

Let's see what the respondents said. This is how the question was put forth:

Some scientists want to use human cloning for medical treatments. They would produce a fertilized egg, or human embryo, that's an exact genetic copy of a person, and then take cells from this embryo to provide medical treatments for that person. Supporters say this could lead to medical breakthroughs. Opponents say it could lead to the creation of a cloned person because someone could take an embryo that was cloned for medical treatments and use it to produce a child.

That was the question. That is the way it was phrased on therapeutic cloning. It might produce medical breakthroughs but also a reproductive clone.

How did the people respond to the question?

Sixty-three percent said therapeutic cloning should be illegal and 33 percent held the opposing view.

Even framed on just the issue of therapeutic cloning, 63 percent say: No, I don't want to do that. I don't want us to go there. Yet we continued to dawdle in this body. We did not take up the issue. We would not hear it or bring it up on the floor until now. It is the pending business with a 6-month moratorium. It is not a complete ban. It is a complete ban for the 6 months. But after that, this would sunset.

I think this is a very prudent move that this body should take in addressing this highly controversial, highly problematic and monumental bioethical issue. Our Nation is currently wrestling with monumental bioethical issues. As I mentioned, the House of Representatives has dealt with this issue. They have passed a ban on human cloning with a 100-vote margin. The President keeps calling for it. This body has not acted.

On these bioethical issues, many of which I have raised on the floor previously—and I am going to keep raising in the future—we need to debate all these issues, but we need to act now to have a moratorium on human cloning so the Senate can properly debate the issue and hopefully resolve it in the coming 2 or 3 months. That is what we are asking for in the underlying amendment.

I would like to take this opportunity to address some of the profound moral issues that this Nation is going to need to wrestle with and the Senate is going to need to wrestle with for us to deal with the issue of human cloning.

Human cloning demands the public's attention, in part, because it implicitly revolves around the meaning of human dignity, around the meaning of human life, and the inalienable rights that belong to every person. Should a clone belong to someone or should a clone not belong to someone? I think we ought to resolve that issue before it starts being forced upon us by private companies creating clones.

Some will argue that the issue simply needs to be studied before any research begins, a notion which does not respect the rights of the clone. Some people say: Let's just create a group of

clones out there, and let's see and let's research and let it evolve.

Shouldn't we fundamentally deal with the issue first about what is a clone? Is it the property of somebody who created it? Is it a person? It is genetically identical to the person from whom it was created. It is physically identical. Is this a person or is this a piece of property?

We should be debating that ahead of them being out there in the public. Should we allow people to create clones of themselves for spare body parts? That would be down the road a longways, but people are thinking about those sorts of things now. We now have the creation of the first human clone.

I think clearly we should err on the side of caution at this point in time. We should call a timeout. We should have a 6-month moratorium so we can all sit down and think about this.

This is not going to kill the research into helpful areas of research. Some people looking at this are saying: OK. They are confusing it with embryonic stem cell research, which I personally have a deep problem with because you are destroying an embryo to create that research. But this moratorium does not apply to embryonic stem cell research. That is going on. There is even Federal funding for some embryonic stem cell research, as the President outlined in an August speech with the NIH, much with which I continue to disagree.

I think we ought to focus on the adult stem cell. Be that as it may, the embryonic stem cell work is going on and would not be affected by this moratorium.

What this moratorium goes at is saying: Do not create human clones for any purposes. Do not create that. After a period of 6 months it expires.

So for those purposes, I think this is an entirely appropriate issue for us to push the pause button. The alternative of this is for us to do nothing. But if we do nothing, if we do not put a pause on this, you are going to see a lot more headlines such as the one shown on this magazine. You are going to see a lot more human clones or you are going to hear about them being implanted in women once they get to the point where the technology is such that that can take place. You are going to see all that taking place and this body will not have even spoken. We will not have said, yes, we agree or we disagree. The President has spoken and the House has spoken, but we will not have even said, OK, we agree we should or we disagree. We will not have done anything.

That is why I plead with the sponsors of the bill that we should take up this particular issue. We would allow this amendment that has the important energy language in it for energy security that contains the important moratorium on human cloning. And that would be allowed to be voted on by this body. We would not have a cloture vote that rules out the vote on these two

imminently important issues that need to come before this body at this particular time.

So I plead with my colleagues, do not vote on a procedure that knocks off these two very important issues. Let us have a vote on these two issues.

We are going to be in town. We should take up these very important issues that are of immediate importance and need to be considered. I look forward to discussing this further with my colleagues as we get a chance to bring this amendment up for a vote.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). The Senator from Ohio.

#### AN ENERGY POLICY AS STIMULUS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the amendment to the underlying bill before the Senate.

