

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

we started drilling tomorrow, the first barrel of crude oil would not make it to the market for at least 10 years. So it would not affect our current energy needs. There is a real question in all of the debate going on about the concerns that are immediately in front of us. This is not the answer to that.

We are talking about whether or not, on the one hand, we risk the environmentally sensitive Coastal Plain for the equivalent of just 6 months' worth of usage or consumer usage in the United States. And this is not something that will be available for use for 10 years. It doesn't make sense to me.

I think that in this energy bill, when we are trying to look to the future, we ought not to be going to the past in terms of trying to drill our way to energy security and independence.

According to the EIA, an independent analytical agency within the Department of Energy, drilling in the Arctic Refuge is projected to reduce the amount of foreign oil consumption by the United States in 2020 from 62 percent to 60 percent—a whopping 2-percent difference by 2020. This certainly is not going to address our energy needs. Drilling in the Arctic Refuge will not really make a dent in the question of the overdependence on foreign oil. Even John Brown, the CEO of BP Amoco, admitted in an interview on "60 Minutes" back in February that it was "simply not possible for the U.S. to drill its way to energy independence." That is why we have a proposal in front of us that is comprehensive.

I would like to, once again, commend the sponsor and the leader on this issue, Senator BINGAMAN, for not only his leadership in coming forward with a broad plan that moves us to the future, but also his patience during this process, as we have moved through all of the amendments and the different comments in which each of us have been involved.

When we look at the tradeoff, I simply don't believe it is worth it. Drilling in the Arctic Refuge will lead, potentially, to environmental damage. The proponents of drilling claim that the modern techniques are clean and would cause no environmental damage.

First, drilling accidents do happen. Over the past several years, across the Nation, there have been accidents due to poor maintenance, equipment failure, human error, even sabotage. Certainly, in this time of concern about terrorism, we need to be concerned about that as well. In these accidents, crude oil was dumped into our rivers, our lakes, our streams, and wetlands, and often dangerous hydrogen sulfide gas was released into the air as well.

This doesn't seem to be a good tradeoff for the equivalent of 6 months' worth of oil that we cannot actually begin to use for 10 years. We can create more jobs and help our U.S. steel industry and help our economy and make other kinds of positive benefits without drilling in the Arctic Refuge.

There are more than 35 trillion cubic feet of natural gas immediately avail-

able in the existing oilfields on the Alaskan North Slope. Currently, natural gas is produced with this oil but is reinjected, as we all know, back into the ground because there is no pipeline to bring it to the lower 48 States. Constructing the Alaskan natural gas pipeline will create more than 400,000 new jobs and provide a real opportunity to the U.S. steel industry, which, I might add, is incredibly important in my State of Michigan, where we are concerned about an integrated steel industry from the iron ore mines in the upper peninsula of Michigan to our steel mills.

This pipeline would require up to 3,500 miles of pipe and 5 million tons of steel. The Alaska natural gas pipeline also would provide natural gas to American consumers for at least 30 years and would be a stabilizing force on natural gas prices.

We can do that. We agree on that. We can move in this direction. It creates jobs. It adds to the availability of energy sources and does not risk one of the most important, pristine, environmentally sensitive areas in our country.

There are other, better supply options available to us. Currently, as we all know, in the Gulf of Mexico, it is a source of 25 percent of the crude oil produced in the United States, 29 percent of the natural gas, and there are 32 million acres in the western and central portions of the Gulf of Mexico under lease but not developed. Why are we not talking about those areas?

In addition, the oil industry is extremely optimistic about the prospects of finding additional oil reserves in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska where we are already drilling. In fact, the three largest oil discoveries in the last 10 years were made in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska. So we have options.

I am always perplexed in this debate to hear why this is the focal point of the administration's energy plan, this one piece of land, when we do have other options, and we have other options for creating jobs as well.

We also know that conservation and investment in new technologies are the real solutions. Given relatively small amounts of oil available in the Arctic Refuge, it does not make sense to endanger this 1.5-million-acre Coastal Plain that is the biological heart of this pristine national treasure.

An energy policy such as the Senate energy bill that encourages conservation and investments in new technologies can help us come closer to achieving independence within 10 years.

I am very proud of what is happening in Michigan as it relates to alternative fuels, agriculture, and also what we are doing in terms of technologies that are important for our future.

The bottom line is the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is one of the most pristine places in the United States. This tradeoff is not worth it.

We can meet our energy needs in other ways that look to the future. We can create important jobs for our people in other ways with the natural gas pipeline. We have other opportunities to drill that do not involve risking this important part of our heritage. Our ability to pass this area on to our children and to protect it is very important.

When we look at all of the various wildlife species, all of the animals and birds that are involved in this area of land and the habitat involved, I cannot imagine that we, in fact, will be serious about risking this fragile and irreplaceable national treasure.

I hope my colleagues will join with us in protecting this area for the future of our children and our grandchildren, and that we will move forward in the other parts of this energy bill and the other opportunities we have to lessen our dependence on foreign oil and create the economic and energy security that we all would like.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I rise today in opposition to cloture on these amendments. I want to say a few words about the energy bill in general, and then I want to explain my opposition to drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Our country needs a comprehensive energy policy, and certainly that policy needs to recognize the current importance of oil, gas, and coal exploration. But to ensure America's energy security for the future, it should support energy efficiency, conservation, clean and renewable energy sources, and it should help diversify our energy sources.

Overall, I have to say I am disappointed in the direction in which this energy bill is heading because it has been diverted from achieving these important goals. I am disappointed because we had an opportunity to make progress on our long-term challenges.

This bill started off in the right direction. Unfortunately, after many amendments, it is now a far different bill, and I believe it does not respond adequately to the challenges we face either in my home State of Washington or nationally.

It focuses too heavily on coal and natural gas. It does too little to diversify our energy sources.

It does not meaningfully raise fuel economy standards, and it does not protect electricity customers. In fact, it creates considerable uncertainty in electricity markets. It pursues electricity deregulation despite the hard lessons learned through our recent experiences in California and with Enron.

It takes regulatory authority away from the States and gives it to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

And it does not do enough to encourage investments in our transmission systems.

Overall, this energy bill reflects the way we have treated energy policy for decades. We have not addressed the long-term problems. Instead, we wait until there is a crisis, and then we are stuck at looking at bad, short-term fixes like drilling in ANWR. We have not dealt with our long-term dependence on oil. We have not invested enough in renewable energy. We have not diversified our energy resources, and we have not put enough financial incentives behind conservation.

The responsible way to address our energy problems is to focus on the long-term solutions like reducing our need for oil and investing in clean and renewable energy sources.

Unfortunately, much of this bill continues to largely endorse the past practices of short-term fixes that do not address many of the real long-term problems.

Today we are being asked to damage a sensitive ecosystem and spoil one of our national treasures for the sake of oil production. We cannot drill our way out of energy problems. That is a fact.

I ask my colleagues: At what point do we say "enough is enough"? Today we are being asked to allow the President to authorize exploration in a critical wildlife refuge. Where will we and future generations be asked to drill tomorrow?

To get out of these short-term traps, we need to invest in long-term solutions, such as diversifying our energy sources.

This bill started with a strong renewable portfolio standard which would have diversified our energy sources. After many changes, however, these standards are now no better than the current pathways we have. To me, that is a missed opportunity. We should be doing more to diversify our energy sources.

Currently, Washington State and the Pacific Northwest are very dependent on hydroelectric power to meet our energy needs. This dependence contributed to severe price spikes during last year's drought and California's disruption of the west coast energy market.

I fear that in our rush to address last year's energy shortfall, we in Washington State are now becoming over-reliant on natural gas. Diversifying our energy resources will help us prevent future price swings. Developing other resources like wind, biomass, solar, and geothermal energy will protect us from future shortages and will ensure our communities and economy they can continue to grow.

However, rather than enacting a strong renewable portfolio standard, this bill will continue the failed strategy of digging more, burning more, and conserving less.

I refer next to the electricity title in this energy bill. The Presiding Officer is from Washington State and she knows we have worked on and agreed to many amendments. However, electricity consumers in this underlying bill do not appear to be protected. I

think we are moving too quickly to deregulate electricity markets and to create regional transmission organizations. From the California energy crisis to the collapse of Enron, the events of the last few years have highlighted the importance of moving slowly with electricity legislation.

In Washington State, our regional transmission system has more than 40 major bottlenecks. There are many other parts of the Nation that also have major bottlenecks, and we need to fix them.

We can build all the generation facilities we need but still not have power because the transmission capacity is inadequate.

With all of the problems we are experiencing in our transmission systems, this is not the time to dramatically alter the way electricity markets are regulated and function.

With regard to electricity legislation, I think we should proceed very cautiously.

I will now turn to the debate over drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, which I strongly oppose. For the record, I have heard from many residents of my State on this issue. They have called me, sent me letters, faxes, e-mails, and a clear majority oppose drilling in ANWR.

I will vote against oil exploration in ANWR because the potential benefits do not outweigh the significant environmental impacts. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is an important and unique national treasure. In fact, it is the only conservation system in North America that protects the complete spectrum of Arctic ecosystems. It is the most biologically productive part of the Arctic Refuge, and it is a critical calving ground for a large herd of caribou, which are vital to many Native Americans in the Arctic. Energy exploration in ANWR would have a significant impact on this unique ecosystem. Further, development will not provide the benefits being advertised.

The proponents of this measure argue that over the years energy exploration has become more environmentally friendly. While that may be true, there are still significant environmental impacts for this sensitive region. Exploration means a footprint for drilling, permanent roads, gravel pits, water wells, and airstrips. We recognize that our economy and lifestyle require significant energy resources, and we are facing some important energy questions. However, opening ANWR to oil and gas drilling is not the answer to our energy needs.

Many people are incorrectly stating the exploration of ANWR will reduce our dependence on foreign oil. As a nation, the only way to become less dependent on foreign oil is to become less dependent on oil overall. The oil reserves in ANWR—in fact, the oil reserves in the entire United States—are not enough to significantly reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

There are four ways to really reduce our need for foreign oil. First, we can

increase the fuel economy of our automobiles and light trucks. Higher fuel economy standards will reduce air pollution, reduce carbon dioxide emissions, save consumers significant fuel costs, and reduce our national trade deficit.

In addition, cars made in the United States will be more marketable overseas if they achieve better fuel economy standards. Last month, many of us in the Senate tried to raise CAFE standards, but our efforts were defeated.

A second way to reduce our need for foreign oil is to expand the use of domestically produced renewable and alternative fuels. That will reduce emissions of toxic pollutants, create jobs in the United States, and reduce our trade deficit.

Third, we can invest in emerging technologies such as fuel cells and solar electric cars. The United States has always led the world in emerging technologies, and this should not be any different.

Fourth, we can also increase the energy efficiency of our office buildings and our homes.

These four strategies will reduce our dependence on foreign oil and protect one of our Nation's most precious treasures.

The proponents of drilling in ANWR have argued it will help our national security, and I want to comment on that. Back in 1995, the same proponents of drilling in ANWR fought to lift the ban on exporting North Slope oil. Prior to 1995, oil produced on American soil, on the North Slope of Alaska, was, by law, headed for domestic markets. This export ban had been in effect for over 20 years. In 1995, some Members worked to lift that ban. On the other hand, I helped lead a bipartisan filibuster, with Mr. Hatfield, a great Senator from the State of Oregon, to keep the export ban in place because it served our Nation's interest. Since that debate first took place, I have become even more convinced that sending our oil to overseas markets is the wrong policy for our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. It is recognized that gasoline prices in west coast States are frequently among the highest in the Nation. It is estimated that since 1995 more than 90 million barrels of Alaskan oil have been exported overseas. Approximately half of that oil went to Korea, a quarter of it went to Japan, and the remaining went to China and Taiwan. I would respectfully suggest to the administration and the proponents of drilling in ANWR that if this debate were really about providing Americans with our own oil or about denying Saddam Hussein the means to develop his evil plans, here in the Senate we would be considering reimposing the export ban.

The administration has been silent on reimposing that ban, the House has been silent on reimposing the ban, and I doubt the Senate will move on it either.

Now I suspect that someone from the other side is going to stand up and say that the House-passed ANWR bill precludes the exportation of oil from ANWR and that the pending amendment limits the exportation of ANWR oil except to our friends in Israel. But it will be easy for proponents to do an end run around those provisions.

First, the export ban would have to survive in conference. Even if it survives, oil companies will still be allowed to export more of the oil they drill from other parts of Alaska where the ban does not exist.

The proponents will say there have not been any recent exports of North Slope oil. The fact is that as soon as the economics line up, we will add to the 90 million barrels already sent overseas.

Let us remember that the amount of oil in ANWR is too small to significantly improve our current energy problems, and, further, the oil exploration in ANWR will not actually start producing oil for as many as 10 years.

Exploring and drilling for oil and gas in ANWR is not forward thinking. It is a 19th century solution to a 21st century problem.

For all of these reasons, I oppose energy exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and I continue to have strong concerns about the energy bill as it is currently written.

I yield back my time.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, many of us who have come to this Chamber over the last 24 hours to speak on this most important issue have approached it from a variety of points of view, all of them with some degree of logic that points out a frustration, if not a legitimate concern, about the energy supply of our country.

A few moments ago, the Senator from Michigan was speaking about ANWR, that it was only a moment in time that would pass quickly and that we ought to be much more interested in other sources of energy.

While she was speaking, I was thinking of a trip I recently made to her State, to Dearborn, MI, to the laboratories of Ford Motor Company, and there, for a period of time, I had the opportunity to visit with their engineers and scientists and look at what clearly is some of the latest technology that the laboratories of Ford Motor Company are employing toward future transportation.

One of those is a much touted, much talked about hydrogen fuel cell. Someday in the future, many of our cars might well be fueled by that fuel cell, generating the electricity that would drive the electric motors in the hubs of the wheels of that car.

I drove that car. I had the privilege to take it out on the track at Dearborn

and drive it around the track. It was an exciting experience, to think that this vehicle could be my future, my children's and my grandchildren's future, as a form of transportation. Very clean; a drop of water now and then emitting from the tailpipe of that car.

So it is an exciting concept, to think we have invested, taxpayers have invested in future technologies that someday may be available to the consuming public as a form of transportation.

Let me talk about the rest of the story, about which the engineers and the scientists huddled around the hydrogen fuel cell at Ford Motor Company talked. They talked about the tens of billions of dollars it would take to build the infrastructure to fuel the hydrogen fuel cell that would have to be spread across the country, comparable to the gas station on every corner of America today that fuels the gasoline-powered cars.

Had we thought about that? Well, I had not thought about it to that extent, that it would take decades to build that kind of infrastructure so that driving a hydrogen fuel cell car would be as convenient as the gas-powered car we drive today. Certainly, whether it be Seattle, WA, or Boise, ID, I am not confident we would want to drive to one spot, one location only, to fuel our hydrogen car. I am sure we would want it at least as nearly convenient as fueling our gas-powered car of the day. That was one issue.

The other issue is a very real problem in the minds of American drivers today as to the acceptability of hydrogen cars. It is a little thing called "boom," a fear that it might blow up. It is a false fear. The hydrogen fuel cell car would not blow up because it is a very safe form of energy. But the reality and the public perception is there. A decade of information, hundreds of millions of dollars invested in experiments and public relations and education and experience is all going to be part of that equation.

What happened the day I drove that \$6 million prototype hydrogen-fueled cell car at Dearborn, MI, taught me something. It taught me we do not instantly do new things around here; we don't instantly have a new hydrogen-fueled cell car. Its day will come, and I do believe it might. It clearly is environmentally clean, and it would be important for our economy.

Yes, the economy will create hundreds of thousands of jobs and invest billions of dollars to get us into new forms of transportation. However, they predicted at Ford Motor Company that we were literally decades away, if not double decades, from a hydrogen-fueled cell car.

I say to the Senator from Michigan whose economy depends on the employment of the auto industry to make her State go, what do you do in the meantime, if you don't have the fuel to drive the engines of the cars that the workers in Dearborn, MI, produce today?

That is part of what the Senator from the State of Michigan represents.

I guess you let them be unemployed. If gas goes up to \$3 or \$4 a gallon, certainly the kind of vehicle, if not the quantity of vehicles that are produced in Michigan today and by the auto industry around the country, is going to dramatically change. Some would say that is perfectly fine, that is the way the marketplace ought to work, and, therefore, who cares? I think the Senator from Michigan cares. I know the Senator from Idaho cares because in Idaho, driving from Boise, ID, to Twin Falls, ID, is not around the corner. A few minutes down the road is 2½ hours. It is 250 miles. To go anywhere in my State means driving a couple hundred miles. My State is 600-plus-miles long. By the way, that is from here to Boston. And it is about 550 miles wide at the widest.

My State is a mile-intensive State. People travel long distances. Transportation is critically important. Large, safe automobiles that consume a certain amount of energy are necessary and important.

Important to my State, which is now becoming a manufacturing State and a processing State, are the products we produce which have to get to places like Chicago, to the Detroit, the New York, and the Minneapolis-St. Paul because we feed a world economy. If we cannot get the product we produce to that economy at a reasonably priced way, then either we go out of production or it gets produced closer to that marketplace.

