

When Prime Minister Rabin made the famous statement that we have to negotiate with our enemies, we have to make peace with our enemies because we do not need to make peace with our friends, that set a parameter in a statesmanlike way for the necessity for Prime Minister Rabin to deal with Chairman Arafat and for us and others to have had talks with him. However, on this state of the record, where it appears that Arafat has been paying terrorists recently, it seems to me very hard to conduct negotiations with Arafat on the expectation that his commitments will be observed.

We do have moderate Arab leaders. We have King Abdullah of Jordan, a man in his late thirties, heir to King Hussein's good work. We have King Mohamed of Morocco, another able young man in his late thirties who has the potential for leadership. We have President Mubarak of Egypt. It seems to me that those are the leaders who ought to be convened.

It would be my hope that Saudi Arabia would play a constructive role in a peace conference. The Saudis came forward with a proposal which had merit because it was the first time the Saudis have said they would normalize relations with Israel if Israel would recede to the pre-1967 borders. I do not think it is possible to recede to those borders, but there had been negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians on borders, and I think an accommodation would be worked out. However, when the Saudis agreed to normalize and the Syrians agreed with that, that was a significant step forward.

Candidly, it was a major disappointment to see Saudi Arabia have a telethon for the Palestinians and raise, according to press reports, some \$92 million. Where was their telethon for the American victims from September 11th? We know that of the 19 terrorists involved, 15 were from Saudi Arabia, and then Osama bin Laden is a Saudi. It would be my hope that we could expect something more from Saudi Arabia.

As we look forward, I was pleased to see Secretary of State Powell say today that Assistant Secretary Burns will remain in the region, that General Zinni will be there to carry on his role, and that CIA Director George Tenet may be going in the near future to work out security arrangements so that there is an active role by the United States.

I urge the administration to move forward on a conference which would be at the ministerial level, in a sense making the move for Foreign Minister Peres to be the negotiator for Israel; a conference which hopefully would omit Arafat; a conference which hopefully would have Jordan, Egypt, Morocco, and Saudi Arabia as principal participants to be guarantors representing the Palestinian efforts and making arrangements which could be relied upon and could be carried out.

It is very important, in conclusion, that the process be continued. When

Secretary Powell went to the Mideast, he undertook very substantial risks. Everyone cannot hit a home run every time they go to bat, but I think the Secretary did a good job and made a constructive step. Now it should be carried forward with a peace conference attended by other Arab leaders.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDWARDS). 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 partnerships 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.

Murkowski/Breaux/Stevens amendment No. 3132 (to amendment No. 2917), 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.

Stevens amendment No. 3133 (to amendment No. 3132), 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3132 AND 3133

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I welcome a chance to speak about the pending amendments. There are two amendments that have been proposed related to ANWR:

A first-degree amendment by my friend Senator MURKOWSKI relates to the proposal to open ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge area, to drilling, and the second-degree amendment by Senator STEVENS proposes to do that but also proposes a major relief program related to the U.S. steel industry primarily. I will try to talk about the ANWR-related provisions of the bill, and particularly the energy aspects of those today.

I oppose opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas development, and there are many reasons why. Some of those reasons relate to the energy security issues with which we are trying to deal. Some relate to environmental concerns. I am strongly committed, as I believe most Members of this body are, to our Nation's energy security, and the energy bill we have put forward tries to emphasize domestic energy supply and the importance of energy in national security.

However, developing the oil and gas resources in this Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge, this area known as the 1002 area, is simply not a necessary component of a progressive energy policy for this country. The development of the Coastal Plain has been debated in this country and in this Congress for nearly 40 years. Experts still disagree about the actual reserve potential.

In May of 1998, the Geological Survey released new estimates of oil in the refuge. In that analysis, the USGS's mean estimate of economically recoverable oil on Federal lands within the 1002 area was from 3.2 to 5.2 billion barrels, and that was assuming a price of \$20 to \$24 per barrel using 1996 dollars. Today the United States consumes about 19 million barrels of oil each day, almost 7 billion barrels of oil each year.

We have a chart I will put up which I think begins to make that point. As this chart indicates, production from the Arctic Refuge would not contribute significantly to solving this problem. I will make the point by reference to this chart.

Domestic oil production, as shown on this chart, has been declining since 1970 and continues to decline today. That is this green line toward the bottom of the chart. Total oil demand, on the other hand, in the United States has been going up and is expected to continue going up. This chart goes from the year 1950 to the year 2020. We can see demand continuing to go up.

This middle line is transportation demand, and one of the points this chart makes is that total oil demand is driven directly by transportation demand. I think people can see that pretty readily. This little red line down in the right-hand side is domestic oil production with ANWR. So we can see that domestic oil production, although it

continues to decline, would uptick. For a period starting at about 2012, we would see an increase in domestic production under ANWR, if ANWR was open to development. It does not reverse the long-term trend, which is less U.S. production, more imported oil, but for a relatively short period, considering our Nation's history, we would see an increase in domestic production.

The estimate we have from the Energy Information Agency is we would see about a 2 to 3 percent of oil demand in a given year coming out of the ANWR production at the peak of that production. The Energy Information Agency assumes it will take 7 to 12 years before we have any production from ANWR.

We had a hearing in our Energy Committee. We invited representatives of some of the major oil companies that have interests on the North Slope, and the representative from ExxonMobile was asked that very question: How long will it take to bring production to market if we go ahead and enact legislation? His estimate was 10 to 12 years. He said: Assuming there are no legal problems that need to be overcome, it would take as few as 8 years; more likely, it would take something in the range of 10 years.

According to the Energy Information Agency, peak production would not occur for nearly 20 years after initial production. So development would not address the near-term prices or shortages with which people are faced.

The figures the Energy Information Agency has given me indicate their estimate is 54 percent of the oil we consume, as of January, was imported oil. That is why I believe clearly we need to address the problem. We need to try to pass comprehensive energy legislation. As I said before, though, opening the Arctic Refuge is not the answer to this dependence on foreign oil.

The recent report that the Energy Information Agency came out with has a quotation in it that I think is very important. This is on page 6 of a report that the Energy Information Agency issued in February of 2002. That was 2 months ago. They say:

The increase in ANWR production would lead to a decline in the U.S. dependence on foreign oil for the 2002 referenced case. Net imports are projected to supply 62 percent of all oil used in the United States by 2020. Opening ANWR is estimated to reduce the percentage share of our imports to 60 percent.

I will put this second chart up to make the point very graphically. What the Energy Information Agency is telling us is there will be less need for us to import oil if we open ANWR, and that reduced need for imports would come in about 2012. It would be about 2 percent. Instead of importing 62 percent of our oil in the year 2020, we would be importing 60 percent of our oil in the year 2020.

The other thing the Energy Information Agency says, which I think is very instructive, if we carry their projec-

tions out—and these are all their projections; this is technically recoverable oil from ANWR as they see it—if these are carried out, by the year 2026 those two lines come together again and we are back in a situation where we are as dependent on foreign oil in the year 2027, for example, as we would have been absent any drilling in ANWR.

By the year 2030, their projection is we are going to be 75-percent dependent upon imports for our oil if ANWR is open for drilling and we are going to be 75-percent dependent upon imports of foreign oil if ANWR is not open for drilling. So from their perspective, if we look at a 28- or 30-year timeframe, they see absolutely no difference in the extent of our dependence whether we open ANWR or we do not open ANWR.

Another point I think is important to make is this focus on developing the Arctic Refuge has drawn attention away from real opportunities we do have to enhance our domestic energy production and reduce our reliance on imported oil and help us attain energy security. Let me mention some of these opportunities from which I think we have had our attention deflected.

First is the development of the abundant gas resources on other parts of the North Slope that are already open for development, coupled with the construction of a natural gas transportation system, a pipeline to bring that gas from the North Slope down to the lower 48. I will speak some more about each of these in a moment.

A second opportunity I think we have not given enough attention to is that production from the National Petroleum Reserve, Alaska. This is a highly prospective area for recent oil and gas leasing activity, and it is one where I think we have great potential to produce additional oil.

A third opportunity is new production from lands already under lease that are not being developed. There are many such lands offshore Louisiana, Texas, and Alabama, and we need to give more focus to how we incentivize production out of those areas. Fourth is the reliance on other forms of energy. We have been trying to make that point throughout the debate on this energy bill.

Long term, if we are going to avoid the projection on this chart, which is that we will be 75-percent dependent upon foreign sources of oil by 2030, we have to find alternative sources of energy as a substitute for this imported oil. That needs to be a very high priority for our research and development effort and for the provisions we have in this bill.

I believe the most important energy issue in Alaska is not the Arctic Refuge—although hearing the debate one would think that was the central issue as to whether we did what should be done to meet our energy needs in the future. The most important issue is Arctic gas. The North Slope of Alaska contains rich supplies of natural gas. There is more than 32 million cubic

feet of natural gas immediately available in existing oil fields in the Alaskan North Slope. The total natural gas estimates are in the area of 100 trillion cubic feet. We do not need new legislative authority in order to produce this gas.

However, currently, the natural gas that is produced with oil on the North Slope is being reinjected because there is no transportation system, there is no pipeline with which to bring that gas from the North Slope to the lower 48. Congress dealt with the issue in 1976 when it enacted the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System Act. Responding to the energy crisis of that decade, Congress called for the immediate construction of a gas transportation system and an expedited process for accomplishing that goal. Due to changed economics, due to other intervening factors, there have been more than two decades that have passed and we still do not have any pipeline. We do not have any kind of transportation to bring that gas to the lower 48.

The energy bill pending in the Senate tries to address the issue. The House-passed bill does not try to address the issue. This bill does. We would increase the supply of domestically produced natural gas to U.S. consumers by expediting the construction of the Alaska natural gas pipeline. It provides for streamlined procedures for permits, for rights-of-way and certificates needed for the U.S. segments of the pipeline, as well as financial incentives to reduce the risks of the project.

We have had a lot of discussion about jobs as part of this debate about ANWR. This natural gas pipeline I am talking about, which is distinct from ANWR, the natural gas pipeline creates more than 400,000 new jobs. This is in contrast to the Congressional Research Service estimate of 60 to 130,000 jobs that would be created by opening the Arctic Refuge.

Senator REED, who chairs the Joint Economic Committee, released a new report last month estimating that opening the Arctic Refuge results in the creation of 65,000 jobs nationwide by 2020, an employment gain of less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the U.S. workforce as a whole. Building the pipeline would not only create thousands of new jobs but also provide a huge opportunity for the steel industry. The project requires up to 3,500 miles of pipe, 5 million tons of steel. The Senate bill encourages the use of North American steel and union labor in the construction of the pipeline. The total cost of the pipeline would be in the range of \$15 to \$20 billion. I strongly support going forward with that and putting whatever we can in this legislation to encourage its construction.

In addition to these enormous supplies of natural gas from existing oil fields, there is another substantial opportunity to obtain additional oil and gas from the Alaska North Slope. This is the National Petroleum Reserve, Alaska. We have a chart that shows

something of which most Americans are not aware. The map shows a large area, the National Petroleum Reserve, Alaska (NPRA), which is the orange area on this chart. It is a very large area. This is the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and includes the 1002 area. There are 23 million acres of public land in the NPRA. It is approximately the size of Indiana. It was created to secure the Nation's petroleum reserves. It is administered by the Bureau of Land Management which, in 1999, offered 4 million acres in the northeast portion of the NPRA. They offered 4 million acres in that area for leasing. The result was very successful. It was a very successful lease sale. There was a high level of industry interest, with over \$104 million in bonus bids for 133 leases on 867,000 acres in this NPRA area.

Exploration drilling has occurred. The industry has made major finds. A second lease sale is scheduled to take place in June of this year in another part of the National Petroleum Reserve, Alaska. The planning is also being undertaken to open additional portions of the NPRA after the sale that takes place in June. This is an opportunity that does not require any change in the law in order for drilling to go forward. As the map indicates, there are vast areas of Federal and State land on the North Slope that are already open to oil and gas leasing and development. The yellow portions on the chart are already under lease.

In addition, under the current 5-year leasing plan, the State of Alaska plans an aggressive leasing program in the areas between the NPRA and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Not only do I believe these parts of the North Slope other than the Arctic Refuge can contribute significantly to meeting our oil and gas needs, there are Federal lands currently under lease elsewhere that are also not being produced. Let me show a chart with our Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. This chart shows 32 million acres in the Outer Continental Shelf that have already been leased by the government to oil companies for exploration and development that have not yet been developed. We do not need to pass a law in order to have drilling in those areas, either.

In addition to my belief there are many other good opportunities to increase domestic oil and gas production, and I mentioned some here, I am particularly concerned this controversy about the Arctic Refuge diverts attention from an important underlying goal which we need to have in this bill, and that is to diversify our energy mix.

What we are trying to do in the bill to support more research and development, to support development of alternative sources of energy, in the long run will do more to solve our national energy problems than what we have done so far.

I will comment for a minute on the issue of CAFE standards because that

has come into the debate in various ways. I will show another chart that shows why, in my view, we should have gone ahead and required higher CAFE standards for vehicles. This chart shows a blue line, which is net imports of oil, given current law. The green line indicates net imports if we open ANWR to drilling. It shows the amount required to be imported for a period of 20 years is reduced under that scenario. Then if we had net imports with CAFE, had we raised the CAFE standards, we would see that net imports would not only be more than the imports would be in the case of drilling in ANWR but they would stay lower. That is the advantage of it. In the case of drilling in ANWR, you have a relatively short-term benefit which goes away once the oil is used up. In the case of CAFE standards, you have a continuing benefit for the indefinite future.

I do think we need to revisit that issue. I hope we can. I hope we can get some support from the administration to do something more significant.

I received a letter—I know my colleague, Senator MURKOWSKI, had it printed in the RECORD yesterday afternoon—from Secretary of Energy, Spencer Abraham, our former colleague, for whom I have great respect. He was citing the various things he is doing as Secretary of Energy to help us reduce our dependence on foreign oil. I gather he sent this letter to all Members of Congress. He said:

I will be meeting this week with the American Automobile Association—AAA—to identify ways to encourage Americans to drive smarter, to prepare their cars to operate more efficiently to save fuel and money.

I am not opposed to him meeting with the AAA to encourage Americans to drive smarter, but that is not an adequate response to the energy challenges this country faces. We need to do better. This administration should be supporting increased CAFE standards. It should be supporting provisions of this bill to encourage efficiency in the use of energy and not just depend upon Americans to drive smarter.

You can put a little more air in your tires. You can, perhaps, get your car tuned up. But the truth is, if the car is manufactured to run at 12 or 14 miles per gallon—14 miles for each gallon that you buy—you cannot do a whole lot to solve that problem.

I know there are others who want to speak. There will be opportunities later for me to add to my comments. Let me conclude by saying that opening the Arctic Refuge is not, in my view, good environmental policy. More importantly, it is far from necessary as part of a national energy policy. Oil and gas development on the Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge does little for our Nation's energy security. If you take the long-term view, which is 2030, it does nothing to deal with our energy security needs.

It is a diversion from the efforts we should be taking as a country to address the important subject of energy,

a subject that is crucial to our economy, to our way of life and our future. I urge my colleagues to join me in the effort to oppose opening this area for drilling.

I believe Senator BREAUX was expecting to speak at this time in favor of one or both of the amendments, so I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I am pleased to follow the distinguished chairman of the Energy Committee. Although we differ on the conclusion, I certainly have the utmost respect for the good work he has done in bringing this bill to the floor, along with the Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI, in an effort to try to develop something we do not have in this country and that we desperately need, and that is an energy policy that is good for America.

The energy policy we have—or probably do not have—is probably good for OPEC but it is not good for America. Why do I say it is good for OPEC? Because the facts are that we import about 57 to 58 percent of the oil we use in this country. It comes not from America, not from allies in Canada, or good friends in Mexico, but about 58 percent of the oil and gas we use in this country for everything we need, from agriculture to cars and trucks to our residences being heated in the winter and cooled in the summer—that 58 percent of the oil and gas we need for all those services which are critically important to the United States and every citizen of this country does not come from America. It comes from countries where, if people in this country did what they did in their country, they would go to the penitentiary.

What am I talking about? Every few weeks people in OPEC, the sheiks and the people who control the energy in those countries, meet in fancy resort hotels around the world, they meet in secret, and they determine how much they are going to price the oil that America has to buy. They regularly and openly fix prices. If companies that are providers in this country did that in America, they would go to the penitentiary. That is clear. It is illegal. Yet we as a nation have accepted that policy on the part of the principal supplier of oil for our country.

We do not control our destiny; we do not control our future, as long as we rely on people who fix prices to provide this country with the ingredients we need to be a strong and secure and prosperous nation. That has to come to an end.

It is not going to be easy. There is not one answer. There is a multitude of answers which we have to incorporate in an energy bill which is balanced, which provides help and assistance for new forms of energy, for alternate forms of energy.

I voted for \$6 billion worth of tax incentives for new forms of energy. Many people in Louisiana think it is ludicrous that I am doing that. When I talk

about wind power and chicken manure being converted into energy, people in my State say: What are you doing? Why don't you try to encourage oil and gas production? I say: Yes, that is important, but alternative sources of energy are also important.

The point I make about where we get our energy supplies is just this simple. If we were dependent for, say—think about it—58 percent of the food we eat in this country, suppose it came from a foreign source which was not very dependable. People would be marching in the streets in Washington, saying you have to stop that policy. It is insane. We can't depend on foreign countries for our food. It is essential to our national security. You cannot allow a policy which gets agricultural products from countries on which we cannot depend. People would march in the streets—and rightfully so.

That is exactly what we do when it comes to energy. We are satisfied. We are fat, we are happy, until they turn the faucet off just a little bit. It happened in 1973 and it brought this country to our knees. We had long lines at filling stations. We had lack of supplies. We had people getting in fights trying to buy gasoline so they could take their children to the doctor and to school and run commerce in this country. We saw what they could do. At that time we were probably 30-percent dependent on imported oil. Today it is about 58 percent. We look around the world and the circumstances today are much worse than they were in the 1970s.

There has been an attempted coup in Venezuela, which is one of our largest suppliers. The President of that country is in bed with Castro and Libya and Iraq, and we are dependent on them for much of the energy supply in America. Purchase of it comes from Louisiana where we refine it in Lake Charles. Is that a secure source? Of course not. They just had a revolution. The guy they kicked out is back. He is not particularly a friend of the United States when he is giving oil to Cuba at discounted prices and threatens to cut it off to us at any moment.

Getting oil from Iraq, is that a stable source? The Middle East situation today is as volatile as it has been in generations.

So the point I would make to start this discussion is we, in these United States, have to be more reasonable, more balanced in how we approach the solution. There is no absolute, safe method of achieving energy independence that doesn't have some risk. Let's admit that up front. That is, of course, true.

But we have a policy in this country when it comes to oil and gas. Think about it. You could not drill offshore anywhere on the east coast, from Maine to Key West. It is all locked in—or, rather, locked out from any development, although there are potential reserves in those areas that are substantial.

If you look on the west coast of this country, you can go all the way from Washington State down the west coast, all the way down to Mexico and you cannot have any new leasing in any of those areas whatsoever. We did that because Republican administrations and Democratic administrations, Republican Congresses and Democratic Congresses, have taken all those areas and said: Don't do it here. Not in my backyard. The problem is the backyard is the entire west coast of the United States. Don't do it in my backyard on the east coast. The problem is it is the entire east coast of America.

Some have said, and some of the environmental groups have said, "Do it off Louisiana," as if we were not important from their perspective, and as if we didn't have some of the most valuable resources in terms of wetlands, fin fish, birds, oysters, shrimp, and all of the fur-bearing animals that we have in the very fragile wetlands where we lose 25 square miles a year because of erosion. But they are saying: Do it there. We are doing it there. We will continue to do it there because we believe this is a national issue and we should make our contribution towards energy security. We have done it for 60 years off our coast and on our shores. There have been mistakes. There have been problems, but we have learned from those mistakes. And today it is much more secure than bringing oil in rusty-bucket ships that leak and spill oil on the oceans of this country. Less than 2 percent of the oil that finds its way into the oceans of America and the world come from offshore development. Most of it comes in tanker discharge, industrial runoff, and other sources, and natural seepage, but not from offshore production activities—less than 2 percent, according to the National Academy of Sciences. I think we have shown it can be done safely and in a fashion that protects the environment.

There is no place I would rather fish in America than the Gulf of Mexico. We have literally hundreds and hundreds of platforms that have wells, exploration wells, and production wells that produce natural gas and oil for the rest of this country. We have a pipeline system that takes natural gas and sends it to Chicago, New York, New England, or to the west coast, and all over this country, coming from one particular source in the gulf where there is a 60-year record of it being done safely. Despite that, when we tried to have additional leasing in the gulf, Congress tried to stop that even.

President Clinton, to his credit, proposed a compromise called lease sale 181 in the Gulf of Mexico. To my regret, the Bush administration cut that by two-thirds. It was a proposed lease sale that was two-thirds less than President Clinton had proposed in the Gulf of Mexico. And this Congress tried to eliminate it completely because they did not want it in their backyard.

From where is it going to come? From where is it going to come, if not

from a domestic source right here in this country where we have shown we can do it safely, in a secure fashion, and in an environmentally sensitive fashion? I think there are many parts of the country that are doing their share.

The concept that because it is a wildlife refuge and somehow we are not supposed to be able to do anything on it other than look at caribou is ridiculous. Here are the wildlife management and wetland management districts around the country where we have production already. There are 9 facilities in Texas and 12 in Louisiana. Every single wildlife refuge in Louisiana—which has some of the best in the world, the best in the country, and which has more wildlife features and more fragile ecology than the North Slope—12 separate production facilities on wildlife refuges, one of them owned by the Audubon Society, which has production on their own refuge from which they get royalties, strongly support it, but nowhere else.

I think it has been shown that, in fact, you can have production, if it is done properly and in a sensitive fashion—and in wildlife refuges, as well as in areas that are not. It can be done. It has been done and it has been done safely.

This is an example of the type of facility in Louisiana. Look at how small of a print that is. In Alaska, there are 19 million acres in ANWR. When we are talking about reserving a portion of that 19 million acres, which is less than the size of Dulles Airport, to do one type of operation, of course, it makes an imprint. Is it huge? Of course not. Is it dangerous? Of course not. Can it be done safely? The answer is yes. History has shown us that it can be done in an environmentally safe fashion. We would not need that, if we were not importing 58 percent of our oil from countries that are not safe and not reliable.

If we had enough energy production from other sources, then we would not need to do it in the wetlands because we would have more than we needed right here in this country. But that is not the case when we are importing 58 percent from places that fix prices and which have us literally over a barrel when it comes to having enough energy to run the cars, to run industry, and agricultural entities in this country. We can't afford not to look at developing it here in this country. That is the point I would make.

There are some who say we will have a problem with the caribou up there. Caribou aren't endangered. They are like a bunch of cows. There are more of them now than there were years before. In addition to that, we are not damaging the lifestyle of caribou by having some energy development in the same area they happen to be walking through once or twice a year.

Some say: You can't do anything up there because of the caribou. They have nice pictures of caribou. They say: Don't do anything to damage the

caribou. The caribou are more plentiful in that part of the country than they were in Prudhoe Bay. They are doing quite well, thank you very much.

For those who said, "Well, you are going to interfere with their lifestyle," look at this photograph. These are not dummies that somebody put out on the North Slope. The Senator from Alaska knows that area quite well. It is his State. These are living, breathing, multiplying caribou within a stone's throw of a production facility in Alaska. Does this look like the caribou lifestyle is being interfered with? Does it look as if they are not happy and content, grazing near the pipeline and production facility?

Some will make the argument you can't do it because the caribou walk across this area twice a year, they might calve, and it might disrupt their lifestyle.

Importing 58 percent of our energy is disrupting the lifestyle of Americans, and it is threatening the security of the United States.

We don't want to get into another Afghanistan or have the Middle East shut off the oil supply to this country or ask how we are going to defend ourselves and be protectors of the world when we are buying oil from people who have turned against us because of conflicts with Islamic portions of this world.

We have to be secure. We have to be confident that we can depend on energy. We ought to do whatever is necessary to produce it in this country instead of bending over on our knees saying, please, OPEC, don't disrupt our energy supplies; please, OPEC, don't charge us too much; please, please, please.

You can't say that when you don't have someone to back it up. What are we going to do? Threaten not to buy their oil? We do not have that luxury because we are not doing enough to produce energy right here in America.

For those people who say, "Don't drill in ANWR," get off the caribou argument. They made that argument about the Prudhoe Bay pipeline; it was going to kill all of the caribou; they will move somewhere else; they weren't going to have calves. That has not proven to be correct by one iota. The caribou are there and they are thriving. That simply, in my opinion, is not a legitimate argument as to what we should be looking at. We should be looking at it from the standpoint of safety and making sure it has the utmost of environmental equipment that is needed to make sure it can be done safely. I would suggest that it doesn't matter how we protect it. It is a lot safer than importing energy that we are bringing in by tankers from around the world.

Some have said that in order to get this measure passed we have to sweeten the pot for some of the steelworkers who lost their jobs. I am not for that. That is not what the issue should be.

Some have said maybe our friends in the Middle East and the Israelis will

help and maybe we can get enough votes to pass this measure. It should pass on its own.

I would vote for trying to get something good from the standpoint of energy security. It should pass or fail on its own merits. We ought to be able to look and decide whether it is a good idea.

When I was back in the House in the 1970s, we wrote the Alaska Lands Act. We looked at this area. We set aside the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge with 19 million acres with the clear thought that we ought to take a small portion of it and look to see whether we could possibly do more for energy. The USGS tells us that it equals a 30-year supply of oil coming from Saudi Arabia.

Some say there isn't much up there. We will not know until we take a look. The USGS tells us that it is potentially a 30-year supply—the equivalent of what we get from Saudi Arabia. That is not insignificant. That is a huge amount. Some say it is a 1-day supply. It is 1 day if we cut off all other sources. If you look at it from the standpoint of potentially how much is there, a 30-year potential is very significant considering what we get from Saudi Arabia.

We may not get this thing done. We may continue to say: Don't do it in my backyard; don't do it on the east coast, don't do it on the west coast, don't do it in the Gulf of Mexico, don't do it—don't, don't.

But my point is simply this: If not there, where? For somebody who thinks it is better to import it from the Middle East rather than produce it in our country with our own people running the program and with our environmental laws in effect, I suggest that is not a good tradeoff.

This amendment should pass. We should go about the business of bringing energy security to this country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BREAUX. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask the Senator from Louisiana: Some people have suggested that the better answer is, rather than opening ANWR to drilling, we should simply concentrate on the Gulf of Mexico and put up every possible lease sale. I think that lease sales are already taking place in 2,000 to 3,000 feet of water. And the industry has had a very successful effort in producing there. It requires a great deal of technology.

But I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana believes this is a better solution than exploration in other areas of the country, where States such as Louisiana or Alaska want the development to occur?

Mr. BREAUX. From a selfish standpoint, I could say: Don't do it anywhere else. Just do it in Louisiana. It creates jobs. It creates income. And it creates infrastructure. We are happy to sup-

port that activity. If I looked at it from only a parochial standpoint, I would say: Only do it in the Gulf of Mexico. Don't do it anywhere else. But that is not in the best interest of the country.

You have to do it in the gulf, but you have to do it in other places where oil may be present. One of the most promising and potentially the largest supplies, other than the Gulf of Mexico, is, in fact, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

So if you look at it as national policy, it is not enough that Louisiana and Texas do it. Other States have to be involved; and ANWR is one of those sites. We cannot keep saying "don't do it here" and "don't do it there" and "don't, don't, don't." The fact is, we ought to do it where we can find available energy. I would say ANWR is one of those.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I wonder if the Senator would show us that particular chart because I think it depicts the statement that has been made continually: "Well, not in my backyard."

Mr. BREAUX. That is it. It is easy to say: Don't do it in my own backyard. I want to be with environmentalists. And that is fine, but at some point you have to say: We have to have a balanced program.

I talked to some environmentalists about ANWR, and I said: I tell you what, what if we limit it to 1 acre? Would you be satisfied if we only did it on 1 acre in Alaska? The answer was: No. The fact is, they don't want to do it on 1 acre or 20 acres. They just don't want to do it because it becomes a symbol of what they stand for. And I understand that.

But we are in a crisis in this country. I am saying you have to have a balanced approach. This is what has occurred around natural gas, the cleanest burning fuel, the least threatening in this country. People don't like nuclear because it is dangerous. Natural gas is dangerous. They don't like coal because it is dirty. Natural gas is the cleanest fuel we have.

