

and that still was not good enough. The bill was taken down and will be brought back up. We will vote again on cloture, and this week sometime we will pass the Transportation appropriations bill.

But we need to work on issues that are important to this country. Last week a report came out dealing with Social Security and what needed to be done. One of the main directions of that report is for the President's commission to do an analysis of Social Security. Most everyone said the people had a preconceived idea before they were appointed, and that is to privatize Social Security. We have heard from a lot of people that such a plan would require a 41 percent cut in benefits in order to maintain Social Security solvency, according to an October 2000 Century Foundation analysis by the country's leading economists. It is very unlikely that private accounts would earn enough to dig out of the hole. Average single earners would still face 20 percent cuts, with married couples and lower earners doing even worse. So there are a lot of issues that we are being forced to talk about by the administration.

I think it is important we take a look at Social Security to see what we can do to build it up in the outyears, but for people saying Social Security is a disaster, it is broke, simply isn't true. Everyone will draw 100 percent of the benefits until almost the year 2040. And if we did nothing with Social Security prior to 2040—and I certainly hope we will not—people would still be able to draw 80 percent of their benefits. They should be able to draw 100 percent of the benefits.

I think that another direction we are getting from the White House is not appropriate, and that is talking about Social Security being bankrupt. It is not. We need to take a look and do some things so in the outyears it is going to be strong and everybody can draw 100 percent of their benefits, not just 80 percent of the benefits. We also look forward to having the committee chairmen work hard on having hearings so that we can report out as many of the President's nominations as we can. I personally think that the process isn't good; it takes so long. There is a huge hole at the end, and all these nominations are stuffed in this hole. At the other end, where they come out down, it is about this big. It is a very tiny little hole. It is a funnel that has a small end on it. What happens is we do not have the opportunity in a timely fashion to look at these people. They go through the Justice Department, vetted by the White House, and outside entities take a look at them. It has become so burdensome that even an independent analysis says the quickest President Bush can have all his nominees in place will be next February. That is really too slow, and we are going to do our best to process these nominees as fairly and expeditiously as possible.

Mr. President, I would hope that we are allowed to go to the Emergency Agriculture Assistance Act of 2001. It is very important legislation for almost the entire country—I shouldn't say almost the entire country. It is important for the whole country. Title I deals with commodities, and these commodities are things that we take for granted. When we go to the grocery stores, these things are always there. Farmers have difficulty year after year doing what needs to be done. This is an emergency supplemental. As we have heard on this floor from Senators from different parts of the country, if their farmers don't get relief, they will, in effect, go bankrupt. That is why we need to do this as quickly as possible.

Title II is very important. It deals with conservation. There is a new part of the bill that has received a lot of direction and attention. The conservation aspect of this bill is important because we are looking at things we haven't done in the past, such as wetlands reserve programs and conservation reserve programs. So I would hope that Senators HARKIN and LUGAR, who will be the managers of this legislation, are allowed to go forward with this bill as quickly as possible.

It is too bad we are going to have a cloture vote on the motion to proceed, but that is what we have been asked to do.

Title III deals with nutrition, which is a substantial part of this program. It requires a Farmers' Market Nutrition Pilot Program, distribution of commodities, things that again we take for granted. So I hope that we move to title IV dealing with credit and rural development, which is certainly something that Nevada cares about; title V dealing with research; and title VI, disaster assistance, we can move as quickly as possible.

We understand there will be a number of amendments. We hope that we could move to these amendments quickly and not have to face another cloture motion on the bill itself. I think all we are doing is holding up legislation that is vital to the very existence of the family farm. We have heard time and time again how important family farms are to America. This legislation will preserve thousands of family farms that are in desperate shape at this time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as if in morning business. I understand 30 minutes has been allocated to Senator GRASSLEY. I would ask unanimous consent that since Senator GRASSLEY has indicated he cannot be here at this time, 20 minutes of the 30 minutes be allocated to me and the balance remaining, approximately 10 minutes, to Senator CRAIG THOMAS of Wyoming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would it be permissible to the Senator that Democrats still have 5 minutes at the end of his time?

I ask unanimous consent that we have the last 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator repeat the request.

