(A) conditions in Burma, including human rights violations, arrest and detention of democracy activists, forced and child labor, and the status of dialogue between the SPDC and the NLD and ethnic minorities;

(B) bilateral and multilateral measures undertaken by the United States Government and other governments to promote human rights and democracy in Burma; and

(C) the impact and effectiveness of the provisions of this Act in furthering the policy objectives of the United States toward Burma.

SEC. 9. DURATION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) TERMINATION BY REQUEST FROM DEMOCRATIC BURMA.—The President may terminate any provision in this Act upon the request of a democratically elected government in Burma, provided that all the conditions in section 3(a)(3) have been met.

(b) CONTINUATION OF IMPORT SANCTIONS.—

(1) EXPIRATION.—The import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) shall expire 1 year from the date of enactment of this Act unless renewed under paragraph (2) of this section.

(2) RESOLUTION BY CONGRESS.—The import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) may be renewed annually for a 1-year period if, prior to the anniversary of the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, a renewal resolution is enacted into law in accordance with subsection (c).

(c) RENEWAL RESOLUTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term ''renewal resolution'' means a joint resolution of the 2 Houses of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.''

(2) PROCEDURES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A renewal resolution—

(i) may be introduced in either House of Congress by any member of such House at any time within the 90-day period before the expiration of the import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1); and

(ii) the provisions of subparagraph (B) shall apply.

(B) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—The provisions of section 152 (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192 (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f)) apply to a renewal resolution under this Act as if such resolution were a resolution described in section 152(a) of the Trade Act of 1974.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in speaking to the managers of the bill and the interested parties in this matter, the thought is—and this is not in the way of a unanimous consent request but just to inform Members what we are doing—the Senator from Florida will offer his amendment. He will speak on it tonight. Perhaps the other Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON, will speak on his amendment. There are a number of Senators who have requested time in the morning.

The manager of the bill has suggested—and we think it would be OK on our side—that tomorrow we would have an hour on our side and the majority would have 30 minutes on their side, and then the two leaders can decide if we vote at that time or sometime later in the day. Staff is putting that in the form of a unanimous consent request, and perhaps we can enter into that sometime later tonight.

Mr. DOMENICI. We are looking for a unanimous consent request that says in the morning 1 additional hour on that side, a half hour on our side on the Graham amendment, and afterwards there will be a vote. That is being prepared. In the meantime, the Graham amendment is going to be offered for discussion this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

AMENDMENT NO. 884

Mr. GRAHAM of Florida. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DODD, Mr. CHAFEE, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CORZINE, and Ms. COLLINS, proposes an amendment numbered 884.

Mr. GRAHAM of Florida. Mr. President, 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 strike the provision requiring the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an inventory and analysis of oil and natural gas resources beneath all of the waters of the outer Continental Shelf)

Beginning on page 23, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 25, line 8.

Mr. GRAHAM of Florida. Mr. President, the amendment I have just offered will strike section 105 from the legislation we are currently considering.

This amendment is cosponsored by a long and diverse list of Senators: Senators FEINSTEIN, DOLE, CANTWELL, WYDEN, NELSON of Florida, BOXER, LAUTENBERG, EDWARDS, KERRY, MURRAY, LIEBERMAN, AKAKA, LEAHY, SNOWE, DODD, CHAFEE, KENNEDY, CORZINE, and COLLINS.

In this legislation, section 105 appears to be benign. It calls for an inventory of Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas resources that may be in the ownership of the Federal Government. However, there are some insidious objectives and means to achieve those objectives in this legislation.

In my judgment, section 105 is nothing more than a prelude to a direct attack on the moratorium which currently exists in the Gulf of Mexico, off New England, the Pacific Northwest, and California, and to do so in a way that will avoid a full and public debate.

The OCS inventory, which is suggested in section 105, is neither benign nor innocuous. It will provide for a totally duplicative survey to one that is already conducted by the same office that would be directed to do the study under section 105, which is the U.S. Department of the Interior Minerals Management Service. This is the front page of the latest of the 5-year reports, which the Mineral Management Service does on U.S. resources and reserves in the Outer Continental Shelf. As you will see, this latest assessment was done in the year 2000. So it has been only 3 years since we had a comprehensive analysis.