The point I am making and the point that has been made by many today is we are an energy-dependent economy; we are an energy-dependent society. We use a great deal of it. We are wealthy because of it. We are free because of it. We have great flexibility as a country because of it. We are powerful because of it. And we can help other freedom-loving people around the world because of our capacity to not only use energy but produce energy.

Yet today we have heard many coming to the floor opining the fact that production was somehow bad in the name of the environment, in the name of the critter, in the name of the pretty little plant, in the name of life after, in the name of generational concerns, in the name of something. Someone has found a reason not to produce additional energy for this country. Yet their very presence on the floor, the very wealth that has created this country was, in part, a direct result of the abundance of reasonably priced, reliable energy.

When I listen to some of my colleagues, a fundamental thought goes through my mind. Don't they get it? Don't they understand the jobs that are created in their State are based on a certain economic equation and that if you adjust that equation arbitrarily or you deny its right to be in place, you run the risk of destroying that job and dramatically changing the economy of the country? Don't they get it?

What happens if we get \$3-a-gallon gas in this country? What happens to the cost of doing business in this country? What happens to the thousands and thousands of people who no longer have a job because of that in this country? Don't they get it? Or is praying at the altar of a creature, a plant, a concept, an idea so much more important that somehow we stand back and deny the right of this country to produce the energy it needs reasonably, presently, and in an environmentally sound way?

Don't they get it? Yeah, they get it. We all get it. My wife told me last night: Don't you get emotional over this issue; you really shouldn't; keep your cool. I am trying to, but it is very frustrating for me to suggest to my grandchildren that because of a public policy they are going to be denied certain rights, certain freedoms, certain flexibilities within their lifetime that I had within my lifetime because my forefathers recognized the importance of producing, recognized the importance of abundance, and recognized the importance of wealth generation for this country.

That is the bottom line of the debate we are involved in tonight. It is the fundamental debate that has gone on for the last 4 weeks on the floor of the Senate about a national energy policy.

The first opportunity I had to visit with President-elect George W. Bush, the first opportunity our assistant leader, who has just come to the Chamber, had a chance to visit with President-elect George W. Bush was in TRENT LOTT's office. The issue in Florida had just been solved. The President-elect was in town. He was beginning to put together his Cabinet. He came to the Hill to visit with us. I will never forget that. We were all so very proud and excited about his Presidency. He said: I campaigned on education. I campaigned on tax cuts. I campaigned on the general well-being and the economy of this country and that I would lead these issues before the Congress and before the American people. But let me tell you what is important now. What is important is a national energy policy for this country that gets us back into the business of producing energy. He said: The first thing I am going to do is ask Vice President-elect DICK CHENEY to head up an energy task force. We will make recommendations to you in Congress, and we hope you will move a national energy policy as quickly as possible for the country. We all agreed it was a high priority for our Nation to get back in the business of producing energy.

That was a priority of this President then. It is now. It is a priority of Republicans in the Senate. It is a priority of many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

In establishing national energy priorities, I have changed over the years. I used to think that maybe this was the right way to go and this wasn't and you could do this but you couldn't do

that. I don't agree with that anymore. The policy ought to create the incentives and the opportunities to drive all forms of energy. Conservation ought to be a part, and it is now a part of this legislation. New technologies clearly ought to be a part, and we ought to provide the kind of tax incentives that create the investment that brings the capital that drives new technologies. We have put several billion dollars into new technologies in the last several years: in photovoltaics and wind and the hydrogen fuel cell car that I talked about that I have had the opportunity to drive, all of that is moving forward. All of it is out there in somebody's future. But probably not in my lifetime, at least not all of it, and certainly not some of it. But we ought to be doing all of that. We ought to be utilizing our coal with new clean coal technology. It drives 60 percent of electrical generation today.

My hydro dams in Idaho and in the Columbia and Snake River systems ought not be threatened. They ought to be retrofitted and managed in a way that they are fish friendly, but they ought to be allowed to produce megawatts—10 percent of the national base.

What about nuclear? We have included nuclear in this bill, and we are enhancing it—we are reauthorizing Price-Anderson—another 20 percent of the base. If we believe in climate change and global warming, we are probably going to want nuclear to be a greater portion of that mix in time.

So why on the floor of the Senate tonight are we picking and choosing and saying this but not this? Do we know better? No, we do not know better. But we do know that as we have grown increasingly energy dependent on someone else's production, we have lost our flexibility as a country, we have lost our ability to shape domestic and foreign policy, and in the end, we will lose a little bit of our freedom because our sovereignty, our ability as a country to make those kinds of decisions that drive our economy and shape our attitude and our relationships with our foreign neighbors is, in fact, freedom.

"Oh, it is a freedom argument tonight?" You're darned right it is. Somebody is saying you don't need to produce the 15 or 20 billion barrels of oil in the ANWR, or the 7 or the 8 or the 10—we don't know how much is there, but we know there is a lot there. But if we did, one example about the freedom I am talking about, or the flexibility in foreign policy, if we did produce ANWR—bring it into the pipeline, make it available to our refineries, allow it to go to the pump for you and me to put in our gas tanks—we could turn to Saddam Hussein, who just turned his pumps off last Tuesday, and say: Keep them off. We don't need your oil anymore. We don't need to buy 720,000 barrels a day from you for \$4.2 billion a year so you can use that money to pay Palestinian families to allow their kids to be human bombs.

We don't need to let you do that anymore. Most importantly, we are not going to pay for it.

Our policy today, or the absence of striving toward the form of relative energy independence is, in fact, allowing that policy. Shame on us. Bad policy. But, somehow, over the years, in this state of ambivalence toward production, toward self-sufficiency, we have wandered off toward Saddam Hussein. On any given day it can be anywhere from 55 to 60 percent dependency.

"My goodness, Alaska is just a drop in the bucket." Some say it will drop our dependency on foreign sources 14 percent for the next 20 years. I'll bet Colin Powell, in the last week, wished he had 14-percent greater capacity to bring off a peace settlement or a ceasefire between Palestine and Israel. That would have been a phenomenally larger advantage.

"Oh, it is only 14 percent." Since when did that not count? I think it counts. You cannot be cavalier about this issue.

Now let's talk environment. I do not make little of the environment. I live in a beautiful State. We have very strict environmental standards in my State, and we adhere to them and we believe in them. But we also believe in production. In the 1970s, when we drilled the North Slope of Alaska under the most strict environmental conditions ever imposed on an oilfield, we did it and we did not hurt the environment.

You have heard speeches in this Chamber today and yesterday about the abundance of the caribou herd and all the successes there. A cousin of mine was a foreman for Peter DeWitt. He helped build the pipeline. We were visiting the other night about the phenomenal technicalities involved in building that pipeline, but they got it done.

It was the first time; it was never done before. But Congress said do it cleanly, do it sound environmentally, and they did and that pipeline is 55, 60 miles away from the field we are talking about now.

We are not going to hurt the environment. The technologies of today, slant drilling and all of those new employments of technology within the energy field, weren't there in the 1970s, and we did it well then. We will do it better today.

It is not a matter of hurting the environment; it is a matter of not doing anything. That is the debate here. Do it or do not do it. Take the environmental equation out of it.

If you do not do it, why then are they arguing? Why would anyone take that point of view? I suggest because there are some esoteric attitudes, if you do that you slow down economic growth, you discourage this, and the world changes. It is kind of a cave and a candle syndrome: Find everybody a cave to live in and have candlelight for their reading. You will not have to have all these other goodies that we call the

marketplace, and somehow the world is going to be a better place.

I think not. I think we ought to talk about the differences and the tradeoffs. We ought to talk about the jobs.

My colleagues from Alaska and those who have analyzed this matter would suggest anywhere from 250,000 to 700,000 jobs could be created. Since when did jobs become a dirty environmental idea? I think it is a clean idea. I think it puts food on the tables of a lot of folks. It allows them to buy houses and cars and a college education for their kids. That sounds like a clean idea to me, and somehow someone is suggesting that is a bad idea.

The point here is simple. It ought not be that frustrating. None of us should struggle that mightily about it. It is producing energy for this economy, doing it in a wise and responsible way, doing it in an environmentally sound way, and, oh yes, doing it where it is. You have to go to the oil to get the oil.

We know there is oil under the ANWR in Alaska. The work has already been done. The EIS is already in place. The seismograph estimates a substantial volume. It is the natural and responsible next step in the development of the oil reserves of the State of Alaska and for this country.

We are going to choose to buy from outside the country, if we do not develop. We will continue to buy even if we do develop, but we will buy less. We will be a little more independent. We will create a lot of jobs. We will put \$70 billion in the U.S. Treasury, and hundreds of billions of dollars will remain in the U.S. economy. To me, that just makes a heck of a lot of good sense.

I hope the amendments to this energy bill dealing with ANWR that are on the floor are agreed to. I hope we can vote for them. I hope at least nobody will hide behind a procedural effort. It ought to be up or down, yes or no, are you for it or are you against it? If you are against it and you can justify it—and, obviously, those who speak against it can—then so be it. That is the way we shape public policy in the Senate: honestly, fairly, and hopefully aboveboard for all the American citizens of our great country to see.

I believe we ought to explore ANWR. I believe we ought to develop it. I think this country needs it. I think we are better for it. We will be a stronger nation, we will be more independent, we will have greater flexibility, we will create more jobs, we will get greater opportunities for our kids and our grandkids, and our environment will remain clean and sound and the Porcupine caribou herd will flourish and the world will go on.

But it will be different if we cannot do that. We will be less free, more dependent, with less flexibility. The job of Colin Powell and his colleagues will be even more difficult because we have less independence to engage our friends and our enemies in trying to create a safer world. That is part of the issue. That is part of the debate.

My colleague from Oklahoma is in the Chamber ready to speak. It is an important issue. I hope all of us will take seriously the vote that we will be casting, I believe tomorrow, on cloture on this most important issue. In my opinion, it is a generational issue that comes before the Senate at this time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Republican leader.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague, Senator CRAIG from Idaho, for his speech. I also compliment Senator MURKOWSKI for his leadership in trying to put together a good energy bill, as well as Senator STEVENS. Both have made extensive speeches on the need for exploration in Alaska. I happen to respect both individuals very much.

I happen to have accepted one of their invitations to visit the area. And I believe all Senators received this invitation as well. I encourage my colleagues to do so.

I think there is a long tradition in the Senate where we have given home State Senators great latitude in making decisions that impact their States primarily. I am kind of bothered by the number of people who are coming out against drilling in ANWR without ever being there, without ever visiting the people, and without knowing the real impact.

Alaska happens to be one of the prettiest States in the Nation. It is one of the largest. I have been to several points in Alaska, including the Prudhoe Bay area and the ANWR area. Alaska contains beautiful scenic areas. However, the ANWR area, and particularly the coastal region, is not one of the prettier areas of Alaska. On the whole, although, it is a beautiful State.

When I heard people say we can't mess up this pristine wilderness, I was thinking that maybe they did not visit the area. Again, many States have gorgeous scenic views, and Alaska probably more than any other State. But this particular area can be drilled. It can be explored in an environmentally safe and sound manner without disturbing the environment and without disturbing wildlife.

I compliment the home State Senators. I wish people would listen to them. I think too many people have been listening to special interest groups that are trying to raise money on this issue without giving attention to some of the serious national and State problems.

We have real national problems. We are importing 60 percent of our oil today. We are spending about \$100 billion a year overseas. We are shipping that money overseas to buy imported oil. That 60-percent figure means that we are very dependent on other countries for our livelihood. We have evidence of this in the past when we had curtailments. We had a curtailment in 1973 of 26 percent. There was an Arab oil embargo. This caused long lines at the gas stations as oil prices rose dra-

matically. In addition, unemployment went up as factories stalled and subsequently shut down. We even had schools closed. We had people who weren't able to get heat. We experienced this in 1973 when we were importing 26 percent and in 1979 when we were importing 44 percent. At that particular time, the OPEC countries didn't like our policy—sometimes our policy concerning Israel—so they wanted to teach us a lesson. They curtailed oil shipments to the United States.

Today we find ourselves vulnerable to the hardships we experienced in the past. We are currently importing 60 percent. That number continues to rise. It makes us very vulnerable. Without energy security, we don't have national security.

It is incumbent upon us to do something. President Bush, to his credit, and Vice President CHENEY's, to his credit, formulated a national energy policy—the first administration to do so in decades. The House, to their credit, last June passed a bipartisan energy bill. My compliments to them.

Many of us in the Senate wanted to pass a bipartisan energy bill. I have been on the Energy Committee for 22 years. Every major energy piece of legislation we passed has been bipartisan—every single one.

We passed a bill deregulating natural gas prices. It took years, but we did it.

In the Finance Committee, we passed a bill to eliminate the windfall profits tax. We passed a bill to repeal the Fuel Use Act. We passed a bill to eliminate the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

Many of those mistakes that were made during the Carter administration were enacted by the Democratic Congress which needed to be repealed. And we repealed them in a bipartisan fashion.

We started marking up the energy bill. All of a sudden, the majority leader tells the chairman of the Energy Committee not to have a markup. So the bill we have before us, in my opinion, is in desperate need of improvement. It is 590 pages. It was never marked up in committee.

I have been on the committee for 22 years. I was never able to offer an amendment on this bill.

Some people say: Why have you been on this energy bill for so long? We have to rewrite the bill on the floor. Why are you spending so much time on ANWR? Guess what. If we had marked the bill up in committee, we would have ANWR in there. We had the votes. I suspect the reason the majority leader told Senator BINGAMAN not to mark up the bill is because he is adamantly opposed to exploration in ANWR. He may well have victory on the floor tomorrow. We will find out. I hope he is proud.

What about the hundreds of thousands of jobs that wouldn't be created because we will not have exploration? What about the billions of dollars that we are shipping overseas to little countries, such as Iraq, that really aren't



our best friends? Because he is continuing that policy—he is continuing the dependency, in some cases, on very unstable and unreliable sources of oil.

Our national energy is tied to our energy security, and we are taking steps to secure ourselves. We could reverse our actions significantly by allowing exploration in ANWR. But the majority leader may be successful in keeping it off.

My guess is, if we had done the bill as we have done every single bill for the last 20-some years in committee, that it would have been in the bill, and it would have stayed in the bill. I think the majority leader knows that. Maybe his tactic will be successful, but he has totally disrupted the precedents and the standard of using committee procedures to mark up bills.

We have committees and a process in which they follow. Why disenfranchise 20-some Senators from marking up a bill? This offends me. This bill has 590 pages. The first bill we considered had 539 pages.

Again, no Senator got to mark up either bill. This was put together by the majority leader. This was put together by Senator BINGAMAN. No other Senators I know of got to mark it up because there wasn't a markup held.

Where is the committee report? The standard procedure in taking up a bill is that we will have a committee report and allow individual Senators to make comments supporting or opposing the bill's provisions.

However, since we seem to have skipped this process, we have to dig through the bill and find out what is in it. This legislative language and not the easiest language to read. There is no common English explanation for it, as we have in almost every major bill.

I am very offended by the process. It was done I think primarily to avoid having a vote on ANWR, or making it impossible for us to put ANWR in. We will have to put ANWR in. It will take 60 votes. If we had ANWR in a committee bill, it would only take 50 votes.

The majority leader is able to use the rules and maybe bypass the entire committee structure so he can have a victory. Congratulations. Tell that to the hundreds of thousands of people who don't get a job because we are not going to explore ANWR. Hundreds of thousands of jobs?

Wait a minute. How many things can we do here? Senator MURKOWSKI has said many times that this will create thousands and thousands of jobs. One estimation is that it might create 250,000 jobs, while others offer higher estimates.

How many times can we pass a bill that will say if we do this we are going to be able to reduce our dependency on foreign sources, and, instead of spending \$100 billion overseas, billions of those dollars can stay in the United States—that will stay with U.S. companies, that will be American made, that will be American owned—and where the dividends, royalties, and

payments will go to workers and employees of American companies? How many times do we have that opportunity?

The majority leader may be successful in stopping it, but it makes us more dependent. It makes us more vulnerable to countries such as Iraq and other countries that might be upset with our Middle East policies.

I disagree with that very strongly. I disagree very strongly with countless Senators. I would love to know how many Senators have never been up there and are making decisions that say: I know better than Senator MURKOWSKI; I know better than Senator STEVENS.

I know that both Senator STEVENS and Senator MURKOWSKI have been there several times.

I happen to have been there, I think, once. I learned a great deal. I have been to Kaktovik, and I talked to the villagers. They are all in favor of it. They are more concerned about their environment than anyone else. They live there 365 days a year. Yet we are going to deny them an economic livelihood? I think that is a serious mistake.

I have heard countless people say: We can't do this because of the environmental impact. We are talking about 2,000 acres—2,000 acres—out of a land mass that is 19.6 million acres. And 2,000 acres may be about the size of an average airport, compared to 19 million acres, about the size of South Carolina. That is a very small percentage, very little negative impact, if you consider the impact to be negative in the first place. We have hundreds or thousands of wells in my State of Oklahoma, as Texas and Louisiana do also. We have not seen considerable negative impacts.

A pipeline, is that so bad? You ought to look at a interstate pipeline map and see how many pipeline miles are across the State of Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas. You don't know they are there, but they are there. And people act like that would just desecrate this beautiful area. I just question that.

