

are complying with prescribed reporting requirements.

This bill deserves our support. The House of Representatives moved quickly on its passage last December and, again, last month. They recognized the need for its provisions. Likewise we should move, and move quickly, to send this bill to the President for his signature. We can delay no longer. The principal parties, and I commend them, Senators BROWBACK, KYL, KENNEDY, and FEINSTEIN and their staffs deserve a tremendous amount of credit for the many hours of discussion, meetings, and negotiations which have led to the end result. This bill has the support of our government, the State and Justice Departments, and represents a very common-sense approach to further immigration reform. Thankfully, many of you agree, as evidenced by the nearly 60 cosponsors to the original bill. I am confident, then, that the Senate will pass this profoundly significant legislation and I look forward to that result.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we have had a good presentation from our colleagues on the issue of border security that has had several hours. I am enormously grateful for the presentation of my friend and colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN, and also Senator BROWBACK, Senator KYL, and the thoroughness of their presentations. During the course of the day, since we have been considering this bill, we have been responding to a number of questions that have been brought up.

For all intents and purposes, I don't know another of our colleagues wanting to speak. I don't intend to foreclose that possibility, but I think we were prepared to consider amendments this afternoon. We understood, as the majority leader indicated, there would not be any votes, but we were hopeful at least that we would be able to consider some amendments and set those aside and at least have the opportunity to review them this afternoon and put them in the RECORD so our colleagues could examine them on Monday next. But we will look forward, when we resume this discussion on Monday, to considering other amendments. We invite colleagues, if they have them and if they would be good enough, to share those amendments with myself or the other principal sponsors. We will do the best we can to respond to them, and those who are related we may be willing to accept. We will consider them and indicate to Members if they are acceptable and, if not, why they are not.

We are thankful to the leaders for their cooperation in arranging for us to

be able to bring this matter before the Senate. I will not repeat at this time why there is a sense of urgency about it. I think that case has been well made.

Earlier today, we had a good hearing on this subject matter and we received additional support for this measure, for which we are very grateful. So I think it represents our best judgment on a matter that we consider to be important to the security of our country. I hope we will be able to dispose of this legislation in the early part of next week.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, is there an order for business following the consideration of the pending legislation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not. We are on the border security bill.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

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

ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am once again before the Senate because of the situation regarding the ANWR amendment which will be presented to the Senate next week. We are not on the energy bill now. I have spoken briefly twice this week on energy and its relationship to the possible development of the 1.5 million acres on the Arctic Plain. We call it the 1002 area. Some people call it ANWR.

ANWR is the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. During the period I was in the Interior Department in the sixties, the Arctic National Wildlife Range was created. That range was 9 million acres. It specifically provided that oil and gas leasing under stipulations to protect the fish and wildlife could proceed in that 9 million acres.

The area that is now within the 1002 area was a portion of that 9 million acres. I have a chart to show that. It is a very interesting history. In the original area of the 9 million acres, there is the coastal plain of the 1002 area which is an area set aside by an amendment offered by Senators Jackson and Tsongas. I will talk about that later. It is 1.5 million acres. The remainder of that original Arctic wildlife range is now totally wilderness.

In 1980, there was an addition to the wildlife area in the Arctic. It is refuge, but it is not wilderness. So there are now, because of the act of 1980, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, 19 million acres in this

Arctic area. It is, in fact, the Arctic wildlife refuge. The part that is not refuge yet is the 1002 area which is specifically, because of the Jackson-Tsongas amendment, available for oil and gas leasing following that basic act.

I have to confess to the Senate and to anyone who might be interested in watching this presentation, I have not been sleeping well lately. I have spent almost 34 years in the Senate, and I remember only one other night that I did not sleep, and that was with regard to the time recently when a very great and dear friend of mine passed away, and I was chiding myself because I had not seen enough of him and found I did not sleep.

Since I have been back from the trip to the Asian regions of the Pacific with my great friend, Senator INOUE, during the last recess, I have been trying to concentrate on the subject of the possible oil and gas development in Alaska, not only the oil potential of the 1002 area but also the Alaska natural gas pipeline.

At the time that oil was discovered in 1968 in the great Prudhoe Bay area, which is on State lands and did not require Federal permission to start oil was discovered there in enormous quantities. At the time of the discovery, the wells came in somewhere around 500,000 to 1 million barrels a day.

