

is that we have to be very careful how we handle and protect it. A majority of the people in America do not want the ANWR disturbed because they believe there are areas that we should leave pristine and untouched. People thought that in Nevada it didn't matter that the desert tortoise needs lots of open space. We call them turtles, but the proper name is desert tortoise. There was a time when they were placed on the endangered list. To protect these turtles, we have had to really do lots of things differently. Because of the press of population, we are killing these animals. And extinction is forever. That is what we have to recognize.

I will say what I have said here on a number of occasions. Out of 100 percent of the total oil reserves in the world, America, including ANWR, has 3 percent of the oil reserves; 97 percent of the oil reserves are elsewhere. Kuwait and Saudi Arabia have about 47 percent. As you know, not only do they have large quantities of oil, but it is very easy to get out of the ground.

My point is that we must maintain some of our pristine wilderness areas. One of those we are going to protect is ANWR.

Eighty-seven percent of the land in the State of Nevada is owned by the Federal Government. We are a very densely populated State. People do not understand that. Most say that we are the most densely populated State in America. Why? Because 90 percent of the people live in two metropolitan areas—Reno and Las Vegas.

Eighty-seven percent of Nevada is owned by the Federal Government. What does that mean? It means that 87 percent is as much yours as it is mine. I think we should do what we can to get more of that land into the private sector. But I recognize that federal lands are as much yours as they are mine. That is the same as the ANWR wilderness. That land is as much mine as it is the Senator from Alaska.

I am going to do everything I can to protect that pristine wilderness because we don't have many areas in the whole world that are pristine, let alone in the United States.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 517, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 517) to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through technology transfer and part-

nerships for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Daschle/Bingaman further modified amendment No. 2917, in the nature of a substitute.

Kerry/McCain amendment No. 2999 (to amendment No. 2917), to provide for increased average fuel economy standards for passenger automobiles and light trucks.

Dayton/Grassley amendment No. 3008 (to amendment No. 2917), to require that Federal agencies use ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel in areas in which ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel are available.

Lott amendment No. 3028 (to amendment No. 2917), to provide for the fair treatment of Presidential judicial nominees.

Landrieu/Kyl amendment No. 3050 (to amendment No. 2917), to increase the transfer capability of electric energy transmission systems through participant-funded investment.

Graham amendment No. 3070 (to amendment No. 2917), to clarify the provisions relating to the Renewable Portfolio Standard. Schumer/Clinton amendment No. 3093 (to amendment No. 2917), to prohibit oil and gas drilling activity in Finger Lakes National Forest, New York.

Dayton amendment No. 3097 (to amendment No. 2917), to require additional findings for FERC approval of an electric utility merger.

Schumer amendment No. 3030 (to amendment No. 2917), to strike the section establishing a renewable fuel content requirement for motor vehicle fuel.

Feinstein/Boxer amendment No. 3115 (to amendment No. 2917), to modify the provision relating to the renewable content of motor vehicle fuel to eliminate the required volume of renewable fuel for calendar year 2004.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 3132 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2917

(Purpose: To create jobs for Americans, to reduce dependence on foreign sources of crude oil and energy, to strengthen the economic self-determination of the Inupiat Eskimos and to promote national security)

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], for himself and Mr. BREAUX, proposes an amendment numbered 3132 to amendment No. 2917.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 3133 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3132

(Purpose: To create jobs for Americans, to strengthen the United States steel industry, to reduce dependence on foreign sources of crude oil and energy, and to promote national security)

Mr. STEVENS. I send to the desk an amendment to the Murkowski amendment No. 3132.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes an amendment numbered 3133 to amendment No. 3132.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The underlying amendment was introduced by Senator STEVENS, myself, and Senator BREAUX and, as a consequence, I think deserves some explanation relative to the specifics that are in the underlying amendment.

The items for consideration, some of which were in H.R. 4, include specifically a 2,000-acre limitation on surface disturbance. Specifically, an export ban of any oil from the refuge cannot under any circumstances be exported, with the provision of authority for exports to Israel. Further, we would extend the U.S./Israeli oil supply arrangement, which is due to expire in the year 2004, to the year 2014.

We would further have a wilderness increase designation, adding a million and a half acres of wilderness from the current refuge management in the southern portion of the refuge.

Finally, there would be a Presidential finding—and this Presidential finding is quite specific that the refuge would not be open until the President makes a finding it is in the national security interest of this Nation.

There would also be a triggering mechanism such as energy supply, threat to strategic reserves not sufficient to cover.

I encourage my colleagues to reflect a little bit on how the underlying amendment was constructed. A great deal of time went into this effort by Members of both parties. I know there has been some frustration about the manner in which this amendment has been brought before the body, and I know there is a question of why we simply do not introduce the House-passed bill, H.R. 4.

The reason is very simple. We have taken a radically different approach because, as I have indicated in my opening remarks, the amendment we offer today does not open ANWR, per se. Let me repeat, the amendment does not give the authority to open ANWR. Rather, the amendment grants the President the authority to open the area for safe exploration only if he makes a determination it is in the national security interest of this country. Obviously, the President has the power, given to him in the Constitution, for extraordinary responsibilities associated with the decisionmaking process, and it is clearly appropriate in this time of crisis that the President be given that authority.

I think it is fair to say for far too long Congress has proved itself incapable of dealing with extreme and difficult issues that have difficult political consequences, and this clearly is one of those issues. However, at this time in our Nation's history we can no longer afford, for our national security, to be held hostage to the massive disinformation campaigns of some of the extreme environmental groups. So we must move on. That is the responsibility of each Member of this body.

Some who oppose opening ANWR are perhaps on autopilot right now and are gearing up for their rebuttals, but I ask them to stop for a few moments and listen to what conditions must be met should the President decide this action is in the national interest of the Nation because many of those who will be opposed to this amendment do not know what they are fighting about.

If development is moved forward, the following conditions must be met: As I indicated, only 2,000 acres of surface disturbance on the Coastal Plain can occur. We have a chart that shows what the footprint is. It shows the entire area of ANWR, which is roughly 19 million acres, which equates to the size of the State of South Carolina. It also recognizes there is within that 19 million acres both wilderness and refuge. We are proposing to add to the wilderness. We are going to increase it from 8 million acres to 9.5 million acres, and we are going to reduce the refuge by that amount. So we are increasing the wilderness.

What does 1.5 million acres equate to? The green area is the 1002 ANWR Coastal Plain. We are adding wilderness equal to that amount. That is the significance of what we believe is a responsible proposal that addresses the concerns of many who say in this area where you are proposing drilling in 1.5 million acres there should be some consideration to more wilderness.

The authorization of the footprint in the 1.5 million acres is limited by the House bill, limited in this Senate bill, to 2,000 acres, roughly 3.13 square miles. The area proposed is the little red dot. It would be similar to a postage stamp being dropped on the floor of the Senate Chamber. That is what we are looking at.

For those under the misunderstanding that this area of ANWR is untouched, let me show a few pictures of the actual footprint. There is the village of Kaktovik. There are roughly 3,000 people in that village. They are American citizens, Alaskans. They have dreams for a better lifestyle, job opportunities, running water, things we take for granted. That is their community. It is in ANWR. They feel very strongly about supporting this because it improves their lives and improves opportunities for their children, including educational opportunities.

This is a picture of the village meeting house in Kaktovik. Those are real people, real kids. We have pictures of real kids going to school. Nobody shov-

els the snow off the sidewalks in that community. Those are happy Eskimo kids who dream about a better life. They dream about having running water and sewer lines.

Let me show you a honey bucket. Many Members dismiss this, suggesting this is a Third World situation, not something that occurs in the United States. It does occur. It occurs in my State of Alaska. I will share it. It is not the most pleasant sight in the world, but it represents a reality, the reality of a people who want a better lifestyle and jobs and opportunities associated with oil development. That is a honey bucket. We don't have to look at it too long. It is not too pleasant.

This area is permafrost. That means the ground is frozen year-round. Water and sewer lines can only be obtained at great costs. We have that in Barrow, AK.

It is important to see the contrasts in the Arctic. Contrast the development of the responsible residents of the Arctic Eskimos and primarily those in Barrow, Wainwright, and other villages. You cannot go further north than Barrow, without falling off the top. The significance is that community has a tax base, revenues. They have jobs. They have running water and sewer lines, things we take for granted.

In this debate, few Members are going to get down into the earthy issues of what the people of my State want. That is a little beneath the echelon around here, but it should not be. These are American citizens. Their dreams are like yours and mine.

This map shows a small footprint in a very large area. We need to recognize the arguments of today as opposed to the arguments of the late 1960s. We built an 800-mile pipeline, from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez. It is 800 miles long. It is one of the construction wonders of the world at a cost of \$7.5 to \$8 billion. It was supposed to come in at under \$1 billion. The pipeline has moved 20 to 25 percent of the total crude oil produced in this country in the last 27 years. It has been bombed; it has survived earthquakes.

It has accommodated some of the animals. I will show Members what the bears think of the pipeline. They are going for a walk. Why are they walking on the pipeline? It is easier than walking in the snow. There is a compatibility there because no one is shooting those bears. They blend in with the modest amount of activity.

I point out that the infrastructure is already in place. The 800-mile pipeline is operating at half capacity. The prospects for finding a major discovery of oil in the 1002 area, according to the geologists, range somewhere between 5.6 and 16 billion barrels. That is a lot of oil.

But it is nothing if you don't compare it to something. What can you compare it to? Let's try Prudhoe Bay. Prudhoe Bay is the largest oilfield in North America. That is the harsh re-

ality. It is almost 30-year-old technology. If we have an opportunity to develop ANWR, we can make that footprint much smaller because we went in 30 years to another field called Endicott, which was 56 acres and produced 100,000 barrels a day, coming on as the 10th largest producing field in North America and now is the 7th largest.

Getting back to a meaningful comparison, if indeed the estimated reserves are somewhere between 5.6 and 16 billion barrels, if it is half, that is roughly 10, and what was Prudhoe Bay supposed to be? It was supposed to be 10 and it is now supplying its 13th billion barrel. When people say it is insignificant, is 25 percent of the total crude oil produced insignificant?

There is more oil in ANWR than there is in all of Texas. I don't know what that means to my Texas friends, but it is a reality.

This is a jobs issue. This is a jobs issue associated with project labor agreements. This pipeline simply cannot be built without the very important labor unions and their members. We don't have the skills. Only organized labor has the skill. It is a very significant jobs issue. That is why virtually every union supports this effort.

There is another issue that has clouded a lot of the debate. That is the issue of oil exports. I have heard time and time again: You will develop this area and export the oil to Japan. That is a fallacy. We have not exported one drop of oil to Japan or any other nation since 2 years ago last June. We provide Hawaii with oil.

Where does our oil go? From Valdez, AK, down the west coast of the United States, about half of it goes into Puget Sound. Some of it goes into Oregon indirectly because Oregon doesn't have refineries. The rest of it goes down to San Francisco and Los Angeles where it is refined. That is where the oil goes.

We also have an exclusion for Israel from the export ban, and we would extend the U.S. oil supply arrangement with Israel for 10 more years. The expiration date is 2004; we will extend it to 2014.

Let me talk about environment protections, export, labor agreements, and so forth because the amendment included almost 20 pages of carefully drafted environmental standards that I suspect all 100 Senators should favor. These came in from environmental groups, from the Department of the Interior, from the State of Alaska, the Governor, and many others. Among them are the imposition of seasonal limitations to protect denning and migration.

Let me show the area in the winter-time so you have an idea of what it is like about 10 to 10 ½ months a year. It is a very harsh environment. Very harsh. There are no trees. There is ice, snow, and occasionally when there is a whiteout, it looks like the other side of the chart. One cannot see the difference between the sky and the land. As a consequence, it is very hazardous

to fly in unless you are an experienced instrument pilot.

The point is, the limited activity associated with ANWR is primarily in the very short spring when there is a migration through the area. There is not going to be any development. There is not going to be any activity. That is why the imposition by the Secretary of seasonal limitations is so important. It is prudent management.

Further, there is a requirement of the lessees to reclaim the leased land. If oil is developed there, it is going to have to all be reclaimed. It further requires the use of the best commercially available technology. That means the industry has to go out and get the very best.

It requires the use of ice roads, ice pads, and ice airstrips for exploration. Let me show you what an ice road looks like. That is an ice road. It is going to a well in the Arctic, in the Prudhoe Bay area. For those who suggest there is something unique about the Prudhoe Bay area vis-a-vis the Kaktovik area—it pretty much looks the same.

The interesting thing here is this is new technology. We did not use that in Prudhoe Bay because we did not have it. Now it is ice roads. You make your roads out of ice—very limited activity.

One of the provisions is to prohibit public use on all pipeline access or service roads. So you are not going to have visitors, hunters, fishermen, and so forth.

I think we have another chart that shows what the same area looks like in the summertime. That is roughly 2.5 months of the year. That is all we really have, free of ice and snow. You can see the small lake—there is a little well there. That is a pretty small footprint. I have heard people say you are going to have jet airports, you are going to have cities. That is absolutely preposterous.

Further, it requires there be no significant adverse effect on fish and wildlife, which is referred to many times throughout this amendment, and it requires consolidation of facility siting. It requires the Secretary of the Interior to close certain special areas of unique character and maybe close additional areas after consultation with local communities.

Finally, surface disturbance of 2,000 acres of the Coastal Plain—2,000 acres out of 1.5 million acres in the Coastal Plain. And we are adding 1.5 million acres of wilderness. That footprint is the size of a postage stamp on this floor.

Let me chat a little bit about national security because I think that is germane to our consideration. This amendment is a matter of national security. I do not think we really reflect on the fact that this Nation is at war. Just 7 months ago, our Nation was under attack. Regarding our dependence on foreign oil, that attack has brought forth more and more awareness of what the merits of reducing our

dependence are and the recognition that this is probably more important now than ever, as we look at the chaos in the Mideast. Within the last few days, more than 30 percent of our oil imports are currently threatened with the self-imposed Iraqi embargo, and God knows what the political upheaval in Venezuela will lead to, plus what is going on in Colombia with threats to the pipeline. Those countries export a large amount of crude oil to the United States. The point is, we can no longer rely on a stable supply of imported oil.

I would like to refer to artwork painted by a famous artist who hailed from New England, the State of Vermont. It was painted by Norman Rockwell for the U.S. Office of War in 1943, entitled "Mining America's Coal." There is the coal miner. It is a picture of a coal miner, and you notice his blue star pin, which shows he had two sons in the war. This type of poster was displayed in America's places of work—the shipyards, the factories—specifically to encourage war-related industries to increase output.

We are at war now. Where are the posters? Developing our own resources is just as important as it was in World War II. We need oil to transport our families, but we also need it to transport our troops, and we are going to need it in the future. The reality is that air power and naval power cannot function without oil. In spite of what we create around here, you do not fly out of Washington, DC, on hot air. The Navy no longer uses sails; it is oil.

While the public can generalize about alternative energy sources, the world—and the United States—moves on oil. We wish we had another alternative, but we do not. In the meantime, the Third World developing countries are going to require more oil, and so this Nation becomes more vulnerable unless we are committed to reduce our dependence on imported oil.

Some would hint that wind power is viable as an alternative to oil. As I said before, you are not going to be able to move troops on wind power or solar power. You are going to need oil.

As we look at our relationship with Iraq, opening ANWR will certainly make us less dependent on countries such as Iraq.

Let me show you a picture of our friend Saddam Hussein. There he is. I do not know how much attention is going to have to be given by America and its elected leadership to recognize what this means. Saddam Hussein is saying: Oil as a weapon.

What was the last experience we had with a weapon? It was three aircraft used as weapons. What happened? Catastrophe for America. America will never be the same: The two trade towers are gone; the Pentagon; the heroic effort to try to take over the control of the aircraft that crashed in Pennsylvania. Aircraft are now weapons of war. Oil is a weapon of war.

On the first day of April, Iraq's ruling Baath Party confirmed our worst

fears when it issued a statement saying "use oil as a weapon in the battle with the enemy." Of course they meant Israel. Outrageous statements such as these confirm what we have been saying all along: We simply must not rely on Iraq. We must reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

What is the estimate? USGS, the Department of the Interior, suggest that we could, by opening ANWR, reduce our current dependence, which is 1 million barrels a day from Iraq. That would provide this Nation with a 40-year supply, equal to what we import from Iraq. Last year we sent Iraq over \$4 billion.

Here are the crude oil imports from Iraq to the United States in 2001: 283 million barrels. It has gone up each month. In December it was 1.1 million a day.

Look at the irony of what happened in September. In September we had an all-time high of almost 1.2 million barrels a day from Iraq. We all know what happened in September.

We have a photo of our friend Saddam Hussein up here. Here he is: American families count on Saddam Hussein for energy.

Every time you go to the gas station, you are in effect funding Iraq, and Iraq is funding terrorism. Is there a connection there? Members say: Senator MURKOWSKI, this is not going to replace our dependence on foreign oil. I certainly acknowledge that. But it is going to reduce it. It is going to send a very strong message to the cartels of OPEC, and the other nations upon which we depend, that we mean business about reducing our dependence on imported oil.

In 2001, America imported a total of 287.3 million barrels of oil from Iraq. Looking at a map of imports, according to the Energy Information Administration, you ought to know who gets some of their oil. There are different States. I will identify some of the States because it causes a little reflection. That is just what it should cause.

Mr. President, 48.1 million barrels of Iraqi oil were imported into California; 4.9 billion barrels of Iraqi oil were imported into New Jersey; 1½ million barrels into Minnesota; Washington; and the list goes on. Don't think somebody else is getting the oil. It is going into all of the States in red—New Jersey, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri, Minnesota, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. That is where it is going.

