

cattle. This report talked about the real possibility of the introduction of bioterrorism through the food supply in concentrations of agriculture production of that size. It is true. How difficult would it be, however, to do that to a food production system which you have a wide network of family farms on America's land producing America's food? From a national security standpoint, it is important that we have support for family farmers.

Europe does it. Europe does it for another reason. Europe has been hungry and decided never again to be hungry and never again to be dependent on concentrations of food producers. So they, in Europe, have a network of producers, small farmers, dotting the landscape of Europe because they have been hungry once and have determined never to do that again, and the best defense against hunger is to have family farmers all across Europe producing their food supply.

The same is true in this country, in my judgment. Exactly the same is true. Add to that the national security implications of having broad distribution of food supplies in this country produced by family farms. Again, as I said when I started, I think family farms produce something very enriching and very important to who we are as a country. Much more than that, they also contribute to this country's national security.

The House of Representatives has passed its farm bill. We have a responsibility in the Senate to pass ours. The difference between the House and the Senate farm bill that would amend or change the Freedom to Farm Act will be hundreds of millions of dollars to farmers in North Dakota alone.

The Freedom to Farm bill was passed when the price of grain was quite high and it collapsed almost immediately, and family farmers have lived now for 4 or 5 years with commodity prices that are far below the cost of production. The result is a whole lot of families are struggling. Many have lost that struggle and have moved from the family farm because they went broke. Others are hanging on, just hoping.

The only thing farmers have ever been able to live on is hope; hope that somehow next spring they would be able to find somebody who would lend them the money to plant a crop; hope if they put the crop in that perhaps it would rain enough so that the crop would grow; hope that it would not rain too much and drown out that crop; hope they did not have insects; hope they did not have hail; hope that crop disease did not destroy the crop.

If beyond all of those hopes they finally raised a crop, hope when they combined or harvested that crop and put it in a truck and drove it to an elevator that there would be a price that was decent. With that kind of hope, farmers deserve our help during the tough times, and it is my hope the Senate will understand its responsibility right now in the next several weeks to

take up the challenge of the House and pass a farm bill, a good farm bill, that says to family farmers we are standing with them, we are standing behind them, and we want to provide a bridge over price valleys to try to help them through these tough times. If we do that, it also will strengthen our country. That also will strengthen our economy.

We will not have economic recovery in this country if we say it does not matter what happens to those who live on the land; it does not matter what happens to family farmers.

Economic recovery also begins by helping those who produce America's food supply, and I hope the Senate will take up this challenge in the next couple of weeks.

I conclude by saying this: I come from rural America. I was raised in a town of 300 people. We raised horses, had some cattle. When I left my home county—it was a fairly large county geographically—there were 5,000 people living there. There are now 3,000 people living there. Like most rural counties, it is shrinking. The Lutheran minister in one of the communities in my home county told me she has four funerals for every wedding at which she officiates.

There is this movie "Four Weddings and a Funeral." This is the opposite: four funerals for every wedding. Why is that the case? Because in those small towns and those rural areas, people are getting older, the population is aging. Very few new people are moving in, very few young people are taking over the farms, because they can't make a living.

As the age increases, the economies of the communities are shrinking. What used to be a plum is now a prune—my home county and thousands like it across this country.

If one just thinks this is about numbers and balance sheets, let me again describe how it is not. It is about dreams, about people's lives. There was an auction sale, which happens too often in my State. A fellow named Arlo was the auctioneer. He told me he was auctioning a tractor at the auction sale. People bid and bought the tractor. At the end of the auction sale, where he auctioned many things from the family farm because the farmers could not make it, a little boy, about 9 years old, came up to him. He was the son of the farmer who was being sold out. He grabbed the auctioneer around his leg, and he kind of shouted at him. He said: You sold my dad's tractor. Arlo kind of patted him on the shoulder to try to calm him down. This little boy had tears in his eyes. He looked up and said: I wanted to drive that tractor when I got big.

