women. It is about fairness in civil rights. We are going to continue to pursue this item. We are going to pursue it this week and the 4 weeks when we return in September. We are going to continue to pursue it until we have justice for these workers.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE ENERGY CRISIS IN OUR NATION

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, on several occasions I have risen before this body to address the crisis associated with energy in our Nation today. We have all experienced the high price of gasoline. We have seen a slight reduction of late, but I want to assure my colleagues that that situation is temporary, at best.

The rationale for that is understandable if one considers the fact that we are currently consuming just about an amount equal to the productive capacity of our industry to supply gasoline. There are many good reasons for this. One is that we haven't built a new refinery in this country for almost 10 years now. We have closed about 37 refineries in the United States in the last decade and, as a consequence of our increased dependence on imported oil, we have lost a good deal of our leverage because currently about 56 percent of the oil we consume in this country is imported. Most of that comes from the Mideast. As a consequence, we have become more dependent on imported oil from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

The fastest-growing supply of oil now coming into the United States is from Iraq. That is rather curious. A lot of people forget that in 1991 we fought a war over there. We lost 147 lives. We had nearly 427 wounded. We had a number taken prisoner. Yet Saddam Hussein is the one we are looking toward now.

I think the American public should be aware that it is pretty difficult to define just what the energy policy of the Clinton-Gore administration has been. We have seen their policy with regard to the nuclear industry, which provides about 20 percent of the power generated in this country, and they have said no to storing high-level nuclear waste. We are one vote short of a veto override on that matter. We have not been able to generate that last vote. So it is clear that the administration has said no to the nuclear industry, as far as expanding its contribution to energy in this country.

As we look to hydroelectric, we have seen a policy which suggests that perhaps some of the dams out West should be taken down, with no consideration for the realization that there is a tradeoff associated with that. If you take those dams down, you are taking the tonnage that is moved by barge and putting it on the highways. The implication of that is significant. It is estimated that as many as 700,000 trucks per year would have to go on the highways to replace the current cargo capacity of barges that would be lost.

If we take away nuclear and go to hydro, oil is certainly something we are looking toward other nations to provide, as opposed to developing the resources here in the continental United States, in the overthrust belt of Colorado, Wyoming, and other areas, and where there is oil in my State of Alaska, the Gulf of Mexico, Texas, and other States. It is my understanding that the administration has withdrawn about 64 percent of the public land in the overthrust belt, which is in the Rocky Mountain areas, excluding them from the development of energy resources. The potential for coal, of course, is significant. There are no new coal plants being built in this country. The cost of permitting is such that we find they are uneconomical. The emphasis seems to be on natural gas. But if we look to the last 6 months, we have seen natural gas prices go from about $2.16 to over $4 for delivery later this winter.

The crisis associated with our energy policy, or lack of an energy policy, is real in every field of energy resources. Emphasis is placed by the administration to some extent on renewables. While we all support renewables, it is fair to say that renewables only constitute about 40 percent of our energy consumption, even though we have spent about $70 billion in subsidies in this area. While they have a potential, surely they are not at the forefront nor are they capable at this time of relieving our dependence on conventional energy sources.

As we look at our policies today, I think there is confusion in the minds of Americans as they reflect on the statements of their political leaders and the policies they pursue. It is very easy to be confused.

I would like to share some examples with my colleagues.

If we go back to our Vice President, AL GORE, in his book ''Earth in the Balance,'' AL GORE, the environmentalist, wrote that ''higher taxes on fossil fuel . . . is one of the logical first steps in changing our policies in a manner consistent with a more responsible approach to the environment.''

All of us are obviously concerned over the health of our environment. We want to have a responsible approach associated with the environment. Nevertheless, the idea that raising the price of gasoline is good for the American economy and good for the American people is pretty hard to sell to the American public at this time when gasoline prices, depending on where we are in the country, range anywhere from $1.75 to $1.95 or higher.

I think it is fair to say that perhaps the Vice President overlooks the reality that Americans live long distances from their jobs because they prefer to do so. We are a mobile society. As we are confronted with higher energy prices, obviously it not only affects our pocketbooks, but it affects inflation rates.

At about the same time that the Clinton/Gore administration was talking about conservation, the Vice President was casting a tie-breaking vote in the Senate to raise gasoline taxes—we all remember that—and the Environmental Protection Agency determined that more expensive ''reformulated gasoline'' needed to be sold in many areas of the country.