As a matter of fact, I look at the ANWR Coastal Plain, and it would take just a small connection to be able to tie into the TransAlaska Oil Pipeline. This small connection would be about 100 miles long.

I look at the gas pipeline, and I heard the Senator from Michigan say, oh, she is all in favor of the gas pipeline. That is all new pipeline, and that is about 3,000 miles. The pipeline we are talking about is maybe 100 miles, connecting from ANWR to the oil pipeline that is already built. The oil pipeline is about 800 miles.

Now we are talking about a 3,000-mile pipeline, almost all of it new, going through a lot of virgin territory that has never had roads, never had a pipeline on it. This is the gas pipeline that a lot of people are saying would do 100 times the environmental damage of what we are talking about, connecting

to the oil pipeline that is already there—100 times the environmental damage.

I heard somebody say, what about the caribou, or what about the wildlife in the area? I remember flying up there and looking around and looking at the wildlife. Alaska is a gorgeous State that has a lot of wildlife. In that particular Coastal Plain area, when I was there, I did not see hardly any wildlife. I could see more wildlife in my State of Oklahoma or the State of Louisiana in any square mile than what I saw at the time I happened to visit there. I did not visit there when the caribou were migrating in.

I care about the caribou. I saw a lot of caribou at Prudhoe Bay. I remember when Prudhoe Bay was originally built, there was about 3,000 caribou. Today, there are 20-some thousand. The caribou herds have multiplied dramatically. I think there are up to 27,000 caribou in the Prudhoe Bay area, about 9 times what there was 25 years ago. So the caribou have been protected fairly well. They have multiplied significantly and have proven not only to survive but to survive quite well with the TransAlaska Pipeline. I am sure they could survive with this small little junction from the ANWR area to the Prudhoe Bay pipeline.

So people who are raising these facades, "Well, we can't disturb the wildlife," "We can't disturb the natural environment," what are you doing supporting the gas pipeline that is 3,000 miles through virgin territory versus a pipeline that might be 100 miles connecting ANWR to the TransAlaska Pipeline? That does not make sense. That is absurd. I am just shocked by some of the false arguments that are being raised.

I do want to create jobs. I do want to make us less dependent on foreign sources. I do not want Saddam Hussein, who is now talking about having an oil embargo against the United States for 30 days because he doesn't like our policies in the Middle East—I don't want him to hold any type of economic leverage over the United States. Right now we are importing about a million barrels per day from Iraq, from Saddam Hussein.

Guess what. The production we expect to receive from ANWR is about a million barrels a day, except that it is estimated to last 20, 30, 40 years.

The Prudhoe Bay production that we have had for the last 25 years grew to a couple million barrels a day. Now it has declined to about a million barrels per day. So we have excess capacity of a million barrels, and ANWR could help complement that. Then we would have 2 million barrels per day coming down the TransAlaska Pipeline. That is over 25 percent of our domestic production. Our country—our Nation—needs that for national security. So to deny this, I believe, is a national security issue.

So we should give deference to our home State colleagues of Alaska. We should listen to their advice, and we should allow exploration in ANWR.

I urge my colleagues to consider doing what is right for America, what is right for our country, what is right for our national security, and, frankly, what is right for Alaska.

This project is supported overwhelmingly by Alaskans because they believe they need it, both economically and for the national security implications as well.

So I urge my colleagues, tomorrow, to support Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator STEVENS and allow exploration in the ANWR area.

Mr. President, one final comment I will make, and that is, there is an amendment pending—I guess we may have a vote on it—dealing with money going to help the steel industry cope with some of the difficulties they have. Some people call them legacy costs, but it is picking up health costs for retirees.

I think that is a serious mistake. I do not know why the Federal Treasury or the taxpayers should have to take general revenue money, or money coming from this pipeline to pay pension costs or health care costs for one particular industry. If you are going to do it for this industry, then what about the textiles, what about auto workers, what about railroad workers?

You have a lot of industries that have a lot of retirees who are struggling with paying their pensions and/or health care plans. They made those contracts. Is the Federal Government responsible to come in and assume all the costs of those contracts? If so, we have real serious problems. If we are going to do it for one, how can we not do it for another? I think it would be a serious mistake and set a serious precedent that I hope we don't follow. So I urge my colleagues to vote no on the steel legacy amendment, as it has been called.

However, I urge my colleagues, with every fiber in my being, to support exploration in ANWR, the Murkowski amendment. Let's listen to the Senators from the State of Alaska. They know this issue inside and out, far better than anybody else. They have been there countless times. Let's follow their advice and open up ANWR for exploration.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, we are now debating energy policy in the Senate that will affect the lives of generations to come, so we must make sure that our approach is comprehensive and balanced. We cannot allow poor energy policy proposals to be used as a smokescreen for an unwillingness to focus on the harder long-term issues. Drilling in the Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge is one such bad policy proposal.

It is impossible for the United States to "drill" its way out of oil dependency. The United States has 3 percent of the world's oil reserves but consumes 25 percent of the world's oil. The Arctic refuge contains less than 6 months of economically-recoverable oil

and that oil would not be available for 10 years. This means that drilling in ANWR would not provide any immediate energy relief for American families.

Further, the claim that drilling in ANWR would create thousands of jobs is excessive. The job estimates used to support drilling in the Arctic refuge were developed by the American Petroleum Institute, API, in 1990 and are insupportable. According to the Congressional Research Service and other recent independent studies, the API used exaggerated estimates and questionable economic analysis.

More than 95 percent of Alaska's North Slope is open to oil and natural gas exploration or development today. In 1999, the Clinton administration opened nearly 4 million acres of the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska to oil and gas drilling and signed a bill lifting the ban on the export of Alaska North Slope oil, a move strongly supported by industry. This action opened 425 tracts on 3.9 million acres, an area more than twice the size of ANWR. As a result of improved technologies and renewed interest in the North Slope, the lease sale returned more than \$104 million in bonus bids, 50 percent of which will go to the Federal Government, and 50 percent to the State of Alaska. The oil industry should explore and develop the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska before there is any consideration of opening ANWR.

As population and the economy grow, so does the demand for energy. We do need to keep the United States at the forefront of innovative energy production. The efficient use of energy has to be our primary goal and we need to create incentives to conserve. There are many ways to do this. Midwestern farmlands are ideal for growing high-yield "energy crops," including soybeans grown in Michigan, to help power our economy. Corn grown in the Midwest can be used to produce ethanol, a cleaner burning fuel for vehicles. While there are barriers that must be overcome to bring these alternative sources of power on line, we should support renewable energy programs by offering incentives to those who use them.

Further, a new generation of automotive technology is under development that offers great promise in our quest to achieve greater fuel efficiency. Technologies such as hybrid vehicles, which use an internal combustion engine in combination with a battery and electric motor, and fuel cells, which are devices using hydrogen and oxygen to create electricity and heat, should help to dramatically improve fuel economy and protect our environment.

Drilling in our pristine wilderness will not alter our dependence on foreign oil, it will only alter our protected wilderness. We have a responsibility to promote a balanced energy plan that invests in America's future and protects our environment, not one that damages a unique and irreplaceable wilderness.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I got an e-mail from my oldest son, who told me he was surprised by the comments of the Senator from Minnesota concerning this issue being a political issue and politics as usual. I am not surprised. But I did tell him I think the Senate has changed.

Before I go to my other remarks, I would like to relate to the Senate what happened to me as a young Senator, a young appointed Senator. I came here in 1968, and by the springtime of 1969, Senator Gordon Allott of Colorado, who was a friend from the days when I was in Washington at the Interior Department. When I left I was Solicitor, and I was very close to Gordon Allott. He was a personal friend as well as the person I worked with in the Eisenhower administration.

He said he thought it would be good if I would meet with some of the older Senators and talk about life in the Senate. So I said I would, and a day or two later, Senator Allott said they were going to gather up in Senator Eastland's office. At that time it was on the third floor. I think it was room 306, just above what has been one of the leader's offices on the second floor.

As I walked in, I found that I was facing eight of the senior Senators. I hadn't been around long. I had been familiar with Senate activity. But it was a very interesting meeting: Senator Eastland of Mississippi, Senator Allott of Colorado, Senator Cotton of New Hampshire, Senator Paul Fannin of Arizona, Senator Hruska of Nebraska. I believe the others were Senator Long of Louisiana, Senator Randolph of West Virginia, and Senator Talmadge of Georgia.

Those were different days. They were days when there was a different feeling in the Senate. These were eight senior Senators, four from each side. Obviously, they enjoyed one another's company. Those were the days when, late in the afternoon, there were a few refreshments on the table in Senator Eastland's office. He said to me: Why don't you help yourself, son. I did, and I sat down. And Senator Allott said to me they just thought they ought to talk to me a little bit about how it was easy to get along in the Senate if one understood the Senate.

For instance, the conversation went to the point of the fact that we were a new State, a young State that had only been in the Union for 10 years. They wanted to make sure I understood the Senate. Senator Allott told them I had been around during the Eisenhower days. I had been with the liaison to the



Senate. They said they wanted me to understand relationships in the Senate.

We talked about senatorial courtesy and what it means to have a right to be consulted concerning appointments to your State. We talked about just the idea of the aisle as a separation between individual Senators; this is a place where, if you are going to be here, you ought to know who you are working with, and they welcomed a newcomer, an appointed Senator, to visit with them on how they felt about the Senate.

It was one of the most interesting conversations of my life. The point got around to a new State and the prerogatives of a new State. One of the things they told me was very simple: If you and your colleague agree on an issue that affects your State, for instance, land in your State, you let us know because we believe you know more about your State than we do, and we are going to rely on you; we are going to rely on you to make the judgments on Federal actions that affect your State, and only your State.

I thought about that last night. I have listened to people here over the years talk about the rights of their States and what has happened to their States and what might happen to their States.

I don't think any State has lived through what we have lived through in the first years of our statehood. We have been denuded of jobs—I will talk about the people who have done it—by a group that takes advantage of the division of the country in order to achieve objectives they could not achieve but for the divisions that exist in the Senate today. It is truly a split Senate. Relationships between the majority and minority are strained more than I have ever seen them.

We have a situation where the two of us, since 1981, have sought the fulfillment of a commitment made to us in 1980, and it is apparent now that it will be denied—not permanently; we still will have a chance to come back at this again. This bill will not forever forbid the concept of oil and gas leasing in the Arctic Plain of Alaska, but it will not happen until there is an act of Congress to authorize it to proceed.

In terms of the relationships of the Senate, I raised the question: What about other Senators? Are we to presume that the concept of the Senate relying upon the two Senators from that State, if they agree on an issue pertaining to their State, the Senate will listen to them? I don't think so.

I think we have seen really a split in the Senate intentionally caused by the radical environmental organizations of the country that think they really control the country now. I will show you; they probably do. They probably do much more than the public believes.

Senator WELLSTONE said today that he had meetings with the Gwich'in people because of the pristine wilderness, and they live in the area. I beg to correct the Senator. The Gwich'in live on

the south slope of the Arctic range. They are Canadian Indians, at least part of a Canadian tribe of Indians called the Gwich'in. They have land in Alaska. They opted not to participate in the great land settlement of the Alaska Native lands settlement. They opted out. They took their land and did not want to rely in any way on the Federal Government.

As a matter of fact, right after they took their land, rather than participate in the land claims settlement, they put their land up for oil and gas leasing. No one wanted to lease it. They put their land up for coal leasing. They do have a lot of coal. And no one wanted to lease it.

As a matter of fact, we hardly ever heard from the Gwich'in about this issue until they were hired by one of the environmental organizations, and they have become the spokesmen for the environmental organizations as a representative of the Alaska Native people. But they are Canadian Indians who live in Alaska.

The Alaska Native people, the Alaska Federation of Natives, and particularly the great Eskimo community on the Alaska North Slope, support drilling in the 1002 area of the Alaska Coastal Plain. They live in the area. The Gwich'in do not. The people who own land within this area at Kaktovik, the Eskimo people, violently support this. They want it to happen. They have been denied the right by Federal order to drill on their own land, and our bill removes that impediment.

I have tried my best to explain why we went into the concept of looking at the steel legacy program. One Senator said he thought my effort was not real, not authentic, and I sought to take advantage of the hopes and pains of his people. If I had been here, I would have taken a point of personal privilege. That is an accusation of immoral conduct on the part of a Senator—were it true. It is not true.

Who made that linkage? The people who don't want to work with us. They know my amendment would provide a cashflow to the steelworkers who are currently going to be denied their medical care that they thought they were going to get. One Senator said: It is only \$1 billion. It is only \$1 billion. Well, we are getting \$1.6 to \$2.7 billion, we believe, in the bonus bids. And they only get \$1 billion. Between now and 2005, they only get \$1 billion. They get \$8 billion over 30 years. If it is cynical, it is cynical because of the people who don't want to face up to their own responsibility.

We need that steel. We can't build this gas pipeline from Alaska, 3,000 miles from the North Slope to Chicago, unless we have steel. We can't have steel unless the steel companies of this country survive. They are not going to survive under the current circumstances.

As I said yesterday, 30 steel companies have gone bankrupt in the year 2000. Do the people who represent those

areas understand their State? I understand mine. My State is bankrupt because the last administration closed down our mines, our timber operations, oil and gas activity, and our cruise ships. They have closed us down and want us to be a national park.

I am trying to represent my people, but I just hope these people here don't come in and accuse me of having taking action to take advantage of the hopes and pains of people.

I hope I am here then. I hope I am here then. We will have a discussion then. One said that drilling can't help because they thought that the legacy fund could not be solved by the moneys that would come from drilling in ANWR. I never said they would be solved. I never said they would be solved. I said we could provide a plug in that fund to keep them going until we got production from the Arctic Plain, and then we could go up to a total of \$18 billion in 30 years to make that fund sound.

Now, it is one thing to not agree with a Senator who is trying to put two things together. By the way, let me remind the Senate that the great civil rights legislation of this country was introduced by Everett Dirksen of Illinois as a rider to another bill. It was a rider to another bill. It was the military structure and school bill. He added the civil rights legislation.

From some people on the other side, you would think the Democratic Party started civil rights in this country. The person who introduced the major bill was Everett Dirksen of Illinois, working with Lyndon Johnson when he was majority leader. Johnson called up the bill so that Everett Dirksen could offer that amendment. It was in February 1960.

In terms of other debates, when we were talking about the Foreign Military Sales Act of 1970, John Sherman Cooper of Connecticut and Senator Frank Church of Idaho offered an amendment to limit military operations in Cambodia. That became a substantial change in that bill. It became two bills, and, because they were joined together, they passed.

In 1982, we joined the Trade Reciprocity and Dividend Withholding Acts, and the proponents of both succeeded in bringing them together in the Senate. It is not unknown for a Senator to suggest that two separate pieces of legislation ought to be joined together in order to make a coalition of Senators who believe in an objective.

I take umbrage to some of the comments made by those people who don't have the guts to come forward and represent their own people. I would represent my people here until I die. We have done that. We have gone to the wall. I am accused of being the pork chief, or the chief porker around here. Why? Because my State is almost dead

due to the actions of the last administration in shutting down our timber industry, oil and gas industry, mining industry, and the cruise ships' total opposition to the State of Alaska in terms of any kind of development on Federal land, whether it was within or without the great withdrawals we have been talking about.

When we entered into that agreement in 1980, person after person—Senator MURKOWSKI and I read them—including the President, said we have reached an understanding so that the land can be preserved that needed to be preserved, but Alaska can go forward with development of oil and gas and timber and mining. They said that. They acknowledged it in public that there was a deal—a deal.

A deal, to me, is not a bad word. Up our way, when we make a deal, we shake hands. We don't have to have an act of Congress if you give a man your word, your promise. As Robert Service said, "A promise made is a debt unpaid."

Congress made a promise to Alaska that this land would be opened to oil and gas. It was shown in that environmental impact statement that there would be no permanent harm to the fish and wildlife area.

Now along comes this environmental group that has to be the most horrendous thing that I have gotten into. I wish I had more time for this, and some day I will take a lot more time for it. I think, because of these people, we have lost that ambience on the floor.

In the days of Senator Mansfield, we used to have dining groups. Mansfield encouraged us to get together. As young Senators from both sides of the aisle, we would invite people from the other side of the aisle to our homes for dinner. At least three times a year we used to have dinner with other Senators in each other's homes. We got to know one another. We took them to our States. We would travel with each other. We disagreed here on the floor and we did our job representing our people; but we were friends.

Many Senators right now are not going to have many friends in the Senate after this year is over. It is because of what is happening now—this great division, turning everything into political issues. We are told that on every issue the President has to have 60 votes—not a majority, but every one of the President's programs has to have 60 votes in order to stop the opposition of the majority.

That is not like the days of Mike Mansfield or Lyndon Johnson. Lyndon Johnson cooperated with President Eisenhower. Mike Mansfield cooperated with President Nixon and President Ford. Where is the spirit of cooperation from the majority?

I think it is high time people understood what is going on here. It is going to have a long-term impact on the Senate, as far as this Senator is concerned. I still have my friends over there, and

I love them. By the way, they are still my friends. They understand what we are doing. They are the Senators from the old days who understand that when two Senators agree concerning an issue in their State, they ought to be listened to by the Senate. They don't always agree, but they certainly should not be attacked.

