

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

of Fort Scott, about 40 miles away. It was an old Indian fort early on. Then it was used, obviously, as well, during the Civil War.

In a concession to make space for veterans wanting to be buried at the Fort Scott National Cemetery, burial spots are currently being made smaller, and sloping land that originally was deemed unusable is now being used.

Thanks to the extraordinary efforts of these veterans I have mentioned, these 13 veterans, working as the Fort Scott National Cemetery Expansion Committee, 10 acres of land will be added to the cemetery. This land, just across the old stone wall from the cemetery, was purchased by the 13 veterans, who took out a loan, and who then sought contributions and worked the crowds at American Legion and VFW halls throughout the region to raise money to pay off the loan. Once the loan was paid off, the veterans donated the land to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

On Veterans Day, this year, November 12, 2001, this land will be dedicated and ready to handle about 3,300 burial sites. I applaud the initiative of these Fort Scott veterans who have successfully undertaken the effort to expand this historic cemetery and provide a place of honor for veterans and their eligible dependents for several decades to come.

I point this out because Fort Scott National Cemetery is one of the oldest veterans cemeteries in the country, dedicated by Abraham Lincoln. It is filled up—or soon will be full. These veterans, by their own initiative, secured the loan, purchased the land, got the loan paid off, and donated it to the Department of Veterans Affairs, which is receiving the land, and now will be able to provide an additional 3,300 burial sites for veterans.

I think that this is such a commendable thing that these veterans have done. I will be there on November 12, along with a number of other people, to recognize and honor what these men have done. I think it is wholly appropriate to recognize what they have done in this body as well.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

(The remarks of Mr. TORRICELLI are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RECESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 2:30 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:32 p.m., recessed until 2:30 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MILLER).

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are now 20 minutes of debate evenly divided on the Hutchison amendment. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I understood it was 30 minutes equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I suggest the Senator from Connecticut be recognized—and this has been cleared on both sides—as in morning business for 7 minutes.

(The remarks of Mr. DODD are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 7 minutes.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, so there is no misunderstanding, I have spoken with Senator LANDRIEU and Senator HUTCHISON, and the unanimous consent request Senator LANDRIEU made takes 3½ minutes off each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to use 5 minutes and be informed at the end of 5 minutes so Senator DURBIN may take the floor, and I would like to reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be notified.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, my amendment attempts to be a compromise between those who wish to take the caps off the attorney's fees for suing the District of Columbia School District and what I think is a quite reasonable approach, which is to keep the caps but raise them.

For the last 3 years, we have had caps on attorney's fees. That was made necessary because of the exorbitant fees that were being charged to the Dis-

trict, and that was money coming directly out of the education system. In fact, before the caps were put in place, attorney's fees represented \$14 million of the DC school budget. Since the caps have been put in place, we have had a figure of \$3.5 million per year average for attorney's fees, and the extra \$10.5 million has been able to go into the services we are seeking to provide for handicapped and special needs children.

Moreover, we have been informed by the District of some of the excessive fees that were being billed before the caps. This is billing the school district for plaintiff's lawyer fees when the plaintiff has been successful. One attorney before the caps individually made \$1.4 million in fees in 1 year suing the District of Columbia schools.

Another law firm billed over \$5 million in a single year to the District of Columbia schools. Submission of a variety of questionable expenses, including flowers, ski trips, and even a trip to New Orleans ostensibly made to scout out private schools far from the District that might be able to accommodate special needs students.

The reason we are trying to put some reasonable caps on these attorney's fees and excessive billings is so the money will go into education. Our amendment has a cap of \$150 an hour. If a lawyer billed 2,000 hours at \$150 an hour, that would be a \$300,000 annual income.

So, we are not saying lawyers should not make a reasonable amount, and we are certainly not subjecting parents to lawyers who cannot make a living. I think \$150 an hour is quite respectable. That is why we have tried to reach out to the other side and do something that is reasonable but not exorbitant.

We are trying to help the District of Columbia schools. We have a letter from the superintendent of schools and the president of the school board requesting us to take this action. They are very concerned that millions of dollars will go into lawyer's fees rather than to improve the services they give. In fact, they are increasing the number of teachers for special needs students. They are increasing the amount of medical equipment for these special needs students, and that is exactly what we want them to do. So I am trying to be helpful to the DC schools. Educators are the ones who can best determine need.

Our amendment also has an out; that if the District itself believes the caps are too low, they have the ability to override this amendment and this act of Congress and increase the fee caps, with the mayor and the school district working together.

I think that takes care of letting the local people have a final decision, doing what they have asked us to do in putting on reasonable caps, as they are trying to do the very difficult job of providing a quality education for all the students of the District of Columbia.