I am not arguing the merits of that—other than to report that before my committee on Energy and Natural Resources, one of the principals of the Environmental Protection Agency advised us that they are now required under the Clean Air Act to have nine different types of reformulated gasoline in this country.

That meant our refiners had to batch the gasoline additives, they had to transport it separately, they had to store it separately. Obviously, all of that has a significant cost for the taxpayer. According to a memorandum from the Department of Energy and the Congressional Research Service, EPA's gasoline requirements balkanized markets, strained supplies, and raised prices.

Since the policies of the administration were so effective in raising the prices, one might expect the Vice President to be pleased. But confronted with angry consumers on the campaign trail, the Vice President suggests that refiners and oil companies are to blame. A lot of finger-pointing is going on around here.

Let me refer to an article that appeared in the Washington Times of July 19. This is an editorial covering a memorandum that came from the Clinton Energy Department suggesting that the Department was indeed aware that the administration's own regulations pertaining to so-called ''reformulated'' gasoline, rather than the oil industry gouging, were primarily responsible for the increased price of motor fuels.

The reformulated gas—RFG—rule, which stipulated that refiners mix different types of gasoline for different localities, has made it impossible, or at least very difficult, to take advantage of the economies of scale in production and distribution that heretofore have helped keep U.S. energy prices stable and low.

Their memo, which was sent June 5—a full week before the administration began to blame the oil industry for raising fuel prices—states that the RFG reformulated gasoline rule was a major reason for the price spike, delaying claims made by the administration that they couldn't see any reason other than blind greed for the change in per-gallon gasoline prices.

I am not here to defend the industry, but I think it is fair to say that for the administration and the media to simply overlook what the cost of reformulated gasoline, applied regionally in this country with nine specific types of reformulated gasoline, has done to the price of gasoline speaks for itself.

It is kind of interesting. This article said something to the effect that the media and Dan Rather stated during the July 14 broadcast that, ''Republicans today sided with the oil companies against the Clinton/Gore administration on the question of who and what is to blame for higher gasoline prices.''

When you invoke this type of mandate on the first of June, you are certainly going to get a reaction from the American public when the price of reformulated gasoline goes up dramatically, particularly in the Midwest. That is what is known around here—and we are no strangers to it—as ''dancing the sidestep.''

Another example of the Clinton/Gore administration's attitude towards energy goes back a little further, when we needed Russia's support—or at least its acquiescence—in NATO's war in Kosovo. There is strong evidence that the administration sought to persuade OPEC to cut production and drive crude oil prices up some 18 months ago. It seems this was done to help Russia, an oil exporter generally badly in need of hard currency, in exchange for its acquiescence—which we got—in NATO's war in Kosovo.

Despite the fact that his own administration colluded with OPEC to manipulate prices, our Vice President has called on the Federal Trade Commission to investigate oil companies and refiners—for colluding to manipulate prices. I don't know how long that is going to take, but I suspect it is going to take some time for that investigation to be completed. In any event, I find that highly ironic.

Here is another example.

We have all heard that our Vice President says he wants to reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil in the volatile Middle East. But his stated policy is to curtail Federal oil and gas leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf. We heard him make that statement in Louisiana, that, if elected, he would terminate leases and buy back others.

He would also defer any opening of public land in the Rocky Mountain Overthrust Belt in Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado. He also urged the President to veto a 1995 bill allowing a small sliver of the Alaska Coastal Plain to be opened for oil and gas exploration.

That area, I might add, in my State of Alaska, could have enough oil to replace imports of Saudi Arabian oil for the next 30 years. It is estimated the area might contain as much as 16 billion barrels. Of further note, the area known as ANWR has 19 million acres, most of which is already set aside in wilderness. The remaining acreage, 1.5 million acres, is left for Congress to make a determination on. The industry says that out of that 1.5 million acres, oil is in abundance. With the advancement of technology we have in building icy roads in the wilderness, the footprint will be less than 2,000 acres. Clearly, the Clinton-Gore administration will not give us an opportunity to make a determination whether domestically we can reduce our dependence on imported oil and develop this very important resource in my State of Alaska.