The great environmental organizations—I call them the radical environmental organizations—opposed the building of the Alaska oil pipeline. As a matter of fact, that pipeline was delayed for over 4 years by litigation brought by these radical groups trying to prove everything from we were going to kill the caribou to we were going to destroy the area. They have alleged since that time that this area which we call the 1002 area is wilderness.

Wilderness is a word of art in our State because we have more wilderness in our State than all the rest of the United States put together. This area that was set up in the fifties by the Secretary of the Interior and then approved by President Eisenhower was originally set up at the request of the Fairbanks Women's Garden Club. Fairbanks was my first home in Alaska, and that area was set aside in response to their request that there be some area designated in which the interests of the fish and wildlife of the Arctic area would be protected, but they specifically—specifically—excepted from that protection the concept of oil and gas leasing subject to consideration of stipulations that would, in fact, be required to protect fish and wildlife should there be oil and gas development.

Prudhoe Bay is in the area of State lands, and this is Federal land. As the President realized at the time we obtained statehood, we obtained the right to select lands. All other States of the Union had the right on public lands to take sections 16 and 36 out of every

township. They selected those lands as they were surveyed.

With an area such as Alaska, which is one-fifth the size of all the United States, 20 percent of all the lands of the United States and half of the Federal lands are in the State of Alaska. We determined we could not wait for surveying and asked Congress, and did receive, the right to select lands which were then to be surveyed out—not the whole State to be surveyed but our selection to be surveyed out.

Subsequently, our native people received in 1971 the right to, again, select lands to satisfy their settlement of the Alaska Native land claims in the Settlement Act of 1971 of some 40 million acres outright, and additional areas were represented by their traditional burial grounds and traditional lands. So it adds up to about 45 million acres that the Alaska Natives selected.

We are in the process now of trying to relate all of this to the American public so they will ask their Senators to support what we want to do, and that is to open this 1002 area now—as it was committed to us in 1980 would be done—to oil and gas exploration and development.

To get this all into context, this chart shows our State of Alaska imposed upon the United States using the same scale. Normally, when one looks at the State of Alaska at the top of the North American maps, they see Alaska just a little place up at the top where people think that has to be a small place.

Actually, it goes from the east coast to almost the west coast and almost from Duluth down into the middle of Texas. It is a concept of space that most people do not realize, almost three times the size of Texas. My old friend, Senator Tower from Texas, used to say he was afraid we might iron the place out and it would be as big as the whole country because there are a lot of mountains up there.

This is a route of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline which was the subject of action by the Senate in 1968. This is the ANWR outline with the 1002 area in green, and the area we seek to develop is right up there. Two thousand acres out of the 1.5 million acres will be developed according to the bill passed by the House authorizing us to proceed with oil and gas exploration in ANWR.

The problem I have been talking about all week is we face a different circumstance than we did in 1973 when we sought to get the oil and gas pipeline completed. It had been, as I said, subject to litigation for a series of years and we determined we had to get legislative authorization to proceed. My great and good friend and mentor, Senator Jackson of Washington, was the chairman of the Senate Interior and Indian Affairs Committee, and he was the author of the Right of Way Act to amend the rights of way provisions to cross Federal lands for utilities and pipelines. We encouraged him to include a provision to authorize the con-

struction of the oil and gas pipeline, and to permit its immediate initiation. During that period of time, as a matter of fact, Senator Jackson sent out a letter—and I will have that put on everyone's desk on Monday. It was signed by himself and Senator Hatfield—urging that the views expressed by these extreme radical environmentalists be ignored because of the great necessity to have that oil because it was a matter of national security.

This is a poster of General Eisenhower back during World War II where he called attention to the Petroleum Industry War Council. There were some people leaving their work in the oil fields and enlisting in the Army, and General Eisenhower, to his great credit, sent this message:

Your work is vital to victory . . . Our ships . . . Our planes . . . Our tanks must have oil.

He was then the supreme commander of our expeditionary force and he said, "Stick to your job. Oil is ammunition."

We are at war again, and the same radical environmentalists are now opposing us moving out into another area of Alaska to explore for oil and gas. It is within this 1002 area.

In 1980, I had long and serious discussions with two great Senators. This is the photo taken of Senator Jackson, Senator Tsongas, and myself, standing outside in the hall, discussing the amendment that had been agreed to, that I agreed to support, that my colleague opposed, in order to settle the dispute over the Alaskan National Interest Conservation Lands Act. That 1002 provision was authored by these two Senators.