Mr. REID. Yes. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska have 20 minutes, Senator GRASSLEY 10 minutes, and the Democrats would have the last 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I believe Senator REID misunderstood me. This was Senator GRASSLEY's time. Senator THOMAS wanted the remaining 10 minutes. I have no objection to providing the last 5 minutes to the other side.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI.

#### ENERGY CRISIS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I very much appreciate the senior Member of this body, the President pro tempore, who is presiding at this time, for giving me the opportunity to advise my colleagues of the seriousness of the energy crisis in this country. I think we would all agree that the matter of energy is something we take a good deal for granted. We take for granted that America has been blessed with an affordable, plentiful, reliable supply of energy which pretty much provides us with a standard of living second to none. But it is something, again, that is there. We take it for granted. And we look forward to it continuing.

We have had some attention given to the crisis out in California, but for the most part it has not hit the majority of Americans. I think it is fair to say from the following information we have seen there is a growing concern that perhaps what happened in California could spread to other parts of the country.

As far as our national security is concerned, we have had a lot of discussion; we have seen communiques; we have seen articles concerning the national security of our country tied into energy simply because we have increased our imports of crude oil into this country from about 37 percent in 1973 to over 56 percent at this time.

As a consequence, we have become more beholden to OPEC and, the OPEC cartel, and the OPEC cartel has set a price structure of \$22 to \$28 and reduced supply. It is pretty much assumed now we are going to be in a period of increased dependence on imported oil from OPEC in the Middle East for the increasing timeframe in the future until we find another alternative to crude oil, which is not likely to occur.

In addition, we have economic security which, of course, is fostered by

growth and our continued expansion of jobs and the personal aspects associated with energy. The security of our lives is somewhat dependent on energy, the future of our dreams. We have factors to consider such as commitment, safety, and freedom from harm. Energy is directly related to that in the sense of what happens when our kids are home; the lights go out, the security alarm does not work—things to be concerned about in a very rapid period of time. We have the issue of job security to keep Americans at work and create more jobs. Energy powers the workplace, and that moves this economy forward, bringing each of us along with it.

As we look at our standard of living, our plentiful supply of energy, the affordability, and the recognition that some of this is in question, I think we have to look at the reality associated with the actions being contemplated in this body and the House of Representatives. It is our understanding that the House of Representatives will be addressing an energy bill this week.

The reason things are different this time is we have brought together a set of circumstances which I have highlighted on previous occasions, but previously it was different. We have had a series of situations highlighted by what is happening in California. We have seen an increased dependence on foreign oil, as I have indicated, of 56 percent. The Department of Energy indicates that will increase to 64, 65, 66 percent by the year 2010.

What is different about oil compared with our other sources of energy? America and the world move on oil. We have other sources of energy for electricity, including coal, natural gas, wind, hydro. But we use oil. As we look at our increased dependence on foreign oil, we recognize it affects our national security. Yet we are becoming more and more subject to control by the Middle East. We have not had any nuclear plants licensed in over 10 years in this country; nuclear is about 20 percent of our energy. We have seen gas prices soar from \$2.16 to over \$10 and then come down again, but nevertheless we have seen a dramatic increase at a time when we are using natural gas at a faster rate than we are finding new gas reserves. We have not seen a new oil refinery in this country in almost 20 years. We have not seen a coal-fired plant built in the last 10 years. We find suddenly we do not have adequate transmission; the transmission lines are overloaded, both natural gas and electricity. So things are different now.

I fear as we pursue an energy bill in the Senate, we are going to end up where we were the last time we attempted to make some subjective corrections. I think it is important to recognize this in the Energy Committee where most of this legislation resides. In 1992, we passed a number of very positive, meaningful bills out of committee to increase domestic produc-

tion, to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, to expedite infrastructure, develop alternative fuels, encourage renewable fuel development, promote conservation, and increase funding for the LIHEAP program which provides assistance for those with low income.

My point is we passed a meaningful bill but what we enacted was virtually nothing: Double flush toilets and a left turn on a red light. That is what we passed.

If we pursue an energy bill this time, it appears to me we are pursuing much of the same that we passed in committee but are not passing into law simply because of a concern by well-meaning environmental groups that there is something wrong with increasing supply. We will have to increase supply.

