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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I would just like to share a few remarks at this time concerning the energy bill. We need to improve our production of energy within the United States, and I would like to share a few thoughts about why I think it is a critical part of stimulating the economy.

At this time of economic slowdown, we need to create circumstances that will allow the economy to grow and flower. It has struck me for some time—and I have mentioned this on the floor previously—that our economic slowdown began over a year ago, and it began not long after we saw a tremendous surge in the price of energy. The price of a barrel of oil in the United States was as low as $13 a barrel. It soon leaped to $30 a barrel. And 60 percent of all the oil we utilize in the United States is purchased abroad.

So there was a tremendous transfer of American wealth. We got no more oil—not a single barrel of oil—but we were paying more than twice as much for that oil as we were paying just months before it surged upward.

That drained a great deal of money from this economy. It demonstrated, with great clarity, the dependence we have on foreign oil. And most of the reserves of foreign oil are in the Middle East. It has pointed out the dangers we face if we do not make some changes.

Now we are engaged in hostilities in the Middle East, and we see, once again, just how fragile that supply of oil is to our Nation, and how quickly it can be interrupted.

Our economy needs to improve. I think it is incumbent on us to consider, quite seriously, reforming our energy laws so that we can produce more energy in this country. If we can do that, we will be able to keep more money at home. So when a well is drilled, the question is, Will it be drilled in Saudi Arabia or Iran or Iraq or Kuwait, or will it be drilled somewhere in the United States? When it is drilled here, not only does the money stay here—the royalties that are paid to the State or the landowner for the oil—but all the people who drill the well, all the people who work at it, process the oil, and move that oil from the wellhead site—all of those people will be paid salaries; and then they will pay taxes. They will help reduce our unemployment, increase tax revenue, and provide income for American workers.

So we need to do a number of things to improve our energy situation so that we reduce the drain on our economy from the constant purchase of oil abroad.

Conservation is a critical part of that. The more we can reduce the use of oil and gas in America, then the less demand we have to transfer wealth abroad to purchase it. At the same time, the more we can produce in the United States, the greater our chance will be to churn that money again within the United States, creating jobs, salaries, retirements, and health care benefits, as well as taxes for our States and our governments, our local school systems, and the Federal Government. It will strengthen our economy in a number of ways.

I think improving our energy production would be a critical step in revitalizing our economy. I do not think it is coincidental that we began to sink not long after we saw a tripling of the price of oil on the world market.

I am delighted to see the ranking member of the Energy Committee, Senator MURKOWSKI, in this Chamber. I know he wants to speak on this issue. He has been a constant, steady advocate for America: What is good for American workers, what is good for this country, what we need to do to remain economically strong.

If we do not remain economically strong, we cannot do the good things in this country, and around the world, we want to do.

He has been a great champion of that. As I said, I see he is in this Chamber. I suspect he would like to talk on the energy issue in more detail.

I thank him for his leadership and yield the floor to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, let me acknowledge the comments of my good friend. He and I have shared stands on many issues; and one that I think is prominent at this time, as indicated, is on the issue relative to the request by our President that we have and pass an energy policy, and that we do it with dispatch.

Our President has spoken out four times in the last 2 weeks, indicating the general observation that, indeed, we need an energy bill.

Quoting from a late October release, the statement is made that:

Tax relief is only part of the job. We need an energy plan for America. Under the leadership of the Vice President, we have drafted a comprehensive, common sense plan for the future of our country.

It further states that:

It has passed the House of Representatives in H.R. 4. It needs a vote in the U.S. Senate. We need to be more self-reliant and more self-sufficient.

On October 17, he indicated:

I ask Congress to now act on an energy bill. The House of Representatives passed its bill in August. This is an issue of special importance to California, the State of Washington [which the Presiding Officer represents]. Too much of our energy comes from the Mideast. The plan I sent up to Congress promotes conservation, expands energy supplies, and improves the efficiency of our energy network. Our country needs greater energy independence.

On October 4:

There are two other aspects to a good, strong economic stimulus.

I note that the President uses the words ''economic stimulus.''

One is trade promotion authority, and the other is an energy bill. I urge the Senate to listen to the will of the Senators and move forward on a bill that will help Americans find work and also make it easier for all of us around the table to protect the security of the country.

We have spent a lot of time talking about homeland security. An integral piece of homeland security is energy independence. I ask the Senate to respond to the call to get an energy bill moving.''

The President made another comment to a group today asking again that this body move on an energy bill. It would be derelict if we are to conclude this session without addressing an energy bill.

We are not alone. I have letters here from the American Legion, Vietnam Veterans Institute, Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, Gold Star Wives of America, Catholic War Veterans, Survivors of Pearl Harbor, all who participated in a press conference yesterday here in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the following letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, October 25, 2001.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: We write today out of a sense of urgency concerning our national security, as it relates to our need for energy independence. The development of America's domestic energy resources is vital to our national security. We respectfully urge you to adopt the provisions contained in H.R. 4, the ''Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001.''