In light of that, why would we oppose this new study? We would oppose the new study because we think it is duplicative and redundant. We oppose it because it would allow certain techniques, which have previously not been used but which have been shown to be detrimental to the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf, including the fish resources, to be utilized. But, in my judgment, the most insidious aspect is a provision in section 105 which states that after the inventory is completed it should be used as the purpose of analysis of the Outer Continental Shelf. Let me read to you subparagraph 5 under section 105:

The inventory and analysis shall identify and explain how legislative, regulatory, and administrative programs or processes restrict or impede the development of identified resources and the extent that they may affect domestic supply, such as moratoria, lease terms and conditions, operational stipulations and requirements, approval delays by the Federal Government and coastal States, and local zoning restrictions on onshore processing facilities, and pipeline landings.

I think that language is clearly intended to take the results of this newly mandated inventory and use them as the basis, focusing exclusively on the issue of affecting domestic supply, to build the case that the moratoria, which California and other coastal States have had now for 20 years, would be undermined.

That moratoria has been voted on by Congress on many occasions in recognition of the fact that, first, there are other interests involved beyond maximizing the exploitation of our Continental Shelf oil and gas resources. There are issues of the environment and there are issues of the economy, which are dependent upon the environment—particularly, the purity of the water and the security of the coastal areas.

Second is the fact that it does not take into consideration the question of we want to have a domestic supply of oil and gas, but for what time period? If we were to initiate a policy that says we will drain America first, we can rest assured that our grandchildren, if not

our children, will live in an America that will be totally dependent upon foreign petroleum sources.

The estimate is that, as of today, we have known reserves of petroleum which, at current levels of utilization, will last approximately 50 years. We have much longer reserves of natural gas, stretching into the 200-year-plus estimate.

I think it is eminently wise public policy to say we will try to husband our domestic resources as long as possible to delay the date when we will be fully dependent upon foreign resources. This practice of providing moratoria on certain of our resources plays a significant positive role in that policy of attempting to stretch our domestic resources.

As the list of cosponsors indicates, this is by no means a partisan issue. The moratoria have broad bipartisan support, and have had it for over 20 years. This is also not an issue that is bicameral. The House of Representatives has already adopted an Energy bill, stripping out language that was virtually verbatim to that which is in 105 of the Senate bill.

Our desire is to have the Senate take the same position that our House colleagues have already taken, so when this issue is taken up in conference, the issue of an inventory that has as its objective undermining the moratoria will not be a conferenceable item.

I believe our colleagues in the House have shown wisdom in the course of action they have taken, and I ask my Senate colleagues to show the same wisdom by eliminating section 105. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, which will adopt or reinforce a policy where we look at multiple issues in the management of our coastal areas, including the issue of exploitation of the resources but also the potential effect of that exploitation on other economic and environmental considerations; that we also recognize the valid function of those adjacent State and local communities and how this issue would be resolved, and the legitimacy of the Federal Government's Coastal Zone Management Act as the means by which those interests would be expressed. For all those reasons, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and strike section 105 from this bill, and then with the joy that we will know that we have taken a step to protect some of our most critical ocean resources, move on to the consideration of other provisions in this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I understand Senator DOLE desires to speak on the same side. I don't intend to speak but for a moment. I will do my speaking and other members of the committee will be welcome to do so in the morning. I will take a couple of minutes and then yield to them for the evening.

As you well know, as you are a member of the energy committee, not too long ago the Senate of the United States said to this committee of Senators: Give us an energy policy for America's future, prepare a blueprint, a program, a policy, a set of activities that tells us what we ought to be doing for America's economic future, for our jobs, for our prosperity, as it relates to energy. We thought that if we did nothing else, perhaps that little mission meant we ought to find out what we have. What does America own?

We thought about it for a while and we said that is pretty simple. That is exactly what they would like us to do. They would like us to find out—even if we don't know what to do about it—what we have. What do we own? So a simple proposition was put in here, using the most modern techniques, disturbing nothing, to go out and find out how much oil and gas is in the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States—the property marked by my good friend from Florida in green on his chart—that we have already, as a nation, said based on today's circumstances we don't want to touch.

Does that mean we should not know what is there? The distinguished Senator from Florida says: We do know what is there. No, we do not know what is there because the most modern techniques are clearly changing what we know about what we own and what is underground. We do not have one of those most modern evaluations that has been put over that property that is within our control that could be used for America if we ever needed it and, I would even say, in a crisis.

As an ultimate reserve, should we not know what is there? That is the issue. It is, do we want to adopt an ostrich policy or do we want to adopt a policy of being on the surface, above board with our eyes open and know precisely what we are looking at? That is it. You can read the language. We will read it very precisely.