This is about dreams, about families, about kids. It is about the future. Family farming is much more than just business, it is part of our culture. Our country needs to understand that. We have a responsibility to write a new farm bill, one that works, one that works for family farmers.

In conclusion, as I have said before, if writing a farm bill is not about investing in families who farm in this country, retaining a network of families across the prairies of this country, then we don't even need a farm bill. We don't need a farm bill to help the giant agri-factories. If someone wants to buy 3,000 milk cows and milk them 3 times a day, God bless them. They don't need Uncle Sam's money. But a family with a family yard and a light that shines over where that family sleeps, where the dreams reside, cannot make it through tough times and price depressions. The only way to save family farms when the prices collapse is that the Government say: This part of our economy matters; we hope you get through the tough times—we will build a bridge over the valleys. If the Government is willing to do that, it will retain a food supply network populated on average by family farms that produce that food supply.

In a world desperately hungry, where so many people go to bed at night with an ache in their belly, when thousands die every day from hunger and hunger-related causes, it is unthinkable to me that what we produce in so great abundance somehow has no value. They take it to the elevator, and farmers are told their grain has no value. It has value to the people in the world who are starving. It has value to the 500 million people who go to bed at night hungry. But our farmers are told, that which you produced, which rested on your hope in the spring to produce a crop, has now no value in the fall when it is harvested.

There is a major disconnection in this country about the value of agriculture, its worth to family farmers, its worth to the world and what it contributes to the stability of the world. We had better think through in a more clear way how all of that fits together. Food is an enormous asset. Those families who produce it are a significant asset to this country. It is time the Congress understands that.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ANWR

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have spoken several times today about energy policy. I will spend a few more minutes talking about something that has created a lot of confusion and controversy and in some respects bad feelings; that is, what we should do about ANWR.

The majority leader has indicated the volume of the business to be completed by the Senate is heavy. The subject of national energy policy is important. But we also acknowledge the jurisdiction of national energy policy cuts across several committees, all of which have a hand in charting the future of that policy. Of course, that is one of the main reasons Senator DASCHLE yesterday indicated we need to do an energy bill. If we are going to do it sometime in the next few months, it has to be done by bringing it to the floor directly. When it comes, it will occupy much of the Senate time.

I hope, however, we will not devote the Senate's precious time to a debate on drilling in ANWR. That debate, if we choose to have it, will be divisive, as it has been. Many do not believe you can drill in ANWR, and if you do so, it fundamentally changes the character of this national treasure, this pristine wilderness. We also believe whatever the size of the footprint of ANWR, it opens the possibility of a larger, more destructive footprint in the form of an oil spill. It is tough, very difficult to prevent accidents. It is very difficult and tougher still to prevent those who may be out to cause problems in the wilderness. It is not a speculative threat.

At the Trans-Alaskan pipeline last week, as most of my colleagues are aware, a lone rifleman shot some holes through the pipeline. This appears not to have been an act of terror but an act of one person out to do some damage to a critical part of the Nation's infrastructure. This action, where holes were shot in the pipeline, rupturing an 800-mile-long pipeline which spans from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, gushed oil from 2:30 in the afternoon to 3 a.m. the following Saturday morning. That is 36 hours. They thought something was wrong but couldn't find where the leak was.

It took 36 hours to locate, plug the hole, and stop the rush of oil. I referred earlier to 250,000 gallons, but it was actually 285,000 gallons of crude oil spewed over many acres surrounding this pipeline. The cleanup crews have worked hard to capture about 88,000 gallons of that crude oil, leaving 200,000 gallons over that pristine area.

When you go to the gas station—and most of us have to pump our own gasoline because they are almost all self-service stations—if you fill that tank a little bit too full, the gas runs all over the pavement. When I was a younger man, I worked for Standard Oil and later Chevron. I pumped gas. One of our jobs was to put as much gas as you could in a car, but if it spilled out, just a little, it ran all over, and it was embarrassing. People thought you wasted 25 cents' worth of gas when it was probably half a penny or a penny's worth. Think what 250,000 gallons of crude oil would do to any environment.