Over the past 8 years, domestic production in this country has plummeted 17 percent as demand for foreign oil has risen 14 percent. We now depend on foreign oil to supply 56 percent of our needs. The averages of the last few weeks are as much as 64 and 65 percent. However, during the disastrous 1973 Arab oil embargo, we were only 35-percent dependent. Some of my colleagues remember we had gasoline lines around the block. The public was mad. They were upset and blamed the Government. Their rhetoric and policy just doesn't match up. We are now in the year 2000 and we are on average in excess of 56 percent dependent on foreign imports.

Our Vice President also says we must increase our use of cleaner-burning natural gas to replace ''dirty coal.'' But his policy is to put the most promising areas for the discovery and production of natural gas off limits to exploration. I refer to another quote he made October 22 at a campaign appearance in Rye, NH. Our Vice President said: I will do everything in my power to make sure there is no new drilling, even in areas of the OCS already leased by previous administrations.

This is yet another example of what folks find confusing. Our Vice President, in his book, ''Earth in the Balance,'' wrote: Mining inffluent must return to the Earth as pure as they came.

But did you know that the Vice President, with his family, certainly don't follow this practice, pocketing $20,000 a year in mining royalties from the zinc mine on his Carthage, TN, property. He has pocketed $500,000 over the past 25 years. Considering this zinc mine has contaminated the banks of the Caney Fork River with heavy metal—that is in this general area. This is the Caney Fork River. This is the area that is concentrated with pollutants from the leaching field. This is the actual area where the mines are. This is the leaching field. This is the Gore complex above. They have had violations of clean water standards from time to time. It is clear that the mine does not meet standards set forth in the Vice President's book. I am sure however, that the royalty checks got cashed.

This is a picture that appeared in the June 30 Wall Street Journal cover article of this particular mine and the activities associated with it. I ask unanimous consent the article from the Wall Street Journal of June 30 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 30, 2000]

AL GORE, ENVIRONMENTALIST AND ZINC MINER

(By Micah Morrison)

''The lakes and rivers sustain us; they flow through the veins of the earth and into our own. But we must take care to let them flow back out as pure as they came, not poison and waste them without thought for the future.''—Al Gore, ''Earth in the Balance.''

''He taught me how to plow a steep hillside with a team of mules. He taught me how to clear three acres of heavily-wooded forest with a double-bladed axe. . . . He taught me how to stop gullies before they got started. He taught me how to drive, how to shoot a rifle, how to fish, how to swim. We loved to swim together in the Caney Fork River off a big flat rock on the back side of his farm.''—Al Gore on his father, Sen. Albert Gore Sr., from algore2000.com.

CARTHAGE, TENN.—On his most recent tax return, as he has the past 25 years. Vice President Al Gore lists a $20,000 mining royalty for the extraction of zinc from beneath his farm here in the bucolic hills of the Cumberland River Valley. In total, Mr. Gore has earned $500,000 from zinc royalties. His late father, the senator, introduced him not only to the double-bladed ax but also to Armand Hammer, chairman of Occidental Petroleum Corp., which sold the zinc-rich land to the Gore family in 1973.

It also seems that zinc from Mr. Gore's property ends up in the cool waters of the Caney Fork River, an oft-celebrated site in Gore lore. A major shaft and tailings pond of the Pasminco Zinc Mine sit practically in the backyard of the vice president's Tennessee homestead. Zinc and other metals from the Gore land move from underground tunnels through elaborate extraction processes. Waste material ends up in the tailings pond, from which water flows into adjacent Caney Fork, languidly rolling on to the great Cumberland.

MESSY BUSINESS

Mining is intrinsically a messy business, and Pasminco Zinc generally has a good environmental record. But not one that would pass muster with ''Earth in the Balance,'' Mr. Gore's best-selling environmental book. As recently as May 16, the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation issued a ''Notice of Violation.'' It informed Pasminco that it had infringed the Tennessee Water Quality Control act due to high levels of zinc in the river.

Those zinc levels exceeded standards established by the state and the federal Environmental Protection Agency. A ''sample analysis found that total zinc was 1.480 mg/L [milligrams per liter], which is greater than the monthly average of .65 mg/L and the daily maximum of 1.30 mg/L.'' Pasminco ''may be subject to enforcement action pursuant to The Tennessee Water Quality Control Act of 1977 for the aforementioned violation,'' the notice stated.

