



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1995

No. 175

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by Father Paul E. Lavin of St. Joseph's Catholic Church, Washington, DC.

PRAYER

Father Paul E. Lavin, St. Joseph's Catholic Church, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:
In Psalm 25, David sings:
I wait for you, O Lord;
I lift up my soul to my God.
In you I trust: do not let me be disgraced;
do not let my enemies gloat over me.
No one is disgraced who waits for you but only those who lightly break faith. Make known to me your ways, O Lord; teach me your paths.
Guide me in your truth and teach me, for you are my God and Savior.
For you I wait all the long day, because of your goodness, Lord.
Remember your compassion and love, O Lord
for they are ages old.
Remember no more the sins of my youth,
remember me only in the light of your love.

We praise You O God and we bless You; You have called us to life and given us so many gifts. We have sought and accepted offices of public trust, and now put our trust in Your compassion and love.

Direct now all our actions by Your holy inspiration and carry them on by Your gracious assistance so that every prayer and work of ours may reflect Your will.

May our lives and voices give glory to Your name. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

ORDER TO PROCEED TO H.R. 1833 AT 2:15 P.M. TODAY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous order, the Senate begin consideration of H.R. 1833 at 2:15 today and that morning business be extended until 12:30.

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today there will be a period for the transaction of morning business until 12:30 p.m. The Senate will stand in recess between the hours of 12:30 and 2:15 today in order to accommodate the respective party luncheons.

At 2:15, the Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 1833, a bill to ban partial birth abortions. Rollcall votes can, therefore, be expected to occur on amendments to H.R. 1833 or on any other items cleared for action.

Mr. President, I believe I have 20 minutes reserved for morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. With the permission of the Chair, I would like to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 20 minutes.

OPENING THE ARCTIC OIL RESERVE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, for a number of days I have been sharing

with my colleagues my observations on the opening of the Arctic oil reserve, or ANWR. Briefly, for those Members who are not familiar with this, let me just do a quick review. In the Congress and in the reconciliation package in both the House and the Senate is the authority to initiate a lease-sale in ANWR. There are many misconceptions relative to the proposal because a number of people believe that the entire area is at risk.

This area in green, including the yellow area, consists of about 19 million acres. That is an area the size of the State of South Carolina. In 1980, Congress withdrew and set in permanent status the green area, consisting of 8 million acres of wilderness, which is shown in green and black here, and another 9½ million acres of refuge, leaving the coastal plain for disposition by the Congress.

This area in red is the area retained by the Eskimo people of the village of Kaktovic. You will notice that they have no access out of that area other than into the coastal plain which is Federal land. The lease-sale we are talking about is a proposal to lease 300,000 acres out of this million and a half acres because the other 17 million acres has already been withdrawn. So we are talking about a very small area.

To suggest that the entire area is at risk clearly is a misinterpretation of the facts. We log our telephone calls in our office, as do most Members of the Senate, because it is important that we have public reaction. It is kind of interesting to note that, as calls come in relative to my speaking on this issue, there is a perception that we in Alaska are initiating an activity that somehow is irregular or a departure from what is happening in other States. I can only respond to that by suggesting that our State has only been a State for 36 years.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S16713

As a consequence, we are today establishing our land patterns in this huge area of Alaska, which is one-fifth the size of the United States. It has 33,000 miles of coastline. Other States were established—such as the State of Virginia, nearly 200 years ago, and Washington, Oregon, California, 100 years ago. So as a “new kid on the block,” so to speak, as we attempt to develop resources, whether it be timber, fish, oil and gas, or mining, we are trying to take advantage of the science and technology that is available today and learn from the mistakes of others and balance and develop an economy.

I do not think many people have a total understanding or an appreciation of that. They think that the limited development in Alaska is somehow not in keeping with the times. The reality is that we have to have natural resources, develop those natural resources. We have a job base, and those jobs are high-paying jobs in construction, timber, mining, oil and gas. If we do not develop those resources, we simply get the materials from other countries, export our jobs overseas and export our dollars.

