

last week, and I said it the week before—I will put a hold on all the legislation, not the major appropriations bills and judicial appointments, that individual Senators on the other side have sponsored. This legislation should go through on unanimous consent. It is not controversial. It has the support of all of us. But I have no other choice but to do so. I have no other choice but to fight like the dickens and use my leverage. I have been around the Senate for 11 years now, and I know the way things work.

It is very rare that today we continue to have these anonymous holds on legislation such as this to help homeless veterans. The only way I can fight and the only way I can continue to make this a priority—it is a priority to me, it should be a priority for every Senator, and it should be a priority for our country—is to ask my colleagues to go and spend some time—and maybe many of my colleagues have—in homeless shelters, meeting with street people. My colleagues would be amazed at how many of them are veterans, how many of them are Vietnam vets. Surely we can do better.

Anonymous hold? I do not know why. I guess I have my own suspicion, but I will say this: I have a hold on all the bills from individual Senators on the other side, and they are going nowhere until whoever the Senator is steps forward and either debates me and we have a vote or that Senator takes this hold off.

I will say this: I do not blame the Senator for wanting to remain anonymous. I would want to remain anonymous if I were blocking this legislation. We can do better for veterans in our country. We can do better for veterans in a lot of different ways, but this is legislation where a lot of us came together on both sides of the aisle. We have done some good work. It is not the cure-all or end-all. I do not want to make this out to be perfect, but I say to my colleague from Georgia it makes life a little better for some people. In this particular case it happens to be veterans. It is the kind of thing we should be doing in public service, and I cannot understand where this anonymous hold comes from or why.

Every day I am coming to the Chamber and I am going to do the same thing. I am going to continue to have a hold on all this other individual legislation sponsored by individual Senators on the other side until this bill goes through.

Other than that, I do not feel strongly about it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. May I ask the time I have reserved for morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may speak for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

ENERGY SECURITY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, we are all aware of the shocking events that occurred on September 11. We are certainly aware of the vulnerabilities that were shown to our Nation by this action. As we reflect on the risk today, I think we would acknowledge that never in our history have we, as a nation, been forced suddenly, shockingly, to reevaluate almost every aspect of our life.

Americans must make a choice now about risks; we must make choices we never thought we would have to make. From our mail to our shopping malls to ball games, life in America is now a reflection, looking back through the lens of terror. Surveying that risk, perhaps no single area causes greater concern than that of energy as a consequence of our increasing dependence.

We rely on safe, stable, affordable, and plentiful supplies of energy to power our progress, but the choices made on energy have left us vulnerable and exposed on two different fronts, two fronts that add up to our Nation's energy security, and I will discuss those today.

A report detailing these risks was received yesterday by Gov. Tom Ridge, head of Homeland Security. What he did was itemize some of the risks we have at home. We have seen a great deal of publicity given to the realization that about 20 percent of our energy is produced by nuclear powerplants. We have about 103 reactors around the country producing clean, affordable energy. The fact the energy is affordable, reliable, and free of emissions such as greenhouse gases, is very appealing. However, there is no free lunch. Nuclear power does create a by-product that must be dealt with, but when managed responsibly and stored safely this waste poses no threat and no risk to public health.

I might add, in the several decades of generating nuclear power in this country, we have never had a casualty associated with the operation of nuclear reactors for power generation.

So the industry, as well as government, has done an extraordinary job of proving nuclear energy has a significant place in our energy mix.

In 1982, the Government made a promise to the American people to take care of that waste and provide a permanent repository. The contractual agreement was that the Government would take the waste in 1998.

Madam President, 1998 has come and gone. Today, after years of delay, bureaucratic wrangling and \$12 billion in taxes collected from the ratepayers who depend on nuclear power, that promise made by the Federal Government to take the waste remains unkept.

I don't know the opinion of the agencies regarding the sanctity of a con-

tract, but this was a contract. There are lawsuits pending for the lack of fulfillment of the terms of the contract, somewhere in the area of \$40 to \$70 billion. Instead of storing the waste in a central, single, secure facility where we can concentrate all of our resources on keeping it safe, nuclear waste is being scattered across the country. We have it in our powerplants, we have outside some of the plants storage in containers, casks designed for that storage, but these are not permanent. We have shut down plants where the waste is being stored. These plants were not designed for the permanent storage of this waste or the shutdown of plants. We have 16 different plants with a total of 230 containers now holding high-level nuclear waste on an interim basis.

In South Haven, MI, dry-cask storage pads are 200 yards from Lake Michigan. Twenty percent of the world's fresh water is in the Great Lakes chain. On the shores of the Chesapeake Bay, dry-cask storage sits less than 90 miles from Baltimore, near Washington, DC, with the U.S. Capitol and three major airports. These containers are approved, but there is no substitute for a permanent repository deep in the group, out of harm's way where it was designed, and that is Yucca Mountain in Nevada.

We have had several debates through the years on this issue. I understand the reluctance of my friends from Nevada to accept the reality that Congress made a designation, subject to licensing, that the repository would be at Yucca Mountain in Nevada. We are still waiting after years and years. We have had a Presidential veto. We are seeing a situation of delay, delay, delay.