This was not the first time Mr. Gore's mining benefactor had run afoul of environmental regulations. In 1996, the mine twice failed biomonitoring tests designed to protect water quality in the Caney Fork for fish and wildlife. Mine discharge ''failed two acute tests for toxicity to Ceriodaphnia dubia,'' a species of water flea, according to a mine permit analysis by Tennessee environmental authorities. ''The discharge of industrial wastewater from Outfall #001 [the Caney Fork effluent] contains toxic metals (copper and zinc),'' the analysis stated. ''The combined effect of these pollutants may be detrimental to fish and aquatic life.''

Tests for The Wall Street Journal by two independent Tennessee laboratories, showed trace amounts of zinc and other metals in the Caney Fork that were in compliance with federal standards. But soil tests revealed what one lab called problematic ''large quantities'' of heavy metals in the riverbank soil downstream of the Caney Fork effluent. In both sets of tests, samples of water and soil were provided to the labs by the Journal.

Soil samples drawn from the mine effluent and downstream ''contained large quantities of Barium, Iron, and Zinc, as well as smaller amounts of arsenic, Chromium and Lead,'' Warner Laboratories found in September. ''The soil from each of these sites seems to have some problems according to our findings. The levels of Barium, Iron and Zinc far exceed any report limit [a detection threshold within the testing system] and it should be noted that these results are extremely high compared to typical soil found in a populated neighborhood.''

Tests conducted in June by the Environmental Science Corp. found similar traces of heavy metals in the water and soil. The report found the soil samples to contain relatively high levels of ''Barium, Iron, Zinc, and several of the other metals, including Aluminum, Calcium and Magnesium.'' The ESC report also noted traces of cyanide in some water and soil samples.

Pasminco is not required to test soil along the banks of the Caney Fork. Both labs, while noting anomalies in the soil, believe the results do not warrant concern as environmental hazards. The water and soil clearly are not, however, ''as pure as they came,'' as Mr. Gore demands in ''Earth in the Balance.''

A 1998 study by the Environmental Working Group, a Washington-based organization, criticized the zinc-mining operation for purchasing a toxic waste that included sulfuric acid and reselling it as fertilizer. The mine buys acid waste from steel plants, uses it as purification agent in zinc processing, and then sells the waste to fertilizer companies, according to a report in the Tennessean, a Nashville newspaper. Most soil scientists say the procedure is safe.

Tennessee environmentalists disagree. Clearly, when you spread those types of chemicals around on a farm or on the land, you're going to get a lot of runoff,'' Brian McGuire, executive director of Tennessee Citizens Action told the Tennessean. ''So it's going to get into the water. We're poisoning ourselves.''

A Pasminco official noted that the mine has had few violations and works to uphold a ''very strict standard'' of environmental quality. The Gore campaign did not respond to requests for comment. But some Tennessee residents say Mr. Gore becomes testy when questioned about the zinc mine. Tom Gniewek, a retired chemical engineer from Camden, Tenn., has studied zinc mine for years and tried to question Mr. Gore about it at town-hall meetings. ''He gets real angry,'' Mr. Gniewek says. ''Instead of answering the question, he attacked my motives and accused people like me of vandalizing the earth.''

Mr. Gore's original purchase of the zinc-rich land is of some interest as well, shedding light on his long relationship with Mr. Hammer, the former Occidental Petroleum chief. A controversial influence peddler who trafficked in politicians of all stripes and parties. Mr. Hammer pleaded guilty in 1975 to providing hush money in the Watergate scandal.

Mr. Hammer cut a wide swath across Washington from the 1930s until his death in 1990 at 92. His controversial career was marked by decades of profitable business dealings with the Soviet Union, which were closely watched by the FBI. He leapt into the big time by acquiring Libyan oil rights for Occidental Petroleum through what biographer Edward Jay Epstein has characterized as a combination of shrewd business dealings and bribery. After his 1975 conviction, Mr. Hammer spent the rest of his life campaigning for a pardon, which President Bush granted in 1989.

Mr. Hammer cultivated close relationships with many politicians, but he was closest to Mr. Gore's father, a U.S. senator from 1953 until 1971. Mr. Hammer's Occidental Minerals snapped up the zinc-bearing property in 1972. The senior Mr. Gore's farm is on the opposite bank of the Caney Fork. Mr. Hammer paid $160,000, double the only other offer, according to the Washington Post, which first disclosed details of the arrangement during the 1992 presidential campaign.