The significance of developing this area is that geologists tell us this is where a major discovery might be made. Because Prudhoe Bay is in decline—this area has been producing 25 percent of the total crude oil produced in the United States in the last 18 years. As this area declines, the question is: Can we, or should we, replace it by bringing on line this area, the small footprint here in the coastal plain known as ANWR?

Clearly, we can do it safely. We have been able to develop Prudhoe Bay. We have developed an 800-mile pipeline. We had a bad accident with the *Exxon Valdez* vessel, but that is something that had nothing to do with a pipeline. It was one of those human failures. The ship went aground in a 10½-mile channel.

The point I want to make here this morning, Mr. President, is that we developed a small field adjacent to Prudhoe Bay 10 years ago. That was the 10th largest producing field. History tells us that if the oil is here, they can develop it in about 2,000 acres. To get back to some of the comments which I think have prompted me to try and give a little more explanation as to why Alaska should be attempting to develop its energy resources, there are suggestions that somehow we are beholden to an oil lobby as a delegation, that we should be giving more concern to the environment, that they think we have financial ties to the oil companies.

One woman indicated she felt so strongly about it that she had worked to get a moratorium on elephants in Africa and she was going to go to work to make sure we got a moratorium not to develop oil in Alaska.

I would like to think that these people who are obviously very interested would have a full understanding of the

implications and an argument relative to the pros and cons of responsible development.

With that background, let me just proceed briefly, because I think that there is need for some reflection on what Congress intended in 1980. The name of Senator Scoop Jackson of Washington is familiar to all Members of the Congress. He was a beloved and long-time Member of this body. It was at his insistence that this area, the 1002 area, be left out of the wilderness area and the refuge withdrawals to be setup specifically for Congress to address the prospects of oil and gas. That was done in 1980, Mr. President.

As a consequence of that, now is the time for the decision to be made, and since it is in the reconciliation package, we look forward to discussing the merits.

One of the most significant considerations is the reality that this Nation is now 51 percent dependent on imported oil. That oil comes in from the Mideast, and of course we send the dollars and the jobs to the Mideast.

In the last few days we have seen a crisis in the Mideast, a very unfortunate situation, but, nevertheless, it proves the frailty of that part of the world, and our increased dependence on oil eventually will result in some kind of a crisis occurring as we look at Iran, Iraq, Libya and their moves toward nationalism.

It is kind of interesting to reflect on the attitude of some of the opinion-makers that have had a responsibility with regard to our increasing dependence on imported oil.

Former President Carter's Energy Secretary Schlesinger has testified in support of developing this area, stating that we can develop it safely, that we should reduce our dependence on imported oil.

Some of the Orthodox Jewish organizations in the United States are the biggest supporters. They see increased dependence on the Arab States as a threat to Israel's security interests. Union support—the significance of what this activity would generate for America unions; it would be the largest concentration of construction in North America. The Teamsters, the laborers, the IBEW, the maritime unions all support this. This is a significant job issue.

It is estimated that the lease sale would bring about \$2.6 billion in revenue. That revenue, half of which would go to the Federal Government, the other half to the State of Alaska, would be raised in the private sector of the United States without one cent of Government funding.

Now, there is a suggestion that some Alaskans do not support ANWR, some of the Native people in Alaska do not support opening.

Mr. President, I want to take that fiction and state it factually. The Alaska Federation of Natives, which is the native organization in our State, voted two to one in favor of opening the area.

I think it is unfortunate that the Secretary of the Interior, as he represents all the Native people of our State, has chosen to represent a very small segment, the Gwich'ins, representing about 1 percent of the Native people in Alaska. The Gwich'ins are fearful that the Porcupine caribou will somehow be at stake. The justification for that is not supported by any evidence as I will show in the next chart.

This happens to be a picture taken of Prudhoe Bay which shows the oil pipeline, shows a well being drilled, and it shows a number of caribou, pointing out the reality that the caribou are very adaptable.

To suggest that the porcupine caribou cannot be managed by a joint management team of the Gwich'ins, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the State department of fish and game is not based on any factual evidence by any means.