It matters not too much to this Senator from New Mexico what this Senate decides to do about this issue. It matters a lot to me as chairman of the Committee on Energy that I do what I was asked to do, and I thought I was asked to ask the committee members: Would you like to spend some American tax dollars to find out what we own so that it will be there in the inventory on the rack, so to speak, in the event something happened to America?

I thought the answer to that question was yes. We wrote it up, and we put the issue to the members. One member is sitting here, the new Senator from Tennessee. There was a rather large bipartisan vote on a simple proposition. Of course we want to know. Why would we want to stick our head in the sand and say we know there is oil there, we know there is gas there, but we do not want to use the most modern techniques to tell America what is there? As is going to happen tonight and tomorrow, there will be all this fear aroused that we are going to harm the sea line, the coastal shore, the beauty of America that is alongside these shores.

This says nothing about doing that, and everybody knows that we are not saying do anything whatsoever to these shorelines. What we are saying is, is it not, one, the responsibility of the committee to suggest to the Congress that we find out? I think the answer to that is unequivocal. Yes, we sure should.

Second, since you should have and you did, should the Senate now turn around and say you should have, you did, but we want to take it out, we want to throw it away, and we do not want to do it? That is the issue.

I sense that there is going to be enough fear established that people are going to be voting as if we are destroying something. Quite the contrary, I think we are doing something positive. I do not think we are destroying a thing. We are saying to folks: We have a lot of oil and gas out there. If the situation really gets bad—and what that might be, I do not know; none of us in this room knows—but if things got bad enough, there it is, and we know it is there, and it has been measured with the most modern-day techniques which are, indeed, not only marvels but they are marvelous in terms of what they will tell us about the capacity for the future.

Unless my friend from Tennessee wants to say a few words, I do not intend to spend any more time tonight. We will split our half hour tomorrow among three or four Senators from the committee in further response to the amendment that our distinguished friend from Florida has brought to the floor in a bipartisan manner with a lot of Senators.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise in favor of the Graham amendment to S. 14, the omnibus Energy bill. My State like so many others, is going through a painful economic transition. We have lost tens of thousands of jobs in textiles and the furniture industry, family farms are going out of business, and many of these traditional manufacturing jobs have been in rural areas, where there are fewer jobs and residents are already struggling to make ends meet.

In 1999, North Carolina had the 12th lowest unemployment rate in the United States. By December 2001, the State had fallen to 46th—from 12th to 46th. That same year, according to the Rural Center, North Carolina companies announced 63,222 layoffs. Our State lost more manufacturing jobs between 1997 and the year 2000 than any State except New York. Entire communities have been uprooted by this crisis. According to the Employment Security Commission of North Carolina, the jobless rate rose from 6 percent in March to 6.4 percent just one month later.

So you can see, Mr. President, North Carolina is hurting. But one area that remains strong is tourism—one of the State's largest industries. Each year, travelers venture into our State to enjoy the mountains of Asheville, the Southern-city charm of Charlotte, the beaches of the Outer Banks, and many other State treasures.

Last year, there were 44.4 million visitors to North Carolina, ranking it the sixth most popular destination behind California, Florida, Texas, Pennsylvania and New York. In fact, last year domestic travelers spend nearly $12 billion across the State, generating $2.2 billion in tax receipts.

The industry remains strong, despite the war, and the Nation's economic concerns. In fact, while the tourism volume nationwide increased by less than 1 percent last year, North Carolina saw a 3 percent increase in visitors.

Put simply, tourism plays a vital role in North Carolina's economy, but offshore drilling could drastically impact these numbers.

Communities along the Outer Banks have spoken out time and again against offshore drilling because of the impact it cold have on the economy and the environment—and I agree with them.

I thank my good friend, Chairman DOMENICI, for his hard work and dedication to produce a comprehensive energy bill, one that will help our country end its dependency on foreign oil. While I fully support Senator DOMENICI's efforts, I must disagree with regard to section 105.

Section 105 in the Senate bill has been presented as a study of the oil and gas reserves in the Outer Continental Shelf, but the effect of this section would be to open up scientific *exploration*. The final bill that passed the House of Representatives, as we have heard, rejects language that would open up scientific exploration of the Outer Continental Shelf.

The waters off the coasts of North Carolina have been placed off limits to further leasing under the current moratoria. President Bush extended the moratorium and Secretary Norton has been very clear about the administration's intention to uphold it. Congress and the Administration in the past have agreed with States in the moratoria areas that drilling would pose too many risks to their economies and shores.