According to deed documents in Carthage, a year later Mr. Hammer sold the land to the senior Mr. Gore for $160,000, adding the extremely generous $20,000 per year mineral royalty. Ten minutes after that sale, the former senator executed a deed selling the property, including the mineral rights, to his son, the future vice president, for $140,000. Albert Gore Sr. told the Post he kept the first $20,000 royalty for himself, evening up the father-son transaction.

The purpose of the sale appears to have been transferring the annual $20,000 payment from Mr. Hammer to the young Mr. Gore. The Post reported that the ''$20,000 a year amounts to $227 an acre, much more than the $30 an acre Occidental Minerals, part of Hammer's oil company, paid the senior Gore and some neighbors a few years before the 1973 arrangement.''

In 1992 then-Sen. Gore told the Post that although he had been working for ''slave wages'' as a newspaper reporter, he quickly came up with a $40,000 down payment from two previous real-estate investments. In 1974, the zinc mine began annual payments of $20,000 to Mr. Gore, an important source of income to the young politician for many years.

After the senior Mr. Gore lost his 1970 Senate re-election bid, Mr. Hammer named him chairman of Island Creek Coal, an Occidental subsidiary, and appointed him to the board of directors of Occidental Petroleum. The late Mr. Gore's estate is conservatively valued at $1.5 million, including a block of Occidental stock worth between $250,000 and $500,000. The vice president is executor and trustee of his father's estate, with ''sole discretion'' to manage a trust on his mother's behalf.

As Albert Gore Jr. rose through the political ranks, Mr. Hammer continued to assist him. The Hammer family and corporations made donations up to the legal maximum in all of Mr. Gore's campaigns, according to Mr. Hammer's former personal assistant, Neil Lyndon, writing in London's Daily Telegraph. Mr. Gore regularly dined with Mr. Hammer and Occidental lobbyists in Washington, Mr. Lyndon wrote. ''Separately and together, the Gores sometimes used Hammer's luxurious private Boeing 727 for journeys and jaunts.'' The former Hammer aide noted that the ''profound and prolonged involvement between Hammer and Gore has never been revealed or investigated.''

Mr. Hammer was famous for his dealings with the Soviet Union, and received a humanitarian award in Moscow in 1987 from International Physicians Against Nuclear War. Mr. Gore, who had been elected to the Senate in 1984, delivered a speech to the same convention, saying conventional arms should be cut along with nuclear weapons. As vice president, Mr. Gore became the Clinton administration point man on relations with Russia.

MORE HYPOCRISY

Mr. Gore would be well served to get the facts out about his relationship with Mr. Hammer, beginning with the zinc bounty. The issue is bigger than whether there is a pollution problem in Tennessee. When Mr. Gore's zinc riches are at stake, he appears unwilling to live by the standards he sets out for others in ''Earth in the Balance.''

His record of uncompromising environmental rhetoric seems another instance of the kind of hypocrisy that has dogged his campaign for months. He's been accused of being a slumlord for providing substandard housing to a tenant on a rental unit adjoining his farm. A well-remembered 1996 speech to the Democratic National Convention, invoking his sister's death by lung cancer and attacking the tobacco industry, also contributed to his reputation for slippery sanctimony when his close ties to Tennessee tobacco were revealed. And of course Mr. Gore has been sharply criticized for posturing on campaign finance reform while under investigation for possible fund-raising crimes in the 1996 campaign.

No mention of the zinc mine appears in ''Earth in the Balance,'' on Mr. Gore's campaign Web site or in his speeches. At this point the story of the Tennessee farm, the zinc mine, the politician and the influence peddler is largely one of cant and hypocrisy. This is not a hanging crime in the political world, but the vice president, among others, might note that Bill Clinton's problems also began with a murky land deal and a shady financier.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Again, it is not my desire to criticize somebody because they own a mine or have a resource interest, but there is a certain criticism when one recognizes the reality that this mine is hardly a model for anyone, based on the number of violations that have been filed in Tennessee over an extended period of time on this particular mine.