To make matters even worse, Saddam Hussein recently announced that he is increasing money relative to the suicide bombers from \$10,000 to \$25,000. We revolt at even the thought of that. But you have to recognize that is an incentive, and it is still going on. Since the prices have been raised in the last month, we have had at least 12 suicide bombers who have been successful in their acts of terrorism in Israel. Saddam Hussein is rewarding the acts of murderers who are spreading terrorism

throughout the free world. One wonders if it will come to the shores of the United States.

As Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld said:

Saddam's payments promote a culture of political murder.

That is a pretty harsh statement. It comes from our Defense Secretary. I couldn't agree more. With facts such as these, it is impossible for me to imagine why we would want to send one more American dollar to this man.

I just looked at an article that appeared today, April 16, in the Wall Street Journal. It is entitled "Iraqi President Saddam Hussein Praises Suicide Bombers, Urges Iran Oil Halt."

It said:

Iraq's President Saddam Hussein who sends cash to the families of Palestinian suicide bombers reiterated his support for the attacks, Iraqi media reported Tuesday. The Iraqi leader during a meeting with military officers and engineers on Monday night—today is Tuesday, Mr. President—said, "Suicide attacks were legitimate means used by people whose land is being occupied."

Moslems have been divided over suicide bombings, with some saying Islam forbids any suicide, others condemning bombers for attacking civilians, and others, such as Saddam, supporting them without reservation. Saddam has made payments up to \$10,000 to families of Palestinian suicide bombers since the Israeli-Palestinian clashes began in September 2000.

In his comments on Monday, Saddam also urged Iran to follow Iraq in cutting off oil exports for 1 month to support the Palestinians and to return 140 Iraqi warplanes and civilian planes that escaped to Iran during the 1991 gulf war. Iran claims only 22 Iraqi planes. He urged the Arab governments not to yield to "U.S.-Zionist blackmail" in which Zionism and those from that area are using Hitler's deeds against Jews in addition to the September 11 order to subdue the world.

Those are the comments of one who obviously is unstable.

Saddam gets roughly \$25,000 from us, this Nation, for oil every 90 seconds that pass. That is one homicide bombing every 90 seconds. Think about it.

What are we going to do about it? We are talking about it, but we would like to ignore it because it is very unpleasant. He is rewarding the acts of murderers who are spreading terrorism. As I have indicated, our Secretary of Defense called it a "culture of political murder."

There are a lot of tensions in the Mideast. They are rising exponentially each day and each hour. Why some of my colleagues would be interested in continuing our reliance on oil from that part of the world is simply beyond me, especially at this time when we can make a commitment to reduce it.

I, for one, would find it very difficult to go back to my home State of Alaska and defend that position, especially if I had to look into the eyes of a mother or father such as the American depicted in this Rockwell work who, as we speak, had a son or daughter overseas fighting for America's freedoms.

I have stood on this floor and made the comparison time and time again

that as we import oil from Iraq, we are also enforcing an aerial blockade and the no-fly zone over Iraq. We have bombed them three times already this year. We take his oil, put it into our airplanes, and go bombing. That may be an oversimplification with which the State Department would argue.

But, by the same token, what does Saddam Hussein do with his money? He keeps his Republican Guard well fed, and they keep him alive. He develops weapons of mass destruction, and aims it at whom? We know he has a missile delivery system capable of going to Israel. We know he is developing biological weapons. We suspect he might be developing nuclear weapons.

When are we going to address that threat? That is a real responsibility for our President because, as we have seen with the tragedies associated with September 11, had we known, we would have taken action to prevent that. The same set of circumstances apply to Saddam Hussein. There have not been U.N. inspectors in Iraq for over 2 years. He is in violation of his agreement with the U.N. He is a threat to the world, and we are still depending on him.

Wake up, America. It is time.

In addition to the amendment being about national security, it is also about the economic security of this country. It is projected to create jobs—real jobs. We just came from a rally outside. We had organized labor in support of this issue. We have had the veterans saying they would much rather see us open ANWR than send American men and women to foreign soil to fight a war over oil. A former Senator in this body, Mark Hatfield, made that statement several times. He said: I will vote for opening ANWR any day rather than sending another American soldier overseas to fight a war over oil on foreign soil.

One of the interesting things about that particular study—jobs in the area of 250,000—was it was conducted by a Massachusetts firm, McGraw-Hill. The capability of that firm I will leave to those more qualified than I and who reside in the State of Massachusetts. Some have quibbled about the numbers, but it is a step in the right direction. Every single new job created is important, especially in these times, and especially for those who are in the unfortunate position of being unemployed. These aren't service jobs working at McDonald's; these are high-paying jobs associated with responsible development of our resources—jobs created throughout America, not just my State of Alaska.

One thing about the movement of oil, as I indicated, is that it goes from Alaska and down to the west coast of the United States where it is consumed. But it has to go in U.S. ships that are built in U.S. yards with U.S. crews and which carry the U.S. flag because the Jones Act mandates that the carriage of any goods between two American ports has to be in a U.S.-

flagged vessel. There are as many as 19 new double-hull tankers to be constructed. That means jobs in America's shipyards—big jobs, good-paying jobs. This is the largest contribution of tonnage to the American merchant marine.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, could I just ask a strictly procedural question of my colleague?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Please, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask my colleague—so we can try to get a sense of planning how we will proceed—what he would anticipate in terms of how long he thinks he may be presenting the amendment. Then we can get a sense of how we might go forward.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I will probably be talking for another 20 minutes or thereabouts. There is a second degree pending, and Senator STEVENS is anticipating recognition to talk about his second degree so I am guessing probably an hour.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska very much. And I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, let me again make reference to the creation of what this would do for America's merchant marine.

It would result in some 19 new double-hull tankers to be constructed in U.S. shipyards, primarily in the gulf and the State of California and, I would hope, in the State of Maine.

It is estimated that these tankers will pump about \$4 billion into the U.S. economy. That will create about 2,000 to 5,000 jobs in our shipyards. And this isn't going to require a Government subsidy. These are private funds that will build these ships to haul U.S. oil from my State of Alaska to Washington, Oregon, and California.

Somebody did a little calculation and figured that is equivalent to 90,000 job-years just for the construction of the tankers alone. Also, the equivalent in infrastructure to be used in ANWR will be constructed not in my State but in the other States of this Nation—not in the Arctic of Alaska. Therefore, Americans from all over the country will be put to work in this effort.

The other alternative is to simply send the dollars overseas, which affects the balance of payments and does not keep the jobs or the dollars here.

Some opponents note that oil will not be flowing the day after the ANWR amendment is passed. But what they forget is jobs certainly can be flowing the day after. Americans could go to work constructing everything that will be needed.

If you wonder about the numbers, listen to those who are in the business, the unions. They will benefit from new ANWR jobs, and they have been behind

this effort 110 percent. And why not? These are American jobs. These are American unions. They have already had almost 30 years of experience in the Arctic in Prudhoe Bay, and they know, firsthand, the kind of jobs ANWR will create and they know how to do it right. So let's put America to work.

The things we have to talk about, as well, are projections because we really do not know how much oil is in ANWR. There has only been one well ever drilled, and it has been on the Native land at Kaktovik shown up there at the top of the map I have in the Chamber. But there is one well. The results of that well have been kept confidential by the Native community, the State of Alaska, and the two companies, the joint venture.

But geologists, based on 2-D seismic, prior to 1980, had some access in the area. They have gone back and reviewed their analysis, and they have come to the conclusion that, indeed, this area could contain the largest amount of oil in North America.

Some are going to downplay the amount of oil in ANWR, but even numbers from the Clinton administration, the U.S. Geological Survey showed that the Arctic Coastal Plain clearly was North America's best bet for a major oilfield. The Clinton administration's U.S. Geological Survey estimated, in 1998, that there was a 5-percent chance of finding 16 billion barrels, a 50-percent chance of finding 10.3 billion barrels, and a 95-percent chance of finding 5.7 billion barrels.

I want to put this in context. Texas has proven reserves of 5.3 billion barrels. So the projections indicate that ANWR, indeed, has more oil than all of Texas. Is that significant to this body? Is that significant to Members other than those from the State of Texas?

Even if the most conservative effort of 5.7 billion barrels proves to be correct, it would still be the second largest oilfield ever discovered in the 100-year history of the U.S. oil industry, and it would be second only to what? Second only to Prudhoe Bay. If the 5-percent estimate proves right—16 billion barrels—ANWR would be the largest field ever found in North America. To anyone who knows anything about oil and gas in this country, these numbers are truly staggering.

Some Members have come to this Chamber and have argued that there is only a 6-month supply there. But I would hope all Members have enlightened themselves on that argument because it is so misleading it hardly bears a response. But for the benefit of those who might not have come to grips with it, a 6-month supply assumes that there would be no other source of oil, no other source imported, no production in this country of any kind other than ANWR—no imports, no domestic supply.

This is a bogus argument. We are going to produce oil. We are going to continue to import oil. So it would

only be a 6-month supply of oil if there was no other oil produced domestically and none imported. So that is a fallacious argument.

It is also important to look at how ANWR will impact our domestic production. Along these lines, it is fair to recognize the Energy Information Administration—which, by the way, provides impartial energy assessment—recently provided an analysis of ANWR's effect on domestic oil production.

This is what it said about the project: Assuming the USGS mean case for oil in ANWR, there would be an increase of domestic production by 13.9 percent.

That is the answer to those who say the increase is of no consequence—13.9 percent. They say: Assuming USGS's higher case for ANWR, that would be an increase of 25.4 percent of domestic production. An increase of domestic production by 25 percent is certainly significant.

Let's put some of the ANWR projections into perspective.

If ANWR yields the Clinton administration's medium estimate of 10.4 billion barrels of oil, ANWR would then provide—and I want to go to some States because it is important that States get some comprehension of how much that would provide—it would provide Massachusetts with 87 years of its oil needs. That is based on the 117 million barrels used in Massachusetts in 1999. It would provide Connecticut with 132 years of Connecticut's oil needs; for South Dakota, roughly 479 years, based on 21 million barrels it used in 1999.

How can Members from those States argue that ANWR is not projected to have a lot of oil, with those numbers? It is a lot of oil.

We have heard from Members who are a little disillusioned with the progress of the energy bill talk about CAFE. They say: The answer is CAFE. If we would just go to CAFE, we could save millions and millions of barrels of oil.

I think it is interesting to reflect a little bit about CAFE because if the proposal of increasing CAFE standards is the answer instead of opening ANWR, it reflects on a couple realities. The Senate has already rejected the argument, No. 1, and, more importantly, the consumers rejected that argument through their purchasing choices.

This is important to recognize. The top 10 most fuel-efficient vehicles account for less than 2 percent of all vehicle sales. Think about that. The public has a choice, and the top 10 most fuel-efficient vehicles account for less than 2 percent of all vehicle sales.

What do we want to do here? Do we want to direct the public on what kind of automobiles they have to buy? That is one answer. We could put a tax on heavier automobiles; that is another answer. But the proposal they have been pushing, known as the Kerry amendment, is simply not acceptable to the American people, as evidenced by the vote on the floor of the Senate.

It would force increases in fleet average fuel economy to 36 miles per gallon by the year 2016. It would cause massive losses of U.S. auto workers' jobs, roughly 200,000, as the debate pointed out. It would cost several tens of billions of dollars to the U.S. economy. It would put American lives at risk in smaller, lighter vehicles. The Senate took these concerns into consideration when it addressed CAFE several weeks ago and rejected the Kerry amendment. Instead, the Senate voted for the Levin-Bond approach, which resolved the issue in favor of letting the experts—not the Congress, the Senate—at NHTSA do their jobs.

Opening ANWR doesn't take away jobs or cost lives. Opening ANWR would create jobs for hard-working Americans. When we get into the argument of CAFE, be very careful and reflect on the debate that took place; it would be a convenient copout for the argument against reality. The world moves on oil. America moves on oil. As the Third World develops, there is going to be more and more requirements for oil, until such time as we obviously reduce our dependence by increasing production here at home.

The time to act is now, and for those who suggest that somehow we are rushing into ANWR, let me tell you, I have been in this body for almost 22 years. I have been with it all the time and so has Senator STEVENS and others. Amazingly, some of the biggest opponents of ANWR have indicated we are rushing into this issue and we are moving it through the system too fast.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Some of the same Senators have been involved in this debate for years, as I have said. You can go back to 1980, when Congress passed the Alaskan National Interest Conservation Act and included the section 1002 area, which is up on top in the green on the chart.

The 1002 area required that the Department of the Interior report to the Congress on the biological resources and the oil and gas potential on the Coastal Plain of ANWR—this green area. The Department of the Interior extensively researched the issue and, after 7 years, a final legislative environmental impact statement was submitted to Congress recommending that ANWR's Coastal Plain be opened. That was the Department of the Interior, after 7 years of research.

Now, when we talk about CAFE and about increasing the vehicle fuel efficiency standard, we want it to be done rationally, safe—not just picking a mileage standard out of the air.

We talked about the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration. We talked about the fact that Democrats and Republicans overwhelmingly rejected what was an arbitrary new standard because it would force American families to buy unsafe cars in the name of fuel efficiency. That was a conscious decision. The American people knew we could get higher CAFE, but they didn't want to

trade safety for it. As a consequence, I don't want Washington ordering American families to buy certain types of vehicles. We can talk about solar and wind, and that isn't going to help us in this argument and we know that.

Now, Congress has addressed ANWR. At other times, we have had legislation introduced. We have had hearings. In 1995, a conference report authorized the opening of ANWR and it was passed. So in 1995, Congress passed ANWR, but it was vetoed by the Clinton administration. If it had not been vetoed in 1995, we would have oil already flowing from ANWR, as I speak today.

Now, there is a projection of revenue from the sale of royalties and the royalty bids, and the lease bids alone will produce roughly \$1.5 billion in Federal funds. This is not with any appropriation or authorization. This is the private sector funding, if you will, this level of activity in bonus bids and royalties. Where does the money go? It goes into the Treasury basically because these are Federal lands. This amount does not include the billions of dollars that will be generated from royalties in the outyears because, again, we have been producing in Prudhoe Bay for 27 years, to be exact.

ANWR is the only provision in this bill that generates any revenue. I will repeat that. In this entire energy bill that we have labored over for some 5 weeks, ANWR is the only provision that generates revenue of any consequence, and this is from the private sector, not appropriations. Many other provisions in this bill do the exact opposite. They simply authorize new programs that would require further Government spending.

Now, there used to be a policy around here—and Senator STEVENS is well aware of it; he has been here longer than I—that was evident when I came here in 1981. Senator Scoop Jackson was certainly one who fostered it. It was kind of the general feeling that if the two Senators from the State supported an issue, the consensus was they probably knew what was best for their State and what was best in representing the people of that State. So don't forget, there is a States right issue here. Don't forget what Alaska's attitude in this is. The entire congressional delegation supports it, including the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and the Alaska State Legislature. Most importantly of all, the Eskimo people, the residents, of the Coastal Plain and nearly 75 percent of Alaskans support it.

There is a photo of some of the Eskimo kids who are looking to the future. They want running water. They want to have an educational opportunity, a job opportunity. It is important to remember this because on many occasions other Senators have made passionate arguments regarding activities in their States.

Although we talk about agricultural supports, and various other issues, I am reminded of the Senator from Flor-

ida and his attitude regarding lease sale 181 last summer, representing the wishes of the people of Florida. As a result of the Florida delegation's advocacy, the lease sale boundaries were scaled back by the administration.

Senator STEVENS and I are doing the same thing. We are representing the wishes of our State. It is unfair for people from other parts of the Nation to obstruct the will of our citizens. Florida has said "not in my backyard" and that is fine. They have a right to do that, and I respect that. But there is a bit of a reciprocity here. Alaskans are willing to have environmentally sound exploration take place in their backyard, so why not let them?

We have a chart that shows development, if you will, on the east coast and the west coast and, hopefully, we have it—yes. I think it represents "not in my backyard." If you look at that chart, you can see the blue area off the east coast of the United States. That is roughly 31 trillion cubic feet of gas. The only problem is, there is no authorization or authority for exploration. That is from Maine to Florida. That is off limits. They don't want it in their backyard. If you go down to the gulf, there is a good portion of it.

On the west coast—Washington, Oregon, and California—no way; no lease sales offshore.

If you go into the overthrust belt, in Wyoming, Montana, and Colorado, there is a significant potential for oil production. It has been withdrawn by the previous administration as a consequence of the roadless area language.

If it is not in my backyard, where is it? One spot, obviously, is Alaska, and I think we have made the case that clearly the State of Alaska supports this.

We have had debates in this Chamber. I remember when the Senator from California announced her displeasure with the current administration's decision to appeal a case impacting 36 drilling leases off the California shore. She stated that there is a disregard for States to make decisions about their own environment.

The Senator from California proposes that leases be withdrawn from California's coast and swapped to Louisiana's coast. She actually said:

We are going to swap it so that the oil companies can drill where people want them to drill.

In other words, the industry can drill where there is support for it. Unfortunately, that does not seem to apply to Alaska.

It is the old saying: Not in my backyard. The people of Florida and California should remember that if oil is not found in other parts of the country, there may come a time when we are forced to explore closer to their shores. In fact, the Senator from Massachusetts has suggested we focus on more drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. He has even called for four times more drilling in the gulf.

Drilling in the Gulf of Mexico is fine, but I do not understand why Members

should think it is any better for the wildlife than development in ANWR. It should be noted there are many more species in the Gulf of Mexico than there are in ANWR.