Back to the containers. They are approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, but there is no substitute for permanent repository. We have waste at home, and 14 other plants are in the process of being decommissioned, one in Massachusetts, two in Connecticut, and three in California. We are getting more and more plants that are closed.

President Clinton vetoed a bill to accelerate the waste transfer and move us ahead of our current opening date of 2012. That is the current date. I recognize nobody wants the worst, but the reality is we have to put it somewhere. The \$6 billion expended on Yucca Mountain clearly indicates Yucca Mountain was the favorite site. Unfortunately, our previous President vetoed the bill, and the waste sits, no closer to a permanent home. The waste is there, exposed and vulnerable, presenting another target for potential terrorists, nestled in our communities, beside our schools, homes and families. It is irresponsible to not address this situation.

I don't want to prolong the argument relative to the issue of the danger of this waste. It is being monitored by the best oversight available, the best protection, the best security. Still, it is

not designed to stay where it is. We should put this waste in a central repository, designed to take the waste and pool it until we meet the determination of whether we will put it underground permanently or reprocess it.

I will discuss the other risk relative to our energy, and that is the risk overseas. Our risks grow greater as we leave the confines of the United States, where at least we have some control over the choices we have made. We rely on parts of the world where the leaders chose to undermine peace, democracy, and liberty, and will work to undermine our Nation, as well.

We are more than 56 percent dependent on foreign oil. We simply do not have the flexibility to be independent, should the need arise. I am not suggesting we can independently remove all of our dependence on foreign oil, but we certainly have options, and the Senate must act on the options. Unless we make the right choices now, the drivers relative to our energy security are OPEC.

What has OPEC done lately? We know they just planned to cut 1.4 billion barrels of production. Why? Clearly, to increase the price. They want to have a price between \$22 and \$24. The way to do that is to control the supply. That is just what they have announced they are doing. They are cutting production.

We have resources at home, but our hands are tied. We do not seem to be able to reach an accord on how to use places such as ANWR, in my State, which hold the key to energy independence by reducing substantially our dependence on Mideast oil. The Senate has approved safe and limited exploration for ANWR, but President Clinton vetoed that legislation in 1995. Had President Clinton not vetoed that bill in 1995, we would very possibly have as much as a million barrels a day flowing from the ANWR area. That would offset the million barrels a day we are importing from Iraq.

I have asked many times, how can we compromise our energy security when on the one hand we import oil from Iraq and Saddam Hussein and at the same time we are enforcing the no-fly zone over that country, putting our young American people's lives at risk with a blockade in the sky. With the oil money, he is paying his Republican guards to keep him alive. He is also developing capability for a missile, with perhaps a biological warhead. Where does he aim? Most of those items of terror are at our ally, Israel. That may be an over simplification of foreign policy, but one could reach that conclusion.

We could be far less dependent today if we considered the merits of opening this area. Using conservative estimates, in the 6 years that have elapsed since the President last vetoed the ANWR bill, that would have been more than enough time to have researched that tiny sliver of land, built the infrastructure on 2,000 acres, and gotten the oil flowing.

I have a chart that puts it in perspective. It is important, as we address this issue—and this Congress will address this issue either by an agreement with the Democratic leader to allow time for an energy bill to come up or it will be on the stimulus package because it belongs there. I ask my colleagues to reflect what other stimulus can they identify that generates somewhere in the area of \$2.5 billion in Federal lease sales, money to the U.S. Treasury, provides about 200,000 jobs throughout this Nation, and does not cost the taxpayers one red cent? That is why this issue belongs on the stimulus package.

Think of the tankers that would be built in U.S. shipyards with U.S. crews to expand the oil from Alaska, which is currently about 17 percent of all the crude oil produced in this country. We could be far less dependent than we are today. We are only one supertanker terrorist activity in the Straits of Hormuz away from serious disruption of our oil supply.

Let me point out the reality associated with the ANWR issue. It is so misunderstood. There is a threat that ANWR is at risk. What is ANWR? This is ANWR in relationship to the State of South Carolina. They bear a striking resemblance: about the same acreage, 19 million acres. That is a big chunk of real estate. Of what does ANWR consist? It already consists of three specific designations by Congress: 8.5 million acres in wilderness classifications in perpetuity, another 9 million put into a refuge, and Congress left out the 1.5 million acres, the coastal plain, for determination of whether or not to open it for oil and gas exploration. Why? Clearly, the extensive exploration in Prudhoe Bay suggested the largest single deposit may be found in this coastal area.

We take that and move along a little further and recognize that the House bill, H.R. 4, said: OK, we will open this area for exploration, but the footprint can be only 2,000 acres.

That is 2,000 acres out of 19 million acres. If you reflect on that, what are the prospects? They say somewhere between 5.6 and 16 billion barrels. Prudhoe Bay has produced 13 billion barrels, and it was only supposed to produce 10. This could equal, easily, what we would import from Saudi Arabia for 30 years.

Some say it will take 10 years and some say it will take 7 years to get this oil. It is estimated if the oil is there—here is the pipeline that is already in, an 800-mile pipeline—we can open up this area somewhere in the area of 18 months if we expedite the permitting process because we already have some fields of discovery and a pipeline approximately halfway over here. Put this in perspective. What is a 2,000-acre footprint worth?

This is an item from Petroleum News, Alaska, "Gwich'in, Ensign Link Up New Mackenzie Delta Drilling Company."