As I said last week, God would that they would still be alive. We would not be having these arguments because they were men of their word. They gave us their commitment. My State, my colleague and I, had opposed the Alaskan National Interest Conservation Lands Act because of the original provisions in the House bill that would have prohibited oil and gas development in the 1002 area. They crafted the amendment that gave us the chance to proceed to develop oil and gas in that area, provided there was an environmental impact statement filed, approved by the Secretary of Interior and the President which then had to be approved by Congress, which then had the job of authorizing proceeding with oil and gas development in that area.

It was 1980 that we received that commitment. At the time of that commitment, we thought this would proceed in a year or two. As a matter of fact, the first environmental impact statement was made during the first Reagan administration. President Reagan asked Congress to approve it. Congress did not act. Then they ordered another environmental impact statement, and the President asked Congress to approve it. It did not. Subsequently, during the Clinton administration, Congress initiated two acts, primarily at my request, to approve an

environmental impact statement and direct the administration to commence oil and gas leasing activity in this area. President Clinton vetoed those bills.

So we are now, 21 or 22 years later, based on the act of 1980, still trying to see that the commitment made to Alaska, as part of the condition for withdrawing almost 100 million acres of Alaska—which, incidentally, came ahead of the State selections, ahead of the Native selections. The only concession we could get out of the whole situation that made any sense was the 1002 area, which we knew was our future.

I was just home to Alaska twice in the last 2 weeks, and I have to report that my State is in dire trouble. Our timber mills have been closed down. Our pulp mills are closed down. All our major mines are closed down. There is no wildcat oil and gas activity in our State at all. Even the number of cruise ships that come to Alaska has been limited now by action of the Federal Government.

Our future is still in resources. Half of the coal of the United States is in Alaska. None of it can be reached because of an act of Congress. That act of Congress provided that in order to have the right to develop the coal of Alaska, an operator would have to restore the natural contour. Well, that coal is found in areas of ice lenses and extreme cover of ice and water. Obviously, when coal is strip-mined, there is a hole. The original contour cannot be restored.

That provision was added to a bill one day, over my great objection, and has prevented the development of any new coal mines in Alaska since that time.

Our oil is in the Arctic. It is not only in our State. We have the one in Canada, too. If we look at the map of the Arctic of the world, that is where most of the oil is, up near the Arctic Circle and above the Arctic Circle. We have the vast areas where oil in tremendous quantities has been found.

We believe within the area covered by 1002—I did not mention that was a 7-year fight; from 1973 to 1980 we fought to try to preserve the right to develop this area. But this is a historic oil and gas activity in the Canadian area.

This is adjacent to us. Our wells are in the Prudhoe Bay area, very few of them. These are the Canadian oil wells all over in this area, including the area of the Porcupine caribou herd. The Porcupine caribou herd is a Canadian herd. It is not an Alaskan herd. It comes into Alaska once a year, most of the time, and comes up during the calving period. It is not during the mating period but the calving period. The calves have been dropped up in this area, not in the 1002 area but in the area along the plain. There have been sometimes when they have gone into the 1002 area and there have also been times in recent years they have not come at all. One of the reasons for that is the path the caribou wanders

through Canada. In Canada, caribou is not a game animal; it is a domestic animal. They can harvest as many as they want. These caribou can be harvested in Canada. The numbers are going down, no question, but not because of interference on our slope.

To the contrary, the central caribou herd—around the land of the pipeline—has increased in size and is almost four to five times in number as before. The western caribou herd is not migrating anymore and is out toward Wainwright, AK. This map shows the withdrawal areas I mentioned. The areas are in the withdrawal land before the State of Alaska was granted statehood and before the Natives got their land. These lands were set aside in 1980 by an act of Congress. One of the conditions in our favor was that we can explore that little area up there in the 1002 area.

The western herd of caribou is out here. They could not migrate anymore. The central caribou herd has increased enormously, so has the western. It is the Porcupine herd that is reduced in numbers, but there is no oil and gas activity now that has caused that. We keep hearing we caused that, but there is no oil and gas activity there. That is caused by hunting and by predators. We now do not have any control over the wolves. Those caribou travel thousands of miles to go to the Arctic area to drop their calves. They are, most of them, pregnant female caribou and are easily killed by wolves. The same people who are trying to prohibit us from oil and gas activity bring on the problems of trying to find some way to reduce the predators that are killing the Porcupine herd.