Let's talk about the fundraising groups. We have some charts. Fundraising groups started off as philanthropic organizations that raise money to help achieve conservation objectives. They have been the subject of a review by the Sacramento Bee. Why do I look at that? They happen to own our largest newspaper, the Anchorage Daily News. We came across some of these articles that I will ask to put in the RECORD.

The Institute of Philanthropy suggests that fundraising expenses not exceed 35 percent. This is the percentage of environmental groups' donations used to raise more money, not for environmental protection. The National Parks Conservation Association uses 41 percent of the money they raise to raise more money; the Sierra Club, 42 percent; Defenders of Wildlife, 50 percent; Greenpeace, 56 percent; National Park Trust, 74 percent. So 75 cents out of every dollar goes to raise more money, not to help the parks.

Are these philanthropic, eleemosynary institutions? Are they? No. They are organizations that are now there to participate in the management of them. Let me show you, for instance, the annual income of these groups. This is just income of the presidents of philanthropic organizations. They are not the President of the United States, but you will see that several make more than the President of the United States. All but one makes more money than any Member of Congress. They are out raising money from people. They send them letter after letter, and they spend more money to go out and get more money, and they raise more money than they do for their objectives. Look at what they do with what is left.

The median household income in the United States in 2000 was \$42,148; that is the income of a husband and wife in a household in the year 2000. The Sierra Club's executive director makes \$138,000, which is conservative. All they really do now is raise money. That is a pretty good income. The president of the Earth Justice Legal Defense Fund makes \$157,000. They raise money so they can sue—not in terms of doing anything for the conservation; they are protesters. Defenders of Wildlife, \$201,000. The president of the Wilderness Society, \$204,000; that is Fred Gaylord Nelson. He has graduated to a better salary. President, National Audubon Society, \$239,000. World Wildlife Fund, \$204,000. National Wildlife Federation, \$247,000.

What is eleemosynary about that? Are these volunteers to save the world?

These are people in it for what they can get out of it, and what they get out

of it is both money for themselves and money to contribute to people who support them. We will get into that, too.

This is the amount of mailings sent annually by these groups. These are mailings, in the millions, for more fundraising, not money to notify people of a problem: the Audubon Society, 7 million; Greenpeace, 8; the Sierra Club, 10.5; Defenders of Wildlife, 11; the National Wildlife Federation, 12.5; National Parks and Conservation, 17; World Wildlife, 19; Nature Conservancy, 35. They mail about 160 million mailings a year. The response is 1 to 2 percent.

I wonder who owns the mailing companies. I have to look into that. Somebody is making money on just the mailings from these people. What are they doing?

One hundred sixty million mailings, how many trees does that take, Mr. President? They are stopping us from cutting our trees in Alaska. From where are they getting that paper? They are not recycling it all. This group has in mind controlling what the Government does with regard to Federal lands in particular.

Who spends more to protect the environment? This is from the "Environmental Benefits of Advanced Oil and Gas Exploration and Production Technology" published in the Clinton administration. This is not this administration. This is the Clinton administration.

It is clear that the oil and gas industry spent \$8 billion, in this 1 year, 1996. That is more than EPA's entire budget for 1996 and 333 percent more than all environmental groups put together. The oil and gas industry spends more to protect the environment by the Clinton administration's findings than all environmental groups put together. The environmental groups spent \$2.4 billion in 1996. That is their total spending, and we have seen most of this is spent to raise more money—this is from environmental groups—not to protect the environment, but to raise more money and pad their own wallets.

It is amazing, as I look at law firms around the country. They are advertising to get contributions to protect the environment, and what they are really doing is taking contributions and paying themselves to represent protest groups. It is an interesting connection to the environment. I am not sure that is advancing the cause of the environment.

In any event, they are really soliciting money for their own salaries, which in my day in practicing law would have been thought to be unethical. It is not unethical now, I guess.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of articles from the Sacramento Bee be printed in the RECORD. They were written by a Bee staff writer in April of last year. The first is called "Green Machine." Tom Knudson's article says:

Dear friend, I need your help to stop an impending slaughter. Otherwise, Yellowstone

National Park—an American wildlife treasure—could soon become a bloody killing field. And the victims will be hundreds of wolves and defenseless wolf pups.”

So begins a fund-raising letter from one of America's fastest-growing environmental groups—Defenders of Wildlife.

The article goes on:

In 1999, donations jumped 28 percent to a record \$17.5 million. The group's net assets . . . grew to \$14.5 million, another record. And according to its 1999 annual report, Defenders spent donors' money wisely, keeping fund-raising and management costs to . . . 19 percent of expenses.

But there is another side to Defenders' dramatic growth.

Pick up copies of its federal tax returns and you'll find that its five highest-paid partners are not firms that specialize in wildlife conservation. They are national direct mail and telemarketing companies—the same ones that raise money through the mail and over the telephone for nonprofit groups, from Mothers Against Drunk Driving to the U.S. Olympic Committee.

You'll also find that in calculating its fund-raising expenses, Defenders borrow a trick from the business world. It dances with digits, finds opportunity in obfuscation. Using an accounting loophole, it classifies millions of dollars spent on direct mail and telemarketing activities not as fund-raising but as public education and environmental activism.

Sounds like another Enron to me.

Again, I ask unanimous consent this series of articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being on objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento Bee, Apr. 23, 2001]

MISSION ADRIFT IN A FRENZY OF FUND  
RAISING

(By Tom Knudson)

“Dear Friend, I need your help to stop an impending slaughter. Otherwise, Yellowstone National Park could soon become a bloody killing field. And the victims will be hundreds of wolves and defenseless wolf pups!”

So begins a fund-raising letter from one of America's fastest-growing environmental groups—Defenders of Wildlife.

Using the popular North American gray wolf as the hub of an ambitious campaign, Defenders has assembled a financial track record that would impress Wall Street.

In 1999, donations jumped 28 percent to a record \$17.5 million. The group's net assets, a measure of financial stability, grew to \$14.5 million, another record. And according to its 1999 annual report, Defenders spent donors' money wisely, keeping fund-raising and management costs to a lean 19 percent of expenses.

But there is another side to Defenders' dramatic growth.

Pick up copies of its federal tax returns and you'll find that its five highest-paid business partners are not firms that specialize in wildlife conservation. They are national direct mail and telemarketing companies—the same ones that raise money through the mail and over the telephone for nonprofit groups, from Mothers Against Drunk Driving to the U.S. Olympic Committee.

You'll also find that in calculating its fund-raising expenses, Defenders borrows a

trick from the business world. It dances with digits, finds opportunity in obfuscation. Using an accounting loophole, it classifies millions of dollars spent on direct mail and telemarketing not as fund raising but as public education and environmental activism.

Take away that loophole and Defenders' 19 percent fund-raising and management tab leaps above 50 percent, meaning more than half of every dollar donated to save wolf pups helped nourish the organization instead. That was high enough to earn Defenders a “D” rating from the American Institute of Philanthropy, an independent, nonprofit watchdog that scrutinizes nearly 400 charitable groups.

Pick up copies of IRS returns for major environmental organizations and you'll see that what is happening at Defenders of Wildlife is not unusual. Eighteen of America's 20 most prosperous environmental organizations, and many smaller ones as well, raise money the same way: by soliciting donations from millions of Americans.

But in turning to mass-market fund-raising techniques for financial sustenance, environmental groups have crossed a kind of conservation divide.

No allies of industry, they have become industries themselves, dependent on a style of salesmanship that fills mailboxes across America with a never-ending stream of environmentally unfriendly junk mail, reduces the complex world of nature to simplistic slogans, emotional appeals and counterfeited crises, and employs arcane accounting rules to camouflage fund raising as conservation.

Just as industries run afoul of regulations, so are environmental groups stumbling over standards. Their problem is not government standards, because fund raising by nonprofits is largely protected by the free speech clause of the First Amendment. Their challenge is meeting the generally accepted voluntary standards of independent charity watchdogs.

And there, many fall short.

Six national environmental groups spend so much on fund raising and overhead they don't have enough left to meet the minimum benchmark for environmental spending—60 percent of annual expenses—recommended by charity watchdog organizations. Eleven of the nation's 20 largest include fund-raising bills in their tally of money spent protecting the environment, but don't make that clear to members.

The flow of environmental fund-raising is remarkable. Last year, more than 160 million pitches swirled through the U.S. Postal Service, according to figures provided by major organizations. That's enough envelopes, stationery, decals, bumper stickers, calendars and personal address labels to circle the Earth more than two times.

Often, just one or two people in 100 respond.

The proliferation of environmental appeals is beginning to boomerang with the public, as well. “The market is over-saturated. There is mail fatigue,” said Ellen McPeake, director of finance and development at Greenpeace, known worldwide for its defense of marine mammals. “Some people are so angry they send back the business reply envelope with the direct mail piece in it.”

Even a single fund-raising drive generates massive waste. In 1999, The Wilderness Society mailed 6.2 million membership solicitations—an average of 16,986 pieces of mail a day. At just under 0.9 ounce each, the weight for the year came to about 348,000 pounds.

Most of the fund-raising letters and envelopes are made from recycled paper, but once delivered, millions are simply thrown away, environmental groups acknowledge. Even when the solicitations make it to a recycling bin, there's a glitch: Personal address labels,

bumper stickers and window decals that often accompany them cannot be recycled into paper—and are carted off to landfills instead.

“For an environmental organization, it's so wrong,” said McPeake, who is developing alternatives to junk mail at Greenpeace. “It's not exactly environmentally correct.”

The stuff is hard to ignore.

Environmental solicitations—swept along in colorful envelopes emblazoned with bears, whales and other charismatic creatures—jump out at you like salmon leaping from a stream.

Open that mail and more unsolicited surprises grab your attention. The Center for Marine Conservation lures new members with a dolphin coloring book and a flier for a “free” dolphin umbrella. The National Wildlife Federation takes a more seasonal approach: a “Free Spring Card Collection & Wildflower Seed Mix!” delivered in February, and 10 square feet of wrapping paper with “matching gift tags” delivered just before Christmas.

The Sierra Club reaches out at holiday time, too, with a bundle of Christmas cards that you can't actually mail to friends and family, because inside they are marred by sales graffiti: “To order, simply call toll-free . . .” Defenders of Wildlife tugs at your heart with “wolf adoption papers.” American Rivers dangles something shiny in front of your checkbook: a “free deluxe 35 mm camera” for a modest \$12 tax-deductible donation.

The letters that come with the mailers are seldom dull. Steeped in outrage, they tell of a planet in perpetual environmental shock, a world victimized by profit-hungry corporations. And they do so not with precise scientific prose but with boastful and often inaccurate sentences that scream and shout:

From New York-based Rainforest Alliance: “By this time tomorrow, nearly 100 species of wildlife will tumble into extinction.”

Fact: No one knows how rapidly species are going extinct. The Alliance's figure is an extreme estimate that counts tropical beetles and other insects—including ones not yet known to science—in its definition of wildlife.

From the Wilderness Society: “We will fight to stop reckless clear-cutting on national forests in California and the Pacific Northwest that threatens to destroy the last of America's unprotected ancient forests in as little as 20 years.”

Fact: National forest logging has dropped dramatically in recent years. In California, clear-cutting on national forests dipped to 1,395 acres in 1998, down 89 percent from 1990.

From Defenders of Wildlife: “Won't you please adopt a furry little pup like ‘Hope’? Hope is a cuddly brown wolf . . . Hope was triumphantly born in Yellowstone.”

Facts: “There was never any pup named Hope,” says John Varley, chief of research at Yellowstone National Park. “We don't name wolves. We number them.” Since wolves were reintroduced into Yellowstone in 1995, their numbers have increased from 14 to about 160; the program has been so successful that Yellowstone officials now favor removing the animals from the federal endangered species list.

Longtime conservationist Peter Brussard has seen enough.

“I've stopped contributing to virtually all major environmental groups,” said Brussard, former Society for Conservation Biology president and a University of Nevada, Reno, professor.

“My frustration is the mailbox,” he said. “Virtually every day you come home, there are six more things from environmental groups saying that if you don't send them fifty bucks, the gray whales will disappear or the wolf reintroductions in Yellowstone will fail . . . You just get supersaturated.”

"To me, as a professional biologist, it's not conspicuous what most of these organizations are doing for conservation. I know that some do good, but most leave you with the impression that the only thing they are interested in is raising money for the sake of raising money."

Step off the elevator at Defenders of Wildlife's office in Washington, D.C., and you enter a world of wolves: large photographs of wolves on the walls, a wolf logo on glass conference room doors, and inside the office of Charles Orasin, senior vice president for operations, a wolf logo cup and a toy wolf pup.

Ask Orasin about the secret of Defenders' success, and he points to a message prominently displayed behind his desk: "It's the Wolf, Stupid."

Since Defenders began using the North American timber wolf as the focal point of its fund-raising efforts in the mid-1990s, the organization has not stopped growing. Every year has produced record revenue, more members—and more emotional, heart-wrenching letters.

"Dear Friend of Wildlife: It probably took them twelve hours to die. No one found the wolves in the remote, rugged lands of Idaho—until it was too late. For hours, they writhed in agony. They suffered convulsions, seizures and hallucinations. And then—they succumbed to cardiac and respiratory failure."

"People feel very strongly about these animals," said Orasin, architect of Defenders' growth. "In fact, our supporters view them as they would their children. A huge percentage own pets, and they transfer that emotional concern about their own animals to wild animals."

"We're very pleased," he said. "We think we have one of the most successful programs going right now in the country."

Defenders, though, is only the most recent environmental groups to find fund-raising fortune in the mail. Greenpeace did it two decades ago with a harp seal campaign now regarded as an environmental fundraising classic.

The solicitation featured a photo of a baby seal with a white furry face and dark eyes accompanied by a slogan: "Kiss This Baby Good-bye." Inside, the fund-raising letter included a photo of Norwegian sealers clubbing baby seals to death.

People opened their hearts—and their checkbooks.

"You have very little time to grab people's attention, said Jeffrey Gillenkirch, a veteran free-lance direct mail copywriter in San Francisco who has written for several national environmental groups, including Greenpeace. "It's like television: You front-load things into your first three paragraphs, the things that you're going to hook people with. You can call it dramatic. You can call it hyperbolic. But it works."

The Sierra Club put another advertising gimmick to work in the early 1980s. It found a high-profile enemy: U.S. Secretary of the Interior James Watt, whose pro-development agenda for public lands enraged many.

"When you direct-mailed into that environment, it was like highway robbery," said Bruce Hamilton, the club's conservation director. "You couldn't process the membership fast enough. We basically added 100,000 members."

But environmental fund raising has its downsides.

It tends to be addictive. The reason is simple: Many people who join environmental groups through the mail lose interest and don't renew—and must be replaced, year after year.

"Constant membership recruitment is essential just to stay even, never mind get bigger," wrote Christopher Bosso, a political

scientists at Northeastern University in Boston, in his paper: "The Color of Money: Environmental Groups and the Pathologies of Fund Raising."

"Dropout rates are high because most members are but passive check writers, with the low cost of participating and translating into an equally low sense of commitment," Bosso states. "Holding on to such members almost requires that groups maintain a constant sense of crisis. It does not take a cynic to suggest . . . that direct mailers shop for the next eco-crisis to keep the money coming in."

That is precisely how Gillenkirch, the copywriter, said the system works. As environmental direct mail took hold in the 1980s, "We discovered you could create programs by creating them in the mail," he said.

"Somebody would put up \$25,000 or \$30,000, and you would see whether sea otters would sell. You would see whether rain forests would sell. You would try marshlands, wetlands, all kinds of stuff. And if you got a response that would allow you to continue—a 1 or 2 percent response—you could create a new program."

Today, the trial-and-error process continues.

The Sierra Club, which scrambles to replace about 150,000 nonrenewing members a year out of 600,000, produces new fund-raising packages more frequently than General Motors produces new car models.

"We are constantly turning around and trying new themes," said Hamilton. "We say, 'OK, well, people like cuddly little animals, they like sequoias.' We try different premiums, where people can get the backpack versus the tote bag versus the calendar. We tried to raise money around the California desert—and found direct mail deserts don't work."

And though many are critical of such a crisis-of-the-month approach, Hamilton defended it—sort of.

"I'm somewhat offended by it myself, both intellectually and from an environmental standpoint," he said. "And yet . . . it is what works. It is what builds the Sierra Club. Unfortunately the fate of the Earth depends on whether people open that envelope and send in that check."

The vast majority of people don't. Internal Sierra Club documents show that as few as one out of every 100 membership solicitations results in a new member. The average contribution is \$18.

"The problem is there is a part of the giving public—about a third we think—who as a matter of personal choice gives to a new organization every year," said Sierra Club Executive Director Carl Pope. "We don't do this because we want to. We do it because the public behaves this way."

Fund-raising consultants "have us all hooked, and none of us can kick the habit," said Dave Foreman, a former Sierra Club board member. "Any group that gives up the direct mail treadmill is going to lose. I'm concerned about how it's done. It's a little shabby."

Another problem is more basic: accuracy. Much of what environmental groups say in fund-raising letters is exaggerated. And sometimes it is wrong.