A new native-controlled oil and gas drilling company has been formed to provide oil-

field services in a land claims area of the Mackenzie Delta that is seen as a likely route for any Mackenzie Valley pipeline.

Gwich'in Oilfield Services, 51 percent owned by the Gwich'in Development Corp. of Inuvik, Northwest Territories and 45 percent by Calgary-based Ensign Drilling, is expecting to start operation this winter.

The Gwich'in Development settlement area covers 22,422 square miles and is governed by the Gwich'in Tribal Council.

Gwich'in Development Corp., wholly owned by the tribal council, has a mission to build an investment portfolio that offers business opportunities, employment and training to Gwich'in residents.

I ask unanimous consent the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Petroleum News, Alaska; Sept. 30, 2001]

GWICH'IN, ENSIGN LINK UP IN NEW MACKENZIE

DELTA DRILLING COMPANY

(By Gary Park)

A new Native-controlled oil and gas drilling company has been formed to provide oil-field services in a land claims area of the Mackenzie Delta that is seen as a likely route for any Mackenzie Valley pipeline.

Gwich'in Oilfield Services, 51 percent owned by Gwich'in Development Corp. of Inuvik, Northwest Territories, and 49 percent by Calgary-based Ensign Drilling, is expecting to start operations this winter.

The Gwich'in settlement area covers 22,422 square miles and is governed by the Gwich'in Tribal Council.

Gwich'in Development Corp., wholly owned by the tribal council, has a mission to build an investment portfolio that offers business opportunities, employment and training to Gwich'in residents.

Tom Connors, chief executive officer of the corporation, said Sept. 10 that the deal with Ensign gives the community a chance to participate in the development of oil and gas resources.

Ensign president Selby Porter said his company's experience and equipment make it the right choice to work with the Gwich'in people.

"The development of a local work force and infrastructure is key to the continued development of oil and gas resources of the Arctic region of Canada," he said.

Formation of the new company was announced Sept. 6.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I also ask unanimous consent that two other articles be printed in the RECORD, "The Slick Politics of ANWR Oil" by Paul K. Driesssen, and "The Sacred Slope" by Jack Stauder, Ph.D of the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth, relative to this issue.

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

THE SLICK POLITICS OF ANWR OIL

(By Paul K. Driesssen)

A new Native-controlled oil and gas drilling company was recently formed to provide oilfield services in the Mackenzie River delta area of northwestern Canada, adjacent to Alaska. According to Petroleum News Alaska, the company was created to provide investment and business opportunities, employment and training for tribal members. It expects to start operations this winter, to expand oil and gas development activities in the Arctic region.

This new enterprise, Gwich'in Oilfield Services, offers some fascinating insights into the slick politics of militant environmentalism.

The majority owner is none other than the Gwich'in Indians Tribal Council. Those are the same Gwich'in Indians that for years have been poster children for the cause of opposing oil exploration in the flat, featureless coastal plain of Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR).

But nearly 90% of the Gwich'in live in Canada. Only 800 live in Alaska. The Alaskan Gwich'in live some 250 miles from the coastal plain, if one travels along the route caribou follow in migrating to and from ANWR.

As the crow flies, the Indians' Arctic Village is 140 miles across the all-but-impassable Brooks Range. Those majestic mountains—the ones seen in all the misleading ads and news stories opposing ANWR oil exploration—are 30 to 50 miles from the coastal plain. (It's amazing how a telephoto camera lens can make them look so close.)

The Gwich'in Tribal Council plans to drill in a 1.4-million-acre land claims area governed by the Indians. This is the same amount of land that's been proposed for exploration in ANWR. The proposed drill sites (and a potential pipeline route) are just east of a major migratory path, where the caribou often birth their calves, rather than awaiting their arrival in the refuge.

Back in the 1980s, the Alaska Gwich'in leased 1.8 million acres of their tribal lands for oil development. (No oil was found.) Any reservations they may have had to the latest leasing plans were apparently very muted.

It is hard to grasp how drilling for oil in their own back yards is perfectly OK, but exploration on public and Inuit Eskimo lands 140 miles away somehow "threatens their traditional lifestyle." It's equally hard to condone their willingness to collect countless thousands of dollars from environmental groups, to place full-page ads in major newspapers, appear in television spots and testify on Capitol Hill in opposition to ANWR exploration—and then lease more of their tribal lands for drilling. But none dare call it hypocrisy.

Government geologists say ANWR could contain as much as 16 billion barrels of recoverable oil. That's enough to replace all our Persian gulf imports for 10 years or more. At peak production levels, it could provide $\frac{1}{10}$ of total U.S. oil needs. Developing this critically needed energy could also create 735,000 jobs, save us from having to send hundreds of billions of dollars to OPEC, and generate tens of billions in royalty and tax revenues to defend and rebuild our nation.

All these benefits would result in the disturbance of about 2,000 acres—less land than the terrorists destroyed or damaged in New York City—in a refuge the size of South Carolina. And any drilling would be done in the dead of winter, using ice airstrips, roads and platforms that will melt when spring arrives.

