

trust fund. But it is a victimless crime, right?

In fact, as one of the railroad executives says in the paper today, "It is our money." It is their money. Well, what if we were taking money out of the Social Security trust fund and giving it away? After all, probably the guy who gets it, it would be their money.

The point is, however, the Federal Government is on the hook to pay these benefits. There is nowhere near enough in the trust fund today to pay the benefits. When we give this \$15 billion away, we are putting the taxpayer on the hook and come 2019, when the bottom falls out, the railroads—I am not going to be here. I do not know how many people are going to be here when it happens, but it is going to happen if we pass this bill. When the bottom falls out, the railroads are going to run in and say, we cannot operate and pay these kinds of taxes.

Nobody is going to say, well, you should have thought about that when you participated in stealing \$15 billion out of this trust fund. They do not say that.

They are going to say, well, look, we cannot let the railroads go broke. So what we are going to do is we are going to have the Federal Government pay an even larger share of the cost of this retirement program.

That is basically where we are. We have a proposal before us that claims it is reforming the program. It claims it is earning interest on the assets of the railroad retirement program. But if it is earning interest, why are the assets going down instead of going up? Because before one penny is invested, before one penny is earned, it slashes the amount of revenue going into the pension fund. It vastly increased the benefits being paid out.

The railroads are for it because they get \$7.5 billion. Railway labor is for it because they get \$7.5 billion. Who pays the \$7.5 billion? The taxpayer.

Let me sum up by noting what we ought to do. I want to state a paradox. America loves consensus. I have to say when I go to my State, the people are sweeter to me now than they have been in a very long time. I think they are because they sense we are pulling together. We had this terrible thing happen on September 11, and I think for about 6 weeks we did have a pretty good consensus, and I was proud of it.

Bipartisanship and consensus are not always good things. Let me repeat it because it is a pretty startling statement. Bipartisanship and consensus are not always good things. In fact, the Founders understood checks and balances. When labor and business get together, it is not always in the public interest.

What we have in railroad retirement is literally a proposal to pillage \$15 billion out of the railroad retirement trust fund over the next 17 years, give half of it to the railroads, half to the union, and the taxpayer ends up in a very deep hole in supporting railroad retirement.

They will claim when you hear the debate: But when it goes to hell, the taxes on the railroads are automatically raised. They are, but only up 22.1 percent. To get back in the year 2026 where we would be if we never let the money be taken out, there must be a payroll tax of 153 percent. Obviously, this is not going to happen.

What should we do? First of all, nobody wants to hear this stuff. When all the people came in to our offices, this sounded as if Christmas had come early, so 74 Members of the Senate signed onto it and gave it a big fat kiss. Now nobody wants to know the problem. Nobody wants to fix it. Here is how we can fix it and still dramatically improve the well-being of the railroad and the retirees. Take the \$15 billion and invest it; don't pilfer it, invest it. Then out of the interest that we earn on the investment, once the money is earned, look at strengthening the trust fund, look at these very high taxes railroads have to pay, and look at benefits. But don't go out and spend the money first. Invest the money first, earn on the investment, and then look at using that to make the system safe and sound, first; and then to improve it, second.

I would change the program by requiring, before any taxes are cut, before any benefits are increased, we make the investment and we actually have the money in hand. I do believe there is a very real problem of what we are doing—even if you have the money, and it is clear you don't.

Here is another figure: To just fund the new benefits promised, even with the interest rate you could earn by investing the money, you would have to raise payroll taxes by 6.5 percent more. It would have to be 6.5 percent higher each year, for the next 25 years, just to pay for the lower retirement age, the quicker vesting and the more generous pensions. We are not raising payroll taxes when we increase the benefit; we are lowering them.

We need to fix this bill. We are going to have cloture on it. I hope we have a chance to debate energy, which is a crisis issue, and too human cloning, because I believe the Senate would vote overwhelmingly to at least have a 6-month pause to look at it. That would also give an opportunity to come up with a rational way to improve railroad retirement. This is almost too good to be true, because it is too good to be true. There is no investment scheme that has ever been derived that would let you do what is being done here. If you look at the trust fund, it is clear it is too good to be true because it is not true. I hope, even at this late date, even though people are signed on to this bill, that people will look at it and give us a chance to fix it.

I am going to offer a series of amendments. One of them will say don't cut taxes, don't raise benefits until you have made the investment and earned money to pay it from. Don't just draw down the trust fund, because right now

we have a trust fund. Don't use it up now so we don't have it when retirees need it.

Another amendment I will offer would be to not let the money be taken out of the Social Security trust fund to pay for these new benefits. These are things that need to be addressed.

I have come today to basically explain how it is possible to be against this bill. It appears that everybody is for it, but it is a bad bill. It is a dangerous bill. It is a bill that puts the taxpayer in mortal danger. It is a bill that doesn't make any sense on its face. I don't know how anybody could have ever sold it. I am sure whoever came up with this whole deal of giving half of it to labor, half to management, and selling it to Congress as a reform based on investment—even though the trust fund goes down like a rock—I am sure whoever devised this stuff made millions. And they should have.