Why then, in these tough economic times, should States such as North Carolina be asked to bear the risk of exploration for resources that are under moratoria and not even accessible for development? Section 105 hints to a backsliding from that protection by allowing intrusive activities into moratoria areas, through a study that is not needed.

The Minerals Management Service already compiles estimates of Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas resources every 5 years. In fact, the last one was completed in the year 2000, and includes estimates of undiscovered conventionally and economically recoverable oil and natural gas. We already know, for instance, that 80 percent of the Nation's undiscovered, economically recoverable Outer Continental Shelf gas is located in the Central and Western part of the Gulf of Mexico, which is currently not subject to the moratorium.

So it would appear that section 105 of this energy bill is duplicative and unnecessary.

In fact, the only logical explanation for new data under section 105 would be for future exploration activity like drilling, which is inconsistent with the current moratorium. We have a national crisis. Now, more than ever, we must work to end our dependence on foreign oil sources. It is vital that this Nation boost its domestic oil production, but we cannot do so by ignoring the wishes of coastal communities in North Carolina and other States that oppose drilling.

Our local people, not the Federal Government, should decide what is best for their areas. The Federal Government should not take action that will further hurt our already struggling State economies. That is why I urge support for the Graham amendment, which would continue to protect those areas under moratorium. We owe it to our States. We owe it to our local communities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of the bill tomorrow morning at 9:30, there then be 90 minutes of debate remaining prior to the vote in relation to the pending Graham amendment; provided further that Senator GRAHAM or his designee be in control of 60 minutes and the chairman in control of the remaining 30 minutes. Further, I ask consent that following the use of that time, the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the amendment, with no amendments in order to the amendment prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM of Florida. The Senator from New Mexico said ''in relation to.'' That would not preclude the possibility of an up-or-down vote as opposed to a tabling motion?

Mr. DOMENICI. Either/or.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. It would be either/or.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise this evening to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida and commend him on his leadership on this issue. The amendment that is before us tonight will prevent exploration in offshore areas that are currently protected under law. The truth is, we should not need a special amendment to protect sensitive offshore areas that are currently off limits to energy drilling and exploration, but today we find this amendment is needed because the underlying Energy Bill would essentially roll back a longstanding ban on exploration that protects our coastal areas.

This Energy Bill calls for the Department of Interior to inventory oil and gas resources. It does not rule out exploration or drilling in any part of the Outer Continental Shelf and it does not prevent exploration or drilling in areas that are currently protected.

Some may say they just want to allow an inventory of oil and gas off our coasts, but taking an inventory of what lies beneath the sea floor is not like taking an inventory of what is in the kitchen pantry. Looking for oil and gas off our coasts is an invasive process. It carries risks. It harms marine life and it can create serious environmental damage.

If it was just taking an inventory, it would be one set of environmental concerns, but I think we all know what is really going on and it is much more than inventory. This is not just about seeing what is out there. It is really about preparing to drill for oil and gas in areas that have been protected for years, for decades actually, by law.

Let's be clear. Oil companies are not going to spend millions of dollars to inventory our coasts just for the fun of it. They want to begin drilling in areas that are protected, and this Energy Bill would give them the start they want.

I am reminded of that analogy about how if a camel gets its nose under the tent, pretty soon the whole camel will follow. Well, if we do not want the camel in our tent, stop it when it tries to poke its nose in.

Once those oil companies get their equipment down there, they will be steps away from setting up oil rigs and creating a host of dangers on our shores. If we do not want oil companies drilling off our shores, then we cannot let them get started with these so-called inventory projects.

There are good reasons why over the years Congress and past Presidents have agreed to protect parts of our Outer Continental Shelf. In fact, that moratorium that today protects the coast of my State of Washington was passed by Congress in 1990 and protected by an executive order by the first President Bush. Today, the current Bush administration wants to repeal that protection and pave the way for drilling off our coasts.

Those who want to explore for energy off our coasts would like us to believe it is harmless, but it is not. When we consider offshore oil and gas development, we have to be concerned about oil spills and the release of other toxic materials. There are other environmental effects that pose dangers to marine mammal populations, fish populations, and air quality. Seismic testing techniques used by the offshore oil and gas industry can kill marine animals. This is not harmless.

If this administration had a better record on the environment, I might be inclined to give them more leeway, but this administration has shown an eagerness to roll back environmental protections on so many issues that they do not have much credibility when they say they want to just look for oil off our coasts.