It is unclear how we will clean this up. The Environmental Protection Agency and the Alaska Department of

Environmental Protection estimate they may leave the oil-soaked land in place and try to treat the land. Others say maybe they have to remove all this oil-soaked brush and trees and even treat the soil. So it is not clear how they are going to clean it up, but it is clear it is terribly difficult to prevent lone acts of ignorance, terrorism, and simply accidents involving our energy infrastructure. I think we would all be well advised to not have another 800-mile pipeline.

Madam President, I will ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of editorials. I just picked up a few here. We were on the Defense authorization bill when various Senators on the other side held up this legislation because they wanted the energy bill on it. These editorials from the Philadelphia Inquirer, Los Angeles Times, New York Times, Charlotte Observer, Chicago Tribune, and the Charleston Gazette—just to pick a few newspapers—the last one is the Albuquerque Journal—say this is wrong; you cannot tie energy policy to things that have no bearing, no relation to it.

I hope, as important as energy policy is, that we move forward at the right time and the majority leader understands the importance of it. We are going to do that. But we recognize the divisive nature of ANWR.

I ask unanimous consent these articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Philadelphia Enquirer, Oct. 1, 2001]

BACK TO NORMAL

ENERGY ISSUES SIGNAL A RETURN TO PARTISANSHIP

Brief though it was, the hiatus from political hijinks has begun to wane in Washington.

Under the guise of national security, some elected officials have started to slip pet projects into unrelated legislation, grinding progress to a halt.

Last week, the worst offender, Sen. James Inhofe (R., Okla.), stalled an urgent \$345 billion defense authorization bill by hitching it to the notion of drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska.

Talk about poisoning a bipartisan well. Few issues are more divisive.

One amendment to the defense bill contains the entire House energy bill, which was passed in July. Rather than debate it on its merits, Sen. Inhofe suggested the Senate rubber-stamp it as an after thought to needed defense appropriation.

This is no way to do business—even in wartime.

The energy bill has been shelved all summer, waiting behind faith-based initiatives, campaign-finance reform and a patients' bill of rights. As U.S. policy-makers rightly focus on the Sept. 11 attacks, energy probably should move up on the domestic agenda.

But realize that, since the attacks, gas supply and prices have been stable. The organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries agree Thursday to maintain its current production level, despite a precipitous drop in the price of crude oil. Unlike last fall, the supply of winter heating fuel is stable, with lower prices expected.

A growing consensus among energy analysts, government officials and economists

predicts that the Sept. 11 attacks will have no short-term impact on energy supply. Even if the immediate supply were threatened, drilling in the Arctic refuge isn't the answer. No oil would flow for 10 years—the time needed to construct oil fields and a delivery route.

And even if the most optimistic estimates were correct, Arctic refuge oil would reduce imports only a few percentage points. Nearly half of U.S. demand would still be met by foreign oil. The country will remain vulnerable to the world market as long as demand for fossil fuels keeps rising.

The United States needs an energy overhaul, not just more oil. The long-term supply-and-demand problems outlined by Vice President Cheney's energy team last spring haven't changed. Remedies must include new technologies and conservation, as well as improvements in conventional fuels.

An energy program too important to be passed as a tangential political maneuver. The Senate should reject these amendments.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 28, 2001]

ARCTIC DRILLING IS STILL BAD

The United States needs to take decisive steps to improve its security against terrorism but should be wary of attempts to use the crisis to stampede Congress into bad policy decisions. In one such attempt some lawmakers are trying to rush through legislation to open the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to oil exploration and drilling.

"We can't wait another day," House Republican Whip Tom DeLay of Texas raged at a press conference. "This country needs energy produced by Americans in America for America," declared Rep. W.J. "Billy" Tauzin (R-La.). Hold on. Drilling in the Arctic refuge was a bad idea before Sept. 11 and is just as bad today. Rushing the energy bill through the Senate wouldn't make the ANWR provision better.