Speaking of other Senators, let's look at the New England States. New England enjoys the benefit of getting their natural gas from big offshore platforms off Nova Scotia. When it comes to America getting oil from its own land in ANWR, some of the Senators from the east coast are trying to lead the challenge for the opposition. Although the drilling for natural gas may be offshore, off the coast of Nova Scotia, it requires onshore gas processing facilities on Canadian land. Remember, whatever happens to Canada's environment is closely linked with our own. If they really thought drilling for energy was so bad for the environment, they would have sponsored a bill barring the Canadian gas from entering the United States. But, obviously, charity begins at home.

If there is concern about the effects on the environment, I would think some of the Senators would have concerns with the effects of offshore drilling on New England's fisheries, but that is never brought up. When it comes to Alaska, they are standing in the way of something that at least 75 percent of Alaskans support.

Looking at other activities, in the State of Massachusetts, the "big dig" has been dragging on for years. Some environmentalists are not pleased with it, but the "big dig" has not been interrupted. Instead, it has produced thousands and thousands of jobs in Massachusetts, and that is good for Massachusetts, and the Massachusetts Senators should take credit for it. But why can't citizens of Alaska be permitted the same rights?

Finally, let's not forget the only people who are located within the boundaries of ANWR are our Native people. In fact, they reside on their own land.

I am going to put up the picture of Kaktovik again because I think it is representative of reality. Many people choose to overlook reality and think there is no footprint, there is nobody there. That is not the case. They are the Inupiat, a proud people, and they live in the Kaktovik by choice. They have lived there for thousands of years and support opening ANWR.

They graciously invited some of the most outspoken opponents of ANWR to Kaktovik so they could see firsthand their way of life. Unfortunately, the Inupiat did not get the courtesy of a reply because of the intervention of the Sierra Club and some environmental groups who used their influence, if you will—and I am being gracious—to not allow the people associated with some of the villages that occupy the Gwich'in nation even to go up and look at the prosperity associated with the Eskimos in the Barrow and Wainwright area.

A number of invitations have been extended to Members of the Senate



from the Inupiat Eskimos. It is too bad Senators have not taken them up on their offer because the Inupiat have a very interesting and compelling story to tell. They are for self-determination. They want the right to improve their lifestyle and that of their children, and this amendment supports that right of self-determination and their right to develop and live on their land as they please.

They have some 92,000 acres that have been held hostage by the Federal Government long enough. The opponents often gloss over the fact that the Inupiat Eskimos hold title to the land in the Coastal Plain. They do not pay any attention to it. They assume those people up there will just have to somehow work out their lives, but only Congress can give them the authority to have access.

Without congressional approval to open the Coastal Plain, they are unable to develop their privately owned land. There are the 95,000 acres consisting of the village of Kaktovik and the one well that was drilled in that area. Responsible development will allow the Inupiat Eskimos to provide for themselves, heat their homes, provide education, and live in sanitary conditions.

Again, the plumbing in the Arctic is not sanitary. It is not pleasant. There are honey buckets. They want a better lifestyle. They believe responsible development in the area is their fundamental human right to economic self-determination.

This amendment would still allow the Inupiat Eskimos to enforce regulatory powers to make sure the wildlife and traditional environmental values are respected and protected. After all, who is more concerned about the caribou than the Native people who reside there and live off them?

Let me show another picture about the caribou. It reflects the reality. My colleagues have seen it before, but these are not stuffed caribou, these are real caribou, and they are roaming the fields of Prudhoe Bay. Nobody is running them down with a snow machine. Nobody is shooting at them. They are protected, and they wander, and they increase.

When we hear debate about the Porcupine herd—this is the western Arctic herd right in the heart of the oil fields. When we started 27 years ago, there were 3,000 or 4,000 animals. Today there are 26,000 animals. We do not want to confuse the Inupiat Eskimo or the Gwich'ins who live hundreds of miles away from the Coastal Plain, but we have charts that show a little activity on the Canadian side because, as my colleagues know, Alaska does share a border with Canada, and the Gwich'ins are on both sides of Alaska and Canada.

It is known that while the Inupiat Eskimos living on the Coastal Plain support opening ANWR, clearly the environmental groups have had to search far and wide for someone to foster their cause, and roughly 150 miles south of

Kaktovik beyond the Brooks Range outside the ANWR boundary, they have found significant support, an Arctic village and other villages, the basic traditional home of the Gwich'ins.

I admire and respect the Gwich'ins for their wishes, but I hate to see environmentalists trotting this indigenous group around saying opening ANWR will hurt their caribou. There is no evidence to suggest that.

The greatest harm to the caribou—this is rather significant because while it may seem confusing, everything on the right of the line straight up and down is Canada and everything on the left is Alaska. One can see the purple. This is the Porcupine caribou herd as they move around during migration. They are on the edge of the 1002 area for a short time during the short summer, but in their migration they do go through Canada. They cross the Dempster Highway.

At the Dempster Highway during their migration, there is a significant number of caribou that are taken for subsistence, sport, and for, obviously, those who need them, the point being, the Gwich'ins have under previous discussions entered into leases for their own land.

This is a copy of the actual lease, Native Village of Venetie. They indicated a willingness in March of 1994 to lease their land. For anyone who questions the details, I am happy to provide a copy of the lease. I am simply saying they have a right to choose what they want to do, but at that particular time they were willing to lease their land. Unfortunately, there was not much interest in it because the prospects for oil discovery were not in the area.

So I think what we should recognize is the central Arctic caribou herd is a herd with which we have had experience. They have increased from 6,000 to 26,000, increasing by more than four times. As the environmentalists have addressed this argument, why, it is pretty weak to suggest we cannot manage this herd for the benefit of the indigenous people. I think it is fair to say, as we look at development, there is no evident harm to these lands or the potential of anything of any consequence affecting the lifestyle of those people.

As we have tried to address the concerns of the Gwich'ins, the difficulty has been encouraging them to simply visit the Eskimos of the Arctic to reflect on what development has meant to their standard of living. What we have in this amendment are protections. We have recommendations that require all the lands be returned to their natural state, and we also have the recognition that, while the Gwich'ins have been opposing activity on the Alaska side, they have been very aggressively pursuing it on the Canadian side. The Gwich'ins in Canada have formed development corporations, as they should. They have an oil-field service company, which they have every right to do.

So this debate should not revolve simply around the Gwich'ins, recognizing that many of them do not live near the Coastal Plain. Instead, we should remember the Inupiat Eskimos who own land right in the Coastal Plain. So there is a difference, and I encourage Members to reflect on it.

Finally, the Inupiat argument is compelling. It is an important one. My friend Jacob Adams, who is an Inupiat, is president of the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, one of the Fortune 500 companies, a very successful corporation in my State, and I quote his statement:

I love my life in the Arctic. But, it is harsh, expensive and, for many, short. My people want decent homes, electricity, and education. We do not want to be undisturbed. Undisturbed means abandoned. It means sod huts and deprivation.

He also said:

By locking up ANWR, the Inupiat people are asked to become museum pieces, not a dynamic and living culture. We are asked to suffer the burdens of locking up our lands forever as if we were in a zoo or on display for the rich tourists that can afford to travel to our remote part of Alaska. This is not acceptable.

I agree, it is not acceptable. I recognize this entire debate is complex and sometimes puts Members in uncomfortable positions, but I also realize this energy debate, especially in regard to ANWR, has been used as a soapbox for some of the most extreme and crafty environmental groups in our country, groups that have treasure chests to support their agenda.

While the issues are complex and the debate has at times become heated, the big picture can still be framed very simply. Is it not better to have a strong domestic energy policy that safeguards our environment and our national security rather than to rely on the likes of Saddam Hussein to supply our energy? The answer is clearly yes.

I, unfortunately, realize that some in this Chamber have found that ANWR has become a political issue. It is another piece of the political puzzle. They could not be more wrong. I have been around long enough to know that lots of people do things for their own reason, but when their actions sell short the American family, the American service man or woman, the American laborer, America's future and America's security, we must not let their efforts succeed.

Do not sell short America's national security. We cannot keep relying on increasing imports from foreign nations such as Iraq, which has publicly said they will use oil as a weapon. How many times do they have to say that before we believe them? Please do not sell America short in order to support the extreme environmentalists' latest popular cause, because we know once we authorize the opening of ANWR these groups are going to move on to another cause. They are not created for one specific cause.

By the way, do not worry about those environmental groups. They are still going to be around, as I indicated. They will find another cause, as I stated. Remember, energy is not about politics and an agenda. It is about families across the Nation wondering if their jobs will be there when they get up in the morning. It is about looking for our Nation's independence.

I believe in a country that is dependent on no one but God alone. We have every right to look out for our Nation's independence.

Our President, President George W. Bush, has asked time and time again for the Senate to follow the example of the House of Representatives and pass an energy bill. The House has done so. H.R. 4 has ANWR in it.

On numerous occasions, the President has expressed specifically his strong support for opening ANWR. He knows it means more jobs for America. It means security for our Nation, which is especially important at this time. He knows as long as we are dependent on other nations for our energy our very security is threatened and our future is at stake.

So the task of this body is clearly to deliver to the President an energy bill that reduces our reliance on foreign oil while at the same time creates thousands of new American jobs. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize the weight of the task we are starting on. Agendas need to be pushed aside and Members have to muster the courage to do the right thing, even on difficult issues such as ANWR. We need to do what is right for American workers, what is right for our national security, what is right for the Inupiat Eskimos who live in the Coastal Plain, and what is right for America's future.

There has been talk this amendment will put the environment in the hands of big oil. Let me say something about big oil. Big oil is a citizen of my State—Exxon, BP, a number of companies. In reality, those companies are doing business in Alaska because they can make a return on investment. They qualify as good citizens. They have the capability to get oil all over the world and bring it to the United States. Some have said: Where is big oil on the issue of ANWR? There is Phillips Petroleum, other companies. We have not really seen much of them. There is a good reason for that. They are international oil companies. They will come to Alaska if it is open, but if it is not open they will go wherever, and they will import the oil into the United States. That development will not have the oversight that Alaskan oil development will.

Make no mistake about it, Prudhoe Bay is the best oilfield in the world. One of the things I find very frustrating is Members do not seem to care where oil comes from, as long as they get it. But if we can develop it at home, with our environmental laws, both Federal Government and State, is that not in the best interest of Alaska?

So we should make sure we recognize big oil for what it is.

The talk that this amendment will put the environment in the hands of big oil is unrealistic. In reality, the environment will be directly in the hands of the American worker who will be working up there, and he and she knows how to do it.

If Members oppose the lease amendment, they are really saying to the American worker: I don't trust you. Instead, send the right signal and do the right thing. Vote for the American worker and show them we trust them to be good stewards at work, that we trust them to take pride in their jobs, and we trust them to help America keep strong and safe.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. REID. I ask the Senator from Alaska to yield.

Mr. STEVENS. I am happy to do that.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the majority leader has asked me to announce there will be no rollcall votes tonight. It is my understanding the Senator from Alaska will speak for a considerable period of time this evening, is that not correct, I ask Senator STEVENS?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes. I don't know how long.

Mr. REID. We have had a number of inquiries. I think it would be appropriate we announce there will be no rollcall votes. The majority leader authorized me to do that.

Has the Senator from New Mexico entered the unanimous consent request?

Mr. BINGAMAN. I am informed the Senator from Alaska objects to any unanimous consent agreement and, therefore, he would go ahead and speak today. Tomorrow I will seek recognition when we get back on the bill.

Mr. REID. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have just had a marvelous experience across from the Capitol grounds. We had a press conference attended by the leaders of organized labor, many Senators, a great many members from organized labor, and members of the Alaska Native community. We ought to take time to see whether that settles in with the American public. Three of the greatest labor leaders in the country were there and another representing the fourth. They say they want this project to go forward. They want this area to be drilled.

The concept of extended debate is to give a chance for the public to listen to debate on an issue and to determine whether they should contact their Senators about the issue. I hope that can happen. I hope it is still possible to have the country listen to the leaders of organized labor, listen to the leaders of the State of Alaska and consider whether or not it is safe to drill in the area set aside 21 years ago for just that purpose—to drill in the 1.5 million acres on the Arctic Coastal Plain.

I have been through this before. I asked myself today: Why are we here?

Why are we doing this now? The normal process for handling this legislation, which has been passed by the House of Representatives, would be to go to the committee, come to the Senate, be assigned to a committee, be considered by that committee, and report it back to the floor. This bill does not do that. It went to the committee. The committee voted to include the drilling of the Arctic Coastal Plain, ANWR, and the leadership said: No, you cannot report that bill to the floor. Instead, we will draft our own bill.

The majority of the committee that has jurisdiction over this bill voted to report it in the manner we would like to see it approved. We don't get that chance. It comes on the floor, it is a different bill, drafted by the leadership of the majority side of the Senate. We are told: Take it or leave it. Get 60 votes for your amendment or forget about it—as though we are filibustering. They are filibustering our amendment, but we have to have the 60 votes in order to stop them from filibustering our amendment.

This is a point of frustration for someone who has lived through this continuum dealing with Alaskan lands. I talked about it before and I will talk about it ad nauseam until we get the point across that the State of Alaska made a commitment to the Federal Government in 1980 that we would accept the bill that had been outlined by the leaders of the Democratic Party in the Senate, Mr. Jackson in particular, God rest his soul, but he was a great friend. He opposed us in many ways. We reached a consensus on the issue of this Arctic Coastal Plain.

So everyone understands, we are talking about 1.5 million acres on the Arctic Coastal Plain that was set aside in 1980 for the purpose of oil and gas exploration. Anyone who comes to the floor and says this is wilderness is a liar—a liar. Anyone who tries to pretend that somehow or another we are violating the law is a liar. If it was back in the old days, I would challenge them to a duel. I am up to my ears in what I have been hearing about this that is absolutely untrue.

The ANWR area was set aside by the Jackson-Tsongas amendment for the purpose of allowing exploration. It does not become a working part of the Arctic Wildlife Refuge until that is complete. The difficulty is, people say it is wilderness. This area, the ANWR Coastal Plain, is not wilderness. The area of the Arctic Wildlife Range south of that, in the light brown, is 8 million acres of wilderness. But that 1.5 million acres is not wilderness.

Reading the Wilderness Society publication one would think we are invading the most pristine place on Earth. It is hell in the wintertime—60 below. I took the Postmaster General there and the digital thermometer said minus 99 because of the windchill factor. This is not some pristine place that should be protected. It should be protected at a time when it needs protection, which is



the summer. And we do that. We do not drill for oil and gas in the summertime.

Why are we here? We are here because some people on that side of the aisle, the majority side of the Senate, have decided they will block this. They do not honor the commitment made by the United States and the President of the United States when the 1980 act was signed. That was a commitment to our people in Alaska.

In 1980, these areas that are marked and checked were withdrawn by the act of Congress called the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. All of that was withdrawn in 1978.

My colleague, Senator Gravel, blocked a bill to do this because they could not build up there. In 1980, he still objected, but I reached an agreement with Senator Tsongas and Senator Jackson that I would help get this bill done in exchange for an absolute commitment in the law that that area would remain open to oil and gas acres, the 1.5 million acres, and the bill was signed by the President of the United States.

Now they are saying that is a pristine area; you cannot do it. And the Democratic Party has put this in their platform, "Don't drill in Alaska's Arctic," as though the Democratic Party owns Alaska. Someone asked: Who owns Alaska? The public owns Alaska. The public owned all those places, too, but they were set aside for the elite few.

There are no roads there, no airport in there, no way to get there except through guided tours, twin-engine planes with guides and millionaires visiting those areas of Alaska. Eighty percent of the parklands in the United States are there. There are only three parks you can get to by road.

What we are talking about is coddling to the radical environmentalists of this country. We have half the coal of the United States in Alaska. Did you know that? One time when Ed Muskie was running for President, he decided he needed some environmental votes and he came up with an amendment that said: If you mine for coal in the State of Alaska, you must restore the natural contour after you are through.

In Alaska, coal comes with ice lenses, permafrost. When you put the steam points down to melt it, the water runs off. Take the coal off and there is no way in God's Earth you can restore the natural contour. Since Ed Muskie's amendment, not one new coal mine has been opened—30 years, with half the coal in the United States. No, no, we cannot do that.

When I first went to Alaska, I worked on the Rampart Dam on the Yukon River. It would have been the largest power project in the United States. It would have provided my whole State with electrical power. It was economically feasible. There is no question about it. The environmentalists said, "No, you cannot build that dam," and they blocked it. It is gone.

We had, when I came to the Senate, the great forests of Alaska. Forests

here, here, and here: The largest forests in the United States. We were cutting 1.3 billion board feet of timber a year on a cutting cycle of 103 years. We would not cut the same place twice in 103 years.

As part of ANILCA, that was lowered to 450 million board feet a year. Last year, we cut 47 million. Why? The environmentalists have decided that timber in Alaska should not be cut. Notwithstanding the sustained use/yield concept that was in place, they just blocked it.

When we passed this bill in 1980, we had six world class mines—six. They are all closed now but one. Why? Environmental litigation. You cannot mine in Alaska now. We have 32 of the 37 strategic and critical minerals and metals of the United States. None of them are being mined except one mine up in the Kotzebue area, the Red Dog Mine, the zinc mine, the largest in the world. Why are they closed? Environmental litigation from radical conservationists, environmentalists.

We get down to the question of oil and gas. When we argued this bill in the period of the 1970s and 1980s, there were 50-odd wildcat operators in Alaska drilling for oil and gas. There is not one today. Not one. Do you know why? The last administration closed it all down. There are no permits to go out and explore for oil and gas on Federal lands, outside of the great Prudhoe Bay—which is State land. It is not Federal land at all, it is State land.