Consider a recent mailer from the Natural Resources Defense Council, which calls itself "America's hardest-hitting environmental group." The letter, decrying a proposed solar salt evaporation plant at a remote Baja California lagoon where gray whales give birth, makes this statement:

"Giant diesel engines will pump six thousand gallons of water out of the lagoon EVERY SECOND, risking changes to the precious salinity that is so vital to newborn whales."

Clinton Winant, a professor at Scripps Institution of Oceanography who helped prepare an environmental assessment of the project, said the statement is false. "There is not a single iota of scientific evidence that suggest pumping would have any effect on gray whales or their babies," he said.

The mailer also says:

"A mile-long concrete pier will cut directly across the path of migrating whales—potentially impeding their progress."

Scripps professor Paul Dayton, one of the nation's most prominent marine ecologists, said that statement is wrong, too.

"I've dedicated my career to understanding nature, which is becoming more threatened," he said. "And I've been confronted with the dreadful dishonesty of the Rush Limbaugh crowd. It really hurts to have my side—the environmental side—become just as dishonest."

Former Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo halted the project last year. But as he did, he also criticized environmental groups. "With false arguments and distorted information, they have damaged the legitimate cause of genuine ecologists," Zedillo said at a Mexico City news conference.

A senior Defense Council attorney in Los Angeles, Joel Reynolds, said his organization does not distort the truth.

"We're effective because people believe in us," Reynolds said. "We're not about to sacrifice the credibility we've gained through direct mail which is intentionally inaccurate."

Reynolds said NRDC's position on the slat plant was influenced by a 1995 memo by Bruce Mate, a world-renowned whale specialist. Mate said, though, that his memo was a first draft, not grounded in scientific fact.

"This is a bit of an embarrassment," he said. "This was really one of the first bits of information about the project. It was not meant for public consumption. I was just kind of throwing stuff out there. It's out-of-date, terribly out-of-date."

There is plenty of chest-thumping pride in direct mail, too—some of it false pride. Consider this from a National Wildlife Federation letter: "We are constantly working in every part of the country to save those species and special places that are in all of our minds."

Yet in many places, the federation is seldom, if every, seen.

"In 15-plus years in conservation, in Northern California, Nevada, Idaho, Oregon and Washington, I have never met a (federation) person," said David Nolte, who recently resigned as a grass-roots organizer with the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Alliance—a coalition of hunters and fishermen.

"This is not about conservation," he said. "It's marketing."

Overstating achievements is chronic, according to Alfred Runte, an environmental historian and a board member of the National Parks Conservation Association from 1993 to 1997.

"Environmental groups all do this," he said. "They take credit for things that are generated by many, many people. What is a community accomplishment becomes an individual accomplishment—for the purposes of raising money."

As a board member, Runte finds something else distasteful about fund raising: its cost.

"Oftentimes, we said very cynically that for every dollar you put into fund raising, you only got back a dollar," he recalled. "Unless you hit a big donor, the bureaucracy was spending as much to generate money as it was getting back."

Some groups are far more efficient than others. The Nature Conservancy, for example, spends just 10 percent of donor contributions on fund raising, while the Sierra Club

spends 42 percent, according to the American Institute of Philanthropy.

Pope, the Sierra Club director, said it's not a fair comparison. The reason? Donations to the Conservancy and most other environmental groups are tax deductible—an important incentive for charitable giving. Contributions to the Sierra Club are not, because it is a political organization, too.

"We're not all charities in the same sense," Pope said. "Our average contribution is much, much smaller."

Determining how much environmental groups spend on fund raising is only slightly less complex than counting votes in Florida. The difficulty is a bookkeeping quagmire called "joint cost accounting."

At its simplest, joint cost accounting allows nonprofit groups to splinter fund-raising expenditures into categories that sound more pleasant to a donor's ear—public education and environmental action—shaving millions off what they report as fund raising.

Some groups use joint cost accounting. Others don't. Some groups put it to work liberally, others cautiously. Those who do apply it don't explain it. What one group labels education, another calls fund raising.

"You use the term joint allocation and most people's eyes glaze over," said Greenpeace's McPeake. The most sophisticated donor in the world "would not be able to penetrate this," she said.

Joint cost accounting need not be boring, however.

Look closely and you'll find sweepstakes solicitations, personal return address labels, free tote bag offers and other fund-raising novelties cross-dressing as conservation. You also find that those who monitor such activity are uneasy with it.

David Ormsteadt, an assistant attorney general in Connecticut, states in *Advancing Philanthropy*, a journal of the National Society of Fundraising Executives: "Instead of reporting fees and expenses as fund-raising costs, which could . . . discourage donations, charities may report these costs as having provided a public benefit. The more mailings made—and the more expense incurred—the more the 'benefit' to society."

The Wilderness Society, for example, determined in 1999 that 87 percent of the \$1.5 million it spent mailing 6.2 million membership solicitation letters wasn't fund raising but "public education." That shaved \$1.3 million off its fund-raising tab.

One of America's oldest and most venerable environmental groups, the Wilderness Society didn't just grab its 87 percent figure out of the air. It literally counted the number of lines in its letter and determined that 87 of every 100 were educational.

When you read in the society's letter that "Our staff is a tireless watchdog," that is education. So is the obvious fact that national forests "contain some of the most striking natural beauty on Earth." Even a legal boast—"If necessary, we will sue to enforce the law"—is education.

"We're just living within the rules. We're not trying to pull one over on anybody," said Wilderness Society spokesman Ben Beach.

Daniel Borochoff, president of the American Institute of Philanthropy, the charity watchdog, said it is acceptable to call 30 percent or less of fund-raiding expenses "education." But he deemed that the percentages claimed by the Wilderness Society, Defenders of Wildlife and others were unacceptable.

"These groups should not be allowed to get away with this," Borochoff said. "They are trying to make themselves look as good as they can without out-and-out lying. . . . This doesn't help donors. It helps the organization."

At Defenders of Wildlife, Orasin flatly disagreed. The American Institute of Philan-

thropy "is a peripheral group and we don't agree with their standards," he said. "We don't think they understand how a nonprofit can operate, much less grow."

Even the more mainstream National Charities Information Bureau, which recently merged with the Better Business Bureau's Philanthropic Advisory Service, rates Defenders' fund raising excessive.

"We strongly disagree with (the National Charities Information Bureau)," said Orasin. "They take a very subjective view of what fund raising is. We are educating the public. If you look at the letters that go out from us, they are chock-full of factual information."

But much of what Defenders labels education in its fund raising is not all that educational. Here are a few examples—provided to *The Bee* by Defenders from its recent "Tragedy in Yellowstone" membership solicitation letter:

Unless you and I help today, all of the wolf families in Yellowstone and central Idaho will likely be captured and killed.

It's up to you and me to stand up to the wealthy American Farm Bureau . . .

For the sake of the wolves . . . please take one minute right now to sign and return the enclosed petition.

The American Farm Bureau's reckless statements are nothing but pure bunk.

"That is basically pure fund raising," said Richard Larkin, a certified public accountant with the Lang Group in Bethesda, Md., who helped draft the standards for joint cost accounting. "That group is playing a little loose with the rules."

Defenders also shifts the cost of printing and mailing millions of personalized return address labels into a special "environmental activation" budget category.

Larkin takes a dim view.

"I've heard people try to make the case that by putting out these labels you are somehow educating the public about the importance of the environment," he said. "I would consider it virtually abusive."

Not all environmental groups use joint cost accounting. At the Nature Conservancy, every dollar spent on direct mail and telemarketing is counted as fund raising.

The same is true at the Sierra Club. "We want to be transparent with our members," said Pope, the club's director.

Groups that do use it, though, often do so differently.

The National Parks Conservation Association, for example, counts this line as fund raising: "We helped establish Everglades National Park in the 1940s." Defenders counts this one as education: "Since 1947, Defenders of Wildlife has worked to protect wolves, bears . . . and pristine habitat."

"It's a very subjective world," said Monique Valentine, vice president for finance and administration at the national parks association. "It would be much better if we would all work off the same sheet of music."

At the Washington, D.C.-based National Park Trust, which focuses on expanding the park system, even a sweepstakes solicitation passes for education, helping shrink fund-raising costs to 21 percent of expenses, according to its 1999 annual report.

Actual fund-raising costs range as high as 74 percent, according to the American Institute of Philanthropy, which gave the Trust an "F" in its "Charity Rating Guide & Watchdog Report." Borochoff, the Institute's president, called the Trust's reporting "outrageous."

"Dear Friend," says one sweepstakes solicitation, "The \$1,000,000 SUPER PRIZE winning number has already been pre-selected by computer and will absolutely be awarded. It would be a very, very BIG MISTAKE to

forfeit ONE MILLION DOLLARS to someone else."

Paul Pritchard, the Trust's president, said the group's financial reporting meets nonprofit standards. He defended sweepstakes fund raising.

"I personally find it a way of expressing freedom of speech," Pritchard said. "I can ethically justify it. How else are you going to get your message out?"

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the article goes on to say:

No allies of industry, they have become industries themselves, dependent upon a style of salesmanship that fills mailboxes across America with a never-ending stream of environmentally unfriendly junk mail, reduces the complex world of nature to simplistic slogans, emotional appeals and counterfeit crises, and employs arcane accounting rules to camouflage fundraising as conservation.

It goes on to say:

Six national environmental groups spent so much on fund-raising and overhead they don't have enough left to meet the minimum benchmark for environmental spending—60 percent of annual expenses—recommended by charity watchdog organizations. Eleven of the nation's 20 largest include fund-raising bills in their tally of money spent protecting the environment, but don't make that clear to members.

The direct mail costs that we have seen can go up to 74 percent of the total money received and is being reported to members as money spent to protect the environment. Are these the people the Senate ought to believe? They are the ones the people on the other side have been quoting all day. That is why we are raising it. They have been quoting them as the sources for the information they present to the Senate—all these things are going bad in Alaska, all these tragedies that have happened to Alaska. What they do not mention is the human tragedy that has happened to Alaska.

This article was printed on April 23, 2001. I hope Senators will read this and all other Sacramento Bee articles in this series. In fact, I think the Sacramento Bee ought to receive an award for them. They are enormous in terms of their reach.

The Sierra Club, for instance, one time said:

By this time tomorrow, nearly 100 species of wildlife will tumble into extinction.

They sent that to retired people and to working people who believe in protecting the environment. This says, as a matter of fact:

No one knows how rapidly species are going extinct. The Alliance's figure is an extreme estimate that counts tropical beetles and other insects—including ones not yet known to science—in its definition of wildlife.

And the Defenders of Wildlife are raising money.

This article says:

We will fight to stop reckless clear-cutting of the national forests in California and the Pacific Northwest that threatens to destroy the last of America's unprotected ancient forests in as little as 20 years.

As a matter of fact: Clear-cutting the forests has stopped. It is down 89 percent from 1990, and yet they wrote that letter after the timber cutting stopped.

Again, I urge Members of the Senate to read these articles written by the Sacramento Bee. It is high time someone started looking into them, and we will do that later.

Mr. President, I have another series of articles from the Sacramento Bee. This time it is called "Litigation Central."

It says the "flood of costly lawsuits raises questions about motive." I refer to this article of April 24, 2001.

It says, in part:

Suing the government has long been a favorite tactic of the environmental movement—used to score key victories for clean air, water and endangered species. But today, many court cases are yielding an uncertain bounty for the land and sowing doubt even among the faithful.

"We've filed our share of lawsuits, and I'm proud of a lot of them," said Dan Taylor, executive director of the California chapter of the National Audubon Society. "But I do think litigation is overused. In many cases, it's hard to identify what the strategic goal is, unless it is to significantly reshape society."

The suits are having a powerful impact on Federal agencies. They are forcing some government biologists to spend more time on legal chores than on conservation work. As a result, species in need of critical care are being ignored. And frustration and anger are on the rise.

It goes on:

During the 1990s, the government paid out \$31.6 million in attorney fees for 434 environmental cases brought against Federal agencies. The average award per case was more than \$70,000 [for attorneys fees alone]. One long-running lawsuit in Texas involving the endangered salamander netted lawyers for the Sierra Club and other plaintiffs more than \$3.5 million in taxpayer funds.

It is a growth industry, suing the Federal Government for an environmental cause, mythical or otherwise.

Lawyers for the industry and natural resource users get paid for winning environmental cases.

As a matter of fact, the environmental groups are not shy about asking for money. This is from this article:

They earn \$150 to \$350 an hour . . . In 1993, three judges on the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Washington were so appalled by one Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund lawyer's flagrant overbilling that they reduced her award to zero.

The lawyer had claimed too much money.

I see the Senator from Iowa is in the Chamber. Does he have a timeframe problem?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I would like to speak on ANWR for about 10 minutes if I could, or a little bit less.

Mr. STEVENS. I do not want to keep the Senator waiting. I have a lot more than that to speak. I ask unanimous consent that I be able to yield to the Senator from Iowa for 10 minutes without losing the floor.

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

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. First of all, I thank the Senator from Alaska for his kindness.

I have heard discussed in the Senate this area of Alaska being about 19 million acres, and I have heard that there was only going to be drilling in about 2,000 acres of that 19 million acres. Two thousand acres out of 19 million acres is not very many acres.

My State of Iowa is about 55,000 square miles, and that multiplies out to about 35 million acres. So 19 million acres would be a little bit more than half of my State of Iowa. I know how big the State of Iowa is. I do not want to claim that I know how big the State of Alaska is, but I know how big the State of Iowa is because I travel every year to all 99 counties to hold at least one meeting in each county.

I know how much 2,000 acres happens to be because that would be about 3 square miles in the neighborhood of my farm in Iowa. Take 3 square miles out of my State of Iowa and it is practically nothing. So I do not know what the big deal is about drilling on 2,000 acres in the State of Alaska or even in the State of Iowa. It would be equivalent to about a pinprick on a map of the State of Iowa. That is the way I see it.

I say to the Senator from Alaska, to me, this ends up almost as a no-brainer. From the facts we have heard, that this will supply enough oil for my State of Iowa for 126 years—I have also heard it would be equivalent to the amount of oil we would bring in from Saudi Arabia for 30 years. I think I have heard the figure of 55 years is the amount of oil that would come from Saddam Hussein. I have also heard my colleagues say we send \$4.5 billion a year to Iraq for oil.

If all of this is correct—I do not believe that it has been refuted. I have not heard all the debate. But it really comes down to whether or not we would like to get our energy from areas that we control in the United States, or we want to get oil from unstable governments around the world, and whether or not we ought to save that \$4 billion for America, spend it in America, or spend it with Saddam Hussein.

I also believe when we do drill in Alaska—and the Senator from Alaska does not have to respond to this unless I am wrong, but I believe when we drill in Alaska, there are very rigorous environmental rules that have to be followed.

We hear about the pristine areas of Alaska, and I do not dispute that, but do we not also have pristine areas in Siberia? I assume that whether it is Alaska or whether it is Siberia, there is going to be more oil added to the world pool of oil because it is going to be needed.

So would people in the United States rather have us drill under the strict environmental rules of the United States as they would apply in Alaska or would they rather have us let the Russians

drill in Siberia where I know there was oil floating out of pipelines for long periods of time—and I do not know whether it has ever been cleaned up—and where there would be little concern about the environment in Siberia where Russia would be drilling?

I would think people in America would rather have us drill under the strict guidelines of the environmental requirements of the United States than they would in a country that does not have such guidelines, particularly considering these are considered pristine environmental areas, whether it is in Alaska or whether it is anywhere in the Arctic area of the world. I think you would have to look at them the same way.

So I have come to the conclusion, I want to tell the Senator from Alaska, not just from listening to him but listening to other people and studying this, that I happen to think he is right on this issue. I think we have an opportunity not only on this issue but on a lot of parts of this legislation to pave the way for a balanced, long-term national energy strategy that will increase U.S. energy independence and limit the stranglehold foreign countries have on American consumers. A comprehensive energy strategy must strike a balance among development of conventional energy sources and alternative, renewable energy and conservation.

I think the President's approach of incentives for production, incentives for conservation, and incentives for alternative and renewable fuels is a very balanced energy program. It is a program that, No. 1, incentives for renewables take care of the short-term needs of the country, and in the case of the second and third points, conservation and renewables take care of the long-term energy needs of our country.

During the past few weeks, I have had an opportunity to express my strong support for renewable fuel provisions included in this bill which require a small percentage of our Nation's fuel supply to be provided by renewable fuels such as ethanol and biodiesel.

As a domestic renewable source of energy, ethanol and biodiesel can increase fuel supplies, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and increase our national economic security. But they can't do it alone, and it can't be done overnight. That is why we need short-term solutions and we need long-term solutions.

The Senate has had an opportunity to consider renewable portfolio standards, which I believe will go a long way to promote renewable energy resources for electrical generation. However, that is only part of a solution.

As ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, I have had an opportunity to work with Chairman BAUCUS to develop an energy-related tax amendment that includes provisions for development of renewable sources of energy such as wind and biomass and



incentives for energy-efficient appliances and homes. The tax package, however, unlike the underlying energy bill, recognizes that a balanced energy plan can't overlook the production of traditional energy sources such as oil and gas.

Developing domestic oil resources is vital to our national security. The United States is dependent upon foreign countries for over 58 percent of our oil needs. We are currently dependent upon Saddam Hussein, which I already referred to but, more specifically, for about 750,000 barrels of oil a day or 9 percent of our U.S. oil imports.