The facts are unchanged. The refuge is estimated to contain 3.2 billion barrels of oil that can be pumped without economic loss, enough to supply the nation for about six months. It would take roughly 10 years for these supplies to reach gasoline pumps. We could save five times as much oil by raising the fuel efficiency standard of new autos by three miles per gallon. There may be just as much oil in other parts of Alaska, including the 23-million-acre National Petroleum Reserve, now open to the oil companies. Domestic production can and should expand where it is economically feasible and does not threaten special areas.

The wildlife refuge, on the north slope of Alaska between the Brooks Range and the Arctic Ocean, is the home of the 129,000-head Porcupine caribou herd, which migrates more than 400 miles to the coastal plain to calve. The refuge also has polar and grizzly bears, Dall sheep, musk oxen, wolves, foxes and myriad bird species.

Once the first drill pierces the tundra, the refuge will be changed forever, despite the denials of drilling proponents. Would we harness Old Faithful for its geothermal energy? Put a hydroelectric plant at Yosemite Falls? You could not measure the potential cost to the environment in Yellowstone or Yosemite, nor can you in the Arctic.

[From the Charlotte Observer, Sept. 28, 2001]

HARD TIMES, BAD LAWS

Congress shouldn't be stampeded by terrorist attacks. Don't get the idea that politics has been suspended while Washington focuses on terrorism. In fact, supporters of some politically controversial proposals are reshaping them to make it appear they're necessary to help win the struggle against terrorism.

Take the Bush Administration's proposal to drill for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, for instance. Some proponents of drilling say Congress should move quickly to allow to it in order to lessen U.S. dependence on oil from the politically unstable Middle East.

Baloney. Drilling in Alaska wouldn't make a dime's worth of difference in U.S. dependence on imported oil. At present the United States produces less than half the petroleum it consumes. Economist Paul Krugman, writing in the *New York Times*, notes that drilling in the wildlife refuge, at its peak, would supply only about 5 percent of our consumption. Even with drilling there going full steam, we'd still depend on imports for 45 percent of our needs.

The quest for a cut in the capital gains tax is irrelevant to the present crisis. Some Republican backers of a rate cut say it's necessary to pump money into the economy to pull the nation out of a recession.

More baloney. The way to jumpstart the economy is to put money in the hands of people who are likely to spend it quickly. Simply rebating the federal payroll taxes would do that quicker and better than tinkering with the capital gains tax. And a one-time rebate would be in keeping with Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan's caution against making long-term changes to deal with short-term problems. "It's better to be smart than quick," he said. While Mr. Greenspan favors reducing or eliminating the capital gains tax over time, he does not favor doing it now.

The disaster of Sept. 11 didn't change the arguments for and against drilling in the wildlife refuge or cutting the capital gains tax. Politicians who suggest otherwise are attempting to use the terrorist attack to advance an unrelated political agenda. Congress rightly feels a need to do something, but it shouldn't be stampeded into doing something wrong.

[From the *New York Times*, Oct. 2, 2001]

STRONG-ARM TACTICS IN THE SENATE

Members of Congress have largely resisted the temptation to exploit this moment of national crisis to promote pet causes. One exception is a small group of senators and House members, led by Senator James Inhofe, an Oklahoma Republican, who favor opening up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling. Last week Mr. Inhofe threatened to take the energy bill passed earlier this year by the House and add it as an amendment to the high-priority Defense Department authorization bill. The energy bill includes a provision opening the refuge to drilling.

Tom Daschle, the majority leader, has scheduled a cloture vote for this morning. If successful, the vote would make it impossible to attach non-germane amendments like Mr. Inhofe's to the bill. Senators who care about sound legislative procedure—not to mention a rational approach to the country's energy problems—will vote for cloture.