War and international terrorism have again brought into sharp focus the heavy reliance of the United States on imported oil. During times of crises, such reliance threatens our national security and economic well being. The import of more than 50 percent of our petroleum from the Persian Gulf further compounds our foreign trade balance at a time when our energy demands continue unabated. It is important that we develop domestic sources of oil, contained within our public lands—such as the supplies within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Working for a comprehensive energy policy and achieving responsible energy independence are critical national security and economic goals. H.R. 4, as passed by the House of Representatives, is a major step forward to achieving these imperative goals. We strongly urge your support.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. SANTOS,
National Commander.

VIETNAM VETERANS INSTITUTE,
October 30, 2001.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: We write today out of a sense of urgency concerning our national security as it relates to our energy supply. The development of America's domestic energy resources is vital to our national security. We respectfully urge you to

immediately pass H.R. 4, the comprehensive energy legislation.

We are pleased the House of Representatives, acting with bipartisan support, addressed our energy vulnerability by passing H.R. 4, the 'Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001' or the 'SAFE Act of 2001.' It is imperative the Senate do the same. Following the horrific events of September 11, 2001, failure to pass this bill would pose a threat to our people, our economy, and our national security, that we all wore the uniform to maintain.

All Americans, as well as our military troops, need this legislation enacted into law. If we intend to rebuild our economy and continue the campaign against international terrorism and those who attacked us, we must develop domestic sources of oil contained within our public lands—such as the supplies within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We must be able to rely to the fullest extent possible on our own resources to provide for the maintenance of our economy at home and our prolonged war effort abroad.

By passing H.R. 4, the comprehensive energy legislation now, the Senate will be supporting our troops in the field and all working Americans, including those displaced by this heartless act of aggression. We, as Veterans, stand united and cannot overstate the importance of this legislation, and respectfully request you lead the Senate by voting on and passing H.R. 4 so our nation can move forward in defense of freedom around the world.

We know that when the chips are down, America can and will stand and fight, using all its resources and all its might to defend our nation and the cause of freedom around the world. Join us in this cause. Pass the comprehensive energy bill and help us rebuild America!

With the support of our members,

J. ELDON YATES,
Chairman and Founder.

AMVETS,
Lanham, MD, October 26, 2001.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
The Capitol, Washington, DC

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: On behalf of AMVETS, I am writing to encourage you to bring H.R. 4, the Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001, before the full Senate for consideration at the earliest possible moment prior to the close of the 1st Session of the 107th Congress.

As you know, our current reliance on foreign oil leaves the United States vulnerable to the whim of individual oil-exporting countries, many existing in the unpredictable and highly dangerous Persian Gulf. And it cannot be overstated that energy supplies touch nearly every aspect of our lives from our economy to our national security.

Passage of H.R. 4, would greatly assist in our ability to secure a more dependable and diversified domestic supply of energy. And, I would note that since the Persian Gulf War our security has become more threatened with our dependence on foreign sources of oil growing from 35 percent of domestic supply to nearly 60 percent.

AMVETS firmly believes that we cannot wait for the next crisis before we act. H.R. 4, as approved by the House, is a critical part of an overall policy America requires to promote dependable, affordable, and environmentally sound production and distribution of energy for the future. We urge your expedited approval of this legislation.

Dedicated to service,

JOSEPH W. LIPOWSKI,
National Commander.

STATEMENT OF OUR NATION'S VETERANS GROUP ''OUR DOMESTIC ENERGY SECURITY IS OUR NATIONAL SECURITY'', OCTOBER 30, 2001

We, the undersigned, representing our nation's veterans, strongly believe that the development of America's domestic energy resources is a vital national security priority. The horrific events of September 11, 2001, constitute a threat to our people, our economy, and our nation's security. With U.S. troops actively engaged in combat overseas, we firmly believe that America can and will win this prolonged war against terrorism, using all its resources to defend our nation and the cause of freedom around the world.

Because of these beliefs, we applaud the House of Representatives for its bipartisan work in addressing our energy vulnerability by passing H.R. 4, the ''Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001'' or the ''SAFE Act of 2001.'' It is imperative that the Senate pass the House version of H.R. 4 so that our nation can move forward in establishing our energy security, as well as our defense of freedom at home and abroad. It is essential for us to develop all domestic energy resources including the supplies within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

By passing H.R. 4, the comprehensive energy legislation, the Senate will be supporting our troops in the field, all Americans, their families, and our nation. We, as Veterans, stand united and respectfully request that the Senate vote on and pass H.R. 4.

J. ELDON YATES,
Chairman and Founder,
Vietnam Veterans Institute.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. These letters indicate their support for energy legislation to be passed out of the U.S. Senate. From October 25:

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: We write today out of a sense of urgency concerning our national security as it relates to our need for energy independence. The development of America's energy resources is vital to our national security. We respectfully urge you to adopt the provisions contained in H.R. 4, the ''Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001.''