Last month, the Bush administration took another disturbing step to undermine our environmental protection related to oil and gas drilling. In fact, on May 26, 2003, the New York Times reported that the administration proposed to defer for 2 years requirements for permits under the Clean Water Act for certain activities of oil and gas producers to prevent contaminated runoff. This is a bad precedent and a step in the wrong direction for protecting our environment. There is no good reason for oil and gas developers to be exempt from requirements that are imposed on other developers to prevent contaminated runoff.

So not only do they want to let the big oil and gas companies start looking for oil in areas that have been protected for decades, this Bush administration is going to free those oil and gas companies from the rules everyone else has to follow to protect contaminated runoff. Not on my watch. We know there is a better way. Congress should be seeking long-term solutions that make sense for energy development and that balance environmental protection and economic growth. The proposal to drill in areas of the OCS that are currently under moratoria falls far short of the balanced approach we need. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to stop an attack on decades of protection for our sensitive coastal areas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise to support the Graham amendment. I am a cosponsor. BOB GRAHAM and I have been battling on the question of oil and gas drilling off the coast of Florida, and it is very clear to us, as we have waged this battle over the course of the last 25 years in public office, that the people of Florida do not want it for environmental reasons but also for business reasons; that Florida's $50 billion tourism industry in large part is because we have beautiful, unspoiled beaches.

I know what the people in my State of Florida want. They do not want oil drilling off their shore. I ask the Senator from Washington what is the thinking of her people in her State of Washington?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Florida, I have listened to his battles for many years as he has fought to protect the beautiful shores of Florida. I have seen the shores of Florida, and they are gorgeous. He is right, tourism is a critical part of the economy of his State of Florida, as it is to mine. People come to Washington State to see our beautiful mountains, our beautiful forests, and to fish. The last thing they want to see is oil drilling off our coasts.

This underlying bill that allows an inventory is simply a step for the oil companies to then get in and drill. My State would be absolutely appalled to see that happen.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. What do you think about the rest of the Pacific coast States, Oregon and California? What would the people think?

Mrs. MURRAY. As the Senator from Florida knows well, for all who live on coastal States, our economies are struggling today; the high-tech industry is struggling; Boeing has lost thousands of jobs.

There is still the beautiful environment that people come to visit. The last thing anyone wants in our rain forests, whether in Oregon or Washington, or the beaches of California, the last thing they want to see is an oil rig or, worse, an oilspill in the areas we care so much about.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I talked at length with the senior Senator from North Carolina earlier today. Senator EDWARDS is quite concerned about the oil drilling off of the Outer Banks.

The people directly affected are crying out. There are States that do not mind drilling off the coast—the State of Louisiana, the State of Texas. There are about 2,000 wells in the Gulf of Mexico and they are primarily off of Texas and Louisiana, some off of Alabama, some off of Mississippi, all of those States whose Senators do not seem to mind because it must reflect their people's feeling that there be oil drilling. In the Gulf of Mexico, the geology shows that is where the oil and gas is, in the western gulf, in the central gulf, but not in the eastern gulf.

The people of Florida simply do not think it is worth the tradeoff of spoiling the environment and spoiling a $50 billion tourism industry to take the risk where the geology shows there is very little likelihood of oil, to take the risk that a well will be hit, that an oilspill will occur.

There is another reason. We have tremendous military facilities in the State of Washington. What we are finding is with so many of the military facilities on the gulf coast now that the naval facility on Vieques Island in Puerto Rico is being closed down, some of that training for the U.S. Navy is being shifted to the gulf coast of Florida, not necessarily on the land.

Because of computers and virtual training, they can now image what would be the target zone, and it can be out in the middle of the Gulf of Mexico. That helps in preparation of our Navy for its proper training, but will that Navy be able to train if there are oil rigs in the eastern Gulf of Mexico? The answer is no.

I ask the Senator from Washington, is there any similar military activity in the Senator's State? I certainly know there is in California where they are launching from Vandenberg Air Force Base. Is there such a facility?

Mrs. MURRAY. The Senator from Florida makes an excellent point. Our military needs to be ready for whatever conflicts come to them on the war on terror. They need to be out there training. Certainly at Makah Air Force Base and the other bases we have, they need to know they have a place they can train and not be interfered with.

I add, as the Senator from Florida knows, there are other economies that we count on as well. Fishing is a tremendous economy and part of our economy base in the State of Washington. They would not be excited about having oil rigs out there where people are fishing, as well as tourism, but certainly the military is an important part of my State. We want to make sure they have the space they need for training. The Senator makes an excellent point.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I have to tell a little story to the Senator from Washington before she leaves. In the middle of the 1980s I was the junior Congressman from the east coast of the State of Florida. There was a Secretary of the Interior named James Watt who was absolutely intent on drilling. They offered for lease off the east coast of the United States leases for sale all the way from North Carolina south to Fort Pierce, FL.