Drilling in the Arctic is a contentious issue on which the Senate is closely divided. Railroaded the idea through without proper hearings defies elementary standards of fairness. There is also no evidence that drilling in the refuge will significantly reduce America's dependence on foreign oil. The House bill that includes the drilling provision is itself an ill-conceived mishmash of tax breaks that would do a lot for the oil, gas and coal industries without putting the country's long-term energy strategy on a sound footing.

Reducing America's dependence on foreign sources of energy is a complicated business, and there are many experts who believe that

the surest road to energy security is to improve the efficiency of our cars, homes, factories and offices, and to invest heavily in non-traditional sources of fuel. Before the terrorist attack, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee had begun extensive hearings aimed at producing an energy bill that would balance exploration and conservation. This measured process should now be allowed to resume, free of pressure from partisan maneuvering.

[From the *Chicago Tribune*, Oct. 2, 2001]

THE GREASY POLITICS OF ALASKA OIL

In a display of unity and statesmanship seldom seen in Washington, most politicians have put aside partisanship and personal squabbles to concentrate on helping a traumatized nation recover from the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11.

Then there's Sen. Frank Murkowski, a Republican from Alaska.

Last Wednesday, he threatened to bring all Senate business to a halt unless there was a vote on the Bush administration's energy bill, which contains a provision to open Alaska's National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling—a pet project of his and a few others in the Senate.

"If I have to hold up normal legislative business, I will do that," he said.

Way to go, senator: Your sense of national priorities is about as keen as your timing. What better moment to push your agenda than now, when your colleagues and the nation are still mourning the dead and pondering how to prevent another terrorist attack?

Though drilling was approved by the House earlier this summer by a comfortable margin, it faces much tougher going in the Senate. Indeed it's a short-sighted proposal that would damage one of the few pristine wilderness areas left in the country. It ought to be defeated; the terrorist attacks don't change that.

Yet, Murkowski and a few others—Sens. James Inhofe (R-OK) and Larry Craig (R-ID)—are using the national crisis to grease the drilling proposal through the Senate with a minimum of debate.

Murkowski's office says the oil could start gurgling through the pipelines as soon as a year from now—if only the Senate would pass legislation to dispense with lawsuits, environmental studies and other inconveniences.

In other words, forget the details and let'er rip.

Any responsible plan to drill in Alaska will take anywhere between 7 and 10 years of study, planning, engineering and construction. At that, the oil from there would have just a small impact on the amount of oil the nation needs to import. In the short or the long term, drilling in the refuge has little to do with the terrorist challenges the country faces.

What an astonishingly crass move, to manipulate the Sept. 11 tragedy to get the energy bill approved. Threatening to shut down the Senate smacks of gross political opportunism.

[From the *Charleston Gazette*, Oct. 1, 2001]

ENERGY

DON'T USE TRAGEDY

Some energy industry executives would use Sept. 11 to further their own greedy agendas. Sadly, some in Congress are willing to help them use this national tragedy to add billions of dollars to their bottom lines.

Sen. James Inhofe, R-Okla., is attempting to amend the controversial House energy bill into the unrelated defense appropriations bill. That energy bill includes billions of dol-

lars in subsidies to oil, gas and coal interests, and it would open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to exploration and drilling.

Coincidentally, Inhofe is Congress' top recipient of campaign money from the oil and gas industry. He's already received \$56,200 this year from drillers, according to the Center for Responsive Politics—nearly \$20,000 more than he received in the entire 1999–2000 election cycle.

Inhofe says this is a natural time to talk about the security implications of the nation's dependence on foreign oil. Fine. What does that have to do with giving billions of dollars to polluting industries? What does that have to do with despoiling the nation's last pristine ecosystem?

If the United States wants to lessen its dependence on foreign oil, there are better ways. Congress could finally raise the gas mileage standards for cars, and apply passenger car standards to minivans and SUVs.

Congress could encourage alternative energy sources that cause less environmental damage.

This debate was poised to happen before the Sept. 11 attack. But energy industry lackeys like Inhofe want to use that tragedy to sidestep Senate debate and get what they want.

