

Senator MURKOWSKI made extremely astute observations and concisely detailed the hard truths of the United States' current energy condition.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senator MURKOWSKI's article.

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

[From the Anchorage Daily News, May 4, 2003]

DEVELOPING ALASKA OIL IS GOOD FOR GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT

(By Lisa Murkowski)

As Congress continues to debate whether to permit some limited oil development on Alaska's Arctic coastal plain, we must ask whether America is doing everything it can to protect its energy security in the future.

As a new Senator from Alaska, I may shock some by acknowledging some hard truths. First, this nation needs to do a far better job of energy conservation and needs to develop innovative energy technologies to meet our growing need for clean and efficient fuels.

For example, overcoming the technical hurdles of hydrogen-powered vehicles could be very beneficial in meeting our future energy needs. Second, opening a tiny part of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge by itself will not solve all our energy woes, as it will take time to develop the area's potential. But ignoring the area's huge energy potential equates to hoping that foreign sources will supply our winter heating oil and summer gasoline needs at reasonable prices into the distant future. That's like students avoiding studying for finals in hopes that a snowstorm will force schools to close in May.

It also ignores the limitations of the refining process for crude oil and the growth in demand for aviation fuel, diesel, plastics and other items made from oil. The truth, according to the U.S. Energy Information Agency, is that there's a 50-50 chance the Arctic coastal plain holds about 10 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil—enough to produce about 1 million barrels a day for 30 years.

Rather than some inconsequential amount, such a find would be the largest oil field discovered in the world in the last three decades and would equal nearly one-fifth of America's domestic production by 2010.

Equally important, at current prices, it represents \$15 billion a year that we won't have to spend on buying oil overseas, in some cases enriching dictators who wish us ill. Producing more energy at home would strengthen our economy by producing jobs and tax revenues here. It would foster our national security in the midterm by lessening the potential for America to be subject to blackmail from foreign oil boycotts.

And allowing more oil development in Alaska would honor the promises Congress thrice made to my state, first at our statehood, later in 1960 when President Eisenhower created the Arctic National Wildlife Range and most recently in 1980 when 131 million acres of Alaska was withdrawn as parks and refuges. Each decision specifically permitted oil development to take place on the coastal plain, unless such development would harm Alaska's environment. And the truth is that tapping into a tiny percentage of ANWR's vast acreage won't.

According to the recent environmental impact statement for reauthorization of the trans-Alaska oil pipeline, less than 1 percent of the vegetation of the Arctic coastal plain likely will be impacted by future oil development. Safeguards in congressional legisla-

tion will guarantee that no more than 2,000 acres of the 40 million acres of coastal plain will be touched.

Directional drilling underground allows oil wells to be placed up to seven miles apart, preventing disturbance to the animals that breed and graze in between. New procedures on seismic work prevent ocean noise when bowhead whales are passing.

Some worry about the impacts on calving caribou. But Alaska's experience at the nearby Prudhoe Bay oil field, where the caribou herd has grown sixfold, shows that caribou can not only tolerate but flourish in oil fields. That is especially the case since restrictions will prevent any drilling noise during the two months when the caribou might be present.

Developing oil domestically actually is good for the global environment since it reduces the importation of oil on foreign-flagged, single-hulled tankers, requiring the oil industry to meet America's stringent environmental safeguards.

Alaska's beauty certainly is not threatened as 192 million acres of Alaska remain protected—nearly the size of all East Coast states combined. The truth is that America needs to both conserve and produce more energy.

If we can, as some have argued, reduce our foreign reliance on oil by 1 million barrels per day by increased conservation, and also increase production from ANWR by adding a million barrels, the 2 million barrels resulting from this two-pronged approach would substantially improve U.S. energy policy.

The government predicts that U.S. oil production will continue its steady decline unless we act now. By 2015 America will be producing just 30 percent of the oil we consume daily. We've wasted a quarter century on this debate.

Let's help ourselves by developing our own oil reserves now.

LEADING THE FIGHT AGAINST GLOBAL HIV/AIDS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the size of HIV is about 100 nanometers. That is tiny, microscopic, and invisible to the naked eye. A nanometer is one-billionth of a meter. If you divide 3 feet, into 1 billion parts, and take 100 of those parts, that is the size of HIV. That is 2,000 times smaller than a human hair.

