

could be continued in that 1.5 million acres we all knew was part of the Arctic that has enormous promise for production of oil and gas.

The main reason for speaking now is to say to the Senate, the time is right. There is no longer any time for partisan debate on this issue. This is a matter of national security. Before the week is out, we are again going to see gas lines in this country. I cannot emphasize too greatly my feeling about the delay that has taken place now since 1980.

In 1980, Senators Jackson and Tson-gas committed to help us get that oil exploration going to determine if oil and gas could be produced in substantial quantities from that Arctic coast area. That promise has not been kept because of the opposition that has come from the radical portion of the environmental lobbying group in this city. It is time to put radical environmentalists behind us and realize this country is united in trying to fight this war against global terrorism.

I am also going to bring in a nice big poster. Do you know who is on that poster? General Dwight D. Eisenhower. He is saying to the oil and gas workers in World War II: Stay on the job because we need oil. Without oil, our military cannot function.

That same thing is true now. The military is consuming vast quantities of oil, and we have to have oil to fight this war.

I hope the Senate is willing to listen to me for a long time this week because as this situation gets worse, I will remind the Senate again and again and again. The ANWR issue should have been closed out in 1981. Now, 21 years later, at the time the crisis we all feared has come, we still are facing a filibuster against approval of what the Senate and the President of the United States agreed to when that bill was passed in 1980.

I thank my friends for allowing me to speak at this time.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 3210

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is now a unanimous consent request pending; is that true?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know my friend from Oklahoma has reserved the right to object. Let me for a couple minutes speak to several issues before he determines whether or not he is going to object to this request.

In the wake of September 11, a number of insurance companies are declining to provide coverage from losses which result from terrorist attack. At 2:30 today, I had a meeting in my office with a large number of real estate people in desperate need to have their projects go forward. They are not able to obtain antiterrorism insurance.

I know it is a serious problem. We continue to hear from the General Accounting Office and others that those insurance policies that are available are priced so high that they are really not affordable, even though they may be available. It is unfortunate that last year before adjournment we heard objections to our unanimous consent request to take up H.R. 3210, the House terrorism bill, and amend it with a substitute offered by the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD, and others. We believed that our effort to move forward was in good faith and addressed a present need. We found that some of our colleagues insisted on the consideration of amendments that made it difficult to complete the work on this issue, and it was not completed.

Today, we are again seeking unanimous consent on Senator DODD's proposal which provides the safety net needed to keep insuring against terrorist risks. In turn, that coverage would allow builders to keep building, businesses to keep growing, and hopefully prevent further economic setbacks.

This amendment was a product of extensive bipartisan negotiations. It was developed with extensive consultation with a number of Senate Democrats and Republicans, including Senator GRAMM of Texas, as well as the White House and the Treasury Department. While we were unable to reach agreement on every point, the proposal incorporated, line-by-line, suggestions by our colleagues from both sides of the aisle and this administration. It represented a compromise.

It requires substantial payments by insurance companies before the Federal Government provides a backstop. The proposal would require the insurance industry to retain the responsibility to pay up to \$10 billion in losses in the first year, and up to \$15 billion in losses in the second year, or around 7 to 10 percent of the annual premiums for each affected company.

This legislation would ensure stability in the insurance market so that businesses can afford to purchase insurance.

I say to my friend from Oklahoma, this is imperfect, but we cannot let the perfect stand in the way of the good. We need to move forward.

What others are trying to do is too much. It is just not going to happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Still reserving the right to object, I ask my friend and colleague, if I understand his request, it is to take up the House-passed bill and the substitute and pass without further amendment the Dodd-Sarbanes-Schumer substitute; is that correct?

Mr. REID. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NICKLES. He is saying let's take up the House-passed bill. The request I was going to make, and I ask my colleague if he would agree with this, is let's take the House-passed bill and let's have an amendment on each side,

one amendment, an amendment, whichever—maybe it is the Dodd-Sarbanes-Schumer amendment. I believe the amendment I was hoping our side would offer would be the Dodd-Grumm amendment.