Look at what has happened. As I show you this on the map I have in the Chamber, this area is subject to no restrictions. You cannot drill for potentially 21 trillion cubic feet of natural gas on the west coast because it is all blocked off. There are 31 trillion cubic feet of potential natural gas reserves on the east coast. You cannot drill a well anywhere there.

There is lease sale 181, which we just fought in this Congress, where people want to say: Don't do anything here. There are 24 trillion cubic feet of potential natural gas reserves, and Florida is importing over 90 percent of the gas they use from other sources. They do not produce but a trickle of their gas in Florida. They import over 90 percent, and they say: Don't do it off my pretty beaches. Don't do it off my million-dollar houses. Go do it somewhere else. There isn't anyplace else.

The only place we are doing it is shown here on the map. So look at the

interior of the country. We have more places where you can't look for oil and gas than you have where oil and gas potential exists.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Would my friend from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. BREAUX. Sure.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I don't want to argue with the Senator's basic point. I am in general agreement with him, that we ought to be drilling some places where we are not drilling today. But the chart the Senator has seems to indicate you are not drilling in northwestern Mexico. That is one of the largest gasfields in this country, the San Juan Basin. We are drilling at an amazing rate up there. I support the drilling that goes on there, by and large.

I do not know about all the rest of the Rocky Mountain region, if that map is intending to indicate you cannot drill in it. But an awful lot of our State is being drilled in, and appropriately so.

Mr. BREAUX. I just say, referring to the map, the access restrictions I am talking about on the coast clearly are a total prohibition. And this is a total prohibition. This has restrictions on access to those areas. For some of these areas, it should be.

But what we are talking about today is not access restrictions to ANWR; we are talking about a total prohibition on ANWR. That is not access restrictions. That is a lot further.

If we want to pass a bill that says we are going to carefully coordinate how you can get into that area, how you can exit that area, what you can do in that area, that is one thing; but the legislation we have in the current law of this country is: no access. That is not access restrictions; that is totally no access to areas that have potentially huge amounts of energy.

Again, I would say, don't do ANWR if we don't need it. But anytime this country is importing 58 percent of our energy, I would suggest we need it. Are we importing 58 percent of our energy because we like to do that? Of course not. We are over a barrel paying OPEC prices, which they fix every 6 weeks.

I think, if we are going to have a national energy policy, everybody has to come to the table, not just half of the equation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, let me begin, if I may, by first of all saying it is my intention to answer each and every one of the assertions just made by the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Alaska. There is ample proof that those of us who oppose drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge are strongly in favor of drilling in many other parts of this country and are strongly in favor of a policy which keeps the United States on the cutting edge of energy production.

In a few moments I will show how we are producing extraordinary amounts

of natural gas, almost all the coal we consume, huge amounts of oil and other sources of energy, and, in fact, we are building new powerplants all across this country.

None of us are standing here with our head in the sand arguing that we should not continue to produce energy. Moreover, I think the arguments made underscore the fundamental difference in the approach by those of us who believe there is a different energy future for the United States that does not require us to do injury to something we have set aside for a purpose.

Beginning with a Republican President, and going through a series of Presidents over the last 25, 30 years, there has been an honoring of an ethic in the United States that suggests that the concept of a preserve should be exactly that.

My colleague, a moment ago, said: What would happen if we said, drill in only 1 acre? Well, everyone understands that if you begin with 1 acre, it does not stay at 1 acre. It will progress. The first acre is the violation of the notion of set-aside. The first acre is the violation of the concept of pristineness. The first acre is the destruction of the concept of an arctic wildlife refuge that is absent any kind of industrialization.

My arguments against drilling in ANWR are not based on the caribou. That was a wonderful picture, a great discussion of caribou, but that is not the principal argument here. It is interesting, however—and I will show, a little later, that our own Fish & Wildlife Service—I have heard my colleagues referring to radical environmental groups. The people who are cautioned against this are the administration's own functionaries who worked on this for years. The Fish & Wildlife Service finds there would be problems with respect to the ecosystem. The U.S. Geologic Survey has serious questions with almost all of the numbers that have been put forward by the proponents.

So I begin at the beginning. I want to try to lay a record out here that I think is clear and, I hope, understandable and, I hope, in the end, compelling about why it is inappropriate to drill in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge. But I do want to say, the two visions are different visions of the energy future of our country.

I honor what the Senator from Louisiana said. He is a strong advocate for his State. He is a terrific Senator. And he is right, we do need to do more drilling. I am in favor of more drilling. We should do more drilling in the deep water Gulf of Mexico, which Lord John Brown, the CEO, chairman of British Petroleum, says is the most significant oilfield unexploited in the world, which is where at least British Petroleum would like to put its energy, its efforts, not in ANWR.

But let's begin at the beginning.

Our colleagues have come to the floor and suggested to our fellow Senators

that this is the first time in history that a "national security" issue has been filibustered.

First of all, one could make a serious argument about the degree to which this is, in fact, a national security issue. But I will accept the question of how much oil we import. The question of American dependency on oil is legitimately a concern of the United States. But it is not addressed by drilling in ANWR, No. 1, and, No. 2, the record shows clearly that this is not the first time such an issue has been filibustered.

If ANWR is important to the energy national security of the United States because it would affect how much oil might be available or how much oil we are importing, then CAFE standards are equally a national security issue for our country. In fact, CAFE standards are a far better response to national security because even the oil companies will tell us they can't produce oil from ANWR for anywhere from 7 to 10 years.

When my colleagues come to the floor of the Senate and suggest to us that the crisis in the Middle East is a reason to drill in ANWR, that is a misleading argument because no oil will flow from ANWR, given the permitting, lawsuit, developmental processes, as I will show later, until from 7 to 10 years from now. And you don't even get to the peak production until somewhere, perhaps, around 2020.

That said, if you put CAFE standards in place, you would have a much faster response to the oil. You would get 1 million barrels saved in a decade, and that would grow exponentially. In ANWR, as you drill, you lose the oil. You reach a point of peak production, and then it starts to go down. But if you put CAFE standards in place, it grows and grows through the years. So in fact, CAFE standards result in three times the savings of ANWR.

I don't want to get into a CAFE standards argument. That is not why I am here. But CAFE standards is as much a national security issue for the United States as the question of whether or not we drill in ANWR. I will show later how ANWR doesn't even affect the total amount of oil on which we are dependent except for this tiny little sliver that is barely discernable on a graph.

The point is, our colleagues have suggested this is the first time. I want to say this because the accuracy that disappears in this process is very important. The fact is, in the 101st Congress, second session—I was a member of that Senate; I remember the vote—we had a motion to invoke cloture on the Motor Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Act. It failed. In other words, it was filibustered. It was filibustered, and 42 Senators managed to prevent us from passing the effort by Senator Richard Bryant of Nevada to have CAFE standards, which is a national security issue.

Among those Senators who voted to continue the filibuster and not allow us

to put CAFE standards in place were both Senators from Alaska and the Senator from Texas, who have asserted that we must allow a straight vote on ANWR. Let's dispense with the national security argument, and there is further reason to dispense with it because of the amount of oil we have in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge.

I want to show this chart. This is the world supply of oil production versus the Arctic Wildlife Refuge. If the Presiding Officer is having trouble seeing ANWR, that is because here it is. It is this yellow line at the very bottom of the chart versus all the oil production of the world.

The United States of America only has 3 percent of the oil reserves of the world, including ANWR, including the Gulf of Mexico, our national monuments, all of our oil. Every single year, the United States of America uses 25 percent of the world's oil. I don't know any child in school who can't quickly figure out that if we only own 3 percent but we use 25 percent of the world's production, we have a problem.

We have a serious problem.

You can't drill your way out of this problem. If you drill all the oil in ANWR, you still face a fundamental issue which is the United States of America is overly dependent on foreign oil and is growing more and more so.

In 1973, when we first met the cartel's oil crisis, we had a dependency on foreign oil of about 35 percent. Yet we responded, supposedly, with CAFE standards, with more production. Today, we are about 55 or 56 percent dependent on the rest of the world. And in the next few years, we will grow to 60 percent. Does anybody in their right mind believe if we depend today on foreign oil for 60 percent of our oil, that ANWR, which is only a fraction of the 3 percent that we possess, somehow has the ability to make a difference to the United States? The answer is no. No, you can't. You just can't squeeze that enough.

So there are two competing visions here: A vision of the status quo, a vision that is similar to the one that is reflected in a willingness to avoid doing anything about global warming, even though every scientist says global warming is a problem; a willingness to ignore the need to be involved in the realities of science versus our desire just to go along the way it is and not upset the equilibrium in any way whatsoever.

The fact is that about 70 percent of America's oil use goes to transportation. When I hear my colleagues talk about our terrible dependency on the Middle East for oil, ANWR doesn't end the terrible dependency on the Middle East for oil. I just heard the Senator from Louisiana say: Gosh, it would be great if we could vote in a way that we are not the hostages of Middle Eastern countries that can cut off our oil.

Well, yes, it would be great. But voting for the Arctic Wildlife Refuge doesn't do that. It leaves you still 60-

percent dependent on foreign oil. And any cartel, any terrorist, any country that wants to hold the United States hostage will hold us hostage until we liberate ourselves from our oil glut, dependency, whatever you want to call it.

Those two visions are the vision of the status quo over here, and a vision over here of those who believe there is a different energy future for the United States.

I quickly say as an outline, my sense of that energy future for the United States begins with four important principles. Those principles speak directly to what the Senator from Louisiana just said about whether we are willing to drill.

No. 1, absent an exhaustion of remedies and a life-threatening threat to the United States, absent that, the United States should do nothing that doesn't make economic sense. Principle No. 1: It makes economic sense to do what we choose to do absent some life-threatening challenge that is coming down the road.

Principle No. 2: We should commit ourselves again, given the same caveat, absent a threat that we have just got to respond to, we should commit ourselves that the choices we make do not diminish the quality of life of any American at all. So it makes economic sense. We don't diminish the quality of life. We can make those choices now.

Principle No. 3: All of us who are opposed to the Arctic Wildlife Refuge must have the courage to stand up and say we are going to be dependent on oil still for 30 to 50 years or more in this country. It will take that long to make the energy transition, to make the transportation transition. And what we must do is put in place a set of policies that begin to accelerate our capacity in an economically viable way to begin to make that transition to this new energy future.

That is alternatives and renewables and the hydrogen fuel cell and hybrid cars and a host of other things.

I don't know why my colleagues are so pessimistic about America's capacity to meet a challenge through the skill and creativity of our entrepreneurs.

When we put our entrepreneurial skill and energy to work in the United States of America, there is nothing we can't do. We have proven it—when we went to space. We proved it in the Manhattan Project when we needed to create a response to the terror of the Axis Powers and win World War II. We have proven it time and again.

I believe that just as President Kennedy put a challenge to the country saying we are going to go to the Moon in 10 years—not knowing, incidentally, if we could in fact get there, not knowing if it was in fact achievable, but telling America that the reason we are going to do this is because it is difficult. And we did it.

In 1990, when everybody said, oh, it is going to cost \$8 billion to reduce the

amount of sulfur in our air as part of the Clean Air Act and we cannot do it in that time period, what happened, Mr. President? We did it faster than we ever thought we would or could, and we did it for a cost not of \$8 billion, or for \$4 billion, which the environmental people thought it would cost; we did it for \$2 billion, and we did it faster.

The reason we did that was that no one was able to factor in the exponential benefits of technology, the rate at which one technological discovery spurred the next technological discovery. The way, in fact, that the serious commitment of the United States could do it invited private capital markets to make the decision that, hey, that is worth the investment. It is the old field of dreams: Build it, and they will come. We decided we were going to build it, and they came, and we did it faster.

My colleagues are very pessimistic about the ability of the United States to bring online all of these other capacities to do these things more efficiently, cleanly, and effectively, and we can create tens of thousands, millions of jobs in this country, putting people to work in production for other parts of the world that also have the same demands and needs.

Again, I repeat, we cannot drill our way out of America's energy challenge. We have to invent our way out of this challenge. We should begin now to encourage the greatest laboratories, our universities, our venture capitalists, the private sector, in the strongest way possible to begin to move us to this new energy future where America is not dependent upon these other countries.

I am particularly sensitive when I hear my colleague say we don't want our young men and women sent off to these countries and put at risk. Let me tell you, I think one of the things I have fought for as hard as anything in the Senate is common sense about how we wage our wars and where and when we put people at risk.

Mr. President, this is a false promise to America. The sons and daughters of America are more at risk every day that we remain prisoners of this equation where more than 45 percent of the world's oil supply is in Saudi Arabia. There is nothing we can do about that. We don't have as much. No matter what we try to do, we won't be able to repeat it. Moreover, the amount of oil in ANWR will not affect the price of oil globally at all. It doesn't create the kind of independence we want.

This is a statement of Lee Raymond, chairman and chief executive officer of ExxonMobil Corporation. He is in the oil industry. He knows what he is talking about:

The idea that this country can ever again be energy independent is outmoded and probably was even in the era of Richard Nixon. The point is that no industry in the world is more globalized than our industry.

That is a chief executive of an oil company.

Whether or not we do ANWR with respect to price is also critical. The first President Bush said:

Popular opinion aside, our vulnerability to price shocks is not determined by how much oil we import. Our vulnerability is more directly linked to how oil dependent our economy is.

President Bush is correct. Nothing about drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge fundamentally alters the dependency of the United States. No one in the industry will suggest that, even at its best amount of oil, the Arctic Wildlife Refuge makes anything but a few tiny percentage points, in the low single digits, of difference on a 60-percent dependency on foreign oil.

Even if you drill in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge, you cannot affect the energy price. Alaska Governor Tony Knowles said:

Evidence overwhelmingly rejects the notion of any relationship between Alaska North Slope crude and West Coast gasoline prices.

Great Britain is entirely energy independent, fuel independent. They have their own North Sea oil. But Great Britain, despite the fact that it has a 100-percent capacity to supply its oil, is subject to the same price increases and the same price shocks as other countries in the world. ANWR, with its tiny little percentage, is not going to affect that.

Let me deal with another issue if I may. I have enormous respect for Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator STEVENS. They are friends. They have been my colleagues a long time, and they are fighting a fight in which they believe. They particularly believe in it for their State. I think every one of us in the Senate accepts responsibility for helping States that have difficulties making up revenue differences. That is why we have a Federal system in this country. We help farm country for different things at different times. I am certainly always prepared to try to be of assistance to the State of Alaska in ways that it needs it.

One of the Senators, or both, has spoken about Senator Tsongas a number of years ago. None of us could comment on what was or was not said between Senators. I accept what Senator STEVENS says. All I know is that Senator Tsongas was asked point blank in 1992:

Do you believe that the Alaska refuge should be opened to drilling in 1992?

Here is what the Senator said:

Absolutely not. I believe we should prevent exploitation and devastation of this national treasure. To address our energy needs, we should promote maximizing energy efficiency, renewable resources, and our plentiful natural gas reserves.

Once again, I cannot go back in history to a time when I wasn't here. But I do know that Paul Tsongas, as late as 1992, was opposed to drilling and certainly had no sense of any commitment he had made at that point in time in that regard.

In this debate, as I mentioned a moment ago, I want to deal with the question of production. The Senator from Louisiana asked: What are we going to do? Where are we going to produce our

energy? He asked legitimate questions, such as: If we are not going to do it here, how do we do it there, and so forth.

Let me clarify this for the record. The proponents of drilling in the Arctic Refuge want to cast those of us who don't want to do it as somehow anti-energy production. As I have just described, I have a vision—and I think others share it—of huge energy production for the United States of America. We cannot grow our economy if we don't grow our energy production. We want to grow our economy, and we want the jobs that come with it. We need the strength for our Nation. Of course, we have to expand our energy production. Here is where these debates always somehow get dragged down, because people want to go to the places—I don't know, for sort of a debate advantage or political advantage but not where the truth is.

This debate is not about whether or not we need to expand our energy. This debate is over how we expand our energy. How do we do it? Do we do it in ways that we know violate the air, leave toxic waste sites, tear apart the health of our fellow citizens, that pour particulates into the air so we have more emphysema, more lung disease, more cancer or do we try to use the ingenuity God gave us to go find the cleaner, more thoughtful technologies that make a difference in the long-term future of our country and indeed the planet?

That is the choice. Once again, I say there are those who want the status quo where they think all we do is drill oil, and there are those who believe there is a different energy future for the country.

Let me point out, America produces almost all the coal that we consume, and the tax package that is in this energy bill, if we pass it, promotes clean coal—clean coal.

America produces about 85 percent of the natural gas that we consume, and this energy bill includes a provision to federally subsidize the construction of the massive gas pipeline to carry the estimated 35 trillion cubic feet of natural gas from the North Slope of Alaska to the lower 48 States.

Those who argue that we are coming to this energy unconscious ignore the fact that in this very bill, there is a provision to build a pipeline from Alaska to the lower 48 States so we can burn clean energy in an intelligent way.

We hear that those of us opposing the development of ANWR are even against electricity production. Wrong again. In New England alone we have built 12 new powerplants in the past 2 years. We have put more than 3,500 megawatts online, another 12 new powerplants are under construction and will come online in the next 2 years, putting an additional 6,300 megawatts online. There has been no opposition to these projects.

We produce a significant amount of oil in America. We do not produce all we consume, as I have just described,

and that will never happen without some extraordinary introduction of efficiencies and alternatives. I have explained why, and I do not have to go back over that, but we remain one of the largest oil producers in the world today. I say this because given the debate in this Chamber, Americans might believe the only oil in the Nation is somehow underneath the Arctic Wildlife Refuge and we are preventing the only oil in the Nation from being drilled. That is just not true.

According to the Energy Information Administration of the United States, we are one of the top oil producers in the world today. In 2001, the United States produced roughly as much oil on a daily basis as Saudi Arabia and the former Soviet Union, which is about 8 to 9 million barrels a day.

America produced more than twice as much oil as Iran, more than three times as much as Iraq, more than three times as much as the United Arab Emirates, and more than three times as much as Canada. The idea that we have blocked all the oil development is absolutely ridiculous, faced with those statistics.

I want to talk about the Gulf of Mexico. Ask an oil company executive privately right now—and some of them have gone on record publicly—whether they really want to dig in Alaska. The answer is sometimes no, or it depends. Oil companies are holding 7,000 leases today for deepwater exploration in the Gulf of Mexico and not using most of them. The reason they have not drilled in the Gulf of Mexico where they already have the permits is because they have waited for the price of oil to go up because that helps the economics.

The fact is, if tomorrow the United States were cut off, it would not be only Alaska we would look to; it would be the Gulf of Mexico; it would be other oil supplies of the United States to which we would look.

According to the Minerals Management Service, there are between 16 and 25 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil in the central and western Gulf of Mexico. That depends on the price, as I will explain in a moment.

Economically recoverable oil is different from other categories of oil that are in the ground and available. "Economically recoverable" reflects what you can get at the current cost of oil.

One of the interesting points is most of the studies of our colleagues who come in here and say we ought to do this and create 700,000 jobs and so forth are based on a completely false price for oil, not the price we have today.

Development in the Gulf of Mexico has accelerated. According to the Minerals Management Service, 42 new deepwater fields have come online since 1995. Production is expected to climb from under 1 million barrels per day in 1995 to as much as 1.9 million barrels per day 3 years from now.

The Gulf of Mexico reserves are so promising that Lord Brown, whom I mentioned earlier, the CEO of British Petroleum, calls them some of the most promising reserves in the world. He was asked where the most important place to find oil is in the United States. He was asked this in an interview by "60 Minutes" a couple of months ago. Here is what he said:

The deep water Gulf of Mexico, part of the United States, is probably one of the greatest new oil provinces in the entire world.

Let me highlight some of the production that is underway in Alaska because it has been suggested that somehow we are shutting down Alaska's capacity to pump oil.

Last May, the State of Alaska completed a lease sale of 950,000 acres on the North Slope. It is the largest lease by any State in history, and they have announced another 7 million acres will be put up for lease in the coming years.

The State of Alaska has scheduled 15 oil and gas leases on 15 million acres.

In 1999, the Bureau of Land Management held a lease sale of 4 million acres in the National Petroleum Reserve, Alaska. It is in the process of releasing 3 million acres and other plans and it has announced a third lease sale of a planning area of 10 million acres.

In April of 2001, BP, Phillips, and ExxonMobil predicted that there is at least 7.8 billion barrels of oil to be developed on the North Slope of Alaska.

In many ways, the Arctic Wildlife Refuge represents our God-given natural strategic petroleum reserve. If, indeed, 20 years from now none of these things I have predicted happen, if we are so backed up in a corner, if technology does not come through, if we do not do our work, then at least we might have had the wisdom to have held on to this God-given strategic petroleum reserve, rather than going for it right now at a time when it is not necessary and in demand.

Let me speak to some of the important issues that I think have to be clarified as part of the record.

No. 1, how much oil is in Alaska? We hear of different amounts of oil that we could find there. There are very different estimates. Some people say more than 16 billion barrels; some say far less; some argue not enough to make development economically viable. That is not where I am. I am not trying to go to either extreme, and I think those who only go to the extremes do a disservice to the debate.

I would like to present what I think is the amount of oil that could be technically recovered, and that is the amount of oil that could be extracted using today's technology without any consideration of cost. Of course, we know cost is a consideration, but I am going to deal with it technically.

I have heard this reference continually to radical environmental groups. I do not think the United States Geological Survey is a radical environmental group. They say there is a 95-percent probability that at least 6 bil-

lion barrels of oil are technically recoverable. There is a 5-percent probability that at least 16 billion might be technically recoverable. The mean, or the most likely outcome, is that 10 billion barrels of oil are technically recoverable.

The second question is then, How much is economically recoverable? This is an estimate of how much oil you could produce at a certain price of oil. That number matters actually much more than the technical reserves because oil companies simply do not produce oil they cannot bring to the market profitably.

According to the U.S. Geological Survey, again, if oil is priced at \$25 a barrel, then there is a 95-percent chance that 2 billion barrels are economically recoverable. There is a 5-percent chance that 9 billion barrels are economically recoverable.

A mean chance, or the most likely outcome, is 5 billion barrels are economically recoverable. I might add, these numbers are taken straight from the Congressional Research Service briefing on the Arctic Wildlife Refuge, and the cost estimate is directly from the Energy Information Administration reported by CRS.

It is difficult to estimate how much oil might be in the refuge. There are complicating factors, but for the claim to keep coming at us that the refuge is going to produce 16 billion barrels and to make all the arguments dependent on that is not to do justice to the probabilities I put forward and to the realities of oil exploration. The claim is not only unrealistic, it runs counter to what proponents claim to be the leading reason for drilling, because the leading reason for drilling is that it is going to produce for us cheap oil.

If it is going to produce cheap oil, you diminish the amount of recoverable oil because the economics do not work. So if you are driving the price down—you cannot get caught in this argument and have it both ways.

I also want to highlight the important difference between what is called in-place oil, technically recoverable oil, and economically recoverable oil. I know this is a little arcane, but I want to do it because I want the record to reflect this is not about caribou alone, it is not about some "not in my back yard." This is about clear science, economics, oil policy, national security policy, energy policy, and the long-term interests of our country.

The fact is these definitions are vital to understand and to weigh the choice we have. On Alaska's North Slope, near Prudhoe Bay, there is a field called West Sak. In 1989, Arco estimated the West Sak field held as much as 13 billion barrels of oil in place, with another 7 billion listed as potential. Estimates published in the Society of Petroleum Engineers placed the estimate at more than 30 billion barrels of oil in total. But the Alaska Department of Natural Resources estimates that only 370 million barrels of oil, less than 2

percent of the oil in that reserve, will be produced through the year 2020.

Why? Because that is all that is economically recoverable. This is Alaska itself telling us it is limited because of the price. It is not enough to say there is oil in the ground. We have to understand how much one can get out, at what kind of price, and what is realistic. We are going to hear that with emerging technologies and still-to-be-invented technologies, the amount of economically recoverable oil might rise. I concede that. That is true. That is a positive thing, if it happens in the future. But it is also true that the amount of economically recoverable oil may be less and the price may go down.

Why may it go down? Because a whole bunch of people are already starting to push that technology curve in the alternatives, and if suddenly someone comes in with the capacity to do the hydrogen fuel cell or other things, the entire transportation mix and dependency of the United States changes, the demand curve goes down, and the price goes down, and far less oil will be recoverable.

On March 10, 2002, the New York Times published a story with the following headline: "Oil Industry Hesitates Over Moving into Arctic Refuge." The article highlights why the oft-repeated claim that the refuge will produce 16 billion barrels of oil is simply inaccurate, and I share this quote: "Big oil companies go where there are substantial fields and where they can produce oil economically," said Ronald Chappell, a spokesman for BP Alaska, which officially supports the area and drilling. He continued: "Does ANWR have that? Who knows?"

That is the conclusion of the company; not 16. Who knows?

The article continues: There is still a fair amount of exploration risk here. You could go through 8 years of litigation, a good amount of investment, and still come up with dry holes or uneconomic discoveries, said Jerry Kepes, the managing director for exploration and production issues at the Petroleum Finance Company, which is a Washington consulting firm for oil companies. Quote: It is not clear that this is quite the bonanza that some have said.

So we have to weigh, do we take this not quite so clear bonanza and destroy an Arctic wildlife refuge, for which some people have disrespect but, as I will show, I think is a concept that captures the imagination of many Americans and is worth preserving.

This article says a great deal about how little oil might be in the refuge, and it stands in stark contrast to some of the claims we have heard in the press and in the Senate about the 16 billion. An article in the Washington Post examines some of the competing claims over the refuge oil potential. It said as follows:

How much oil is out there? No one knows for sure. But the environmental movement's favorite statistic is a USGS estimate that the Coastal Plain contains 3.2 billion barrels

of economically recoverable oil at the current price of \$20 per barrel, about what the Nation uses in 6 months.

I will concede in the last few days the price of oil has gone up a little bit. That figure probably goes up with it, and of course that is true. But Senator MURKOWSKI wrote a letter to the Post that the USGS actually estimates 10.3 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil. The truth, according to the USGS, that conducted this study, is they have said directly Senator MURKOWSKI is wrong in stating that figure and the environmentalists are right, and that is a quote from the USGS.

To lay it out, proponents of drilling are regularly exaggerating the production by as much as 200 percent. Likewise, some of the opponents of drilling sometimes underestimate production by as much as 40 percent, assuming that oil costs less than \$20 per barrel.

In my estimation, the most reliable prediction is that the refuge might produce about 5 billion barrels of oil over its productive lifetime, and that is if oil is priced at about \$25 per barrel. I should add that the Energy Information Administration predicts oil will be at about \$22.50 per barrel, not \$25 per barrel. So, again, 5 billion barrels may be somewhat high.

What would it mean if one were to find 5 billion barrels in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge? That is the next thing we ought to try to measure. A lot of promises have been made by the other side. They have suggested it is a solution to oil shortages, heating oil shortages, high gas prices, electricity brownouts, unemployment, national security. It is even being tied to specific conflicts and incidents around the globe. Someone might believe, listening to this, that the Arctic Wildlife Refuge is the magic elixir that is going to cure most of the ills we face. But the fact is, if one is simply an oil company and they are looking to drill some oil, that can be a lot of oil. It is money, money in the pocket, profits; no question about it. I acknowledge that.

That is not what we are measuring. We are not an oil company. We represent the people of the United States of America, and our country has to weigh that potential 5 billion barrels and what it means in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge to the curves we displayed earlier that show our dependency on foreign oil, 70 percent of which goes into transportation, which mandates that we begin to deal with a whole different set of energy choices for our country.

There is another issue we need to think about with respect to this. We need to think about how much oil is going to be produced not in the total lifetime but on a daily basis because that is what affects supply. This number helps us understand what the real impact of the Arctic Wildlife Refuge might be. Once again, the proponents of the drilling, from the White House to the Senate, have exaggerated those estimates more than they have even exaggerated the overall recoverable oil.

We have heard that the refuge oil is, as I said, a solution to a whole bunch of problems, such as the California electricity crisis. I showed the quote where Alaska Governor Tony Knowles responded it will not have any impact at all on California. The refuge, as I said, will not produce oil for 7 to 10 years. That means if you open the refuge today, you are not going to see oil until about 2012, maybe a couple of years earlier.

The relevant agencies of our government and the industry itself have said this 10-year figure is about the average; maybe 7 to 10, but they bank on about 10. The Energy Information Administration says 7 to 10 years. The Congressional Research Service says 10 years. The industry's own economic analysis produced by WEFA Economic Forecasters, which I should add is wildly optimistic about every aspect of oil drilling, predicts it will take 10 years for the oil to begin flowing. That is from the group that produced most of the studies on which they rely. They say 10 years.