The continuum of what we have been through as a State makes a lot of us wonder if we were right to seek statehood. Were we right? Many of our people wanted to be a commonwealth. Canada was then a commonwealth to the British empire. Some of our people wanted to be a commonwealth in the U.S. system. We said no, we want to be a State. We are Americans. We believe in America. The highest level of enlistment in the U.S. military in World War II was from Alaska, the highest level of veterans per capita today in the United States is in Alaska, from all periods of wars in this past century.

The question is, Why are we here? We are here because an elite few have decided that Alaska should be their playground. The working people today woke up. That meeting outside, across from the Capitol, is a bell tolling for the Democratic Party, and it better listen. It better listen because the working people want jobs. This is a jobs bill.

We will provide jobs. Instead of sending our money over to buy Saddam Hussein's oil, we will produce it on our own shores. We will produce it from Alaska. There are 15 sedimentary basins in Alaska. We have drilled three of them. This will be the fourth. No one knows whether it has oil or gas. We believe it does. We have still a lot left to drill in Alaska, provided some future generation removes some of those lines. Those lines were drawn to prevent development.

We are at the crossroads now with this bill, of whether or not we listen to

the President of the United States and, because of the interests of national security and economic security we proceed as was promised in the 1980s to develop this land.

You cannot really understand the 1980 act unless you go back in history. When you go back in history, you go back to the Statehood Act. I was in the Interior Department at the time of statehood. Part of that Statehood Act was section 4. It was a commitment to the Alaskan Native people that once Alaska became a State, Congress would address the question of the claims of the Native people against the United States—not against the State but against the United States, their claims as aboriginal people.

We did that. As a matter of fact, I helped prepare some of that when I was still with the Eisenhower administration. After that came to an end, I went back to Alaska, worked on many things, came back here in 1968, and one of the first things we started working on when I became a Senator was the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act. That became law in 1971. It was the only time in history that Congress has settled claims against the United States of aboriginal people—of our continent. It was necessary because of the very diverse number of tribes in Alaska and the size of Alaska.

I forgot to mention it earlier today, but let me mention it now: Alaska is 20 percent of the land that the American flag flies over. The State of Alaska is one-fifth of all the land of the United States.

On that land were a series of tribes that had claims against the United States. We worked for 3 years and finally, in December of 1971, passed the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act. One of the conditions of that act was section 17(d)(2). That condition said: Before the Native people of the State of Alaska take their lands—Alaska was guaranteed some lands as it became a State; the Native people received some lands in settlement of their claims against the United States—there must be a study of what land should be set aside in the national interest, in Alaska. That was 1971.

For 9 years we argued over that, 9 full years. It became a slogan in Alaska, the (d)(2), 17(d)(2). We called it the "(d)(2)" issue; (d)(2) meant how much of the State was going to be set aside, and the State was prevented from taking it so it could be used to support the economy of the State. How much of it is going to be set aside to prevent the Alaskan Native people from getting the claims they really claim because it is set aside by these people who sought these withdrawals? In fact, the (d)(2) issue is what built the empire of the radical environmentalists in America.

For 9 years they raised money, advertised, went throughout the country, if not the world, to raise money to "save Alaska." Save it from what? There was not any development proposed in any of those areas. There are no roads in

there. There are fewer roads in Alaska than there are in King County, WA.

Those are diverse people, living in five different sectors of the largest State in the Union. But, no, it was an issue to withdraw them to prevent the State from getting them—prevent the Natives from getting them; because if we got them, we might develop them. The one area that was not set aside was that area; the 1.5 million acres was set aside for us to use to keep the pipeline filled.

In the time of the Persian Gulf war, I went to the oil industry and I said: You have to increase the throughput of the pipeline. It was designed for 1 million barrels per day. It was running at about 1.9 million barrels a day. They looked into it and reported back they could do it. They increased it to 2.1 million barrels per day in the interests of national defense because we were shut off from a lot of access to oil at that time of the Persian Gulf war.

Today, it is 950,000 barrels a day. We do not have enough reserves to keep the oil pipeline, the 48-inch in diameter, half-inch-thick pipeline, 800 miles from the North Slope to Valdez—we do not have enough oil to keep it filled now. Where do we get the oil in between time? My colleagues say we are getting the oil from Saddam Hussein. The only oil increase we have gotten since our throughput went down is the increase in imports from Saddam Hussein.

We do not buy it directly from him; we buy it from the Food For Oil Program, and he gets the money from that. So we are not really giving him American dollars; we are going through some other exchange. We are washing the money going into Iraq because we don't want people to think we are dealing with Iraq, but it is Iraqi oil and we all know it.

What does he do with it? He is rebuilding his military. Senator INOUE and I have just gone around the world, really—went into Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Pakistan, and we talked to people over there about what is going on over there. We went to China, Singapore, Indonesia, the Philippines—looking at what is happening with terrorism in the world. Who is supporting them? Who do you think? Saddam Hussein is supporting them. It is known he is supporting them.

Where is he getting the money? From everybody who buys oil in those States that Senator MURKOWSKI showed, where the oil is going.

We paid Saddam Hussein \$6.5 billion in 2001—\$6.5 billion went to Saddam Hussein for his oil. The only way we can replace that is to produce our own.

We are some sort of people who listen to these obstructionists who tell us to not keep the commitment Congress made to Alaska in 1980: Forget about that. We don't need that oil.

Let me tell you that we need a lot more than that oil.

There was an interesting article in U.S. News & World Report on April 1 of

this year. It was called "A waste of energy?"

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### A WASTE OF ENERGY?

(By Gloria Borger)

Pity the poor caribou. There they are, minding their own business, roaming silently in the snow and soft tundra of the desolate Arctic landscape. Then, suddenly, they're everywhere: migrating through green Web sites worldwide, their survival the subject of urgent concern. If Big Oil starts drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, envoirs say, the lovely reindeer are at risk. Antlers, unite!

Enough already. The caribou are fine. In fact, since exploration started around Alaska's Prudhoe Bay in 1968, the local herd has thrived. And in case you're interested, the polar bears roaming ANWR are doing nicely, too. But don't get confused: This fight over 2,000 Arctic acres is not about wildlife. It's not even about oil. It's about political theology—and a small piece of land that has become a huge symbol and great fodder for fundraising. "We need a poster on the wall, and here it is," says Bruce Babbitt, ex-Clinton interior secretary, who opposes drilling in ANWR yet keeps a certain perspective on it. "Why do we spend so much time quarreling over this tiny sliver that has no real implication for energy independence?"

Good question. Here we are, in a war likely to expand throughout the world's oil-producing region, and we're importing 57 percent of our oil—including 790,000 barrels a day indirectly from our buddy, Saddam Hussein. Has this focused the nation on a serious plan for both conservation and production? Hardly. Competing energy plans are stuck in Congress, which is oddly bent on choosing either conservation or production—and could get nothing as a result. "Energy policy doesn't have to involve either-or choices," says Tony Knowles, Alaska's pro-development Democratic governor. Then again, he hasn't spent much time in Congress lately.

To wit: The Senate disgraced itself recently when it killed a gradual increase in gasoline mileage standards for cars that could save as many as 1 million barrels a day. Soon it will most likely kill any drilling in ANWR, which might have provided a small start in the right direction. "We shouldn't let this debate paralyze a real debate over energy policy," says John Holdren, an environmental policy guru at Harvard, who opposes ANWR drilling. But it has. "People have given up on the really big issues" like clean-air policy and climate control, he adds.

That's because ANWR is too easy to spin. Consider the numbers: Drilling proponents say that ANWR will produce a tremendous amount of oil; opponents counter that it's a mirage, less than a six-month supply. The truth is that no one really knows. Kenneth Bird, leader of a U.S. Geological Survey project that studied the potential for oil in the refuge, says the range of "technically recoverable" oil is somewhere between a relatively modest 4.3 billion and 11.8 billion barrels. Different groups use different numbers. "One could spend the entire day writing letters to the editor," Bird sighs. What's more, his estimates were done in 1985. "We might be able to see more with modern seismic equipment," he says. But is anybody proposing a new federal study? Of course not.

Then there's the Big Oil argument. To hear the opponents tell the story, oil companies are salivating at the prospect of drilling in

ANWR. They're not—at least not now, because oil prices aren't high enough and they're not clamoring to spend the next decade in litigation. In fact, says Babbitt, "oil companies might not bother with it." So why is the administration pushing it? Because oil prices are bound to go up—and Republicans like oil production, which has become a popular national security issue.

And what about the environment? Sure, there's bound to be some impact. Technology has advanced, but drilling is never going to be a perfectly clean business. Purists say that's enough to bag the effort, even though no one is predicting ecological disaster. "I asked an environmentalist whether he would oppose the drilling if it were on just 1 acre, and he said he would," says a pro-drilling Democrat, Sen. John Breaux of Louisiana. "How can you fight that ideology?"

You can't. There's too much at stake here politically for either side to give. And so the nation continues to feed its oil addiction without increasing homegrown production. Meantime, real energy policy languishes while the symbols thrive. And the poor caribou start looking more like Chicken Littles every day.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will read portions of it. It says: "A waste of energy?"

Pity the poor caribou. There they are, minding their own business, roaming silently in the snow and soft tundra of the desolate Arctic landscape. Then, suddenly, they're everywhere: migrating through green Web sites worldwide, their survival the subject of urgent concern. If Big Oil starts drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, environs say, the lovely reindeer are at risk. Antlers, unite!

Enough already. The caribou are fine. In fact, since exploration started around Alaska's Prudhoe Bay in 1968, the local herd has thrived. And in case you're interested, the polar bears roaming ANWR are doing nicely, too. But don't get confused: This fight over 2,000 Arctic acres is not about wildlife. It's not even about oil. It's about political theology—and a small piece of land that has become a huge symbol and great fodder for fundraising. "We need a poster on the wall, and here it is," says Bruce Babbitt, ex-Clinton interior secretary, who opposes drilling in ANWR yet keeps a certain perspective on it. "Why do we spend so much time quarreling over this tiny sliver that has no real implications for energy independence?"

Good question. Here we are, in a war likely to expand throughout the world's oil-producing region, and we're importing 57 percent of our oil—including 790,000 barrels a day indirectly from our buddy, Saddam Hussein.

Remember that this is U.S. News & World Report, not Senator STEVENS.

Has this focused the nation on a serious plan for both conservation and production? Hardly. Competing energy plans are stuck in Congress, which is oddly bent on choosing either conservation or production—and could get nothing as a result. "Energy policy doesn't have to involve either-or choices," says Tony Knowles, Alaska's pro-development Democratic governor. Then again, he hasn't spent much time in Congress lately.

To wit: The Senate disgraced itself recently when it killed a gradual increase in gasoline mileage standards for cars that could save as many as 1 million barrels a day. Soon it will most likely kill any drilling in ANWR, which might have provided a small start in the right direction. "We shouldn't let this debate paralyze a real debate over energy policy," says John Holdren, an environmental policy guru at Harvard,

who opposes ANWR drilling. But it has. "People have given up on the really big issues" like clean-air policy and climate control, he adds.

That's because ANWR is too easy to spin. Consider the numbers: Drilling proponents say that ANWR will produce a tremendous amount of oil; opponents counter that it's a mirage, less than a six-month supply.

If there was ever a lie, that is a lie. The trust is that no one really knows. Kenneth Bird, leader of a U.S. Geological Survey project that studied the potential for oil in the refuge, says the range of "technically recoverable" oil is somewhere between a relatively modest 4.3 billion and 11.8 billion barrels.

It goes on. I wanted to get to that because I want to get back to Prudhoe Bay.

Prudhoe Bay's estimate was 1 billion barrels. When they looked at that, we had the fight over whether or not Prudhoe Bay should be opened and whether the oil could be transported through the Alaska oil pipeline. The estimate was approximately 1 billion barrels of recoverable oil. We have produced now over 13 billion barrels. If this estimate is similar to the other conservative estimates in terms of oil and gas, this is more oil than is dreamed of.

Why can't we drill it? Why can't people here understand that the commitments that were made ought to be kept by the Congress? It is a commitment in the law—not just a promise. It was a hard-fought battle for 9 years, as I said.

I remember that night when Senator Gravel blocked the 1978 act. It was really a bill that we passed out of conference. But the House had already passed it. We were ready to adjourn. The Senator from Alaska asked that the bill be read after the adjournment resolution could be agreed to. He couldn't read that bill in the time left for that Congress, and it died. It died.

I went home with a group of people called the Citizens for Management of Alaska Lands, and we decided we would start raising money for the next Congress. We chartered a plane to go from Juneau to Anchorage, and it crashed. I was on it with my wife Ann and five people. Only one other person—our former Ambassador, Tony Motley—and I survived. We picked ourselves up from that disaster, went back and reorganized. We started working again in 1979 and 1980 and committed ourselves to try to get the issue settled.

Do you know why? We couldn't select our Alaska State land. There was what we call a freeze on it. The Interior Department refused to process the State's request for the lands it was entitled to under the Statehood Act until this issue was settled. The Natives couldn't get their hands on it until this issue was settled. We had to agree to the 1980 act. We had no alternative. We are a land-poor society. We are a resource-based State. So we entered into the agreement. We said: All right. There were a few little tweaks and things made here.

There are some interesting things. The occupant of the chair might be interested in this.

We call this the foot of the gate of the Arctic. That withdrawal was not there in 1978. It was put there to block this road from going over to that mining district. They did not want to withdraw that area, so they just blocked the access.

There is a similar block of access here—the road into Seward. There is a similar block of access here, and a block of access in here, and a total block of access in the southeast—no roads.

That is what that 1980 act meant. There will never be, as long as those withdrawals persist, roads to connect the State of Alaska from point to point. We depend on airports and on water courses. We have only one road system that goes from Anchorage into Fairbanks and down the Alaska Highway to Canada.

I hope people listen to these things. I am not sure they do.

I will tell you a little aside. When I lost the leadership election in 1984, my friend from Kansas Bob Dole became leader. He asked me if I would help bring television to the Senate. It was then opposed by my friend Russ Long and a couple of other Senators. I conferred with them. We and the distinguished current President pro tempore decided we would allow it. We worked out bringing television to the Senate.

I do not know whether that is educational or not. We are going to have a chance this week to find that out. At least for me, this is the first time I have used the concept of the public coverage by television of the proceedings on the floor of the Senate to try to interest people from other States in an issue that affects my State so vitally. That is why I mentioned the labor leaders' meeting in the front of the Capitol today and the invitation I received this morning to speak to the building trades convention of the AFL-CIO, which I was pleased to do.

It is because people are thinking about jobs.

When I started thinking about this bill—let me go back to this. It is a good idea to go through this again. I want to make sure people understand what we are talking about. We are talking about section 1002 of the Jackson-Tsongas amendment of December 1980, signed by President Carter after he lost the election in 1980. This is the provision drafted by the two Democratic leaders at the time on this legislation. It said:

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.

That is not an inconsistent position by Senator Jackson.

Where is a copy of that letter?

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent a copy of this letter be placed on every Senator's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. This is dated July 3, 1980, signed by Henry M. Jackson, chairman, and Mark Hatfield, ranking minority member, of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. It says:

In this year of sharply heightened national concern over the economy, energy and national defense, the Senate is about to consider Alaska lands legislation—an issue which would have a profound effect on each of these vital subjects.

We write to ask for your full support of the Alaska lands bill approved by the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. After extensive hearings, study and mark-up, the Committee approved this bill by an overwhelming and bi-partisan vote of 17-1.

The Committee bill is a balanced, carefully crafted measure which is both a landmark environmental achievement and a means of protecting the national interest in the future development of Alaska and its vital resources. The bill more than doubles the land area designated by Congress as part of the National Park and National Wildlife Refuge systems; it triples the size of the National Wilderness Preservation system. It protects the so-called Crown Jewels of Alaska. At the same time, it preserves the capability of that mammoth state to contribute far beyond its share to our national energy and defense needs.

A series of five major amendments to the bill and an entire substitute for it will be offered on the Senate floor. The amendments in total would make the bill virtually an equivalent of the measure approved last year by the House. Each amendment in its own way would destroy the balance of the bill.

While the bill is a gigantic environmental accomplishment, it also is crucial to the nation's attempt to achieve energy independence. One-third of our known petroleum reserves are in Alaska, along with an even greater proportion of our potential reserves. Actions such as preventing even the exploration of the Arctic Wildlife Range, a ban sought by one amendment, is an ostrich-like approach that ill-serves our nation in this time of energy crisis.

That was 1980.

Continuing:

Instability of certain nations abroad repeatedly emphasizes our need for a stronger domestic supply of strategic and critical minerals. Each of the five proposed amendments would either restrict mineral areas from development or block effective access to those areas. Four of the seven world-class mineral finds in Alaska would be effectively barred from development by the amendments. That simply is too high a price for this nation to pay.

Present and potential employment both in Alaska and in the other states would be significantly damaged if the committee bill is amended. Cutting off development of the four mineral finds discussed above would alone cost thousands of potential jobs, many of them in the Lower 48 states. The amendment on national forests would eliminate up to 2,000 jobs in the southeast Alaska timber-related economy.

We urge you to focus on the central fact that the Alaska lands bill is not just an environmental issue. It is an energy issue. It is a national defense issue. It is an economic issue. It is not an easy vote for one constituency that effects only a remote, far-away

area. It is a compelling national issue which demands the balanced solution crafted by the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

We look forward to your support.

Cordially,

MARK O. HATFIELD,  
*Ranking Member*

HENRY M. JACKSON,  
*Chairman*

Madam President, do you know why I read that letter? Three of the four amendments that they urged for the Senate not to adopt were, in fact, adopted. The environmental people, at that time, were growing in strength, as I said before. They won every issue but one—every issue but one. There was only one issue that the State of Alaska prevailed on that was a major issue.