I think the Senator from Kansas has spoken eloquently on the need to pass a moratorium on human cloning. It is interesting to note that about 80 percent of the people in this great Nation agree with that. It is also interesting to note that the other portion of the amendment calling for an energy policy for this country is also supported by about 80 percent of the people in this country. Although I do not ordinarily pay that much attention to polls, I say, in this case, the polls reflect good public policy for the United States of America.

Mr. President, with all the debate that has been going on in this body and throughout the Nation as to whether or not we actually need a stimulus bill, I reiterate my view that, yes, we do need a stimulus bill.

It is important that we pass a bill from several points of view.

Psychologically, the American people need a stimulus bill. For all the talk over the last couple of months about how much we need a stimulus bill, the public has now grown to expect we will pass a stimulus bill. I think that has been taken into consideration in the decisions the American public has been making. They see it as a positive measure, one that will bring us out of our economic doldrums and put things back on track.

As my colleagues know, the National Bureau of Economic Research reported earlier this week what many of us knew; and that is, our country is in recession. The people in my State of Ohio have known that since last year.

We need to spark our economy by getting businesses to boost investment. We need a stimulus package to help raise consumer confidence and get the American people spending again. As you know, consumer spending makes up two-thirds of our economy. We have to get buying. That is what we need to do: We have to get buying.

We need an economic stimulus bill that will put money in people's pockets, one that will restore consumer confidence, give businesses the money

they need to survive by letting them recapture taxes they paid in the past.

We need a bill that will lower people's tax rates by expanding the amount of earnings that are taxed at the 10-percent marginal rate. We need a stimulus package that provides a "life preserver" to the unemployed by giving them 13 additional weeks of unemployment benefits and one that responds to their health care needs.

One proposal that responds to what Americans want is the Centrist Coalition package that the Presiding Officer is completely familiar with and that has been sponsored, on a bipartisan basis, by the Presiding Officer, Senators JOHN BREAUX, OLYMPIA SNOWE, ZELL MILLER, and SUSAN COLLINS.

Regardless of what we do involving a stimulus bill, the American people expect us to work together in a bipartisan fashion. They see President Bush doing that. He is more worried about protecting the Nation's interests than in partisan politics.

Indeed, some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have been critical of the President because he has not been partisan enough. In fact, he has gone the extra mile, I believe, to be non-partisan.

The American people believe that Congress' motives are the same as the President's. If they become convinced otherwise, that we are working for special interests or succumbing to our past bad habits of playing politics, the consequences are going to be devastating.

It will lower their confidence in us and in the economic future of our Nation. Things changed on the 11th of September. Those of us in Congress should never forget it.

There is one other action we need to take to stimulate our economy, improve and enhance public health and the environment, secure our competitive position in the global marketplace, and secure our homeland and national security. That action is the adoption of an energy policy for this Nation.

That is why I am so enthusiastic about the amendment to the underlying bill. Given the tragedy of September 11 and the actions that have occurred in the aftermath, enacting an energy plan is much more relevant than ever before.

As far as I am concerned, and many others, our adoption of an energy package is, in the long term, more important to this country than the economic stimulus package.

Because of the situation in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf and Southwest and Central Asia, we are more vulnerable today than ever before.

You can see from this chart that one-fourth of our crude oil imports, 27.18 percent, come from the Middle East. Consider the following numbers: Iraq, 6.83 percent; Kuwait, 2.9 percent; Saudi Arabia, 16.79 percent; the United Arab Emirates, about three one-hundredths of

1 percent; Oman, less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent; Yemen, three-tenths of 1 percent. Given the near constant instability in the region, it should give my colleagues little comfort to know that we are so reliant on that part of the world.

OPEC, which produces approximately 40 percent of the world's oil supply, has threatened to cut oil production 4 separate times this year, and they cut oil production a total of 3.5 million barrels per day or 13 percent this year. I know this is a figure that can be difficult for people to comprehend, but every day, the United States receives 750,000 barrels of oil from Iraq. If we look at the chart, over 6.8 percent of the oil we import every day comes from Iraq.

In December, the United Nations will be conducting a periodic review of Iraq's oil-for-food program. In the past Iraq has suspended exports during the review in order to press their case that the program be allowed to continue uninhibited by the United Nations. This could happen again.

As many of you know, Iraq could be next on the list of nations that we go after because of their threat to world peace. It would be surreal if we were importing oil from Iraq at the same time we were engaging in antiterrorist activities against that nation.

It was strange enough that when we had the last oil crunch last year, we were providing them with technology to increase their oil production while at the same time we were conducting air sorties over their no-fly zone. We were bombing them on one hand and providing them technology so they could increase their oil production at the same time. It doesn't make sense.