The House has acted. This letter was signed by the American Legion.

Here is a quote from the AMVETS letter:

On behalf of AMVETS, I am writing to encourage you to bring H.R. 4, the Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001, to the full Senate for consideration.

The Vietnam Veterans Institute:

We write today out of a sense of urgency concerning our national security as it relates to our energy supply.

The important point is that each one of these organizations reflect on our energy supply in conjunction with our national security.

They further state:

If we intend to rebuild our economy and continue the campaign against international terrorism and those who attacked us, we must develop domestic sources of oil contained within our public lands—such as supplies within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We must be able to rely, to the fullest extent possible, on our own resources. . .

That is signed by J. Eldon Yates, chairman and founder of the Vietnam Veterans Institute. We have our Nation's veterans groups also signing on as well. These represent a pretty significant voice of those who gave so much for America, for the freedoms we enjoy and the realization that we can never properly repay the contribution made by our veterans.

I note in the letter from the American Legion:

War and international terrorism have again brought into sharp focus the heavy reliance of the United States on imported oil. During these times of crisis, such reliance threatens again our national security and economic well-being. The importation of more than 50 percent of our petroleum from the Persian Gulf further compounds our foreign trade deficit at a time when our energy demands continue unabated. It is important that we develop domestic sources of oil contained within our public lands, such as the supplies within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

We have a pretty good representation of what America's veterans think about the necessity of this body passing an energy bill. It is important to note that one member of this body, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, is quoted as saying, with regard to his comments on patriotism vis-a-vis ANWR:

This is not the moment to falsely cloak in the mantle of patriotism a choice as clear and as critical as the choice about the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

I will let the Senator speak for himself relative to an explanation. It is in deep contrast to the attitude prevailing among America's veterans organizations.

If we look at reality associated with what is happening in the world today, we can reflect on just how we have compromised ourselves into a position of vulnerability. There is a gentleman who was a Member of this body for many years, Mark Hatfield of Oregon. Mark Hatfield was a pacifist. I think I can liberally use that general terminology. His position on opening up this area of public lands in my State of Alaska was very clear. He said: I will support opening up ANWR any day rather than send another American man or woman into harm's way to fight a war on foreign soil. Make no mistake about it, that is just what we are doing today; we are fighting a war on foreign soil.

What is the last war we fought over oil? We have to go back to the Persian Gulf conflict. We have to go back to what Saddam Hussein of Iraq was basically up to, what his objective was. His objective was to go into Kuwait, invade Kuwait and go into Saudi Arabia. He knew that he could control the world's supply of oil, and the power and influence that would come as a consequence of that would certainly put him in the driver's seat relative to policies in the Mideast.

What are we doing today? We are importing somewhere between 700,000 and a million barrels of oil from Iraq, from our friend Saddam Hussein. What do we do with that oil? We enforce an aerial blockade to a large degree because we fly our planes over enforcing the no-fly zone. It might be compared to a blockade at sea, only this is one in the air. We are putting in danger our men and

women as they enforce this. They take out targets, radar targets, from time to time. He attempts to shoot us down. He shot down a couple of drones. He has almost shot down one of our interceptor aircraft. As a consequence, as we continue this policy, our vulnerability is evident.

In so doing, he takes our money, pays his Republican Guards for protection, develops a missile capability, develops, for all practical purposes, activities associated with fostering terrorism, he develops a biological weapons capability. Who does he aim it at? He aims at our ally Israel.

That is a consequence of the United States losing its leverage relative to its continued dependence on Mideast oil.

We see the latest press release dated October 25, AP, ''Qatar Calls For Oil Production Cuts.'' We all know what this means. This means the OPEC nations are coming together to reduce the supply so that the price of oil can be increased in that range of $22 to $25.

We see another headline, from Washington Post, October 26, ''Iraq Caught Smuggling Oil, U.N. Official Says.''

As we all know, Iraq is under economic sanctions regime. The U.N. has control, up to a point, over monitoring the sale of oil from Iraq. But what Iraq has been doing is they have been cheating. What they do is they bring a tanker into their port. There is a certification on a bill of lading for so many barrels of oil. The U.N. inspectors sign off on it. And then after they leave, they fill up the rest of the tanker with illegal oil, and, obviously, the profits go to Saddam Hussein.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 26, 2001]

IRAQ CAUGHT SMUGGLING OIL, U.N. OFFICIAL SAYS

(By Colum Lynch)

UNITED NATIONS, OCT. 25.—Iraq was caught smuggling $10 million worth of oil through an Athens-based shipping company in violation of U.N. sanctions, the United Nations said today. U.S. and U.N. officials have long suspected Iraq of siphoning between $1 billion to $2 billion in oil revenue each year. But this is the first time that the United Nations has obtained hard evidence to support those suspicions. Under the terms of a U.N. oil-for-food program begun in 1996, Iraq is allowed to sell oil to buy humanitarian goods, pay restitution to the victims of the Persian Gulf War and fund improvements in the country's infrastructure. Iraq exported more than $18 billion worth of oil last year.