The problem is, this isn't some kind of game. This is real public policy. The idea that we would have a bill that will literally pillage the trust fund of railroad retirement funds is a startling thing. This may pass. It probably will pass. I would rather it not pass on my watch. I am going to vigorously oppose it. I hope my colleagues, even at this late date, will look at these things. If somebody wants to debate this, if somebody wants to come over and present their figures, if they will let me know, I will come over and debate them on this subject. However, I haven't seen anybody present the argument for the other side. I believe there is no argument for the other side.

What we are seeing is basically misinformation. The idea that we have railroads saying, "All we want to do is invest the trust fund," when billions of dollars are being taken out of the trust fund despite interest that is supposedly being earned, obviously something is very wrong.

I urge my colleagues, I urge people that follow these issues, to look at these facts, verify what I am saying and raise these issues.

People writing about this in the media, don't be confused. I am not concerned about investing \$15 billion. That is God's work. I am for investing \$15 billion. What is happening, when the trust fund is projected to look like this line, and it is turning out to look like this, that is not investment. That is pillaging. That is taking money out of the trust fund.

We need people to start asking: Why are we doing this when the taxpayer is liable? If they start asking, maybe we can fix it.

I appreciate the indulgence of the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WYDEN). The Senator from Alaska.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, let me make sure we know where we are on the legislation before the Senate.

The underlying bill is the railroad retirement bill. We have two amendments combined as one, one is the adoption of H.R. 4, the House energy bill; the other issue concerns a moratorium on cloning for 6 months. That is Senator BROWNBACK's legislation.

I will speak today on the energy issue because I think it is paramount. If we look at the polling information we have, it is obvious what American public opinion consists of. This survey was done in November by the IPSOS-Reid Corporation: 95 percent of Americans say any Federal action on energy is important; 72 percent of Americans say passing an energy bill is a higher priority than any other action Congress could take. Mr. President, 73 percent of Americans say Congress should make the energy bill part of President Bush's stimulus plan. Mr. President, 67 percent of Americans say expiration of new energy sources in the United States, specifically ANWR, is convincing reason to support passing an energy policy bill. That is 67 percent.

I am not particularly happy with the way the energy bill, H.R. 4, which we introduced, is here. It is the House bill, which did pass the House by a substantial margin. I am fearful the vote on Monday at 5 o'clock will be somewhat convoluted because you will be looking at several issues at the same time and Members can justify their positions on perhaps previously having voiced their support for the railroad retirement bill, or voiced their opposition against cloning, or been a proponent or opponent of the House bill.

In any event, the good news is we finally have a energy bill up for discussion because that has not been the case before, because of the majority leader's refusal to allow us time but, more significantly, the refusal to allow the committee process to work.

As we have seen ordinarily around here, the committees do their work and report out a bill and the bill comes before an entire Senate. In this particular case, the energy bill was taken away from the committee chairman and taken over basically by Senator TOM DASCHLE. In so doing, he really stripped, if you will, the responsibility of the committee of jurisdiction. But as the ranking member, all I can do is express my frustration. As a consequence, we still do not have the Democratic bill that we anticipate is coming.

I think it is fair to say there has been a deliberate attempt to discourage the taking up of the House bill before the Senate body, in the manner in which the majority leader has simply exerted his influence. So the members of the committee of jurisdiction will not have had any input in the development, at least from the Republican side, of whatever we are likely to see next week.

Some have said, what is the importance of this? Is there some reason we are rushing into this? I remind my colleagues, we are not rushing into it.

This has been before us for a couple of years. We introduced the bill, Senator BREAUX and I, earlier this year. We have had hearings on it. On the other hand, we were precluded from reporting it out of committee for the simple reason that we didn't have the votes to report it out of committee.

This morning we had some discussion with the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. LIEBERMAN. He made several arguments against one portion of the bill and that is the opening of ANWR. I am going to be rebutting these over a period of time because that seems to be the only way we can focus in on the points and try to counter those points with facts rather than fiction.

What he failed to mention earlier today was the rights and interests of the Native people of Alaska who live in the 1002 area, the area of Kaktovik, and their rights to develop their own land in this area. As the chart behind me shows, you can see the ownership of the 95,000 acres of land that is private Native land. This is the 95,000 acres of Native land that is within the 1002 area. That is the area that would be leased.

In the manner in which this land was transferred over to them, while they have the land in fee simple, they have no authority to drill for gas for heating their own homes. These are American citizens entitled to the same rights as any other American citizen. They do live in the area. As a consequence, their rights are certainly thwarted opening up this area where they would have not only access to develop those lands; they would also have access for a route out if they should wish to initiate some exploration.

It is important to recognize there is a human element here. The human element is the residents, the kid who lives in Kaktovik. You have seen the picture before. Some people are under the impression that this is the Serengeti of the Arctic. We have views of the Serengeti, but that is Kaktovik, and it is a village of less than 400 people. The point is, people live there. The point is, it is a very harsh environment.