I also point out job security. This is a jobs issue in the United States. It was interesting to hear the debate the other day in the House of Representatives. The Teamsters and the Democratic caucus had an opportunity to express the merits of increased supply.

As a consequence of the points I made relative to the fact that things are different, yet we are pursuing the same old alternatives, we are putting emphasis on renewal, putting emphasis on alternatives, placing emphasis on wind power and solar power, but we are not really increasing supply as the demand has increased.

This chart demonstrates what is happening. The burden of increasing energy bills hurts most those families who can afford it the least. Almost 14 percent of the family budget is spent on energy for families earning less than \$15,000. The point is obvious and most convincing: Runaway energy rates are costing Americans a great deal of money in their households, as well as costing jobs.

We have reviews from coast to coast. American working families have seen more than 400,000 jobs basically disappear since the first of the year. A large reason for that, a significant reason, is the cost of energy. In June alone, 114,000 jobs were lost. Most of those were good-paying jobs, manufacturing jobs, for so many families. We saw Northwest Airlines lose 2,000 jobs; International Paper, 3,000 jobs; aluminum plants in the Northwest find it more profitable to sell electricity than make aluminum; Miller Brewing Company found high energy costs made it more economic to brew beer in Dallas and ship it to California instead of brewing it there in the first place. In Delaware last week, Du Pont indicated it was relieving its workforce by some 1,500, and possibly up to 5,000, jobs and another 1,500 contract jobs. The reason? Increased energy costs.

The problem is widespread: 54 companies had mass layoffs in Wisconsin in May, a significant portion due to high energy costs; Oregon alone has had 7,000 employees laid off since last summer. State officials blame rising energy and fuel costs. California black-

outs have cost 135,000 jobs in California. Unless we turn this around, the economic doom of a few short years ago will turn into a prolonged bust. The reason for this is the demand has increased but we have not increased the supply.

As I indicated, the emphasis has been on renewables and alternatives. We spent some \$6 billion, but they still account for less than 4 percent of the total energy mix. That includes hydro as well. As we look at potential solutions, there are some at hand. That is the President's comprehensive, balanced natural energy plan. The plan includes more than 100 specific recommendations to increase conservation, improve energy, and domestic supplies of energy as well. This plan will directly create more than 1.5 million new jobs. We need these jobs in the United States today.

The direct benefits speak for themselves, but the indirect benefits will be immeasurable. By easing energy costs, returning stability and reliability to our energy grid, businesses can again look forward to growth, and that means jobs. Through incentives to promote new energy production, the energy plan will help to ensure meeting our growing demand. New energy supplies mean new jobs. They mean the stability of existing jobs. The plan places an emphasis on American ingenuity and American technology. We are using our best and brightest to craft solutions to these energy problems. It will take hard work. It will take new thinking and new jobs as well.

The plan also encourages development of resources that exist here at home, and that includes the safe exploration for energy under a small portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

It is interesting to see some of the propaganda on this issue. I have here a page from Rollcall. It is sponsored by a number of the environmental groups—American Rivers, Defenders of Wildlife. It is rather interesting because what it says is what, in effect, we did in 1992. It says:

#### Let's Promote Clean Energy

A responsible bill would encourage the use of clean energy and set significantly higher efficiency standards for motor vehicles to reduce global warming pollution. Clean and renewable energy sources, such as wind, solar and geothermal. . . .

That is where we were in 1992. Surely we want this technology. But it simply is not here yet. It now constitutes less than 4 percent of our energy supply.

This is part of the problem when we listen to our well-meaning friends who simply propose a clean energy bill. They do not say how we are really going to increase the supply. We have to dramatically increase the supply.

#### Rollcall says:

#### Let's Reduce Pollution

We could significantly cut emissions of global warming pollutants by setting stronger fuel economy standards for cars, SUVs and light trucks.

They talk about 40 miles per gallon. But they do not talk about the preference of Americans to buy automobiles. One of the interesting things in this country is that the 10 most fuel-efficient automobiles on the market today constitute exactly 1.5 percent of the automobile sales.