Benon Sevan, the executive director of the program, provided the U.N. Security Council on Wednesday with a letter from a Greek captain who has admitted illegally exporting 500,000 barrels of Iraqi crude during two trips to the Persian Gulf port of Mina Al-Bakr in May and August. Chiladakis Theofanis, captain of the oil tanker Essex, wrote to the United Nations and the United States in September that Iraq loaded 1.8 million barrels into his vessel on May 16 while a team of U.N. inspectors looked on.

When the U.N. officials left the site, the Iraqis pumped an additional 230,000 barrels of crude into the tanker and provided a bill of lading for the additional oil to a company called Roundhead Inc., Sevan said. A similar scheme was repeated on Aug. 27.

''The ships involved first loaded the quantities of oil which were authorized under the program,'' Sevan said in a letter to the Security Council committee that oversees Iraq's oil exports. ''After United Nations inspection agents had finalized their activities on board of the ships, the load pumps on the platform were allegedly restarted in order to load additional volumes of oil on the vessels.'' Iraq's ambassador to the United Nations, Mohammed Douri, denied the charges.

The Security Council has been attempting to stop the Iraqi smuggling but has encountered resistance from Russia, which has contended there is little proof. Russia has blocked a U.S.-British proposal to revise the sanctions policy against Iraq.

The proposal aims to ease civilian imports while tightening the controls on oil smuggling and the purchase or prohibited weapons. Moscow favors steps aimed at lifting the sanctions entirely. The oil-for-food program will be up for renewal on Nov. 30.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. It indicates that when the U.N. officials left the site, the Iraqis pumped an additional 230,000 barrels of crude oil into the tanker and provided a bill of lading for the additional oil to a company called Roundhead Incorporated. This was repeated again on the 27th. The estimated revenue that has come into Iraq is indicated to be between $1 and $2 billion in additional revenue as a consequence of these activities.

We know this cheating is going on. We are about to face the reality that the price of oil is going to be increasing as OPEC recognizes the vulnerability of the United States.

I want to share one more thing with the Senate. This is the foreboding reality of the future. Some of us around here remember what happened in Iran a little over a decade ago. The fall of the Shah. The Shah fell. How did he fall? He fell in a revolution that occurred as a consequence of the unrest in that country at that time.

I would suggest that the record would note that the same set of circumstances are very much in evidence in Saudi Arabia today.

You may recall the Greek myth about Cassandra, who had the ability to predict the future, combined with the curse that nobody would believe her. When it comes to energy, I am beginning to feel somewhat like Cassandra.

I have come to this floor week after week pointing out the peril of our current energy situation and the looming disaster that is our energy future if we simply maintain our current course. I have come before this Senate week after week calling for a balanced and responsive energy policy to the crisis ahead, a policy that stresses production and conservation, which promotes the development of alternative energies, as well as prudent development of traditional resources.

Earlier this year, Senator BREAUX and I submitted a bipartisan energy bill that had over 300 pages. The bill had extensive proposals for conservation and alternatives. But the only thing most of the colleagues focused on was the 2 pages covering a small sliver of the Arctic in my State of Alaska known as ANWR. That is where the lightning rod was, Madam President.

As we know, we are living in a new era today, after September 11. Our country and our way of life were attacked on that date, and we are in the midst of the anthrax scare. It is, in all likelihood, closely connected with the attacks in New York and Washington. What do September 11 and the subsequent events have to do with energy? I say, everything.

At the risk of sounding like a Cassandra again, I want to set out the facts as they are known now and invite this body to look into the future.

Fact No. 1: Every reputable scientific study of our future energy consumption suggests that, even with dramatic conservation and rapid development of economical alternatives, our dependence on oil as a percentage of overall energy use will increase for the next 20 years. Whether we like it or not, a stable source of oil is key to our economic viability for the foreseeable future.

Fact No. 2: Absent new discoveries, the major source for new energy imports will be the Persian Gulf, the location of a majority of the world's known reserves. We are already dependent for about 25 percent of our total oil use on the Persian Gulf, and that number will only increase. This Nation today is importing 57 percent of the crude oil we consume, with half of that coming from the Persian Gulf.

Fact No. 3: Our relationship with the Persian Gulf countries is uneasy, to say the least. Of the major oil-producing countries in the Persian Gulf, we apply some form of economic sanction to all of them. Think of that. We have economic sanctions on virtually all of those countries in the Persian Gulf from which we import oil. We have a moratorium on imports from Iran. We import, as I indicated, somewhere between 700,000 and a million barrels a day from Iraq, which we have been bombing for 10 years. Our relations with the remainder are complicated by a number of factors, not the least of which is our alliance with Israel, a country which is the sworn enemy of most of those nations in the Mideast.

