

administration and, as I said, particularly the Department of Education, or perhaps the law enforcement department, to try to come up with some things that could be used by communities so we can avoid, whenever possible, the kinds of things that have happened around the country, and I suppose will continue to be a threat. I think it will be worthwhile.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE ENERGY CRISIS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, over the last several days I have had an opportunity to respond to inquiries regarding the energy crisis in this country and specifically the bill Senator BREAUX and I introduced. It covers many of the questions surrounding the adequacy of energy in this country.

We have attempted to focus, first, on the reality that we are in an energy crisis. I wonder when the media and some of the people in this country are going to figure out the reality of this. The issue is not about oil. It is not about ANWR. We have a 303-page bill, and it seems as though everybody wants to focus in on one segment, and that segment calls for increasing our supply of oil from ANWR in my State of Alaska.

It is not just about oil. It is about a terrible energy shortage in this country. It is about our national security. It is about our economy. And it is, indeed, about the recognition that if we do not take some immediate action, this crisis is going to get worse.

I am amused at some of my colleagues. It seems to be focusing in, somewhat, on a partisan basis. To suggest somehow the crisis is being overblown by our President, that by drawing attention, we are compounding the problem, befuddles me. The reality is that what we have seen, over an extended period of time, at least the last 8 years or thereabouts, is a failure to recognize our demand has been increasing and our supply has been relatively stagnant.

To some extent, we have seen that in the crisis in California. We saw an experiment in deregulation fail. We saw an effort to cap, if you will, the price of retail power in California. The results of that effort are associated with the bankruptcy, for all practical purposes, of California's two main utilities as a consequence of the inability to pass on the true cost of that high-priced power that came from outside the State of California, that California absolutely had to have to meet its demand. Those costs, unfortunately, were not able to be passed on to the consumer.

Now we see the utilities basically bankrupt. We see situations where the State is stepping in and guaranteeing the price of power. I wonder if there is any difference between the California consumer ratepayer and taxpayer. They are all the same. But the burden is being shifted now to the taxpayer as the State takes an increasingly dependent role in ensuring that California generates power and has enough power coming in. When we talk about talking down the economy, I wonder if we are not being a little unrealistic.

If we look at what happened in reporting fourth quarter earnings of the Fortune 500, we find that many of these reports have the notation that increased energy costs is one of the reasons for the projections not being what they anticipated.

We also have what we call the phenomena of NIMB—not in my backyard. In other words, we want power-generating capacity but we don't want it in our backyard. Where are you going to put it?

It reminds me very much of the situation with regard to nuclear energy. Nuclear energy in this country provides about 20 percent of the power generated in our electric grid. Yet nobody wants to take the nuclear waste. We have expended \$6 billion to \$7 billion out in Nevada at a place called Yucca Mountain, which was designed to be a permanent repository for our high-level waste. The State doesn't want it. The delegation doesn't want it.

Are there other alternatives? The answer is yes. What are they? Technology.

It is kind of interesting to look at the French. Nearly 30 years ago at the time of the Yom Kippur War in the Mideast, in 1973, the French decided they wouldn't be held hostage again by the Mideast on the price of oil. They embarked on technology. Today they are 85-percent dependent on nuclear energy. What do they do with the high-level waste? They reprocess it, recover it and put it back in the reactors. It is plutonium. They vitrify the rest of the waste, which has a lesser lifetime. As a consequence, they don't have a proliferation problem and the criticism that we have in this country over nuclear energy. But, again, the NIMB philosophy is there—not in my backyard.

From where are these energy sources going to come? Are you going to have a powerplant in your county in your neighborhood? That isn't the question exactly. But in some cases it is the question.

Some suggest we can simply get there by increasing the CAFE standards and increase automobile mileage. We have that capability now. You can buy cars that get 56 miles per gallon, if the American public wants it. They are out there. Some people buy them, and we commend them for that. But is it government's role to dictate what kind of car you are going to have to buy?