I ask my colleague, would he modify his request to allow one amendment offered to the House substitute, one proposed by the majority leader, and one proposed by the minority leader, and make that small modification?

Mr. REID. The problem, I say to my friend through the Chair, is that we have other Senators, committee chairs, for example, who believe they have to have a few amendments of their own. They believe, as I have heard my friend from Oklahoma speak on a number of occasions, that committees need to be heard more. My whole point in offering this unanimous consent request is that this may be imperfect, but it is really a big bound forward. If we try to say we will have one amendment on your side and one on our side, then we have to go through this somewhat never-ending process of saying: What is the amendment going to be on this side? What is the amendment going to be on your side? Are we going to have time agreements on the amendments?

I just think we would be so much better off looking at what was negotiated. We came within hours of finalizing this before we recessed last year.

I say to my friend, I appreciate very much his good-faith effort. That is something that is worth pursuing. But it is going to be so difficult, and by pursuing that, people who want to obtain loans—one man in my office today had over \$2 billion worth of projects on his desk they wanted to go forward on. He can't because he can't get insurance. I shouldn't say he can't get it, but he can't afford it.

So I hope we can have this consent that I suggest be agreed to. If we can't, I think it is too bad. We will be happy to go back and look at the amendment process. We should not do that. We should move on with this agreement.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I object to the Senator's request.

I ask unanimous consent—this is going to be a very slight modification—that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 252, at the majority leader's call, at his time of choosing; that we can consider Calendar No. 252, H.R. 3210, the Terrorism Risk Protection Act, and that two amendments be in order, one by the majority leader and one by the minority leader; that time agreements be entered into; that the Senate consider both amendments, and then the remainder of the Senator's request—that after the amendments are dealt with, the bill be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements thereon appear in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I say to my friend that in a short

time I will object because I think we really need to move forward with something as quickly as possible. At some subsequent time—I think time is so critical in this—we will reoffer our unanimous consent request.

I appreciate what the Senator is trying to do, but one of the things that might be considered is—and I have no authority for this whatsoever—I believe we should move forward on my consent at this time, but maybe if we cannot work something out—which I think would be a shame—I would be happy to talk with the Senator to see if there is something we can do. We might want to start out with agreeing that the vehicle we would be amending would be the Dodd-Sarbanes-Schumer substitute amendment and offer two amendments to that, rather than to the House bill.

Anyway, at this time I object for the reasons previously stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Nevada. I hope we can work this out. I am happy to meet with him. I think our objectives are similar. We would like to pass the legislation dealing with terrorism risk protection. We realize there is a serious problem. Just to say we are going to take the House-passed language and pass an amendment that Senators DODD, SARBANES, and SCHUMER have agreed to leaves out Senator GRAMM, who also came up with the agreement that I believe Senators DODD and SARBANES had agreed to earlier.

I hope we can come up with something. You pick the underlying bill, and maybe the underlying bill would be the Dodd-Sarbanes-Schumer proposal, but give us an amendment and let's vote. We can come up with fairly short time constraints—at least on this side; hopefully, we can on both sides—and we can pass something and get to conference. The House-passed bill is significantly different, as my colleague knows. We have to work out the differences with the House. I think this is important legislation and it needs to pass, as the Senator from Nevada mentioned. It needs to pass quickly. Hopefully, bipartisan leadership in the Senate can orchestrate a procedure where we can get this done in the very near future.

I thank my colleague. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

A THREAT BY SADDAM HUSSEIN

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, Senator STEVENS from

Alaska, for his statement dealing with the threat—and maybe the threat implemented today—by Saddam Hussein of Iraq, saying he is going to have an oil embargo against the United States.

I think Senator STEVENS mentioned we imported 263 million barrels of oil from Iraq last year—maybe 273 million barrels. Right now, it is over a million barrels per day. That is a significant amount. I heard commentators say today that we don't import that much. I don't know whose figures they are looking at, but a million barrels per day is a lot. Selectively, right now, we are importing 60 percent of our Nation's oil needs.