Last week, as we have been reminded during this debate, Iraq stopped its exports of 2.5 million barrels a day in response to developments in the Middle East, further driving up crude oil prices. It is important that Americans know that last year alone, we spent \$4.5 billion of our money to pay for Saddam Hussein's oil, thereby providing funding to help Iraq with its war machine.

The United States has the resources on our land that could reduce or eliminate the stranglehold Saddam Hussein has on our economy. By developing our resources in Alaska, we could produce 10 billion barrels of oil and perhaps as much as 16 billion barrels of oil. This amount could replace the oil I have referenced from Saudi Arabia or the oil from Iraq for a long period of time. So for the sake of our national security, we ought to be developing our own natural resources at home.

Opponents have made claims that opening ANWR to oil development would do tremendous environmental harm. But, again, I repeat for my colleagues, 2,000 acres out of 19 million acres is a no-brainer. Only the best environmental technology will be used for exploration and development, leaving the smallest possible footprint.

Opponents have also argued that oil development in ANWR will hurt wildlife. Remember the warnings from environmental groups about the danger to the caribou if we developed Prudhoe Bay? They were wrong. Since the development, we have had increases in herd size. I ask my colleagues, what is better for the environment: Developing resources in the United States, using the toughest environmental standards ever imposed, or importing foreign oil produced without much consideration for the environment?

We must do more to develop in an environmentally sensitive way the resources God has given us in stewardship. I hope my colleagues will join with me to support this approach to opening Alaska and ensuring that the bill before the Senate does more to protect our national security and to reduce our dependence upon foreign oil.

I thank my colleague from Alaska. I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, last night at the Library of Congress I ran across this ad. I was going to talk

about it later, but I wanted the Senator to see this. This is an ad on one of the displays in the Library of Congress. Millions of acres in Iowa and Nebraska were put up for sale by the Burlington and Missouri River Railroad Company.

I will develop later that the West was opened, really, because President Lincoln offered \$1 million and every odd section of the right-of-way for the first railroad to link the east and west coasts of the United States. We don't think in terms of that now. Once those railroad companies got a hold of the land, they put it up for sale. They put it up for sale at \$2.50 an acre and let people have 10 years' credit to pay for it. That is what stimulated the development of the West. That is what stimulated the expansion of the United States.

What have they done in my State, one-fifth of the land mass in the United States? They have blocked us at every turn, withdrew lands with economic potential, blocked us from using our own lands that had economic potential, closed our mines, closed our pulp mills, closed our timber mills, canceled the permits of the wildcat well drillers for oil and gas. We have lost the American dream of private ownership of lands in Alaska.

I thought the Senator might be interested in that. It is a very interesting exhibit at the Library of Congress. It includes some of the artifacts of the history of our great country, including the great move to make land available to those people who developed the transportation system. Talk about blending. Here is the transportation system of the United States, the first railroad to go from east to west across the United States. Persons who built that obtained every odd section along the right-of-way of the railroad, and from that came the expansion to the west.

People complain about my suggestion that we join together oil development in the Arctic Plain and the future of the great steel industry of the United States.

I am pleased to have received this letter addressed to me:

We write as members of the House with a strong interest in the steel industry to convey our strong support of your efforts to resolve the legacy cost burden of the domestic steel industry, and especially your efforts to assist the steel industry's retirees and their dependents.

As you know, the domestic steel industry has significant unfunded pension liabilities as well as massive retiree health care responsibilities that total \$13 billion and cost the steel industry almost \$1 billion annually. These pension and health care liabilities pose a significant barrier to steel industry consolidation and rationalization that could improve the financial condition of the industry and reduce the adverse impact of unfairly traded foreign imports.

It has come to our attention that a unique opportunity has arisen in the Senate to remove this barrier to rationalization while assisting the retirees, surviving spouses, and dependents of the domestic steel industry. It is our understanding that you have offered

an amendment to the energy bill this week which will break the impasse on the legacy problem.

Once again, we would like to extend our wholehearted support to you in this endeavor. We look forward to working with you to find a viable solution to bring a sense of security to the over 600,000 retirees, surviving spouses, and dependents before the end of the 107th Congress.

I ask that that letter be put on every desk. It is a bipartisan letter signed by an equal number of Democratic Members and House Members in the House of Representatives.

I go back to the comments about the Sacramento Bee articles. On August 19, the article by Thomas Knudson, titled "Old Allies Now Foes in Alaska's Oil Battle":

Environmentalists come under fire for their impassioned efforts to bar drilling in a wildlife refuge.

It details the problems. For instance, JIM CLYBURN of South Carolina, who voted for oil drilling in Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, is chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus and sided with the Bush administration. This article points out that in the House the pro-drilling side won 223 to 206. The Senate is expected to take up the matter this fall.

The [environmental] rhetoric has been an insult to us, CLYBURN told an energy trade journal. A lot of us don't feel obliged to be purists on this issue.

How many times can you cry wolf and have your audience still believe in you? said Mark Buckley, a commercial fisherman and member of the National Audubon Society in Kodiak, Alaska, who opposes Audubon's anti-drilling stance.

This article goes on to point out, in terms of environmental groups' advocacy against this, advocacy mail-in campaigns on roadless areas, national forests, and genetically modified crops. At least eight major groups are circulating letters on the single topic of the Arctic Refuge drilling.

It is a very meaningful article about the way these environmental groups really single out those who support drilling in the Arctic Plain. It is, one of the balanced articles that deals with the question of this drilling.

As the Senator from Iowa said, 2,000 acres out of 1.5 million acres is not very much. It is 3 square miles.

Here is a nice one: Yours Free When You Contribute \$10 Or More . . . our polar bear tote bag.

It's the perfect way to show you're working to Keep the Arctic Wild and Free.

If you complete the enclosed reply form and return it with your membership gift of \$10 or more, you get a little tote bag. It says: Keep The Arctic Wild & Free.

It is available only to NRDC members, but it is a concept of what we are looking at. For that membership, you can join the club. They do not tell you that 75 percent of their money is not spent for conservation.

The next article I want to talk about was published on November 11 of last

year. It talks about the people who live on the slope, on the North Slope. It says:

Like detectives, the two Inupiat Eskimos gathered all the information they could about the Alaska Wilderness League, a relatively new arrival to the environmental community far away in Washington, D.C.

From Bloomberg News, the St. Paul Pioneer Press and other sources, Tara Sweeney and Fenton Rexford read about a group that was passionate, self-assured and actively working to halt oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge with a blend of environmental activism—such as street theater and letters to the editor—and lobbying politicians.

But when they examined the league's federal tax return, they discovered a group that portrayed itself in a different manner: as a tax-exempt charity focusing on science and education.

"The Alaska Wilderness league sponsored two educational trips to the Arctic refuge . . ." its tax form says. "The Alaska Wilderness League supported the 'Last Great Wilderness' slide show, seen by thousands of people to educate them" about the refuge.

Rexford, a leader of the Eskimo village of Kaktovik—the only permanent human settlement on the refuge—was astonished.

"What they do and what they tell the IRS they do are two different things," said Rexford, who favors oil drilling. Last month, he made his views known to the IRS itself, filing a complaint in which he and other village leaders allege the League is violating tax law by "devoting substantially all of its resources" to lobbying.

In filing the complaint, Rexford did more than challenge the Alaska Wilderness League. He also struck at a vital support system for environmental groups: their 501(c)(3) tax status. [We are going to go after that too, Mr. President.] That status saves nonprofits millions in corporate and other taxes, makes them eligible for foundation funding and allows contributors to deduct donations from their own income taxes.

Rexford and Sweeney said they got the idea from IRS audits of the Heritage Foundation and other conservative nonprofits during the Clinton administration. In June, they watched with interest as the Frontiers of Freedom Institute, a pro-business think tank, filed an IRS complaint against Rain Forest Action Network, a tax-exempt group that scales skyscrapers to protest logging.

The League's executive director responded angrily to the Inupiat attack.

"The Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation either has been misinformed by its friends in the oil industry about the law or it has deliberately distorted the facts in a cynical attempt to intimidate America's conservation groups," said director Cindy Shogan.

"We have a right to represent the interest of our members . . . so long as our legislative advocacy activities stay within specified IRS limits," Shogan said. "We fully comply with all IRS laws."

But Rexford—who hunts whales, seals and caribou for subsistence—said it is Shogan who is misinformed. He said the Inupiat corporation "has not solicited information from the oil industry, nor will we. It is apparent that the AWL simply cannot fathom that a native-owned organization has enough intelligence and talent to think independently and . . . file a complaint of this nature."

Most environmental groups are 501(c)(3)'s, which means they can receive tax-deductible contributions but can spend only a small portion on lobbying. The spending limit varies. But in many cases, it ranges from 12.5 percent to 20 percent—and cannot exceed \$1 million.

A handful of others, such as the Sierra Club and Greenpeace, are 501(c)(4)'s, which means their contributions are not tax-deductible but they can spend what they want on lobbying. Based on its federal tax return for 2000, the Alaska Wilderness League does not run afoul of spending limits on lobbying. On that return, the League reported spending \$81,283 to influence legislation, well under its legally allowable limit of \$130,623.

The essence of the Inupiat's complaint is that the League spends most of its money on lobbying but disguises it as education and science. As evidence, they cite League letter-writing and phone campaigns targeting federal lawmakers in several states, testimony before Congress and League-sponsored "junks" for members of congress to the Arctic refuge.

Another one of these articles on December 9 said:

Log onto the Web sites of the National Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society and other environmental groups and you learn that the struggle to save the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska from oil drilling is about more than protecting the environment.

"It is also a human rights issue since the indigenous Gwich'in Indians rely on this important area for their subsistence way of life," say the Wilderness Society's Web site: [www.wilderness.org](http://www.wilderness.org).

But this fall, Petroleum News Alaska—a trade journal—reported a story that environmental groups have not publicized: Over the border in Canada, the Gwich'in Tribal council joined forces with an oil firm to tap into energy resources on their lands.

This very same tribe that is paraded around as being the spokesman for Alaska Native people, they drilled on their lands in Canada for oil and gas. They formed a partnership.

"It's time for us to build an economic base," said Fred Carmichael, president of the tribal council in Inuvik, Canada. That is the Gwich'in tribal council.

Two Senators said they talked to the Alaska Native people who opposed it and said they just assumed all Alaska Natives opposed it. It is not true at all.

The Eskimos have an opposite point of view, this article says.

They say drilling can be carried out in concert with the caribou. But their position is discounted by environmental groups because the Inupiat have extensive ties with oil companies through their own tribal business: the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation.

"The national debate has placed us as caricatures—us, as the tools of the oil industry, and them—the Gwich'in—as caretakers of the environment," said Richard Glenn, vice president, lands, for the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation. "It's unfortunate. And it's not accurate."

I believe these articles ought to be written by those people who are visited by the Gwich'in.

It says:

But in Alaska, most Alaska natives actually support drilling. In 1955, the Alaska Federation of Natives, which represents 400 of the village corporations and is the state's largest native organization, passed a resolution in favor of tapping the refuge's energy resources.

It says simply:

"Environmental groups are using the Gwich'in to advance their own agenda. That's as simple as I can put it," Tetpon said.

That is John Tetpon, the federation's director of communications.

I hope Senators will read some of these things that have been written about these people who are bringing these stories about what is going on in our State. It is a very difficult problem.

I particularly call the attention of the Senate to the article on April 24 of last year because it points out that litigation central, these lawsuits, are not only costing the defendants a lot of money, they are costing the Federal Government a lot of money and they are taking a lot of people who should be working on the environment into courtroom after courtroom after courtroom to defend against these lawsuits that are brought. For what? In order to get the attorney's fees paid by the winning side in the environmental litigation. In some instances, they do not have to win.

These environmental groups are currently raising \$9.5 million a day, \$3.5 billion a year, and you can see where it is going by our charts. It is not going to improve the conservation, it is going to pay salaries—it is going to pay very large salaries—and it is going to make mailings to raise more money.

I commend the entire series of Sacramento Bee articles to Senators for further reading from April 22, 2001 through April 5, 2001. Further investigative articles were printed on November 11, 2001, December 9 and December 18, 2001. They are excellent articles and they expose what is really happening in the environmental movement in America today.

I don't know how to say it other than to say I am appalled that so many people in the Senate rely on them as presenting facts. They do not present facts. They present positions and look for arguments to support them.

I think it is time that we tried to get back to the concept of reliance upon the people from the State. I said that before. If the Senate would listen to the two Senators from Alaska concerning what is going on in Alaska, the country would be better off, and so would Alaska. We live there.

Most of the people who criticize us have never been there and won't go there. Particularly, they won't go there in the wintertime.

I told the Senate yesterday that when I took my great friend, the late Postmaster General, up there one time, we pulled up to the postal substation at Prudhoe Bay. The digital thermometer showed minus 99. There was a wind chill factor. I didn't have the courage to tell him it wouldn't go below 100. That was as far down as it would go. It was digital. The wind chill and the temperature had a factor greater than minus 100 degrees.

How many people want to go up there and go around up there? The old people

live there. The Eskimos live there year-round in that climate. We have learned how to exist and how to care for ourselves in our environment. I have not really been in that too long myself, frankly. I am not that acclimated to it.

I think the real problem is that no one here understands that we don't drill in the Arctic in the summertime. It is not a summertime operation. You can't get vehicles across the tundra. We wouldn't want to do it. It would leave scars. We don't leave scars. They did in times gone by, but everybody learned from the mistakes of the past. We wait until it is frozen. We take water in, spray water, create an ice road, gravel the top of that, and put more water on top of that to make a compact ice road. We use it until the springtime when it starts to break up, and they don't bring things across that road anymore. As a matter of fact, most in the State don't use gravel. They only place gravel is used is where they have to have some traction going up the hills. There are not many hills, by the way.

I want to go back again to this problem of steel. I want to first take the occasion to thank the great labor leaders of this country who took time to join us yesterday in a press conference across from the doors of the Senate.

We had Terry O'Sullivan of the Laborers; Mr. Sullivan of the Building Trades Department; Marty Malonie of the Pipefitters; Frank Handy of the Operating Engineers; Joe Hunt of the Iron Workers; Terry Turner of the Seafarers; Mike Sacco, President of the Seafarers; Mano Frey, President of the Alaska AFL-CIO; Jerry Hood, President of the Alaska Teamsters and special assistant to President James Hoffa of the National Teamsters Union.

They came to speak to the members of their unions through the press to urge them to contact their Senators and ask them to support the drilling in the Arctic Plain. They know it means jobs.

I just heard the Senator from Massachusetts say that at most it is only 1 percent of the world's reserves—only 1 percent. These are the same people who not 6 months ago were saying ANWR could only produce oil that would sustain the United States for 6 months. The projection they have on this is the projected estimated reserve. The projected reserve in Prudhoe Bay was 1 billion barrels. We have already produced 13 billion barrels, and we believe there is another 15 years there—about a third more. We will have produced 20 billion barrels when the estimate was reported that the world's reserves were 1 billion barrels. So much for reserves.

The real issue is jobs. That is why these labor leaders were with us—jobs. They know we are talking about jobs. When we send our money to Saddam Hussein to buy oil from Iraq, we don't involve American jobs. We have to find some way to sell something abroad to bring those dollars back or we have an

imbalance of trade. We have had that for a long time. It harms our economy and currency. But we are exporting jobs as we import oil.

That is why they were there. They were there in order to get us to understand that they want to help us deal with the creation of jobs that would come from pursuing the oil and gas potential of that area.

They were great friends of Scoop Jackson. They understood, as he understood, the Arctic from the point of view of jobs. Jackson did not oppose drilling in the Arctic. As a matter of fact, he and Senator Tsongas made it possible for us to be here today arguing to proceed as was intended in 1980.

We have added to this the idea of the pending second-degree amendment—the amendment I offered which the Senator from Minnesota said is a sham amendment. Raising the visibility of the needs of the steelworkers and the coal workers is not a sham amendment. You may not agree with it, but it is offensive to call it a sham amendment. It is only sham because they won't support it. If they supported it, it would be very valid, even from their point of view.

The question is, Can we find a way to reverse the trend that prevents the building of the pipeline necessary to bring the already discovered and measured gas from Prudhoe Bay to the Midwest? We know it is there—50 to 70 trillion cubic feet. I don't have the exact figures because it was reinjected into the ground. It was estimated to be 50 to 70 trillion cubic feet of gas produced from the oil since 1968. The gas has been reinjected into the ground. We need a 3,000-mile pipeline.

We are trying to find some way to ask people to address the question of how to maintain a steel industry that can support a pipeline of that size—1,500 miles of gathering pipelines, thousands of valves, hundreds of trucks, hundreds of backhoes, and hundreds of pieces of road-building equipment to build access to these areas. It is enormous. It is the largest gas delivering plan in the world. It is projected to be the largest private enterprise project in the history of man—totally financed by private enterprise. But if private enterprise doesn't survive in the steel industry, we are not going to have that pipeline in the timeframe that we need it. If we started it in 2003, the first gas would be coming through in about 2010 or 2011. Knowing that the environmental opposition will sue, that will add 6 years to that. We are talking about between 2015 and 2020 making that gas available to the U.S.