This shameful attempt to use the deaths of thousands of Americans is grotesque. West Virginia senators Robert C. Byrd and Jay Rockefeller should show their respect for the dead, and for what the United States has been put through, by voting against this callous amendment.

[From the *Albuquerque Journal*, Oct. 1, 2001]

POLITICAL MANEUVER BLOCKS DEFENSE BILL

So, is this a time of national unity, in which divisive policy issues are to be set aside while we deal with the emergency at hand? Or, is the rush to pass the enabling legislation to clear our military for action just another golden opportunity to steamroll unrelated partisan issues over the opposition?

For some Republicans, it is the latter.

Sen. James Inhofe R-Okla. has refused to withdraw his amendment to the Defense Authorization Bill that would tack on energy legislation passed by the House and a Senate energy bill sponsored by Sen. Frank Murkowski, R-Alaska. Both would open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil exploration.

Fast-track solving of legislative problems by tacking amendments onto unrelated bills is a congressional practice in normal times, if a bit short on legislative honesty.

But, these are not normal times. The maneuver makes a mockery of the touted bipartisanship to deal with the situation left in the wake of the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks.

There have been bipartisan calls for quick action on the \$345 billion defense bill.

"Our troops are counting on it; the Pentagon needs it," said Senate Majority Leader Thomas Daschle, D-S.D. "I can't think of a more urgent piece of legislation than this right now under these circumstances."

Sen. Inhofe, however, sees the urgency only as a rare opportunity for a bit of political war profiteering—if he can get a majority in the Senate to go along.

The question of drilling in ANWR is a contentious issue Congress will have to deal with at some point. But, blocking an essential defense bill in an effort to slip it past without debate on its merits is a reprehensible tactic in these troubled times.

To his disgrace, Inhofe has already blocked action on the defense bill until next week. Senate colleagues should reject his maneuver and get back to unity of purpose in addressing the urgent task at hand.

Time enough to pick up on the contentious and important ANWR debate on its own merits after Congress has done all it can to provide for the anti-terrorism effort ahead.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

CONSIDERATION OF AN ENERGY BILL

Mr. INHOFE. I was hoping the assistant majority leader would stay on the floor so I could tell him I was very pleased with what happened last night. I have dealt with the assistant majority leader and majority leader for several weeks now in an attempt to get an energy bill to the floor. I understand an agreement has now been announced that the majority leader and assistant majority leader will bring one to the floor.

I started to say to Senator REID, when I saw him walk out—I wanted him to be here so he could hear me compliment him on this action. I think it is critical.

I believe we should have gone through an extensive committee markup. On the other hand, as the weeks go by and we get closer to adjournment, I think this would be an impossible thing to do at this point.

Second, I am hoping when this bill comes to the floor—and there is now a commitment from Senator DASCHLE to bring it to the floor during this Congress, before adjournment—that we get it in time to be very deliberative, in time to consider all the amendments.

I do not know what this energy bill will look like when it comes to the floor. I will read this now to make sure it is in the RECORD in case someone else hasn't done so:

At the request of Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Chairman Jeff Bingaman today suspended any further markup of energy legislation for this session of Congress. Instead, the chairman will propose comprehensive and balanced energy legislation that can be added by the majority leader to the Senate Calendar for potential action prior to adjournment.

While it did not have a chance to go through the committee process, which I would have preferred, when it became apparent that it was not going to go through, I thought the next best thing was to go ahead and send it straight to the floor; let us work on it here. We need to put amendments on it. We need to be in a position where we are able to offer the amendments to make sure it has the necessary provisions to do something about an energy policy for the future.

I do not say this in at all a partisan vein because I started, in the 1980s, try-

ing to get the Reagan administration to have an energy policy.

Then I tried to get the Bush administration, the Bush I administration, to have an energy policy for this Nation. They would not do it. I thought surely he would, coming in from the oil patch, but he did not.

Then of course we tried during the Clinton administration, and they decided they were not going to do it.