All through the debate there is no mention of the rights of these people. It is always the environmental community that says we should not support opening ANWR. They come up with no evidence, no suggestion we cannot do it safely. It is just generalities.

Throughout this debate what I am going to be doing is countering the comments that have already been made because they are the same tired arguments you have heard previously. One of the comments is it is only a 6-month supply. That is a ridiculous argument. How anybody could even repeat it here is beyond me because we all know that could only happen if there was no oil production in the United States, if all stopped, there would be no further importation coming into the United States in ships, and we would only depend on one source. That is a bogus argument. I am amazed that intelligent Members of this body would even stoop

to suggesting that anyone would buy that kind of argument, a 6-month supply.

Clearly, what we are talking about is a significant discovery, somewhere between 5.6 and 16 billion barrels a day. What does that mean? That means more oil, more proven oil than in Texas. Texas is always considered to be one of the major oil producing States and it is. But from the Energy Information Administration Reports, Texas' proven reserves total 5.3 billion barrels. In 1998, the USGS estimated there was a 95-percent chance that more than 5.7 billion barrels would be found in ANWR. That is a 95-percent chance. That is more than the proven reserves in Texas today.

There is a 50-percent chance of more than 10 billion barrels, and a 5-percent chance of more than 16 billion barrels.

I am going to go into this a little bit more because it is something that constantly comes up, because it is something that was coined by the extreme environmental community that is opposed to this: a 6-month supply. Let's look at this on an average. The average would be Prudhoe Bay.

We have some pictures of Prudhoe Bay here. You can see the oilfield over there; it is the largest oilfield ever found in North America. It was supposed to produce 10 billion barrels and it is almost to its 13 billionth barrel now. That has been supplying the Nation with about 20 percent of its total crude oil for the last 27 years. So it is very significant.

Here is ANWR over here. There is Kaktovik, the village you have seen the pictures of. Then there is the makeup of just what is ANWR. I have told people time and time again, it is a big hunk of real estate. It is 19 million acres in its entirety. The entire State of Alaska is about 365 million acres.

What we have done is, we have done a little comparison for you to show you that ANWR and South Carolina are about the same size. The only difference in the ANWR 19 million acres, we set aside 8.5 million acres as a wilderness in perpetuity. Those are not going to be touched. Nor is the balance of the refuge in the darker yellow. Only the green area is proposed for lease sale. In the House bill before us, the footprint is limited to 2,000 acres. That is the little square you see up in red.

That is the proportion. You have the pipeline already in, the 800-mile pipeline. The same arguments that were used in the 1970s against the pipeline and the late 1960s are prevailing today. We built that pipeline. It is one of the construction wonders of the world. It has moved 20, 25 percent of the total crude oil produced in this country.

I know there are some who have, simply, a closed mind to this issue because they made a commitment to America's environmental community. It is our job to make a commitment to do what is right for America, and what is right for America is to reduce our dependence on imported oil. You do it one

way. You do it by producing more domestically.

You can talk all you want about energy savings, the world moves on oil. You don't drive out of here on hot air. You don't fly out of here on hot air. Your ships and your trains don't move out on hot air. They move on oil. I wish we had another alternative, but we do not.

We can talk about coal. We can talk about natural gas. We can talk about nuclear and we can make our points, but the world moves on oil and we are going to continue moving on oil for some time in the future. That is why it is so important that we develop, here in the United States, an additional supply of significance.

Don't tell me about a 6-month supply because, if you do, you are doing a disservice, not only to your other colleagues but to yourself because you are kidding yourself.

If there is no oil there, believe me, it is not going to be developed. There is no consideration for the Native people's rights. I talked about that earlier this morning. That distresses me because they are my constituents. They have every right as American citizens to control their land and develop their land, and they can't even drill for gas to heat their homes.

Some say we are rushing through this too fast. We have had hearings. Here is the history. Between the 100th and 107th Congresses—this has been around for a long time—there have been over 50 bills regarding this topic, there have been 60 hearings, there have been 5 markups.

Legislation authorizing the opening of ANWR passed the Senate once already—in 1995. Legislation authorizing the opening of ANWR passed the House twice already. The conference report authorizing the opening of ANWR passed the Congress back in 1995. It passed the Senate. But, unfortunately, President Clinton vetoed it. If we had passed it in 1995, it could very well be producing oil.

Something that should lie in the minds of all Americans is that we are starting to lose lives over oil. We lost two U.S. Navy sailors because a ship sank while being inspected by the Navy. It was sailing out of Iraq filled with illegal oil that had gotten beyond the oversight of the U.N. inspectors. The sailors were on that vessel inspecting it, and the ship sank.

The point is this: Had this particular legislation not been vetoed by the President in 1995, I am sure we would have had a different situation relative to the situation we see currently in Iraq. I will talk about that a little later.