They also say:

Let's Improve Energy Efficiency

The cleanest, cheapest, quickest way to meet our energy needs is to improve energy efficiency. To help consumers, let's have an energy bill that dramatically increases the fuel economy of our vehicles. . . .

That is fine, but what does it do to increase supply? We have hydro; we have nuclear, but it does not say anything about increasing nuclear energy in this country, which is clean.

We are going to fall into the same trap we did in 1992. We are going to go through a lengthy process here, but we are not going to produce any more energy. One of the things that bothers me a little bit is the misleading statement in this particular ad. It says:

The bill would open up pristine and ecologically fragile lands like the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and the Rocky Mountain Front to oil drilling. There's no excuse for sacrificing these and other national treasures and the wildlife that depends on them. . . .

They further say:

The economically recoverable oil in the Arctic Refuge would meet only six months of our nation's needs, and wouldn't start reaching us for ten years.

Both those statements are absolutely false. To suggest it would be a 6-month supply would be to assume that there would be no other energy produced in the United States or imported into the United States for a 6-month period.

If you want to turn it around, you say: Therefore we are not going to allow any development to occur in Alaska. Therefore the United States will be short a 6-month supply.

It is used over and over again. It is a standard environmental pitch. It says it would take 10 years. It would not take 10 years. The Department of Energy and Department of Interior have indicated they would have oil on line in 3.5 years, if indeed the oil is there in the abundance it has to be.

In conclusion, I think we should note a couple of facts that are very real. We are looking at jobs in this country. Opening ANWR would create about 700,000 new jobs nationwide, associated with the development of ANWR if, indeed, it carries the reserves that we anticipate.

We anticipate somewhere between 5.6 and 16 billion barrels of oil. That would equal what we would import from Saudi Arabia over a 30-year period of time.

Here at home we have this opportunity. We are not going to drill our way out of this crisis, but we can substantially relieve our dependence.

The other point I want to make is about national security. We are becoming more and more dependent on countries such as Iraq where we enforce the

no-fly zones. Saddam attempted to shoot down our U-2 just last week. We buy a million barrels of oil from Iraq, and what do we do with the oil? We put it in our planes and go bomb him, take out his targets. He develops a missile capability and aims it at our ally, Israel. I don't think that is the best foreign policy.

If you look at the ANWR chart, you get a different view of the realities. And the reality is there is a huge area called ANWR. It is a relatively significant portion of dedicated wilderness: 8.5 million acres are in wilderness, 9 million already in refuge, and 1.5 million acres are the 1002 area that we are considering opening. There is no scientific evidence that says we cannot do it safely.

What about refuges? We do all kinds of development in refuges. We have 30 refuges all over the country where we drill for oil and gas. These are the States that have them. We have the specific refuges here in Texas, Oklahoma, North Dakota, New Mexico, Montana, Mississippi, Alaska, California. What is so different about ANWR?

Is there a reason we cannot use this technology in ANWR? Refuges are open to exploration for minerals and oil and gas as well. It is easy to confuse a refuge with a wilderness or with a park, but we do not allow any motorized access in wildernesses and parks. Each is unique to its own specific purpose. The balanced use of Federal land is commonplace in a refuge. It is the norm. So many people misunderstand that.

In more than 30 Federal refuges from coast to coast we safely explore for mineral resources. There are over 400 wells in Louisiana alone, so what is different about ANWR?

By definition, refuges are balanced places where the environment is always protected and resources are explored only where the resource exists. ANWR is a refuge and it is no different. To suggest we cannot do it safely is not proven by any scientific evidence. This is an emotional argument brought about by the environmental community to generate revenue and dollars.

Let me conclude with a couple of references because my time is almost up. We have new technology in ANWR. The new technology is the directional drilling which lends itself very much to 3D seismic. The old way you used to drill was to go straight down. If you hit it, you were lucky. This is the new systematic 3D seismic which allows you to get into the pockets of oil. It is estimated by the technologists, today if we were going to drill under this cap, we could come out at gate 8 at Reagan Airport. This technology has advanced that much.

We have the toughest environmental standards here in the world. Prudhoe Bay is the finest oilfield in the world even though it is 30-year-old technology.