So this is our chance right now. As long as we have lip service, saying, yes, it is important; yes, it is important for our national security to have an energy policy, but not doing anything about it, we are doing a great disservice to our Nation.

Here we are in two wars for all practical purposes right now. In Iraq you may have noted this morning another one of our Predators was shot down, and of course what is happening in our war on terrorism around the world. This is no time to be playing around with what is probably the single most important aspect of our ability to defend America, and that is our current reliance upon foreign sources for our ability to fight a war.

When Don Hodel was Secretary of Energy and Secretary of the Interior, back during the Reagan administration, he and I went around the Nation giving speeches as to why our dependence on foreign countries for our ability to fight a war is not an energy issue; it is a national security issue. We went, I remember, to New York and Chicago and different places to try to explain to people we cannot be dependent upon foreign sources for our oil and still be able to fight wars and defend America as the American people expect of us.

At the time that Don Hodel and I went around the Nation, we were 37 percent dependent upon foreign sources for our ability to fight a war. Today that is now 56.6 percent.

What I am saying is we are importing 56.6 percent of the oil we are using to run America and to fight wars. Today, in this current environment, it costs much more, in terms of amounts of oil, to fight a war than it did in the past.

Of the 56.6 percent that we are dependent upon for our ability to fight a war—we have to say it in that way—half of that is coming from the Middle East. Do you know who the largest contributor to our dependency is, in the Middle East? It is Iraq. Here we are at war with Iraq. They just shot down one of our Predators, a third one, this morning. We are sending battle groups over there to defend America, sending them into combat situations with Iraq, yet we are dependent upon Iraq for our ability to fight a war against Iraq. That is preposterous. It is not believable that this could be happening.

That is why I say we have to get out of this position. We have to establish a national energy policy that is comprehensive, that does have as one of its cornerstones the maximum that we are going to be dependent upon foreign

sources for our ability to fight a war. And that is not just the Middle East; that is other parts of the world also.

To be in a 56.6 percent dependency—and, incidentally, by the end of this decade, if we don't do something to dramatically change it, it is going to be 60 percent. That is 60 percent dependent upon foreign governments for our ability to fight a war.

What happened last night is a major breakthrough because we now have the majority leader stating that he will have a comprehensive bill before us to vote on before we adjourn. That is major. We are going to have to consider all aspects. I don't want to see something coming down that is not comprehensive. It is going to have to talk about where our untapped resources are in this country.

I can see right now all the lobby of the far left environmental extremists are going to say this is an ANWR bill. It is not an ANWR bill. Of the comprehensive bill, H.R. 4, from the House of Representatives, that passed—and that is the one we will probably go into conference with—out of 200 pages, only 2 pages talk about ANWR. That is a very minuscule part of it. It covers a lot of items. For example, we have untapped resources in the United States other than ANWR. We have some offshore opportunities, where we have tremendous reserves.

I happen to be from the State of Oklahoma. We had huge stripper well production. When we talk about stripper wells, we are talking about small wells, shallow wells that only produce 15 or fewer barrels a day.

But if you had producing today, right now, all of those stripper wells, or marginal wells that we have plugged in the last 10 years, then it would equal more oil than we are currently importing from Saudi Arabia. That shows it is out there.

Why can't they do it? They can't do it because to lift a barrel of oil out of the ground, it costs us 10 times as much in the United States in marginal production as it does in Saudi Arabia, for example. So it is not the price of the oil so much as, when they make this decision as to whether or not to explore for these marginal wells, they have to have some idea of what the price of a barrel of oil is going to be when it is ultimately produced—and that will be a period of a year. We have jumped around from \$8 to \$35 a barrel in less than a year, so how can they predict that? That has to be included in a comprehensive energy policy so we can exploit all of these opportunities.

The other day I was on a program with one of our well-respected Senators, and I made the comment almost in jest that you can't expect to run the most highly industrialized nations in the history of the world on windmills. He said, in fact, you can. He talked about this wind technology. Fine. We want to go after these other technologies and exploit other opportunities out there—hydroelectric, the sun,