

THE ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 539

(Purpose: To eliminate methyl tertiary butyl ether from the United States fuel supply, to increase production and use of renewable fuel, and to increase the Nation's energy independence)

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] for himself and Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. TALENT, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. BAUCUS, proposes an amendment numbered 539.

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

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

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

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer this renewable fuels amendment on behalf of myself and Senator DASCHLE, as well as a number of other Senators on both sides of the aisle who have worked on this important issue for a number of years.

I think the fact that the Democratic leader and I have joined together to offer this amendment demonstrates the significance of this particular issue as well as the broad bipartisan support that this compromise package enjoys.

I do want to take this opportunity to commend all of the cosponsors of the amendment, many of whom came to the floor yesterday morning to speak, for their hard work, their dedication over the years in forging this agreement. I also note that the President has made passage of this amendment a priority, and I commend him for his commitment to getting this done.

This particular amendment will enhance America's energy independence and energy security by increasing the use of domestically produced, clean, renewable fuels. As the chairman of the Energy Committee has pointed out many, many times, America is dangerously dependent on foreign oil. We currently import 60 percent of the oil we consume, and that number is increasing. One of the major goals of this energy bill we are debating on the floor of the Senate is to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. This amendment is a critical component of that effort.

The Frist-Daschle amendment establishes a national renewable fuels standard of 5 billion gallons per year by the year 2012, nearly tripling the use of ethanol and biodiesel over the next decade. It phases out the use of MTBE over a 4-year period and authorizes funding to prevent and clean up MTBE contamination from leaking underground tanks. And it repeals the Federal oxygen content requirement for reformulated gasoline, with strong antibacksliding language to ensure that air quality is not compromised.

Mr. President, as I said, this amendment is the product of a great deal of work by many Members of the Senate over the last several years. It is a compromise that has broad, bipartisan support. It will reduce our dependence on foreign oil. It will protect the environment. It will create jobs. It will increase farm incomes. It will stimulate investment in rural communities.

I look forward to working with Senator DASCHLE and all of the other supporters of this package to get it adopted as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority whip.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know the schedule of the majority leader is burdensome. I do wish to say a few words while he is here regarding the proposed rule change.

First of all, I have said, on a number of occasions in recent weeks, that I understand the intensity of the feeling of members of the majority—some members, not all—on the Miguel Estrada nomination and that of Priscilla Owen. But I do say, that for people to lament that the process is broken regarding judges is simply without foundation or fact. Mr. President, 124 judges have been approved for President Bush—124. Two have been held up.

The number of cloture motions that have been filed, for those of us who have served in the Senate for some time, is somewhat meaningless. The reason you continually file new cloture motions is if there is a change in the vote. And for Priscilla Owen and Miguel Estrada, there has not been a single vote change—not one. They are all the same. So filing those cloture motions is just for show; it has no basis in substance.

Now, I do say to the leader that I think this is being approached in a proper fashion. I think that to go to seek a rules change is the way it should be done. If you don't like what is going on here, try to change a rule.

I have been personally—and I am sure it has not gone without the notice of others—concerned about some of the statements made by Members of the majority saying they are going to have this rule changed regardless of what the Rules Committee does; that if it does not work out in the Rules Committee, they are going to come here

and have the Presiding Officer just say what we have been doing is unconstitutional.

Now, one of the newspapers announced that this would be nuclear. I think, legislatively, nuclear is the proper term.

I have no problem—I say this to the majority leader—seeking to change the rules. If the rules are changed by a procedure we have always used here in the Senate, I will go along with that. But to have something done, that is to say suddenly that you cannot have a filibuster because it is unconstitutional, creates many different problems. Does that mean if 11 members of the Judiciary—a majority—holds up a judicial nominee, that that is unconstitutional and it can come immediately to the floor? I think not.

So I recognize—I have been as frustrated as anyone trying to get cloture motions filed and cloture determined on a vote. I can remember when I was a relatively new Member of the Senate—I was not too new then—during the Clinton administration and we were trying get grazing changed in the western part of the United States. We had four or five cloture motions filed. We got up to 57 or 58 Senators on that occasion. And we were moving, filing the cloture motions that seemed to be gaining status.

Then suddenly GEORGE MILLER from the House and HARRY REID from the Senate were called to the White House, and the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, said: We are not going to support you on this anymore. It is over with. He had made some arrangements with House Members, and our trying to get cloture invoked on something we believed was very important was, in effect, pulled out from under us. I can still remember that.

But in those, I say to the majority leader, when cloture motions were filed by Senator BYRD, we kept gaining votes. In relation to Miguel Estrada and Priscilla Owen, that is not the case.

So again, I say, that the majority leader is approaching this in the Senate way, the right way. I do say—and I know he has had conversations with the Democratic leader, and I have spoken to other Members on the other side—I hope it will be done in that fashion and not by some jury-rigged fashion to change the rules by some "constitutional" matter.

I even understand one of the Republican Senators is filing a lawsuit. Fine. More power to them. Let them file a lawsuit. I think that is the way it should be determined. But don't change the Senate rules in some other fashion because it would really damage our ability to move forward on legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, just in closing, on my behalf, the whole purpose of submitting this resolution today is to further elevate the debate in recognition that things change in