asking for that. As a matter of fact, the bill says you can't even drill to determine the assets that America owns. It will be done by new, modern technology, seismic and otherwise, that in a few years will say to America, through Congress, to the President—and it will be a truthful, full disclosure, a transparency—America, if you have a problem, you have some alternatives. You can import natural gas in big ships that will bring it over here in a liquefied manner. We will still be paying foreign countries for it. We don't know if the price will come down. We don't know if they will have a cartel. They don't now. But if I were them, they are not subject to any national laws of ours, they could form a cartel. Natural gas could keep going up. We would keep importing it.

I can tell the American people, if we have this asset out there and some State thinks that maybe we ought to drill, or the United States of America believes we are throttled, we ought to know what is there. That is all. Some decision can be made in the future.

I say to my fellow Senators, please understand, this is not a proposal to change any moratoria. This is not a proposal to harm the State of Florida. We compliment the distinguished Senators, Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. NELSON, who have argued eloquently on behalf

of their State. Senator DOLE has been here. The Senator from New Jersey has been here. We recognize all of them.

Did Senator BINGAMAN have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator BINGAMAN has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Senator DOMENICI may have my 30 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield myself 30 seconds.

What we are asking is nothing more, nothing less than on behalf of the American people, let the experts go out and find out how much is there. In a rather superficial way, without having ever done the real seismic work, we have an idea of what is there, across the circle around America that has been described so eloquently by Senator LANDRIEU. We know somewhat what is there. But we don't know with any kind of assurance. We need that. That is what the amendment is about.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I tell the Senator, the distinguished chairman of the committee, we already know what is out there.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, is not a vote in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes left.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, again, I tell the Senator that we already know what is out there. In fact, the MMS does an inventory every 5 years. Here is the latest one. This is a 2003 update. The new one will come out this summer, in 2005. So we are not doing an inventory here as it is explained. What we are doing under this bill is doing something new. We are doing seismic explosions that could cost the Federal Government, in all of the Outer Continental Shelf, up to a billion dollars.

Seismic explosions. These air guns shoot air pressure all the way to the surface of the ocean floor. Now, that is what we are trying to stop. Since we know what is there—and they drilled several dry holes in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, off Florida. We know there is not any oil and gas there. They want to do a new type of exploration. Yet this is in a moratorium. So if it is in a moratorium until the year 2012, why are we going to allow, under this bill, going out and doing seismic explosions in the Outer Continental Shelf all around the United States? It makes no sense.

What it is is the first step to drilling. It is the proverbial camel's nose under the tent. Once he gets his nose under the tent, the camel is going to get in the tent, the tent is going to collapse, and there is going to be drilling all off the coast of Florida, all off the eastern seaboard and all off the western Pacific coastline.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida, Mr. MARTINEZ, is recognized.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, my understanding is that I have one minute to close.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That time has expired.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute to close on the amendment.

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I simply want to note that I am very appreciative of the chairman and ranking member of the committee where I have had the pleasure of working. I believe this is a great and good bill. I want to take this one little provision out that would do so much harm to the people of Florida and would be potentially invasive to our future. I want to remove it so that we can continue forward with this good bill.

I believe, without question, the issue here is not just about these inventories but about future drilling. We cannot drill ourselves to energy sufficiency by what we might find in the Gulf of Mexico.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment so we can take out this one piece of the bill, and the bill can be a successful bill. Then we can go into conference and provide an energy future for our country that is desperately needed. There are many things I want to vote for in the bill. I continue to be greatly concerned about not just an inventory but about where that path would lead. This is not only for the people of Florida but many other coastal Senators have expressed themselves as this being in the best interests of many of our States. I yield back my time.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 143 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Akaka	Dodd	Levin
Bayh	Dole	Lieberman
Biden	Durbin	Martinez
Boxer	Feingold	McCain
Burr	Feinstein	Mikulski
Cantwell	Graham	Murray
Chafee	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Clinton	Inouye	Obama
Coleman	Jeffords	Reed
Collins	Kennedy	Reid
Corzine	Kohl	Rockefeller
Dayton	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
DeMint	Leahy	

Schumer	Snowe	Sununu
Smith	Stabenow	Wyden

NAYS—52

Alexander	Crapo	McConnell
Allard	DeWine	Murkowski
Allen	Domenici	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Ensign	Pryor
Bennett	Enzi	Roberts
Bingaman	Frist	Salazar
Bond	Grassley	Santorum
Brownback	Gregg	Sessions
Bunning	Hagel	Shelby
Burns	Hatch	Specter
Byrd	Hutchison	Stevens
Carper	Inhofe	Talent
Chambliss	Isakson	Thomas
Coburn	Kyl	Vitter
Cochran	Landrieu	Voinovich
Conrad	Lincoln	Lott
Cornyn	Lott	Warner
Craig	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—4