Asked in a Senate hearing how long it will take, the president of the exploration of production for ExxonMobile said:

In the normal process we would probably allow 3 to 4 years for the permitting which would put you in the 10-year range.

Let's end these arguments that this is the cure to the Middle East crisis today, or that this is somehow going to prevent a young American man or woman in uniform from having to go over and defend an oilfield next year, the year after, or the year after that. The United States, even if we drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, is still so dependent on foreign oil now, until we change our overall energy mix, America's youth will be at risk to protect America's dependency.

We have heard a lot of talk about jobs, how many jobs will be created, what this will do. We have even heard that the Arctic Wildlife Refuge drilling is the solution in place of the stimulus or part of the stimulus during the course of last year, and it will produce an immediate impact. It is interesting to note Secretary of the Interior Gale Norton has been sent around to a bunch of press events in Missouri, Arkansas, Indiana, and New York as a representative of the Federal Government—incidentally, the agency charged with managing our public lands—and she has been promising the drilling of the Arctic Wildlife Refuge creates 700,000 jobs across the Nation. Secretary Norton's tour, No. 1, is a political tour, not the management of our lands. And oil drilling in the Arctic Refuge does not create 700,000 jobs. That claim comes directly from a study that has been universally discredited. It is a bogus study.

First of all, the 700,000 job claim is for 1 year in about 2015. Yet you never hear the Bush administration mention that. Not only is the 700,000 number a wild exaggeration, but it doesn't rep-

resent the startup and decrease with respect to jobs in this particular effort. Moreover—and here is the most important thing, much more important than anything else with respect to the study—the claim is based on a 12-year-old study produced by WEFA Economic Forecasters, paid for by the American Petroleum Institute. According to that API study—this is their study—drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge produces zero jobs for the next 4 years; zero jobs according to their own analysis.

There is a choice. We can invest in the pipeline for natural gas which could immediately produce jobs, or we could drill immediately in other areas where we know we already have permitting and the ability to drill. That would be a more immediate job production than this. It is interesting, you would have to wait until 2007 for the jobs to be produced.

I highlight a couple of the technical inaccuracies of this study which has been thrown around so much. The Center for Economic Policy and Research assessed that study and made the following points.

No. 1, according to Energy Information Agency estimates, the API study overstates oil production in the refuge by a factor of 3. Adjusting the projections to keep them in line with the EIA estimates reduces predicted job creation by more than 60 percent. The API study assumes other oil producers, especially OPEC, do little to increase production and bolster oil prices. Adjusting other production to keep them in line with conventional estimates reduces the job creation by another 40 percent. The API study assumes the economy will be far more affected by a drop in oil prices than is reasonable to expect and substituting a more reasonable estimate lowers the projection by about 75 percent.

As I have said, that study was written 10 years ago. So we can test some of the assumption and predictions easily. The study was based on oil costing more than \$45 per barrel in the year 2000. Let me repeat: Here is a study that they are still using, they still come to the floor to say creates a lot of jobs, that, in fact, predicted a price of oil double what the price of oil is today, which increases the recoverable oil and changes the entire economics. Oil back then was \$25 per barrel.

Here is another example. The study assumes that when Arctic oil flows, the world market for oil will be 55 million barrels per day. The world market today is already more than 70 million barrels a day, and it will be much higher by the time the production occurs. When the wrong and, frankly, stretched assumptions are corrected in the API study, the job estimates fall to 50,000 nationally. To put this in perspective, that is fewer jobs than what our economy generated in an average week over the years 1997 through the year 2000. That is what our economy is capable of doing in any week if our economy is moving in the right direction.

I will read from an Associated Press article published in March a remarkable story that shows that while President Bush's Cabinet Secretary, Gale Norton, tours the Nation promising America 700,000 jobs, the people who supported the API study are distancing themselves from it because it is faulty. Here is what the article reports:

The authors of the 1990 study no longer work at the company [that prepared it], according to a spokesman who acknowledged it was "a bit out of date." "We would not come up with the same numbers today," said Mary Novak, an economist and managing director.

Some of the assumptions made more than a decade ago "are suspect, and you might underestimate," says Roger Ebel, a global energy expert for the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

And he has been involved in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge drilling debate.

The Congressional Research Service has looked at this question and assessed how many jobs might be created from drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge. Its report also casts doubt on the API study. CRS said the following.

First, if the economy is operating at full employment, jobs created by drilling in the refuge would come at the expense of an equal number of jobs in the rest of the economy. In other words, if we pull this economy out of recession and get ourselves to full employment, drilling is not going to create any additional jobs.

That is the Congressional Research Service; it is not me. I am quoting the Congressional Research Service.

Second, job creation from drilling in the Arctic Refuge may be as little as 8 percent of API's claims. The Congressional Research Service gives a range of between 60,000 and 130,000 jobs. Again, when the economy was expanding in recent years, it created that many jobs in 3 weeks.

Third, should oil prices drop, which CRS describes as uncertain, any employment gain from that drop would be offset by harm to oil producers not operating in the refuge, who would then conceivably reduce their operations and workforce, impacting suppliers and local economies in other ways.

Let me turn to a question of price. Jobs is not the only expanded, exaggerated component of the argument. Another is the question of how, if we develop in the refuge, we will lower the price of oil and gasoline, heating fuel, diesel, all the products we produce from oil. When we examine the facts which I went through a bit earlier, the fact is, the price of oil now is not going to be affected by what happens in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge because, as we have seen, you have to be, first of all, certain about the amount of oil it will produce; and, secondly, there are three different assumptions to make about the oil from the refuge. You could use the exaggerated peak production, you can use the 1 million barrels a day you hear about from the President and from other supporters, or you could use the mean production, which is about 660,000 barrels for 1 year, in the year

2020, or you could use an average production over the life of the refuge, which is about 360,000 barrels of oil.

I say the reason we might use any of these is that none of them, even the overblown 1 million barrels a day, will have any impact on oil prices whatsoever. Use any one you want, it does not matter, because the bottom line is that you cannot affect the price even on the day of the Arctic Wildlife Refuge's largest production of oil. Here is why.

Central to the idea that the refuge will lower oil prices is the notion that the United States of America, in our production, drives oil prices. It does not, and it will not. It cannot. The price of oil is set in the global market. According to the Energy Information Administration, the world market for oil in 2020 will consume 119 million barrels per day. Refuge oil, for that single peak year of 2020, would amount to between .25 and 1.17 percent of the entire global consumption. That is simply not enough, under economic models of anybody anywhere. No economic model would suggest that .25 to 1.17 percent of the total production has the ability to affect that global oil price. The fact is that the average production, probably at around 360,000 barrels, is much less than peak production, and we all know that is not going to have the ability to affect the price. So this argument is incorrect.

What about independence from imported oil? I talked about that. I do not want to repeat all of that now. But the bottom line is there is not one single day in which the Arctic Wildlife Refuge production will replace Saudi imports. It just doesn't amount to that. These are not my numbers, these are the numbers that come from the Congressional Research Service.

I should point out the technical estimate is not a likely outcome. It is not the economic estimate. I use it to make the point that using only the highly optimistic, greatest potential, you still do not have the ability to affect the total of the Saudi imports.

The false promises go way beyond Saudi Arabia. As we have heard them say over and over again, ANWR will ensure energy independence; it will reduce our dependence on imported oil. Nothing we have heard has revealed anything except that promise is completely inflated and unrealistic because of the relationship of the amount of oil there to the global supply.

The report from the Energy Information Administration was requested by Senator MURKOWSKI. This report, requested by Senator MURKOWSKI, says if you accept the EIA's reference case for oil imports and the mean estimate for refuge oil production that is the most likely outcome, oil imports will drop from 62 percent to 60 percent for 1 year, about 2020. Every other year, imports will be higher. This is, again, the Energy Information Administration in response to Senator MURKOWSKI.

So the President of the United States and other proponents have told Amer-

ica they have a plan for the Nation, a plan to ensure energy independence, to protect our national security. They back up the plan with a lot of talk about national security. They have insisted we attach ANWR to the Department of Defense authorization bill last year because it was an urgent matter of national security. They hold press events with big pictures of Saddam Hussein. When two servicemen died in duty to our Nation, they suggested it was about the Arctic Wildlife Refuge and that was related because we do not drill in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge.

Their plan, this master plan that will ensure energy independence, is simply without validity. Under no economic model whatsoever, under no supply and demand curve, no way whatsoever can 3 percent supply the needs of 25 percent and growing. It just does not happen. So we need to vote accordingly here in the Senate.

The fact is that 20 years from now, we will import 60 to 62 percent of our oil from foreign countries. Nothing we do, absent inventing alternatives, is going to diminish that. If we drill in the Arctic Refuge, we are not going to stop importing oil from Saudi Arabia. Nobody suggests that. We are not going to stop importing it from any of these other nations we are concerned about ultimately.

So I think it is clear that the flow of money to terrorists is not going to stop. If we drill in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge, it is not going to suddenly make peace in the Middle East. If we drill in the Arctic, our forces are not suddenly going to come home. There is going to be no change in deployment; There will be no change in what we may have to do with respect to Saddam Hussein, which we ought to do anyway, regardless what happens in the ANWR.

Will a single soldier, marine, or sailor today in harm's way come home if we make a decision to drill? The answer is no. We should not. We should terminate this notion that somehow fools people that that is, indeed, what is at stake here.

I want to correct one thing I said a moment ago. The CAFE standards would not begin immediately. Earlier I misspoke when I said that. The CAFE standards take some time to ramp up and take effect. But had we put that into effect in 1990, we would today, in the year 2002, be saving 1 million barrels of oil per day, which is close to the amount we import from Iraq. That represents the Iraq figure.

I have spoken almost entirely about energy policy. It is my own belief that this is sort of the critical moment in the life of the United States, in our lives, to make a choice about our future. Are we going to just kind of keep going down the road where we pretend to ourselves that just drilling for oil is the solution? Or do we begin to force the transition?

In the 1930s, many parts of America did not get electricity. They could not

get it. But Roosevelt and others decided it was critical for the development of our Nation, for our Nation's future economy, and for our well-being, for kids to be able to have schools with lights, to have power and so forth in their homes—that we got that electricity out into the rural and poor communities. So what did we do? The Federal Government spent several billion dollars to subsidize, to make sure we put that electricity out.

In the same way, the Government must today make a decision about the well-being of our country. Are we better off continuing down a road where we already know we have oil we can drill in Alaska and the North Slope? I have described how much we are drilling, how much has been leased and put out for lease already. We already know we have 7,000 leases in the Gulf of Mexico. We can go down there and continue that process. But are we going to make the decision as a country to begin to embrace a future that is a different mix of fuels for transportation and begin to legitimately end our dependence on foreign oil?

The only way to change our dependence on foreign oil is to change the way we propel our motor vehicles. Transportation consumes 70 percent of the oil we use. I said this at the outset, and I want to repeat these principles. Not one of these choices we make for our energy future should be done if it doesn't make economic sense. We do not have to lower the quality of life for Americans. We have to recognize we are going to drill for 30 to 50 years and we have the places we can do that. Finally, most of the gains in the near term, in terms of fuel use and our dependency, are going to come from efficiencies in the current regime. Those efficiencies come from hybrids, new technologies, alternatives, renewables, et cetera.

Those are the principles that must guide us. But I do not want to leave out what I think is a critical component of this argument that should not be diminished. It does not deserve to be derided in the way it has been derided by some of our colleagues, with respect to what this refuge means in terms of the environment.

Some who want to industrialize the Arctic Refuge call it a barren wasteland. It has been described as hell. It has been described in many different ways, but I think those descriptions reveal more about a point of view and the value than it does about the Arctic Wildlife Refuge.

There are those on the opposite side of this debate who may look at the refuge and only see beauty in an oil rig, and they may only see the foregone profit of conservation. But those views do not reflect the science, and I don't believe they reflect the best instincts of Americans.

Let me read some of the more objective descriptions of ANWR's environmental value to America today and to future generations. The Arctic Na-

tional Wildlife Refuge is one of the great untouched lands remaining in America and on the northern continent. Its ecological value is unlike any other in the Nation and in the world.

The Congressional Research Service describes the refuge as follows: "The portion of Alaska's North Slope between Prudhoe Bay and the Canadian border represents this country's largest, most diverse remaining example of a largely untouched arctic ecosystem. . . . The apparently hostile nature of the area belies its national and international significance as an ecological reserve. It protects a virtually undisturbed, nearly complete spectrum of arctic ecosystems, and is one of the last places north of the Brooks Range that remains legally closed to development."

In 1959, the Fish and Wildlife Service wrote: "The great diversity of vegetation and topography . . . in this compact area, together with its relatively undisturbed condition, lead to its selection as the most suitable opportunity for protecting a portion of the remaining wildlife and its frontiers. That area included within the proposed range is a major habitat, particularly in summer, for the great herds of Arctic caribou, and countless lakes, ponds, and marshes found in this area are nesting grounds for large numbers of migratory waterfowl that spend about half of each year in the rest of the United States; thus, the production here is of importance to a great many sportsmen. . . . The proposed range is restricted to the area which contains all of the requisites for year round use. The coastal area is the only place in the United States where polar bears dens are found."

The Department of Interior found in 1987 that "the Arctic Refuge is the only conservation system unit that protects, in an undisturbed condition, a complete spectrum of the arctic ecosystem in North America." It described the 1002 area as "the most biologically productive part of the Arctic Refuge for wildlife and is the center of the wildlife activity. . . . The area presents many opportunities for scientific study of a relatively undistributed ecosystem."

Let me repeat that the Fish and Wildlife Service is not a radical environmental group. Frankly, I am tired of people who refer to this sort of radical environmental component when our own agencies—the Fish and Wildlife Service and Interior—are telling us, don't disturb this.

This is what the Fish and Wildlife Service says:

The closeness of the Brooks Range to the Arctic Ocean in the Arctic Refuge creates a combination of landscapes and habitats unique in North America. The area has exceptional scenic, wildlife, wilderness, recreation, and scientific values. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the only protected area in the Nation where people can explore a full range of arctic and subarctic ecosystems.

The Refuge includes alpine and arctic tundra, barren mountains, boreal forests, shrub thickets, and wetlands. The coast has numerous points, shoals, mud flats, and barrier islands that shelter shallow, brackish lagoons. The tundra is typically a layer of peat overlain by a carpet of mosses, sedges, and flowering plants. Spruce, poplar, and willow trees shade the south slope valleys.

Continuous summer daylight produces rapid but brief plant growth. Underlying permafrost and low evaporation cause many areas to remain wet throughout the summer.

These factors, along with shallow plant roots and a slow revegetation rate, result in a fragile landscape easily disturbed by human activities.

Why would we violate the concept of a pristine area? Why, when oil is available in all these other areas we talked about, is there such a compelling interest in destroying that area at this point in time?

The Fish and Wildlife Service has inventoried some of the refuge's environmental qualities. They include:

18 major rivers; arctic tundra, the Brooks Range, boreal forests, and a full range arctic and subarctic habitats; the Brooks Range of mountains rise only 10-40 miles from the Beaufort Sea on the coastal plain; the greatest variety of plant and animal life of any conservation area in the arctic; more than 180 birds from four continents have been identified in the Refuge and its coastal plain is a major migration route; Peregrine falcons, endangered in the lower-48 states, thrive in the Refuge; it is home to 36 species of land mammals; it protects the calving ground of the Porcupine caribou herd, the second largest herd in North America; it is home to black, brown and polar bears; 9 marine mammals live off its coast; 36 fish species live in its rivers and lakes; there are more than 300 archaeological sites; and, there are no roads, trails or developments. Wilderness prevails.

That is the question before the Senate, whether this is a valuable wilderness. People say it is only going to be a small imprint; it is only going to be a few pipes and a few roads. The fact is, experience has shown us that is not an accurate description of what happens.

William O. Douglas, the former U.S. Supreme Court Justice said.

This is the place for man turned scientist and explorer; poet and artist. Here he can experience a new reverence for life that is outside his own and yet a vital and joyous part of it.

Cecil Andrus, the former Secretary of the Interior, said:

In some places, such as the Arctic Refuge, the wildlife and natural values are so magnificent and so enduring that they transcend the value of any mineral that may lie beneath the surface. Such minerals are finite. Production inevitably means changes whose impacts will be measured in geologic time in order to gain marginal benefits that may last a few years.

Congressman Morris Udall said,

It is a whole place, as true a wilderness as there is anywhere on this continent and unlike any other that I know of.

President Jimmy Carter has written,

Having traveled extensively in this unique wilderness, I feel very strongly about its incredible natural values. . . . "I have crouched on a peninsula in the Beaufort Sea to watch the ancient defensive circling of musk oxen who perceived us a threat to their young. We sat in profound wonder on the tundra as 80,000 caribou streamed around and past us in their timeless migration from vital calving grounds on the coastal plain. These phenomena of the untrammelled earth are what lead wildlife experts to characterize the coastal plain as America's Serengeti.

We have heard that drilling will not take place on the entire Refuge. Rather it will take place only on the refuge's coastal plain, the so-called 1002 Area. So I want to talk some about the 1002

Area and why it should be protected. It is not a complicated issue. The coastal plain is a special place even within the environmental treasure of the refuge, and it is the place where oil exploration is likely to do the most damage to the Refuge.

The Department of Interior found in 1987 that the

1002 area is the most biologically productive part of the Arctic Refuge for wildlife and is the center of the wildlife activity. . . . The area presents many opportunities for scientific study of a relatively undistributed ecosystem.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has said that

The Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge, the part of the Refuge being considered for oil drilling, is the most biologically productive part of the refuge and the heart of the refuge's wildlife activity. Opening the Arctic Refuge to oil development would threaten the birthing ground of thousands of caribou and important habitat for polar bears, swans, snow geese, muskoxen and numerous other species.

I repeat that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is charged with the responsibility for making those judgments.

A group of more than 500 ecologists, biologists, resource managers, and other experts from around the country have assessed the scientific literature and the importance of the Coastal Plain. They made the following conclusion:

Five decades of biological study and scientific research have confirmed that the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge forms a vital component of the biological diversity of the refuge and merits the same kind of permanent safeguards and precautionary management as the rest of this original conservation unit. In contrast to the broader coastal plain to the west of the Arctic Refuge, the coastal plain within the refuge is much narrower. This unique compression of habitats concentrates the occurrence of a wide variety of wildlife and fish species, including polar bears, grizzly bears, wolves, wolverines, caribou, muskoxen, Dolly Varden, Arctic grayling, snow geese, and more than 130 other species of migratory birds. In fact, according to the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Arctic Refuge coastal plain contains the greatest wildlife diversity of any protected area above the Arctic Circle.

Scientists with the National Audubon Society studied how oil development might impact the millions of birds that migrate through the Coastal Plain to locations throughout the lower 48 States, South America, and even Africa. They concluded that:

The Arctic Refuge, including its coastal plain, has extraordinary value as an intact [intact] ecosystem, with all its native birdlife. The millions of birds that nest, migrate through, or spend the winter in the refuge are a conspicuous and fundamental part of the refuge ecosystem.

Obviously, this is a special place. Those who deride it as simply a barren wasteland, better for oil drilling than anything else, I think do a disservice to the conservation ethic, the preservation ethic, and to the value of the ecosystem itself, which has been preserved for a purpose.

But let me just point out how drilling would, in fact, impact this special place I have described. This is the last thing I will do before yielding.

We hear people argue that oil drilling will do little or even no harm to the Coastal Plain ecosystem. But, unfortunately, the evidence from decades of oil exploration in other areas of Alaska shows otherwise. It simply tells a different story. The history speaks.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has examined that question and concluded the following:

All reasonable scenarios for oil development on the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge envision roads, drilling pads, long pipelines, secondary or feeder pipelines, housing, oil processing facilities, gas injection plants, airports and other infrastructure. In addition, the U.S.G.S. 1998 assessment found that oil in the Arctic Refuge appears to be spread out in several pools rather than in one large formation like Prudhoe Bay, making it harder to minimize the development "foot print."

A group of more than 500 ecologists, biologists, and resource experts wrote the following:

The Interior Department has predicted that oil and gas exploration and development would have a major effect on water resources. Fresh water already is limited on the Refuge's coastal plain, and direct damage to wetlands will adversely affect fish, waterfowl, and other migratory birds. These potentially disruptive effects to fish and wildlife should not be viewed in isolation, however. . . . We urge you to protect the biological diversity and wilderness character of the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge from future oil and gas development.

I want to summarize a briefing provided to the Senate by the Wildlife Society of America. The society was founded in 1937. It is an international, nonprofit, scientific and educational association dedicated to excellence in wildlife stewardship through science and education. Its membership is comprised of research scientists, educators, communications specialists, conservation law enforcement officers, resource managers, administrators, and students from more than 60 countries.

What makes their briefing so important is that it addresses both the scientific evidence and the erroneous information that has been widely circulated by the industry and by drilling proponents. Let me address the scientific first. I will read from their position on the refuge.

In September of 2001, the Wildlife Society released its official position of petroleum exploration and development in ANWR. It was prepared and approved by the Alaska chapter of the Wildlife Society. They object to oil development on the Coastal Plain for the following general reasons:

The adverse effects of petroleum development on some wildlife species at existing North Slope oil fields have not been avoided.

The unique aspects of wildlife resources in the environment in the Arctic Refuge Coastal Plain are such that mitigation of the impacts of oil development is questionable.

The long-term, cumulative effects of petroleum extraction on fish and wildlife resources are unknown.

There is substantial scientific merit in maintaining part of Alaska's Arctic Coastal Plain in an undeveloped state for long-term studies of the effects on fish and wildlife resources of climate change in the Arctic.

The statement continues:

The Alaska Chapter's position statement committee was composed of federal, state, industry, and university wildlife biologists, including caribou experts—all from Alaska. In developing the position statement, the committee accounted for all available data relating to wildlife resources and oil development, whether the data supported or opposed drilling. Most committee members have had extensive experience working in northern Alaska and used this experience to formulate their recommendations.

The Wildlife Society advocates using sound biological information in policy decisions. The Society desires that all scientific aspects of the ANWR issue, including the uncertainty permeating the issue, be considered openly, as the final policy is developed. Careful analysis is extremely important at this time, because not only are the wildlife impacts of oil extraction uncertain, but numerous other issues—such as the amount of recoverable oil, the potential energy benefits from it, and the prudence of drilling in the Refuge—are still under debate.

The society provided additional important details to support its conclusion. Let me say very quickly what they said:

Development of the Coastal Plain's petroleum resources could have serious, long-term impacts to caribou and other wildlife resources of the Arctic Refuge.

With present knowledge of the fish and wildlife resources of the Arctic Refuge and of the functioning of arctic ecosystems, and considering available information on the impacts of current and ongoing petroleum development in Alaska's North Slope oil fields, the primary biological concerns of the Alaska Chapter of The Wildlife Society regarding oil and gas development in the Arctic Refuge include:

Potential impacts on the Porcupine Caribou Herd that migrates to the Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge;

Potential impacts on muskoxen that inhabit the Coastal Plain of the Refuge year round;

Potential impacts on polar bears that use the Coastal Plain in [that period of time]. . . .

[As well as] the effects of disturbance on up to 500,000 adult snow geese that migrate through the Coastal Plain;

The dewatering of streams and lakes during exploration and production activities. . . .

Alterations of shoreline ecosystems for the construction of causeways, drill pads, and other petroleum-related facilities. . . .

The unknown, long-term, and cumulative effects of development on ecosystem processes critical to long-term viability and integrity of the arctic environment.

Based on studies in existing areas of oil development in the North Slope, they believe petroleum development on the Arctic Wildlife Refuge would inevitably result in loss of wildlife habitat and probable declines in some wildlife populations.

Many times throughout this debate, people have pointed to the development of the central and western portions of Alaska's North Slope, particularly Prudhoe Bay. They say this proves that the oil companies can develop the refuge without harming the

environment. Well, no one is going to dispute that wilderness goes on forever in every place. But you cannot put an oil drilling complex in a wilderness area and call it wilderness. You just can't do it. You are either going to decide you are going to have some area set aside as pristine wilderness or you are not. That is part of what this debate is about, in conjunction with the question of timing.

Maybe in the United States of America, somewhere down the road, our backs will be up against the wall, and maybe we will not have made good economic decisions, maybe we will not have developed the technologies we need. Maybe somewhere down the line other nations all gang up, and they will not supply us, and the United States may be stuck in a position, and this tiny bit of oil will make a difference, and the United States at that point might decide it wants to make that choice.

But there is nothing in the economics, there is nothing in the current global situation, there is nothing in the amount of oil that can be found, there is nothing in the economically recoverable oil that suggests that that kind of difference is worth this choice at this time, particularly when there is so much in the way of oil alternatives in the Gulf of Mexico, natural gas alternatives, and continued drilling in Prudhoe Bay, the North Slope area.

But the record of Prudhoe Bay itself is not quite as pristine as they want to suggest it is. Oil development on the North Slope has resulted in 500 miles of roads, more than 1,100 miles of pipelines, thousands of acres of facilities spread out over 1,000 square miles, 3,800 exploratory wells, 170 exploratory drill and drill pads, 22 gravel mines, 25 processing plants for oil, gas, and seawater, 56,000 tons of nitrogen oxides, which contribute to smog and acid rain, which is twice as much as is emitted by the city of Washington, DC. Our Nation's Capital emits less global warming gas than drilling in Prudhoe Bay.

Nearly 400 spills occur annually on the North Slope's oilfields; roughly 40 toxic substances, ranging from waste oil to acids, have been spilled. As much as 6 billion gallons of drilling waste have been dumped in 450 reserves pits. Three class I injection wells have been constructed and injected with more than 325 million gallons of waste. Thirty class II injection wells have been constructed and injected with more than 40 billion gallons of waste.

Several experts have examined the impacts of oil development in Prudhoe Bay on the environment and what it might mean for the oil development of the Arctic Refuge. Again, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service says:

Air and water pollution and contaminated sites continue to be a serious problem in Prudhoe Bay and are inevitable with any oil development. Many gravel pads on the North Slope are contaminated by chronic spills. In addition, hundreds of oil exploratory and production drilling waste pits have yet to be closed out and the sites restored. More than

76 contaminated sites exist on the North Slope and contractor performance has been spotty.

Prudhoe Bay is a major source of air pollution and green house gas emission among the Arctic Coastal Plain. Prudhoe Bay facilities annually emit approximately 55,000 tons of nitrogen oxide which contributes to smog and acid rain. North Slope oil facilities release roughly 24,000 tons of methane. Industry has numerous violations of particulate matter emissions and has opposed introduction of new technology to reduce nitrogen oxides and requirements for low sulfur fuel use.

That is our own Fish and Wildlife Service.

A group of more than 500 ecologists, biologists, and resource experts wrote Congress saying:

Based on our collective experience and understanding of the cumulative effects of oil and gas exploration and development on Alaska's North Slope, we do not believe these impacts have been adequately considered for the Arctic Refuge, and mitigation without adequate data on this complex ecosystem is unlikely. Oil exploration and development have substantially changed environments where they have occurred in Alaska's central Arctic. Since the discovery of oil at Prudhoe Bay in 1968, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service estimated about 800 square miles of Arctic habitats have been transformed into one of the world's largest industrial complexes. Oil spills, contaminated waste, and other sources of pollution have had measurable environmental impacts in spite of strict environmental regulations. Roads, pipelines, well pads, processing facilities, and other support infrastructure have incrementally altered the character of this system.

The Wildlife Society, the Alaska chapter, believes that "petroleum exploration and development are not warranted on the Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge," which they have deemed, as I mentioned earlier, a critical area for the abundance and diversity of wildlife.

We also need to look at the issue of compliance. This is particularly true when oil production starts to decline, as it will. There is a curve here. Let me share it with you. I have the chart in the cloakroom. Maybe we can get it in a minute.

The point of the chart is to show that obviously, like any finite resource, as you begin production, you begin slowly. You build up. You build up to a peak. And then, of course, since there is only so much there, you begin to come down. What often happens in this debate is we wind up with peak production day being the amount of oil that is thrown around, whereas you have to work up to that and then come down.

If you were to compare that to what would happen, for instance, with CAFE standards, CAFE standards don't go up and down, CAFE standards continue to accrue as you go forward. Every day in the future, you will be grabbing X amount of carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and so forth, out of the atmosphere and recapturing it or preventing it from going in.

You can actually save three times as much fuel as the peak production day. You save three times as much foreign

dependency by putting CAFE standards in place as you would drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge.