Eskimos who actually live in ANWR want the same benefits the Gwich'in seek. As Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation president Fenton Rexford notes, the Eskimos are tired of using 5-gallon buckets for sanitation, because they don't have toilers, running water or a sewer system. They also understand the national security issues at stake here. No wonder they support exploration by an 8:1 margin.

Bin Laden & Company just sent us a wake-up call from Hell. In mere hours, they plunged us into an economic crisis and a long, difficult war that must be waged both overseas and in our own neighborhoods. Is there anyone who seriously believes we can afford to continue letting a small band of politically correct Alaska Indians and environ-

mental militants hold the United States hostage on ANWR oil?

It's time to face reality, toss bogus anti-oil arguments on the ash heap of history, and support exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

THE SACRED SLOPE

(By Jack Stauder, Ph.D.)

This story bears telling first, for the silliness it exposes about the conventional wisdom of liberal opinion on campus today regarding environmental issues; and second, as an example of how to challenge such silliness.

Last spring I arranged for myself to be appointed to a new "Sustainability Committee" being set up by the powers on high at the University of Massachusetts, where I teach. I was suspicious of what was intended on campus under that slippery rubric.

Luckily, the Committee has done little so far except receive rather pompous memos tinged with utopian musings coming from a couple of professors at the Boston campus of our state system, including a Professor B. (Names of colleagues in this piece have been hidden to protect tender egos; but otherwise all the quoted e-mail here has been unchanged.) Professor B. regards himself as a great expert on "sustainability."

Anyway, the little controversy I will describe began with an e-mail forwarded through a couple of leftist professors on my campus. Its origins appear to be from one the endless number of lobbying groups on the left. One of the burdens of having left-wing friends, as I do, is that they often pass on these lobbying efforts. This e-mail, however, was circulated to all twenty or so members of our Sustainability Committee as well as the professors in Boston by one of the sillier members of our Committee. Bear with my account as you read it; the fun begins after it.

Sunday, October 7: "Is Nothing Sacred?"
From: Professor G.

Dear Friend of MoveOn, In this time of tragic urgency, our leaders in Washington have pulled together and put all things controversial and partisan aside for the sake of national unity. Our friends on Capitol Hill are making sacrifices, holding off on key issues that can be won only through struggle, such as energy and campaign finance reform. Our opponents have respected the national need for unity too, until now.

But today we learned that Sen. Frank Murkowski (R-AK) is breaking with this patriotic spirit by trying to tack one of the most controversial issues in America onto the Defense Authorization bill:

He wants to drill for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, the heart of the last great wilderness ecosystem in North America. This is a mistake, because:

Any oil found there wouldn't come on line for 10 years;

The refuge contains just 6 months supply of oil;

Existing fuel-efficient technologies could save more than that;

Once it's gone, it's gone forever.

The Defense bill will be debated this Wednesday through Friday.

Please call your senators now:

Senator John Kerry

Phone: 202-224-2742

Fax: 202-224-8525

Senator Edward M. Kennedy

Phone: 202-224-4543

Fax: 202-224-2417

Be sure they know you're a constituent, and urge them to:

"Please—block—the vote on the Murkowski drilling amendment to the Defense Authorization bill."

Please call even if you think your Senators are solid supporters of protecting the refuge. Many Senators simply don't yet believe that Murkowski will do it, but our sources are reliable.

America's entire environmental movement must rally now.

Please let us know you're making this call, at our website. We'd like to keep a count. Thank you. Your call will matter.

Sincerely,

—Wes Boyd
MoveOn.org
September 19, 2001

[I was riled enough by this message to reply to all on the Committee who had received it:]

Sunday, October 7: "Re: Is Nothing Sacred?"
From: Professor Jack Stauder

Is it appropriate to circulate such partisan lobbying action information throughout a university committee? I don't think so. We shouldn't tire others out through incessant propaganda, no matter how close to our hearts our causes are.

But if we are going to be wasting our collective time this way, let me get in on the fun.

There are two sides to each controversy. I've actually been to the North Slope of Alaska. I've never seen an uglier landscape.

The proposed drilling area is a small speck in a vast tundra: it would compare to the size of the township of North Dartmouth within the entire area of Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island put together. The "great wilderness eco-system" would be virtually unchanged by the proposed drilling. Nothing would be "gone" forever.

People can say any area is "sacred" if they want. However, the Inupiat (Eskimo) of the North Slope, the only people who have ever lived there or would want to live there, are by a large majority in favor of drilling for the oil. Why would people here in Massachusetts want to deny them their wish? Few of us if any will ever go to visit this "sacred" place, if only because it is so inhospitable to all but the Eskimo—cold and dark throughout the winter, a huge flat marshland swarming with mosquitoes in the summer. Yet out of spiritual arrogance some presume to tell the Alaskans what to do with their land.

The oil deposit is estimated to be a quite substantial one, otherwise there would be no interest in drilling there. One should automatically distrust the misleading statistics and factoids thrown out by environmental groups who make their living propagandizing issues like this. The oil from Alaska wouldn't meet all our needs, but it would make us that much less dependent on the Middle East—a welcome goal.

And even if "existing fuel-efficient technologies could save more" than drilling in Alaska could provide, this statement is a non-sequitur, for doing either does not preclude the other.

Should I go on and on? Should I tell you who to call in Congress and what to tell them? No, I won't, because it's not the business of the Sustainability Committee, in my eyes, to serve as a propaganda vessel for anyone's "cause" or "special interest."