In any event, to suggest this thing be given further study, that is a cop-out. We have been at this. We have had hearings. I know the occupant of the chair has been on the committee. This has been under discussion. The obvious road block here is the refusal of the Democratic leadership to allow us to

vote it out of committee and to have an up-or-down vote in the committee. They took away the authority of Chairman BINGAMAN and rested it with the majority leader. They do not have a bill yet. Maybe they will have a bill in a day or two, with little or no Republican input. This has become a very partisan issue.

It is similar to what happened on the Finance Committee with the stimulus bill. We had no input, and suddenly we went to markup and to voting the bill out and found it was so partisan that we had to start the process again.

I don't know what the majority leader's objective is in delaying. But we finally have this up before this body. Again, I am distressed with the manner in which we are forced to tie ourselves in on railroad retirement. That should be a separate bill. Nevertheless, we have to take what we can get around here. When you are a small State with a small population, you don't have a large House membership. As you know, we only have one House Member.

Some of the comments from my friend, Senator LIEBERMAN, this morning, about this being an insignificant amount of oil—let me tell you that the estimated 10 billion barrels of oil coming out of ANWR would support his State of Connecticut for 126½ years based on the current petroleum needs of about 216,000 barrels a day. From the standpoint of South Dakota, it would provide oil for South Dakota for 460 years.

We can all throw statistics around. Nevertheless, it is frustrating when there are suggestions that this is a meaningless, insignificant potential and not worth disturbing what they call the Serengeti of the Arctic.

Let me comment a little bit on some of the claims by the Senator from Connecticut that we are rushing through the ANWR process. As I indicated, nothing could be further from the truth.

A conference report authorizing the opening of ANWR passed the Congress in 1995. Reviewing the history shows that ANWR has not only been addressed by this body but it has also been addressed by various agencies of the Department of the Interior, the House of Representatives. The proposal has been before Congress for 14 years.

The time to act is long overdue. The issue has been dragged out long enough over the years. I think both sides know what is happening to us with the vulnerability associated with our increased dependence.

I have some charts that show the actual increase in consumption.

Here is the reality of U.S. petroleum consumption from January of 1990 to September of 1999. You can see that we are currently at a little over 20 million barrels a day in consumption. We can conserve more. If you want a high-mileage car, you can buy it. Any American can choose, through their own free will, cars that are more comfortable or cars that can handle more people.

We have some other charts I want to bring up.

This is where our imports come from—from the OPEC nations: Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Venezuela, and Nigeria. We are importing currently about 56 percent of our total crude oil. I think we have another chart that shows just where we have been. In 1997, we were importing 37 percent. We were importing 56 percent in 2001. The Department of Energy estimates that we will import 66 percent by the year 2010.

What does that do to our national security? I will get into that a little later. Clearly, it is an issue that should be addressed.

Another issue is that of jobs. I have always believed that if anybody in this body could identify a singular more important stimulus than opening up ANWR, I would certainly like to hear from them. That offer is still out there because I haven't heard from them.

To give us some idea specifically of what would be initiated by opening this Coastal Plain, the development scenario can only take place on 2,000 acres. That is what is in the bill. That is what is in H.R. 4.

Let's talk a little bit about the realization that we are likely to get somewhere between 5.6 and 16 billion barrels a day and what it is going to do for jobs. This is a jobs issue.

First of all, the area has to be leased. It is Federal land. There would be a lease proposal. The estimate of the bids that would come in by the major oil companies, such as ExxonMobil, Texaco, or Phillips Petroleum, and others would be somewhere in the area of \$3 billion. The taxpayers would obviously see a generation of funds coming from the private sales and going into the general fund.

Let's talk about jobs.

There was a generalization made by Senator LIEBERMAN that the jobs issue is insignificant because more jobs could be created, if you will, by energy conservation. I wish that were true. I wish we could justify that with some statistical information to prove it, because we are talking about continued dependence on imported oil and how we can relieve that. We are not talking about energy as a whole.

There are various studies we have seen over the years. According to the Wharton Econometrics Forecasting Association, ANWR development should produce 735,000 jobs in all 50 States. Why? Because we do not make valves; we don't make insulation. These things are made in various States in the United States.

In a different study, the U.S. Department of Energy estimated ANWR will produce 250,000 full-time jobs in America. Interestingly enough, this study was contracted out to a Massachusetts firm. This is something of which the junior Senator from Massachusetts should take note. Let me repeat—he was here earlier; unfortunately, he is not in the Chamber now—a firm in his own State has estimated at least

250,000 jobs will be produced. I am not sure he is aware of that. And this contract was given to a Massachusetts firm.

Opponents of drilling in ANWR try to downplay these arguments and try to argue the lower numbers. But regardless of whether it is 250,000 or 735,000, either way, it would still be a step in the right direction as far as stimulus to the economy because where else can you find another issue that will employ somewhere between 250,000 and 735,000 jobs and does not cost the taxpayers one red cent. And it keeps the jobs here at home rather than sending our dollars overseas and importing the oil. Every single new job in this country is important, particularly at a time when we have a recession and a downturn.