That herd is about 165,000. Most of the animals, about 4,000, are taken by the Canadian Gwich'ins on the Canadian side and 400 by the Alaskan Gwich'ins.

The point is, as we look at the development of this area, there are huge areas of wilderness and refuge that will be protected forever, and that the Alaska delegation stands behind them. Again, the footprint is .1 of 1 percent of the area, about 2,000 to 3,000 acres at the maximum.

Let me just talk a little bit more about the caribou because it has a warm and cuddly aspect to it, as it should. The caribou range over vast areas and their range is dependent on basically three factors. One is predators. If there are a number of predators, or the predators are at an all-time high, like the wolf, obviously it will have an effect on the young caribou. The winter kill is a consequence of a tough winter, resulting in a decline of the herd. There is overgrazing, which will also cause a decline in the herd.

As a consequence, it is fair to say of the approximately 34 herds in Alaska, two-thirds of them are on an increase, about 10 percent are on a decline, and the rest of them are stagnant but cyclical, as many of the ranging land animals in the wild.

Now, we also have a presumption by the Secretary of the Interior that he is protecting our future by blocking access to opening up this area. I suggest the Secretary of Interior is actually gambling with our future.

We sent troops to the Persian Gulf. We recall the gas lines in the 1970's. We are exporting our dollars and jobs. We are making less environmentally conscious nations produce oil.

Another fiction is this is a battle between rich and greedy oil companies and poor and saintly environmental groups. I want to talk about some of the environmental groups tomorrow, Mr. President. Environmentalism in the United States is big business. There is nothing wrong with it. We

should recognize it simply for what it is.

Now, the oil industry is big business in the United States. It provides jobs. It provides our Nation with energy security, as well.

We should not kid ourselves. The battle here is in many aspects between the very rich national environmental lobbyists and some of our poor Alaska Native people who want alternative lifestyles. They want to have running water. They want to have sewage disposal rather than honey buckets. They want to have jobs. They want to relieve themselves of the dependence on welfare. They are being deprived of these opportunities by the suggestion that we cannot open up this area safely.

Sometimes we see a double standard, a standard that suggests that this idealistic election of not allowing responsible development—there is no consideration of the human element, there is no consideration of the people that live in the area of what they feel they should have is a right to a job, a right to a good education, a right to have a future for their children, other than welfare.

As a consequence, Mr. President, there is one overwhelming fact in this debate. All Americans stand to benefit from ANWR exploration. Those benefits are: Jobs, as I have already outlined; security, by eliminating the necessity of our increased dependence on imported oil, which is already 51 percent. We can do it without any significant harm to the environment, using our technology, our engineering skills, our can-do capability. And one other item that this body spends a lot of time and effort on, and that is the concern over the deficit, balance of payments. In other words, the fact we are buying more overseas than people are buying from us.

What is that deficit made up of? Nearly \$56 billion, half of it, is the price of imported oil. The other half is our trade imbalance with Japan. So, here we have, in this particular issue, responsibly opening up this area in our State with a very small footprint, utilizing our technological capability, an opportunity to address some concerns that we all have—jobs, national security, the ability to develop this in harmony with the environment, and an opportunity to balance the budget.

I was also considering the merits of two articles that appeared in the Wall Street Journal and New York Times on October 27. They both concern themselves with the increase in the price of oil, to show you how fragile the world of oil is relative to any crisis that exists throughout the world. We have seen crises in the Mideast in the last few days, but we are also seeing one in Russia. "Concerns About Yeltsin's Health Help To Push Oil Prices Higher." "Prices of Oil Futures Jump on Report of Yeltsin Having Health Problems." Clearly, the former Soviet Union has a tremendous capability to produce oil. On the other hand, their

infrastructure is such it is not a very attractive market.

Finally, let me just comment on one point relative to the people of the area, because the people of the area are so often left out of any equation that affects the environment or the ecology.