—Jack Stauder, Soc/Anth Dept

[As I rather expected, my questioning of a liberal environmental icon—the sacredness of wilderness—brought a prompt reaction, from none other than Professor B., to all members of our committee. Note his condescending familiarity towards me, although I have never met the man.]

Monday, October 8

From: Professor B.: "Re: Is Nothing Sacred?"

To All, Jack's contention that the Sustainability Committee shouldn't be used to lobby

issues is probably correct. On the other hand, if someone wants to send an e-mail to everyone on her/his address book, this a free right. I respect Jack for exercising his right of free speech and expressing his views. Now I will exercise mine.

I disagree with two points that Jack made: one, the North Slope is not "their" land, it is "our land," and furthermore, our children's land. Second, I am convinced that focusing on the front end, i.e., the production end, of the pipeline, especially the oil pipeline, does preclude achieving anything near the easily achieved efficiencies at the use end of the pipeline. I think I read from a reliable source that increasing the fleet mileage of American automobiles will save more oil in a short time than the most optimistic estimates of oil to be obtained from the North Slope. I also understand that the average fleet miles per gallon of American made automobiles is the lowest in 25 years, largely due to SUV's not being held to the standards of automobiles.

Now Jack, those of us who argue for a philosophy and policy of increasing the efficiency of our economy over the Texas mentality of "we'll shoot, drill, and fight our way out of this mess," and "be damned with those pencil-necked liberal flakes who want us to change our superior American lifestyles of ostentatious, conspicuous consumption, and profligate waste. Be damned I say. So what if we are only 5% of the world's population and contribute 25% of the CO₂ in the world."

Jack, you sound like the Montana Cattlemen's and the Northwest Lumberman's Association's attitude that our land is their land to do what they damned well please.

Now, by God, I have changed my mind. I think any sustainability committee that is serious ought to go on record as strongly opposed to increased exploitation of finite resources and dangerous pollution when there are scientifically and technically double ways to increase efficiency of our economy, to say nothing of some of us who strongly believe we are morally wrong in our consumption habits. Yes, we do feel that the environment is a "sacred" trust.

Some of us even believe that there is a definite nexus between American consumerism and the feeling of being oppressed in some third world countries. A feeling so strong as to even, at least partially, foster terrorism. Hope all is well.

W. B.

[These predictable opinions of Professor B. offered some targets too tempting to resist, although I restrained myself from addressing his every point. Below is the e-mail I returned, again to the whole committee, although it was addressed to him.]

Wednesday, October 10: "The Sacred Slope etc."

From: Professor Jack Stauder

Dear Prof. B.: You make some interesting points in your recent memo, but I think some clarification is in order.

You are certainly right that most of the North Slope, being federal government land, in some sort of legal sense belongs collectively to all American citizens. However, perhaps because I am an anthropologist I believe it would be a bit culturally arrogant to inform the Native Americans whose ancestors have lived in that region for a couple thousand years that (in your words) "the North Slope is not 'their' land, it is 'our land'." Native Americans (the Inupiat in this case) tend not to appreciate this attitude from white men.

The point I tried to make in my previous memo is that in issues like this, of environmental protection and economic develop-

ment, I believe that the first consideration, out of respect, should be paid to the views of the local people actually inhabiting the place in question. After all, they know their environment best, and have the most to lose or gain depending on what happens to it. I trust their wisdom more than that of lobbying groups based in Washington, D.C. Perhaps you disagree.

Also, maybe because I grew up in the West (Colorado and New Mexico) I was put off by your glib caricature of "the Texas mentality." We are encouraged in our university to embrace diversity, but it seemed to me your remarks smacked of regional prejudice and mean-minded stereotyping of a great state of our union—a state, by the way, that has for long provided the rest of us with many valuable goods, including the oil and natural gas that have moved our vehicles and warmed our houses. We should be thanking Texans, not making fun of them.

On other Western topics, you accuse me of thinking like Montana cattlemen and Northwest lumbermen. I'm not quite sure what you mean, although you seem to be down on these groups. Do you want them put out of business? Do you want them to stop producing goods for our use? Can we in Massachusetts produce the beef and wood products we need and use? Again, as with the Texans, I say let's thank these rural producers for their efforts—not affect to despise them.

Would you not at least admit the possibility that these hard-working Americans contribute much more of real value to their countrymen, than do university professors firing off vaporous memos by e-mail?

Finally, what am I to make of the sly statement you append to the end of your last message: "Some of us even believe that there is a definite nexus between American consumerism and the feeling of being oppressed in some third world countries. A feeling so strong as to even, at least partially, foster terrorism."

I hope there is no insinuation in these words that somehow Americans are responsible for what those squalid foreign fanatics did on Sept. 11. I trust you are not one of the "Blame America First" fringe that hangs around American campuses. But what are you getting at?

I can see how the terrorists might resent and hate the United States for being such a prosperous, dynamic, creative society—one that is open, democratic, tolerant of all religions, and respectful of human rights and individual liberties. After all, none of the Middle Eastern terrorists come from societies with these characteristics. But why should we feel guilty for the evil acts their perverted ideology leads them to?