Perhaps I was green enough—I didn't know any better—to take him on. I took him on, as a junior Congressman. I was getting absolutely nowhere. We beat it back one year. They left it alone the next year and came back with a new Secretary of the Interior the third year and they were intent they were going to ram through those leases. The only way I was able to beat it was I finally got the Department of Defense and NASA to own up to the fact and to press that on the administration back in the mid-1980s that you cannot be dropping the solid rocket boosters off of the space shuttle with oil rigs down there and you cannot be dropping off the first stage, after it is spent, on the expendable launch vehicles coming out of Cape Canaveral with oil rigs out there. That is the only way we beat it back in the mid-1980s.

I thought they were going to leave us alone. Two years ago, when an important appointment was up in the Department of the Interior, I went to the Secretary of the Interior, Secretary Norton, and she assured me that in the eastern Gulf of Mexico there would be no attempt at oil drilling for the next 5 years. That was a commitment made to me with regard to an appointment and the Senate's consideration. What is in this bill does not break her commitment, but it clearly starts to imply that what is being done is the intention of drilling.

I hope we are going to be able to muster the votes with Senators who do not have coasts, with help from Senators such as the distinguished Senator in the chair, listening to this debate.

With their help, we may just have the votes.

When Senator GRAHAM and I tried 2 years ago just with regard to the Gulf of Mexico off the State of Florida to keep the moratorium there, we did not get but 35 votes for our amendment, so the amendment did not pass. It was later that I got that commitment from Secretary of the Interior Gale Norton.

But this is portending something else. We are going to fight. I hope we have the votes.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Florida, thank you on behalf of all who care about this issue for your longtime battle and diligence. Every time you are right, they keep coming back at you, but you keep winning.

I agree, there are a number of Senators on this floor who are not from coastal States but they should be joining because certainly they all come to our States to see the beautiful coastlines, whether it is Florida, Washington State, California, or Maine. They want to preserve that, too. They want to take their grandchildren and great-grandchildren, some day, to your State. I certainly hope they want to come to ours, too. If we devastate the environment, the tourism will not be there.

I thank my colleague for working on this issue.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I am not a junior Congressman anymore but I am a junior Senator. Although there have been some birthdays between the time I was a junior Senator and a junior Congressman, I still have a lot of fight in me.

I think we have a decent shot of winning this amendment and this vote will take place tomorrow.

There is no need repeating a number of the things that have been said. Let me summarize, on first glance, section 105 of this bill seems reasonable. Do we know what the resources are so we can prepare an assessment? Upon further reflection, upon reading the language, it becomes unnecessary and unreasonable when you recognize the Secretary of the Interior has conducted an inventory just 2 years ago. On the plan there is going to be an inventory that is going to be conducted in 2005, just 2 years from now. Why should the U.S. Congress and the Secretary of the Interior go about duplicating the efforts that had just been done and were going to be done? We know most of the Outer Continental Shelf is under a moratorium. Almost all of those areas, under this plan, of section 105 of the bill would be required to be reassessed under the moratorium. So I am just not sure. I kind of smell something fishy here.

Why does the Congress want to waste taxpayer money on a duplicative inventory of areas off limits to oil and gas exploration?

The House of Representatives has already realized the importance of this amendment. They passed it with a voice vote in an overwhelming show of bipartisan support. So if we can pass this amendment of Senator GRAHAM, this issue is over and done with because of an identical provision in the bill that has passed the House.

We already know that many coastal States exercise their rights under the Coastal Zone Management Act because oil and gas exploration plans that have been proposed would threaten those States. In their own efforts to control the destiny of their own shores and their own environment, they have exercised their rights under the Coastal Zone Management Act not to have oil drilling.

Those who oppose this amendment, when we hear the final debate tomorrow, are going to argue that it is the only section in the Energy bill that addresses the volatility of natural gas prices. But how does it do that? We already know where natural gas is from. We know where it is from the 2000 assessment. We already know the President and the Congress have acted to prevent leasing of oil and gas drilling, so what is the true purpose? What I smell is a kind of fishy smell: what is the true purpose? You have to come to the conclusion it is to roll back the moratorium on oil and gas drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf. What is the true purpose? It is to weaken the States' rights under the Coastal Zone Management Act.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this Graham amendment and strike this unnecessary language from the Energy bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of Senator GRAHAM's amendment.