As a consequence, I think it is important to note that those who know a lot about job creation wholeheartedly support drilling in ANWR. I am talking about the unions, such as the maritime unions, the Teamsters, the seafarers, and various others.

The North Slope oil fields have already significantly contributed more than \$300 billion to the U.S. economy.

If we go through some recent announcements, let me tell you the significance of a couple hundred thousand jobs.

On November 29, it was announced 1,409 jobs may be lost. IBM announced 1,000 layoffs.

On November 28, it was announced 850 jobs may be lost. Ames Department Stores announced they will close a distribution center in Ohio, which jeopardized 450 jobs.

I could give you a list of the various announced job cuts.

Alcoa plans to lay off 6,500 employees and close plants.

Chevron announced 550 more job cuts.

Every day we have seen news clips to this effect. So we should be very concerned about stimulating the American economy and generating jobs in the private sector. And this is one of the best ways to do it.

My friend, the Senator from Oregon, is the Presiding Officer. I know the activity associated with Alaska's oil-fields has traditionally been important to Oregon, particularly to the shipyards there.

It is estimated by the American Petroleum Institute that 19 new double-hull tankers will be needed if ANWR is opened. All U.S. ships will have to be built at U.S. shipyards and carry the American flag. The analysis predicts that the construction of these tankers will boost the economy of America by producing more jobs in the shipyards. They indicate that the new tankers will be needed solely because the old North Slope tankers are being phased out by 2015 because of the double-hull tanker requirements.

So more American jobs will be created because the Jones Act requires that the oil that is transported within the United States—namely, my State

of Alaska down to either Washington or California; but in Portland there is a large shipyard that has accommodated these ships before—must be transported by tankers by U.S.-flagged vessels built in the United States. The analysis correctly assumes that if ANWR passes, it will include an oil export ban. So there will be a provision that this oil cannot be exported. It also assumes that the ANWR oil will be transported by tankers to refineries in Washington, California, and Hawaii. The Oregon area ordinarily does not have the refining capacity.

The American Petroleum Institute estimates this would pump \$4 billion almost directly into the U.S. economy and would create 2,000 construction jobs in the U.S. shipbuilding industry and approximately 3,000 other jobs.

The API predicts this would compute to more than "90,000 job-years," by estimating that it will take almost 5,000 employees approximately 17 years to build the ships necessary to transport this oil.

They predict one ship must be built each year for 17 years in order to coincide with the schedule for retiring the existing tankers.

To me, this sounds like stimulus. It sounds like a stimulus for creating jobs in shipyards, many of which have been hurting for some time.

Another issue is the alleged opposition by Gwich'ins. Most of the Gwich'ins, we know, live in Canada. I am aware some of them live in the Arctic village areas, with a population of roughly 117 people. They fear that the caribou that they depend on for subsistence will be decimated. They fear the caribou might take a different migration drive, perhaps further from their village; that it would be harder for them to hunt the 300 to 350 they kill each year.

But, first, there is no evidence that the oil development—with the strict controls proposed to prevent disruption during the June-July calving season of the Arctic Porcupine herd, to reduce noise, and to control surface effects—will harm the herd.

I have a picture in the Chamber that shows some caribou activity in Prudhoe Bay. I will give you a comparison. Experience over the past 26 years in Prudhoe Bay, where the herd has more than tripled in size and where the caribou calves—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alaska in morning business has expired.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I request as much time as I need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, as I announced earlier today, we need to complete our business by 1:15 today because of the problem at the Dirksen Building. The majority leader wishes to give a presentation prior to that time. So if the Senator would maybe take another 10 minutes, would that be appropriate?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. We are in morning business, and the limitation of time in morning business is what?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The limitation is 10 minutes for each Senator in morning business.

Mr. REID. I know you just barely exceeded that.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. We were talking about 15 minutes.

Mr. REID. Yes, we did 15, that is right.

I see Senator BAUCUS, who wishes to give a statement, is in the Chamber.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I was under the impression we would have plenty of opportunity to discuss this today. Might I inquire when we are coming in Monday?

Mr. REID. We can come in as early as you would like. Two o'clock.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. How about 1 o'clock?

Mr. REID. Would you need more time on Monday than that?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. One o'clock would be agreeable because what you are telling me now is basically that I am out of time for today.

Mr. REID. Yes. Right. I would be happy to talk to the majority leader. I am sure we could work that out.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I am a little disappointed because I think we are being kind of squeezed on time on this issue.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Alaska, if you want to come in earlier than 1 o'clock, I would be happy to talk to him. We are not trying to squeeze out anybody. They are closing the Dirksen Building.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The Dirksen Building will be closed at 4 o'clock?

Mr. REID. Yes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Why don't we come in at noon?

Mr. REID. I will do my best. We will do our best. We have presiders, and all that. We will come in earlier than 2 o'clock, for sure.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for another 10 minutes.