In my time in the Senate, I have taken literally 100 Senators to the North Slope to show them this area. Those are the caribou that do come to the oil and gas area. This is the central caribou herd. I don't care if it is winter or summer, you will find them there. In fact, when we finished the oil pipeline, the university developed a new type of cover for the tundra, and it happens to be a very great favorite of the caribou. We have the oil industry replant that whole area with the new vegetation. It is tremendous food for them.

In passing, it is not just caribou that like the pipeline. The pipeline is like a paved highway. Did you know oil coming from the ground in Alaska is hot? If you go near the pipeline, you are walking on a nice, warm sidewalk. The bears like it. We have great fondness for our wildlife. Alaskans go out of their way to make sure industrial activity does not harm our fish and wildlife.

Returning to the 1980 act, if you want my history lesson for the day, when I was assistant leader, I sat here night after night and listened to the history lessons, as I call them, of the distinguished President pro tempore, Senator BYRD, chairman of our committee. I wish God had given me the prodigious

memory he has. I don't have that kind of memory, but I like history lessons and I am trying to give one now.

In 1978, a year I was up for reelection, we had this act before us, the Alaska National and Lands Conservation Act. In 1978, just before the election, that bill had been brought out of conference and I had agreed to support it. My colleague was opposed to it. At the very last minute, Senator Gravel objected to that bill proceeding until the bill itself was read. An adjournment resolution had already been entered so, in effect, that request killed the bill.

Following that, I might add, I went back home to try to start getting ready again for consideration of this bill, and riding with my wife and five other people in a chartered jet we crashed going into Anchorage. My wife Ann was killed and all the passengers, other than myself and one other passenger, were killed. Those people killed were the head of what we called the Citizens for Management of Alaska Land. We were trying to raise funds to, once again, present our position to the Congress in the period of 1979 and 1980.

By 1980 we had developed this bill after long arguments and meetings with my great friends, Senator Jackson and Senator Tsongas. Senator Jackson was chairman at the time. Section 1002, the Jackson-Tsongas amendment started with:

The purpose of this section is to provide for a comprehensive and continuing inventory and assessment of the fish and wildlife resources of the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; an analysis of the impacts of oil and gas exploration, development, and production, and to authorize exploratory activity within the coastal plain in a manner that avoids significant adverse effects on the fish and wildlife and other resources.

Those conditions were met. Two environmental impacts were followed. There was a period of seismic activity that went on in the 1980s. We all know the largest reservoir that could contain oil or gas on the North American continent is beneath the 1002 area. There is no question about that. That is a scientific fact.

When we get to the period of time when we try to look at this development, we are often told you can proceed without this. This is, again, now moving over to the Prudhoe Bay oil fields, not just one but several now. This is Kuparuk, further to the west, Prudhoe Bay, and the Sourdough Oil field, a small field adjacent to ANWR. We have within the 1002 area the village of Kaktovik. They have lands that belong to the Natives, but by order of the administration at the time they got the title to those lands, they were prohibited from drilling on the lands. They said they had to wait until the Congress authorized drilling on the Coastal Plain. So if we pass this bill, they, too, will have the right to proceed to determine their own rights.

The oil pipeline goes now from Valdez to Prudhoe Bay. This is the Wainwright area, which is the area of

the caribou of the western herd. This is the size of ANWR. It is equal, the refuge itself, to South Carolina. We are not talking about a small piece of land. But the proposed development area in this 1002 area, 1.5 million acres, of 2,000 acres is 3.13 square miles from a State that has 565,000 square miles.

We are at wit's end. That is why this Senator is losing some sleep. That 2,000 acres is roughly the size of Dulles Airport. That is what this bill limits us to use. We cannot use more than 2,000 acres of the 1.5 million acres set aside in the Oil and Gas Exploration Act. It is not wilderness.

I will discuss later the newspapers that keep talking about the wilderness area of ANWR. They are talking about the wilderness area of ANWR where there is no oil and gas activity proposed at all. None at all. I believe one of the great problems we have is to try to deal with the subject without a full explanation. The difficulty that I have right now is in trying to orient myself to the bill. We will file an amendment next week—there has been a lot of gossip about this so I might as well get down to talking about it on the record.

Yes, this Senator has been talking to people involved in the steel business, to the steelworkers, to other labor unions, and I have been talking to a great community of this Nation, the Jewish community. All have an interest in the development of this area.