We know the Vice President has been critical of some; namely George W. Bush, for his close ties to big oil. In fact, the Vice President's family has close historical ties to Occidental Petroleum and shares in that company which, in its public disclosure, is valued between $500,000 to $1 million. Occidental Petroleum plans to drill in the ancestral lands of over 5,000 U'wa Indians in the Colombia rain forest. They threatened suicide if Occidental goes forward with its plans.

I ask unanimous consent an article from the June 26 Washington Times that substantiates that allegation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCCIDENTAL DEAL BENEFITS GORES—SALE OF FEDERAL OIL FIELD BOOSTS FAMILY FORTUNE

(By Bill Sammon)

Vice President Al Gore's push to privatize a federal oil field added tens of thousands of dollars to the value of oil stock owned by the Gore family, which has been further enriched by skyrocketing gasoline prices.

Shares of Occidental Petroleum jumped 10 percent after the company purchased the Elk Hills oil field in California from the federal government in 1998. Mr. Gore, whose family owns at least $500,000 in Occidental stock, recommended the sale as part of his ''reinventing government'' reform package.

The sale, which constituted the largest privatization of federal land in U.S. history, transformed Occidental from a lackluster financial performer into a dynamic profit-spewing, oil giant. Having instantly tripled its U.S. oil reserves, the company began pumping out vast sums of crude at low cost.

As the months went by, Occidental was able to sell the oil, which ends up at gasoline retail outlets like Union 76, for more profit. Rising oil prices have significantly improved Occidental's bottom line, said analyst Christopher Stavros of Paine Webber.

This year, the company posted first quarter revenues of $2.5 billion, or 87 percent higher than a year earlier. That's a bigger increase than at nine of 10 other oil companies listed in a survey that Mr. Gore cited last week as evidence of price gouging.

The rise in Occidental oil prices, coupled with the acquisition of the Elk Hills field, has paid handsome dividends for the Gore family.

The vice president recently updated his financial disclosure form to put the value of this family's Occidental stock at between $500,000 and $1 million. Prior to the Elk Hills sale and gasoline price spike, Mr. Gore had listed the value of the stock at between $250,000 and $500,000.

Gore aides insist the vice president's push to sell Elk Hills does not constitute a conflict of interest. They point out the family's Occidental shares were originally owned by Mr. Gore's father, who died in 1998, leaving the stock in an estate for which the vice president serves as executor.

Although Mr. Gore continues to list the stock on his financial disclosure forms, aides said the shares are in a trust for the vice president's mother, Pauline.

''He doesn't own stock because he's trying to avoid conflicts of interest,'' said Gore spokesman Doug Hattaway. ''He's the executor of the estate, but he's not the trustee of the trust. It's a separate thing.''

Still, Mr. Gore's recommendation to privatize Elk Hills ended up enriching his mother, who is expected to eventually bequeath the stock to the vice president, her sole heir.

Last week, Mr. Gore began a concerted effort to blame skyrocketing gasoline prices not only on ''big oil'' but also on Texas Gov. George W. Bush. Gore aides have emphasized that Mr. Bush once ran several oil-exploration firms and has accepted more campaign contributions from oil companies than the vice president.

The Texas governor has dismissed the attacks as an attempt to divert attention away from Mr. Gore's energy and environmental policies, which have driven up gasoline prices. Political analysts say the spiraling gas prices could imperil Mr. Gore's presidential bid because they are highest in the Midwest, which he must carry in order to win the White House.

The political and financial fortunes of the Gore family were established largely with oil money from Occidental's founder, Armand Hammer. Part capitalist and part communist, Mr. Hammer became the elder Gore's patron more than half a century ago, showering him with riches and nurturing his political career through the House and Senate.

The elder Gore enthusiastically returned the favors. In the early 1960s, Sen. Gore took to the Senate floor to defend Mr. Hammer against FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who wanted to investigate Mr. Hammer's Soviet ties.

In 1965, the elder Gore helped Mr. Hammer obtain a visa to Libya, where he opened oil fields that turned Occidental into a multinational powerhouse.

When the elder Mr. Gore lost his re-election bid in 1970, Mr. Hammer installed him as head of an Occidental subsidiary and gave him a $500,000 annual salary. The man who had begun his career as a struggling schoolteacher in rural Tennessee ended it as a millionaire oil tycoon.

The younger Gore also benefited from Mr. Hammer's generosity. He was paid hundreds of thousands of dollars in annual payments of $20,000 for mineral rights to a parcel of land near the family's homestead in Tennessee that Occidental never bothered mining.