What is Prudhoe Bay? Prudhoe Bay has produced its thirteen-millionth

barrel of oil. It was supposed to only have 10 million barrels. My point is, as we look at the prospects for ANWR, the prospects for a major discovery according to the geologists is quite good, with an estimate of 5.6 to 16 billion. If it is 10 billion, it would be as big as Prudhoe Bay which has supplied this Nation with 20 percent of its crude oil for the last 20 years. Exploration would be limited to a sliver of land, roughly 2,000 acres.

We have ice roads, which is new technology, as the chart will show. This is the directional drilling. There are the ice roads. We build these out of water. Some people say there is no water in the North Slope. That is ridiculous. You build snow fences, generate snow, you can drill down below permafrost and there is plenty of water, or you can take the salt water and use it through a desalination process, which is quite common.

This advanced technology makes the footprint manageable. A 2,000 acre-foot would average five average family farms. Caribou do not calve in the 1002 area. They did not this year or the last 2 years. Here is a picture of the calving area. The environmental arguments just do not support any of these generalizations.

There is an abundance of drilling on the Canadian side. There is a caribou herd. Here is the information on the charts. It shows where Anderson Exploration conducted seismic studies. There are lease sales and echo plan areas all over the Canadian side. Here is the range of the Porcupine caribou herd, and here is the drilling that is going on. Of course, here is Alaska and here is Canada.

My point is to suggest that while the Canadians object to our initiating activity, they have a very aggressive ongoing program. Obviously, they look at themselves as competitors with Alaska supplying the United States with oil and gas.

Exploration and development of ANWR is supported by Alaskans. Alaskans are proud and protective of the environment. Alaska has the best oversight in the world in the development of oil and gas. Prudhoe Bay is required to adhere to State law as well as Federal law. We care about where we get our oil. If we look at the area of Saudi Arabia and OPEC nations, we don't seem to give any consideration on how it is produced and whether it is done environmentally and in a compatible manner.

Alaskans are proud and protective of the environment, and we are willing to do our part to end the energy crisis. There is no NIMBY in my State; that is, "Not in my backyard." Seventy-five percent of all Alaskans favor exploration. The Alaskans who live there—the people who must breathe the air, drink the water, and make the decisions about their communities—support exploration. It is absolutely unfair to deny them the same kind of opportunity everyone else enjoys in this country.

Kaktovik is a small village in ANWR in the 1002 area. Environmentalists say there is nothing there, that it is the Serengeti of the north. It is a village of about 250 people. There is a physician there, a small school, and a general store. They are real people.

Do not be misled by the suggestion that somehow we don't have the capability and we cannot do it safely. We can. Why not do it for American jobs?

This issue reaches a critical mass this week as Congress finally—and I emphasize “finally”—begins to work on a comprehensive energy bill. I urge my colleagues both here and in the other body to recognize that this is a fork in the road, and our efforts can have great impact for the American worker. Do we continue down the path of instability and rising energy costs—a path that finds more American families with pink slips and uncertain futures—or do we head down a path for job creation based on solid science and growth?

With a comprehensive, balanced national energy strategy in place, we can look forward to reliable, affordable, and plentiful energy that has fueled this economy in the past and that will power a bright future. I hope that is the choice because we cannot afford to make the mistakes we made in 1992.

I will not stand by in this body and allow us to pass an energy bill that does not increase the supply of energy in this country. It simply is unconscionable. That is apparently where we are headed, to some degree.

I think it is important that we recognize what is going on in the House of Representatives and those in opposition who are suggesting alternative renewables with no increased supply, and recognize that we have a serious concern over the loss of jobs in this country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Chattanooga Times by Lee Anderson who has been to ANWR and has some interesting things to say about it.

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

President George W. Bush wants to help head off our future energy problems by drilling for oil in the far, far north of Alaska, in an area called the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Environmentalists and liberals are yelling, “Over our dead bodies.” And now that the Democrats control the United States Senate, they think they will win. But would you rather continue to rely on Iraq's Saddam Hussein and a host of other foreign nations for American oil?

There are some facts about Alaska and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge that sensible people should look at rationally—though many people won't do that.