I have also been talking to people who are concerned about the Alaskan natural gas line. I will be talking about that soon, too.

I thank the Chair for his courtesy on this Friday afternoon. If I don't get this out of me, I won't sleep tonight either.

One of the great problems we have been facing is the battles with the press, so let's start with that. Let's start with our own Washington paper. In the past, in 1987 and 1989, this newspaper argued in favor of proceeding with exploration on the Arctic coast. It said:

... But that part of the Arctic coast is one of the bleakest, most remote places on this continent, and there is hardly any other place where drilling would have less impact on the surrounding life. . . .

... That oil could help ease the country's transition to lower oil supplies and . . . reduce its dependence on uncertain imports. Congress would be right to go ahead and, with all the conditions and environmental precautions that apply to Prudhoe Bay, see what's under the refuge's tundra. . . .

In 1989 it said:

... But if less is to be produced here in the United States, more will have to come from other countries. The effect will be to move oil spills to other shores. As a policy to protect the global environment, that's not very helpful. . . .

... The lesson that conventional wisdom seems to be drawing—that the country should produce less and turn to even greater imports—is exactly wrong.

What do we see now? December 25, 2001—nice Christmas present for somebody:

Gov. Bush has promised to make energy policy an early priority of his administration. If he wants to push ahead with opening the plain as part of that, he'll have to show that he values conservation as well as finding new sources of supply. He'll also have to make the case that in the long run, the oil to be gained is worth the potential damage to this unique, wild and biologically vital ecosystem. That strikes us as a hard case to make.

They made the case in 1987. They made the case in 1989. They are saying George Bush should make it now. Where is the consistency of the Washington Post? What has changed in the Washington Post? The management? They haven't changed any science. They haven't produced any science.

Now, in February they said:

Is there an energy crisis, and if so, what kind? What part of the problem can the market take care of, and what must Government do? What's the right goal when it comes to dependence on overseas sources?

America cannot drill its way out of ties to the world oil market. There may be an emotional appeal to the notion of American energy for the American consumer and a national security argument for reducing the share that imports hold. But the most generous estimates of potential production from the Alaska refuge amount to only a fraction of current imports.

That is wrong. They belie the fact that Iraq is currently threatening to withhold exports to us—or really to the international food program that we buy from. In fact, our oil will produce as much as a 30 years' supply from Iraq.

Today Iraq sends to every suicide bomber's family \$25,000 in cash. If we can believe the reports we got yesterday, even the Saudis have a fund now to pay the costs of education and maintenance for the children of suicide bombers. From where is that money coming? It is coming from the United States.

Had Congress listened to President Reagan, had President Clinton not vetoed the bill, we would be producing oil from that area now.

At the height of the Persian Gulf war, 2.1 million barrels of oil a day came down from the Alaska oil pipeline. When I was home last week, it was 950,000 barrels. Meanwhile, we are now importing over 1 million barrels a day from Iraq—at least we were until he shut it off.

There is no consistency in these national newspapers when they do this. Why should one generation act on the recommendation in 1987 and 1989 and another one be told now that is all wrong? There ought to be some kind of integrity in the Washington Post.

The New York Times—an interesting thing, if you follow this. I am not going to do it, follow the transition. When one of these papers changes its mind, the other one changes its mind. This is the New York Times. Then in 1987, 1988, 1989, the same thing.

Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge . . . the most promising untapped source of oil in North America.

. . . A decade ago, precautions in the design and construction of the 1,000-mile-long

Alaska pipeline saved the land from serious damage. If oil companies, government agencies and environmentalists approach the development of the refuge with comparable care, disaster should be avoidable.

In 1988 they say the same thing:

. . . the total acreage affected by development represents only a fraction of 1 percent of the North Slope wilderness.

Again, they call it wilderness. It is not wilderness.

. . . But it is hard to see why absolutely pristine preservation of this remote wilderness should take precedence over the nation's energy needs.

That is the issue today. Should a small group of radical environmentalists block the United States from obtaining another source of oil to lead us toward total dependence on foreign sources? At the time of the oil embargo in the 1973 area, we imported about 35 percent of our oil. Today we are approaching 60 percent. Now they turn around on us, from having supported us through the whole series—1987, 1988, 1989.

New York Times, 1989:

. . . Alaskan oil is too valuable to leave in the ground.

. . . The single most promising source of oil in America lies on the north coast of Alaska, a few hundred miles east of the big fields at Prudhoe Bay.