This amendment, which I cosponsor, would strike language in the Energy Policy Act that would authorize an inventory of the oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf.

This amendment mirrors a bill that Senator CORZINE and I introduced last month. It would protect the sensitive marine areas off the coast of New Jersey and of other coastal States.

For over 20 years both Democratic and Republican administrations have respected the moratorium on leasing and preleasing activities on Outer Continental Shelf.

In his 2004 budget request, President Bush also honored the wishes of the coastal States.

His request included the traditional moratorium language—and so should the Energy bill before us.

The people of New Jersey, and the residents of all coastal States, do not want oil and gas rigs marring their treasured beaches and fishing grounds.

Such drilling poses serious threats to our environment and to our economy, and so do the technologies used to gather data.

The seismic surveys authorized in the Energy bill produce explosive pulses which have produced documented organ damage in marine species and have been associated with fatal whale strandings.

Dart core sampling, also authorized in the bill, is known to cause the destruction of fish habitat on the sea floor and to smother seabed marine life with silt.

Is all of this damage and destruction justified—just to gather data? I don't think it is.

Additionally, in New Jersey our economy depends heavily on shoreline tourism.

Tourism in my State is a 10-billion-dollar-a-year industry and provides employment for thousands of people.

We simply cannot afford damage to our shorelines, nor to the marine life which inhabits our coastal waters.

What the Energy bill proposes is a step in the wrong direction. What purpose would be served by performing an inventory of oil and natural gas resources along the Outer Continental Shelf, if there is no intention of drilling in these regions?

This provision completely undercuts the language which Congress has approved for years—and it clearly undercuts the stated wishes of the coastal States that would incur the greatest damage.

Our country needs new sources of energy. And there are many energy sources vastly underutilized in America.

We have barely scratched the surface of our country's potential for developing renewable energy.

The enormous energy conservation and efficiency savings that are possible are largely untapped. Too often these measures are voluntary rather than a part of the way we do business.

If we better utilize these untapped sources of domestic energy, perhaps Congress won't be tempted to sweep aside the will of the people of New Jersey and the will of the citizens of other coastal States.

We must continue, as we historically have, to recognize the right of States to govern their own shorelines.

I urge my colleagues to vote for Senator GRAHAM's amendment.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, what kind of energy policy does this country need? There is little argument about the need for affordable, reliable energy from diverse sources. The bill before us seeks to achieve that laudable goal in the worst possible manner: on the back of the American taxpayer. This bill subsidizes two types of energy. That which few consumers would be willing to pay for and that which companies would produce and consumers would pay for in the absence of subsidies. I ask my colleagues if this makes any sense?

Let's let the competitive market determine our energy future. Let's let the market, with millions of individual consumers pursuing their individual energy needs, based on their own unique situations, steer this country's energy economy. Let us not dictate to consumers and taxpayers how they should spend their energy dollars.

Recently this body voted on a tax bill that allows taxpayers to keep more of their hard-earned money in an attempt to jump-start this economy. The tax cut was passed on the premise that consumers and businesses are better suited than government to make sound economic decisions that translate into economic growth. That same premise applies to energy. Yet the Energy bill under debate tosses that premise out the window. Suddenly the consumers and businesses of this country, which we are trusting to make sound economic decisions to put the whole economy back on track, cannot be trusted to make sound energy decisions. Instead, we are dictating their energy choices for them. No body of persons, not even a panel of 100 of the world's most brilliant economists, let alone the Senate of the United States, has the knowledge, wisdom or foresight to make such decisions rationally for millions of American citizens.

Let's take a look at what this bill would do. It mandates greater use of ethanol, a fuel that is already heavily subsidized. Without subsidies and mandates, ethanol would virtually cease to exist as a motor fuel. It subsidizes renewable energies such as wind power, which again would not survive in the competitive marketplace due to the high cost and low value of the electricity produced. It subsidizes coal, already the most plentiful and affordable energy source in this country. Coal power will continue to thrive in this country whether subsidized or not, as long as we don't regulate it out of existence, yet we are providing subsidies for coal power. This bill subsidizes nuclear power, which would probably be competitive were it not for the onerous regulatory restrictions that needlessly burden that industry. The list goes on.