That is why I brought that poster here, to ask people to think ahead. Lincoln, one of our greatest Presidents, thought about how to connect the east coast and the west coast of the United States. He conceived the idea himself to offer a bounty incentive to the railroad industry to build the railroad from the east coast to the west coast. He got Congress to approve it, and they

paid for it. One million dollars was to be paid to the first railroad that completed a coast-to-coast railroad. Every section along the right-of-way was loaned by the Federal Government.

The problem of the country today is the people living in these States don't know the policies that led to their private enterprise as compared to the policies that led to our serfdom under the Federal Government.

We thought when we became a State that we had a right—and we did have a right—to 103.5 million acres to be selected from vacant, unappropriated and unreserved Federal land. To us, that meant as of the day we became a State in January of 1959.

To the people in the Congress, in 1980, it meant those lands that were left after they had reserved 104 million acres for special purposes for these elite areas. You can't get to them. As I said before, only three of them can be reached by road. Most of them don't have an airport. You fly in by float plane, or you hike in. They are recreational areas for the elite few of the world.

But, in any event, they withdrew them, preventing the State from getting lands it was going to select, preventing the Natives from getting the lands they were going to select from the Alaska Native Lands settlement.

People ask: Why were people disturbed? That 1980 act took away from the 365-million-acre pool of lands that were available to be selected for the State and Native settlements, and reserved them—directly contrary to the historical policy of the United States to make Federal lands available for sustaining the private enterprise economy.

By what these people are doing now, we are going to be a dependent colony of the United States. We are going to be dependent upon having someone, in a position such as mine, who can add to the budget the moneys that are necessary for survival in Alaska.

The real problem about this is that, when you look at the basic law, it is July 1, 1862, that led to that. It led to that. Following that, in 1984, the Federal Government issued a table of grants to States. I want to put this in the RECORD because it shows what every single State has received. There is no question that, as the Nation moved West, the policies of the United States were to enhance the development of the private sector, as I have said before.

We end up with a situation, where as of 1983, 3 years after that act was passed, the Federal Government still owned 87.9 percent of Alaska. The part that we own is subject to control through acts such as the 1980 act. So it really does not matter. I think that the development of these lands, and the use of Federal lands, is a question we ought to explore sometime in the future.

But for now I would like to put in the RECORD the table that shows the grants to the States, from 1803 to 1984, showing what happened in the other 49

States—48 States. Hawaii had the same problem. Hawaii really was not treated properly in terms of their lands. Mr.

President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 4.—GRANTS TO STATES, 1803-FISCAL YEAR 1984

(Amounts in acres)

State	Purpose									
	Common schools	Other schools	Other institutions	Railroads	Wagon roads	Canals and rivers	Miscellaneous improvements (not specified)	Swamp reclamation	Other purposes	Total
Alabama	911,627	383,785	181	2,747,479		400,016	97,469	441,666	24,660	5,006,883
Alaska	106,000	112,064	1,000,000						103,351,187	104,569,251
Arizona	8,093,156	849,197	500,000						1,101,400	10,543,753
Arkansas	933,778	196,080		2,563,721			500,000	7,686,575	56,680	11,936,834
California	5,534,293	196,080		320			500,000	2,194,196	400,768	8,825,657
Colorado	3,685,618	138,040	32,000				500,000		115,946	4,471,604
Connecticut		180,000								180,000
Delaware		90,000								90,000
Florida	975,307	182,160		2,218,705			500,000	20,333,430	5,120	24,214,722
Georgia		270,000								270,000
Idaho	2,963,698	386,686	250,000						654,064	4,254,448
Illinois	996,320	526,080		2,595,133		324,283	209,086	1,460,164	123,589	6,234,655
Indiana	668,578	436,080			170,580	1,480,409		1,259,271	25,600	4,040,518
Iowa	1,000,679	286,080		4,706,945		321,342	500,000	1,196,392	49,824	8,061,262
Kansas	2,907,520	151,270	127	4,176,329			500,000		59,423	7,794,669
Kentucky		330,000	24,607							354,607
Louisiana	807,271	256,292		373,057			500,000	9,505,335		11,441,955
Maine		210,000								210,000
Maryland		210,000								210,000
Massachusetts		360,000								360,000
Michigan	1,021,867	286,080		3,134,058	221,013	1,250,236	500,000	5,680,312	49,280	12,142,846
Minnesota	2,874,951	212,160		8,047,469			500,000	4,706,591	80,880	16,422,051
Mississippi	824,213	348,240		1,075,345			500,000	3,348,946	1,253	6,097,997
Missouri	1,221,813	376,080		1,837,968			500,000	3,432,561	48,640	7,417,062
Montana	5,198,258	388,721	100,000						276,359	5,963,338
Nebraska	2,730,951	136,080	32,000				500,000		59,680	3,458,711
Nevada	2,061,967	136,080	12,800				500,000		14,379	2,275,226
New Hampshire		150,000								150,000
New Jersey		210,000								210,000
New Mexico	8,711,324	1,346,546	750,000			100,000			1,886,848	12,794,718
New York		990,000								990,000
North Carolina		270,000								270,000
North Dakota	2,495,396	336,080	250,000						82,076	3,163,552
Ohio	724,266	699,120			80,774	1,204,114		26,372	24,216	2,758,862
Oklahoma	1,375,000	1,050,000	670,000							3,095,760
Oregon	3,399,360	136,165			2,583,890		500,000	286,108	127,324	7,032,847
Pennsylvania		780,000								780,000
Rhode Island		120,000								120,000
South Carolina		180,000								180,000
South Dakota	2,733,084	366,080	250,640						85,569	3,435,373
Tennessee		300,000								300,000
Texas		180,000								180,000
Utah	5,844,196	556,141	500,160						601,240	7,501,737
Vermont		150,000								150,000
Virginia		300,000								300,000
Washington	2,376,391	336,080	200,000						132,000	3,044,471
West Virginia		150,000								150,000
Wisconsin	982,329	332,160		3,652,322	302,931	1,022,349	500,000	3,361,283	26,430	10,179,804
Wyoming	3,470,009	136,800	420,000						316,431	4,342,520
Total	77,629,220	16,707,787	4,993,275	37,128,851	3,359,188	6,102,749	7,806,555	64,919,202	109,780,866	328,427,693

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we are in a situation where one provision of our bill—it is in our amendment and in Senator MURKOWSKI's underlying amendment—grants the Kaktovik village the right to drill on their land. They have land that is owned by their Native village. It was part of the 1971 settlement. Their people settled their claims against the United States by accepting conveyance of lands that were due to them. Each village was given the township in which it was located and further lands depending on population.

But for this village only, in the State of Alaska, there is a Federal law in another provision of basic law that says they cannot drill on their land, I believe it says, until the 1002 area is authorized to be drilled by the Federal Government. In the old days we would have said that shows the forked tongue of the Federal Government.

It told them they had a settlement. It told them they got the right to their lands. It gave them fee title to the surface. It gave the subsurface to their regional organization. But they cannot use it. Why? Because of the policy with regard to the 1002 area. But even there,

it was, again, an imposition on the private structure of our State.

I think the great problem I have here is what is going to happen now to the steel industry. I have raised the issue, and, apparently, I may have done more harm than good, according to some people, at least if you listen to the Democratic Senators; that is what they are saying. I don't know what good they are doing for them.

I challenge the Democratic Senators to come up with a proposal to find a funding stream to save the rights of the steelworkers and the coal workers and be within the budget and not subject to points of order and the possibility of being passed. With their help, this would pass. With their opposition, it is not going to pass. I know that.

But what happens to the steelworkers? What happens to the future of our gas pipeline if there is no steel industry in the United States? You can't even plan ahead. You can't order ahead. I said yesterday, you have to order ahead a piece of that big 52-inch diameter, one-inch-thick pipe, and test it to see if this new concept of a chemically treated pipe will withstand the pressures it has to withstand in order

to have gas pumped 3,000 miles to the market.

That is not going to exist. The assets of the steel industry are going to be burdened by the claims of the working people who have retired and who will be put out of work between now and 2004. And it makes no sense. It makes no sense that there are over 600,000 who are out of their health care. And the Democratic leadership is promising a vote on steel legacy costs with no source of money. Where is the money? Where are the bucks? Where are the dollars? They have a solution, but no one has mentioned from where the money is going to come. Where can they find a cash stream that will come in from a new source, replacing the money we send out to Saddam Hussein? We would take that money and use a portion of the moneys that come to the Federal Government from that activity in the Alaska Coastal Plain and solve the problem of the steel industry and the steelworkers and let them proceed to reorganize the steel industry of the United States.

Two weeks ago, I am told, 82,000 retirees of LTV Steel lost their health care benefits. Another 100,000 are coming. Bethlehem Steel and U.S. Steel—

chapter 11—could go in chapter 7 bankruptcy. No other steel company, other than Bethlehem Steel, could have rolled the steel to repair the U.S.S. *Cole* after it was attacked by terrorists. It is in bankruptcy facing extinction. And I am criticized for trying to find some way to solve the problem that might lead them further down that road to extinction.

I am happy to tell the Senator from those States that I will vote for any plan they can come up with which is funded and within the budget and does not raise taxes that will solve the problems of their retirees. I challenge them to come up with that program. They have criticized my suggestion, a legitimate, bona fide attempt to meld two basic issues that should be before this Senate. We used to call that win-win. It is lose-lose now. We lose; the steelworkers, the coal workers lose, too.

They are not voting one way or the other in my State. I have coal workers, but there is no steel in my State. I am not involved in that. It is not a political issue, as far as I am concerned.

I have not told very many people, but I worked in a steel mill once. I spent 8, 9 hours a day lifting pieces of rolled steel off the belt. Others were lifting the other side. I had one side I was lifting—8½ hours a day. That was just before I entered the military to become an Army Air Corps cadet. But I have had a lot of jobs. I have had union cards, and I am proud of it.

It offends me greatly that some of these people, some of these people who never did a day's work in their life—they never dug a ditch; they never lifted steel; they never lifted concrete bags; they really never did any real manual work—don't know laborers. They appeal to them politically, but they don't know them.

The laboring people want a check. They want a job. They do not want a bunch of BS from the people who represent them. They want their benefits to be secured. They depend upon their Government to see it is done.

I do not think they are offended at me for suggesting this. I have not had one call from any steelworker or coal worker saying: Hey, guy, what are you doing messing up our future? No way. The people are accusing me of being crass. And opportunists are afraid of their own future, these Senators who won't face up to representing their people. I am tired of being accused of doing something wrong by trying to help them.

This is the testimony of a Leo Gerard of the U.S. Steelworkers. He opposes this amendment because of his commitments in the past, but he gives the story of what happened to the health care and pension benefits of the great steel industry. It is quite a story. He points out that there are subsidies in other countries for these. We subsidize agriculture. We subsidize so many things through entitlements.

We don't face up to the problem of what we do about retirees who lose

their benefits because of the failure of the economic system. I don't think it is wrong to think about how to use new revenues that come to the Federal Government by virtue of legitimate Federal action and seeking development on Federal lands, how we can use those revenues to meet this crisis as outlined by Mr. Gerard.

I will not include this testimony because he agrees with me. He doesn't agree with me, but he does point out the plight of these people he represents. Many of them are retirees who—how can I say this gracefully—are approaching my age. They are at the point where they are going to need help by the Federal Government one way or the other.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print the testimony of Mr. Gerard in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. STEVENS. I say to you in closing—I won't be talking on this amendment again, I don't think—the Senators who represent coal and steelworkers have made their own choice. The environmental movement is more important to them than the unemployed workers and retirees who lose their benefits in their States. That is the fact. They don't like it, but that is the fact.

I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

TESTIMONY OF LEO W. GERARD, PRESIDENT UNITED STEEL WORKERS OF AMERICA BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR & PENSIONS, MARCH 14, 2002

Madam Chair and distinguished members of the Committee, thank you for your invitation to appear before you today to discuss the health care and pension crisis facing several hundred thousand steelworkers across the nation.

By every measure, the American steel industry is in crisis. As of today, 32 U.S. steel companies representing nearly 30 percent of U.S. steelmaking capacity have filed for bankruptcy. Twenty-one steelmaking plants are idled or shutdown representing the loss of 25 million tons or 19 percent of this nation's steelmaking capacity.

Some analysts mistakenly believe that minimills (which produce steel by melting scrap in electric arc furnaces) haven't been hurt by unfair trade and record low prices, it is noteworthy that fifteen of these 21 shutdowns are minimills. In fact, shut down steel capacity is almost evenly divided between integrated steelmakers and minimills.

Steel prices have fallen to the lowest levels in twenty years. The December, 2001 composite average of steel prices published by Purchasing Magazine had declined by \$140 per ton or 33 percent from the average between 1994 and 1997. The industry posted a combined operating loss of \$1.3 billion during the first nine months of 2001.

How did this happen?

The USWA warned our policymakers as early as 1997 that the Asian economic crisis and the collapse of the Russian economy would, if not dealt with correctly, lead to a flood of imported steel. The delay by our own government in responding to the crisis made

matters considerably worse. The events of 1997 and 1998 were only the latest in what the U.S. Department of Commerce has identified as thirty years of predatory unfair trading practices and government subsidies by many of our trading partners.

Some today suggest that the American steel industry must be restructured, as if this had not already happened before. Between 1980 and 1987, the American steel industry underwent a painful restructuring, eliminating 42 million tons of steelmaking capacity. Over 270,000 jobs were eliminated. Many workers were forced to take early retirement based on the promise of a pension and continued health care benefits. The tax base in steel communities in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, West Virginia, Minnesota, and elsewhere shrank as workers went from earning paychecks to collecting unemployment benefits. Some local communities have never recovered from the last steel crisis.

Yes at the same time that our American steel industry has been contracting and downsizing our foreign competitors have been adding additional steelmaking capacity. OECD data indicates that foreign steel producers had excess raw steel production capacity amounting to over 270 million metric tons. That is more than twice the total annual steel consumption in the United States. Recent multilateral talks in Paris on reducing global overcapacity have revealed that despite the reductions in U.S. capacity, our trading partners fully expect the U.S. steel industry to continue to downsize even further. The Paris talks are instructive for they illustrate yet again that multilateral negotiations are no substitute for strong enforcement of our own trade laws, including Section 201 and our anti-dumping laws.

The testimony which you have heard today from steelworkers and retirees from Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota illustrates the depth of concern across the nation by our active members and retirees. They have worked hard and given the best years of their lives to this industry. Now, they are simply asking that promises made become promises kept.

At the end of 1999, American steel's retiree health care benefit obligation totaled an estimated \$13 billion. Health care benefits for 600,000 retired steelworkers, surviving spouses, and dependents annually cost domestic steel producers an estimated \$965 million or \$9 per ton of steel shipped. Another 700,000 active steelworkers and their dependents rely upon the domestic steel industry for health care benefits. The average steel company has approximately 3 retirees for every active employee—nearly triple the ratio for most other major basic manufacturing companies. Several steel companies have retiree health care costs that are substantially higher than the industry average. Our active members and retirees are concentrated most heavily in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Maryland, Illinois, West Virginia, Minnesota, and Michigan, but they live all across the nation.

In the U.S. up to now, we have made a public policy choice in favor of employment-based health insurance coverage rather than guaranteed national health insurance. This means that when an employer goes bankrupt or liquidates its operations, absent a social safety net, workers are at risk of losing their health insurance and access to health care services. Regrettably, thousands of steelworkers from Acme, Laclede, Gulf States, CSC, Northwestern Steel and Wire, and various other steel companies are now facing this terrible prospect.

The USWA is very proud of its record in negotiating decent health care coverage for both its active workers and its retirees. In 1993, our union made history when we negotiated pre-funding of retiree health care in

the iron ore industry. Benefits provided to steel industry retirees are equivalent and, in some cases, more modest, than benefits provided to retirees from other basic manufacturing companies, such as Alcoa, Boeing, and General Motors.

These plans typically include cost containment provisions, such as deductibles, co-payments, pre-certification requirements, coordination with Medicare, and incentives to utilize managed care. Most of our retirees pay monthly premiums from 25 to 40 percent of their retiree health care benefit, plus several hundred dollars a year in deductibles and co-payments. Retiree premiums from major medical coverage vary by employer due to differences in demographics, regional health care costs, utilization, and design of the plan. The USWA estimates that the average major medical premium during 2001 was approximately \$200 per month for a non-Medicare eligible couple and \$150 a month for a Medicare-eligible couple.

American steel's international competitors do not bear a similar burden. In one form or another, foreign producers' retiree health care costs are offset by government subsidies.

In Japan, the government provides government-backed insurance programs. Government subsidies cover some administrative costs and contributions to Japan's health care programs for the elderly.

In the United Kingdom, the UK's National Health Service is 85 to 95 percent funded from general taxation with the remainder coming from employer and employee contributions.

In Germany, health care is financed through a combination of payroll taxes, local, state, and federal taxes, co-payments, and out-of-pocket expenses, along with private insurance. Insurance funds with heavy loads of retired members received governmental subsidies.

In Russia, de facto government subsidies exist. While Russian steel companies theoretically pay for workers' health care, the national and local governments allow companies not to pay their bills—including taxes and even wages. At the end of 1998, Russian steel companies owed an estimated \$836 million in taxes. According to the Commerce Department report, the Russian government's "systematic failure to force large enterprises to pay amounts to a massive subsidy."