When oil exploration is over, when the companies don't want to invest any more money in the project, what is the commitment to clean up? All over this country—the Presiding Officer's State of New Jersey—there are unfunded liabilities in toxic sites where the companies don't clean them up. We have just seen this administration seek to change the "polluter pays" principle which, incidentally, is a tax on the American citizen. I don't know if people are focused on that right now. Maybe it is worth a moment. When you undo "polluter pays," as the principle that has guided our cleanup in America of our toxic sites, then the question is, Who pays? The average taxpayer is going to pay. The Federal Government is going to have to dump that money in if the "polluter pays" principle is not there. That is a tax increase on Americans. It is the Bush environmental tax on Americans.

By ending "polluter pays," we are now going to turn, and either nobody cleans it up—which is what is happening right now because we are not putting the money into Superfund—or the taxpayer across the country pays.

That is the problem in Alaska, too. Who is going to clean up in the end? What is the State pristineness? Can you ever restore pristine? The answer, I think most people know, is no.

In the year 2000, BP Alaska reached agreement with the Environmental Protection Agency to pay \$7 million in civil and criminal penalties and \$15 million to carry out a nationwide environmental management system. BP was sentenced in Federal court in February 2000 to pay \$500,000 in criminal fines and \$6.5 million for failing to report illegal hazardous waste disposals on the North Slope.

From 1993 to 1995, employees of a contractor up there illegally discharged hazardous substances, including solvents, waste paint, paint thinner, waste oil containing lead and toxic chemicals such as benzene, toluene, methylene chloride, by injecting them into wells. They failed to report the illegal dumping as required by law.

The Wall Street Journal, in a series of investigative stories, has documented widespread problems at other facilities on the North Slope. On April 12, 2001, they reported:

Days before Interior Secretary Gale Norton's much-publicized tour of Alaska's Prudhoe Bay oilfields last month, state inspectors made a startling discovery: almost a third of the safety valves tested at one drilling platform failed to close.

The story continues:

... technicians say they have complained for years about the integrity of the industry's "friendlier technology." Some technicians who operate machinery—which proliferates on Prudhoe Bay and could be replicated in the wildlife refuge—are so understaffed and lacking in routine maintenance that they are leak-prone and vulnerable to explosions.

On April 26, 2001, the Wall Street Journal reported:

About 10 percent of the safety shut-off valves in BP Amoco entire drilling operation on Alaska's Western Prudhoe Bay failed to pass state tests during the first quarter. . . .

On November 9, 2001, the Wall Street Journal reported that an internal report revealed "widespread operational problems at its giant oil field in Prudhoe Bay"—that they were widespread operational problems. Investigators found large and growing maintenance backlogs on fire and gas detection systems and pressure safety valves. The report concluded:

The systems are old, portions of them pre-date current code and replacement parts are difficult to obtain.

Let me close by saying I have made it clear in my comments that those of us who oppose the Arctic Wildlife Refuge do not oppose drilling.

We embrace drilling in many parts of our country as an ongoing need for 30 to 50 years of this country's future. We will remain oil dependent, despite even our best efforts, if we were to make our best efforts. I have suggested that we need an organizing principle for our energy future that does what makes economic sense. We should not make choices that don't make economic sense, and we do not have to lower the quality of life of any American.

We heard debate on the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago about what kind of cars people were going to be "forced" to drive. No American is ever going to be forced to drive any kind of car if we do what we need to do with respect to the future. If you want to drive a big SUV or a huge truck to take your kids to soccer games, go ahead, absolutely. I think most soccer moms in America are outraged that cars get as little mileage for the gasoline as they do. They would love to pay less when going to the gas station to fill up.

All of that technology is available to us to allow people to drive the car of their choice that is more efficient. There are many choices available to us. We can drill in those 7,000 leases in the deepwater drilling of the Gulf of Mexico. I have gone through the long list of the Arctic leases that were available that were put out last year. The largest oil and gasoline lease in the history of our Nation, just over a year ago, was 950,000 acres on the North Slope. They have scheduled 15 oil and gas leases on 15 million acres now. The third lease sale of a planning area of 10 million acres is coming right down the road.

We don't need to drill in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge and destroy the concept of a pristine refuge in order to accomplish our goals of, in fact, being independent or improving the national security of our country. That is really the choice here, for all of us in the Senate: Whether we will respect this concept until we find 15, 20, 30 years from now that we leaders of the country have not made wise choices with re-

spect to the alternatives and renewables, alternative means of propelling our automobiles.

I was just out at the National Energy Alternative Renewable Energy Lab in Colorado meeting with Admiral Truly. They are doing extraordinary work. They say if the United States were to put in more effort and ratchet up our research on alternative propulsion, alternative heating, and other mechanisms, we could significantly advance the curve in this country.

We have not been serious about that. The only thing we appear to be serious about thus far is continuing the dependency that has put us into this problem in the first place.

So I hope my colleagues will take advantage of this vote, which represents an opportunity to suggest that our value system in this country, and our sense of economics, and our sense of security are well-grounded and well-placed with respect to the Arctic Wildlife Refuge.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORZINE). The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the Senator from Massachusetts. He is a friend. I have visited his home and I have great love for his wife. I find it very interesting that the Senator from Massachusetts has discussed about every other creature of the world but has never talked about the people of the Arctic Slope. He never talked about the Eskimo. In fact, despite repeated requests to go to the area, he has never been there. As a concept, I find it hard to understand my friend's continued reference to the "wilderness area" and drilling in a "wilderness area."

The 1½ million acres of the Arctic Coastal Plain is not a wilderness area and was never designated as a wilderness area. Drilling there would not be drilling in a wilderness area. It is unfortunate that the Senator, and others, continue to say that because it represents a breach of faith.

Paul Tsongas, in fact, did offer four amendments to the 1980 act. One of them he withdrew. It was on the Coastal Plain. There was a compromise on the Coastal Plain. I, too, am sad that Senator Paul Tsongas and Senator Scoop Jackson are not here because, were they here, they would say a deal is a deal.

We passed out the letter that Senator Jackson authored with Senator Hatfield, which is on every Senator's desk, which says:

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 Refuge, a ban sought by one amendment, is an ostrich-like approach that ill-serves our Nation in this time of energy crisis.

That is the letter signed by Senators Jackson and Hatfield in 1980.

Fair is fair. I will talk about the senatorial courtesies and the prerogatives of the past. Right now I want to answer my friend. At one time during his comments he said British Petroleum does not seek to explore in ANWR. Am I hearing right? There has been no such announcement by British Petroleum. It is one of the major producing entities in the North Slope now and, as far as I know, it has never been the concept of seeking the right to proceed with the commitment to explore the 1½ million acres covered by the section 1002 in the 1980 act.

The Senator talked about jobs. That is wonderful. We like that. The Senator talked about drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, and he wants to develop the National Petroleum Reserve of Alaska. He has had that opportunity since he has been in the Senate. Nobody has proceeded at all with that. We have tried to get that done. We have not been able to do it. It is like the rest of Alaska. People say it is wilderness because it is undeveloped. It is not wilderness in the legal sense, unless it is classified as "wilderness."

So far as I know, it is not possible for that statement to be made on the floor of the Senate—that we would drill in wilderness if we were to drill in the 1002 area of the Arctic Coastal Plain.

The Senator from Massachusetts belabored, I think, the CAFE standards concept. It would be three times the savings, he says, of ANWR. Well, ANWR doesn't persist in savings; ANWR is production. Beyond that, CAFE standards deal with gasoline. We are dealing with oil. Mr. President, 44 percent of a barrel of oil becomes gasoline; 56 percent is refined for other products. You can have all the CAFE standards you want. If you want the other products, you have to refine a barrel of oil. There is too much talk here about gasoline being oil. One time the Senator from Massachusetts said 70 percent of the oil goes into transportation. That is not so at all. Maybe 70 percent of the gasoline goes into transportation, but it is not oil. In fact, the bulk of the oil goes for a lot of things, including home fuel, jet fuel, kerosene, and lubricants. I wonder how far our aircraft would fly if we stopped refining a barrel of oil to get jet fuel. You would still have the part of the barrel that would make gasoline.

I remind those who are looking at this chart that these are items made from oil—from toothpaste to deodorants, footballs, lifejackets, pantyhose, lipstick, dentures, and they all come from a barrel of oil.

Mr. KERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. I did not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. KERRY. Does the Senator want to have a dialog?

Mr. STEVENS. I will have a dialog when the time comes.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STEVENS. A real problem is the people who really take advantage of the Nation when we are evenly divided,

the minority of the population—2 percent—which represents these radical environmentalists. The Democratic Party sees fit to seek to win elections by preventing us from proceeding with the prospect of discovering oil on the Arctic Plain, but it has not been a traditional position of that party because, obviously, the two people who reserved this area were, in fact, Democratic Senators—Senator Jackson and Senator Tsongas. They were Democratic Senators. They entered into a commitment with us that this area would be explored, and if it proved to be not a situation where irreparable harm would occur on the Arctic Plain, this area would then be faced with a request from the President and the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with oil and gas leasing.

Oil and gas leasing is prohibited at the present time. We know that. It is prohibited by law. The 1980 act prohibited oil and gas leasing in this area until the procedure is followed. This is the procedure. It has taken us 21 years to get to this point.

This is the "Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Coastal Plain Resource Assessment Recommendation to Congress and Legislative Environmental Impact Statement" required by the law of 1980. It demonstrates that there would be no irreparable harm to this area if oil and gas leasing would proceed.

I have some real problems with what is going on here. I want to talk about them at length later. I understand the Senator from Texas wishes to speak, so I will be glad to yield to her when she is ready.

These people, the Eskimos, the Inupiat who live on the North Slope, seek this decision by Congress. They want this area to be explored. Their schools, their roads, and their future depend upon jobs. This is their area. They believe it can be done safely. They even own some of the land up there.

Mr. President, did you know they are prohibited from drilling on their own land, land they received from the Federal Government in settlement of their claims? There is no question—no question—that these people want to proceed.

The Senator was referring to this land as wilderness. Those people live right there. This is the village that is within what the Senator from Massachusetts calls wilderness. This is not wilderness. This is the home of the Inupiat people, the Eskimo people of Alaska.

There are some Alaska Natives who live on the South Slope who really are part of the Canadian Indian nation known as Gwich'ins. They oppose this. We know that. They are probably up in the galleries now. They oppose it, but the Alaska Eskimos do not oppose it. They live there, and they want this development. They want to see it developed.

The first time I went up to the North Slope, it was a very sad visit. It was

back in the fifties. I tell you, they had a very small runway. Wiley Post crashed just north of there. We landed at this little village in which the people lived in terrible circumstances and conditions. They had no modern conveniences at all. I invite you to go up and take a look at Barrow—five-, six-, eight-story buildings with elevators, beautiful schools, a wonderful airport, tremendous people enjoying their lifestyle. They like the Arctic. That is their home. They like their opportunities now to have their feet in both the present and the past. They are wonderful people. They make tremendous citizens of the United States, and there is no question they want to proceed.

I have a letter that went to Senators DASCHLE and LOTT in April of this year from the Kaktovic Inupiat. This is a photograph of some of their children. They say they want the promises given to them. They want this area open. They are the only residents of the 19.6 million acres that were recognized within the boundaries of that refuge. They own some of the land. They own 92,160 acres of the land, and they are currently prohibited by the Federal Government from drilling on their land because of the situation in the 1002 area.

They were told to wait until the approval was given by Congress to proceed in the whole area. They seek—and I hope before we are through, we will recognize their request—to use their own lands to determine whether or not beneath those lands there are oil and gas resources. That is another matter we will go into.

They say:

We don't have much, gentlemen, except for the promises of the U.S. Government that the settlement of our land claims against the United States would eventually lead to control of our destiny by our people.

That is denied now by the opposition of the majority party to this amendment that is before us.

We believe this will be the largest oilfield on the North American Continent, somewhere in excess of 40 billion barrels of oil. We do not build paved roads; we build ice roads in these areas. It is true that on State lands, where Prudhoe Bay was discovered—those are State lands—they are subject to the construction of roads by the permission of the State of Alaska. It is an entirely different situation than being within the 1002 area which is subject to total control by the Federal Government.

The House has already limited the use of this 1002 area, 1.5 million acres, to 2,000 acres of surface—2,000 acres out of 1.5 million acres. That is what we are being denied the right to use.

I do believe it is unfortunate that we have the concepts now of so many people who enjoy life and make so many studies from afar. They are making studies from all of these scientific organizations that are supported by these environmental organizations. I am going to talk about those later, Mr.

President. I see two other Senators are in the Chamber.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will be pleased to follow the Senator from Texas. I ask unanimous consent that I follow the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, with the understanding I may resume the floor later this afternoon, I will yield the floor to these Senators.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. The Senator from Texas will speak, and then the Senator from Minnesota follows; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska. In fact, I thank both Senators from Alaska for leading this very long fight to open up a very small portion of their State for the purpose of exploring and drilling to make America more stable in this crisis in which we find ourselves.

I want to go back over what is in the Murkowski-Breaux amendment because I think if you listen to some of the debate, you will be confused.

First, the key provision is a provision I put in this amendment early on that says the President must find that it is in our national economic and security interest to drill in ANWR. The President must consider the impact on increasing the independence we would have on foreign imports for our basic energy needs in this country.

This amendment limits the size of production to 2,000 acres, and in that 2,000 acres it is confined to a part of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge that is plain. There are no trees and wilderness in this part of ANWR. We are talking about drilling on 2,000 acres in an area the size of the State of South Carolina, where there are no trees whatsoever.

In addition, I think it is important to note that we have limited in this amendment when they can drill. They can drill between November and May, when the land is frozen. There would be ice roads and ice runways. The footprint on the land would be minimal to none because they would be using the ice roads rather than driving on the land.

In addition to that, the caribou, which is an animal that mates throughout the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, mates during the summertime. There would be no drilling in the summertime. Any argument that this might in some way disrupt caribou mating is not a valid argument at all.

There would be 1.5 million more acres of real wilderness that would be designated as wilderness where they could not drill—this is in addition to ANWR in exchange for opening this nonwilderness area of the Coastal Plain.

It is a balanced amendment. The environment is protected. It is very important that we look at the environmental safeguards America would put on drilling in ANWR to assure that we will have environmental standards.

This same reserve may well be drilled in Russia which is very close to Alaska, as we all know. About 20 miles separates them at their closest point.

They could drill right across the coast from Alaska, and we do not know what their environmental safeguards would be. We certainly would not have control over them, and that would affect the Alaska coastline even more because we would not have control of the way Russia might decide to drill. They might not decide to drill only in the winter. They might not decide to put any limitations on the kinds of ships that would come in and out of the water. I think that maintaining control is the better environmental argument.

ANWR would produce at least a million barrels a day. That is about the amount we import from Iraq every day. The percentage of the U.S. oil needs that would be met by ANWR is nearly 5 percent. We consume 20 million barrels of oil a day. We import 12 million of those barrels. We are right at 60 percent of our needs every day having to be met by imports. Our ANWR production would make up for 8 to 10 percent of our current imports.

I heard the Senator from Massachusetts say this is going to be a drop in the bucket for our energy needs; that this really gets us nowhere. So why would we do it?

We would do it because we need to do everything we can to maintain our own stability and to look to ourselves for our economic and security needs. I would rather be looking at American jobs with American resources, American production and American control than to say 60 percent imports for our needs is OK. I especially think that the argument falls flat when we realize that the 60 percent includes some of America's known worst enemies, such as Iraq. Iraq has threatened America before; so have some of the other countries from whom we import oil. Then there are countries with whom we have great friendships, such as Venezuela. They also send us about a million barrels a day but they are in upheaval. There are strikes and the government is in a very precarious situation. So while we would certainly count Venezuela as a friend, they are not as reliable right now as we need to have.

I think we need to look at this whole ANWR issue in light of the circumstances. I have always felt that America needed an energy policy that depended on our own resources. Today, it is no longer an option. It is no longer a matter of good public policy; it is a necessity. It is a matter of national security that we control our own economy.

If countries, that would do us harm, could say "we will stop exporting oil to

America and shut down their factories, keep them from being able to drive to work, shoot the prices so high the airline industry starts to crater," then are we not going to beat them from within? Maybe we do not have to beat them from without because if their economy starts sinking we are going to win. Of course, they are right.

If we allow that to happen, we are not responsible stewards of our country.

Iraq has, in fact, said they are going to stop exporting oil that could come to America. With Iraq using this as a weapon, and other countries possibly doing the same, or deciding that perhaps they cannot export any more because of their internal situations, then what are we going to do if we have not planned ahead?

The Senator from Massachusetts says we should conserve our way out of the crisis, but let's look at that. The 10 most fuel-efficient automobiles in America make up 1.5 percent of the automobile sales in America. In America, we have long distances to drive. In America, people have big families, and we know a heavier car is safer than a small car. So it would seem the Senator from Massachusetts would demand that people have only the choice of an unsafe car, that is not the one they want for their families, as a way to become more stable in our economy.

I fundamentally disagree with him that this is the right approach. I think we need to look to our own resources as part of a balanced package that would keep our country strong.

I think we should have incentives for more fuel-efficient automobiles, so that if people make that choice of their own free will, and if that meets their family's needs, they would be able to do that and maybe even get a tax credit for it. I think we need to look for alternative forms of energy. I think we have walked away from nuclear powerplants, which are known to be the most clean and effective ways to produce electricity. I think there are new things we will be able to find in the future, such as ethanol, hopefully, becoming more reasonably priced; other forms of wind energy that certainly could produce electricity, not in the great amounts we need at this time, but I think Americans are ingenious and we will find other sources. But that should not be all we need to do.

We need to have a balanced plan that also allows us to produce the amount of energy we would need to keep our country strong. The major sources of oil in this country are ANWR and the Gulf of Mexico. We are drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, but we have not yet found the technology to go as deep as we would need to go in parts of the Gulf of Mexico to tap the added resources that might be available there. We do however certainly have the capability to look to that resource as well. In the Senate bill, we do not try to help get the Gulf of Mexico oil. No. The House bill allows us to continue the

royalty help that we give for deep drilling in the Gulf because it is more expensive and takes more research and exploration.

Senator Bennett Johnston of Louisiana passed a royalty relief bill that takes the first part of oil royalties from deep well drilling in the Gulf. It abates those royalties in order to create an incentive for companies to add that expense of drilling in that deep Gulf area. That credit lapsed and is no longer in effect. The House energy bill puts that back in play.

We should do that. That is a valid incentive because it would produce more oil in the Gulf.

In the Senate bill, there is very little about production, aside from the marginal well tax credits which were my in bill. I have fought for the marginal well tax credits for a long time. I am pleased that they are in the bill because the marginal well tax credits could help the marginal, small, little bitty wells to give them a floor so that anyone willing to go in and tap a site, that would produce only 15 barrels a day or less, would be able to withstand the falling prices. A number of those small wells were closed when oil was \$11 a barrel a couple of years ago and they haven't been reopened because of the instability of the prices.

If all the small wells are drilled and producing, we do have that credit in this bill which will equal the amount we import from Saudi Arabia. It is a significant amount. It takes 500,000 wells to do it. These are generally small businesspeople. That is good.

Other than that, there is nothing in this bill that speaks to production. The House bill has the incentives for deep Gulf drilling, which I think is very important and I certainly hope will come out of the conference report if we can pass the bill before the Senate.

The House has ANWR, which the Senate does not, and about which we are fighting and talking today. ANWR is a significant addition to our own national stability. The ability to control our destiny rests in ANWR and deep Gulf drilling. When you put those together with increasing nuclear capabilities, clean coal burning, wind, and other forms of renewables, a balanced package of conservation and production includes ANWR and the deep Gulf incentives.

As we debate this, I hope some of our Members, who have said they are very concerned about drilling in ANWR, will look at the facts: ANWR has no trees in the part we will drill, it would only be done in the winter when you use ice roads and ice runways so there is no footprint on the land, where it would not hurt the environment, but, in fact, would be severely restricted by environmental concerns.

If we are going to have affordable, reliable, and clean energy, we must have a balanced package. Not to pass a bill that gives the amount we import from Iraq and Saudi Arabia and Venezuela is hardly worth the effort because it

wouldn't give enough stability to control our own destiny.

It is essential we pass a bill that allows America to control our economy and will produce American jobs. We are talking hundreds of thousands of jobs. That, in itself, helps stabilize our economy. That is why the Teamsters Union and the building and trade unions have been so helpful in this effort. I have never seen a union so committed and so sincere and work so hard as the Teamsters to try to keep these jobs in America. We have lost many jobs, thousands of jobs, since September 11.

These are good-paying jobs that would become available if we drill in ANWR and in the deep Gulf—not only the jobs on the rigs themselves, but all of the companies that produce the pipe, all of the companies that produce the oil-well supplies.

It would be a huge boost to our economy. However, most importantly, it would stabilize our economy from oil price spikes that will hurt our airline industry, that will hurt our factories, that will hurt profitability and start causing more layoffs if we do not get control.

I thank my colleagues for finally allowing this amendment to come forward. It is our responsibility to pass this amendment for the limited exploration in ANWR with the environmental safeguards and with the very specific times that assure we would not have a footprint on the land. This is our responsibility. It is a national security issue. It is an economic issue. If we don't look out for America, who will? This is the Senate of America and we must look out for the people, for the jobs, for the security of our country. That is what we have been elected to do. It is our job and it is time to step up to the plate and do the right thing for the people who have put their trust in us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARNAHAN). The Senator from Nevada.

MR. REID. I have spoken with the two managers of the bill. I would like to propound a unanimous consent request that Senator WELLSTONE be recognized for 20 minutes, Senator LIEBERMAN for 20 minutes, Senator BOND for 20 minutes, and Senator LOTT for 10 minutes, in that order.

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

The Senator from Minnesota.

MR. WELLSTONE. Madam President, when I first came to the Senate, my first year here in 1991, I think with Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator BAUCUS, we started a filibuster against well drilling in ANWR. We succeeded. I am proud to be part of this effort as well.

With all due respect, as I listen to some of my colleagues speak, they make the case we need to do this for our own national security; we need to do this for energy independence; we need to do it for our consumers. I think it has precisely the opposite effect.

We are talking, altogether, the equivalent of what the United States con-

sumes for 6 months. We are talking about oil that is not recoverable for another 10 years. And we are also talking about continuing to barrel down this oil path, this fossil fuel path, which is destructive to our environment.

I am an environmental Senator from the State of Minnesota. I am concerned about global warming. In many ways, it is not our future. There is a different future.

I come from a State, for example, a cold weather State at the other end of the pipeline. When we import barrels of oil or MCFs of natural gas, we export billions of dollars. Last year our energy bill was between \$10 and \$11 billion, but we have wind, biodiesel and ethanol, biomass electricity, saved energy, efficient energy use, and clean technology and small business. There is another direction that we can go. There is simply no reason to destroy a pristine wildlife refuge. There is no reason to do this environmental damage.

One of the most moving meetings I ever had was with the Gwich'in people who live on the land. They made the appeal to me as a Senator out of their sense of environmental justice not to let this oil drilling go forward.

This whole idea of energy independence for America, based upon another idea that we drill our way to independence, makes no sense. The United States of America has 3 percent of the world's oil reserves, but we use 25 percent of the world's supply. Saudi Arabia has 46 percent of the world's supply.

On each point, I take my colleagues to task. I don't think we get more energy independence from this. I don't think we get lower prices for consumers. I don't think we do better for our environment. Frankly, this proposal represents not a big step forward but a big leap sideways, at best.

On the jobs count, we can go back and forth and back and forth. Senator KERRY spoke; Senator LIEBERMAN will speak. I know what the American Petroleum Institute has said about the jobs. I also know when we look at the Congressional Research Service, which we all look to as an independent research organization, we are talking about 60,000 jobs.

If you move down another path where you are not so dependent on big oil and where you really look at renewable energy and saved energy, it is much more labor intensive, it is much more small business intensive. It creates many more jobs, and it is much more respectful of the environment. It keeps capital in our communities. That is the marriage we ought to make here on the floor of the Senate. We don't need to be doing the bidding of these big oil companies any longer.

In part 2 of my presentation—I will stay under 20 minutes because there are many Senators who want to speak—I want to turn my attention to a portion of this amendment, the second-degree amendment, which purports

to address the very serious problem of legacy costs of steelworkers or, in my State, taconite workers—that is to say, people who are retired and who are losing their health care benefits and their insurance benefits.

We need to respond to this pain. I am a part of a real effort, a bipartisan effort with Senator ROCKEFELLER and Senator SPECTER, to deal with legacy costs and to provide the help to people. This amendment on this bill is not authentic. It is not a real effort. In many ways I cannot think of an amendment I am more in opposition to because I think, frankly, it takes advantage of the pain of people and the hopes of people, it is an amendment that does not do the job.

Why in the world are we now being told on the floor of the Senate the only way we can get relief to thousands of steelworker retirees around the Nation, where their health benefits and their life insurance is in jeopardy, is by tying it to what the oil industry wants to do in Alaska? I would like to know who made that linkage, and how anyone can argue that is the only way we can help steelworkers, retired steelworkers, or, for that matter, whether or not this, in fact, is even a real effort.

Let me explain. The amendment does not deliver on the promise. Senators come out here and say the only way we can do this is from the royalty from the oil drilling. The Senator from Alaska says the legacy costs could be as high as \$18 billion. I think the costs are about \$14 billion over 10 years. Drilling in ANWR cannot produce those kinds of Federal revenues. This amendment dedicates much of the ANWR revenue to other purposes.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, nonpartisan CBO, less than \$1 billion of the revenue from ANWR is going to be available, in this amendment, to pay for steelworker legacy costs over 10 years. In other words, less than one-tenth of what the CBO says we need to cover these legacy costs for steelworkers, for the taconite workers who are the steelworkers in northern Minnesota—less than one-tenth of what we need is covered by this amendment. And that presupposes the House Republican leadership would sign onto it—they have not—and that this administration would sign on to it. They have not.

So what we have here is a little bit of sleight of hand, where you get oil drilling for ANWR in the House bill—it is in there—and in the Senate bill. You get less than one-tenth of what we need for legacy costs. That is all you get. But you do not have any prior agreement from the House Republican leadership, and they take it out in conference. You do not have any prior agreement from the White House. They take it out in conference.

I have to tell you, this is in many ways this amendment tells a horrible story. The steelworkers, hard-working people—the range has seen tremendous

pain. LTV workers are out of work. This doesn't help people out of work now who are also losing their health care benefits. But for retirees, it says we can help you, but the only way is if you go along with what the oil industry wants, and if you look at the fine print, you find out this doesn't meet more than one-tenth of the cost.

Where is the commitment from the White House? Where is the commitment from the Republican leadership? I tell you what, we will bring a bill out to the floor which will cover legacy costs. Then all Senators get a chance to vote on it. Then we can decide who wants to provide the help to people.

By the way, it is also help to an industry that simply is not going to be able to compete without our doing so.

I want to say, the second-degree amendment—it is so interesting. I have another piece here. There actually will be no oil produced on lease on the Coastal Plain which will be imported except to Israel. There is even language of oil for Israel. Oil for Israel, legacy costs for steelworkers—although not really. It is not real. But this seems to me to represent the old politics where you are trying everything to get the votes. You do not know what else to do so you start adding on all these other amendments, and you think you can buy off this group of people or buy off this vote or get this vote or get this vote.

I am a Senator from Minnesota. I want to make the final distinction between a real effort and my position on ANWR so it is clear. I am opposed to the oil drilling. I led a filibuster when I first came here. I am opposed to it now. I will vote against oil drilling in ANWR, period.

The second distinction, I am for a real effort to deal with the legacy costs of retired steelworkers. We have to. I am working with a bipartisan group of Senators who are equally committed.

If we want to talk about what kind of revenue we are going to need, it is going to be, over 10 years, about \$14 billion. There is less than \$1 billion revenues from actually ANWR revenues to cover the legacy costs. That doesn't do the job.

The steelworkers know this and they have said so. We don't need to be doing the bidding of the oil companies to help the steelworkers. We can do that on our own. We can do that right here on the floor of the Senate.

When we bring the legislation out, it will be a tough fight. I do not know where the administration will be. Frankly, I think we need their commitment first because if we do not get their commitment first, we will never be able to provide it. It will be \$14 billion over 10 years. We have to do it for the industry, for this industry to have a chance, an industry that is so important to the national security of our country. This is a national security question. But we also have to do it to make sure we get the help to people who have worked so hard all their lives.