Let me suggest that the greatest obstacle to affordable and reliable energy in this country is the U.S. Government. Before this body looks outward for solutions to our energy problems, it should look inward. It should identify those laws, regulations, and other Government impediments that prevents this country's citizens and businesses from making sound energy decisions. We encumber the U.S. energy economy with all sorts of onerous and often unneeded and outmoded rules that raise the cost of energy and distort energy markets. Instead of fixing this state of affairs, this bill compounds these errors by further raising the cost of energy to American taxpayers and further distorting energy markets through subsidies.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak to an amendment to fix a funding gap that exists for meritorious Women's Business Centers that are graduating from the first stage of the program and entering the sustainability portion.

I would like to first thank Senator SNOWE, Chair of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, for working very closely with me on this issue. Her leadership and support has been invaluable. I would also like to thank Senator BINGAMAN for his support on this issue. As a long-time ally of the Women's Business Centers and all SBA programs, his assistance on this amendment has been very helpful. Last, I want to express my gratitude to Senators HARKIN, EDWARDS, CANTWELL, ENZI and DOMENICI, as well as Congressman MCINTYRE, for their backing and for their hard work to resolve this issue.

As I have said on more than one occasion, women business owners do not get the recognition they deserve for their contribution to our economy: Eighteen million Americans would be without jobs today if it weren't for these entrepreneurs who had the courage and the vision to strike out on their own. For 18 years, as a member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I have worked to increase the opportunities for these enterprising women in a variety of ways, leading to greater earning power, financial independence, and asset accumulation. These are more than words. For these women, it means having a bank account, buying a home, sending their children to college, calling the shots.

And helping them at every step are the Women's Business Centers. In 2002 alone, these centers helped 85,000 women with the business counseling and assistance they likely could not find anywhere else. Cutting funding for any centers would be harmful to the centers, to the women they serve, to their States, and to the national economy.

The funding gap for Women's Business Centers in sustainability exists because the Small Business Administration has chosen to short-change existing, proven centers in order to open new, unproven ones. By incorrectly interpreting the funding formula set up in the Women's Business Centers program, the SBA has made way for new centers at the expense of those that are already established. This is both bad policy and contrary to congressional intent.

As the author of the Women's Business Centers Sustainability Act of 1999, I can tell you that when the Women's Business Centers Sustainability Act of 1999 was signed into law, it was Congress's intent to protect the established and successful infrastructure of worthy, performing centers. The law was designed to allow all graduating Women's Business Centers that meet certain SBA standards to receive continued funding under sustainability grants, while still allowing for new centers—but not by penalizing those that have already demonstrated their worth.

Currently there are 81 Women's Business Centers in 48 States. Forty-six of these are in the initial program, 29 are already in sustainability, and 6 more are graduating or have graduated from the initial program and are now applying for sustainability grants. Because of these potentially 6 new sustainability centers—from Georgia, Iowa, Illinois, North Carolina, Texas, and Washington State—and because the SBA is incorrectly interpreting the funding formula for sustainability grants in order to open new centers, the amount of funds reserved for Women's Business Centers in sustainability must be increased from 30.2 percent to 36 percent.

This amendment does just that. It directs the SBA to reserve 36 percent of the appropriated funds for the sustainability portion of the Women's Business Centers program—even though the SBA already has the authority on its own to increase the reserve—thereby protecting the established Women's Business Centers form almost certain grant funding cuts and still providing enough funds to open six or more new centers across the country.

I want to again express my sincere and steadfast support for the growing community of women entrepreneurs across the Nation and for the invaluable programs through which the SBA provides women business owners with the tools they need to succeed. As a long-time advocate for women entrepreneurs and SBA's programs, my record in support of the SBA's women's programs and for women business owners speaks for itself. I have continually fought for increased funding for the women's programs at the SBA, for sustaining and expanding the women's business centers, and for giving women entrepreneurs their deserved representation within the Federal procurement process, to name a few. With respect to laws assisting women-owned businesses, I have been proud to either introduce the underlying legislation or strongly advocate to ensure their passage and adequate funding.

This amendment is necessary to continue the good work of SBA's Women's Business Center network, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period of morning business.

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

EULOGY OF DAVE DEBUSSCHERE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I read in a number of national publications brief excerpts of the eulogy that former Senator Bill Bradley gave at the funeral of Dave Debusschere. The paragraphs I saw were really moving.

I was able to obtain a copy of the full eulogy that Senator Bradley gave on May 19 at St. Joseph's Church in Garden City, NY. It is really, truly, a moving eulogy. It outlines the context and the relationship of Dave Debusschere and Bill Bradley and other members of the New York Knicks team, but especially those two who were roommates