There were some minor changes of boundaries that we argued about, whether this part of this town should be in that withdrawal or another part in some other area. But there were four major issues that the chairman and ranking member raised, and Alaska lost three of the four. We won one. We had a solemn commitment from the two leaders. Senator Tsongas had those four amendments that Senator Jackson and Senator Hatfield talked about. Senator Jackson and Senator Hatfield had the committee bill. They melded it. They took three of the Tsongas amendments. But they left one out. They left us access to the Coastal Plain for oil and gas exploration and development.

One wonders whether history should have anything to do with subsequent action by the Senate of the United States. One Congress cannot bind another Congress. But one Congress can enact a law that it takes another Congress to enact and have a President sign it. This is one of the things that was required, and it was the great error of my career in agreeing that the area would be open only if a subsequent law was passed by Congress approving the process which was set up.

The process was that an area would be available for oil and gas leasing. There would be an environmental impact statement. There would be seismic research to see if there was a possibility of recovering oil. If both of those proved positive, then there would be a request of Congress to authorize the use for exploration of oil and gas.

Senator Jackson later that year, on August 18, addressed the Senate. On page 21651 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 18, 1980, he said:

Mr. President, I rise in support of the substitute offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. During the past several weeks, Senator Tsongas and I, as well as Senators Roth, Hatfield, and Cranston, have attempted to draft a compromise substitute amendment. We have before us an amendment which we believe represents an equitable solution to the Alaska lands issue.

He goes on to say later in that same timeframe:

The substitute retains the Senate Energy Committee's language relative to an oil and gas exploration program on the Arctic Coast-

al Plain in the existing Arctic Wildlife Range. Several changes in the committee's provisions were incorporated regarding the wildlife portion of the Arctic Slope study. The timing of the seismic exploration program and the Secretary's report to the Congress regarding further oil and gas exploration on the plain were also modified slightly. . . .

Taken together, this approach provides adequate protection for the affected wildlife in the area—including the Porcupine caribou herd—while insuring that an assessment of the area's oil and gas potential is undertaken.

We won one issue, and now the majority party wants to deny us that compromise.

It is an interesting area, the Arctic. Did you know, Madam President, following the great Teapot Dome scandal in 1923—the year of my birth, incidentally—the President, President Harding, withdrew 25 million acres of Alaska as a national petroleum reserve to salve the national conscience about the Teapot Dome scandal. That is what it was. That area has never really been explored for oil and gas. It was set up in 1923.

In 1943, during the conduct of the war, Abe Fortas, who many of us knew, the then-Acting Secretary of the Interior, withdrew all lands in the State of Alaska—all lands in the State of Alaska—about 20 miles south of the Circle. All of that land was withdrawn. Nothing at all could be done up there by Alaskans, the people who lived there and stayed there. He withdrew other lands—the so-called public land order 82—in the Katagkak region down here—it was a broad-scale thing—and in the Cape Lisburne area. This is the area we are talking about now that was withdrawn in 1943—not from oil and gas but from any kind of activity. That persisted until we got to the Statehood Act. And just prior to the Statehood, the Kobuk gas field was discovered just south of the Alaska Range, in that area right there.

While I was at the Interior Department, the Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton, amended public land order 82 allowing oil and gas exploration to take place in the Kobuk gas field. As a matter of fact, later in 1959, after we obtained statehood, Secretary Seaton further modified it to affect lands up around the national petroleum reserve of Alaska created by President Harding. And then, in December of 1960, he in effect repealed that land order. He really did it by amending the previous land order and making it possible for Alaska to select lands in that area because under the Statehood Act the State of Alaska could not explore north of the Arctic Circle without prior approval.

He gave the State the authority to select the lands. The area they selected was Prudhoe Bay. That was really divine guidance that took us to that place because that was the only place we could drill in the Arctic at the time. Alaskans found the largest supply of oil on the North American continent at

that time—on State lands, not Federal lands. Those Federal lands have never been opened to oil and gas, as intended by Secretary Seaton or by President Eisenhower. Subsequent administrations have found some way to frustrate access to the oil and gas resources of that area.

I have talked for a long time. I will talk a while longer because I will go into this amendment I filed in the second degree. I will speak more about the Arctic wildlife area and what it means. I filed an amendment in the second degree because, as I looked at the House-passed bill, it approved ANWR and it limited the amount of land that could be used to 2,000 acres out of that 1.5 million acres. All that can be used is 2,000 surface acres. But it postulates that there will be a series of bonus bids for the right to lease the land, somewhere between \$1.6 billion and \$2.7 billion. The House bill channels a portion of that money to what I would call a little carrot—a little conservation restoration of the areas already withdrawn from parts of the refuge.

I thought about that, and I thought about where the drilling in the Arctic wildlife refuge area—ANWR area, the 1002 area—would take us. It takes us a step further toward building the Alaska natural gas pipeline—something the American public should learn about, something on which I hope the great unions of this country and the steel industry and others will start educating the public.

At the time Prudhoe Bay oil was discovered, we found that gas was associated with the oil. There was no means to transport the gas, so a series of reinjection facilities was constructed and, as the oil and gas is produced, the gas is separated and it is reinjected into the ground. There are now 50 trillion to 70 trillion cubic feet of gas known to exist under State land in the Prudhoe Bay area.

We now propose that we build a natural gas pipeline to take that gas to the midwestern part of the United States. It is the largest amount of gas we know of that is not transportable so far. It would transport, when built, a pipeline 52 inches in diameter, 1 inch thick, running 3,000 miles from the North Slope to Chicago, down the Alaska Highway, through Canada, and into the Midwest. Along with that, it takes 15,000 miles of gathering pipelines and adjunct lines.

Originally, they thought about bringing the pipeline through the pristine part of Canada. That has been abandoned. The State wants it to come this way. This is the area here. We are going to follow, partially, the Alaska pipeline right-of-way and come down the Alaska Highway and go through Canada, along the route of the current pipeline through Canada.

People said: What does that have to do with drilling in the Arctic region of the Alaska Coastal Plain?

Mr. President, there is no source of funds that I can see, with the existing economic situation, in the foreseeable

future to help get that Alaska gas pipeline started other than funds from the production of oil in the Arctic Plain. The more I study, the more I find we have a really interesting situation in steel. Obviously, I am not from steel country. I don't know a lot about steel. But I have been learning a lot about it since we started this effort.

Since the year 2000, approximately 30 steel companies in the United States have entered bankruptcy, and 60,000 workers are already out of jobs in those places. In 1980, there were more than 500,000 U.S. steelworkers. By the year 2000, there were 224,000. That was 2 years ago. Since that time, we have had, as I have indicated, 30 more steel companies fold.

One of the contracts that exist between the steel companies and their workers is the benefits program—a promise that was made for the contribution to their past work in our society. It was an agreement to pay health benefits for the retirees. There are presently estimated to be 600,000 of those retirees, at a minimum. The companies they worked for are going bankrupt. There is a plan to try to consolidate the U.S. steel companies, but there is a little hitch. These workers have the right to put a lien on those assets before they are consolidated. So a plan was devised, and it is a difficult one to follow through. But it is a plan to use the fund to pay the cost of the health care delivery for the retirees and let the assets go into a consolidated steel industry that would be capable of contributing to major projects such as our Alaska natural gas pipeline.

The plan is the legacy plan, and the legacy would be to keep the commitment made to the retirees. It requires a cashflow for 30 years of \$18 billion. If the steel industry does not find \$18 billion, it is my judgment they will not be able to consolidate. If they do not consolidate, we will not have a steel industry capable of meeting our needs.

I do not know if you know it, Madam President, but recently Robert Miller, chairman and CEO of Bethlehem Steel, testified that:

Bethlehem Steel was the only domestic company with the capability to provide the special steel plate that was required to repair the U.S.S. *Cole*.

One steel company left in the United States could meet our national defense needs—one.

I told the union group today I believe there are three things that keep a democracy alive: One is food, one is oil, and one is steel. That gives us the ability to maintain our economy and to defend ourselves.

We have taken very ample care of the farmers, I have to say that. In going through this, I found that in the last 10 years we have spent \$656 billion on the farm community in regular bills and \$17 billion in the last 10 years on special emergency bills for the farm communities. How much have we spent for steelworkers? How much have we spent

for oil? Nothing. They are part of the private enterprise system and must survive themselves.

How can they survive if Congress gets in their way? We are supposed to facilitate the development of this country and maintain our economic viability. We are supposed to provide for our national defense. As a matter of fact, that is one of our constitutional duties—to provide for the national defense and promote the general welfare of this country.

I find it hard to believe we are getting so much criticism of the amendment that I have suggested. What it does is it takes part of the money that would come to the Federal Government and channels it into a fund which will address the health care costs for those retirees, enable the industry to be reconstituted, revitalized, provide money to the Department of Commerce to help with some loans and grants to those steel companies to get them going again, and provide money to the Department of Labor to train people to do some of the work we are going to need.

It is a gigantic project. There are two steel mills in the world today that are capable of rolling the pipe for the Alaska gas pipeline—two. The design of that pipeline will require one-half of the world's capability to produce steel pipe for a period of over 5 years. One project. In order to get it started by 2010, the orders have to be placed by next year. It is not possible to place those orders unless we know where there is a cashflow to take care of the problems of the retirees.

This project of ours will take 5.2 million tons of steel. It will involve \$3 billion to \$5 billion in initial steel orders alone. We are not talking about the 15,000 miles of gathering pipe. We are not talking about the hundreds of trucks that will carry that pipe down that long 3,000-mile road. We are not talking about the trucks and equipment that will improve the roads so the trucks can run on them. Most of those areas do not have roads that can hold trucks that size.

This is a gigantic project, and one must ask himself or herself: Is gas essential to our economy? Is gas essential to our national security? Is this something on which we should have a partisan dispute? Is this something that we should be here debating about a procedural issue, an issue designed to permit a group of Senators to delay action on a bill until the rest of the country can learn about it?

Actually, I am grateful to them for their filibuster against our amendments and their threat of requiring a cloture vote to terminate our debate because it means we are going to be here for a while talking about this subject. As we talk about it, I hope more and more people learn about it.

We establish in my amendment a trust fund for conservation, jobs, and steel reinvestment. It would provide \$155 million for conservation programs.

It would provide \$232 million for commerce grants to retool industries to get ready for the gas pipeline. It would provide approximately \$900 million to reestablish and make solvent the Coal Miners Health Fund. It would provide \$7 billion over 30 years to provide for the Legacy Benefits Program I described.

This is not the only money that goes into the legacy fund. The President has already put in effect the tariffs on imported steel. That money goes into the legacy fund. The companies are in the process of agreeing, as I understand it, to pay \$6 per ton on steel produced in the United States into the fund. But it is woefully short of money to meet the needs for those 600,000-plus retirees. That is not enough money to make it work.

How do we get our gas pipeline started? We try to find a way to put together the exploration and development of this continent's largest oilfield with the problems of developing a gas pipeline to transmit gases already there. We do not have to look for it. It is known gas. It is just not transportable because there is no mechanism to transport it. I believe we can do that.

I am intrigued with some of the statistics as to this pipe. As I said, it is 52 inches, 1 inch thick, and it is called X-80 pipe. It has never been tested before. In order to make it available, a portion of it will have to be rolled to test to see if the theory that has been worked out on computer is correct: That this is the type of pipe that can withstand the pressure necessary to move that gas over 3,000 miles.

Alaska now has the Alaska oil pipeline. It is a 750-mile pipeline. We call it 800, but it is 750 miles of the really big pipe. That weighed 1.2 million tons. Roads had to be specially created for that pipe to be put in place.

Alberta now has a 1,435-mile pipeline. It weighed 2.1 million tons and cost \$1.8 billion delivered. We are looking at, as I said, an enormous amount beyond either of those. The pipeline will be almost as long as the Great Wall of China.

One of the interesting things about it is, eight pipe-bending machines will cost more than \$1 million each and a 2-year lead time will be needed to get that pipe into place. They estimate they are going to need 115 backhoes, 27 D-10 bulldozers, 90 D-9s, and 16 to 20 of the large, magnum class chain trenchers.

In terms of manpower, the workforce in Alaska alone would be 2,300 jobs; in Canada 3,400 jobs. But there are jobs throughout the United States into the hundreds of thousands to build the valves, gathering the pipelines and the various pieces of equipment that are necessary to construct this pipeline.

I am saddened to say a lot of people say: That is a crass and cynical thing to do. You are just looking for votes.

That is right. We are looking for votes to open this area to oil and gas exploration so we can get the money to

start this pipeline. If taking care of and helping the steelworkers and coal workers is necessary to reconstruct the American steel industry so it can participate in it, we should do it.

I think the real problem I have is to try and figure out how we can put this into real context. With due respect to the Democratic Senators, they are shilling for a bunch of radical environmentalists who control the country now in many ways. Tomorrow I am going to speak at length about the articles that were in the *Sacramento Bee* about the way these people seek to control what the *Sacramento Bee* called "the fat of the land." They document it in a series of articles. I have those articles and I will read some of them tomorrow to make sure we know who our enemy is.

It is not the Senators from these various States. They are responding to constituents. They represent 2 to 3 percent of the constituency in most House districts, a little less than that in most elections statewide. They are very powerful, and at times such as we are in right now, look at—we were balanced 50-50. Until Senator JEFFORDS changed his mind, we were 50-50. We are a nation divided. That is when these minorities sneaked in and took control, and that is what the radical environmentalists have done.

I intend to go into that at length tomorrow. I will go further tomorrow into some more statistics about the steelworkers' problems and the reasons I have persisted, even though I must say I do not know so far any Senators who represent the steel States or the steelworker States who have agreed to assist us in this matter. I challenge them to find another cashflow area, another stream of money that will save their workers' retirement benefits. I challenge them.

This is not new. We did it for the black lung disease people in 1992. We have done it a series of times, where we have taken money from one cashflow and put it into an objective where we could not get the money otherwise, but we had a new cashflow and before it was committed, we committed it to good things. I say it this way: Take the airport development fund. All of those taxes do not go into the Treasury. They go into the fund and they pay for airports, they pay for the runways. As to the highway fund, those highway taxes go to pay for a great many things.

Take the emergency agricultural appropriations. Where do they go? They pay the John Deere bill. They pay for the medical insurance for the employees and the farmers. They pay the grocery bill when farmers have trouble. But somehow or another that is normal, right?

When we bring in an emergency bill for agriculture, we do not argue about that at all. We only ask how much more can we raise it because they are farmers. My farmers love them. I voted for those bills; I am not criticizing. I

am saying why only the farm community when there are two other streams that we must maintain to keep this democracy alive? One is oil and one is steel. I want a bill that matches them both.

I thank the Chair for her patience, and I thank my friend from North Dakota. I mean no personal offense in any way in what I say, but I think I have a right now to be disturbed. I have argued this matter in the Senate for more than 21 years. It actually started 31 years ago in December of 1971. I have been in the Senate that whole time. There has not been a year gone by we have not had an issue concerning these reactionary radical environmental groups and what their demands are on our State. Why?

There are only three of us. We are way up there. When Senator MURKOWSKI and I are at home, we are closer to Beijing than we are to Washington, DC. These environmentalists raise money by telling people the harm we are liable to do to that land, but less than one-half of 1 percent of Alaska is occupied by man. It is almost the least populated area in the world; yet it is threatened. It is threatened every day. There is another ad on the TV, another ad in a major paper about how this terrible bunch of people are about ready to destroy this land. Less than one-half of 1 percent has been occupied by man.

It is an amazing thing for me to get involved in this, but I intend to stay involved in it. Let's see if the process works. Let's see if the theory of extended debate for the education of our people still has meaning. Do people listen to us? Are they interested in what the labor leaders in the country say? Are they interested in the plight of the steelworkers? Are they interested in the plight of the coal workers? Are they interested in the future of building that gigantic pipeline that will bring the equivalent of more than a million barrels of oil and gas a day to the central part of the United States?

It would assure that the central part of the United States would have all the gas it needs for 40 years. Is that worth thinking about, worth taking some time of my colleagues to listen to me shout a little bit? I think it is, and I hope the system works.

I remember as a young man seeing "Mr. Smith Comes to Washington." I am not Mr. Smith, but I think the issue is more acute than the one he faced. The issue we face is survival. Do we go on increasing our dependence on foreign oil? How much more are we going to import?

The report I had today was it is at 57 percent in terms of imported oil. I thought it was lower than that. During the crisis that led to an embargo in the 1970s, it was less than 35 percent.

What about steel? During World War II, we produced steel for the world. We produced the steel for the allies. We rebuilt Europe. We built the tanks in the United States, and the planes and the ships that saved the world. Could we do

it again? Are we willing to contemplate doing it even to save our own system? I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam 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. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I will talk for a few minutes on a couple of points. One is a letter we received from the Secretary of Energy, the Honorable Spencer Abraham. It is a letter to me. I will read excerpts.

The letter reads in part:

As everyone knows, gasoline prices have been increasing for the past several weeks in anticipation of the historically higher demand seen during the summer driving season. These increases are a source of serious concern to this Administration and I know they are of serious concern to you.

As I committed to you last year, I intend to keep you apprised of circumstances affecting our oil and gasoline markets and of the steps we are taking to mitigate their effects in the short term and address them in the long term.

Briefly, prices for crude oil have risen by over \$7 per barrel since late February—an increase of over 30 percent—adding as much as 20 cents per gallon to the retail cost of gasoline. Crude oil prices are rising because of global economic growth, OPEC production restraints, and concern over the current tensions in the Middle East and Venezuela. Of course, we are closely monitoring international developments affecting our petroleum markets.