The people of Kaktovik, the people of Point Barrow, the Eskimo people, these are people working their way out of Federal dependency. Because of our success, we are now opposed, seemingly at every turn, by, among others, a Secretary for Indian Affairs, Ada Deer. She now has gone on record as opposing successful Native corporations and organizations that are developing the resources in our State. She wants us to go back, and our people to go back, and be dependent on the Bureau of Indian Affairs. But, as we have seen, dependency brings despondence, it brings a dependence, it kills self-initiative, it breeds a welfare society. Alaska's Native and Eskimo people want to follow the American way, the way of independence, the way of self-help, individual responsibility, family values, a sense of community. Yet we are seeing spokespersons, including the Secretary of the Interior and Ada Deer, Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, actively opposing this development in the area where these people live.

This is a tragic day, in a sense, for the nearly 8,000 Eskimo people, because this is the first time any Secretary of the Interior has rejected his trust responsibility to pursue the naked political objectives of those opposed to the interests of Native Americans. It seems like the Secretary is almost penalizing hard work and success. On one hand they champion dependency, welfare and allegiance to an incompetent Bureau of Indian Affairs. Then, on the other, they put commercial fundraising interests of environmental organization over those of the Eskimo people who need help, who need this opportunity.

So, we see an administration, now, that opposes opening the coastal plain. Yet they are actively selling OCS oil and gas leases in the Arctic Ocean adjacent to the coastal plain. They say that is OK, that is all right. Secretary Babbitt and the others have their priorities backwards. Oil development on the land is safe. Oil development in the isolated wind-driven reaches of the ocean is risky; it can be hazardous.

Mr. President, I see my time is up. I thank the Chair. I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues. Tomorrow, or the first opportunity I can get time in morning business, I intend to comment at some length on the issue of environmentalism as big business in the United States, what it consists of, who it involves, what salaries are being paid, and a list of the assets of the various organizations so the public can understand the other side of the issue. On one side we have big business and oil. On the other side we have big business and the environmental community.

I thank the Chair and wish the Chair a good day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

YITZHAK RABIN

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise to extend my deepest personal sympathies and condolences to Mrs. Rabin, Mr. Rabin's children and grandchildren, to the people of Israel, and to the Jewish community of Missouri and the United States.

Yitzhak Rabin was a warrior. As a young man, he left behind boyhood dreams and assumed the mantle of a soldier for a country that was still a dream to him and many others. He helped liberate 200 of his brothers in a heroic and legendary raid. He fought in the siege of Jerusalem and kept open the vital lines of supply. In 1967, it was General Rabin who was the architect of the determined fury of an Israeli Army that was victorious over three substantial enemies in what would become known as the Six Day War.

Nevertheless, his prowess as a warrior was exceeded only by his courage as a peacemaker. He was an Ambassador to the United States. He made the first visit ever by an Israeli Prime Minister to West Germany. He tried to open peace negotiations with King Hussein of Jordan in the late 1970's. And, in a move that would ultimately cost him his life, he made peace with some of Israel's most substantial enemies.

He need not have been a peacemaker. He could have gone quietly into the annals of history as a warrior, a Prime Minister, a father, and a grandfather. But Yitzhak Rabin was, from his earliest days, a Zionist. His goal, both in war and in peace, was the preservation of a land that God had promised. In the end, he saw in peace and through diplomacy what military victory might never bring—security for his home, for his land, for his nation.

Unfortunately, it was not a journey which he was able to see through to completion. In his life, Yitzhak Rabin defined courage—the courage to fight in war and the courage to fight for peace. His legacy will be judged finally not only by what he started, but also by what Israel and her neighbors will eventually accomplish and achieve.

That is a task which they must pursue and that they must complete. It is a task for which we will all be held accountable. So, when the mourning is completed—and mourn we must and should—may we resolve to do what he started and may the resolve linger in all of us to complete that which he began.

As a boy, Yitzhak Rabin wanted to learn how to make the fertile soil of his land produce crops more abundantly. As a man and as a leader, Prime Minister Rabin plowed and harrowed the rocky ground of peace. It was both his hope and his vision that out of that ground would grow a tree bearing the unknown fruit of peace in a