Mr. BAUCUS. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. REID. I think that will be fine. I say to my friend from Alaska, we certainly are not trying to cut off anybody's right. I don't know how much time the Senator has had, but quite a bit. I understand how fervently he feels and how important this is to the State of Alaska, so we want to make sure that you have all the time you need prior to our voting at 5 o'clock on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. My understanding is, they will do their best to try to see that we come in at noon. I thank the Chair and thank the majority whip.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. We have talked a little bit this morning about the "Serengeti." Let me tell you where the "Serengeti" of Alaska is. It is another

area where all the lakes are, and it is hardly a "Serengeti" because the Coastal Plain is all the same.

But if you look over at the naval petroleum reserve, that is the area with all the lakes with the concentration of birds. It is not within the 1002 area. That is another misleading argument that is continually thrown out.

The other one is that it will take as long as 10 years before ANWR oil is flowing. What they forget is the realization that we already have a good deal of the infrastructure. We have the pipeline. We only need a 70-mile line from the coastal area into the pipeline. And it is suggested once the leases are put up for sale, they will have construction activity in about 18 months.

But more important is the national situation. I am going to close with a reference to that because I think it deserves more of a recognition because of the sensitivity of where we are internationally.

We are importing a little over a million barrels a day from Saddam Hussein. There is no question that there is a great deal of concern as a consequence of the relationship we have had with Saddam Hussein. We fought a war not so long ago. It is kind of interesting to reflect on some of the particulars associated with what happens when we become so dependent. We have heard Saddam Hussein in every speech saying "death to America." He also says "death to Israel," one of our greatest allies over there. Recognizing that he can generate a substantial cash flow by our continued dependence, one wonders why it is in the national interest of our country to allow ourselves to become so dependent on that source.

I also wish to highlight an article excerpted from the Wall Street Journal of November 28, which kind of sets, unfortunately, the partisan setting this matter is in. I will read from it. It is entitled "President Daschle."

One of the more amusing Washington themes of late has been the alleged revival of the Imperial Presidency, with George W. Bush said to be wielding vast, unprecedented powers. Too bad no one seems to have let Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle in on this secret.

Because from where we sit Mr. Daschle is the politician wielding by far the most Beltway clout, and in spectacularly partisan fashion. The South Dakotan's political strategy is obvious if cynical: He's wrapping his arms tight around a popular President on the war and foreign policy, but on the domestic front he's conducting his own guerrilla war against Mr. Bush, blocking the President's agenda at every turn. And so far he's getting away with it.

Mr. Bush has asked Congress to pass three main items before it adjourns for the year: Trade promotion authority, and energy and economic stimulus bills. Mr. Daschle has so far refused to negotiate on any of them, and on two he won't even allow votes. Instead he is moving ahead with a farm bill the White House opposes, and a railroad retirement bill that is vital to no one but the AFL-CIO.

Just yesterday Mr. Daschle announced that "I don't know that we'll have the opportunity" to call up an energy bill until next year. One might think that after September

11 U.S. energy production would be a war priority. In September alone the U.S. imported 1.2 million barrels of oil a day.

This is at a time when we were being terrorized in New York and at the Pentagon.

Furthermore, on the 1.2 million barrels of oil a day we are getting from Iraq, whom we soon may be fighting—imagine that, fighting Iraq and we are talking about not passing an energy bill—the 1.2 million barrels per month is the highest rate of imports since before Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait.

Continuing from the article:

But Mr. Daschle is blocking a vote precisely because he knows Alaskan oil drilling has the votes to pass; earlier this autumn he pulled the bill from Senator Jeff Bingaman's Energy Committee when he saw it had the votes. So much for the new spirit of Beltway cooperation.

We're not so naive as to think that war will, or should, end partisan disagreement. But what's striking now is that Mr. Daschle is letting his liberal Old Bulls break even the agreements they've already made with the White House. Mr. Bush shook hands weeks ago on an Oval Office education deal with Teddy Kennedy, but now we hear that Mr. Kennedy wants even more spending before he'll sign on. Mr. Daschle is letting Ted have his way.

The same goes for the \$686 billion annual spending limit that Democrats struck with Mr. Bush after September 11.

I will not refer to the rest of the article, but it simply says that what we are seeing here is a conscious effort by the majority not to allow us to have a clean up-or-down vote on the issue.

As we wind up today's debate, I encourage my colleagues to think a little bit about their obligation on these votes. Is it their obligation to respond to the extreme environmental community that has lobbied this so hard, that regards this as an issue to milk with all the authorities, somewhat like a cash cow, and are going to continue to use it? This bill covers reducing the demand, increasing the supply, and it enhances infrastructure and energy security.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Wall Street Journal of November 28 be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRESIDENT DASCHLE

One of the more amusing Washington themes of late has been the alleged revival of the Imperial Presidency, with George W. Bush said to be wielding vast, unprecedented powers. Too bad no one seems to have let Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle in on this secret.

Because from where we sit Mr. Daschle is the politician wielding by far the most Beltway clout, and in spectacularly partisan fashion. The South Dakotan's political strategy is obvious if cynical: He's wrapping his arms tight around a popular President on the war and foreign policy, but on the domestic front he's conducting his own guerrilla war against Mr. Bush, blocking the President's agenda at every turn. And so far he's getting away with it.