Fact No. 4: The stability of the Persian Gulf is in grave doubt. We have spent billions to have troops stationed in Saudi Arabia to contain Iraq in the name of the Persian Gulf Stability Accord. Radical Islamic movements are a serious political force in many other countries. Even Saudi Arabia, our traditional bulwark of stability in the region, is now a cause for grave concern.

Mr. Hersh's article, written after extensive consultations with the National Security Agency and others, paints a grave picture of Saudi Arabia's political future, the corruption of

the country's regime, its alienation from the country's religious rank and file, and its vulnerability to Islamic fundamentalism.

Detailed in the article is an eerie reminder of the situation in Iran in the late 1970s under the Shah. Iran was, of course, at that time the United States' stable anchor in the gulf. We all remember too clearly what happened in Iran.

Mr. Hersh also points out the level of complicity between those we rely on for energy in Saudi Arabia and those who seek to attack the United States and our citizens.

Saudi Arabia is the largest single source of funding for radical fundamentalism and its organs of terror. The Taliban would not exist but for Saudi Arabian money. That has been identified. Al-Qaida and Osama bin Laden would not exist but for Saudi money. I need not remind you that Saudi money would not exist at all but for oil. It all comes back to oil.

On October 22, the two largest newspapers in New York and Washington, DC—the sites of the attacks on September 11—issued editorial opinions urging that we resist linkage between the events of the 11th and energy policy—totally in contrast to the position, I might add, of organized labor and veterans in this country.

Let me confront those opinions with another set of basic facts about the September 11 attacks. Osama bin Laden and other radical Islamic groups have three major issues with our Nation. First, the United States alliance with Israel—our traditional alliance with Israel is being put to the test by energy dependence in the gulf. The Bush administration, which has been as good or a better friend to Israel than any other administration in recent memory, is now somewhat at odds with Israel in an attempt to appeal to more moderate elements in the Gulf. What is this all about? It is about oil.

Secondly, bin Laden wants United States troops out of Saudi Arabia. Why are we there? To prevent Iraq from threatening the stability of the gulf. The issue is oil.

Thirdly, bin Laden believes that the value of Persian Gulf oil should be seven times its current price—that is, $144 a barrel. He has written in his extensive writings that he wants to seize control of what he calls the ''Islamic wealth'' in order to end what he calls the ''greatest theft in human history''—the U.S. purchase of cheap oil.''

It is all about oil, oil, oil. To suggest there is no linkage between energy policies and the events of September 11, in my opinion, is ludicrous. It doesn't take Cassandra to see where our energy future is headed. It will, however, require action by this Senate in order to reverse our present course. The House has done its job. The President has asked the Senate to act. I urge my colleagues to pass energy legislation as soon as possible.

I think we have continually communicated, as a minority, with the Democratic leadership urging the scheduling of an energy bill that we can take up and debate prior to going out on recess. There seems to be a reluctance in the Democratic leadership. There is an energy task force report in the energy bill that we have outlined. It is very unrealistic, in my opinion, to address the arguments, one of which, of course, continues to be the issue of ANWR.

One of the fascinating things about the contribution of oil that comes down the west coast to the States of Washington, California, and ultimately Oregon—although Oregon does not have a refinery—is the reality that nearly two-thirds of that oil comes from Alaska. If Alaska doesn't replace that oil, that oil is going to come into these States, and it is going to come from the Mideast, come in foreign tankers that are built in U.S. shipyards, with U.S. crews.

The States of Washington, Oregon, and California should recognize their secure supply from Alaska is much more valuable than the unknown risks associated with bringing oil in from the Mideast.

As Congress looks at the current exposure to terrorism, where a terrorist act in Saudi Arabia can overthrow the royal family in Saudi Arabia, or there could be a terrorist attack on ships going through the Straits of Hormuz—all of that leads to the question: Should we have an energy bill that balances conservation and production?

I will close with the argument relative to those who seem to have a little difficulty with the issue of opening up the Coastal Plain. I will give some idea of the vastness of the area.

Many people in this body have not chosen to take advantage of opportunities to visit the area for themselves. ANWR happens to be about the size of the State of South Carolina. It is about 19 million acres. The House bill allows 2,000 acres to be utilized for development and exploration; 2,000 acres is not much bigger than a small farm, if one can somehow recognize we are talking about 2,000 acres out of 19 million acres.

What is the rest of ANWR? Madam President, 8.5 million acres have been put in wilderness in perpetuity, 9 million acres in refuge, and there is only 1.5 million acres left that only Congress has the authority to open.

In the House bill, only 2,000 acres can have the footprint of development only. Is that responsible? We think it is. Can it be opened safely? We have had 30 years experience in Prudhoe Bay. Prudhoe Bay has developed 13 billion barrels of oil. It was only supposed to develop 10 billion barrels of oil. It has provided the Nation with 25 percent of its total crude oil supply for the last 27 years.

People say ANWR contains a 6-month supply. That is assuming there is no other oil produced in this country and no other oil imported. If, indeed, ANWR is in the range of estimates of 5.6 billion to 16 billion barrels, it would replace what we would import from Saudi Arabia in 30 years or Iraq in 50 years. It would be very substantial.