. . . Washington can't afford . . . to treat the accident as a reason for fencing off what may be the last great oilfield in the nation.

Now they attack my colleague, saying he is wrong in his estimates. They are also saying:

The country needs a rational energy strategy . . . but the first step in that strategy should not be to start punching holes in the Arctic Refuge.

What happened to the New York Times? Change of management? Yes, another change of management. Maybe they hired one of the radical environmentalists, for all I know. But that is not a national newspaper that deserves any credibility. As far as I am concerned, I have written them off. How can you believe them one year and have them turn around and not tell you what they said before, in 1987, 1988, 1989, is wrong? They didn't even recognize in their own editorials that they had taken those positions so the new young people, reading their paper, don't know about that unless some of us call them to task.

Where was the editorial board that was involved in 1987, 1988, and 1989, when this editorial board of the New York Times took a diametrically opposite position? That is not a national paper anymore, as far as I am concerned. It is unworthy of credibility. Beyond that, I might have some long statements about them next week.

Mr. President, I don't want to keep you too long, but I do want the world to know that, starting next week, we are going to be on this bill for a long time. When that bill goes in, I am told the leadership perseveres with their attitude—which was not Senator Mike Mansfield's attitude, it was not Senator Jackson's attitude.

In 1973, there we had the oil pipeline amendment up—conscious of what President Eisenhower had said, conscious of the approach that all of us had taken up to that time, that oil and the availability of oil to this country is a matter of national security as well as economic security. The leadership now says we must have 60 votes—or we should not even bring up the amendment.

I want leadership to know that I don't know that I have 60 votes, and neither does Senator MURKOWSKI. We are going to bring up the amendment and we are going to debate it until we have 60 votes—until we have 60 votes or unless they can get the votes to table our amendment. There is a possibility that could happen.

But I want you to know that every steelworker in the country is going to know who denied them their legacy fund. Every coal worker who is going to fall short of the money on their funds under the act of 1992 will know who did that to them.

Every member of the Jewish community who now supports the development of ANWR is going to know who denied them what they need. Part of this law extends the right of Israel to receive a portion of the output of the Alaska oil pipeline in the event it is denied oil by its neighbors. Most people do not know that. Years ago that was enacted. It must be renewed now. Our amendment renews that.

We support entirely the freedom of Israel. Our State insisted on sharing with Israel our oil as it came out of the pipeline if their oil was shut off. So did the people who buy our oil.

The Senate ought to look to the groups who support an energy policy for America. We have American veterans, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, Vietnam Veterans Institute.

Catholic War Veterans, organized labor, the Seafarers International Union, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the Maritime Laborers Union, the Operating Engineers Union, the Plumbers and Pipefitters Union, and the Carpenters, Joiners and Builders Trade, the Hispanic Union, the Latin American Latino Coalition, the United States-Mexico Chamber of Commerce, Seniors Coalition, United Seniors Association, every major American Jewish organization, scientist organizations of America, Americans for a Safe Israel, American business communities, National Black Chamber of Commerce, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, and Alliance for Energy and Economic Growth. I could go on and on with this list of who supports this.

(Mr. INOUE assumed the chair.)

I welcome the occupant of the chair, my great and long-time friend. As I said last night, we will not keep you long.

We will have to put in orders, if ANWR produces oil, for 17 new double-hulled tankers. As a result of Exxon

Valdez, we decreed in Congress—and the State industries agreed—that all new tankers to serve Alaska must be double-hulled. When this great area starts producing oil, 17 new double-hulled tankers will be built to carry the oil coming out of the Alaska pipeline.

The current occupant of the chair didn't see this chart. I want to present it again for his benefit because the two of us served under that great general. This is what he said during World War II to our oil field workers: "Stick to your job. Oil is ammunition."

If the leadership followed the precedent set by Mike Mansfield, who opposed the Alaska oil pipeline amendment when there was a tie vote—they supported the one provision which accelerated the litigation and required immediate construction of the pipeline. Senator Mansfield would not permit a filibuster on the matter involving national security. Senator Jackson was chairman of the committee. And both of them voted against that oil pipeline amendment when it was a tie vote. They did not try to filibuster against that amendment. Had they done so, we undoubtedly would not have the oil pipeline today.

If those two great leaders had opposed the one amendment that accelerated the construction of the pipeline, we would never have had an oil pipeline.