Where is the administration on this? I have not heard the administration commit itself to anywhere close to the amount of revenue we are going to need to cover legacy costs. The silence of the White House on this question is deafening. The silence on the part of the House Republican leadership is deafening. And the effort to have an amendment attached onto this amendment which purports to help taconite workers on the Iron Range but which really does not—as opposed to the real effort and the real fight which we will make—troubles me.

There are too many people and too much pain. People are hurting. We should not be playing around with this.

The second-degree amendment deserves to be defeated. The underlying amendment deserves to be defeated. I urge my colleagues to vote against cloture, and I believe we will have a strong vote against cloture.

I yield the floor.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I thank my friend and colleague from Minnesota for what is, for him, a characteristically truthful, passionate, and in some senses, courageous statement. But it is typical of his service here. I thank him and all the others of our colleagues who have joined in this filibuster to stop the drilling for oil in the Arctic Refuge.

I must say for myself, in the 13 years now that I have been in the Senate, I cannot remember the last time I said I would participate or proclaim to participate in the leadership of a filibuster. But I have done that in this case because I remember what Senator BYRD instructed us on some time ago—that the purpose of the filibuster, which is to say the requirement for a supermajority to proceed with 60 votes, is to prevent us from allowing the passions of the moment to sweep through Congress and become law and do lasting damage to America's values and interests.

If there ever was an example of how the temporary passions of a moment, if responded to in law, could do permanent damage to our great country, its values, and interests, quite literally, then this debate over the drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is exactly that.

I rise to oppose the amendments before us and oppose the motion for cloture. This proposal has been before us for a long time. I remember discussing it in my campaign for the Senate in 1988. It has risen and fallen over the years, but the basic heart of it remains wrong. It is to develop one of the most beautiful places in America, the Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge, known as the American Serengeti, inhabited by 135 species of birds and 45 species of land animals. The plain crosses all five different ecoregions of the Arctic.

To take this magnificent, unspoiled piece of nature and develop it for what? For a very small amount of oil no sooner than a decade from now, which will

not do what all of us say we want to do, which is to break our dependence on foreign oil. And it will provide no price relief to American consumers of gas and oil.

The fact remains that drilling in the refuge would not produce a drop of oil for a decade—far beyond the time of the current crisis in the Middle East which some have tried to use to gain support for this proposal to drill; and, even then, after the decade, far too little to change in any meaningful way our dependency on foreign oil.

Even if we did allow the drilling for oil in the Arctic Refuge, this administration's own Energy Department concluded that drilling in the Arctic Refuge would only reduce our dependence on oil by 2 percent 20 years from now. That is in the year 2020 or thereabouts. We would depend on foreign sources of oil for 60 percent of the oil we use instead of 62 percent. Is that 2 percent worth destroying this beautiful piece of America?

The fact is, even if the oil were coming out of ANWR, notwithstanding suggestions to the contrary, it would be priced at world prices. So there wouldn't be any relief given to America's consumers if we allowed the drilling for oil. No, the only way for us to remove our economy from the troubles in the Middle East that are going on now or that may go on in years ahead is to end our dependence on foreign oil.

As my colleagues have said over and over again, we don't have much oil left within American control and within America's land—3 percent of the world's reserves of which we use 25 percent every year. It is just not there. Therefore, if we want to break our dependence on foreign oil, as mighty a nation as we are militarily and economically, if we want to truly remain strong and invulnerable to pressure from nations that are weaker than we are but have oil within their land, then we have to break our addiction on oil. We have to develop new sources of energy. We have to conserve more. We have to use the gifts of ingenuity and technology that have created so many miracles in our time to help us power our society and our economy in a way that is not only cleaner than oil but, most important to the moment, is within our control and our possession. Surely, we can do it.

As part of doing this, I say, as so many others who oppose drilling for oil in the Arctic Refuge have said, we are not opposed to all development of America's energy resources. Far from it. While we must move beyond our dependence on fossil fuels, we cannot do it immediately, requiring us to continue to pursue supplies of oil, and particularly to pursue supplies of fuel. In fact, may I say as a Democrat that I am proud that the Clinton administration actually leased more land for energy development than either the Reagan or previous Bush administrations.

But those decisions were evaluated, such as the decisions we shall make

and should make in the future, which is to determine the environmental impact of that exploration—to hold the test up. How much energy will we get? What damage will it do to our environment? By that test, the Arctic Refuge does not pass.

Let me show my colleagues a map of the North Slope of Alaska. Here is this very small area of the Coastal Plain. That is what our colleagues from Alaska want to be able to drill. Compare it to all the rest of this that is now open and, in many cases, already leased for oil exploration. This is a very small part of that area. There is very active exploration and drilling going on in the rest.

We are not asking to take out every possibility of development in enormous swaths of land. The fact is, companies have made promising new discoveries at the locations in blue that I have just indicated. For example, last winter Phillips announced major discoveries of three significant oilfields in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska. The oil companies have plans to drill up to 59 exploration wells over the next 5 years. None of that is going to be affected by our desire to stop these amendments, which aim to get into that last very special and important area to preserve.

What about that small green section in the corner of the map that I pointed to? The so-called 1002 area of the Arctic Refuge is the small biological heart of the ecosystem. Again, we are not asking for the entire North Slope to be protected. We only ask for the small piece of land that serves as the most essential and vital habitat in the region. Much to the contrary of what has been argued, the area is not even the most promising of the North Slope for exploration for oil.

Let me quote from comments of an oil industry consultant in a recent New York Times article:

There is still a fair amount of exploration risk here: You could go through eight years of litigation, a good amount of investment, and still come up with dry holes or uneconomic discoveries.

Listen to the comments of a spokesman for BP Alaska:

Big oil companies go where there are substantial fields and where they can produce oil economically. Does ANWR have that? Who knows?

We owe it to the American people to determine whether the measure before us is responsible and responsive to our energy needs or whether it is simply a distraction that threatens to bring down the 400-plus pages of good energy policy contained in the underlying bill.

To determine that, I think we need only to ask a very businesslike, very American question: What do we gain and what do we lose? I can tell you what we would gain in less than a minute. It would take days to catalog what we would lose. We are prepared, if necessary, to take those days to stop this authorization to drill in the Arctic Refuge.

What we would gain I have talked about. It would take at least 10 years, and then there would be, at best, a 6-month supply of economically recoverable oil—a yield that would be spread over 50 years.

What are the costs? The visible damage would be substantial: an environmental treasure permanently lost, hundreds of species threatened, international agreements jeopardized, oil spills further endangering the Alaskan landscape, and an increase in air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.

The unseen damage of drilling would be just as real: a nation—our Nation—lulled into believing it has taken a step toward energy independence, when it has done no such thing; a nation believing it is extracting oil using so-called “environmentally sensitive” methods when it will not—all in all, the American people misled in both meanings of that term, not appreciating the reality, and also a failure of leadership by those of us who are privileged to serve here in Washington.

Finally, this plan would violate some of our most treasured American values. I speak particularly of the values of conservation. This plan presents a false promise of job creation, a false promise of economic stimulus, a false promise of energy independence, and a false promise of environmental sensitivity.

The first claim my colleagues make is that drilling in the Arctic is a necessary part of a balanced, long-term energy strategy. But, I say respectfully, calling drilling in the Arctic Refuge part of a strategic energy plan is like calling oil a beverage. It is literally and figuratively hard to swallow.

This ill-considered plan will do nothing to wean us from our dependence on foreign oil. But we do have such a proposal which would take aggressive and strategic steps in pursuit of new sources of energy and better conservation; and that is the underlying bill fashioned by Senator BINGAMAN, Senator DASCHLE, and others working with them. It would provide us with the resources we need in the short term by measures such as expediting the natural gas pipeline from Alaska and providing the resources necessary to process the many lands already leased for exploration.

I want to share with my colleagues a few words on the question of the effect that drilling in the Arctic might have on jobs because that is an argument that has been made.

Drilling in the Arctic Refuge will actually create fewer jobs than dozens of the smarter alternatives that would create new industries using American technology that will be encouraged by the underlying bill. The much quoted study claiming that the Arctic drilling would result in 750,000 jobs has since been widely discredited. Even its authors have acknowledged its methodology was flawed.

The real job creation figure, in my opinion, is much closer to 45,000. Those

jobs are short term, most of them in construction, as opposed to the permanent jobs that would be created by new energy industries, new energy technology industries created all over America.

In order to try to settle this question, the Joint Economic Committee looked at the question and found that the proposal would result in modest employment gains, peaking at an estimated 65,000 new jobs nationwide in the year 2020. That would be an increase in projected employment by less than one-tenth of 1 percent over that time—certainly nothing to sacrifice a national treasure for, particularly when we have so many better, new energy alternatives that will create so many more longer lasting jobs.

I would like to say a word about the oil prices impact from drilling in the Arctic because American consumers are sensitive and, appropriately, accustomed to being concerned about the effect of world political and economic events on oil pricing and gasoline pricing and may be deceived into thinking that if we drill for oil in the Arctic Refuge, we will be protected from international oil price fluctuations.

Drilling would have no impact on U.S. oil prices, even under the inflated estimates for petroleum potential that are cited by drilling advocates because the price of oil is determined by broad, global supply and demand, not by the presence or absence of an individual oilfield.

Let's look, for example, at the case of Prudhoe Bay. In 1976—the year before the largest oilfield ever discovered in North America entered production—a barrel of West Texas Intermediate crude oil sold for \$12.65 and standard gasoline averaged—I take a deep breath here—59 cents a gallon. That was 1976.

Two years later, with Prudhoe Bay now adding more than 2 million barrels a day to domestic supply, in 1978, West Texas Intermediate crude had increased by more than 15 percent to \$14.85 a barrel and gasoline averaged 63 cents a gallon. It went up. During the next 2 years, as Prudhoe Bay production increased, oil prices also skyrocketed to \$37.37 per barrel, while gasoline nearly doubled to \$1.19 a gallon—all because of world oil prices.

This obviously does not demonstrate a relationship between Alaskan oil and gasoline prices that will be paid around the world.

In closing, I want to get back to what this all says about our values and the choices we have to make. The question is, Are we willing to destroy a habitat that is home to so much beauty and wildlife and deprive future generations of visiting and experiencing this magnificent part of our country in return for what will slightly—2 percent out of 62 percent—reduce our dependence on foreign oil two decades from now and will not affect the price the American people will pay for gasoline and oil?

I think the answer has to be no. Wilderness and the oil industry cannot

peacefully coexist, certainly not in this case. So we are forced to make a choice. I have made mine. I believe the American people agree. Why? Because conserving our great open spaces is fundamentally an affirmation of our core American values. Conservation is not a Democratic or Republican value; it is a quintessentially American value.

What lesson does it teach the generations that come after us if we go ahead with this terrible mistake of drilling in the Arctic Refuge? That we, as Americans, did not value our national heritage? That we did not conserve it for future generations of Americans? That we sold it for, essentially, effectively, the equivalent of a barrel of oil?

The ethic of conservation tells us it is not only sentimentally difficult to part with beautiful wilderness, it is practically unwise, because in doing so we deny future generations a priceless piece of our common culture.

Let me close with the words of a great President, a great American, a great conservationist, and a great Republican, Theodore Roosevelt. In 1916, he said this:

The "greatest good for the greatest number" applies to the number within the womb of time, compared to which those now alive form but an insignificant fraction. Our duty to the whole, including the unborn generations, bids us [to] restrain an unprincipled present-day minority from wasting the heritage of these unborn generations. The movement for the conservation of wildlife and the larger movement for the conservation of all our natural resources are essentially democratic in spirit, purpose, and method.

That is a quote from the great T.R.

They live and breathe with as much wisdom today as they did in 1916. In addition to all of the pluses and minuses and balances and statistics, they are the ultimate reason why we should reject these amendments to allow for the drilling for oil in the Arctic Refuge.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I rise today to discuss what I think is one of the most important issues our Nation faces, and that is national security.

Yes, this is an energy bill. More specifically, we are talking about an amendment to drill for oil in a small remote region of Alaska. What does that have to do with national security? Let's set the stage because the facts are getting lost in some wonderful rhetoric that takes me away in a dream world. I don't recognize the place I know as Alaska when I listen to it.

We have tried to put out the facts. I have heard other things that are not quite so factual. Just as a beginning, over the next 20 years, U.S. oil consumption is projected to grow even after factoring in a projected 26-percent increase in renewable energy supply, which we strongly support, and a 29-percent increase in efficiency. Some people think that is outrageous. Some people have a terrible guilt trip that the United States uses so much oil we

don't have enough, so we ought to give up.

Drilling in ANWR reasonably could almost double our reserves. The United States has about 22 billion barrels of proven reserves, 3 percent of the world's reserves. ANWR could hold 16 billion barrels of oil more. That is almost doubling. It is adding 16 to 22 billion in our reserves.

We use oil. There is no question about it. We have 5 percent of the world's population. We use 25 percent of the world's oil. But we also produce 31.5 percent of the world's total economic output. We are more efficient than the world as a whole, and we produce food and medicine and goods to improve the lives of Americans and people around the globe.

Let's be serious. When we are talking about the fact that we use oil, yes, we do. There is no question about it. We need to make sure we have adequate oil reserves.

We just heard some information from the Energy Information Administration that is a little outdated. There is more recently a letter of March 22 to Senator MURKOWSKI from Mary Hutzler, Acting Administrator for Energy Information. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter and the addendum be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC, March 22, 2002.

Hon. FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI: Enclosed is a response to your March 21, 2002, request for more information from our Service Report, "The Effects of the Alaska Oil and Natural Gas Provisions of H.R. 4, and S. 1766 on U.S. Energy Markets." The information provided relates to an increase in U.S. oil production, a decrease in net petroleum imports, and the change in net import expenditures across the range of cases explored in the Report.

The projections show that all of the increase in U.S. oil production from opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to oil development comes from increased Alaska production, rather than lower 48 production, regardless of the size of the oil resource assumed to be contained in ANWR. The size of the resource assumed to be in ANWR also has an effect on imports. The larger the ANWR resource base, the greater is the reduction in petroleum imports. Reductions in net expenditures on imported crude oil and petroleum products range from \$5.7 billion in the low ANWR resource case with a reference case oil price path to \$18.3 billion in 2020 (in 2000 dollars) in the high ANWR resource case with a high world oil price path.

If you have further questions, please contact me on (202) 586-6351.

Sincerely,

MARY J. HUTZLER,
Acting Administrator,
Energy Information Administration.

Enclosure.

ADDENDUM TO THE EFFECTS OF THE ALASKA OIL AND NATURAL GAS PROVISIONS OF H.R. 4 AND S. 1766 ON U.S. ENERGY MARKETS

This addendum responds to a March 21, 2002, request from Senator Frank H. Mur-

kowski for more information from the Energy Information Administration's Service Report, "The Effects of the Alaska Oil and Natural Gas Provisions of H.R. 4 and S. 1766 on U.S. Energy Markets." This addendum provides projections on the increase in U.S. oil production, the decrease in net petroleum imports, and the change in net petroleum expenditures across a range of cases.

All of the increase in U.S. oil production from opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to oil development comes from increased Alaska production, rather than lower 48 production, regardless of the size of the oil resource assumed to be contained in ANWR. In 2020, the increase in total domestic production ranges from 500,000 barrels per day in the low resource ANWR case to 1.43 million barrels per day in the high resource ANWR case (Table 1A). In 2020, ANWR is projected to increase U.S. oil production by 8.9 percent in the low resource case, compared to 25.4 percent in the high resource case, compared to the Annual Energy Outlook 2002 (AEO2002) reference case.

The size of the resource assumed to be in ANWR also has an effect on petroleum import reductions. The larger the ANWR resource base, the greater is the reduction in petroleum imports. In 2020, the reduction in net imports of crude oil and petroleum products is projected to range from 450,000 barrels per day in the low ANWR resource case to 1.39 million barrels per day in the high ANWR resource case, compared to the AEO2002 reference case. More than 80 percent of the import reduction is from lower imports of crude oil, as opposed to product imports.

When combined with a high world oil price path, the opening of ANWR has a similar impact on oil import reductions to the opening of ANWR in a reference case (Table 2A). In the high world oil price cases with mean and high ANWR resources, import reductions in 2020 range from 780,000 to 1.32 million barrels per day more than the high world oil price case without ANWR. In the high ANWR resource case with high world oil prices, oil consumption is reduced by half a million barrels per day and about 70 percent of the import reduction is from lower imports of crude oil.

Reductions in expenditures on imported crude oil and petroleum products range from \$5.7 to \$16.0 billion compared to the reference case in 2020, depending on the amount of resource in ANWR (in 2000 dollars). Like the volume changes, more than 80 percent of the reduction comes from lower crude oil imports. In the cases which assume the opening of ANWR and high world oil prices, expenditures on oil imports are \$11.2 billion to \$18.3 billion lower than the high world oil price case without ANWR. The impact on expenditures is greater in the high world oil price cases, because of higher oil prices.

Mr. BOND. They take a look at the estimates for oil produced at ANWR. And obviously, since it hasn't been drilled, we can only estimate. If it is not there, they won't drill. So this effort is all in vain, but I believe our U.S. Geological Survey and the other scientific experts have a pretty good idea.

On average, if you take in the high and the low, U.S. Geological Survey says there would be an increase of domestic production by about 14 percent. If you assume the high case, there could be an increase of 25 percent of domestic production. And when you have this kind of production, this is what it means for us.

People say that is not much oil. In Missouri, 71 years of consumption

could be sustained by that; or Connecticut, 132 years; Minnesota, 85 years. To say that is not significant misses the picture very badly.

What would be our dependence upon foreign oil? Well, without ANWR in 2020, the energy outlook is that 66.7 percent of our crude oil would come in from abroad. If you take the medium case, the medium production case, it would drop that to 62.2 percent. That is a 5-percent or 4-percent reduction. If it is the high case, it would go down to 58.7 percent, an 8-percent decline.

Those percentages make a huge difference. They make the difference between whether we have a situation where we can manage it in tight consumption or whether we are up against the wall.

The 1.5-million-acre Coastal Plain, called the 1002 area, of the 19.6-million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, is one of the best places to look for the oil that America needs. When large chunks of Alaska were set aside in 1980, they saved a small 1.5-million-acre Coastal Plain out of 19.6 million acres. Why did they save it?

Well, we have the letter of July 3, 1980, from Senator Hatfield and Chairman Henry Jackson. They were right when they wrote this in 1980. They said:

One-third of our known petroleum reserves are in Alaska, along with an even greater proportion of our potential reserves. Action 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.

"Ostrich-like approach," those are the words of Chairman Jackson. He said: This is an energy issue. It is a national defense issue. It is an economic issue. It is not just an easy vote you can throw away and get some greenie points. Chairman Jackson concluded:

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

The only regret I have today is that the Energy and Natural Resources Committee did not have an opportunity to craft a bill because I am confident that they know the energy situation. And they would have said that this is a necessary step.

The Energy Department said: The Coastal Plain is the largest unexplored, potentially productive onshore basin in the United States. The USGS estimates there are up to 16 billion barrels of recoverable oil, enough to offset Saudi imports for 30 years.

The 1002 area is not a beautiful piece of America. Congress set it aside for oil exploration. The people who talk about this give these word pictures of a magnificent forest. I don't think they have been there. When I go back home, I ask anybody: Have you been to the North Slope? Do you know what it looks like? They tell me: No.

I kid my colleagues from Oklahoma that it is as attractive as a frozen Oklahoma. Nobody I know has refused

to drill for oil in Oklahoma because of its pristine beauty. I have been there. I have swatted away the mosquitos.

This is what it looks like in the winter. My good friend, the senior Senator from Alaska, refers to it as the proverbial Hades. It is quite a few degrees colder.

When I have been there in the middle of July, it has gone up to 38 or 39 degrees, and there are those hardy souls who work out there in shirt sleeves, 39 degrees, because it is a heat wave.

This is the best we can show you. This is what the 1002 area looks like. That is Kaktovik in the background. Look at this magnificent beautiful piece of Alaska. Look a little flat? Look a little same? It is. But it has its own beauty. It really does.

One of the beauties is it has caribou and wildlife and birds, and they thrive up there. Here is a picture of drilling in Prudhoe Bay. This is Prudhoe Bay. If you can't see very well what it is, all these are caribou. The caribou herds thrive. The drilling does put permanent structures in there. But the temporary rock and gravel roads make a great place for caribou to calve. And the birds are there and the other wildlife is there.

Somebody said we are going to destroy this great swath, this beautiful natural reserve in Alaska. Are we talking about the same thing? We are talking about 2,000 acres, roughly 3 square miles, out of the Coastal Plain of 30,600 square miles. That is less than the size of Dulles Airport and the State of South Carolina. It is 3 square miles out of 30,600 square miles. This was in the area consciously set aside, on a bipartisan basis, because Chairman Jackson and the people on the Energy Committee then realized that this was where we were going to have to get our natural resources.

What would happen if we drilled and they found oil? It would mean 700,000 jobs would be created across the United States—not from a Government make-work program, but from private investment.

Wildlife habitat will be protected under the world's strictest and most environmental standards. To drill out there, you have to take all the equipment in, in the midwinter on ice roads, when it is 100 to 200 degrees below zero. That is so cold that I cannot even think about it. But you do that so you don't disrupt the land.

The caribou herd in and near Prudhoe Bay's oilfield is five times larger than when development began. It is five times larger. Prudhoe Bay is producing 20 percent of our Nation's oil production.

Now, let me say one other thing. As a result of my personal visit up there, the people who live there, the indigenous people, the Native Alaskans, the people who live in the region, they understand that this is the way they can improve their lives. They can make a positive economic contribution to the welfare of this Nation and benefit from

it. They begged us to allow them to go ahead and develop a resource that will not interfere with their fishing and their hunting and the wildlife around them.

I heard it said that it would be 10 years before we got any oil. Well, it depends on how much Congress delays it, how many lawsuits. Perhaps as soon as 3 years after the first lease sale. There has already been discovery on State lands of an oilfield that extends under the Coastal Plain. We know it is there, just not how much. If the Congress were serious about it and we said we want to develop this in an environmentally sound manner and do it quickly, we could get it online.

Contrary to a myth that many on the other side have spread, and as my friends from Alaska pointed out, we are not exporting the North Slope oil. None has been exported since May 2000. The average well at Prudhoe Bay produces over 550 barrels per day, more than 45 times the 12.5 barrels of oil produced per day by the average oil well in the United States. If the oil in ANWR is locked up, a lot of wells will have to be drilled to replace it, or we will be back in the situation in which we found ourselves several weeks ago.

By a very significant majority, 63 Members of this body, said we want to continue to be able to give American consumers the choice to drive SUVs, light pickup trucks, or vans. We ordered the Department of Transportation to use the best scientific and technological information available to push for increased oil and petroleum efficiency, gasoline combustion efficiency, and do everything we can to increase the efficiency. But don't force unrealistic standards that merely require us to move down to smaller and smaller cars until we are driving around in golf carts. If we are going to continue to supply the energy needs that my colleagues who voted with us on the CAFE amendment said we are going to need, we need the oil coming from ANWR. This is absolutely essential for our economy, for the sound development, the business of industry, and, most of all, to supply the transportation needs of our families.

For each dollar of crude oil and natural gas brought to the market, there will be \$2.25 of economic activity generated through the economy. The actual impact of the ANWR oil could be anywhere from \$270 billion to \$780 billion. These are all good economic arguments. But this is not the only question.

Keeping the oil production in the United States means we are buying less oil from overseas. We keep our domestic dollars at home. These are U.S. dollars not going to foreign countries, with leaders who may be on a mission to destroy our entire existence.

If that was too subtle for some colleagues, let me explain it. Just last week, we watched Iraq announced a month-long oil export embargo to protest Israel's response to the terror

campaign. Some argue that Iraq only produces 1.5 billion barrels a day, roughly 4 percent of world production. We are told Saddam Hussein is only supplying 8 percent of U.S. imports. It ought to be time that we tell the American people this country can not and should not maintain that level of dependence on Iraqi oil.

Last year, we paid Saddam Hussein \$6.5 billion. Does that sound like good policy? Do the American people really want to continue any efforts to benefit a tyrant such as Saddam Hussein, who continues his reckless oppression of his own people while threatening the security of the world with the development of weapons of mass destruction?

Madam President, let me answer that question emphatically. The United States must not continue this type of dependence, resulting in billions of dollars going directly to one of this century's most demented and ruthless rulers. The time has come for the United States to develop its own ability to produce oil and petroleum so we don't have to depend on him.

I commend President Bush for his actions in the Middle East, and I fully support him in the efforts to defend our national security. If it should occur one of these days in the near term when the President, we would hope in consultation with this body, deems it necessary, for the protection of peace and safety in the world and our own security, that we take on Saddam Hussein and his tyrannical regime once again, we must not be held hostage by the fact that they are supplying us oil. Right now, they have us over the oil barrel when we have oil and petroleum products in the United States we can develop to maintain our security.

Drilling for oil in Alaska is not just a good, sound option, it is a necessity. We must decrease our dependence on foreign oil every way we can. As I said a couple weeks ago, the Senate wisely adopted reasonable, scientifically based mandates to increase our automobile fuel usage. The CAFE provisions mandate an increase in standards that will help reduce our dependence. We provide incentives for alternative fuels such as electric power, solar-powered vehicles, and other provisions that include the use of biodiesel in bus fleets and school bus systems.

Yes, we must have renewables. Last week, the Senate voted in opposition to an amendment by my colleagues from California and New York that would have undermined the renewable fuels standards. I applaud my colleagues for opposing that effort because renewable standards are one important part of our energy policy. We need to make every effort to decrease our dependence on foreign sources of oil.

I urge my colleagues in the strongest possible way to support the efforts of the Senators from Alaska. I have been there. I have gone with them to visit this region. I have seen the oil exploration underway. I have seen the wildlife running on those plains.

Madam President, when they finish, there will not be any signs of development, and it will still be a barren, mosquito-filled plain in the summer, with its natural attributes and an absolutely hideously cold winter, and the wildlife, the birds, and the fish that thrive up there will continue to thrive. We are not destroying anything.

Even if they were going in to burn and turn it upside down, we are talking about 2,000 acres—2,000 acres, just a little over 3 square miles out of 30,600 square miles. There is no way anybody can legitimately say we are going to No. 1, destroy anything, because we are not destroying it. It is not a pristine wilderness that will not survive the drilling. We have shown how it can be done, and we are only talking about a thumbnail size out of the entire area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator's time has now expired.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank you for that good news, and I urge support. I ask my colleagues to support the Senators from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment that has been offered by Senator MURKOWSKI to allow for exploration in this area known as ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Also, it is very reasonable to pursue what will happen with the funds we would get as a result of opening up this wildlife area. It is important that we look at this issue in the most serious way.

I just got off the phone with the President's National Security Adviser, Condoleezza Rice, talking about the situation in the Middle East. I appreciate the fact Secretary Powell has been there and has been meeting with the interested parties trying to make some progress in that very difficult situation. I am satisfied that we have a better feel now of what can be done, that progress was made in dealing with the situation on the northern border of Israel. But the fact is, we still have a very volatile situation in the Middle East, one that could cause disruptions in a number of ways from that region of the world.

The oil from Saudi Arabia comprises about 25 percent of the oil the world gets. We have had threats from Saddam Hussein. There is no question in my mind that he would use any tool of destructive capability he could find, including cutting off the oil that comes from Iraq.

I still agree very strongly with Senator MURKOWSKI that it is impossible to explain why we would be getting oil directly or indirectly from Iraq, refining it, and then sending it back to the region to be used in our planes to patrol the region to keep Saddam Hussein and the Iraqis under control.

The oil supply in the world is not in a stable situation. We saw this past week in Venezuela a change in Government, and then the former Government

was back in place. This is a country we depend on. I believe the third largest amount of oil we get comes from Venezuela.

The point is, we are in danger. Our national security and our economic security could be threatened by the instability in the world, by the uncertainty or the unreliability of the sources of this oil and gas. If we start losing part of it or large portions of it, we could be in a very difficult situation very soon.

We need a national energy policy. We need additional production, and I predict today that if we do not take advantage of the oil we know exist in ANWR, in that northern extremity of Alaska, we will have some very bad situations evolve in the next few months, or in the next couple of years. I do not want to say I told you so, but when the gasoline prices go up, when supplies cause dislocation, when we have rolling brownouts, it will be traceable right back to this body and to this vote.

We need to understand this is for real. We need our own domestic energy supplies, and all the supplies that might be available. We should make better use and more use of nuclear power, but we have people who do not want nuclear power. They do not want to have a nuclear waste repository. We should make use of hydropower more, although in some areas there are people who do not want hydropower because it might adversely affect some species.