In the first place, the proposed drilling site is so far away and in such a desolate, cold and forbidding area that almost no one will ever see it.

Second, it's not far from Prudhoe Bay, where current oil production is proceeding without serious problems.

But perhaps most important is the fact that the proposed oil production would affect very little land. Consider:

Alaska spreads over 615,230 square miles; already has 125 million acres in national parks, preserves and wildlife refuges.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge consists of 19 million acres. But the area proposed for drilling is only 1.5 million acres. And of that, only about 2,000 acres—about twice the size of Chattanooga's Lovell Field—would be used.

Will reason prevail and bring oil production? Probably not soon.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield any remaining time to the Senator from Wyoming. I thank the Chair for his attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I appreciate the comments of my friend from Alaska. Certainly that issue is important to all of us. We will be dealing with it soon.

#### SENATE AGENDA

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to talk about some of the bills that are coming up and what I see as a very important aspect of what we do here in the Congress. What we do, of course, is important. But let's have some reasoning about where we want to be over time so that the decisions we make as we go through our daily work will be implemented with a vision of where we want to go.

Obviously, we have different views of what our role is here. I was listening to my friend from Nevada, who is concerned about balanced budgets because the Federal Government will not be able to spend enough. Others believe that maybe a balanced budget is where we ought to be and that there ought to be some limit on the size of government.

The fact is that States and local governments are very important components. It makes a difference in where you see things down the road.

I am specifically interested in what is happening in agriculture. We will have a bill before us today on supplemental funding for agriculture. Before long, we will have the 2002 appropriations for agriculture. More importantly, perhaps next year or even at the end of this year, we will have a new farm bill. That farm bill and the appropriations bills we are now dealing with will help us decide where we are going in agriculture.

Those are the kinds of decisions in the longer term that we have to make. Of course, we have to deal with the necessary daily things, but we really ought to be asking where we want agriculture to be in 10 years or in 15 years. These appropriations bills will have a great deal to do with where we go.

I think the same thing is true with health care. We are in the process right now of seeking some revision of Medicare. It is needed. We are talking about how we are going to handle pharma-

ceuticals. What is it we want? How do we want health care structured over time? What do we think is the best way to serve the people of this country? Those are the kinds of decisions that I think too often we don't really give enough consideration to—where we are tied up with how we are going to get funding for this for next year and how we are going to keep this program at this level.

Hopefully, we can step back and see with some vision. Maybe you call it 20/20. Where do we want to be over a period of time?

The Senator from Alaska talked about energy. We are doing some things with energy. Here again, I think we ought to be talking about where we are and some of the things we want to have happen over time, with less dependency on overseas and less dependency on OPEC. At the same time, I am sure we want to be certain we have an adequate supply so that we will have a strong economy and so we can do the things we want to do—reasonably priced—over the long range.

One of the things we experience in my State, an energy-producing State, is boom and bust. All of a sudden, natural gas is worth \$9 when it was \$1.5 or \$2. Everything goes up all of a sudden. Then the price comes down, and the economy comes down.

We want diversity of fuel; we don't want to be dependent on one thing.

Conservation: Obviously, we need to decide what to do. What do you want over time? We want conservation. Is that too much of a sacrifice? Can we do research so that conservation will allow us to use less fuel and still have the same kind of services? I think so, with renewables and new uses.

I remember someone talking at an energy meeting in Casper, WY—where I live—saying we have never run out of a fuel. I suspect that is true. What do we do? We find new and better sources or we use them in a better way. I suspect that is what we ought to be thinking about in terms of applying our long-term efforts.

What about agriculture? Obviously, we want sufficient food. Obviously, we would like to be able to supply food to foreign markets. We want clean food and safe food.

I think most people would like to see family farmers remain on the farm so we don't become an entirely corporate body. Of course, we want to preserve open space. We want to preserve the lands that are being used—and farm communities.

These are some of the things we really ought to measure against what we are talking about to see if they indeed have the best chance to produce those kinds of visions.

Medicare: We want health care for everyone. We want to keep it in the private sector—at least some of us do. Sometimes that is a different point of view. We want to encourage research. We want to limit catastrophic costs so no one is saddled with unreasonable