The U.S. is the only country in the industrial world in which the health care benefits of retirees are not assumed by government to facilitate consolidation in one form or another. It is now very clear that American steelworker retirees stand to be hit twice by the collapse of the steel industry since a majority of them were forced into retirement (350,000)—many prematurely—during the massive restructuring of the steel industry during the late 1970s and the 1980s. First, they lost their jobs before they were ready to retire, and now they may lose their health care and a significant portion of their pension now that they are ready to retire. Our own government's inadequate enforcement of our trade laws is the principal reason that steelworkers and steelworker retirees' health care benefits are now at risk.

Because our government has allowed this unlevel and unfair trade environment to develop and consume our industry, government now has a responsibility to our steelworkers and retirees and to the steel industry to help craft a solution to this problem.

Why is action needed?

Retirees under age 65 and older active employees who have been displaced by plant shutdowns are not yet covered by Medicare.

They cannot purchase COBRA continuation coverage because companies are not

obligated to provide COBRA coverage when they no longer maintain a health care plan for employees actively at work. Steel companies which have filed for Chapter 7 bankruptcy (i.e., liquidation) have already moved to terminate health care plans for their workers and retirees.

They cannot afford COBRA premiums even when such coverage is available.

They cannot afford commercially-available health insurance coverage.

Many cannot meet insurability requirements (and may not have continuous coverage under HIPAA).

Many have difficulty in finding new jobs that pay similar wages or benefits.

Why is action needed for retirees age 65 and over?

Because Medicare has significant gaps in its coverage. Medicare also has significant deductibles and co-payments. There is no coverage for expensive outpatient prescription drugs. Also, health care providers often do not accept Medicare reimbursement rates as full payment, at which point they go after the retiree for full payment.

Medicare Supplemental Insurance ("Medigap") is available, but it is costly and has limited prescription drug coverage. The most comprehensive of the Medigap supplements (Plan J) covers only 50 percent of prescription drug costs and limits drug benefits to \$3,000 per year.

The average retiree receives a monthly pension benefit of less than \$600 to \$700 per month. Most surviving spouses receive monthly benefits under \$200 per month.

Finally, Medicare HMOs (or as they are sometimes referred to "Medicare+Choice") are available only in limited areas of the nation.

Some who have looked at this problem, particularly with respect to access to prescription drugs, have said the Bush Administration's proposed "Medicare Prescription Drug Card" might be a possible solution. The proposed card would provide discounts of 10 to 25 percent from retail drug prices.

But low income drug assistance is limited to people below 150 percent of the Federal poverty level. That's an individual with an annual income of \$12,000 or a couple with a combined annual income of \$15,000. In fact, more than half of Medicare beneficiaries would not qualify for Low-Income Drug Assistance. The Low-Income Drug Assistance proposal does not describe how premiums would be set nor does it describe the level of out-of-pocket expenses (i.e., deductibles or co-payments) to be paid by Medicare recipients. Also, states would be required to assume 10 percent of the cost of the Low-Income Drug Assistance proposal at a time when nearly every state is facing budget deficits because of the recession and sharply rising costs for their Medicaid programs.

The Bush Administration is also considering tax credits as a device for helping the uninsured. Under this proposal, a refundable tax credit of \$1,000 to \$3,000 (depending on family size) would be made available to individuals without employer-provided health insurance. The problem here is that the tax credits are too small to make health insurance. The problem here is that the tax credits are too small to make health insurance affordable. A "Family USA" study found that a healthy 25-year-old woman pays an average of \$4,734 per year for coverage under a standard health plan, compared to the \$1,000 tax credit offered.

Until the steep increases in health care costs can be contained, the real value of any refundable tax credit will diminish year by year. A recent report from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, which is an arm of the Department of Health and Human Services, says that health care costs are ex-

pected to grow at a rate of 7.3 percent annually between now and 2011. That means that by 2011, Americans will be spending \$9,216 per person on health care, or about double what they spent in 2000. The nation's health care bill could reach \$2.8 trillion, or 17 percent of the nation's gross domestic product, by 2011.

Clearly, this problem is not going to go away.

While the United Steelworkers was pleased that the President took a step toward reigning in steel imports by imposing variable tariffs on steel products in the recent Section 201 case, the President pointedly chose not to address the matter of the retirement and health security of steelworkers and our retirees. He is apparently leaving this unfinished business in Congress' hands.

Let me state this very clearly. It is the view of the United Steelworkers of America that the pension and health care commitments made to our active workers and retirees must be honored. These issues are every bit as important to us as the recent Section 201 determination on restraining foreign steel imports.

Our active members as well as our retirees look to you for action. We will work with you and your colleagues in both the House and Senate continuously until this problem is solved and we will not relent in our efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I am not going to be debating the specific amendment on the floor now but, rather, a context in which I believe this amendment and most other aspects of this energy legislation should be considered.

There are three principles I would like to discuss at this hour of the evening. First is, when should we, the Congress of the United States, adopt an energy policy? When can we legislate dispassionately, not in response to an immediate emergency?

Second, an energy policy for when? It makes a considerable difference if we are developing a policy for the next 10 years as opposed to what I think should be the more appropriate time-frame, at least the next 50 years, that we are legislating not for ourselves but for our grandchildren.

And third, an energy policy should include a recognition of other affected issues—economic, environment, and more.

A persistent problem in crafting energy policy is the fact that our willingness to act is greatest in the midst of a crisis, a disruption, or spikes in prices. History has repeatedly shown us that energy crises are the worst time to try to solve our problems. Short-term policy initiatives that deal with things such as market upheavals are often counterproductive. They respond to temporary circumstances. They might be political; they might be economic. They could even be climactic.

California blackouts were the initial impetus for the energy legislation we have today. Those blackouts are now hopefully a thing of the past. Yet we now are casting this issue as how to respond to the threat from Saddam Hussein, that he will cut off supplies from Iraq.



Even if there were silver bullets that the Congress could use to deal with these short-term energy disruptions, Congress often moves too slowly to shoot those bullets in the right direction to hit the right target.

Long-term measures, such as promoting energy efficiency and launching new forms of energy production, don't have time to affect the market if these conditions are temporary.

It would seem to me that the solution to this problem is both logical and obvious. The solution, however, goes against our natural inclinations. The time to address energy issues is between crises, when there is a better chance to do something that will actually work.

If I could refer on this special day, the 54th anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel, to an event which occurred in that region of the world and is recorded in the Book of Genesis. It is Joseph's interpretation of the Pharaoh's dream about 7 good years followed by 7 lean years.

What Joseph's interpretation teaches us is that if we are going to deal with famine, the time to do so is not when the famine has commenced but, rather, the time to do so is during those years of plenty, to set aside for the lean years that will surely be ahead.

The core of a wise energy policy is to avoid a focus on the here and now and look over the 50-year horizon. The focus should not be on us, the current generation but, rather, should be on the well-being of our grandchildren.

An astute public official once said:

If we ever go into another world war, it is quite possible that we would not have access to the petroleum reserves held in the Middle East. But in the meantime, the use of those middle eastern reserves would prevent the depletion of our own domestic petroleum reserves.

That wise public official was Navy Secretary James Forrestal. And the date of his wise statement was 1946.

Forrestal's statement was remarkable in several respects. First, he was looking beyond the next year to what would be happening over the next half century, setting a good example for the kind of thinking to which we should repair as we ask the question: What kind of an energy policy for America, for when?

Second, James Forrestal suggests that we can't change the inevitable. We are not going to be able to produce our way out of the challenges created by our appetite for oil. If we were to take a 50-year view as Mr. Forrestal suggested, what are the challenges we must overcome?

First, there is no likely scenario that will alter the reality that most of the oil consumed in the United States from today into the future will come from foreign sources. Shares of imported oil have been rising steadily for years. Proposals such as those before us in the past few days might slow this trend, but they will not reverse it.

Second, we will likely see the need to dramatically reduce greenhouse gases

that are the by-product of fossil energy use.

There is definitive evidence that greenhouse gases impact our climate and our environment. Because greenhouse gases accumulate in the atmosphere and remain there for decades, or longer, we must commence action now in order to avoid unrestrainable consequences in the future.

We must prepare by taking steps to ensure that strong, early action will avoid the need for drastic, expensive, and maybe unavailable steps when it is too late.

Third, we must develop and utilize alternative fuels, both as a means of reducing our total fossil fuel consumption and the greenhouse gases which are an outgrowth of the use of fossil fuel. Alternatives are an important component of a diverse national environmental portfolio. They represent a solution to our dependence on fossil fuels and environmental problems associated with fossil fuels. Alternatives are critical in a policy that does not believe we should focus our energy goals on draining America first.

I suggest that there are some opportunities in an enlightened energy policy for our Nation. There are three points contained in the energy bill upon which I believe we can all agree. I will point to these as the core of an intelligent energy policy.

Point No. 1: We know we need to increase storage in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in order to provide a greater cushion against disruption in oil supplies. Since the price of oil fell in the mid-1980s, we have missed many opportunities to build petroleum reserves at a time when we can do so relatively inexpensively. One reason may have been the false sense of security that the end of the Persian Gulf war brought in the early 1990s.

During that period, we were able to replace the lost production from Iraq and Kuwait with only a minor release from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Why did this seem to happen so effortlessly? Primarily because we were fortunate to have allies, such as the Saudis, increase their production. The Saudis have been good allies on numerous occasions, but do we really want to have an energy policy for the next 50 years that depends upon the good will of our allies and their own uninterrupted excess capacity?

One of the positive aspects of the President's strategy for energy is his announced support for filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to its current capacity. This act alone will not solve our problems, but it is a good first step and should be implemented. A larger reserve will not eliminate our vulnerabilities, but it will reduce the economic impacts of disruptions and threats from abroad.

Point No. 2: We must use the energy we have available as efficiently as possible. Energy efficiency cannot be accomplished in one giant step. It takes time for manufacturers to modernize

their means of production. It takes even longer for equipment stock to turn over so that customers are buying the more efficient product.

What we need is steady progress. This is a marathon, not a 100-yard sprint. We cannot rely solely on research and development. Low average energy prices in the United States limit the economic incentives to research and develop fuel-saving technologies. More broadly, the entire marketplace does not fully reflect environmental and long-term strategic concerns.

In order to mitigate these realities, we have used efficiency standards for automobiles and appliances to achieve national goals. These standards have allowed us to make significant strides in reducing energy use. During the 1990s, while we made significant progress in some areas, such as the efficiency of refrigerators, we have moved backward in the area that is the largest consumer of fossil fuels, which is transportation. During this period, numerous technological advances for automobiles were introduced and widely implemented, such as airbags, crumple zones, and all-wheel drive. But none of these advances was aimed at increasing the efficiency, increasing the gas mileage of the vehicle.

Now we are on the verge of additional technologies coming to the market, such as the electric hybrid vehicle which is making its debut to very promising reviews. Let's assure the American people that some of these technological advances will go to reducing the amount of money we spend on petroleum. In the appliances market, we can reduce the summer peak loads of electricity by insisting on greater efficiency for air-conditioners. It will take years for new, more efficient models to completely absorb the market. The sooner we start, the sooner we will begin to see the results.

Point No. 3: We must increase the share of alternative sources of energy. If we try to do this all at once, the economic cost will be high. But if we opt for a steady progress toward greater use of alternative energy sources, we can expand our energy options and do so at a reasonable cost. We also must do this with flexibility. We are a diverse nation of States. Each State, each locale, has conditions that make it different from others. Those differences often impact on the ways in which States can participate in national initiatives, including the efforts to increase the use of alternative energy and thus reduce the reliance on fossil fuel.

Point No. 4: We should strive for diversity in our energy sources. Renewables will contribute to that diversity. Another area that I believe has and, in the future, will contribute to that diversity is commercial nuclear power. It wasn't long ago that commercial nuclear power was providing 25 percent of our Nation's electric generation. Today, it is down to 20 percent and

sliding lower. At the same time, that proportion of energy that used to be provided by nuclear is being provided by natural gas. While there are some compelling environmental reasons that natural gas is an attractive energy source for electric production, it contributes to the depletion of an important American natural resource, to use an energy source which is a direct provider of energy, to become an indirect provider of energy by converting natural gas into electric generation. I applaud the provisions of this legislation that will, hopefully, begin to re-energize a safe and secure contribution to the diversity of our electric generation capacity through nuclear.

In the coming years, we will see ups and downs in energy prices. We have been on a roller coaster for the past several months, seeing some of the highest and some of the lowest gasoline prices in recent memory. We will likely see times of turmoil. We are likely to see oil increasingly being used as a weapon in geopolitical disputes. We are likely to see times of calm. During those times, energy seems to be the least of our worries.

But we have before us now an opportunity, an opportunity to create an energy policy for the next generations of Americans, the next generations of citizens of this planet. We are given the opportunity to develop an energy policy that can help us leave a cleaner, safer, more prosperous world, and a world in which energy is used to serve human purposes, not as a source of intimidation.

Our grandchildren will thank us.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have spoken to the Senator from Alaska. The Senator from Alaska indicated he wishes to speak for some time tonight, and I have indicated to him we have a few matters we need to do to close the business of the Senate for today.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 9:45 a.m. on Thursday, April 18, following the opening proceedings, the Senate resume consideration of S. 517 and that there be debate until 11:45 a.m. with respect to the cloture motions filed, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; further, that the time from 11:25 a.m. to 11:45 a.m. be controlled as follows: 11:25 a.m. to 11:35 a.m. under the control of the Republican leader, or his designee; and from 11:35 a.m. to 11:45 a.m. under the control of the majority leader, or his designee; that at 11:45 a.m., without further intervening action or debate, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Stevens second-degree amendment No. 3133, that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived; provided further that Members have until 10:45 a.m. to file any second-degree amendments.

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

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 18, 2002

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:45 a.m. on Thursday, April 18; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate resume consideration of the energy reform bill.

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

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### THE 4TH ANNUAL NATIONAL BREAST CANCER CONFERENCE FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN WOMEN

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, during the weekend of April 19, 2002, as we commemorate Cancer Awareness Month, hundreds of women from around the country will gather in my home town, Detroit, MI, to celebrate breast cancer survivorship among African American women. This is a very special group of women, in that they are all survivors of the most common type of cancer of women in the United States. I take great pleasure in welcoming them to Detroit and want to bring to your attention, the many accomplishments of the sponsoring organizations and the goals of this conference.

The 4th Annual National Breast Cancer Conference, which is sponsored by the Karmanos Cancer Institute, Detroit's nationally renowned cancer treatment center and breast care center, and Sisters' Network, Inc. presents an aggressive agenda focusing on the survivorship of African American Women who have, and who will encounter the challenge of breast cancer, a disease which has claimed far too many lives of the members of any community, but within the African American community, 28 percent more than other ethnic groups. According to a recent report appearing in the Journal of the National Cancer Institute, researchers said that studies have shown that black women are more likely to be diagnosed with late stage breast cancer and to have a shorter survival time than white women. We should all find these statistics unacceptable. During this conference, with the guidance of medical professionals from around the country, including Detroit's own Dr. Lisa Newman, Associate Director of the Waltz Comprehensive Breast Center, there will be discussions on how to eradicate all of those barriers women of the African American community face when assaulted by this dreaded disease.

I am proud to acknowledge the work and dedication of Cassandra Woods, my Michigan Chief of Staff, who is the president of the Greater Metropolitan

Detroit Chapter of Sisters' Network, Inc. and a breast cancer survivor and the national president and founder of the Network, Ms. Karen Jackson. These women and the members of the 37 chapters from around the country are committed to increasing local and national attention to the devastation that breast cancer has in the African American community. These women believe that through education, advocacy, research, and support for each other, they can make a marked difference in breast cancer outcomes and the rate of survival among their sisters.

I applaud this effort, I support this effort, and I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing the best of outcomes for this conference and with the challenges ahead.●

##### THE UNITED STATES/RUSSIAN PLUTONIUM DISPOSITION AGREEMENT

• Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to bring the Senate's attention to a matter of tremendous international importance to our efforts to prevent the terrorists' use of weapons of mass destruction.

I wish to talk about the United States/Russian plutonium disposition agreement, a commitment between our two countries to each permanently dispose of 34 metric tons of plutonium from nuclear weapons. Thirty-four tons is enough material to make over 4,000 nuclear weapons.

I was pleased to help develop aspects of that agreement during several interactions with the Russian leadership of Minatom, both here and in Russia. I was in Moscow with our President in 1998 when the first agreement was initiated. I believe this agreement represents one the most significant accomplishments between the United States and Russia in the last 10 years in our joint efforts to keep the material and technology of weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of those that seek to do us harm.

The agreement basically commits the United States and Russia to turning 34 tons of plutonium into fuel that can be burned in commercial nuclear power plants. In this way, electricity is produced and the used fuel is left in a condition that makes it unusable in the future for nuclear bombs. Facilities will be built in both the United States and Russia to perform this work.

Our Government completed a 4-year process to decide what type of facilities was needed for this disposition mission, and where those facilities should be built. The United States considered four sites, Washington State, Idaho, Texas, and South Carolina, and after a vigorous competition in which the State of South Carolina lobbied very hard to get the mission, the decision was made to site the disposition facilities in South Carolina.

Now, South Carolina is hesitating. The plutonium disposition agreement