The attack on Washington and New York could make things even more unpredictable as support for the United States by oil-producing Arab nations could bring Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida attacks on them. It is important to make it clear that Osama bin Laden would dearly like to bring down the Saudi government because of its Western influence and the alleged exploitation by the United States of Saudi oil. Remember, the Saudis provide 16.8 percent of our oil imports.

On the domestic front, we are also in trouble. The refinery fire in Illinois this past August decreased the available supply of gasoline while our inventory was already low. That caused prices to jump in my State of Ohio and other Midwest States. The price of gasoline jumped up 30 cents per gallon in Ohio over a 2-week period because of a fire at a refinery.

We have had no new refineries built in almost 26 years, while the number of refineries has dropped from 231 in 1983 to 155 today. While the refineries today are more efficient, they are not getting the job done. When a refinery shuts down for repairs or accidents such as fires, it creates price spikes that can be felt across the Nation.

We should not be lulled into complacency because of the temporary low

cost of gasoline. If you travel the country, the price is down. We must do more to increase domestic production of oil in the United States.

Our transmission system also needs to be improved and opened up. We don't have the infrastructure in place to transmit natural gas and the pipelines to transmit oil. Last year one of the reasons we had the large increase in gasoline prices in the Midwest was because of a break in an oil pipeline coming up from Texas and another one coming from Wolverine, MI. Those two events skyrocketed the price of oil in Ohio and many other States in the Midwest.

Because of this, last month I introduced the Environmental Streamlining of Energy Facilities Act with Senator LANDRIEU. Our bill will streamline the siting process for pipelines and transmission lines.

Utility costs are another major factor in our Nation's competitive position in the global marketplace. Long before the events of September 11, utility costs were exacerbating the recession in Ohio and the Midwest. We need to assure Americans that they can count on reasonable, consistent energy costs if we expect to get their confidence back in terms of the economy.

As a major manufacturing State, energy is the backbone of my State, and Ohio and the Midwest are the backbone of this Nation's economy. Twenty-three percent of our Nation's gross State product for manufacturing is concentrated in five States which comprise the Midwest; Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin. For example, when you compare Ohio's manufacturing production with the New England States, Ohio's gross State product for manufacturing is higher than all six of the New England States combined. Energy is the backbone of the U.S. economy. And without a reliable supply, we are not competitive in the world marketplace.

Congress needs to act on an energy bill as soon as possible. It needs to be done on a bipartisan basis.

This chart is really very illuminating. It looks at projected demand for energy in this country between now and 2020. The green line is what we are going to need. The red line is based on current production and shows what we will have available to meet the demands for energy in this country. As my colleagues can see, there is a large canyon between the lines that needs to be filled. That means that we are going to have to produce more oil, more gas, use more coal, produce more nuclear energy, if we are going to take care of this large gap.

Many of my colleagues would argue that the solution to our need for energy is the issue of renewables and other alternatives. The fact is, today, renewables, that includes hydro- and non-hydropower, take care of only a fraction of our energy needs in the United States of America. That is surprising, because I have had some colleagues come to the floor and argue

that all we need are acres and acres of windmills and acres and acres of solar panels and that will take care of our energy problem. The fact is, solar and wind power make up only one-tenth of one percent of our energy needs. There is no way that we are going to be able to deal with our energy problem with renewables because if you look at the bottom line, this purple line, going out to 2020, you can see that it is going to represent a very small part of the production we have in America.

There is no question, we need more energy. We need more oil. We need more gas. We need more nuclear. We need more coal. While conservation helps, it is not going to meet our estimated consumption without drastically changing America's standard of living. We cannot kid ourselves and think otherwise.

Although it won't get the entire job done, a good beginning in our goal of achieving a solid energy policy is a bill that is currently on the Senate calendar, H.R. 4, and which is part of the amendment to the underlying bill before the Senate that was submitted today by Senator LOTT.

It is a good beginning. Those of us who have been on this issue for a long time would like to see amendments dealing with an ethanol component which will help decrease our dependence on foreign oil. We need to use more ethanol. We need to have an electricity title to improve nationwide delivery. We need more funding for clean coal technologies and a nuclear title, including Price-Anderson reauthorization.

It is a beginning, a big beginning, a bill that passed the House of Representatives and one that should be passed in the Senate.

I hope when Monday comes and this body has an opportunity to vote on the issue of cloture dealing with the amendments to the underlying bill that we will vote to allow those amendments to be debated by the Senate. It is important not only to the economic well-being of our country, but it is important to our national security.

