

long lines to buy gasoline, we realized that our dependence on oil from the Middle East was compromising our national security.

So we dedicated ourselves to building vehicles that were more fuel-efficient. And by 1990, the average American vehicle got 40 percent more miles per gallon than in 1973.

That is an American success story, a triumph of good old American ingenuity.

We need to redouble our efforts to conserve oil.

We also need the President to stop filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

It is more than 90 percent full. How much is enough?

There have been two major releases of oil from the SPR. Crude oil prices fell sharply each time.

The first SPR release occurred as the U.S. began bombing Iraq on January 16, 1991. The next day crude oil prices fell from \$32 to \$21 per barrel.

The second release occurred in September 2000. Crude oil prices immediately fell from \$37 to \$31 per barrel after this release was announced.

The President also needs to pressure OPEC to significantly increase its production quotas to lower the price of oil on world markets.

These are some immediate steps we can take to help middle class families.

But to meet our energy needs over the long term, we need an energy policy that looks to the future.

I have already talked about the need to conserve oil.

Conserving would protect consumers, and it would make our country stronger.

Thomas Friedman, who covers the Middle East for the New York Times, wrote last week that we must renew our efforts to free ourselves from our dependence on oil from that region.

He suggested an effort modeled after the Manhattan Project. That, of course, was our extraordinary race to develop a nuclear weapon during World War II.

The Manhattan Project was a success. It helped keep the world free.

And we can do it again.

We are going to be spending a lot of time this week talking about national defense, about ways to make our country stronger.

Well, we can make our country stronger by finding an efficient and environmentally sound way to produce hydrogen fuel.

We can find a way to produce hydrogen fuel by harnessing our abundant renewable energy sources—the power of the wind, the warmth of the sun, and the heat within the earth.

We need to break this bill apart and extract what is good.

Let's take elements of this energy legislation that enjoy broad, bipartisan support, and move them forward to the President's desk.

I was encouraged that the FSC/ETI bill passed by the Senate last week contains the Energy Tax Incentives.

I applaud Senators GRASSLEY, BAUCUS, and DOMENICI for the provision that expands and extends the production tax credit for wind, geothermal, solar, and biomass energy.

The FSC/ETI bill also guarantees a commodity floor price for the Alaskan Natural Gas Pipeline.

I strongly support a price floor and loan guarantees to build an Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline, but this supply won't enter the market for another 10 years.

Senator CANTWELL has introduced a standalone bipartisan bill to improve the reliability of our Nation's electric transmission system.

This bill is noncontroversial and can pass both Houses of Congress.

We can pass meaningful parts of this energy legislation, and begin to implement a strategy that looks toward the future.

We need to act now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, can the Chair advise where we are in the business of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

MOVING AMERICA FORWARD

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I want to spend time talking about the Defense authorization bill. Before I do, I want to respond to this question, are we better off? I think it is a good question.

But the question has to be phrased: Are we better off today than we were after the impact of September 11? My colleagues across the aisle continually block out of their minds the impact of the devastating attack on American soil of September 11 and the challenges this country faced—both emotional, from the scars of the terrible loss of life, as well as the economic impact. That is the question.

Are we better off today with the Taliban not operating freely in Afghanistan? Are we better off today with Saddam Hussein no longer supporting Hamas and Hezbollah, no longer operating the torture and rape chambers?

Are we better off today fighting terrorism in Iraq rather than again back on our shores? Are we better off economically?

Mr. President, I have in front of me an article in today's Minneapolis Star Tribune, and I will refer to a couple sections. It says, in April, Minnesota broke all kinds of job records, led by the State's largest drop in unemployment, to 4.1 percent from 4.8 percent. Economists used words such as "spectacular" and "breathless" to describe the job gains they say were part of the national turnaround.

The U.S. economy added 625,000 jobs in March and April, a turnaround, I note, that was fueled by tax cuts, was fueled by bonus depreciation, was fueled by increasing expansion, fueled by lowering the top rate to give small

business a tax break. The article notes that the 0.7-percent drop in the unemployment rate was the biggest since the State started keeping records in the late 1970s.

Are we better off economically today than we were after the impact of 9/11? Absolutely. With the \$18,000 job decline and the number of unemployed people, also going back to the 1970s, that was 13 percent fewer than the 140,000 unemployed in March. The 4,500 new manufacturing jobs is the biggest monthly increase since the State started tracking the statistic in 1992.

Are we better off today, post-9/11, than we were right after that attack? Absolutely. Completing Tuesday's figures, success in more hiring suggests fewer firings. New unemployment claims dropped 14.1 percent in April. They talk about in this article the manufacturing sector.

We would be better off if we didn't have the other side filibustering an energy bill. We would grow more jobs. We would be better off if my colleagues on the other side were not blocking asbestos reform, if my colleagues were not blocking class action reform, so that we could grow more jobs. We would be better off if my colleagues on the other side were not blocking the appointing of conferees to the highway bill. That is a jobs bill. Have we moved forward? Absolutely. Have we recovered from 9/11? Absolutely. But rather than criticize, my colleagues should come together and stop the obstruction and blocking and let's move America forward.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, we spend a fair amount of time on this floor discussing priorities for our people and our Government. As far as I am concerned, all that talk is about what comes in second to the subject we are on today: national security.

Our first obligation is to defend the American people and our interests abroad. If we don't do that with thoroughness and excellence, nothing else is going to matter for long.

September 11 was a tragic day. It was also the end of a period of denial. For generations, we believed that we could sit here safely, protected by our oceans. But 2 world wars in the last century and the coming of the nuclear age changed that. But when the Berlin Wall fell down and the Soviet Union collapsed, perhaps some lapsed into a false sense of security. September 11th changed that forever.

This bill—the Defense authorization bill—is an attempt to respond to the defense of American interests in the world as it is, now and for the foreseeable future. Failure to be prepared invites the threats we fear. Peace through strength must remain the governing doctrine of American national security.

I support the work of the Chairman, Senator WARNER, on this bill. What a