Where exactly does "consumerism" fit in? If we voluntarily impoverished ourselves down to the level of, say, Afghanistan, would other people feel less "oppressed"? If we "increased the fleet mileage of American automobiles" to consume less oil, as you propose, do you believe that Osama bin Laden will praise us to Allah and call of his terrorists? Seems unlikely to me. Perhaps the Taliban prohibits girls from learning to read so they don't grow up to be seduced by the white sale ads of the Kabul Macy's? Or what about the destruction of those large statues of Buddha? Perhaps that was in response to information that monks of that faith were driving too many SUV's around their lamaseries?

Seems to stretch. The only important product we consume from the Middle East is oil, extracted by our technology, for which the Middle East states are paid royally. It's oil. That is why I suggested that, to free us as much as possible from dependence on that oil, we develop our own resources—like Alaskan oil. We can do this as well as "increase efficiency of our economy," as you desire.

Again, there is no contradiction between the two goals, and it seems self-defeating and silly to pit them against each other.

No, I do not consider the 2000 acres of frozen tundra on the North Slope, where the drilling would take place, as "sacred"—except that it oil would help us meet our sacred duty to protecting our families and keeping our nation strong.

Your, Jack Stauder
Soc/Anth Dept., UMass Dartmouth

[My riposte was apparently too much for Professor B. He threw in the towel, left the field, hung up his cleats—whatever metaphor you might choose. He replied, not to the whole Sustainability Committee, but only to me, that he could not sustain more discourse on the issue.]

Thursday, October 11: "Re: The Sacred Slope, etc." From: Professor B.

Jack, I only partially read your e-mail retort. I think you are missing the purpose of the Sustainability Committee. Bantering words is a waste of time. Let's perform. W.

I think he did read all my retort, and was wise enough to see any further attempt to cross swords with my "banter" might lead to more humiliation of his half-baked ideas.

For our own edification, I think a couple of lessons might be drawn from this otherwise trivial story, about how best to combat environmentalism and its nonsense.

First, as I have learned from Rush Limbaugh: humor helps, irony, sarcasm, ridicule are useful tools in dealing with opponents, especially those who cloak themselves in pretentiousness airs of moral and intellectual superiority, as environmentalists tend to do.

Second, don't give environmentalists a chance to claim the moral high ground in any argument. Aggressively assert your own principles—in this case, the valuable contributions of resource providers, and the positive aspects of American civilization.

Third, know your opponents and exploit the contradictions in their beliefs. For example, a pious tenet of Prof. B.'s liberal creed is that Native Americans are victims □ and ecological saints, to boot—with whom good left/liberalists must sympathize. Yet in this case the environmentalists want to tell them what they can or can't do with their traditional lands! No wonder he is too embarrassed to pursue an argument on this score.

My gibes about "celebrating diversity" (regarding Texans!) were certainly tongue-in-cheek, but highlighted another contradiction in Prof. B.'s attitudes by pointing out his use of prejudicial stereotypes, when good left/liberalists always condemn these □ in the abstract. I was accusing him in effect of being a bigot, of violating one of the taboos of his sort in showing "intolerance." Obviously he didn't like being called out on these grounds.

Finally, questioning him about his opinions regarding the United States put him in an impossible position. If he is like most leftists—and the types of environmentalists that foams at the mouth against "consumerism" and wants to use "sustainability" as a tool to shoehorn us into some type of socialist utopia—then he must have hated the good, but true, things I had to say about American civilization. Difficult as it may be for most Americans to comprehend, the underlying belief of U.S. leftists, including left-wing environmentalists, is that America stinks—that our country is malign, unjust, oppressive, imperialist, and altogether hateful. This view explains why they give themselves the license to tear down our civilization and to impose on us their own utopian ideas.

However, Professor B. and the wiser radicals know, especially in the wake of September 11, that they cannot be so up front

with their anti-Americanism. So he had to grit his teeth and refrain from replying as I more or less waved the stars and stripes in front of him. It must have infuriated and frustrated him.

Good. Let's hope he stays wordless, and that the sustainability project molders in inactivity. But I wouldn't be so sure. These advocates for environmental causes always have a lot of time on their hands.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. These articles highlight the reality of the issue of the Gwich'ins, which is a legitimate concern they have over the Porcupine caribou herd, and the realization that now this issue has taken on a new dimension because most of the Gwich'ins live in Canada. There is a small portion who live in Alaska in this general area.

I might add, this line shows the division between the United States and Canada. Here is the Canadian activity going on on the Canadian side. This is primarily, of course, the home of the Gwich'ins. Nearly 90 percent of the Gwich'ins live in Canada. Only 800 live in Alaska. The Alaska Gwich'ins live only 250 miles from the coastline. Our Gwich'ins are down here in the Gwich'in area of the Arctic village.

What we have here is a massive public relations effort, funded by extreme environmental groups, to suggest that somehow the Gwich'in people's lifestyle is at risk in opening this area. They never acknowledge what is going on with the same Gwich'ins on the Canadian side, where they see an opportunity for better employment, health care, a better way of life for their young people. It is important to understand this issue is more than a public relations issue by the Sierra Club and others, suggesting that somehow the Porcupine caribou herd is going to be decimated by a mild amount of activity here, when clearly this is the indication of the path of the migratory caribou herds, and the Canadians run a highway right across the pass.