The merits of whether we can do this safely, the merits of the arguments of some of America's extreme environmental communities that have used this issue, very frankly, as a cash cow—and they have milked it for all they can and will continue to do so until we eventually authorize the opening of it and they can move on to something else—because this issue is so far away, the American people cannot see the reality of ANWR for themselves. That, indeed, we have the technology to open the area safely.

Recognize the experience we have had in the Arctic over the last 30 years. We built ice roads. We do not develop when the migratory path of the caribou are involved. The potential of the area is very large. If there isn't the oil we expect there to be, we can make a park out of it.

For us not to have knowledge of what is in there at a time when we are increasing our dependence on the Mideast is unconscionable to me.

There are other issues that enter into this, such as our relationship with Canada. Canada considers us a competitor, and there is nothing wrong with competition. Nevertheless, their view of the world is we should not develop any more resources out of Alaska because it competes with theirs in the Canadian Arctic. I can understand that.

As to the growth of the caribou herds in the Prudhoe Bay field, there were 3,000 to 4,000 animals, and now they have close to 26,000 animals in the Prudhoe Bay area. You cannot shoot them.

The Washington Post ran articles depicting polar bears. It is interesting because the pictures—and this is yesterday's Washington Post article—shows a couple of polar bears. When one reads this, one assumes this is in the 1002 area. This is a little east of Barrow. It is not in the 1002 area. We have certification from the photographer who took these pictures that it is not in the 1002 area. But it is a warm, cuddly issue, and people look at polar bears.

The article does not tell you that these polar bears are protected. They are marine mammals. If one wants to take a trophy polar bear, one can go to Canada and shoot it, or one can go to Russia and shoot it, but one cannot in the United States, in Alaska, shoot a polar bear.

I do not know a better way to protect the polar bear than protecting them from traditional trophy hunting. We have taken steps to try and be responsible relative to development in this fragile area. We have the technology to do it right.

Some people say: That is academic, Senator MURKOWSKI, because we are looking at 7 to 10 years before development is complete. If we built the Pentagon in 18 months and the Empire State Building in a little over a year, and this body expedited the permitting

process—we already have a pipeline halfway from the trans-Alaska 800-mile pipeline over to the 1002 area. It ends in a field called Badami. We only have another 40 to 50 miles to go. We can have oil flowing in 18 months. There is absolutely no question about it.

The arguments being used are the same arguments that were used in the late sixties opposing the opening of Prudhoe Bay. They are exactly the same. Only then they said: You are going to run an 800-mile pipeline from the Arctic to southern ports of Alaska, and it is going to be like a fence. The caribou and moose are not going to be able to cross, it is going to break and notwithstanding earthquakes. It is one of the engineering wonders of the world, and it has provided jobs in this country.

I am going to finish with one point, and that is the stimulus. We are talking about a stimulus in this Nation. What does a stimulus mean? It means different things to different people. To some it means jobs; to others it means tax relief. I defy any Member of this body to tell me a stimulus that is more meaningful than authorizing the opening of ANWR because what it would do is it would provide hundreds of thousands of jobs. Not government jobs, private sector jobs in shipbuilding, in developing pipes and valves. It would start immediately. This would come from the private sector in exploration, and those ships would be U.S. ships built in U.S. yards.

What else would it do, Madam President? It would result in the Federal Government getting probably $1.6 billion in revenue immediately in lease sales because it is Federal land. The Federal Government puts it up for lease, competitive bids. The estimate of the Federal share is roughly in that area. That is a pretty good return to the Federal Government to start out.

The last thing, as we look at this stimulus package, you are not going to find anything in it except potentially ANWR which is not going to cost the Federal Government one red cent. I challenge my colleagues to find another project which would provide such a major economic stimulus without costing the taxpayers money, and indeed bringing significant revenue into the treasury.

I rest my case. I thank the Chair for her attention and wish her and all a happy Halloween.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, will the Senator from Alaska yield for a question? I want to get this straight. Right now when we buy oil from foreign countries, the royalties, the labor, the pipes, and all the construction and drilling, all the economic investment is in those foreign countries; is that correct?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Absolutely.

Mr. SESSIONS. But if we were to open ANWR, the Federal Government, just from the sale of the leases, would receive $1.6 billion?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. It is estimated the lease sale would bring the Federal Government about $1.6 billion in revenue. It may be more. Nobody knows because industry would competitively bid it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Would there be royalties paid each year after that during production?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. SESSIONS. If there is production, the Federal Government would receive additional royalties?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. That is correct.

Mr. SESSIONS. Would the State of Alaska benefit from that?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Yes, obviously. I also want to point out that a sizable percentage of our deficit balance of payments, as the Senator knows, is the cost of imported oil.

Mr. SESSIONS. And the workers even in Alaska are supposed to pay Federal income tax.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. They do pay Federal income tax. They are all American citizens, and they are subject to the same laws as the Senator from Alabama and I.