We need additional oil and gas, but yet we have people in America who do not want to have exploration off the east coast, the west coast, the gulf coast, and now in the northern part of Alaska.

We need to make greater use of coal. We can have clean coal technology that allows us to have the benefit of this source of energy without being a problem for the environment. Again, a lot of people oppose that.

What do they propose doing? How are we going to have the energy we need to fuel the growing economy we all want in America? I think we should do all of these things, and that is my problem with this bill. This bill has a lot of conservation incentives and alternative fuels. We have the tax bill that came out of the Finance Committee. There is a large amount of tax incentives for hybrid sales in automobiles, and to encourage getting these marginal wells back in usage. We have all of that in the bill but not what we need for energy production.

The point that is so critical to me—this map I am sure my colleagues and the American people have seen. The area we are talking about is an extremely small portion on the Arctic Ocean, and the people of the region and the Senators and Congressmen of the State want this to happen. We are being told we cannot do that.

We are being told by people from States in the furthest extremities of the eastern part of the United States:

We do not think this should happen in this area.

Whatever happened to Senatorial courtesy and trust? For years as a Member of Congress in the House and Senate, I put my greatest reliance—although I reserve the right to make up my own mind—but I put an awful lot of reliance on the Senators and Congressmen from the States.

When I had the Congressman from North Dakota say to me and others: Yes, the Garrison Diversion is something we want—a lot of environmentalists said we should not have the Garrison Diversion—I took the word of then-Congressman, now-Senator DORGAN about the need for and the justification for the Garrison Diversion.

We have had lots of debates in years gone by about water supply in Arizona. I did not have a Mississippi dog in that fight. I did not know all the ramifications of the argument. Who did I rely on? I relied on the word of the Congressmen and the Senators and the people in the local region.

Why are we not doing that now? Two of the most effective, most respected Senators in this body, the Senators from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS and Mr. MURKOWSKI, are pleading with us to give them the opportunity to do this in a safe, reliable, affordable way in a very small region.

We have the letter from the Alaska Natives who live in this area asking us to support opening of ANWR, and basically pleading with us to give them an opportunity. The people who live in the region want it. They know it can be done safely. They know it can be done in a way that would benefit the people economically. I am really at a loss for words to explain why this should not be done.

There is a national movement of some kind by various groups saying we must not let this happen, but when it comes to dealing with energy independence, when it comes to dealing with the likes of dictators in Iraq such as Saddam Hussein, when it comes to creating new jobs, this is the thing to do. It is supported by labor unions. The people who would be involved in transporting the supplies, the people who would be involved in building the pipelines, they are for this.

For those who are worried about the environment, I have never seen a project that has stronger environmental rules that would have to be enforced than any project I know of, and they have narrowed the area. They have offered to put more land in pristine reservations. Everything possible has been done to make it possible for us in the United States to get the benefit of this exploration and this pipeline and the supply we would get from it.

So when we look at our current situation, relying on 60 percent foreign oil for our energy needs, when we look at the instability in the world, in several countries where we rely on the oil they produce, and then when we look at the

benefits we get economically, and the jobs, this is legislation we clearly should pass.

An energy policy without ANWR is not complete. In my own case, I have spoken about the ability to explore in what is known as the Destin Dome in the Gulf of Mexico, close to where I live. I want it because we need it. I know it can be done in an environmentally safe way and in a way that will not be damaging to the fish in the Gulf of Mexico, and yet we had a tremendous debate in the Senate about opening up even a part of that area. Yet those of us who live there, the Senators from Alabama and Mississippi, although not the case with the Florida Senators, were saying: This can be done, and we need to do it.

I believe a map speaks a million words in explaining what is involved. So I thank Senator MURKOWSKI for his diligence. He has tried every way in the world to make sure the American people understand the importance of this, that they understand this could be done in a way that would benefit America with probably somewhere between half a million and 735,000 new jobs, that it would reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Some people said if we started today, we would not get it online for months, perhaps years. Eventually we are going to have to do this. The time will come when America is going to have serious energy problems and we are going to have to go where we can get energy the quickest, and one of those places is this particular area on that northern slope of Alaska.

So I wanted to come and add my support for this effort. I do not know how in the world we can justify not being for this. I believe President Clinton vetoed this effort in 1995, and yet the Congress has passed this several times over the last 20 years. I believe that is correct information. We should do it once again.

I urge my colleagues, if they are undecided or if they have been leaning the other way, think about it again. The situation has changed. The need for this oil and the gas that might be involved has changed since this debate began. I would not want to be a Senator who voted no on this 6 months from now, because we could be having huge problems. This could be a vote that would haunt us forever. I do not mean that as a threat, I mean it as a plea. We need this.

The Senator from Louisiana and I are very closely situated to the Gulf of Mexico. We know we can get oil and gas with the technology now available. That technology is so sophisticated, one does not just take a potshot down and hope they hit. When they look at the charts, they know exactly where the little shelves are. They can go right to where the oil is.

Some of the best fishing I have ever experienced in my life was around the oil rigs off the coast of Louisiana, not far from the Chandelier Islands. I know

the area. I have been there. I have not been to ANWR.

Senator MURKOWSKI and I will have to debate where fishing is the best. He has tried to take me to Alaska, but I said: "Isn't it very cold up there? Isn't it a pretty barren area?" I would rather go where there are palm trees or oil rigs already in place.

I say to my colleague from Alaska, I really appreciate the job he has done. I am going to work with him to the very last minute to see if we cannot do what is right, not just for the Senator from Alaska, not even just for Alaska. This is for America. If we are from some remote State, for us to say this little piece of 2,000 acres cannot be used to produce oil and gas is irresponsible, in my opinion, when you look at what we are faced with in terms of threats around the world.

I urge my colleagues to pass this. Let us get a good energy bill for the good of our country.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Will the leader yield for a question?

Mr. LOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Does the leader know what the temperature is outside today?

Mr. LOTT. In Washington, DC, I think it is approaching 95. What is the temperature on the northern slope of Alaska?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I was hoping the minority leader would respond by asking me a question. Having been there exactly a year ago today, with Senator BINGAMAN, who left his gloves at home and we had to find a pair of socks for him—we later found him a pair of gloves—and Gale Norton, Secretary of the Interior, it happened to be 77 below zero in Barrow. That gives some idea of the contrast between Washington, DC, and Alaska.

Mr. LOTT. In April it is still that cold?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. It was that particular day a year ago today. So I think that is a little reference to the harshness of the environment up there.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

KAKTOVIK INUPIAT CORPORATION,
Kaktovik, AK, April 17, 2002.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Hon. TRENT LOTT,
*U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATORS DASCHLE AND LOTT: The people of Kaktovik, Alaska—Kaktovikmiut—are the only residents within the entire 19.6 million acres of the federally recognized boundaries of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR). Kaktovikmiut ask for your help in fulfilling our destiny as Inupiat Eskimos and Americans. We ask that you support reopening the Coastal Plain of ANWR to energy exploration.

Reopening the Coastal Plain will allow us access to our traditional lands. We are asking Congress to fulfill its promise to the Inupiat people and to all Americans: to evaluate the potential of the Coastal Plain.

In return, as land-owners of 92,160 acres of privately owned within the Coastal Plain of ANWR, the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation promises to the Senate of the United States:

1. We will never use our abundant energy resources "as a weapon" against the United States, as Iraq, Iran, Libya and other foreign energy exporting nations have proposed.

2. We will not engage in supporting terrorism, terrorist States or any enemies of the United States;

3. We will neither hold telethons to raise money for, contribute money to, or in any other way support the slaughter of innocents at home or abroad;

4. We will continue to be loyal Alaskans and proud Americans who will be all the more proud of a government whose actions to reopen ANWR and our lands will prove it to be the best remaining hope for mankind on Earth; and

5. We will continue to pray for the United States, and ask God to bless our nation.

We do not have much, Gentleman, except for the promises of the U.S. government that the settlement of our land claims against the United States would eventually lead to the control of our destiny by our people.

In return we give our promises as listed above. We ask that you accept them from the grateful Inupiat Eskimo people of the North Slope of Alaska who are proud to be American.

Most respectfully and sincerely,

FENTON REXFORD,

President.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I wonder why they call it barren.

Mr. President, I am going to propound a unanimous consent request momentarily, but I do want to get the attention of the minority leader for 1 second. I am going to have my colleague and friend, JOHN ENSIGN, speak to Senator LOTT based upon the speech Senator LOTT just gave. When the Senator talked about senatorial courtesy and how we should give deference to what Senators from a State want, I want Senator ENSIGN to talk to Senator LOTT about Yucca Mountain because it would seem fair to me, using the analogy that has been stated for drilling in Alaska, the same should apply to Nevada. But we will see.

Mr. LOTT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to.

Mr. LOTT. I am always delighted to talk to Senator REID and Senator ENSIGN. I think maybe the RECORD will reflect in the past that I did listen very closely to some of his pleas. But we will have a chance to debate that another day.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have spoken to the two managers. I have visited with virtually everybody in the Chamber. The staff has visited with various other staff members. We have 11 Senators who have indicated a desire to speak on this matter, which works out so each side goes back and forth, and the time almost works out perfectly also.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator DURBIN be recognized for 20 minutes; following Senator DURBIN, that Senator BURNS be recognized for 15 minutes; following Senator BURNS,

Senator CANTWELL be recognized for 15 minutes; next, Senator VOINOVICH for 20 minutes; Senator LANDRIEU for 30 minutes; Senator FEINGOLD for 20 minutes; Senator DOMENICI for 15 minutes; Senator DORGAN for 20 minutes; Senator CRAIG for 30 minutes; Senator GRAHAM for 30 minutes; and then Senator NICKLES is the last speaker who I have been told wishes to speak, and there would be no time limit on him.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Reserving the right to object, I want to work with the majority whip. Senator STEVENS is going to want to speak and does not want to be limited to any time commitment.

Mr. REID. No problem.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I am also going to reserve my right to extend my remarks. I do not want this list to exclude other Members who may be wanting to speak. In the interest of time, I am quite willing to proceed with the list as given, subject to the gentlemen and ladies who are in the Chamber currently looking for recognition.

Mr. REID. I also ask unanimous consent that following Senator NICKLES, Senator STABENOW be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. It is the understanding, Mr. President, that we will go back and forth.

Mr. REID. The consent I propounded does that. The time works out quite closely, also.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I reserve the right of Senator STEVENS to come in to this sequence if it is necessary. I assume Senator BINGAMAN will reserve that right for himself, as I will, and the majority leader would, as well.

Mr. REID. I certainly think the two managers of the bill should be able to say whatever they believe is appropriate during this debate. But so we have some understanding, until we get this agreement, there is no extended remarks of the two managers. We get this done and Members can speak as long as they wish.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Reserving the right to object, I reserve that for Senator STEVENS because he is in a hearing and he may want to come back. I ask unanimous consent he be allowed to come into the sequence which would involve an interruption.

Mr. REID. I think that is fair.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Senator BINGAMAN and I work well together.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I again propound the request, with the exception of Senator STEVENS, who is involved elsewhere. If he wishes to speak, he will be allowed to speak at the appropriate time for whatever time he desires.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. We would like to have a copy of the list because there are two lists working.

Mr. REID. We will get that to the Senator.

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

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if I am not mistaken, I am the first Senator

under the unanimous consent request. I thank the Senators from Nevada and Alaska.

This has turned out to be a historic debate about energy in that we have spent more time on it than any other issue I can remember since I have come to the Senate in the last 5 or 6 years. It is important we do spend the time, because if the issue is energy security and energy independence, we see on a daily basis why it is not only timely, but absolutely essential for our national security.

We followed the issues in the Middle East for many reasons. There are those who feel a special attachment to the nation of Israel and the alliance of the United States with that nation. There are those who follow it for many other reasons. Let's be honest. One of the reasons we consistently look to the Middle East is because it is a source of energy for the United States. We were involved in a war a little over 10 years ago, the Persian Gulf war, because of the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq. President Bush's father made it clear at the time this was about energy, about oil.

Time and again, the United States focuses its attention on the world because of our dependence on other countries for the oil and gas they send to our shores. It is an essential part of our economy, an essential part of our daily lives. We Americans are very happy and comfortable with our automobiles and trucks. We like that part of being in America. However, it has a price. It has a price not only in maintaining the vehicle but a price in terms of our relationship with the world.

The purpose of this energy bill is to talk about how we establish some energy independence and energy security, how we make the right decisions today so we can say to our kids and our grandchildren, in the year 2002, we took a look at the world and said: We will change a few things in the United States so we don't end up totally dependent on some foreign country for our energy, so that your life and your economy is going to be less dependent on what happens in Saudi Arabia or the gulf states or any other part of the world.

That is as noble an aspiration as could be asked for in political life. It generated, thanks to the leadership of Senator BINGAMAN of New Mexico, this lengthy tome of suggestions for change when it comes to energy in America. What is curious is the administration, President Bush, Vice President CHENEY, and others, came up with their own plan. That plan was fraught with controversy and political intrigue. At one point, we asked a very simple question of the administration: With whom did you meet? Which corporations and companies and associations did you meet with to draw up your energy plan for America's future?

To the surprise of this Senator, and many others, Vice President CHENEY basically said: That is none of your business. We are going to put together

our plan and submit it to you. We hope you like it, but you don't have a right to know with whom we consulted.

In the meantime, the Government Accounting Office has taken the administration to court to produce the names of the people with whom they worked. A court in the District of Columbia ordered the disclosure of some of the names. To the surprise of virtually no one, the major groups that wrote the administration's policy were the oil and gas companies, the energy companies. They are the ones that put it together. Yes, there was an invitation for an environmental group to drop by and say, hello, have a sandwich, and leave, but the substantive work and the appointments were with the energy companies. It is reflected in the administration's approach.

Why are we debating the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge? Frankly, for reasons it is hard to explain, it is the centerpiece of the George W. Bush administration's energy plan for the future of America. We have spent more time talking about that tiny piece of real estate in Alaska than many other issues that do bear on the importance of energy security.

One would be led to believe, if one didn't know the facts, that if we could just drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, if we could scatter that Porcupine caribou herd, put up our pipeline and drill, America could breathe a sigh of relief. We finally found the oil we need for the next century.

Nothing could be further from the truth. That is why you have to ask yourself, if this is not the answer to our energy prayers, why are we spending so much time at this altar? We are spending more time debating the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge than many other critically important elements of our energy security.

It has a lot to do with the group that put together the administration's energy plan. Let's be honest. These oil companies own the rights to drill the oil. If they can get into this wildlife refuge, if they can drill, they will make some money out of it. It is part of business. It is a natural part of the free market economy. It isn't about energy security. It is about these oil companies and their rights to drill and make a profit.

Let me tell you what that means in real terms. Here is a report, not from a left-wing group but from the Energy Information Administration, part of the Department of Energy for the George W. Bush administration. Here is what they have said about the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge:

Net imports are projected to supply 62 percent of all oil used in the United States by the year 2020. Opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is estimated to reduce the percentage share of net imports to 60 percent.

So if we give to those oil companies the right to move into this wildlife refuge, the right to drill in territory and

land which we have set aside and held sacred now for over 40 years, what does America get as part of the deal? A net reduction in our dependence on foreign oil by the year 2020 from 62 percent of all the oil we use to 60 percent. The estimates are all of the oil taken out of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge over a 10-year period of time would amount to 6 months' worth of energy for the United States.

Why, then, if that is what we are talking about, is this the centerpiece of the administration's policy? It goes back to the point I made earlier. It is the centerpiece of their policy because the people who wrote the policy, the special interest groups that sat down and crafted the policy, have another agenda. It isn't energy security; it isn't energy independence. It is about profitability.

Look at the impact of ANWR on net imports. The green line is net imports with ANWR; the blue line is net imports otherwise. They are almost indistinguishable. The chart says the same thing that President Bush's Department of Energy has already said.

So we find ourselves in the position of debating this issue. When President Eisenhower created the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—and I might remind people, President Eisenhower was not viewed as some radical environmentalist—he was following in a long line and a long tradition in America where Presidents of both political parties took a look at their heritage, America's lands, and said: There are certain things which we want to honor, respect, and not exploit.

They took a tiny piece of real estate in one of the most remote parts of America, in this new State of Alaska, and said: This piece we will protect as a wildlife refuge.

For over 40 years, President after President, Democrat and Republican, respected that—until today. Today we have an argument from this President and his supporters in Congress that it is time for us to move in and start to drill.

I suggest to my colleagues that the Arctic Coastal Plain we are discussing is a unique natural area, one of America's last frontiers. These precious lands will be part of our legacy for future generations. Before we cavalierly say to these oil companies: pull in the trucks, pull in the rigs, and start drilling, we ought to step back and reflect as to whether or not this is sensible or responsible. I do not believe it is.

In this energy policy we have brought to the floor, there are a lot of suggestions about reducing our dependence on foreign oil. There was one that came to the floor for debate and a vote a week or two ago which went to the heart of the issue. Of all the oil we import to the United States today from overseas, 46 percent of it goes for one purpose—to fuel our cars and trucks. That is right. Forty-six percent of all the oil coming to the United States goes to fuel our automobiles and

trucks. That number is supposed to grow to almost 60 percent in a few years. In other words, our demands for more vehicles to be driven on the highway as we want is going to increase our dependence on foreign oil.

Doesn't it stand to reason that part of any responsible energy bill would talk about the fuel efficiency of the cars and trucks that we drive?

Not in the eyes of the Senate. We had a vote to put a new fuel efficiency standard on the books and it lost 62 to 38. The Big Three automakers and their supporters came to the Senate and said: We do not want you to improve the fuel efficiency and fuel economy of vehicles in America.

The Senate said: You are right. We are not going to touch it.

Why is that significant? It is significant for this reason. Look at what would happen here in terms of the billions of barrels of oil we would have saved just by increasing the fuel efficiency of cars and trucks in America. If we had gone up to 36 miles a gallon by 2015, with 10-percent trading of credits back and forth, the red line shows we would be saving somewhere in the range of 14 billion barrels of oil cumulative; at 35 miles per gallon, you see the blue line is higher because it is at an earlier date that it is implemented.

You have to scroll down here, if you are following this, and look down low and see what the ANWR means in comparison. It is this line here at the bottom, barely over 2 billion barrels of oil in the entire history of drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

This Senate rejected real savings when it came to fuel efficiency and fuel economy. We rejected that. We rejected it, incidentally, because the Big Three in Detroit and their lobbyists in Washington effectively lobbied the Senate.

But today we are being asked to go ahead and drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, a refuge that has been set aside for 40 years, and we know it doesn't even hold a candle to the savings enhanced fuel efficiency would generate in terms of our energy dependence.

The lesson and the moral to the story is there are a lot more lobbyists for the oil companies than there are for the Porcupine caribou that live in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. That is the bottom line. There are not a lot of people out there with antlers, waiting in the lobby, but there are a lot of folks with Gucci loafers on, and they are waiting to tell us: Don't touch the Big Three when it comes to the fuel efficiency of vehicles.

I think it is shameful to think that between 1975 and 1985 we passed a law that doubled the fuel efficiency of cars to a level of about 28 miles per gallon, and that we have not touched that issue for 17 years. That tells me we have been derelict in our responsibility. If we really cared about America's independence and security, we would be focusing on fuel efficiency, fuel economy of the cars and trucks we

drive. But this Senate walked away from it and said, no, we don't want any part of that debate. We are with the Big Three. We are with the special interests. Instead, let's figure out how we can drill in the ANWR.

That is not the only thing we have ignored. Renewable energy sources, what are those? Those are the ones that are not expended such as fossil fuels. Once you burn the tank of gas, it is gone into the atmosphere. We get the energy out of it and leave the pollution. Renewable energy sources, such as wind and solar energy and hydrogen cells and those sorts of things, fuel cells, all of those have the potential of environmentally friendly sources of energy. How much do we in the United States today rely on that kind of renewable energy to generate electricity? To the tune of about 4 percent of our total, about 4 percent.

Some of us said: Why don't we take on, as a challenge to America, increasing our dependence on renewable environmentally friendly energy sources such as wind power and solar power and fuel cells and hydrogen power? Let's increase the renewable portfolio standard to 20 percent over a 20-year period of time. Senator JEFFORDS of Vermont offered that. I cosponsored it. It is not an unrealistic goal. The State of California currently relies on renewable energy sources for more than 10 percent of its electricity.

We can, as a nation, do it, reduce dependence on foreign energy. But this Senate said no because the oil companies, the special interests out in the lobby, in their three-piece suits, said: No, we are not interested in that. We don't own the wind. We don't own the Sun. We own the oil. We own the gas. Stay dependent on that, America.

So we have a modest goal of increasing our use of renewable energy from 4 percent to 8 or 10 percent. At a time when we are dealing with an energy bill, I think we are suffering from anemia. We are afraid to step out and do what is necessary to make America less dependent on foreign fuel.

Drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve is the answer to every lobbyist's prayer. But, honestly, it is not the answer to America's prayer. America is praying this Senate comes to its senses, that we understand we can make and must make bold and important decisions today. If we say to the Big Three, you have the wherewithal and the technology to produce a more fuel-efficient vehicle so we can still move our kids to soccer games and be safe on the road, they can do it. We issued that challenge before and they did it. They didn't like it. They resisted it.

In 1975, when we increased fuel efficiency, the Big Three said that was impossible. Double fuel economy in America? Let me tell you what is wrong with that idea: Technically impossible; the cars will be so small they will look like gocarts, they will not be safe, Americans won't drive them, and you

are going to drive jobs overseas. That was the argument in 1975.

Guess what. We ignored them, passed the law, and none of those four things happened. By 1985, we doubled fuel economy and none of those things happened. So in the year 2002, when we get in the same debate about fuel efficiency, what did the Big Three say? Technically, it's really impossible, Senator, for us to improve fuel economy. The cars will be so tiny they will be like gocarts. People won't like them. They won't be safe. And people are going to buy cars from overseas. The same arguments, the same empty arguments. It shows an attitude of some of our manufacturers in this country which in a way is embarrassing.

Why is it when it comes to the new generation of vehicles on the road, the hybrid vehicles getting 50 or 60 miles a gallon, they all have Japanese nameplates on them? I don't get it. This is the greatest country in the world, with the strongest military in the world, the best schools in the world, the best engineers in the world. Yet when it comes to automobiles, we are satisfied with the bronze medal every day of the week. Frankly, the Senate has not stepped up to its responsibility in adding the provisions that are necessary to make sure our energy independence is established.

We want energy security but not at the expense of America's last frontier. If we are serious about energy security, we have to reduce oil consumption in the vehicles in our country. A comprehensive, balanced energy policy will provide for oil and gas development in environmentally responsible areas—not the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

We can establish conservation measures. We can cut down on our energy consumption. We owe that not only to ourselves but to our children.

As James E. Service, a retired vice admiral of the Navy, wrote in a recent Los Angeles Times op-ed:

National security means more than protecting our people, our cities and our sovereignty. It also means protecting the wild places that make our nation special. Drilling the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge . . . just doesn't make good sense or good policy.

He said that on January 14 of this year.

But someone before him really set the tone for Congress to think about it. His bust is out in our lobby. His name was Teddy Roosevelt. As Vice President, he presided over this Senate. He is the one who really told America to be mindful of the heritage you leave. I quote him:

It is not what we have that will make us a great nation; it is the way in which we use it.

Teddy said that almost 100 years ago. On this vote, we will find out whether the Senate remembers Roosevelt's advice to our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I think if we have learned one thing from this exercise on energy legislation, it is that we found trying to mark up a bill on the floor of the Senate is pretty difficult. I was reminded that back in 1992 we almost did the same. We didn't have quite the spirited committee action on energy, but we still got into the same kind of a bind when it came to the floor. Maybe it doesn't make a lot of difference.

I would like to remind my colleagues that today we should be talking about a policy we can shape to take us into the future. We are not only dealing with the acute situation we find ourselves in today, but where we want to be in 20, 30, 40, or 50 years from now. What do we do about new technologies, and which technologies are able to be developed in that time? That question indicates to me we have a great deal of flexibility to allow those new technologies to evolve and be used as soon as they are developed. Whatever we do in Government mandates, therefore we should make sure they are not frozen in place. We should allow those new ideas to grow.

Market forces will dictate more in the way of conservation than any mandate by the Federal Government has ever done.

Let me remind you that if gasoline goes to \$2 a gallon, you are still spending more money for the water you buy in that filling station than you are for the gasoline. You will start looking for conservation practices in the things you do in your traveling habits.

Fossil fuel has been the primary fuel of our economy since the turn of the last century. For over 100 years it has served us well, and it could for the next hundred. However, it should not be the only fuel we use in our everyday lives.

New technology has moved us to unlimited use of renewables and different sources in the evolution of conservation technology and practice. We know the present conditions and situations. We should deal with them and decide what our policy will be after resolving this acute situation. The condition we find ourselves in today is about energy security. To those who would use the flimsy argument saying we should use less and produce less, I say there is another one that is acutely in our make-up; that is, energy security is economic security is national security. What direction that takes us in is very important. Our challenge should be that debating this bill will take us beyond that situation. The world condition is at hand, and it should be dealt with right now.

I have iterated many times that we are still dependent on fossil fuels. The switch from those fossil fuels is a process that will take a long time, and it will be very expensive.

What is at stake here? Let us look at the real facts instead of the misinformation that is floating around this town. Let me remind you that the American people know what is at

stake, and they are not comfortable with the facts they are given. They are equally uncomfortable with what is happening on the floor of this Senate.

I have one simple question: Why are we importing oil from Iraq? Agreed, they are allowed to sell oil under the U.N. resolution. The income derived from those sales is to be used to buy food and medical supplies for the citizens of Iraq. If Saddam Hussein sells us anywhere from 650,000 to 850,000 barrels of oil a day, and also sells some oil on the black market, what is he doing with that money? Where do you think it goes? I will tell you where it doesn't go. It doesn't go to the citizens of Iraq. He buys arms and technology to equip his army and support terrorist activities around the world. In fact, we are told that Iraq is paying \$25,000 cash to any family who loses a suicide bomber. That is going way over the line.

From the Gulf, we import about 10.8 million barrels of oil a day, and 1.5 million barrels comes from Saudi Arabia. Nearly a million barrels come from Iraq.

Let us take a look at this tiny little spot called the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Keep in mind that when it was created, this little area was set aside for oil and gas exploration and production. That is the reason it was set aside—not the whole Arctic Plain, but just that little footprint of 2,000 acres or less.

Conservative estimates put the total production at about 1.35 million barrels a day. That would replace 55 years of oil from Iraq and 30 years of oil imports from Saudi Arabia.

The reserves in ANWR are estimated to be 10 billion barrels. That is a conservative estimate.

Remember how we underestimated Prudhoe Bay. It has produced nearly 20 percent of our domestic production in the last 25 years.

Since 1973, domestic production has decreased by 57 percent. We are only producing about 8 million barrels a day, and we are using 19 million barrels a day.

Anybody who doesn't understand that didn't take basic math in the same grade school where I went to school, which is a little country school.

We hear every day on the floor of the Senate that we should be concerned about our balance of payments. We should be concerned about it. Last year alone, we sent \$4.5 billion to Saddam Hussein's Iraq for his oil.

As I said, energy security is economic security is national security.

This has a job impact. We heard all kinds of estimates. But we know this won't happen without the effort of labor. Yesterday, if you had stood with the heart and soul of the labor folks in this country and heard their arguments that this should happen, then you would understand why the Nation supports the development and exploration of this tiny spot.

We have people living in Montana who work on the North Slope. We have

had since the first day they started production up there. They jump on airplanes, spend a couple of weeks, and come home for a week. It is important to my state. If Prudhoe were built today, the footprint would be around 1,500 acres—64 percent smaller than it is. ANWR will impact 2,000 acres out of 1.5 million acres on the Coastal Plain.

I have been up there. I have seen the Porcupine caribou herd. It has grown about three times in size during the last 20 years. That is where they calve. They don't stay there all winter. They are a migrating herd. Nothing has kept them from migrating. The people who live in that area depend on that herd. That is a source of food supply for them. When they migrate, that is when they get their winter stores. They don't have grocery stores like we have down here. They don't want anything to happen to that herd. I don't think they are going to mislead us on how that herd will be impacted.

Oil and gas production and wildlife have successfully coexisted in the Alaskan Arctic for over 30 years. The figures bear that out.

Despite what is told and the misinformation that flies around here, the folks on the Coastal Plain support this by 75 percent. They understand what the revenue does. They understand that it provides a government service which is demanded by them. That is even taking into account the money that it pumps into the National Treasury. Anybody on the Budget Committee around here would understand that also.