Partly as a result of rising oil costs, the Energy Information Agency (EIA) expects an average price of \$1.46 for regular grade gasoline over the next 6 months. However, gasoline prices will peak somewhat higher in certain regions this summer. Higher gas prices strain the budget of America's working families, raise the cost of goods and services, increase harvest costs for American farmers, and ultimately create a drag on the economy that can impact the livelihood of working Americans.

He advises:

For more detailed market information, please refer to EIA's Short-Term Energy Outlook . . . online.

He further states:

Our gasoline market will be in a delicate balance this summer, as it has in the past few years. It only takes one refinery fire—as we saw last August when a fire destroyed part of Citgo's Lemont, Illinois, refinery—or a pipeline disruption—like we experienced the previous June during the Wolverine Pipeline break between Chicago and Detroit—to cause price spikes.

The onset of the driving season coincides with the annual changeover at refineries from winter fuels to specially formulated, cleaner-burning summer fuels that cost more to refine. These fuels are required to protect the public health during the peak ozone season. As recommended in the President's National Energy Plan, the Environmental Protection Agency has already improved some of the rules governing the transition from winter to summer gasoline, including a provision for increased flexibility in blending and reclassification of certain fuels. However, the gasoline market is still constrained



at times by refinery and pipeline capacity shortages in America.

As we did last year, Department of Energy will continue to keep track of gasoline supplies and pricing. We have already reinstated our 24 hour Gasoline Hotline—a 1-800 number for consumers concerned about gasoline prices (800-244-3301).

He further indicated he would be meeting with the American Automobile Association to identify ways to encourage Americans to drive smarter and prepare their cars to operate more efficiently—and save fuel and money.

I ask unanimous consent the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY,  
Washington, DC, April 11, 2002.

Hon. FRANK MURKOWSKI,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI: As everyone knows, gasoline prices have been increasing for the past several weeks in anticipation of the historically higher demand seen during the summer driving season. These increases are a source of serious concern to this Administration, and I know they are of serious concern to you.

As I committed to you last year, I intend to keep you apprised of circumstances affecting our oil and gasoline markets and of the steps we are taking to mitigate their effects in the short term and address them in the long term.

Briefly, prices for crude oil have risen by over \$7 per barrel since late February—an increase of over 30 percent—adding as much as 20 cents per gallon to the retail cost of gasoline. Crude oil prices are rising because of global economic growth, OPEC production restraints, and concern over the current tensions in the Middle East and Venezuela. Of course, we are closely monitoring international developments affecting our petroleum markets.

Partly as a result of rising crude oil costs, the Energy Information Administration (EIA) expects an average price of \$1.46 for regular grade gasoline over the next six months. However, gasoline prices will peak somewhat higher in certain regions this summer. Higher gas prices strain the budgets of America's working families, raise the cost of goods and services, increase harvest costs for America's farmers, and ultimately create a drag on the economy that can impact the livelihood of working Americans.

For more detailed market information, please refer to EIA's Short-Term Energy Outlook (STEO) online (<http://www.eia.doe.gov/steo/>).

Our gasoline market will be in a delicate balance this summer, as it has in the past few years. It only takes one refinery fire—as we saw last August when a fire destroyed part of Citgo's Lemont, Illinois, refinery—or a pipeline disruption—like we experienced the previous June during the Wolverine Pipeline break between Chicago and Detroit—to cause prices spikes.

The onset of the driving season coincides with the annual changeover at refineries from winter fuels to specially formulated, cleaner-burning summer fuels that cost more to refine. These fuels are required to protect the public health during the peak ozone season. As recommended in the President's National Energy Plan, the Environmental Protection Agency has already improved some of the rules governing the transition from winter to summer gasoline, including a provision for increased flexibility in blending

and reclassification of certain fuels. However, the gasoline market is still constrained at times by refinery and pipeline capacity shortages in America.

As we did last year, Department of Energy will continue to keep track of gasoline supplies and pricing. We have already reinstated our 24 hour Gasoline Hotline—a 1-800 number for consumers concerned about gasoline prices (800-244-3301). I have also directed EIA to produce its Energy Situation Analysis Report (ESAR) each weekday in order to monitor world events that could disrupt supplies. The ESAR is released on EIA's website (<http://www.eia.doe.gov/>) daily after 5 p.m.

I will be meeting this week with the American Automobile Association (AAA) to identify ways to encourage Americans to drive smarter, prepare their cars to operate more efficiently—and save fuel and money. I also intend to meet with both refiners and gas station owners to ensure that our distribution system works well from the wellhead to the fuel pump. A flawless distribution system will help to minimize price spikes this year should disruptions occur. As we identify solutions and ideas that help consumers, we will of course provide you that information immediately.

These measures can mitigate somewhat the effects of rising gasoline prices, but the solution is more long term. We must reduce our dependence on OPEC imports of crude oil by promoting energy conservation, increasing domestic oil production, and diversifying our foreign sources of crude oil. We strongly urge Congress to send comprehensive and balanced energy legislation with all of these elements to the President.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

SPENCER ABRAHAM.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, we have been generalizing a bit on this side, relative to the National Environmental Policy Act, about groups in opposition to opening ANWR. On the other hand, I was somewhat relieved to see an ad that appeared in the Washington Post. It is entitled:

Think All Environmentalists Oppose President Bush's Energy Plan? . . . Think Again . . .

I am going to read a couple of excerpts because I think it addresses, indeed, some of the more balanced and responsible environmental groups and their opinions on activities associated with relieving our dependence on imported oil. The first is from Douglas Wheeler, former executive director of the Sierra Club:

The exploration and development of energy resources in the United States is governed by the world's most stringent environmental constraints, and to force development elsewhere is to accept the inevitability of less rigorous oversight.

What he is saying in these few words is that we can do it right in the United States because we have the most stringent environmental oversight on resource development, particularly oil and gas. He implies that is not necessarily the case in other parts of the world, and we seem very nonchalant about taking for granted where our oil comes from. There is very little concern whether the development is harmonious with the environment because our only bottom line is: We have to have the oil.

There is another statement, from James C. Wheat, III, trustee for the Chesapeake Bay Foundation:

The conservation community should take this opportunity to work closely with Congress to ensure that exploration of ANWR results in net environmental gains.

I certainly take Mr. Wheat at his word.

Further, Brian Ball, former chairman of the Nature Conservancy of Virginia:

Technology advances and increased ecological awareness have made this kind of exploration possible while leaving a minimum footprint on the surrounding environment.

Again, I will show that footprint on the chart here, which indicates the little area in red which identifies, obviously, the limitation in this legislation, which is 2,000 acres.

We also received from the Laborers' International Union of North America, Terence O'Sullivan, president, writing to each Member of this body:

On behalf of the more than 800,000 members of the Laborers' International Union of North America, I am writing to express our strong support for opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) on Alaska's North Slope for new oil exploration. I am requesting that you not only support an amendment to open ANWR as a part of comprehensive energy legislation, but also any effort to invoke cloture on the issue if necessary.

The benefits of including ANWR in a comprehensive energy bill are clear. Alaska currently provides 25% of the nation's domestic oil and opening ANWR could boost that figure to more than 50%. New drilling technologies will lessen the oil industry's "footprint" on the surrounding environment by increasing the length of directional drills and allowing for smaller and more compact production pads; if Prudhoe Bay were built today it would affect an area of land 65% smaller. Thousands of good-paying jobs would be created across the country by opening ANWR, 130,000 in construction alone. And best of all, Alaskans support drilling in ANWR by a margin of 3-1. If ANWR is not appropriate as a domestic source of oil production, then where in the U.S. is?

While exploration in ANWR is only one piece, it is a very important piece of a national energy policy that should include increased construction of power plants, including nuclear facilities, oil and gas pipelines, refineries and other energy production facilities. A national energy policy will insure a reliable and affordable source of energy while creating tens of thousands of jobs nationwide.

The Laborers and the entire building trades have a long and illustrious history on the North Slope of Alaska of training a highly skilled workforce, building a solid infrastructure, deploying the new drilling technologies and protecting the environment. That record of success is at least one reason for the strong support among Alaskans for drilling in ANWR.

For all these reasons and more, we strongly urge you to not only support an amendment to open ANWR as part of a comprehensive energy legislation, but also any effort to invoke cloture in order to allow a fair debate on the issue.

Sincerely,

TERENCE M. O'SULLIVAN,  
General President.

Finally, I noted the debate that covered the second-degree amendment which is pending to the underlying

amendment to open up ANWR. I would like to, again, highlight what this second-degree amendment specifically does because it gives America's steel industry an opportunity that otherwise it would not have—basically to rejuvenate and reconstruct the industry so it can be competitive.

We are all aware the administration provided a 30-percent protective tariff to American steel. That is going to be binding for a 3-year period of time. But what we have done here in the crafting of the second-degree amendment, which Senator STEVENS is offering, is to take the funding that would be generated from a combination of royalty and bonus bids—somewhere in the area of \$12 billion over 30 years—and take the royalty Federal share and apply it over a period of time to specifically address the unpaid legacy associated with health benefits for the steel industry. The proposal is to contribute approximately \$8 billion to the steel legacy benefit program.

I ask, Where is this money going to come from if we do not identify a source? We have the source. The source, of course, is from the revenues generated from the royalties and the bonus bids in opening ANWR.

America's steel industry is not going to get another shot at this. This is an identified source. As Senator STEVENS indicated, the prospects for the renewal of our steel industry, for it to become competitive, is given an extraordinary opportunity as a consequence of the reality that we are going to need steel in this country to build that gas pipeline.

The estimated cost of that project is about \$20 billion. My understanding is the order for the steel will be somewhere in the area of \$4 billion to \$5 billion. The last time we built a pipeline across the length of Alaska, from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, it was 800 miles. Do you know where the steel came from? It came from Japan; it came from Korea; it came from Italy. That was 48-inch pipe.

The pipe on this steel proposal is approximately 56-inch or thereabouts—52 to 56. It is X-80 to X-100, depending on the tensile strength of the steel.

If it is not built in the United States, we know where it is going to come from. It is going to come from foreign countries. Why wouldn't this proposal stimulate the steel industry, both management and labor, to recognize we have an extraordinary opportunity to revitalize the steel industry in this country?

They have the problem obviously associated with funding of the health benefits for some 600,000 potentially retired employees. But this is an extraordinary opportunity.

In addition to the steel industry's opportunity for the major link associated with the transportation, that is 3 thousand miles roughly from the Coastal Plain to the Chicago city gate. That is what we are talking about. We are also talking about virtually thousands of miles of additional pipe associated

with development in the Arctic—with both ANWR and the ultimate development of the gas that has been discovered while looking for oil in Prudhoe Bay. That gas is about 36 trillion cubic feet of proven gas reserves.

I emphasize that as one who looks at opportunities for labor and opportunities for capital to come together with this kind of identification of a funding mechanism of \$8 billion to contribute to the steel legacy fund, there is an additional \$1 billion to the United Mine Workers combined benefit fund—this is another fund that organized labor and the coal mining industry has had a shortfall in—the contribution of \$232 million in commerce grants to retool the industry to compete in this project, as well as labor training through the Department of Labor of roughly \$155 million, training steelworkers in the new technologies associated with making this pipe, as well as the direction of funds; and \$155 million for National Park Service maintenance backlog, habitat restoration, and conservation programs.

Isn't this a pretty attractive disposition, if you will, of funds associated with the lease sale and the royalties to be generated from opening ANWR or is there a higher need? You take it into the General Treasury, and you can appropriate. But what we are doing, and what Senator STEVENS has identified so clearly, is trying to meld two opportunities. That gas is going to be developed. The reason it is going to be developed is quite obvious. We are using our gas reserves now faster than we are finding new reserves. Where are we going to get the gas? We go down to the Gulf Coast States, and we are pulling down our gas reserves very rapidly there. We get a significant decline. It is estimated to be about 40 percent when we pull down offshore gas reserves. It lasts a little longer on land.

The reference to putting together an opportunity to revitalize our industry and basically work together to train workers to address some of the combined benefits that the United Mine Workers and the coal industry are short, as well as contribute to the steel legacy benefit program, is one that needs more examination by the Senate.

Unfortunately, we have not been able to go through a committee process, as we know, in bringing an energy bill to the floor. We would have been able to pass ANWR out of committee, but the majority leader saw fit to pull it. As a consequence, we have labored on various aspects of the energy bill because it did not go through the committee process, which is indeed unfortunate. But we have to make the best of the situation.

As a consequence, the second degree that is pending gives America's steel industry an opportunity for a new lease on life. Are we simply going to lie back, address and debate the issues of the steel industry's legacy shortfall or are we going to do anything about rejuvenating this industry?

I think Senator STEVENS indicated in his comments that we need steel, we need energy, and we need food to be a great Nation. Are we going to simply let the steel industry drop off, slough off, and become more dependent on imported steel? We have already given them 3 years.

It surprises me there is not more interest from the industry. I recognize there is a good deal of politics involved. I know Senator ROCKEFELLER has been working on this issue. I see in the Wall Street Journal of April 16 a reference where Senator ROCKEFELLER says any deal that would bind opening ANWR with steel is probably dead because the White House and the House Republican leaders won't provide letters of support for the steel bailout. But he said further that commitments from both camps were crucial to guarantees. They are.

We are going to do something with the revenue from ANWR if indeed we authorize it to be opened. The question is, Do we want to, by ourselves here collectively, come together as a bipartisan group and say this is what we want the money used for?

I have the greatest respect for Senator ROCKEFELLER. He is a good friend of mine. He said in the article that commitment from both camps was crucial to the guarantee that the aid would survive final House-Senate negotiations on the broader energy bill now before the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### GOP BID FOR SUPPORT ON DRILLING FOUNDERS

WASHINGTON.—A steel state Democrat announced he would oppose drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, dashing a Republican bid to build Senate support for ANWR by providing aid to retired steelworkers.

Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D., W.Va.) said the deal fell through because the White House and House Republican leaders won't provide letters of support for the steel bailout. He said a commitment from both camps was crucial to guarantee that the aid would survive final House-Senate negotiations on the broader energy bill now before the Senate.

The steel issue stems from President Bush's March 5 decision to rescue the U.S. steel industry with temporary tariffs on most steel imports.

Drilling in the Arctic is a top priority of the White House and Republicans, as part of their push to reduce dependency on foreign oil. But many Republicans were dismayed at the steel offer, having opposed Mr. Bush's March 5 decision as a political ploy that undermined the U.S.'s free-trade credentials.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I think the Senator from West Virginia is failing to recognize the obligation and opportunity we have to designate those funds. If we designate those funds for steel, that is where they are going to go. When Senator ROCKEFELLER says he is opposed to ANWR, I would respectfully advise him that if you can support the funding determination which is covered in Senator STEVENS'

second degree, then the funding can only come from one source, and that is ANWR.

If this body directs the funds to come from that source, it seems to me that certainly allays Senator ROCKEFELLER's concern that somehow Republicans wouldn't go along with the arrangement. We can dictate the arrangement. We can make it law.

Finally, since we are discussing this, I would like to share a little bit about the status of the steel industry in this country.

I am told there are approximately 50 impacted steel-associated facilities that have been closed since the year 2000—50 impacted facilities—and 25 million tons of steelmaking capacity impacted or eliminated since the year 2000; 25,430 lost steel jobs; idle steelmaking facilities: 6 closed steelmaking facilities in Indiana, Ohio, Utah, Alabama, Arizona, and Tennessee, 15 in Pennsylvania, 3 in Illinois, 4 in New York; in Ohio, Missouri, Kentucky, Indiana, and Alabama, 2 each; iron-rolling mills, and other steel-related and iron ore facilities: 1 in Michigan; closed rolling mills in other steel-related and iron ore facilities: In Missouri, Michigan, 2; Texas, Ohio, 6; Illinois, 4; Pennsylvania, 4; New York, Arkansas, Connecticut, 2; Indiana, California, Minnesota, Maryland, Alabama, Louisiana, 2.

Those are U.S. steel industry and ANWR production key facts.

Let me share with you the U.S. steel employment levels in 1980. There were more than 500,000 U.S. steelworkers in this country. In the year 2000, there were 224,000. It is estimated, in the year 2010, there will be 176,000—an anticipated loss of 21 percent for U.S. steel-related jobs. That is a statistic by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

What does that mean? It means 23,000 jobs lost between 1998 and September 2001; 270,000 steel jobs lost between 1980 and 1987. There are 600,000 current U.S. steel retirees. This is what we are talking about: their health care benefits alone. That is what we can address in this second-degree amendment. We are proposing to contribute \$8 billion.

Where is U.S. Steel? Where is Bethlehem? Where are they? Where are the workers? Where are the retirees? Where are the unions on this one?

It is a source of revenue. Somebody is going to get that revenue when we open ANWR. We are talking about a marriage, if you will, of U.S. steel and U.S. jobs to build the largest pipeline ever conceived in North America, from Alaska to Chicago. What an opportunity. It is a win-win-win situation. Where is the downside?

What does that clean gas do to our environment? It cleans up our air. Forty-seven percent of U.S. steelworkers are employed in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana. Forty-five percent of U.S. steel jobs are related directly to production. Eighteen percent of the jobs are related to installation, maintenance, repair, and construction. Six-

teen percent are related to transportation and material-moving workers. Twenty percent are related to manager, professional sales, and administrative support occupations.

In 2000, 40 percent of steelworkers were covered by union contracts compared with 16.2 percent in durable goods manufacturing and 14.9 percent in all industries.

Bringing new production capacity online—that is what we are talking about—means thousands of new union members or reemploying laid-off union members.

U.S. steel financial data: Domestic steel shipments down 14 percent in the first quarter of 2001.