Mr. SESSIONS. Instead of having workers in Saudi Arabia paying taxes to Saudi Arabia, Iraq, or Iran, they would be paying taxes to the U.S. Government.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Absolutely. This would be all U.S. labor. There would be a prohibition on any of the oil that comes from ANWR being exported out of the United States.

Mr. SESSIONS. I know there are people who have become emotionally committed to this ANWR issue. I hope people will rethink it. As the Senator from Alaska has explained repeatedly, we have such a small area that needs to be produced, and wells are so much more sophisticated today. One well can drain a much larger area than ever before. There is a virtual pipeline there. That is important. The Senator mentioned a threat from foreign dependence.

Was it not just a few years ago the price of oil per barrel on the world market was around $13 and the cartel, since they had so much of the oil, fixed the price and drove it up to as high as $30 a barrel?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. It was a little over $30. As a matter of fact, they basically came together and set a floor and a ceiling. The floor was $22 and the ceiling was $25. If it goes up above that, that is fine for awhile. Then they increase production and bring it down.

Of course, what has happened with this terrorist activity is less jet fuel is used, less automobile gasoline. So we temporarily have a surplus and we are seeing that, but now OPEC is reducing their supply.

Mr. SESSIONS. I guess the point is, these are supposedly our friends who triple the price we have to pay for oil. We have to pay three times as much money to foreign sources, and we get no more oil than we did the day before they drove it up?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. That is true.

Mr. SESSIONS. If they can do that, if they are friends, if we were to have some turnover in government or a war were to break out that could deny some of this, we could see prices even higher than that on the world market?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Absolutely. There is one other point that is obvious to the Senator and to me, but it is overlooked by some, and that is we have other sources of energy. We have natural gas. We have coal. We have biomass. We have wind power, solar power. But because of our technology, America and the world moves on oil. It is put in airplanes. It is put in boats. It is put in trains, automobiles. For the foreseeable future, we are evidently unlikely to find any significant replacement for oil. So that is why we have become so dependent and our vulnerability, to the extent of our national security, is at risk, as our veterans are pointing out.

Mr. SESSIONS. Of course, the Senator is not overlooking conservation. That is another way to reduce dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Absolutely.

Mr. SESSIONS. That is a big part of this bill that the Senator proposed.

I again want to express my appreciation to the Senator. I came to the Senate 5 years ago and heard the Senator delineate this problem and tell us over and over again what we were going to be facing in the future. I think the events in recent weeks have validated the Senator's warnings, the Senator's caution to America, the Senator's call for us to do the smart thing.

I also believe if we can produce more oil at home, it would reduce our deficit and help this economy recovery.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. As the Senate knows, symbolism is so significant. If we were to make a decision to allow the opening of this particular area, we would send a signal to OPEC that we mean business, that we are serious about reducing our dependence. We are not going to replace dependence, but we can reduce it dramatically by a conscientious effort to keep these jobs at home, and, as we both know, the economic forecast suggests there could be significant growing concern over loss of jobs and this is the most significant single identifiable project to create jobs that anybody has been able to pinpoint that does not cost the Government any money or the taxpayer.

Mr. SESSIONS. I will ask one more question. The Senator has challenged us now to name one more project anywhere in this country that will produce as much stimulus as increasing our domestic oil supply as this bill will do, and I think it is a challenge that ought to stay out there and we ought to see if somebody can meet it. Not only will it help us, it will actually produce income and not cost us any money.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I certainly would challenge any Member to come up with a stimulus that would provide jobs, not cost the American taxpayer anything, and indeed bring revenue into the coffers. I thank my good friend and wish him a good day.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

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

AIRLINE SAFETY

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, we are fiddling while Rome burns. The headline in this morning's Washington Post, ''Airport Security Crackdown Ordered,'' particularly galls this Senator. I have been with the FAA since its creation. I have been on the Commerce Committee for right at 35 years. I worked with the old Civil Aeronautics Board. We tried our best to get this entity in ship shape over many years.

It was only the year before last that we finally got the monies that should have gone to airport safety and improvement to go to airport safety and improvement.

We had, in 1988, Pan Am 103. We had extensive hearings. And what did we come up with? What we came up with is exactly what they write in the editorial here, that what we really need is more training and more supervision—''help wanted.'' And then we had further hijackings.

We had the TWA Flight 800 in 1996, and we had further hearings. We had the Gore commission. What did they recommend? The same old, same old of more training and more supervision, more oversight. Got to get stern about this. Crackdowns.

Last year, we passed the FAA authorization bill. And what did we call for? We called for more supervision, more training, and then 5,000 people were killed. And we have folks over on the House side, most respectfully, who do not understand that we have lost these 5,000. Terrorists came along with cardboard knives and committed mass murder, and everything else like that, but they say don't worry about what happened on 9–11.