I know how this impacts a State represented by two Senators who have stood in this Chamber and have fought for their people every day. It is like us going to southern Illinois and saying: You can't have any more oil production down there. But they can't say it because there are no public lands. But in Alaska there are, and that is the difference. Withdrawal of public lands from any exploration of natural gas in the States of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and some in New Mexico, has cost the American people 137 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. And that is going to be the fuel that produces the electricity of the future. We think it is for "the environment," when it could be lifted, produced, and moved with hardly a disturbance to any of the surface of our land.

And, yes, you are going to see natural gas turn up as a transportation fuel.

What we are doing in this argument defies common sense. These are the facts. They should not take away from our investment into new technologies and our determination for conservation. I will not let anybody else redefine the word "conservation" because it is defined as a wise use of a resource. We should move forward on R&D into new technologies. Even coal—and Montana is the "Saudi Arabia" of the coal reserves in this country—it is there, it is handy, it is affordable, and it is ready for use.

Our investment in fuel cell technology will be an important part of our energy mix, and we should not depart from its development. I will tell you what fuel cells do. Fuel cells are to the electric industry what the wireless telephone is to the communications industry. They are safe, clean, and now we have a chance to make it affordable. We should continue our work in that area.

But, in the meantime, let's do what common sense tells us to do: Let's use that little footprint afforded to this country for the production of energy because energy security is economic security, is national security.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, seeing no other Senator seeking recognition, I would like to take just a few minutes to share with you a chart that has already been identified on a couple of occasions but I think needs a little further identification.

As I show you on this map what happened to Alaska in 1980. The ANILCA land law was passed, and our State was, in effect, gerrymandered by Congress.

I want you to look at all those stripes across an area that is one-fifth the size of the United States because it is entirely the Tongass—this area in southeastern Alaska where our capital, Juneau, is located—Ketchikan, our fifth largest city; Wrangell; Petersburg; Sitka; Haines; Skagway—this is a national forest. There are 16 million acres in that national forest. The only thing they forgot is people lived in the forest. The communities were there. The assumption was that there would be no real justification for the State selecting land there. It was not even an issue in statehood in 1959.

The reason it was not an issue is there was an assumed trust between the people of Alaska and the Congress of this country that those people could live in that forest, they could make a living off the renewability of the resources, the fish and the timber.

Previous to statehood, the Department of Interior ran the fisheries resources of Alaska. They did a deplorable job. They figured that one size fits all. We actually had our fishermen on self-imposed limits.

My point in showing you this detail is this is what happened to Alaska. Rather than have a resource inventory of those areas that had the capability for minerals, oil and gas, timber, and fish, there was an arbitrary decision made. It was a cut deal by President Carter. As a consequence, these areas of Alaska were withdrawn. They are wilderness or refuges or sanctuaries, but they were all withdrawn from development.

I want you to take a closer look at the map because here is where the real influence of America's extreme environmental community entered into this national effort.

You notice here on the map, clear across where the Arctic area comes

into play, this is the general area of the Arctic Circle. There is only a little tiny white spot that was left for access, if you will. And the access we have from the Arctic, from Prudhoe Bay, is through that little area where we have this red line, which is the pipeline that brings 20 percent of America's total crude oil to market in Valdez.

They tried to gerrymander, if you will, the designation of land in this State by closing access. We have this huge area out by Kotzebue that is mineralized. They closed that off. This did not happen by accident. This was a cut-and-dry deal in 1980. Now we are living with it today.

I recognize my good friend from Ohio is in the Chamber, so I will be very brief in making this point because I am going to be making several points throughout the remainder of the day.

We have heard quotes from Theodore Roosevelt by some of the speakers. I would like to ask just for a brief reflection on another quote in 1910. Theodore Roosevelt said:

Conservation means development as much as it does protection. I recognize the right and duty of this generation to develop and use the natural resources of our land, but I do not recognize the right to waste them or to rob, by wasteful use, the generations that come after.

Let's look briefly at the record. I am referring to the administration of Jimmy Carter in 1980, and the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. I quote from President Carter's remarks on signing H.R. 39 into law, December 2, 1980. I quote former President Carter:

This act of Congress reaffirms our commitment to the environment. It strikes a balance between protecting areas of great beauty and value and allowing development of Alaska's vital oil and gas and mineral and timber resources.

Our timber resources are totally tied up. We do not have the availability of developing them. As a matter of fact, there is more wood cut for firewood in the State of New York than we cut commercially. We have lost our pulp mills under the previous administration. We have lost our saw mills.

So as President Carter indicated, it allows development of "Alaska's vital oil and gas and mineral and timber resources." It is a promise that has been broken. He further states:

A hundred percent of the offshore areas and 95 percent of the potentially productive oil and mineral areas will be available for exploration or for drilling.

I can tell you, you cannot get a permit offshore, you cannot get a permit on the Arctic Ocean to drill today. Go down to the Department of Interior and try it.

Lastly, I am going to refer to that same meeting, December 2, 1980, and the remarks of Representative Udall of Arizona.

His conclusion was:

I'm joyous. I'm glad today for the people of Alaska. They can get on with building a great State. They're a great people. And this matter is settled and put to rest, and the development of Alaska can go forward with balance.

That is a pretty strong statement. The citizens of the territory of Alaska

bought that. Of course, we were a State at that time in 1980. We bought it, we believed that we could get on with the development of our State. The ability to get on with the development of Alaska was the ability to penetrate the mentality of the Congress and any given administration on the right that we have, as American citizens, to develop our State.

We have been, for all practical purposes, eliminated. Because every time we want to do something, we have to cross Federal land. We don't even have access to our State capital. These were promises made to the people of Alaska. These were promises that have not been kept by the Federal Government.

As we debate the area, the 1002 and ANWR, again, I ask both Republicans and Democrats to recognize, it is not a wilderness. It has never been a wilderness. It is a refuge. The Senator from Louisiana has charts that show us what has happened in refuges. We have oil and gas exploration in them all the time.

This was reserved for Congress. Only Congress can open it. But for those who think it is an untouched, spectacular area, there are people who live up there. There is the village of Kaktovik.

Let's put this discussion in real terms. We are fighting for the rights we thought we had obtained when we became a State, the right to responsibly develop the State. This chart shows oil and gas production in refuges around this country. Don't tell me that somehow we are doing something wrong by trying to open a refuge in the Arctic.

We will have a lot more to say about this. I did want to address the inconsistency and the broken promises that have been made and the fact that our small delegation, Senator STEVENS and I and Representative YOUNG, feel very strongly, as do the residents of Alaska, that this trust has been broken.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise today in support of permitting oil exploration in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge. Permitting oil production in ANWR will help ensure that the United States is better able to meet our growing energy needs in an environmentally sound manner, create and retain hundreds of thousands of jobs, boost our domestic economy, and protect our national security.

America's need to continue to fuel our economic recovery and guarantee future success will require us to produce ever greater amounts of energy to keep up with the demand.

You can see from this chart, according to the Department of Energy, we have a huge gap between our domestic energy production and our overall energy consumption right now. What's more, between now and 2020, we will have to increase energy production by more than 30 percent just to keep up with growing demand.

This looming energy crisis requires us to enact a comprehensive energy policy, the likes of which we have

never had before in this country: a policy that harmonizes energy and environmental policies, acknowledging that the economy and the environment are vitally intertwined; a policy that won't cause prices to spike, hurting the elderly, the disabled and low-income families as we experienced in the winter of 2000-2001, particularly in the Midwest; a policy that won't cripple the engines of commerce that fund the research that will yield future environmental protection technologies, technologies that can be shared with developing nations that currently face severe environmental crises; and, most importantly, a policy that protects our national security and prevents market volatility by increasing domestic energy production.

The current situation in the Middle East and the resulting price increases we have seen at the pump give us a taste of how badly we need an energy policy and how much we need to turn towards domestic sources to meet that goal. However, as we rely on our own strengths for the answers to the coming energy crisis and though we are blessed with large reserves of oil, natural gas, coal, nuclear fuel, as well as access to renewable sources of energy, we must remember that no single source of domestic energy is sufficient to meet all our Nation's energy needs. That means we have to broaden our base of energy sources and not put all our eggs in one basket.

If we were some other nation, diversifying our energy supply might be a great challenge, but God has blessed the United States of America with resources to solve this problem. Conservation has proven successful in reducing energy demand. So often people say: We aren't doing enough to conserve. We are. By incorporating technology breakthroughs into the production of energy-efficient automobiles, high-efficiency homes, more efficient appliances and machinery, conservation has succeeded in saving us millions of dollars while simultaneously improving our environment.

Let's look at this chart. According to the 1995 DOE report, the most recent data available, from 1972 to 1991 the United States saved more than \$2.5 trillion through conservation. That is a lot of foreign oil that we didn't have to buy. It is safe to say that we have saved much more money since then, underscoring that conservation efforts deserve our continued attention.

We currently rely very little on renewable sources of energy. In fact, wind and solar together make up less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our current total energy production. Additionally, they are expensive and heavily subsidized. In fact, the average cost per kilowatt hour of electricity from a newly installed windmill is 5 cents compared to 2 cents per kilowatt from a coal-fired facility.

On top of this, wind and solar cannot be stored, creating reliability problems and making it difficult to spread our costs out predictably over time.

Currently, total renewables production, which includes geothermal, solar, wind, hydro and biomass, reaches only 8 percent of our overall domestic energy production. We should work to increase that, however, since these forms of energy are environmentally friendly and because they can help reduce our reliance on foreign energy sources. However, we also must be realistic about our challenge. Because renewables make up such a small piece of our overall energy picture today, they don't have the capacity to meet our needs in the timeframe we are facing. A sudden, forced shift in these sources would severely strain their underdeveloped capacity, causing shortages and price spikes that would hurt our economy.

For example, the requirement in the Daschle bill that utilities generate 10 percent of their electricity from renewable sources of energy is estimated to increase the cost of electricity nationwide by 5 percent and a whole lot more in a State such as Ohio. Just as we develop new sources of electricity generation, we should continue to encourage development of new energy sources for transportation.

In the 1970s, the United States recognized the need for diverse energy supply by expanding the use of natural gas, coal, nuclear, hydropower, and other renewables, and decreasing the use of oil for non-transportation uses. In 1978, non-transportation uses of oil in this country accounted for almost 50 percent of our oil consumption. Today, these non-transportation uses account for about one-third of our oil consumption.

Though home heating oil use remains high in certain regions of the country, particularly in the Northeast, consumers have increasingly sought other sources such as natural gas to heat their home. In addition, oil-fired powerplants are virtually nonexistent today in the United States. Crude oil prices and policy priorities encouraged substituting oil with other fuels for our non-transportation needs, but oil products still make up 95 percent of the energy used for transportation in the United States.

This number will not decrease unless fuel cells and hybrid vehicles become more economically viable. But their day is coming. In fact, in a recent meeting I had with General Motors executives in Detroit, I was told that the company sees fuel cell technology becoming a viable power source in the next 10 to 15 years. We are talking reality. It is not science fiction to think that our children and grandchildren will see a time when the roads are traveled by cars that run on hydrogen and give off only water.

An amendment from the Finance Committee will help encourage the development of these new technologies, providing an estimated \$2.1 billion in tax incentives for the use of alternative vehicles and alternative motor fuels.

We are doing a lot right now to try and move away from the use of oil in this country and bring down our demand for it through research, incentives, and many other things. Encouraging these new fuel sources is worthwhile, but until they become more widely adopted and cost effective, we will need to continue relying on oil to move people across town and across the country and to move raw materials and finished goods.

As I have mentioned, much of this oil comes from foreign sources. We must increasingly compete against other nations for this oil. As demand grows in response to the expanding world economy, the world economy is growing. For example, at one time, China produced enough oil to meet their domestic needs and still have some left over to export. Today, they import oil.

What if there was an opportunity in the United States to greatly reduce our dependence on foreign oil by using domestic sources of oil? Fortunately, with the amendment offered by Senator MURKOWSKI, we have that opportunity. For over 40 years, Congress has debated whether or not to develop the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, or ANWR. Senator STEVENS' words yesterday were eloquent and very informative on the history of ANWR. I suggest that those who did not hear the Senator, take the time to read his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His remarks should help them to make a better decision on this amendment.

As Senator STEVENS reminded us, this debate is about our national and economic security, but, sadly, the reality of ANWR has always been misconstrued and used as a political tool. I have to say, those who are opposed to allowing a small portion of ANWR to be used to help meet our energy needs have done an admirable job in trying to sway public opinion. Unfortunately, they have incorrectly painted this as a wholesale abandonment of the Alaskan wilderness.

Thus far, they have had vast success in muddying the facts. Today, though, I will make clear what ANWR is, what we are talking about, and what limited, precise oil exploration in ANWR means for our Nation.

Created in 1960, ANWR was expanded to 19 million acres in 1980 by the Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act. While designating 8 million of the original acreage as wilderness, Congress treated the 1.5 million acres of ANWR's Coastal Plain very differently. I am sure Senator STEVENS may remind us again, but back in 1980 Congress debated the same subject. At that time, Mark Hatfield, the ranking minority member and Henry Jackson, Chairman of the Energy Committee, wrote a letter urging their colleagues to support exploration in ANWR because, and I quote:

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.

They also said that the issue:

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

I agree with the points raised in this letter. This is a national security issue as well as an economic security issue. When President Carter signed the Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act in 1980, he stated this legislation:

... strikes a balance between protecting areas of great beauty and value and allowing development of Alaska's vital oil and gas and mineral and timber resources.

Section 1002 of the Act mandated a study of the Coastal Plain, or 1002 area, and its resources. After almost 7 years of researching the wildlife and the impact of oil development, the study recommended full development and described the area as "the most outstanding petroleum exploration target in the onshore United States."

The report recommended full development of this area while also stating that it is the most biologically productive part of ANWR. This means that in 1987, when the report was issued, it was believed that proper environmental steps, combined with technology, which is now 15 years old, would not significantly harm the wildlife.

However, the report did say that if the entire area were leased and oil were found, then there would be major effects on the wildlife. But no one here is talking about that. We are talking about 2,000 acres for oil exploration—2,000 acres out of 1.5 million acres. That is less than one-half of 1 percent of the total area.

This is one of the biggest misrepresentations about this debate. The entire area of ANWR's Coastal Plain is about the size of the State of South Carolina. To the casual observer, he or she thinks drilling means drilling throughout the entire refuge, but it is really just a 2,000-acre site. That is about the size of Dulles International Airport. If you look at this map, you can see just how small the area is compared to the vast wilderness of the Alaska wilderness and ANWR.

The two major concerns of the ANWR debate—and the issues that divide the two sides—are the environment and oil. While we know a lot about the wildlife and impact of oil development, we only have estimates about oil because the prohibition on drilling prevents a definitive answer to the question.

We know that the central Arctic caribou herd has grown from 3,000, when development began at Prudhoe Bay, to as high as 23,000 caribou. We know that development on Prudhoe Bay, which was discovered in 1967, would be 64-percent smaller if built today. We know

that a drill pad that would have been 65 acres in 1977 can be less than 9 acres today. We know that Alaskan oil companies now build temporary ice pads, roads, and airstrips instead of using gravel. We know that the pictures in the commercials and magazines refer to ANWR as "America's Serengeti." They must not be talking about the Coastal Plain, for this area is a winter wasteland, where temperatures regularly reach 70 degrees below zero for 9 months of the year, with 58 consecutive days of darkness.

We also know that the Coastal Plain is along the same geological trend as the productive Prudhoe Bay, and it is the largest unexplored, potentially productive onshore basin in the United States. But nobody knows for sure what is under there because we are prohibited from finding out.

In addition to the initial 1987 report, the Department of the Interior has issued assessments in 1991, 1995, and 1998 based on updated data from the U.S. Geological Survey. According to the USGS, it is estimated that the Coastal Plain holds between 5.7 billion and 16 billion barrels of recoverable oil, with an expectancy of about 10.3 billion barrels. The Coastal Plain can hold more than that, though. For example, the North Slope, was originally thought to contain 9 billion barrels of oil, but it has produced 13 billion barrels to date.

What if there isn't any oil? We know that technology is so advanced for Arctic drilling that there can be hardly, if any, environmental damage from exploratory drilling. For example, an exploratory well drilled in 1985 in the area adjacent to the Coastal Plain did not affect the wildlife. If the area does have as much oil as estimated, the benefit could be great. To put the numbers in perspective, Texas has proven reserves of 5.3 billion barrels. There is a 95-percent chance that ANWR will yield more oil than all of Texas and a 5-percent chance that there is three times as much oil as in Texas.

One of the half-truths being spread by those opposed to this amendment is that there is only 6 months of oil in the Coastal Plain. This is misleading because it assumes no other sources of oil—no imports, no other domestic supply—except from ANWR. The real truth is that, according to the Department of Energy, ANWR's oil supply would last between 30 to 60 years.

Last week, Iraq, one of the "axis of evil" nations, announced a suspension of oil exports. Iraq supplies more than 9 percent of the 8.6 million barrels of oil we import every day. It is a long-standing U.S. policy not to allow oil to be used as a political weapon. We cannot be held hostage to external interests or pressures. Iraq's embargo last week shows there are some countries that still think they can apply pressure in this manner.

I am not upset at the fact Iraq shut its spigot because I have little doubt we will make up whatever dropoff oc-

curs from other sources. Frankly, I think it is incredible that we send \$24 million a week and \$4.5 billion a year to a nation that is clearly an enemy of the United States and over which our military flies regular combat missions. It doesn't make sense.

Iraq's action puts the embargo card back on the table as a weapon to try to shape American opinion and Government policy. Who is to say other leaders in the Middle East might not take the same step in the future? We know who they are today. But who are they going to be tomorrow, particularly in light of growing Muslim extremism. Some of my colleagues may say since all our oil does not come from the Middle East, we can look to other nations. That is true, and one such supplier, Venezuela, is currently undergoing political and labor strife which has a tremendous impact on its oil industry. Indeed, reports by Venezuela's Industrial Council earlier this week indicated that 80 percent of the country's oil industry has been shut down. When Chavez retook the Presidency, oil prices went up almost 5 percent out of fear he will keep a tight rein on the production volume.

It is not out of the question to say our Nation may once again face the long lines we experienced during the 1973 oil embargo. You would have thought we would have learned our lesson and worked to develop other oil. However, we have seen our oil imports rise from 35 percent in 1973, and we are now at 58 percent. We have made very little progress in achieving our energy independence in the nearly three decades since the 1973 embargo.

We had the chance to make significant progress in 1995 when the Senate approved exploratory drilling in ANWR. Unfortunately, President Clinton vetoed the bill. Had he not, the Energy Information Administration estimates that oil could have been flowing to us by as early as next year.

When ANWR is developed, the Energy Information Agency projects that peak production rates could range from 650,000 barrels to 1.9 million barrels per day. The lowest of this estimate would replace the 613,000 barrels per day we imported from Iraq in 2000. The highest estimate would replace 76 percent of the 2.5 million barrels a day we import from the Persian Gulf in 2000.

It is very simple: We need to break our dependence on unreliable foreign energy sources. If the enemies of America are willing to take out the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, does anybody doubt that if they had a chance to impact our energy supply, they would do it?

Shouldn't we be able to at least find out how much oil is in ANWR especially with this commonsense environmentally sensitive amendment? The amendment includes many environmental protections, such as seasonal limitations, reclamation of land to its prior condition, use of the best available technology—including ice roads,

pads, and airstrips for exploration, and more.

Our dependency on foreign nations also threatens our economic security. Price shocks and manipulation from OPEC between 1979 to 1991 are estimated to have cost the U.S. economy about \$4 trillion, while petroleum imports cost the United States more than \$55 billion a year and account for over 50 percent of our trade deficit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. VOINOVICH. I ask unanimous consent for 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, development of the Coastal Plain will bring up to \$350 billion into the U.S. economy and create up to 735,000 jobs at home. In my state of Ohio, the number of jobs created is estimated at 52,000 for the petroleum industry and 31,000 for other jobs, such as oilfield and pipeline equipment manufacturing, telecommunications and computers, and engineering, environmental and legal research. These are real jobs for the people in my State, in spite of the fact we are so far away from Alaska.

The economic impact for oil development in Alaska is not a surprise; we are experiencing it even today. It has meant a great deal to our State and to many other States.

I also wish to point out that we have the support of Alaska's citizens and elected officials. We have heard from both of Alaska's U.S. Senators. We have heard from the Inupiat Eskimos who live and own 92,000 acres of Coastal Plain. Twenty years ago, they were opposed to this, but now are for it.

We cannot continue to rely on unstable foreign sources to meet our energy needs. The events of September 11 made it clear who our enemies are, yet we continue to do business with them and support their terrorist activities by buying oil from them. We know we have the resources domestically to reduce our addiction to foreign oil. Now is the time to tap them.

This amendment is economically sound, it is environmentally responsible, and it responds to our long-term national security needs. It is my fervent hope that my colleagues will recognize these facts and support this amendment to allow for oil exploration in ANWR, just as they did in 1995 and 1980.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 7 minutes prior to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized for 7 minutes.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to this amendment, which would open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil development. I believe drilling in ANWR is a

short-term, environmentally unconscionable fix that fails to address our Nation's real malady: Our dependence not just on foreign oil, but our overdependence on oil itself.

I believe there is no way to justify drilling in ANWR in the name of national security. Oil extracted from the wildlife refuge would not reach refineries for 7 to 10 years and would never satisfy more than 2 percent of our Nation's oil demands at any one time.

Thus, it would have no discernable short-term or long-term impact on the price of fuel or our increasing dependence on OPEC imports. Put another way, the amount of economically recoverable oil would temporarily increase our domestic reserves by only one-third of 1 percent, which would not even make a significant dent in our imports, much less influence world prices by OPEC.

An "ANWR is the Answer" energy policy fails to recognize the fundamental truth: we cannot drill our way to energy independence.

The United States is home to only 3 percent of the world's known oil reserves, and unless we take steps necessary to increase the energy efficiency of our economy and, in particular, the transportation sector, this Nation's consumers will remain subject to the whims of the OPEC cartel. To suggest that drilling in the Arctic is the answer is to ignore the facts and creates a complacency that truly jeopardizes our economic and energy security.

Furthermore, I believe the recent U.S. Geological Survey report on the biological value of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Coastal Plain and the impacts of oil and gas development on resident species reinforces what many of us have argued from the beginning. Drilling in the Arctic represents a real and significant threat to a wide range of species including caribou, snow geese, musk oxen, and other wildlife. This report represents sound science. It was peer reviewed and summarizes more than 12 years of research.

In stark contrast, the Department of the Interior's recent release of a new two-page memo, which purports to examine the impacts of "more limited drilling" in 300,000 acres of ANWR, was prepared in 6 days. One report, 12 years of research; the other report, just 6 days.

Essentially, in this report the administration decided to dispute its own scientists and say drilling in ANWR was acceptable. I disagree with that.

Rather than drilling in ANWR, I believe our task is to craft a balanced policy that will permanently strengthen our national security and energy independence. We need an energy policy that endows America with a strong and independent 21st century energy system by recognizing fuel diversity, energy efficiency, the great assets that distributed generation will create in the future, and environmentally sound domestic production as a permanent solution to our Nation's enduring en-

ergy needs. We are making some progress on these goals within this bill.

Obviously, one of the most important provisions the Senate has thus far debated involves the expedited construction of a natural gas pipeline from Alaska's North Slope to the lower 48 States. There are at least 32 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in existing Alaskan fields, and building a pipeline to the continental United States would create thousands of jobs, provide a huge opportunity for the steel industry, and help prevent our Nation from becoming dependent on foreign natural gas, from many of the same Middle Eastern countries from which we import oil.

It is very important that we make this investment in new natural gas and in job development. Adopting energy efficient technologies can significantly advance our national and economic security. For example, a Department of Energy report, and these are amazing figures, but this Department of Energy report stated that automakers commonly use low-friction tires on new cars to help them comply with fuel economy standards. However, because there are no standards or efficiency labels for replacement tires, most consumers unwittingly purchase less efficient tires when the originals wear out, even though low-friction tires would only cost a few dollars more per tire and actually would save the average American driver about \$100 worth of fuel over the 40,000 mile life of the tires.

Fully phased in, better replacement tires would cut gasoline consumption of all U.S. vehicles by about 3 percent, saving our Nation over 5 billion barrels of oil over the next 50 years, the same amount the U.S. Geological Survey says can be recovered from ANWR.

Unfortunately, I also believe we have thus far missed the single most important opportunity in this bill for truly enhancing our nation's energy security and minimizing our foreign oil dependence. That is, we have missed the opportunity to put in place real and meaningful CAFE standards, which would increase the efficiency of our Nation's vehicles and decrease our foreign oil dependence. I continue to believe the only way to permanently ensure our Nation's security is to look beyond 19th century policies that continue our country's reliance on extraction and combustion of fossil fuels.

Now is the time to launch the transition to a new, 21st century system of distributed generation based on renewable energy sources and environmentally responsible fuel cells. Imagine today if a significant portion of American homes and businesses produced their electricity from these renewables.

I think about the last crisis in the 1970s when our overdependence on foreign oil and high prices changed the dynamic in how many homes were heated with oil and made significant reductions. Our country needs to make those same changes today.

These are policies that will make our energy system truly secure and independent. I agree our national security depends in part on the United States becoming less dependent on foreign energy resources, and that we must develop more domestic supplies and a better balance of renewable energy that will also make us less dependent on nonrenewable fossil fuels. It would be a mistake to look at this ANWR debate in only one way, and to not invest in our country's new sources of energy. Therefore, I cannot support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it in the name of national security, to move ahead onto new energy sources and a 21st century energy policy.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 30 minutes as allocated under the previous order.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, with all due respect to my dear friend and wonderful colleague from Washington, I rise to oppose the position she has outlined and to support the amendment by the Senator from Alaska. I think it is very important for us to spend time on this issue. One of the previous speakers said: Why would we spend so much time on this issue? Why would the Senate, all 100 Members of the greatest deliberative body in the world today, spend so much time on this issue?

The answer is because this is not a small matter. This is not an insignificant debate. This is not a minor point. This is a major point in the debate on the future of this Nation and in what our energy policy is going to look like and how we can strengthen and improve upon it.

It is said that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. But given what I have heard in this Chamber, I say that balance must be in the eyes of the beholder as well because those of us both for and against this amendment continue to say we are for a balanced policy. Yet we argue the different aspects of what balance really is. So I am going to give it one more shot by saying what I think balance is.

The Senators from Alaska have done a magnificent job of making clear that we are not for drilling everywhere; we support a balance.

When this area was created, the areas in dark yellow, light yellow and green, there was a balance in the creation of this piece of land, land that is as large as the State of South Carolina. Here we have a balance: part of a refuge set aside for wildlife of all kinds, and a small part where we could drill. Why would we want to drill here? Because it is the largest potential onshore oilfield in the entire United States. It is not a minor field. It has major resources of

oil potentially, as well as gas. So a balance was struck. A deal of sorts was created.

We said let's set aside a huge piece of land for a refuge, for a wilderness area, and then let's set aside a part of it to drill.

The reason I feel so strongly about opening this section of ANWR to drilling—and it took me a while to come to this position because I have heard a lot of other arguments—is because of this precedent I feel this will set. If we overturn the original dual intent of ANWR and block all drilling there, where will we stop? Instead of adding to production in the United States, either on our shores or off of our shores, we keep taking places off of the map for production. We are not going in the right direction, and we need to change course. That is why this is so important.

I have said this 100 times. The Senator from Alaska has said it, the senior Senator from Louisiana did a magnificent job of saying it this morning, but let me also quote from a person we all respect—both Democrats and Republicans—Richard Holbrooke, whom we know well. I would say there would be no disagreement in this Chamber that this man is an expert in international relations and national security policy. I will read what he said in February this year:

Our greatest single failure over the last 25 years—

Not one of our great failures, not something that we should have done a little better—

was our failure to reduce our dependence on foreign oil—which would have reduced the leverage of Saudi Arabia.

Why does he say this? Because of headlines such as these: "Suicide Bomber Kills 6 as Powell's Talks Begin," "Chavez Reclaims Power in Venezuela," "Powell Meets Arafat, Makes Little Progress."

Mr. Holbrooke knows the uncertainty of the Middle East and we are all learning of the difficulties in Venezuela. He represented our country in the United Nations. He knows what it takes for America to be strong to get to the negotiating table free to make the best decisions we can. He knows our energy policy is in lockstep with our national security policy.

We have a chance to reverse course and not make the same mistake again. Let's have a balance.