Mr. Bush has asked Congress to pass three main items before it adjourns for the year: Trade promotion authority, and energy and

economic stimulus bills. Mr. Daschle has so far refused to negotiate on any of them, and on two he won't even allow votes. Instead he is moving ahead with a farm bill (see below) the White House opposes, and a railroad retirement bill that is vital to no one but the AFL-CIO.

Just yesterday Mr. Daschle announced that "I don't know that we'll have the opportunity" to call up an energy bill until next year. One might think that after September 11 U.S. energy production would be a war priority. In September alone the U.S. imported 1.2 million barrels of oil a day from Iraq, which we soon may be fighting, the highest rate since just before Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in 1990.

But Mr. Daschle is blocking a vote precisely because he knows Alaskan oil drilling has the votes to pass; earlier this autumn he pulled the bill from Senator Jeff Bingaman's Energy Committee when he saw it had the votes. So much for the new spirit of Beltway cooperation.

We're not so naive as to think that war will, or should, end partisan disagreement. But what's striking now is that Mr. Daschle is letting his liberal Old Bulls break even the agreements they've already made with the White House. Mr. Bush shook hands weeks ago on an Oval Office education deal with Teddy Kennedy, but now we hear that Mr. Kennedy wants even more spending before he'll sign on. Mr. Daschle is letting Ted have his way.

The same goes for the \$686 billion annual spending limit that Democrats struck with Mr. Bush after September 11. That's a 7% increase from a year earlier (since padded by a \$40 billion bipartisan addition), and Democrats made a public fanfare that Mr. Bush had endorsed this for fear some Republicans might use it against them in next year's elections. But now Mr. Daschle is using the issue against Mr. Bush, refusing to even discuss an economic stimulus bill unless West Virginia Democrat Bob Byrd gets his demand for another \$15 billion in domestic spending.

Mr. Byrd, a former majority leader who thinks of Mr. Daschle as his junior partner, may even attach his wish list to the Defense spending bill. That would force Mr. Bush to either veto and forfeit much needed money for defense, or sign it and swallow Mr. Byrd's megapork for Amtrak and Alaskan airport subsidies.

All of this adds to the suspicion that Mr. Daschle is only too happy to see no stimulus bill at all. He knows the party holding the White House usually gets most of the blame for a bad economy, so his Democrats can pad their Senate majority next year by blaming Republicans. This is the same strategy that former Democratic leader George Mitchell pursued in blocking a tax cut during the early 1990s and then blaming George H.W. Bush for the recession. Mr. Mitchell's consigliere at the time? Tom Daschle.

It is certainly true that Republicans have often helped Mr. Daschle's guerrilla campaign. Alaska's Ted Stevens is Bob Byrd's bosom spending buddy; he's pounded White House budget director Mitch Daniels for daring to speak the truth about his pork. And GOP leader Trent Lott contributed to the airline-security rout by letting his Members run for cover.

The issue now is whether Mr. Bush will continue to let himself get pushed around. Mr. Daschle is behaving badly because he's assumed the President won't challenge him for fear of losing bipartisan support on the war. But this makes no political sense: As long as Mr. Bush's war management is popular, Mr. Daschle isn't about to challenge him on foreign affairs.

The greater risk to Mr. Bush's popularity and success isn't from clashing with the

Daschle Democrats over tax cuts or oil drilling. It's from giving the impression that on everything but the war, Tom Daschle might as well be President.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill, which is H.R. 4, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY—H.R. 4, THE SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ENERGY ACT OF 2001

H.R. 4 is the legislative portion of the president's comprehensive energy policy. It aims to secure America's energy future with a new national energy strategy that reduces energy demand, increases energy supply, and enhances our energy infrastructure and energy security.

REDUCED DEMAND

Reauthorizes federal energy conservation programs and directs the federal government to take leadership in energy conservation with new energy savings goals.

Expands Federal Energy Savings Performance Contracting authority.

Increases Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), Weatherization and State Energy Program authorization levels to meet needs of low-income Americans.

Expands the EPA/DOE Energy Star program and directs the EPA and DOE to determine whether Energy Star label should extend to additional products.

Directs DOE to set standards for appliance "standby mode" energy use.

Reduces light truck fuel consumption by 5 billion gallons over six years.

Improves Federal fleet fuel economy, expands use of hybrid vehicles.

Increases funding for DOE's energy conservation and energy efficiency R&D programs.

Expands HUD programs to promote energy efficient single and multi-family housing.

INCREASED SUPPLY

Provides for environmentally-sensitive oil and gas exploration on Arctic Coastal Plain.

Authorizes new oil and gas R&D for unconventional and ultra-deepwater production.

Royalty relief incentives for deepwater leases in the central and western gulf of Mexico.

Streamlines administration of oil and gas leases on Federal lands.

Authorizes DOE to develop accelerated Clean Coal Power Initiative.