Dorgan	Kerry
Johnson	Thune

The amendment (No. 783) was rejected.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 11:30 having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:34 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005—
Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside so I may be permitted to offer an amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 817

(Purpose: To provide for the conduct of activities that promote the adoption of technologies that reduce greenhouse gas intensity in the United States and in developing countries and to provide credit-based financial assistance and investment protections for projects that employ advanced climate technologies or systems in the United States)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HAGEL], for himself and Mr. PRYOR, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. DOLE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. STEVENS, proposes an amendment numbered 817.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

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

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I understand under a previous agreement the Senator from Minnesota wishes to offer an amendment. I will withhold further comments until the Senator from Minnesota has had an opportunity to propose an amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I ask that the pending business be set aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 790

Mr. DAYTON. I call up Senate amendment 790.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAYTON] proposes an amendment numbered 790.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require that gasoline contain 10 percent ethanol by volume by 2015)

On page 159, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 211. ETHANOL CONTENT OF GASOLINE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CELLULOSIC BIOMASS ETHANOL.—The term "cellulosic biomass ethanol" means ethanol derived from any lignocellulosic or hemicellulosic matter that is available on a renewable or recurring basis, including—

- (A) dedicated energy crops and trees;
- (B) wood and wood residues;
- (C) plants;
- (D) grasses;
- (E) agricultural residues; and
- (F) fibers.

(2) WASTE DERIVED ETHANOL.—The term "waste derived ethanol" means ethanol derived from—

(A) animal wastes, including poultry fats and poultry wastes, and other waste materials; or

(B) municipal solid waste.

(3) ETHANOL.—The term "ethanol" means cellulosic biomass ethanol and waste derived ethanol.

(b) RENEWABLE FUEL PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations ensuring that each gallon of gasoline sold or dispensed to consumers in the contiguous United States contains 10 percent ethanol by 2015.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, we have been talking about the laudable goals of recycling, our Nation's dependency on foreign oil, and developing alternative sources of energy. The old saying goes, actions speak louder than words. Our current energy program and practices are taking this country in the opposite direction—toward increased imports of foreign oil.

Even with the renewable fuel standard in the Senate bill, which some want to eliminate, the projected gasoline consumption in our country will increase from 135 billion gallons this

year to 168 billion gallons in 2012. That is a 26-percent increase in America's use of gasoline in just 7 years. At a time that worldwide demand is also expected to increase significantly, where we will get the increased supplies? How much will we have to pay for them?

As my colleague, Senator CANTWELL from Washington State, courageously warned last week, even with the adoption of the Senate's renewable fuel standard, our imports of foreign oil would increase from 59 percent currently to 62 percent in 2012. Without adopting the Senate renewable fuel standard, our oil imports would be over 67 percent in just 7 years.

Taking yesterday's world price for oil, which was over \$59 a barrel, we will spend \$220 billion this year for foreign imports of oil, and we would spend \$243 billion in 2012, even with the renewable fuel standard. Anyone who believes the world price of oil in 2012 will not be higher than it is today is beyond optimistic.

Of course, if we can continue to get all the oil we need at today's prices or lower, we would have no need to develop alternatives. That has been our national energy strategy today. People say we do not have an energy policy. I respectfully disagree. Our policy has been and continues to be to maintain the status quo for as long as possible. We continue to depend almost entirely upon oil and oil products, natural gas and its products, coal, nuclear, and hydroelectric power for over 97 percent of our total energy needs nationwide, just as we did in 1970 before our so-called energy crisis began.

The so-called alternative fuels provided less than 2 percent of our country's energy in 1970. They provide less than 3 percent today. None of them are likely to provide significantly more of our total supply 10 or even 20 years from now except for ethanol and other biofuels such as biodiesel. That is why we do not see full-page ads attacking solar, wind, or geothermal energy by the Petroleum Institute or other major energy sources, because they know the alternatives are no threat to replace them anytime soon.

The only alternative source of energy the American Petroleum Institute is attacking is ethanol. Why is that huge industry, oil and gas special interest, spreading misinformation about a business competitor? Because they recognize that ethanol has the ability—not just potential but the ability now, not 10, 20, or 40 years from now but right now—to replace gasoline, to replace not just MTBE, the—3 percent additive to regular gasoline, but to replace the gasoline itself.

I know that from my own experience driving a Ford Explorer that has run on a blend of 85 percent ethanol and 15 percent gasoline all over Minnesota during the past 3 years. My Senate office leased a van that has run on the 85 percent fuel for the last 4 years. Both vehicles have factory-made flexible-fuel engines which can run on the 85-