Between 1997 and 2001, 31 steel companies in the United States filed for bankruptcy and are in chapter 11. This represents more than 21 percent of U.S. steel's capacity.

In the late 2001 timeframe, U.S. steel prices fell to some of their lowest levels in 20 years. Nearly half of U.S. steel employees work in factories with at least 1,000 employees.

Building new high-end, 52-inch X-100 steel capacity in the United States—that is the pipeline we would build in the United States—would mean more factories that could employ thousands of new workers.

This is a \$5 billion contract. The cost of building the new 52-inch X-100 pipeline rolling capacity—it is estimated to run somewhere in the area of \$250 million per facility because we are going to need more than one facility.

Where are we going to buy it if we do not buy it in the United States? We are going to buy it from Korea, we are going to buy it from Japan, and we are probably going to buy some from Italy because that is where we got it the last time when we built the TransAlaska Pipeline.

The total market capitalization of U.S. steel companies, as of March 19, 2002, is \$12.8 billion. Contracts worth \$4 billion or more in steel for the Alaska natural gas pipeline equals one-third of the total value of the entire U.S. steel industry.

Need I say more? I can go through the companies that have filed for bankruptcy. I think I will because it may awaken, if you will, some of the folks out there who are following the debate.

This is an opportunity to rejuvenate America's steel industry—those who are not covered by the steel legacy benefits for their health care, the unfunded health programs, those who are unemployed, those who have been laid off. This is an opportunity for those companies that are still in business to come together and recognize this is an opportunity.

When is the last time we had an opportunity such as this? We debated Chrysler years ago. It was a question of whether we should give a guarantee to keep Chrysler afloat. We debated that heavily in the Congress. It was one of the first real debates we had on whether we were going to save a traditional

well-known corporation in this country. We decided to go ahead with that guarantee.

The results? Chrysler is still in business today. They are a profitable corporation. But the premise of what we did was gambling on Lee Iacocca and his imagination to rebuild the company.

For Heaven's sake, don't we have that same initiative left somewhere in America's steel industry, some CEO who wants to take the challenge? Let's make American steel competitive again. Let's make it great again. We have that opportunity.

And the opportunity is good for all of America because it brings together, if you will, the components. We have the gas. We found it while developing Prudhoe Bay. We need the gas because we are pulling down our reserves faster than we are finding new ones. We are going to build it sooner or later. It is going to require a pipeline.

For Heaven's sake, why not come together with America's steel industry and ensure it is built in America, and get on with revitalizing, if you will, this important industry?

We talk about national security. We can talk a lot about oil. I think Senator STEVENS put it very succinctly when he said: You have to have oil and energy. You have to have food. You have to have steel. So that is what we are talking about here.

States with steel companies filing for bankruptcy: In Indiana, Action Steel, Galv Pro, Great Lakes Metals, Heartland Steel, and Qualitech Steel; in Oklahoma, Sheffield Steel; in Texas, Metals USA; in Pennsylvania, Bethlehem Steel, Riverview Steel, Edgewater Steel, Freedom Forge, Erie Forge & Steel, J&L Structural, and Worldclass Processing; in Missouri, Excaliber Holding Co. and Laclede Steel; in California, Precision Steel; in Ohio, Republic Technologies, CSC Ltd., and LTV Corporation; in Alabama, Trico Steel and Gulf States Steel; in Louisiana, American Iron; in North Carolina, GS Industries; in Illinois, Northwestern Steel & Wire; in West Virginia, Wheeling-Pittsburgh; in Michigan, Vision Metals; in Utah, Geneva Steel; in New York, Al Tech Specialty and ACME Metals. That is 62,500 jobs. That is what is lost.

We are going to be debating this issue extensively, but I did want to follow a little bit on the second degree and challenge America's steel industry, challenge a couple CEOs out there who might have a little of the Lee Iacocca spirit to try to bring America's steel industry together and come to grips with an opportunity.

If we do not open ANWR, clearly it is not going to fund the rejuvenation of America's steel industry. That is apparent. That is why I hope, as we proceed with this debate, there will be a critical evaluation of the merits of opening ANWR, what it can do for our national security, and what it can do for American labor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska is absolutely right in his remarks about the need for the natural gas pipeline that is in this bill. One of the first things we did—I cannot remember if it was the Senator from Nevada or the majority leader who offered the amendment—but we offered the amendment that would create the opportunity to build a gasline from Alaska to Chicago, basically. It would be 3,500 miles long. That gasline would be 52 inches in diameter, and there would be a need for 5 million tons of steel to build that pipeline. It is estimated that pipeline alone would create 400,000 jobs.

So it would seem to me, we would be well advised to move this piece of legislation based on something we can all agree on; and that is, to bring natural gas from the North Slope to the lower 48 States. It is noncontroversial in the sense that it is bipartisan in nature. We have not only authorized the direction of that pipeline, we have also provided, in the legislation, loan guarantees for the private sector to build that pipeline. But we have gotten off on a tangent here on something that both sides have their own opinion of what is best for the country. As a result of that, ANWR is not going to happen.

But it should be recognized that the pipeline should happen. We should join together and quickly handle the remaining amendments. We are working over here to get rid of as many as we can and move this legislation forward.

The Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI, has worked so hard on this issue that he and Senator STEVENS believe in so fervently. I am glad we have the amendment before us. It is important we do that. Simply because I disagree with these two fine Senators from Alaska doesn't take away from the fervor they feel about this amendment. We will find during the debate that will take place in the next couple of days that there are people who believe just as fervently that this amendment is a bad idea.

That is what the Senate is all about—the ability to debate publicly issues of extreme importance to the country. The decision to be made on ANWR is important to the country.

As I have indicated, building a pipeline would not only create thousands of new jobs but would provide a huge opportunity for the steel industry. The Senate has already spoken that we encourage the use of American steel and union labor in the construction of the pipeline. The total cost of the Alaska natural gas pipeline is estimated to be as much as \$20 billion. That is a real shot in the arm.

In addition to these enormous supplies of natural gas from existing oil fields, there is another substantial opportunity to obtain additional oil and gas resources from the Alaska North Slope. It is the National Petroleum Reserve—Alaska. This reserve is 23 mil-

lion acres, as I understand it, of public land approximately the size of the State of Indiana. It was created to secure the Nation's petroleum reserves.

It is administered by the BLM which, in 1999, offered 4 million acres in the northeast portion of this for leasing. The result was an extremely successful lease sale.

That sale had a high level of interest from the industry with about \$105 million in bonus bids for 133 leases on about 860,000 acres. Exploratory drilling has already occurred, and there have been major finds by the industry there.

A second lease sale is scheduled to take place this summer. Planning is being undertaken to open an additional portion of this for leasing. Again, no new law needs to be passed in order to drill here. We are not talking about a piece of land the size of a postage stamp. We are talking about 23 million acres.

As I said while I was waiting earlier today for Senator MURKOWSKI to offer his amendment, I am very happy it is being offered. Tomorrow morning we hope Senator BINGAMAN will have the opportunity to speak. He has managed this bill. He has sat here patiently waiting for this amendment. He has some things to say. I spoke to Senator BREAUX this afternoon. He is on the side of the Senators from Alaska. He wishes to speak tomorrow. Senator KERRY from Massachusetts believes very passionately that drilling in ANWR is absolutely wrong, and he will speak for a considerable period of time to lay out his position. Senator LIEBERMAN is scheduled to come as soon as he has an opportunity to speak in opposition to the two fine Senators from Alaska.

This is going to be a good debate. I personally look forward to it, on a very serious note, and would hope the debate is, for lack of a better description, as high class as it has been to this point. There is a lot to talk about. This is an issue that is important to the country, and it is time we laid our cards on the table and at a subsequent time vote as the Senate will allow us to do, either on a procedural matter or on a substantive matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I very much appreciate the remarks of my good friend the majority whip. The only question I would have is whether or not the majority whip realizes that not one single steel mill in the United States has the capacity currently to make the 52-inch steel pipe that is needed for the Alaska pipeline. They neither have the capacity nor are they familiar with this particular strength of steel. It is 80 to 100 in the dimension.

So I ask the majority whip, my good friend from Nevada, how does he propose we are going to go through this transition of America's steel industry achieving the capability to make the investment when indeed a good portion

of the industry is in bankruptcy, another portion of the industry is in the process of not being able to pay its fund for health care, the legacy costs?

It is important as we get into this debate that we not generalize that somehow America's steel industry is going to participate without identifying where the funds are going to come from because the private sector is going to be very reluctant to invest in America's steel industry. That is why, obviously, the financial community did not see fit to invest in Chrysler when they had their troubled times. They exhausted all their alternatives. They came to the Congress, and the Congress came forward with a guarantee.

I ask my friend from Nevada how he proposes that any steel mill, since not one in the United States currently makes 52-inch X-80 steel pipe, how is the industry going to develop to meet the challenge of the order which we anticipate will be forthcoming?

Mr. REID. I am happy to respond to my friend from Alaska. First of all, the American Iron and Steel Institute has stated that no one in the world can make this pipe right now. But they also go on to say that if in fact there is an opportunity to do this pipeline, American entrepreneurship can do this. Remember, this legislation that we have already accepted in this bill provides loan guarantees.

I also say to my friend from Alaska, I have great faith in the American labor force and those, as I have said, entrepreneurs who have an opportunity to do good things for the country but also make money.

As far as the steel manufacturers, we have worked hard on this. As you remember, last year Senator BYRD worked long and hard on something to bail out the industry. Of course, we received little help from your side of the aisle.

Senator ROCKEFELLER, with whom I have spoken about this, recognizes that if we are going to do something for the steel industry—and we are—that it is going to take real money. We look forward to working with the steel State Senators. It is my understanding steel is now manufactured in some form or fashion in about 16 States.

We are committed to do everything we can to help that industry, not only from the management side but also for those workers who are entitled to a lot of things, not the least of which is pensions.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I appreciate the response of the majority whip. I guess my frustration is in knowing how to get the two sides together. I am referring to the article in the Wall Street Journal today where they quoted Senator ROCKEFELLER saying that, supposedly, the deal was ANWR revenues for steel. He said:

The deal fell through because the White House and the House Republican leaders would not provide letters of support for the steel industry—

He used the word “bailout.” I prefer “rejuvenation.”

I ask my friend, don't we have the power in the Senate to direct the use of these funds, as opposed to what the White House happens to think is in the best interest of the industry or politics? We have the authority, do we not, to direct these funds for the benefit of the steel industry if we authorize ANWR to be opened?

I ask my friend if, indeed, he can explain to me the logic that Senator ROCKEFELLER proposes because he simply says the deal fell through because the White House and the Republican leaders would not provide letters of support for the steel bailout. Why don't we just pass the law here and designate the funds for the industry? That in itself should address the concerns of the Senator from West Virginia.

I recognize it is not appropriate to ask the majority whip to explain the rationale of Senator ROCKEFELLER; nevertheless, I think the principle is here. If we wanted to pass this, we could, could we not?

Mr. REID. First of all, while I don't like to admit it, I don't read the Wall Street Journal, so I don't know what it said. I have not read that. Senator ROCKEFELLER would have to respond to his questions. I have my own reasons why I think it would be a very bad program, not the least of which is I don't think ANWR would be improved. You would have to talk to Senator ROCKEFELLER about that. All I know is that the development of this pipeline would create jobs in steel production, pipe manufacturing, pipe laying, and construction. It would create lots of jobs. By any estimate I am aware of, the pipeline would create probably at least 300 percent more jobs than the ANWR project.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I think the hour is late and I am sure we are about to wind up. I look forward to continuing the debate. I hope we can have, from the organization that represents the American steel industry, some indication by tomorrow's debate just what their attitude would be toward their ability to restructure, to meet the anticipated order associated with the 3,000-mile natural gas pipeline from Alaska to Chicago. We will attempt to contact them in the 24 hours that we have before we start the debate tomorrow to obtain their views on their ability to meet this demand and what conditions would have to be met in order for them to be competitive.

I think it is rather interesting, also—and I simply call this to the attention of my good friend, Senator REID—it is my understanding that someone in the debate, regarding the merits of the 30-percent tariff that was set for imported steel, specifically excluded 52-inch pipe. Now, I encourage Members to check on that because, to me, that pretty much gives an out for American steel. In effect, it says that all steel coming into the United States is subject to a 30-percent import tariff, except 52-inch pipe. It seems to me that is not in the best interest of what we

are talking about here, to try to encourage the American steel industry to gear up for the largest order, by specifically exempting 52-inch pipe, which is what this argument is all about.

I yield the floor.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the Stevens amendment No. 3133, regarding drilling in ANWR:

Tom Daschle, Kent Conrad, Harry Reid, Ben Nelson, Barbara Mikulski, Patty Murray, Dianne Feinstein, Tim Johnson, Tom Carper, Jeff Bingaman, Byron Dorgan, Richard Durbin, Mark Dayton, Jay Rockefeller, Patrick Leahy, Jack Reed.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the Murkowski ANWR amendment No. 3132 to S. 517, the Energy Bill:

Tim Johnson, Tom Carper, John Kerry, Jeff Bingaman, Patrick Leahy, Tom Harkin, Tom Daschle, Harry Reid, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Max Cleland, Maria Cantwell, Jack Reed, Ron Wyden, Carl Levin, Patty Murray, Max Baucus.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the only remaining business is to wrap up. We will do that as soon as the Senator from Alaska allows me to go forward.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I find it rather interesting that here we are, and we have started on this bill roughly at 3 o'clock; it is now roughly 6:35. I think it is extraordinary that the majority would file cloture on this amendment when not one single Member has risen in opposition to either amendment. I do grant the whip that he did mention it briefly—his opinion on certain aspects of it.

But in view of the fact that no one has spoken on the other side, I hope that these amendments could just be accepted. Obviously, that is wishful thinking. I think it, again, represents a terrible departure from the traditions of this body in the way this entire energy bill has been handled. From the beginning, it was taken away from the committee of jurisdiction, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. It was taken away by the majority leader because he knew we had the votes to

include ANWR in the energy bill and present it to the floor for debate.

Now, he also knew that, from a political point of view, he could ramrod his bill without the benefit of the committee process. Yet he has seen fit to take to task our side for delaying the bill.

Let me tell you what happened in this bill. It was an educational process. Most Members didn't have an idea of certain aspects of the renewable portfolio, the electric portfolio. So he has opted out of the tradition of this body in the handling of this bill, and we have been on it for a very short period of time. I am talking about, obviously, the lightning rod, which is ANWR, and we all knew it. Now he has seen fit to file cloture on this amendment when not one single Member has risen in opposition to either amendment. This means that debate around here is no longer of any significance because everybody has their mind made up ahead of time.

I think it is a sorry day for the Senate when we come to this impasse and address the disposition of this paramount issue by a cloture motion so early in the debate.

Outside of expressing my extreme disappointment in the manner this has been handled, I hope that as we address the debate from here on in, it will be represented by factual information, not innuendoes, and that those speaking in opposition have some knowledge because I will venture to say virtually every Member who will speak in opposition tomorrow has never been to ANWR, has never been to Prudhoe Bay, and has never ever considered the significance of what this legislation would do for the Native indigenous people of the North Slope; namely, the Eskimo people of Kaktovik.

I am going to leave one thing for this body as we go out, and that is to reflect on the honey bucket in Kaktovik. That is the difference between a Third World nation and the realities of what a lifestyle would bring to those people who want to have the same conveniences we take for granted; that is, running water and sewer facilities. They can have it if we can open up ANWR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, by any standard one can come up with, in any body, especially any deliberative body, being on a bill since February 18, being on a bill 19 full days of debating would be a pretty good amount of debate. By any standard, being on a bill this long, one would say is enough, but we have not had enough because under the rules of the Senate which protect debate, we are not only going to be able to debate all tomorrow, we can go all night tomorrow if anyone wants to talk. That is what this is all about.

It seems to me we have had every opportunity to have this brought before us. I have been on this floor many

times, most of the time representing the majority leader, saying: Please bring this forward. Could you do it tomorrow? I even said I think I will offer the amendment out of the House just to speed things up. Yesterday I asked: Can we start this in the morning?

The reason we have not had other people speaking in opposition to the amendment is that the two Alaska Senators would not allow us to have anybody. We wanted to intersperse speakers. Senator BINGAMAN, the manager of the bill, wanted to propound a unanimous consent request to set up an orderly process to debate. Senator BINGAMAN, being the gentleman he is, sat down and did not say a word. It is unusual that the manager of the bill has not had the opportunity to speak. He waited around, I guess, but he has been here all day.

Senator BINGAMAN is going to speak tomorrow against these amendments. I announced this earlier. I said Senator BINGAMAN is going to speak against the amendment, and Senator BREAUX is going to speak in favor. Senator KERRY wants to speak for an extended period of time. If anybody is looking for opposition to this amendment, I spoke in opposition to it today. I compared the Arctic wilderness to my home in Searchlight, NV. I compared the desert to the wilds of Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wonder if my friend will yield for a question.

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield to my friend from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I respectfully request the reference not be to the Arctic wilderness because, obviously, we are all aware that this is not a designated wilderness. I thank the Chair.

Mr. REID. I will be happy to restate it: ANWR, and anyplace in my remarks in the last few minutes where I said "Arctic wilderness," I was simply saying not wilderness in the sense of legislative wilderness, but it is a very remote area. The place around Searchlight is not wilderness either in the true sense of the word, but it is pretty wild desert. I did not mean to connote any legal term when I said "wilderness." It is just a place out there all alone, Mr. President.

My friend from Alaska used the words "extreme disappointment." I can relate the extreme disappointment I have had on this bill in the last 18 days waiting, waiting, waiting to get to ANWR. That is the crux of this bill. We know that. If ANWR is disposed of one way or another, we have a bill.