We cannot allow ourselves to be lulled into a false sense of complacency simply because energy prices have stabilized. People say, "Natural gas prices are down, GEORGE," and, "Oil prices are down, GEORGE." The fact is that they have been down before and we have seen them go up. These prices are like a yo-yo, up and down and I am worried that one day, we are going to end up hanging at the end of the string.

It is time for us to act. As sure as the Sun will rise, so too will prices. OPEC will make sure it happens. The longer we wait to pass an energy bill, the more vulnerable this Nation will be to supply disruptions, which will, in turn, have a dramatic impact on our economy, our environment, our health and, yes, our national security.

The time has come for the Senate to act and adopt an energy policy for the United States of America.

Mr. President, 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. MURKOWSKI. 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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from Ohio for outlining his position on the legislation we are discussing, the energy bill, H.R. 4. His presentation certainly summarized the fact that this indeed is in the national security interest of our Nation. He pointed out that our continued dependence on such unreliable sources as Iraq, at a time when we are not sure what our next move will be, puts us in a rather embarrassing position. He has certainly highlighted the vulnerability of this country, which is growing; there is absolutely no question about that.

The question we have—legitimate question—is just whether or not H.R. 4, which has passed the House of Representatives and is before us, does the job as a comprehensive energy bill. I am going to spend a little time on that because I think the public deserves to know what is in H.R. 4.

I will again ask my colleagues to reflect on the vote that is going to take place on Monday. This is not a vote on the issue of ANWR; this is a vote on the entire bill that passed the House of Representatives. A vote will be seen and read strictly as a vote on passing an energy bill. I think that is significant. It is a vote for or against passing an energy bill that has passed the House of Representatives.

With that, of course, is the cloning ban. I support that. The Senator from Kansas made an excellent presentation on the merits of that. It is rather unusual to see such devoid issues brought together, but that sometimes happens in this body. It is important to point that out and highlight that Senator BROWNBACK's presentation is simply a 6-month ban. What we are seeing here on cloning is the scientific and medical movement is so fast that we are not sure where the ethical evaluation should come down. Therefore, a 6-month moratorium on cloning is certainly in order. I certainly support that.

Here is what H.R. 4 does for the Nation. The amendment is the legislative portion of the President's comprehensive energy policy. It aims to secure America's energy future with a new national energy strategy that is designed to reduce energy demand, increase energy efficiency and supply, and enhance our energy infrastructure and our energy security.

I think that should address the issue some have raised that this is nothing

but a very narrow bill containing ANWR. Let me tell you what we have in here in the sense of reducing demand. This bill reauthorizes Federal energy conservation programs and directs the Federal Government to take leadership in energy conservation with new energy-saving goals.

Secondly, it expands Federal energy savings performance contracting authority. It increases the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP. It provides weatherization and State energy program authorization levels to meet the needs of low-income Americans. It expands the EPA and the Department of Energy's so-called energy star program. It directs the EPA and the Department of Energy to determine whether energy star labels should be extended to additional products. We used to see seals of the Underwriters Laboratories. This is much like that, but these stars are awarded for reduction in energy use. In other words, you can get a better, more efficient refrigerator, but you probably won't because your other one is working just fine. But these new ones deserve a particular rating and some identification. That is what the energy star program is all about. It highlights that this is indeed an energy-saving device and technology that has been put on your iron, refrigerator, or dishwasher.

We need to encourage Americans to go out and buy these. But, obviously, some are reluctant because theirs is working fine. But they can reduce energy consumption and therefore their energy bill. It directs the DOE to set standards for appliance standby mode energy use. It reduces light truck fuel consumption by 5 billion gallons over 6 years. Now this is the CAFE—people are saying, "Where are your CAFE savings?" It directs the DOE, in the sense of light truck fuel consumption, to reduce it by 5 billion gallons over 6 years. It also improves Federal fleet fuel economy and expands the use of hybrid vehicles.

What do we mean by Federal fleet? We say before we put mandates on the general public, let's put it on the Government fleet and see how it works. That is kind of the old saying that charity begins at home. So it will improve the Federal fleet economy. It increases funding for the DOE's energy conservation and efficiency R&D programs designed to reduce consumption of energy. It expands HUD programs to promote energy-efficient single and multifamily housing. That should answer pretty much the concern some have raised, well, you don't have anything in your bill to reduce demand. I think we do.

On the issue of increased supply, we have provisions for environmentally sensitive oil and gas exploration on the Arctic Coastal Plain. That is ANWR. I will talk about ANWR later. Clearly, the reserves are there. It is estimated to be between 5 and 16 billion barrels. We have an average somewhere in between 5 and 16. It will be as big as