When the younger Gore first ran for president in 1988, Mr. Hammer promised former Sen. Paul Simon ''any Cabinet spot I wanted'' if he would withdraw from the primary, according to a 1989 book by the Illinois Democrat.

Mr. Gore and his wife, Tipper, once flew in Mr. Hammer's private jet across the Atlantic Ocean. They hosted Mr. Hammer, at several presidential inaugurations and remained close to the oilman until his death in 1990.

In 1992, when Arkansas Gov. Bill Clinton was considering Mr. Gore as his running mate, the elder Gore wrote a memo describing his son's ties to Mr. Hammer. The document was designed to provide Mr. Clinton with answers to possible questions from reporters.

Mr. Hammer's successor at Occidental, Ray Irani, has continued to funnel hundreds of thousands of dollars into the campaigns of Mr. Gore and the Democratic Party. For example, two days after spending the night in the Lincoln Bedroom in 1996, he cut a check for $100,000 to the Democratic Party.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. We have heard that the Vice President and the administration tried to stop drilling in Alaska with expressions of concern for the G'wichin Indians, some of which reside in Alaska, and others which reside in Canada.

But has he spoken out for the U'was in Colombia? Is there an inconsistency here? On the one hand, he allows, and evidently ignores, the drilling in the Colombia rain forest on leases owned by Occidental Petroleum, and he seems to have no objection. But in an area the G'wichin Indians in Alaska depend on for subsistence, a significant area which is in the purview of the Senate to make decisions for opening, he does not support oil and gas exploration. My point is, there is an inconsistency here.

The weight of their policy as it twists and reinvents itself is a mystery to me as I try to summon a clear vision of their intent. His beliefs are a confusing world of images and contradictions. I suspect it might be difficult for others, as well.

PROJECTS ON GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I am also going to take the opportunity to address an issue that some time ago my Committee on Energy and Natural Resources asked the General Accounting Office to provide a detailee to conduct a preliminary inquiry into payments made by the Project On Government Oversight to two Federal officials. The Project On Government Oversight is known as ''POGO.'' This report was received by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. It was prepared by Paul Thompson, the detailee from the General Accounting Office. It is dated July 2000.

There is no question in my mind after reviewing this that the inspector general of the Department of the Interior should be required to review this report and respond to our Committee. I think it is fitting that the Attorney General, Janet Reno, address and resolve some of the questions that are raised by the inquiry.

Let me share some of them. I read as follows from the report of the POGO on July 2000.

CONCLUSIONS

It appears that POGO paid the two Federal officials in connection with their activities to influence the Department toward taking actions and adopting policies that, among other things, (a) directly and indirectly assisted POGO in a project involving matters in which these two individuals were substantially involved as Federal employees and that led to POGO's filing of a lawsuit through which it and the two officials received substantial sums of money and stand to receive potentially millions of dollars more, and (b) benefited the professional and business interests of POGO's chairman and a client of his law firm. The circumstances associated with the payments raised the possibility that the Department of the Interior's development of the policy underlying the new oil royalty regulations may have been improperly influenced by expectations or understandings of the officials that they could personally benefit from using their positions as Federal employees to assist POGO and two of its principals. The officials were substantially involved in key stages of the Department's policy development process in ways that served the interests of the POGO's chairman and its executive director. Whether the payments and circumstances under which they were made could serve to erode confidence in the Department's administration of the royalty management program is a well grounded concern.

Madam President, the entire transcript of the committee report on POGO, prepared for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, is available from the committee's website at http://www.energy.senate.gov.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO H.R. 4461

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following technical corrections at the desk to various amendments to the Agriculture appropriations bill be adopted.

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

The corrections are as follows:

Change the instruction on amendment #3970 to read: ''On page 76, after line 5, insert:''.

Change the instruction on amendment #3068 to read: ''On page 76, after line 5, insert:''.

Change the instruction on amendment #3457 to read: ''On page 85, after line 8, insert:''.

Change the instruction on amendment #3958 to read: ''On page 100, after line 12, insert:''.

Change the instruction on amendment #3985 to read: ''On page 95, after line 22, insert:''.

On page 55, line 22, strike ''$1,216,796,000'' and insert $1,210,796,000''.

In amendment #4003, on page 2, line 9, insert ''90''.