My friends from Alaska said they knew they had the votes. We will find out when we vote on this. Under a procedure of the Senate, unless something changes, we are going to vote on this an hour after the Senate comes in on Thursday. That is under the rules of the Senate. I know—and I repeat what I said a few minutes ago—the Senators from Alaska believe in what they are doing. I repeat the words fervently. I

do not take a bit of credit away from them for doing that. That is their job, and they have done a good job. But there are certain things that are not really—I should say they are not factual in some respects.

For example, on the energy bill, there have been a lot of hearings in the committee on which Senator MURKOWSKI sat as the chairman; now Senator BINGAMAN is the chairman. We went through this before. There were 12 hearings. Senator MURKOWSKI is right, maybe we should have had more hearings. There are not a lot of bills around here that have that many hearings on them. Anytime there is important legislation—which this is, setting the energy policy of this country—it is hard to satisfy everybody.

Senator DASCHLE did the best he could. He brought a bill before the Senate. I lost track of the time: 18, 19 days—a long time ago. We started on the 18th day of February. Senator DASCHLE has done fine getting it to this point. I think the legislation is moving along. I look forward to the debate tomorrow.

Senator MURKOWSKI wants to hear people in opposition to this. He is going to hear some. They will be just as believable as the Senators from Alaska in presenting their case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wonder if my friend will yield. I hate to prolong this, but I have to stay here as long as he does. I guess we have a little bit of a standoff. With respect to the committee process, I certainly concur we have had a lot of hearings, but I ask the majority whip why we did not have any markups. Why did the majority leader forbid our committee from having markups after the hearings, when a majority of the committee supported ANWR? I would certainly appreciate any enlightenment. The only thing I have ever heard is that it was perhaps controversial. But I certainly defer to the whip to advise us as to what the rationale was of forbidding any markups.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I may respond to my friend from Alaska—we have been through this before, but I am happy to go through it again—I had an exchange on the floor with my counterpart, Senator NICKLES, who said we had no hearings, and I listed by date the hearings we had. He said we had no markup, and there was not a markup on this bill. That is acknowledged. Perhaps we learned something from when the Republicans were in control of the Senate because their last energy bill had no markup.

We do not need to have this tit for tat. This is the Senate. There are different ways of moving things forward. Senator DASCHLE did everything by the rules of the Senate. He did not do anything that was shady or try to contrive something. He certainly did not do anything that the Republicans had not done when they were in the majority, except I believe we had a lot more

hearings on our bill than they had on their bill.

As I say, in the legislative process, this is used so many times, but it certainly is as descriptive as I can be: There are two things one does not want to watch: Sausage being made and the Senate creating legislation because it is not a lot of times an orderly process, but we do it by the rules, just as when the Republicans were in the majority they did it by the rules.

Sometimes we wish we did not have these rules, but they are here, and they are here for a reason. We have played by the rules, and we will continue to play by the rules and do the best we can.

The important issue is when we vote. That is when the real decisions are made. On occasions it is hard to get to a vote, as it has been on this issue. On Thursday morning we are going to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I think it is appropriate, however, since we have the responsibility for some consistency, to refer to the manner in which the Pickering nomination was handled.

A quote from the majority leader on March 6 states:

If we respect the committee process at all, I think you have to respect the decisions of every committee. I will respect the wishes and the decisions made by that committee, as I would with any other committee.

Then at a news conference March 14, after the disposition:

Committees are there for a reason, and I think we have to respect the committee jurisdiction, responsibility and leadership, and that's what I intend to do.

Obviously, there was never an opportunity for the committee as a whole to bring the matter to the floor, and I think we all can reflect on that bit of inconsistency.

I conclude by referring to the release on October 9, 2001. It was entitled: Energy Committee Suspends Markups; Will Propose Comprehensive and Balanced Energy Legislation to Majority Leader. This was by Chairman JEFF BINGAMAN, and it says:

At the request of Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Chairman Jeff Bingaman today suspended any further markup of energy legislation for this session of Congress. Instead, the chairman will propose comprehensive and balanced energy legislation that can be added by the majority leader to the Senate calendar for potential action prior to adjournment. Noted Bingaman, it has become increasingly clear to the majority leader and to me that much of what we are doing in our committee is starting to encroach on the jurisdictions of other committees. Additionally, with the few weeks remaining in this session, it is now obvious to all how difficult it is going to be for these various committees to finish their work on energy-related provisions.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, Senator Bingaman said, the Senate's leadership sincerely wants to avoid quarrelsome, divisive votes in committees. At a time



when Americans all over the world are pulling together with a sense of oneness and purpose, Congress has an obligation at the moment to avoid these contentious issues that divide rather than unite us.

I ask unanimous consent that these quotes be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Congress Daily AM, Apr. 16, 2002]  
GOP PLAN TO LINK DRILLING WITH STEEL AID  
FALLS THROUGH

(By Geoff Earle and Brody Mullins)

An idea that top Republicans had been considering to link a steel program with an amendment oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge has fallen through, according to Sen. John (Jay) Rockefeller, D-W. Va.

"It's quite dead," Rockefeller said. "The deal was nixed by the White House."

Rockefeller said that Sen. Ted Stevens, R-Alaska, approached him last week about linking provisions to provide healthcare and retirement benefits to steelworkers using ANWR royalties. Rockefeller said that Stevens told him, "I need oil, you need steel, let's see if we can work together."

Rockefeller, who has opposed ANWR in the past, said he would be willing to back ANWR if it included so-called steel legacy provisions. But Rockefeller said he would not go along unless Republicans could produce letters from the president or vice president. Speaker Hastert, and House Energy and Commerce Chairman Tauzin, to ensure that the provisions are included in a final bill after a conference committee.

But Rockefeller said the administration told him that while a letter might be possible, "you get us 60 votes first."

Sixty votes will be needed to break a filibuster of an ANWR amendment.

Rockefeller said he did not think there were more than 54 votes for a clean ANWR bill. "The deal being off, they'll be lucky if they're at 50," he said. Rockefeller added he was searching for other vehicles to move steel legislation.

Rockefeller said he was able to draw conclusions about the lack of interest on the part of the White House from a conversation with Commerce Secretary Evans.

"The White House isn't behind it, you can forget the whole thing," he said. Rockefeller added that he plans to vote against ANWR.

Meanwhile, the Senate is expected to begin debate today on the ANWR amendment. Energy and Natural Resources ranking member Frank Murkowski, R-Alaska, had considered delaying action until Wednesday, but debate on the measure now is expected to begin today.

Majority Leader Daschle is expected to debate an amendment offered by Sens. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., and Paul Wellstone, D-Minn., to give the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission new authority to safeguard electricity consumers.

On other controversial amendments, Consumers Union called Monday on the Senate to strip from the energy bill a far-reaching ethanol compromise that would triple the amount of ethanol-produced gasoline.

ENERGY COMMITTEE SUSPENDS MARK-UPS;  
WILL PROPOSE COMPREHENSIVE AND BALANCED ENERGY LEGISLATION TO MAJORITY LEADER

(By Jeff Bingaman, Chairman Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Oct. 9, 2001)

At the request of Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle, Senate Energy & Natural Resources

Committee Chairman Jeff Bingaman today suspended any further mark-up of energy legislation for this session of Congress. Instead, the Chairman will propose comprehensive and balanced energy legislation that can be added by the Majority Leader to the Senate Calendar for potential action prior to adjournment.

Noted Bingaman, It has become increasingly clear to the Majority Leader and to me that much of what we are doing in our committee is starting to encroach on the jurisdictions of many other committees. Additionally, with the few weeks remaining in this session, it is now obvious to all how difficult it is going to be for these various committees to finish their work on energy-related provisions.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, Bingaman said, the Senate's leadership sincerely wants to avoid quarrelsome, divisive votes in committee. At a time when Americans all over the world are pulling together with a sense of oneness and purpose, Congress has an obligation at the moment to avoid those contentious issues that divide, rather than unite, us.

Bingaman will continue to consult and build consensus with members of his committee, with other committee chairs and with other Senators as he finalizes a proposal to present to the Majority Leader.

If we respect the committee process at all, I think you have to respect the decisions of every committee. I will respect the wishes and the decisions made by that committee, as I would with any other committee.—Senator Tom Daschle, News Conference, March 6, 2002.

Committee are there for a reason, and I think we have to respect the committee jurisdiction, responsibility, and leadership, and that's what I intend to do.—Senator Tom Daschle, News Conference, March 14, 2002.

For whatever reason, the Republicans are slow-walking the energy bill. They appear not to want to move this to final passage or to a conclusion. We're not sure why they're not more supportive of bringing the debate to a close, but they have yet to offer the ANWR amendment and some of the other more controversial amendments. So we've been on the legislation 12 days already, and, you know, that's almost three weeks, and we have—we have very little prospect of finishing the legislation any time in the foreseeable future. So we're going to have to make some decisions about cloture when we get back, but its disappointing that they have not been more willing to move the legislation forward than we've seen so far.—Senator Tom Daschle, News Conference, March 21, 2002.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I think it speaks for itself that indeed there is an inconsistency. When it benefits the other side, they basically steamroll the process by excluding the committee. They have seen fit to do so, and the energy bill is certainly the most recent, and I think the most blatant, inconsistency associated with the administration of the leadership. I think this is certainly evidenced even further by the manner in which the cloture motion has been laid down this evening, after only less than 3 hours of debate on what, indeed, the majority whip identified as the major issue in the energy bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this indicates how tough Senator DASCHLE's job

is. He is criticized for doing something in the committee. He is criticized by the minority for doing the work in the Committee on the Judiciary. When he does that, he is criticized. When he does not do it, he is criticized on the energy bill.

We do not need this tit for tat stuff, but at least having been in the Senate during the time the Republicans controlled the Judiciary Committee we are at least having hearings for the judges. They would not even do that. We had judges who waited 4 years and did not even get a hearing. I do not think the Judge Pickering nomination is a good example because if they use how they treated our judicial nominees, that is those under President Clinton, we would win that in a slam dunk.

We are moving judges more rapidly than they did. We are giving all the judges hearings as quickly as possible. My personal feeling is the Pickering nomination is not a good example of how the Republicans have treated us with the Judiciary Committee. Maybe some other committee but not Judiciary, because we, for lack of a better description, took it in the shorts with our judicial nominees.

#### LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Ms. LANDRIEU. I am delighted to participate in a colloquy with Senator KENNEDY on the important issue of the Low Income Energy Assistance Program.

I want to recognize Senator KENNEDY's tireless work on behalf of the people in need that this program strives to serve. In particular, I want to laud his efforts to increase LIHEAP authorizations. For too long, this program has not kept pace with Congress' original intent. No one has been more acutely aware of this than Senator KENNEDY himself. He has worked diligently to ensure LIHEAP is fully funded, including an effort to commit \$3.4 billion to the program.

Unfortunately, it takes more than the tireless work of even such a distinguished Chairman as Senator KENNEDY to make this change. It takes each of us in Congress, and a willing administration as well. Unfortunately, that will has not yet been there. In fact, LIHEAP's average annual appropriation since 1984 has been \$1.4 billion.

Mr. President, 22 years ago, LIHEAP was amended, following its original enactment in 1981. With the 1984 amendments, Congress put in place an elegant, simple and straightforward mechanism to ensure these scarce Federal resources got to those low-income Americans in greatest need. It accommodates: Annual updates of State expenditures for low-income home energy requirements—regardless of fuel source—for heating and cooling. Changes in weather—including heating/cooling degree days and fuel price volatility—for electricity, fuel oil, liquid petroleum gases and natural gas.

I have just described to you as near-perfect a means as possible to get the

funds to those low-income Americans in greatest need. This mechanism can get funds to low-income Californians reeling from gas and electric price shocks, or Georgians who last summer endured crushing gas bills.

However, LIHEAP funds do not flow to all the places they are needed today but instead where they were needed in 1979 and 1980.

Back then, it was assumed that LIHEAP appropriations would rise, and the allocation mechanism mentioned above has been cast aside. The law states that unless LIHEAP appropriations exceed \$1.975 billion, the elements described above do not control. Instead, the controlling factor is a state's receipt of funds in 1981.

Much can happen in 22 years. For example, from 1980 to 2000: Dallas' population grew from 904,074 to 1,118,580; Clark County, NV's population grew from 463,087 to 1,375,765; Greater Phoenix, Arizona grew from 1,509,000 to 3,072,000.

It would be unfortunate, if we were unable to respond to such situations, in these areas, or to the needs of the citizens of my own State of Louisiana, merely because LIHEAP was locked into the past. We need to address today's problems as well.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank Senator LANDRIEU for her comments and commend her for her steadfast commitment to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. She is an outstanding advocate for needy families in Louisiana and across the country. She is correct that the program demands and deserves significantly more funding than it currently receives. I'm sure she's as pleased as I am that LIHEAP's authorization levels are increased in the underlying bill. I look forward to working with her and with her colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to increase funding for this vital program.

Senator LANDRIEU has raised some very important concerns about the program which must be addressed during the re-authorization process. I plan to hold hearings on this issue and invite Senator LANDRIEU to testify. Her proposals will play a very serious role during consideration of LIHEAP re-authorization.

Senator LANDRIEU raises a critical point regarding the vulnerability of our poorest citizens to extreme weather conditions. My State is the home of ground-breaking research on the negative health impacts of extreme temperatures, particularly on poor children with chronic illnesses suffering through cold winters. Research at the Failure to Thrive Clinic at Boston Medical Center has indicated that needy children often start to lose weight and suffer additional problems associated with malnutrition, because their families are spending less of their meager incomes on food and medicine, and more on fuel bills. No family should have to choose between energy, rent, prescription drugs, or food.

LIHEAP helps families meet their home energy needs, so they can meet other immediate priorities, too.

From 1979 to 1998, the Centers for Disease Control reports that there were 7,421 deaths in the United States due to heat stroke. Over the same time period, CDC says 13,970 people died of hypothermia, or exposure to cold. In Massachusetts, people who cannot afford to heat their homes efficiently often employ more dangerous methods of heat—such as using space heaters or simply leaving oven doors open. In winter 2000, an unseasonably cold winter for my state, deaths from home fires due to space heaters surged in Massachusetts. Nearly one out of every five fire deaths in Massachusetts in 2000 was caused by a space heater.

Had LIHEAP been fully funded, and had the program reacted more effectively to crises, we would have been able to save lives. The real tragedy of this debate is that the flexibility already in LIHEAP isn't being utilized. Emergency LIHEAP funding, desperately needed in Louisiana, Massachusetts, and across the country, is still sitting at the White House.

The Bush administration is sitting on \$600 million in LIHEAP funds that can be placed wherever it is needed most. Half of this emergency funding was approved by Congress in the previous fiscal year. LIHEAP applications keep increasing, the economy still struggles, and States are forced to cut LIHEAP benefits for our people—but the administration keeps claiming an "emergency" doesn't exist while thousands of families are still facing the terrible choice of heat, cooling, or food. The Bush administration can reach the families it mentioned in its budget message right now by releasing the emergency funds. Until it does so, the administration can't discuss improving LIHEAP with any credibility.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to thank the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, for his interest and commitment to addressing this issue during reauthorization. I look forward to working closely with Chairman KENNEDY on this matter next year as well as the opportunity to testify before his committee. Throughout the South and the Southwest there is an urgent need for this reform and I am grateful for Senator KENNEDY's support.

#### RENEWABLE PORTFOLIO STANDARD

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, we have heard hours of debate on the Senate energy bill. One of the messages that we've heard repeated in statements on many different energy related subjects is that energy policy is highly influenced by region. Energy policy that works in one region may not work in another, nor do policy decisions necessarily translate from state to state. For example, Florida's unique topographic, climatic, and geological conditions make it impossible to harness certain forms of renewable energy, such as wind and hydropower. Just as

it would be difficult for the State of Alaska to rely on solar energy during its dark winter months. For these reasons, I have expressed my concern to the chairman of the Energy Committee, Senator BINGAMAN, that a broadly applied renewable portfolio standard will not work optimally for all fifty states of the union. While I remain supportive of expanding the use of renewable energy supplies as an important part of our national energy portfolio, I prefer an approach that treats regions and states with deference to their unique circumstances. An RPS standard cannot be rigid, but must be flexible.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I have been working with my colleagues from Florida for some time to address their concerns with the renewable portfolio standard in the Senate energy bill. Let me say that I think it is critical to increase the use of renewables in order to decrease our dependence on fossil fuels and foreign imports. However, I also appreciate the differences that occur from region to region and State to State. I would like to extend an offer to Senators GRAHAM AND NELSON to work in conference to find some method that will enable a renewable portfolio standard to accomplish the goal of increasing renewables while recognizing the legitimate differences among States. I believe that we can find an appropriate way to help each state include a renewable standard as part of their overall energy production, and I am committed to working with Senator GRAHAM to accomplish this.

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to thank Senator BINGAMAN for his work on the energy bill and for his offer to help address on my concerns with the renewable standard specifically. I look forward to working together on this important provision, and I withdraw my related amendments.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for a period up to 5 minutes.

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

#### SELECTING DAVID AND ANN SCOVILLE TO RECEIVE THE NATIONAL CRIME VICTIM SERVICE AWARD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I join all Vermonters in congratulating David and Ann Scoville on receiving the National Crime Victim Service Award of 2002. We thank them for all they do to help the victims of crime and to help the public understand victims' needs.

Nearly 20 years ago the Scovilles suffered every parent's nightmare—the disappearance and murder of their daughter, Patricia. The crime that took her from them remains unsolved to this day—a situation that has compounded the Scovilles' suffering and