Some people talk about the merits of climate change. There is some concern

over Kyoto and the recognition that we are producing more emissions. But are we going to solve the Kyoto problem by allowing the developing nations to catch up or, indeed, are we going to have to use our technology to encourage the reduction of emissions?

Let me conclude my remarks this morning with a little bit on the realization that we have become about 56-percent dependent on imported oil. This is an issue that affects my State. We have been supplying this Nation with about 25 percent of the oil produced in this country for the last decade. One of the issues that is of great concern in the development of oil from Alaska—particularly the area of ANWR—is whether we can do it safely. Of course. We have had 30 years of experience in the Arctic.

Another question is: What effect will it have on the economy? What effect will it have on national security?

About one-half of our balance-of-payment deficit is the cost of imported oil. That is a pretty significant outflow of our national product in the sense of purchasing that oil.

The national security interests: At what time and at what point do you become more dependent on imported oil, and at what point do you sacrifice the national security of this country?

We fought a war in 1991. We lost 147 lives. There is a colleague over in the House who made the statement the other day that he would rather see us drill in cemeteries than to see his grandson come back from a conflict in the Mideast in a body bag. We already did once. How many times are we going to do it as we become more and more dependent? It affects the national security and it affects the economy.

As far as the attitude of those in my State, a significant majority—over three-quarters of Alaskans—support opening up ANWR.

Why do you want to open an area on land in a refuge? Let's put it in perspective. This refuge is the size of the State of South Carolina. This refuge contains 8.5 million acres of a wilderness that is dedicated in perpetuity and will not be touched. There are 19 million acres in the refuge that are off limits, leaving 1.5 million acres, a little sliver up at the top. That little sliver consists of 1.5 million acres out of 19 million acres. People say that is the Serengeti of the north. That is an untouched area.

First of all, they have never been there, unlike the occupant of the chair who has been there. And I appreciate his wisdom and diligence in making the trip up there.

There is a small village there with 147 people. They live in Kaktovik with a school, a couple of little stores, a radar site, and there is a runway.

What do the people think about it? They want it. They want the alternative ability to have a lifestyle that provides jobs, educational opportunities, personal services, health care, and so forth.

It is amazing to me to kind of watch and participate in this effort to communicate because the environmental community is spending a great deal of money portraying this area in 2½ to 3 months every summer. They are not portraying it in its 10-month winter period. They are not portraying it accurately relative to the people who live there.

They suggest it is going to take 10 years to develop the area. That is absolutely incorrect. They don't point out the reality that we have the infrastructure of an 800-mile pipeline already there, and that we have moved over towards the ANWR line to the Badami field, which is approximately 25 miles away from the edge of ANWR. If Congress were to authorize this area, it would take roughly 3½ years to have oil flowing.

Some people say it is only a 6-month supply. Tests estimate that there is a range of between 5.6 billion to 16 billion barrels. At an average of 10 billion barrels of production, it would be the largest field found in 40 years in the world.

That will give you some idea of the magnitude. It would be larger than Prudhoe Bay, which has been producing for the last 27 years 25 percent of the total crude oil produced in this country.

Let's keep the argument in perspective. It is a significant potential. It can reduce dramatically our dependence on imported oil from Saddam Hussein and others. It can have a very positive effect upon our economy.

Some Members have threatened to filibuster this. I am amazed that anyone would threaten a filibuster on an issue such as this. It is like fiddling while Rome burns.

Those who suggest that fail to recognize the reality that we have an energy problem in this country, and we have a broad energy bill that we think covers all aspects of energy development as well as new technology.

I urge my colleagues to go back and reexamine the potential.

First of all, let's recognize we have the problem. We are going to have to do something about it. We are not going to drill our way out of it. It is going to take a combination of a number of efforts to utilize existing energy sources. But opening ANWR is significantly a major role, if you will, in reducing our dependency on imported oil.

I remind my colleagues of one other point, and that is, a good deal of the west coast of the United States is dependent on Alaskan oil. That is where our oil goes. If oil does not come from Alaska, oil is going to come in to the west coast from some place else.