Again, we have in ANWR the original intent to have some refuge area, some wilderness area, and some drilling area. Not all drilling. Not drilling everywhere, but where we can. An area for wildlife, for general recreation, and one for the bottom line, businesses, workers, companies, and our economy. This is balanced. Instead, we get no more drilling, a moratorium.

Let me show the other moratoria in the country. In addition to Alaska being taken off the map, we have—Democrats and Republicans are both guilty here—imposed moratoria along

the entire east and west coasts of the United States. There are places in the interior States where, because of rules, regulations, slow permitting, lawsuits, and filings on behalf of certain groups, the production has slowed down, forcing us to continue to increase our imports, year after year. These imports do not always come from friendly nations, from nations that share our values, but sometimes from nations that are in direct opposition to U.S. foreign policy and the democratic values for which we stand.

My second point is, are we asking something of Alaska that we have not asked of other States? The senior Senator from Louisiana showed this chart, and Senator MURKOWSKI showed it earlier. It is worth showing again. We are only asking to allow drilling in the kind of places where other States are already allowing it. Drilling is taking place in nine refuges in Texas; 12 in Louisiana; 1 in Mississippi, 1 in Alabama. You can see the rest. These are ongoing drilling operations in refuges.

Someone in my office the other day, a great labor leader from Louisiana, asked: Senator, why are people against drilling? I was trying to explain. I said: Some people said this area is the last great place. He said: Would you tell them America is full of great places? Louisiana has great places.

I loved when he said, "America is full of great places." There are great places in all of our States. We will preserve them. We will fight to keep them wilderness when we can. But when we refuse to tap domestic sources of oil and gas that would help our Nation, help our economy, create jobs, and release us from our dangerous dependency on imported oil and gas, it just makes no sense to me.

We have been spending a lot of time on this issue because it is at the heart of the debate. We have a weak production policy and, I might say, a weak conservation policy. That is the wrong direction. We need to turn around and go the other way: Strong production and strong conservation. If we don't, I predict there will be a huge price to pay. We will pay it one way or another, either through the lives of servicemen, or through compromised foreign policy. Americans know this. There is no free lunch. We don't seem to know that inside the beltway, but working Americans of all stripes, of all political backgrounds, understand that. It is important. It is about balance. And we need it.

People say ANWR will not produce a lot of oil, that it will not come online for several years—and I agree it will take time. But there is enough oil, even using the lowest estimates, to replace the oil we get from Saudi Arabia for about 8 to 10, maybe 8 to 12 years.

Ask the American people, Would you like to drill on our own land, land that we control, land that we set regulations on, and that we can depend on, or do you want to continue to import oil from Saudi Arabia for 15 years? I don't

think there would be many Americans who would choose the latter.

The third good reason is jobs. We continue to make decisions in this Congress that keep Americans from getting good paying jobs. Every time they want to apply for a job, there may as well be a sign that says: Congress doesn't think we should drill. So go look elsewhere for work.

I don't know about the Presiding Officer, but I have thousands of people in Louisiana who want to work. I have heard Senators say 60,000 jobs doesn't matter. This Senator believes 60,000 jobs is a lot of jobs. We should allow more production, which will lead to more than 60,000 jobs. We should promote investments in conservation and alternative fuels. There are lots of jobs, in science and other high-end jobs, associated with alternative fuels. Why not have good jobs for both production and conservation? Why turn down these job-making opportunities when it is so important to produce jobs for people in Louisiana, for people in Alaska, for people in Delaware, for people in New Mexico? I don't understand it.

We can create good, skilled jobs, where people can make a very good living working 40 or 50 hours, overtime, onshore, offshore, whereby they can buy a home, contribute to their community, send their children to get an equal or better education than they did. I think it is very important.

The fourth reason we need to support drilling in ANWR besides the fact we need it, besides the fact it is balanced, besides the fact we are doing it in many other States in the same way we would be asking Alaska to contribute, besides the fact that it means thousands and thousands of good-paying jobs that people in America would like and need at this time, it is the right thing to do for our environment. I mean that sincerely. I know I said some things on the floor about some environmental organizations, and I believe their positions, with all due respect to the great work they have done, are leading this country in the wrong direction.

I work very well with environmental groups in Louisiana and many of our environmental groups around the Nation. But I will say it again: When we drill and extract resources in America, we can do it in the most environmentally sensitive way in the world. Why? Because we have the strictest rules and regulations.

Even the former executive director of the Sierra Club agrees, and he is on the record saying that by pushing production out of America, all we are doing is damaging the world's environment.

We have the best rules and the best laws. We have a free press and the ability, to punish those who pollute the environment.

That does not happen in other places around the world, places without the same confidence in the law that we can have here in the United States. So the pro-environmental position—and I

mean this sincerely—is to drill and explore and extract resources where we can watch it, where we can control it and where we can make sure it is done correctly.

If I am wrong I would like someone to come to the floor and tell me: Senator, you are not thinking clearly about this.

Apart from the many troubled parts of the world where production is taking place, I don't know where else we would drill. And the saddest part of that to me, or the most hypocritical part of that to me, is that we consume more than everyone else. If we were not consuming that much, I would say fine. But we go to poorer countries with less infrastructure, fewer rules, and weaker laws and enforcement, not because they need the oil but because we need it. And we degrade the environment and support illegitimate regimes because we will not drill in our own country. I do not understand it.

I will make another point about Louisiana. I have heard some of my colleagues come to the floor and say: I will not drill in ANWR, but boy I will come drill in the Gulf of Mexico.

I want to show the map of these States that are net producers of energy. There are only a few of us. There are only 15. There are only 15 States in the entire country, just 15, that produce at least 50 percent of the energy they consume. You can see the States represented here.

We love all of our States, wish them all well, and we are all part of this great Union, but the red States on this chart produce less than half the energy they consume, which means they do not produce oil, they do not produce gas, they do not produce nuclear, they do not produce wind, solar, or hydro, but they want their lights to come on whenever they want and they want to power their businesses and industries.

Nobody can look at this map and say this is fair. I know there are products produced in some States that other States do not produce. I am clear. But there are no moratoria on growing corn, no moratoria on growing cotton. People are not opposed to that or think it harms the environment to grow corn or grow wheat. But we have a policy growing in this country that we do not want to produce anything but we want to continue to consume.

I am for strong conservation measures. I voted against the proposal to reduce CAFE standards, not because I don't agree with the goal, but because the method was wrong. It would have cost too many jobs in my State. There is a better way to get there. I would vote for even more stringent measures but not that particular measure.

There are strong conservation measures that I and many Members support. But this attitude has to change. We have to have an attitude among all of these States that you either reduce your consumption significantly or you decide how to produce the energy. You have your choice. You can produce it

any way you want. But what you cannot do is sit on the sideline, complain and complain, prevent other States from drilling, and then just continue to consume.

I have an amendment. I am thinking about offering this. I hope people who vote against ANWR will think about ways we can encourage our States, in a fair way, to make their own choices about how they would like to generate more energy or consume less, and to put it in balance, so our Nation can truly achieve energy independence. I hope we can do that.

Let me show one more chart. This is the Gulf of Mexico. You can see the red areas here where there is active drilling. We have been doing this now for 50 years. We have made some mistakes. I am the first one to admit it. We didn't know all the things that we know now back in the 1940s and 1950s.

We did not have the science and the technology. But we have made tremendous progress, and we in Louisiana are happy to produce hundreds of millions of barrels of oil and gas, and host pipelines that light up the Midwest and New York and California. We want to do it. We are proud of the industry, and we are getting better and better at it every day.

But it is grossly unfair for our State, and Mississippi and Alabama and Texas, to bear the brunt of this production when other States don't want to produce. Then, to pour salt on the wound, we get no portion of the revenues that are generated. Taxpayers may not realize this, but the royalties that come into the Treasury every time you produce a natural resource can keep our personal income taxes lower.

When we do not drill, royalties do not come into the Treasury, so taxes have to go up to support Government. So a fifth really good reason to explore natural resources is so we can bring money into the Treasury, again in a very balanced approach, and keep taxes minimal for taxpayers.

However, all that money that goes to the Federal Treasury right now, from production in Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, and Alabama, is not shared with those States. Since 1950, we sent \$120 billion to the Federal Treasury. Louisiana, which has produced the lion's share of the offshore production for the whole Nation, has not received a penny.

This is a true story. I know my time is almost to the end, but I am going to end with a couple of points on this. Two years ago the mayor of Grande Isle, a tiny little place down here at the foot of Louisiana, told me of a lot of their unique problems.

The mayor called me and said: Senator, I have a problem. I don't have a sewer system and a water system that is able to bring the fresh water that I need. I have children in school drinking rainwater out of a barrel, dipping a cup into a barrel, drinking the rainwater, because we do not have the right sewer

and water system. Because it is a small town, they do not have the necessary resources. I was sitting in my office in Washington thinking about these children dipping that cup and drinking that rainwater. I know if they just looked up and out just a few miles they could see a rig, producing the Nation's oil and gas. The money it produces is not going to help them get a sewer system which they desperately need. It will not help these children get a road so that when it floods or the weather is bad they can get to school. That money is coming all the way up to Washington for us to spend on all the States in the Nation.

When I ask to have a sewer system for them, I have to come back, ask and plead for money from the budget to get the kids in Grande Isle a drinking water system. That isn't fair.

I will propose and will continue to propose that we have more drilling and that the communities that host drilling share in those revenues. We need infrastructure for the people and families living there, for the workers and the businesses that are participating, and for the associated environmental impacts, which can be minimal. Sometimes they are a little more challenging. But with good science and the old yankee ingenuity and southern ingenuity, we can get that done for the people of our State.

In conclusion, I have given five good reasons why this is so important.

Let me close by reading something out of the *Atlantic Monthly*, "The Tales of a Tyrant", written by Mark Bowden, author of "Black Hawk Down." We are familiar with the incident. Many of us have seen the movie. It is very riveting. I would like to read about the kind of people from whom we are getting our oil.

Wearing his military uniform, he walked slowly to the lectern and stood behind two microphones, gesturing with a big cigar. His body and broad face seemed weighted down with sadness. There had been a betrayal, he said. A Syrian plot. There were traitors among them. Then Saddam took a seat, and Muhyi Abd al-Hussein Mashhadi, the secretary-general of the Command Council, appeared from behind a curtain to confess his own involvement in the putsch. He had been secretly arrested and tortured days before; now he spilled out dates, times, and places where the plotters had met. Then he started naming names. As he fingered members of the audience one by one, armed guards grabbed the accused and escorted them from the hall. When one man shouted that he was innocent, Saddam shouted back, "Itla! Itla!"—"Get out! Get out!" (Weeks later, after secret trials, Saddam had the mouths of the accused taped shut so that they could utter no troublesome last words before their firing squads.) when all of the sixty "traitors" had been removed, Saddam again took the podium and wiped tears from his eyes as he repeated the names of those who had betrayed him. Some in the audience, too, were crying—perhaps out of fear. This chilling performance had the desired effect. Everyone in the hall now understood exactly how things would work in Iraq from that day forward.

If we cannot get enough of the Senate to vote in favor of this amendment,

in spite of articles like this, because of movies that we see, because of headlines like this, and the disruptions not only in the Mideast but in Venezuela, I don't know what will make the Members of this Senate decide that we must produce where we can produce. We can set aside lands where we can set aside land, create jobs for our people and security for our Nation.

I am giving the best I can give. I don't think we have the votes. But I submit this for the RECORD, and hope people will reconsider their positions.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, under the unanimous consent, I believe the Senator from Wisconsin is the next Senator to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I rise to oppose the amendments offered by my colleagues from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI and Mr. STEVENS. I oppose these amendments for several reasons, and I rise to share my concerns with my colleagues.

Energy security is an important issue for America, and one which my Wisconsin constituents take very seriously. The bill before us initiates a national debate about the role of domestic production of energy resources versus foreign imports, about the tradeoffs between the need for energy and the need to protect the quality of our environment, and about the need for additional domestic efforts to support improvements in our energy efficiency and the wisest use of our energy resources. The President joined that debate with the release of his national energy strategy earlier this Congress. The questions raised are serious, and differences in policy and approach are legitimate.

I join with the other Senators today who are raising concerns about these amendments. Delegating authority to the President to opening the refuge to oil drilling does little to address serious energy issues that have been raised in the last few months.

Though proponents of drilling in the refuge will say that it can be done by only opening up drilling on 2,000 acres of the refuge, that is simply not the case. The President will decide whether the entire 1½ million acres of the Coastal Plain of the refuge will be open for oil and gas leasing and exploration. Exploration and production wells can be drilled anywhere on the coastal plain.

I infer that when proponents say that only 2,000 acres will be drilled, they are referring to the language in the amendment which states, and I am paraphrasing, "the Secretary shall . . . ensure that the maximum amount of surface acreage covered by production and support facilities, including airstrips and any areas covered by gravel berms or piers for support of pipelines, does not exceed 2,000 acres on the Coastal Plain."

That limitation is not a clear cap on overall development. It does not cover

seismic or other exploration activities, which have had significant effects on the Arctic environment to the west of the Coastal Plain. Seismic activities are conducted with convoys of bulldozers and "thumper trucks" over extensive areas of the tundra. Exploratory oil drilling involves large rigs and aircraft.

The language does not cover the many miles of pipelines snaking above the tundra, just the locations where the vertical posts that support the pipelines literally touch the ground. In addition, this "limitation" does not require that the two thousand acres of production and support facilities be in one contiguous area. As with the oil fields to the west of the arctic refuge, development could and would be spread out over a very large area.

Indeed, according to the United States Geological Survey, oil under the Coastal Plain is not concentrated in one large reservoir but is spread in numerous small deposits. To produce oil from this vast area, supporting infrastructure would stretch across the Coastal Plain. And even if this cap were a real development cap, what would this mean? Two thousand acres is a sizable development area. The development would be even more troubling as it is located in areas that are actually adjacent to the 8 million acres of wilderness that Congress has already designated in the arctic refuge which share a boundary with the Coastal Plain.

The delegation of authority to open the refuge is controversial, and make no mistake, it will generate lengthy debate.

I have also heard concerns from the constituents in my state who have paid dearly for large and significant jumps in gasoline prices. Invoking the ability to drill in response to a national emergency does not add to gasoline supplies today, nor does it do anything to address the immediate need of the Federal Government to respond to fluctuations in gas prices and help expand refining capacity. In some instances, there were reports of prices between \$3 to as high as \$8 per gallon in Wisconsin on September 11 and 12, 2001. The Department of Energy immediately assured me that energy supplies were adequate following the terrorist attacks, and these increases are being investigated as possible price gouging by the Department of Energy and the State of Wisconsin. With adequate energy resources, constituents need assurances that these unjustified jumps can be monitored and controlled.

And I, along with many other Senators, have constituents who are concerned about the environmental effects of this amendment, and what it says about our stewardship of lands of wilderness quality.

I also oppose opening the refuge for what it will do to the Energy bill as a whole. This measure contains important provisions that we need to enact into law. In light of the tragic events

of September 11, a key element of any new energy security policy should be to secure our existing energy system—from production to distribution—from the threat of future terrorist attack. Americans deserve to know that the Senate has protected the existing North Slope oil rigs and pipelines from attack. Americans deserve to know that the Senate has considered measures to reduce the vulnerability of above ground electric transmission and distribution by providing needed investments in siting of below ground direct current cables, in researching better transmission technologies, and in protecting transformers and switching stations. Americans want us to review thoroughly the security of our Nation's domestic nuclear powerplant safety regimes to ensure that they continue to operate well. Finally, Americans living downstream from hydroelectric dams want to know that they are safe from terrorist initiated dam breaching. We must assure them that this existing infrastructure is secure.

These were issues that the House did not address on August 2, 2001, when it passed its bill, because the terrorist attacks of September 11, were obviously unthinkable at that time. These are issues that drilling in the refuge does not address. But we are a changed country in response to September 11, and these are very real issues today, issues that must be addressed.

In addition, there have been significant technological changes in the last few months that can help us reduce our dependence upon foreign oil. On September 19, 2001, a model year 2002 General Motors Yukon that can run on either a blend of 85 percent ethanol and 15 percent conventional gasoline or conventional gasoline alone rolled off the line in my hometown of Janesville, WI. The 2002 model year Tahoes, Suburbans and Denalis with 5.3 liter engines will be able to run on either fuel. But while my constituents could buy a vehicle that can run on a higher percentage of ethanol fuel, there isn't a place open today to buy that fuel in Wisconsin. We could go a long way under this bill to reducing dependence on foreign oil by using domestic energy crops and biomass more wisely, and we should pass this bill to reflect our new technological capacity.

I also oppose this amendment because there is a lingering veil of concern that special corporate interests would benefit over our citizens by this amendment. Oil companies receive a good deal of financial assistance in the form of tax breaks from the Federal Government to encourage development of domestic oil supplies. I have spoken out, for example, against the percentage depletion allowance in the mining of hardrock minerals, and its use in the oil sector dwarfs the hardrock tax break.

This longstanding tax break allows those in the oil business to, in effect, write off all of their losses. The ostensible reason for the depletion allowance is to encourage exploration of oil

drilling sites, which, presumably, no one would do without such a tax break.

The oil industry argues that other businesses are allowed to depreciate the costs of their manufacturing. But this tax break goes well beyond the costs of deducting capital equipment. For example, a garment manufacturer can only deduct the original cost of a sewing machine, whereas an oil well can produce tax deductions as long as it keeps producing oil. So this deduction can amount to many times the cost of the original drilling and exploration. The depletion allowance is currently set at 15 percent of gross income.

The current cost to the U.S. Treasury for the depletion allowance exceeds \$1 billion a year. This deduction can, in some cases, amount to 100 percent of the company's net income, which means that all profitability comes from Government tax subsidies.

But just in case there is anyone in the oil industry not enjoying sufficient profitability, Congress has come up with a number of other cushions against the risks of capitalism. Big Oil can immediately deduct 70 percent of the costs of setting up an operation of the so-called intangible drilling cost deduction. Other industries have to deduct such costs over the life of the operation, so this amounts to another interest-free loan from the Treasury. It also amounts to a double deduction, since the depletion allowance is supposed to compensate the poor oil producer for the costs of risking a dry well. Repealing this deduction would save more than \$2.5 billion over the next 5 years.

Another tax subsidy encourages oil companies to go after oil reserves that are more difficult than usual to extract, such as those that have already been mostly depleted, or that contain especially viscous crude. This, of course, is more expensive than normal oil drilling. Thus the "enhanced oil recovery" credit helps to subsidize those extra costs. The net effect of this is that we taxpayers are paying for domestic oil that costs almost twice as much as foreign supplies.

The combined effect of the depletion allowance, the intangible drilling cost deduction, the enhanced oil recovery credit, and other subsidies can sometimes exceed 100 percent of the value of the energy produced by the subsidized oil. This makes no economic sense at all. I make these points because the taxpayers already give the oil sector a great deal of assistance, and now we are being asked to give up additional public lands as well.

Before we allow the President to open more public lands, I think we should be mindful of the help these industries are already getting.

I also am concerned about the effect of a decision to open the refuge to oil drilling on resources that we have already designated for special protection. The 19-million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge contains 8 million

acres of wilderness that Congress has already designated. The amendment proposes to essentially trade wilderness designation for other areas in the refuge, 1.5 million acres in the southern portion of the refuge for the 1.5-million-acre Coastal Plain. The existing wilderness areas in the refuge, however, are immediately adjacent to the Coastal Plain. I am concerned that the President would permit drilling on the Coastal Plain of the refuge before Congress considers whether or not the Coastal Plain should be designated as wilderness. Establishment of drilling on the Coastal Plain would be allowing a use that is generally considered to be incompatible with areas designated as wilderness under the Wilderness Act. We have had very little discussion about the effect of drilling in the refuge on the wilderness areas that we have already designated. I want colleagues to be aware that the drilling question threatens not only our ability to make future wilderness designations in the Coastal Plain but also could endanger areas that we have already designated as wilderness in the public trust.

Colleagues should keep in mind that the criteria established in this amendment that the President must certify in his determination to open of the Coastal Plain as a source of oil do not include any new developments or changes in the geological information or economics that affect potential development of Arctic resources. The United States Geological Survey has already reconsidered those factors in its 1998 reassessment of the Arctic Refuge Coastal Plain's oil potential. Rather, the current discussion, in my view, is prompted by the rhetoric and opportunistic efforts of those interests that have long advocated drilling in the Arctic Refuge, to exploit the current response with regard to terrorism.

If drilling may impair our ability to make a decision about the present and future wilderness qualities of the refuge, if the refuge does not contain as much oil as we thought, and if opening the Coastal Plain to drilling may do little to affect our current domestic prices, why, then, are we considering doing this? The facts don't point toward drilling in the refuge: the refuge may not contain as much oil as we think, and opening the Coastal Plain to drilling may have only a minor effect on our current domestic prices.

I raise these issues because I have grave concerns about the arguments that oil drilling and environmental protection are compatible. I traveled, a while ago, through the Niger Delta region of Nigeria by boat, where I observed firsthand the environmental devastation caused by the oil industry. The terrible stillness of an environment that should be teeming with life made a very powerful impression on me. These are the same multinational companies that have access to the same kinds of technologies, and though they are operating in a vastly different

regulatory regime, I was profoundly struck by the environmental legacy of oil development in another ecologically rich coastal area.

For these reasons, I oppose this amendment. I appreciate the fundamental concern that we need to develop a new energy strategy for this country. I do disagree strongly, however, with drilling in this location, which I feel is deserving of wilderness designation. I think this bill achieves its objectives without damaging the refuge, and I encourage colleagues to oppose these amendments.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the majority leader has authorized me to announce there will be no rollcall votes this evening.

I would like to make a unanimous consent request. I have spoken to both managers of the bill. We have, in the unanimous consent queue that is now established, Senator DORGAN speaking for 20 minutes. Senator DORGAN is not going to speak. So in place of that 20 minutes, I ask unanimous consent to amend the order to put in Senator STABENOW for 10 minutes and Senator MURRAY for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I am continually amazed by the ability—and I am sorry my friend from Wisconsin has left the Chamber—to generalize because that is what we are doing here. There is a generalization that somehow the oil industry's application in Africa is perhaps applicable to Alaska. These tactics I find unacceptable because, first of all, we have invited many Members of this body to come up and see for themselves.

You might not like oilfields. That is the business of each and every Member. But the best oilfield in the world is Prudhoe Bay. It is 30-year-old technology. What bothers me about this general criticism is nobody seems to care where oil comes from as long as they get it. The Senator from Wisconsin generalized on several aspects, implying that somehow the limitation in this bill of a 2,000-acre disturbance was broader than that.

Let me read what is in the bill. It ensures that the maximum amount of surface acreage covered by production and support facilities, including airstrips and any areas covered by gravel berms or piers for support pipelines, does not exceed 2,000 acres on the Coastal Plain. I don't know what could be more understood than that statement.

Furthermore, to suggest that exploration is a permanent footprint on the land begs the issue. Here is what exploration looks like in the summertime on a particular area that was drilled. The

reality will show you that the footprint is certainly manageable. To suggest somehow that that particular activity, because of the advanced technology, is incompatible with this area is really selling American ingenuity, technology, and American jobs short.

The Senator from Wisconsin didn't indicate at all the concern of the jobs associated with this. He didn't concern himself as to where we would get the oil. He simply said he didn't think it should come from this area. He talked about the flow of technology, refuge and wilderness.

Let me show you the map one more time. It has been pointed out again and again, but perhaps some Members are not watching closely enough. They simply assume that the ANWR Coastal Plain is wilderness. Congress specifically designated it as a specific area outside the wilderness. It is the 1002. Only Congress can open it. It is the Coastal Plain.

Within ANWR there are almost 8.5 million acres of wilderness. There are 9 million acres of refuge and 1.5 million in the Coastal Plain. What we proposed—and nobody has mentioned—is the creation of another 1.5 million acres of wilderness.

It is time that Members, before they come to the Chamber, familiarize themselves with what is in the amendment. It is a 2,000-acre limitation. Not too many people want to recognize that. They suggest the entire area is at risk. That is ridiculous. We have an export ban. Oil from the refuge cannot be exported. We have an Israeli exemption providing an exemption for exports to Israel, under an agreement we have had which expires in the year 2004. We are going to extend it to the year 2014.

As I have indicated, we have a wilderness designation, an additional 1.5 million acres which would be added to the wilderness out of the refuge. Here is the chart that shows that. We are adding to the wilderness.

If that doesn't salve the conscience of some Members who believe that is the price we should pay, I don't know what does.

Finally, we have a Presidential finding. This amendment does not open ANWR. ANWR is opened only if the President certifies to Congress that exploration, development, and production of the oil and gas resources in ANWR's Coastal Plain are in the national economic and security interests of the United States.

We leave all kinds of things up to the President around here. Declarations of war are often, in effect, handled by the President rather than the Congress—in the informal stage, at least. We think it is a pretty important responsibility. We are giving that responsibility to the President. Yet those from the other side, I don't know whether they begrudge, distrust, or whatever, because it happens to be in the President's energy proposal that we open up the area, and that is good enough for me.

The amendment does not open ANWR. It will only be opened if the

President certifies to the Congress that exploration, development, and production of oil and gas resources of the ANWR Coastal Plain are in the national economic and security interests of this country.

What does that mean? It means different things to different people, I suppose one might say. From the standpoint of at least my interpretation from the former senior Senator from Oregon, Mark Hatfield, the statement I opened with, I would vote to open up ANWR anytime rather than send another young man or woman to fight a war in a foreign land over oil. We did that in 1992. We lost 148 lives. At that time, we were substantially less dependent on imported oil.

Make no mistake about it. Our minority leader, Senator LOTT, indicated in his statement the vulnerability of this country. Our Secretary of State has not been able to bring the parties together in the Mideast. It remains volatile. The situation in Venezuela is unclear. The estimates are this Nation has lost 30 percent of the available crude oil imports that we previously enjoyed—that is an interruption—as a consequence of Saddam Hussein terminating production for 30 days. We have reason to believe Colombia is on the verge of some kind of an interruption which will terminate the oil through their pipeline. This is a crisis.

The reason you don't see Members coming down here and saying, "I guess we had better do something about it now," is very clear. The shoe is not pinching enough. The prices are not high enough. I would hate to say there are not enough lives at risk.

Members could very well rue the day on this vote, recognizing the influence of America's environmental community on this issue. I think everyone who is familiar with oil development in Alaska understands that we consume this oil that we produce in Alaska. It is jobs in America. It is U.S. ships built in American shipyards. These are the facts. By not recognizing the real commitment we have to doing business in America, we are going to have to get that oil overseas.

When the Senator from Wisconsin generalizes about oilfields, he doesn't give us the credit for the advanced technology moving from Prudhoe Bay to the next major oilfield we found in Alaska called Endicott. Endicott was 56 acres. It was the 10th largest producing field. Those are the kinds of technological advancements we have in this country.

As a consequence, I am prepared to continue to respond to those inaccuracies. It is a shame we have to subject ourselves to the pandering associated with interpretations that have nothing to do with the extent of the risk associated to our national security at this time.

The risk is very real. The risk may go beyond the risk associated with just a political view of this issue. In this amendment, we are giving the Presi-

dent of the United States the authority to make this determination. I would like to think every Member of this body values not only the President but his office to see what is in the best interest of our country, our Nation, and our national security.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

RECESS

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess for up to 3 minutes so our colleagues may have a chance to meet His Excellency, President Andres Pastrana, President of the Republic of Colombia, and His Excellency Juan Manuel Santos, Minister of Finance.

President Pastrana's term ends in the next 2 months. We just had him before the Foreign Relations Committee. In all the years I have been on that committee, as I said to my colleagues today and I say to my colleagues here, we have never had a better friend of America as a head of state from any country more so than President Pastrana.

One distinction that marks his service to his country and to the entire region is that when we lose elections here, we get a pension. When you run for election, stand for election, and take a stand in Colombia, you often literally get kidnapped or killed.

I have become a personal friend of the President, and I visited with him and his family. I cannot tell you how much I admire and marvel at his personal courage and that of the other officials in Colombia who have fought to keep the oldest democracy in the hemisphere just that—a democracy.

I ask that the Senate recess for up to 3 minutes for my colleagues to be able to meet the President and the Minister of Finance of Colombia. I ask unanimous consent that we recess for up to 3 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:30 p.m. recessed and reassembled at 5:34 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. CANTWELL).

NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise to oppose the proposal to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. With all due respect to my colleagues on the other side, who I know feel strongly, I feel strongly as well and have been involved with this issue since my time in the House of Representatives, where I consistently cosponsored legislation that would not allow drilling to occur.

It is important that we continue to stress the fact that drilling in ANWR will not create energy independence and that we are talking about, even if