I believe the situation today is an odd one. I am sad that leadership now perseveres in its statement to us that we must have 60 votes.

I close out by saying Alaska Senators are going to try to persevere too. We are going to stay here and the Senate is going to stay here until we get 60 votes next week.

I thank the President for his courtesy.

I yield the floor.

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. STEVENS assumed the Chair.)

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

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

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I wasn't prepared to present a lengthy argument in favor of or against it, but I must tell you that I support you fully, sir. I support your proposal on ANWR. I did so when the pipeline was proposed many years ago. I still recall that at that time the opponents of the pipeline predicted the caribou herd in Alaska would be decimated. I am a lover of animals. I was concerned. But today I am happy to tell you that instead of being decimated, the herd has increased tenfold. There are more caribou than we ever had in our lifetimes.

The opposition to the use of ANWR at this time comes from many sources.

These sources are my friends. As you may know, Mr. President, I have the privilege of serving at this moment as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs. I am concerned about the plight of the Native Americans. Yes, it is true that there is a tribe—a nation—in Alaska opposed to the use of ANWR for drilling of oil—one tribe. I am pleased to advise you, Mr. President, that the Federation of Alaskan Natives, representing all the other tribes, favors your measure. As chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I feel almost compelled to support you if only on that basis.

But there are other reasons for my support. The next reason was given to me just a few days ago when the dictator of Iraq stated: Why don't we use the oil weapon against the United States?

As long as the present condition continues, we will be hostage to oil, we will be captives to oil. We may find ourselves, once again, going out into the desert to fight for oil, risking and sacrificing American lives. And as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Committee, I am not in favor of that, sir.

So when the time comes, I will be answering "aye" on your measure.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished majority whip.

A SENATE FRIENDSHIP

Mr. REID. Mr. President, while I disagree with the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii and the senior Senator from Alaska on this issue, I am forever amazed at the great relationship of the senior Senator from Alaska and the senior Senator from Hawaii.

We develop friendships in the Senate, and I have no question that my friendship with Senator INOUE is one that will last me a lifetime. He is such a wonderful man. And I also have such warmth and feelings for the senior Senator from Alaska. But with the example that is set by the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii, in friendship and in working together on issues, I am, each year, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, stunned by the ability of these two gentlemen to move through the Defense appropriations bill the way they do. This should take weeks of our debate time in the committee and on the Senate floor, but as a result of their working relationship, it is always held to just a short period of time.

So when the history books are written about the Senate, these two men, who now stand before me and with me in the Senate—Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE—will be known for many things, for doing so many good things for our country and for their respective States, but the thing I am going to remember is the example of friendship that I see between the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from

Hawaii. And I do not mean in any way to demean the Senator from Hawaii because I know he believes in his position not because of friendship but because he believes in the merits of the case, as it has, I am sure, something to do with the friendship they have. But the relationship of the two Senators is, as far as I am concerned, encyclopedic as to how we should work with each other in the Senate.

So on behalf of the Senate, I applaud and congratulate these two Senators for the example they set for the rest of us on how civilly the Senate should be run—a Democrat from Hawaii, thought of as a liberal State in some people's minds, and a Republican from the conservative State of Alaska. What we have coming from those two States is two people to show us that with different ideologies we can still work together for the good of the country.

So I say to both Senators, thank you very much.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to speak on a subject that is very important to the American public—the importance of free trade and how free markets can help the United States and the worldwide economy.

By working together to create and foster a free market atmosphere, we can help all nations that actively promote and participate in international trade to improve the economic futures of their citizens. This is good economic policy and good international relations.

As the ranking Republican member on the International Trade Subcommittee and as a member of the Intelligence Committee, I can tell you that international trade has long been one of the most important foreign policy tools of the United States.

Trade was a key component of our post-World War II international political and economic strategy. For more than 50 years, international trade contributed to stability and economic growth throughout the world. It helped lift the nations of Europe and Asia out of the ruins of World War II. And it helped millions of Americans experience unprecedented prosperity here at home.

A large part of the reason that the Berlin Wall fell was the difference in economic performance and promise between a centralized command and central economy and free markets. International trade can play a similar role at the beginning of the 21st century. But, the United States must lead the way.

I am pleased that the administration, led by President Bush, Commerce Secretary Don Evans, and our United States Trade Representative Bob Zoellick, has helped launch a new round of international trade talks. We all have an interest in making the next World Trade Organization ministerial succeed. I believe that success can only