Oftentimes people say, developing Alaskan oil has nothing to do with the California energy crisis because they do not use oil to generate electricity. That certainly is true. I agree.

But what I would add is, California is dependent on Alaskan oil for its transportation, its ships, its airplanes. As a consequence, if the oil does not come

from Alaska, it is going to come from someplace else. It is going to come from a rain forest in Colombia where there is no environmental oversight. It is going to come in ships that are owned by foreign trading corporations that do not have Coast Guard inspections and the assurance of the highest quality of scientific applications to ensure the risk of transporting the oil is kept at a minimum.

I urge my colleagues to reflect a little bit on the reality that this is an energy crisis. We are not going to drill our way out of it. We are going to have to use all of our resources, all of our energy technology, and a balanced approach, which is what we have in our energy bill, to confront this energy crisis.

Mr. President, I thank you for your time and attention.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on behalf of the leadership, I ask unanimous consent that this period of morning business be extended until 12:30 p.m. today, with the time equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

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

TRIP TO ANWR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to extend an invitation to all Members of the Senate to take advantage of an opportunity this weekend relative to a trip to my State of Alaska to visit the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

If Members are free, I would appreciate their contacting my office at 224-6665. We do have room to accommodate more Members. We anticipate leaving Thursday at the completion of business and flying up to Anchorage. We will be in the accompaniment of the new Secretary of the Interior, Gale Norton, and we will be having breakfast in Anchorage Friday morning, then flying on down to Valdez where we will see the terminus of the 800-mile pipeline. Valdez is the largest oil port in North America, one of the largest in the world. We will see the containment vessels, the technology that is used to ensure that if there is an accident of any kind, the capacity for cleanup is immediately there.

We will also have an opportunity to go across from the terminal to the community of Valdez. We will be able

to monitor the Coast Guard station that basically controls the flow of tanker traffic in and out of the port of Valdez. Then we will fly on to Fairbanks where we will overnight and have an opportunity to attend a dinner hosted by some of the people of Fairbanks, including Doyon, which is one of the Native regional corporations. At that time, we will have an opportunity to hear firsthand the attitudes of the people in interior Alaska.

Fairbanks is my home. The 800-mile pipeline goes through Fairbanks. As a consequence, there will be an opportunity to visit the largest museum in our State which contains all the material from public lands that have been generated over an extended period of time. It is an extraordinary collection. It is regarded as one of the finest collections outside of the Smithsonian.

The next morning, we will fly up to Prudhoe Bay. We will visit Deadhorse. We will see the old technology. Then we will go over to the village of Kaktovik in ANWR. We will be in ANWR, and we will be able to meet with the Eskimo people and see physically what is there. We will be able to fly over ANWR, and then we will go back to a new field near what they call Alpine and be hosted by a group of Eskimos at Nuiqsut where they are going to have a little bit of a potlatch for us. Then that evening, we will be in Barrow overnight. Barrow is the northernmost point of the world.

Many of you, if you have any questions about a trip such as that, might contact Senator HELMS. Senator and Mrs. HELMS made this trip a couple years with us. They could be firsthand advocates. What it does is give every Member an opportunity to view objectively the issue of whether or not it is in the national interest to open ANWR, whether we can do it safely, whether indeed it makes, as it does in my opinion and those of many other Alaskans, a significant contribution to the national security interests of this Nation and makes a significant contribution to the economy. They will have an opportunity to hear from Alaskans themselves their attitude on whether or not this can be opened safely.

One of the things that bothers me about this issue is, I continually have to account for my knowledge of the issue as an Alaskan. Yet my opponents, who have never been there and don't have any intention of going, never seem to have to account for their ignorance or lack of knowledge—if I may put it a little more kindly—on the issue.

So this is a rare opportunity, Mr. President. I again encourage Members to think about it. Spouses are welcome to accompany Members. We in Alaska are certainly willing to do our part. This development would take place on land as opposed to offshore. It is much safer to do it on land. It seems to me that as we look at the high price of energy, there is a recognition that we can have some relief, at least from dependence on imported oil, which affects our