This is an open season when the caribou come through and as a consequence we have the pot calling the kettle black, if you will.

It is important that Members take the time to understand this issue and reflect on it. I am going to go through a couple of other points relative to items that need evaluation. Some suggest there is no footprint up here in ANWR, and as a consequence it is a pristine area. That is totally false. This is the village of Kaktovik. There are real people who live here. You can see their homes here, and so forth. This is the spring breakup. It might not be a very pretty picture in the sense of the color, but it shows you the Arctic Ocean, and so forth. The winters are a little tough up there.

This is another picture of a village and this is in the 1002 area, physically there. There are schools, a health clinic, there is an airport. The village people and their lifestyle is as they have chosen it to be there.

I will show you a little picture of the children going to school. It is kind of tough up there in the morning. Never-

theless, these are Eskimo children. You can see telephone polls, snow. Nobody shovels the sidewalks off, I grant you, but they are there by choice. They are real people living in an area where some people say there is no footprint. It is totally inaccurate.

What we are looking at is the merits of trying to bring a fair evaluation of the issue. Some have said: I am going to filibuster this bill.

Think about it. What they are talking about filibustering addresses the national energy security of this country.

Where is our President on the issue? On October 31, October 26, October 17, October 4—he has made statements begging, if you will, and I wish he would direct that this body pass an energy bill. The House has passed H.R. 4.

Here is a statement the President made:

But there are two aspects to a good strong economic stimulus package, one of which is an energy bill.

He asked for an energy bill each time that he has had an occasion to speak on energy. Again in October:

I ask Congress to act now on an energy bill that the House of Representatives passed back in August.

I ask unanimous consent these statements of the President on those dates be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH'S COMMENTS ON ENERGY

October 31, 2001:

And I want the Congress to know that there is more to helping our economy grow than just tax relief or just spending. And there's two items I want to briefly touch on. One is an energy plan.

Our nation needs an energy plan, an energy plan that encourages conservation and encourages exploration. And I believe we can do both in a responsible way. And we need to modernize the infrastructure that develops energy from point A to point B, from plant to consumer. We need to get after it. It is our national interest that we have an energy plan, one designed to make us less reliant upon foreign sources of energy.

October 26, 2001:

Tax relief is an essential step, but it's not the only step we should take. We need an energy plan for America. Under the leadership of the vice president, we drafted a comprehensive, commonsense plan for the future of this country.

It passed the House of Representatives. It needs a vote in the United States Senate. Oh, I understand energy prices are low right now. Thank goodness. But that shouldn't lead our nation to complacency. We need to be more self-reliant and self-sufficient. It is in our nation's national interest that we develop more energy supplies at home. It is in our national interest that we look at safe nuclear power. It is in our national interest that we conserve more. It is in our national interest that we modernize the energy infrastructure of America. It's in our national interest to get a bill to by desk, and I urge the Senate to do so.

October 17, 2001:

And I ask congress to now act on an energy bill that the House of Representative passed back in August.

This is an issue of special importance to California. Too much of our energy comes from the Middle East. 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.

October 4, 2001:

But there are two other aspects to a good, strong economic stimulus package, one of which is trade promotion authority. And the other is an energy bill.

And I urge the Senate to listen to the will of the senators and move a bill—move a bill that will help Americans find work and also make it easier for all of us around this table to protect the security of the country. The less dependent we are on foreign sources of crude oil, the more secure we are at home.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. It is not just the Senator from Alaska crying in the dark. We have heard from Gale Norton, Secretary of Interior, saying it is in the national energy security interests of this country to reduce our dependence, and the best way to do it is basically to open up this area because we have the technology to do it. We can create American jobs.

Also, we have heard from the Secretary of Energy, indicating the significance of what this can mean to reducing our dependence.

We have had the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Anthony Principi, indicate that America's veterans who fought the wars—and I will reflect on one comment made by a former Member, Mark Hatfield, who was a pacifist and a good friend of ours. He said: I would vote for opening ANWR anyday rather than send another American man or woman overseas to fight a war in a foreign country over oil.

That is what we are doing. We did that in the Persian Gulf conflict. We fought a war over oil to keep Saddam Hussein from going into Kuwait and moving on into Saudi Arabia.

If we look at affairs in the Mideast now and consider the vulnerability associated with that area and our dependence on Saudi Arabia and the weakness of the royal family and Bin Laden's terrorist activities that would disrupt those oilfields—we are sitting on a situation very similar to what we saw maybe 30 years ago with the fall of the Shah in Iran. That situation could happen, dramatically, overnight.

We could face a terrorist attack on the Straits of Hormuz. Why are we waiting?

Let me tell you something. I mean this in all candor. This issue has been a godsend to the extreme environmental community. It is an issue that they have been milking for revenue and dollars and will continue to do so until the very end. When it finally passes, they will move on to another issue. It has been a cash cow because they refuse to argue the merits of if it can be opened safely. It can. We have 30 years of experience in the Arctic.

Where would we be today if we didn't have Prudhoe Bay?

The same arguments today being used against opening this area were used 27 years ago against opening Prudhoe Bay: You are going to build a fence across Alaska, 850 miles. The caribou are not going to be able to cross it. It is going to break up the permafrost. All these arguments failed because it is one of the engineering wonders of the world.