What happened just this last week? Last week, a man boarded a plane with a pistol down in New Orleans. The individual remembered he had the gun and said: Oh, my heavens. Then he turned it over to the airline crew, or otherwise. And the same airline security firm that was fined last year in Philadelphia for hiring criminals is still hiring criminals.

The Senate reacted. We got together. We had hearings. We had the airline pilots, the airline crews, the assistants, the airline executives—everyone connected—and they endorsed the approach of federalization; that this was a public safety role, need and responsibility. This coalition determined resolutely that we could not toy with this anymore after that tremendous loss on 9–11 and continue to play games with more oversight and more supervision and more training.

And ordering crackdowns: Can you imagine that, ordering a crackdown 7 weeks afterwards? Why not that afternoon, that night, or the next morning? A crackdown? Oh, no, they had to think of the airlines first, while the airlines themselves are begging for safety because they realize that ensuring passenger safety is essential to reviving the industry. The Senate passed our bill 100-zip; every Republican, every Democrat voted for it. Our measure is, more than anything, an airline stimulus bill.

Americans are not going to get on these planes as long as there is fear, and we have the insecurity that we have. They are not going to get on the planes as long as they have U.S. Air Force planes flying over them ready to shoot them down.

With our bill that stops immediately. Once you secure that cockpit door, not to be opened in flight, there is no reason for hijackings because you can't.

All you can do is start a fight in the cabin, knowing that the order to the pilot is to land at the nearest airport where law enforcement is going to be there and you are going to prison. That is the Israeli El Al approach. We outlined it. We provided the diagram for the El Al plan that I still have. If I had time this morning, I would show it. It is a perimeter defense. In 30 years El Al has not had a hijacking.

Don't talk to me about European private airport security. Sure, European security personnel is better paid because all the European folks are supported for retirement and health care. These minimum wage folks have no retirement, no health care, no security, no anything. And the security firms are worried that they may quit. They all are quitting. That has been the experience at the Hartsfield airport in Atlanta. There has been over 400-percent turnover there. They don't stay there longer than 3 months.

Yet the opposition to real airport security has stories going around. The reason I came to the floor is to again bring attention to the commonsensical, thorough, and bipartisan fashion with which the Senate approached airline security. They are still talking about the Democratic bill on the House side. You can't get it any more bipartisan unless we are going to let the pages vote. Maybe we ought to do that. I mean, can't we get the truth to the American people that we are ready, willing, able, and glad to pay for it, $2.50 per flight? The polls show people would be willing to pay $25 added to a ticket, glad to do it. But we can take care of it with $2.50 so there is no question about being paid for.

The fundamentals of safety have to be hammered home to our colleagues on the House side. We are not playing games anymore. Noone wants to contract out the FBI. I wonder what the President wants? We were told a month ago that the President would go along with our bill. We felt absolutely secure. But they have some political machinations going on over there with Mr. ARMEY and Mr. DELAY. And Mr. ARMEY says: I don't want them all to join a union. Well, they all can join the unions under the private contractor. In fact, a third of them have. The reason the other two-thirds have not, is they can't read the application in order to join. They are refugees and immigrants. The application is in English. Go ahead to the airports. I go through there regularly, almost every week. They just cannot speak the language. That is no fault of their own. They are getting what jobs they can. But we can't do this with Americans' and the airline travelers' safety at risk.

We would not contract out the Capitol Police or the Border Patrol or the Secret Service or the FBI or defense. What is the matter with the Government? You just heard about a bill—all the defense workers at the Charleston naval shipyard, all the ''navalees'' belong to a union. You just heard the majority leader talk about laying down to conservative interests. I am not talking pro-union or anti-union. I am saying federal public safety officers cannot strike and they can be fired. This particular Senator supported President Reagan when he had to take that approach with the airline pilots. But we fiddle while Rome burns.

Would we ever not just contract out? Would we ever give our safety to foreign corporations? Can you imagine taking the defense and contracting it out, or the FBI, to the Swedish company or the Secret Service to the Netherlands company? These are the firms responsible for airline security now. The airlines get the lowest bidder, and they couldn't care less.

That English company, they were fined for hiring criminals and falsifying their background checks. And since the time of the court fines, they have continued to hire criminals and not give the background checks. Yet they say: Well, let's see what they want. Let's get flexibility. You aren't going to have flexibility with the FBI or Secret Service or the Capitol Police. There is not flexibility. It is safety. That is what they have to understand over there, that we are not going to give it to the foreign companies.

We are not going to have the momentary safety checks or the European system. We are going to have the El Al, the Israeli system that has worked, proof positive, for 30 years. Once you secure that cockpit and they know there can't be a hijacking, you can take all these F–15s and F–16s and National Guard reserves that are flying all night long over Washington and New York and wherever and say: Save the money and save the time. Let them go back to their work. There is not going to be a hijacking. There is not going to be a plane shot down. If there is an attempted hijacking, it is down to the first landing and on to jail. That is where they are headed. They know that. So our terrorist adversaries will find some other way, like the mail and anthrax, but not the airlines.