Establishes alternative fuel vehicle and Green School Bus demonstration programs.

Reduces royalty rate for development of geothermal energy and expedites leasing.

Provides for regular assessment of renewable energy resources and impediments to use.

Streamlines licensing process for hydroelectric dams and encourages increased output.

Provides new authorization for fossil, nuclear, hydrogen, biomass, and renewable R&D.

ENHANCED INFRASTRUCTURE ENERGY SECURITY

Sets goals for reduction of U.S. dependence on foreign oil and Iraqi oil imports.

Initiates review of existing rights-of-ways and federal lands for energy potential.

Directs DOE to implement R&D and demonstrate use of distributed energy resources.

Invests in new transmission infrastructure R&D program to ensure reliable electricity.

Requires study of boutique fuel issues to minimize refinery bottlenecks, supply shortages.

Initiates study of potential for renewable transportation fuels to displace oil imports.

Offers scholarships to train the next generation of energy workers.

Prohibits pipelines from being placed on national register of historic places.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Finally, I hope as Members reflect on their responsibility, they recognize that we are at war. This war may expand and extend itself. The continued exposure based on our dependence on imported oil and the likelihood that the flow of oil imports might be disrupted mandates that we have an energy policy and that we have it done in a timely manner. Let's recognize the obligation that we have in voting on this. Is it a vote to respond to the demands of America's environmental community, or is it a vote to do what is right for America?

We have already lost two sailors as a consequence of our dependence on oil from Iraq. I don't want to stand before this body and say I told you so, but if we don't pass an energy bill that will reduce our dependence on Iraqi oil, we are doing our country a grave injustice. It is contrary to the majority of public opinion in this country. Seventy-six percent of public say we should be taking up and passing an energy bill over any other bill. That includes the farm bill and the Railroad Retirement Act. If we ever get to the stimulus, I hope somebody would search their minds and memories to see if they can come up with a better stimulus than the proposal associated with holding up ANWR.

I am somewhat disappointed we were not able to have more time today. Hopefully, the leadership can work out coming in at noon on Monday.

I thank the Chair for its courtesy. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

GUN SHOW BACKGROUND CHECK

ACT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to comment on the words spoken earlier this morning by my very good friend and colleague from Rhode Island, Senator REED. Earlier this morning, Senator REED announced his intention to bring S. 767, the Gun Show Background Check Act, to the Senate floor this year.

At the outset, I deeply respect the Senator from Rhode Island. I think he is a very fine public servant, one of the brightest and most dedicated with whom I have had the privilege to serve. I respect his concerns about guns generally and guns in America. I do not believe, as he stated, that instituting background checks at gun shows will correct the concerns he raised. The events of September 11 and the ensuing concerns about terrorist threats have led to a resurgence by some for stricter gun laws. But with all due respect, responding to terrorism by calling for background checks at gun shows is not an effective tool for making this country safer.

The hijackers of September 11 were not armed with guns. The tragic deaths

of thousands in New York didn't involve a single bullet. The anthrax that arrived in the office of my next door neighbor, Majority Leader DASCHLE, had nothing to do with background checks. The acts of the terrorism on America to date have not been related to guns in any form.

I am not trying to deny the risks and dangers that we face from weapons in the hands of terrorists. But I do not believe that terrorist organizations are buying their weapons one pistol at a time from American gun shows, nor do I believe that closing the so-called gun show loophole will result in fewer guns in criminal hands.

I strongly support the actions our law officials have taken to make our country a more secure place since September 11. And I thank them for their dedication and hard work. They have worked so hard and in many cases overtime, extra hours, no vacation. It is amazing and inspiring. But while we tighten our borders and patrol our country, we must remember the balance between protecting our safety and protecting our civil rights.

Restricting our citizen's access to firearms chips away rights protected by the Constitution. Cloaked in the mantle of eliminating terrorism, bills such as "The Gun Show Background Check" restrict the second amendment and make it more difficult for law abiding citizens to purchase guns.

My State of Montana has a heritage based on hunting and enjoying the great outdoors. Gun shows are events typically held in town meeting halls on weekends. They are very well attended. They are big events. You would be astounded at all the people there going to and fro and talking and exchanging information. People come together and meet neighbors and possibly purchase a rifle to be used on a hunting trip. In addition, gun shows simply are not set up with the technology to make background checks feasible. They are temporary events, and they are not able to be connected to the NICS system for background checks. It is technically impossible.

I appreciate deeply my colleague's concerns, but I do not believe that gun show checks begin to address terrorism or gun violence. We have safeguards in place to keep guns from falling into the wrong hands and focusing on guns when talking about terrorism is missing the bigger picture.

Let's move on to getting an economic recovery bill passed to boost our economy and prove to the terrorists that their actions cannot stop America's progress. Let's get our aviation security bill implemented so our citizens can get back up in the air with complete confidence. Right now, it is the big picture on which we must focus. Gun shows aren't part of the problem, and background checks at the gun shows are not part of the solution.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.