Let's be realistic. America's veterans have spoken. We have had press conferences: The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, Catholic War Veterans of America, Vietnam Veterans Institute. The Veterans of Foreign Wars are for it. The seniors organizations support it. The 60-Plus have come out in support of it, as have the Seniors Coalition and the United Seniors Association; in Agriculture, American Farm Bureau, and National Grange. Organized labor is totally aboard.

I know many Members have been contacted by organized labor—by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, by union laborers, by the Seafarers Union, Operating Engineers, Brotherhood of Plumbers and Steamfitters, carpenters—and America's business. There are over 1,000 businesses that support opening up this area as part of our national energy security bill.

I encourage Members to recognize the reality that we are going to get a vote on an energy bill under one of two provisions. Either the Democratic leadership is going to respond to the President's request to bring up an energy bill before this body or work out some time agreement that is reasonable. We can take it up, have amendments, and have an up-or-down vote on it. It shouldn't be a filibuster issue. Imagine filibustering on our national security. It has never been done in this body before. We should have an up-or-down vote.

Let us recognize it for what it is. If we don't get the assurance from the Democratic leader to take up an energy bill, then our other opportunity is a stimulus bill. And it will be on the stimulus bill. The House has done its job. It passed an energy bill, H.R. 4. It will be on the stimulus bill.

When you think about stimulus, you think about what other stimulus provisions we have talked about which will provide nearly \$1.5 billion worth of revenue from lease sales to the Federal Treasury. It will employ a couple hundred thousand Americans in shipbuilding, and so forth. It will not cost the taxpayer one dime. I challenge my colleagues to come up with a better answer.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDWARDS). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as if in morning business for the purpose of introducing a bill.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, before I do so, I would like to make a couple of comments based on Senator MURKOWSKI's observations.

I think he is absolutely right on point. About a third of Senate Members are veterans. Several are veterans of World War II. One of my comments will certainly not surprise them.

I ask the Senator if he remembers the story about how we won the North Africa Campaign in World War II when some of the world's great generals were pitted against each other: General Patton from America and Field Marshal Montgomery from Great Britain on the Allied side, and Field Marshal Rommel on the German side. History shows that Rommel was not a Nazi. In fact, he was later forced to commit suicide for his complicity in the events designed to kill Hitler.

But at that time, the state-of-art tanks were called Tiger 88s, with 88-millimeter guns in the Panzer Divisions, which outclassed anything that America and Great Britain had in the North Africa Campaign. Everybody knew it. Field Marshal Rommel, of course, was one of the great minds of World War II. Unfortunately, he was on the wrong side.

History tells us that one of the reasons we won that campaign was that we bombed the oil fields. When we cut off their oil, the tanks stopped running.

I remind my colleagues that they still run on oil. They do not run on wind power or solar power.

I am absolutely supportive of Senator MURKOWSKI's belief that there is a national security connection with being less dependent on foreign oil. He mentioned the statistics and how dependent we are. It really should not come as a big surprise to most Americans if we tell them we are more dependent on Iraqi oil than we were before the war. In fact, 25 percent of the oil we import, as I understand, comes from the Saudis, who every year divide much of the billions of America dollars among the 300 members of the extended royal family, one of whom is Bin Laden. It just defies common sense that because we cannot cut this umbilical cord, we are actually paying people for oil so they can buy weapons with the intent of killing.

I want to tell the former chairman that I am absolutely in support of his efforts. When I was chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, I had many opportunities to visit with Native Alaskans and native peoples of the North. I found that almost to the person, when they would come down to lobby about ANWR, the Native Alaskans who are American citizens supported opening of ANWR. The only ones opposed to it were the people who were natives of Canada, Canadian citizens. There was no question in my mind when I asked them how they got here and who paid their bills, they were being spoon fed to

us basically to get us to oppose something that most American natives supported.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank my great friend from Colorado. We have enjoyed many meetings together in conjunction with his responsibilities as chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee. He has been an outstanding proponent of American Indian opportunities.

His reference to history and what happened in North Africa is certainly appropriate to our energy dependence on the Mideast. We just need to look at the terrorist activities associated with September 11. We have found that most of the individuals responsible for taking down the buildings in New York were Saudi Arabian.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is right. I hope history doesn't repeat itself. The only way we can prevent that is to become less dependent on foreign oil.

(The remarks of Mr. CAMPBELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 1644 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

LAND FOR THE FORT SCOTT NATIONAL CEMETERY

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize an activity that is going on in my home State of Kansas that I think is quite commendable. Thirteen veterans from Fort Scott, KS, have expanded the lifespan of the Fort Scott National Cemetery by about 35 years through their hard work and dedication.

I point this out because I think this is what America is all about. It is about a can-do atmosphere and about people taking it upon themselves to do something that they believe is not getting done; and making it happen.

With about 1,100 World War II veterans dying every day, many veterans cemeteries are struggling to accommodate veterans' burials. That is true in my State as well. According to the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, by 2008, the annual number of deaths of veterans from all U.S. conflicts will reach 620,000, or about 1,700 a day.

Fort Scott National Cemetery is one of 12 Civil War national cemeteries. It was dedicated in 1862 by President Abraham Lincoln. I grew up just north