You need to compare that to the shortages we had in 1973 and 1979. In 1973, I believe we were importing about 34 percent. In 1979, it was about 44 percent. And we had embargoes because of conflicts in the Middle East. As a result, we had significant curtailments in the United States. They embargoed exports coming from the Middle East. We had shortages in the United States, and we had gas lines.

I don't quite agree with Senator STEVENS that we are going to have gas lines this week, but if the embargo were expanded and lasted for a significant period of time, we could have significant shortages. I think you will see price escalation. How significant it will be depends on how many other countries get involved. He mentioned there might be strikes in Venezuela. That will compound the problem. If you take away a couple million barrels of oil, you are going to see prices go way up, and you may see shortages in the not-too-distant future. Gasoline prices will be going up in the summertime. You can see demand going up and you can see shortages.

So I think the Senator from Alaska is very timely in saying we need to do what we can to help make sure that Saddam Hussein doesn't have too big of a grip on the U.S. economy. One of the things we definitely can do is increase exploration and production in Alaska. Senator STEVENS mentioned that in Prudhoe Bay, which used to produce about 2 million barrels per day, now is producing less than a million. We need to supplement that. When it was 2 million barrels per day, it was 25 percent of our domestic production. Now it is less than an eighth. We need to really have that increase, and we can do that in an environmentally safe and sound manner by production in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We are going to have a vote on that this week.

I also agree 100 percent with Senator STEVENS when he said that while talking about national security, people should not filibuster. Let's find out where the votes are. Are we going to vote to increase domestic production or are we going to allow Saddam Hussein to be able to suffocate the world economy, and certainly the economy of the United States? Are we going to give him that kind of leverage and power or will we do what we can to minimize it?

I encourage my colleagues to take a fresh look at ANWR—at this 2,000 acres from which we are talking about producing. It is an area similar in land size to the State of South Carolina. That is a 2,000-acre footprint, similar to the size of Dulles Airport or the Oklahoma City Airport; it is not that large of an area. If you haven't visited the coastal region of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, it is not the prettiest area, and work can be done in a way that will protect and preserve the native wildlife species, including the caribou. If you have been to Prudhoe Bay, you found that the caribou love the Alaska pipeline; you saw a lot of caribou hanging around the pipeline. So certainly it can be done in a way to protect the wildlife and the environment, and it will also help alleviate some of the energy shortages we may experience in the not-too-distant future. We are very vulnerable. We are importing 60 percent of our oil needs today. We need to reduce that or it will be 70 percent in another 10 years.

We need to open exploration in ANWR. I hope my colleagues will not filibuster. I hope my colleagues will say: Let's debate it and let's vote on it. This is a national security issue. We cannot have national security without having energy security, and we do not have energy security today.

My compliments to the administration for giving us a national energy plan for the first time in decades. They presented an energy plan, the House has passed one, and the Senate has not been able to do one. We did not even have a markup on this bill in the Senate Energy Committee.

I have been on that committee for 22 years. I did not get to offer one amendment to this bill. This is the bill. It is 590 pages. It did not have ANWR in it. Why? Because we were not able to offer an ANWR amendment because we were told not to mark it up.

This bill came from Senator DASCHLE and Senator BINGAMAN, and they laid it on our desks. It changed substantially from the previous bill. ANWR was not in it. We had the votes in committee, quite frankly, to put ANWR in the bill. People would try to take ANWR out, but I do not think they have the votes to take it out. I believe that is the reason Senator DASCHLE told Senator BINGAMAN not to mark up a bill.

We now have to try to put an ANWR amendment in the bill, and some of my colleagues say: We have to filibuster. I think they are wrong to do that. Senator STEVENS is right, we need national security and we cannot have national security unless we have energy security. In light of the fact Saddam Hussein is now talking about and may be implementing an oil embargo against the United States, I urge my colleagues to do what we can to protect our national security with energy security, and that includes exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

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