Yet that little virus casts a long shadow of death. Reaching across oceans sweeping across continents, burrowing deep into even the most remote villages on Earth, AIDS—the disease that virus causes—has killed 23 million people since it was discovered in 1981. Forty two million people are living with the HIV virus right now. And another 60 million people could die by 2020.

Those are daunting statistics. They paint a dark landscape. But they do not reveal the individual rays of light that have been dimmed by HIV/AIDS. The loving mother who left her child to fend on the streets. The caring husband who left his wife to support their family. The innocent newborn who left the womb facing not a bright future, but an early death.

Nowhere is there a greater threat to life today than in the AIDS-ravaged parts of the world: Africa, the Caribbean, and soon China, India, and Rus-

sia. Millions of lives have already been lost. Millions of more lives will be lost unless we act. But if we do act, if we summon the moral courage to shine light into the long shadow of this little virus, we will change the course of history.

HIV/AIDS has a tremendous impact on a society and an economy. In Zimbabwe, AIDS will wipe out 20 percent of its workforce by 2005. Kenya has reported in recent years as many as 75 percent of the deaths in law enforcement are AIDS-related. In countries with HIV prevalence rates of 20 percent or higher, economic growth, GDP, drops by an average of 2.6 percentage points per year. Economies are shrinking solely because of this little virus. That, my friends, causes hopelessness to prevail.

But we are still losing the battle against the virus. The problem is getting worse, not better. The virus is spreading like wildfire. By 2010, China will have 10 to 15 million cases of HIV/AIDS, and India is likely to have 20 to 25 million cases—the highest estimate for any country. Every 10 seconds brings 1 AIDS-related death and 2 new HIV infections. For every 1 person who has died over the last 20 years, 2 more will die in the next 20 years.

We have a moral duty to lead the world in this fight, . . . to devote more resources and manage those resources so they get where they need go and help the people who need help.

At the end of the week the Senate will take up H.R. 1298 authorizing the President's emergency plan to fight AIDS. The House passed this bill with overwhelming support, 375 to 41. All but one of the House Democrats voted for the bipartisan compromise. This bill is not perfect. But we must not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. The President will sign this bill as it currently stands.

We will defeat HIV/AIDS. As a Senator, as a doctor, as a medical missionary, I have committed to this cause. The President has committed to this cause both in word and deed.

History will judge whether a world led by America stood by and let transpire one of the greatest destructions of human life in recorded history—or performed one of its most heroic rescues. President Bush has opened the door to that latter possibility. We must pass this legislation now and get this program established without further delay.

The President's Global AIDS Initiative is a rare opportunity to enact legislation that will save hundreds of thousands—millions—of lives. This is our moment.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator Kennedy and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that

would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred on September 28, 2001. A 47-year-old Mexican immigrant was beaten in his home by two men who believed him to be of Arab descent. After following the man home, the pair chased him to his front door, broke in after him, and physically assaulted him in front of his wife and child. According to the pair, the assault was revenge for the September 11, 2001 bombing tragedy.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

NATO PROTOCOLS OF ACCESSION

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I would like to speak about the historic vote last week in this Chamber to recommend the ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Protocols of Accession. I add my belated support to the protocols which serve to broaden the world's greatest alliance and, in the process, strengthen it to confront the new dangers of this new century.

It is said that the poppies in the fields of Europe are red with the blood of millions of Europeans and Americans who gave their lives so that millions more could live in peace. Such is the legacy of the 20th century. And from that same period, that same struggle, emerged the most successful strategic alliance the world has ever known—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

For nearly half a century, that alliance manned the ramparts of a Europe that was divided and was still, truly, at war with itself. The fact that the war was a cold one, was itself cold comfort to the countless thousands trapped behind what came to be known as the 'iron curtain.'

When framed against the circumstances of NATO's birth and the fact that for so long the alliance's purpose was to keep the peace in a divided continent, the event that we gathered for last week was truly awesome indeed. Last week, we welcomed many of the nations of Europe once held captive by Communism into the partnership of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The vote gave us the opportunity to affirm the place that NATO holds in the constellation of American security. Our fate is bound up with Europe's—to deny this is to overlook the lessons of history and the signposts of the future. Within Europe we find many of our closest and our oldest allies. For over 50 years, we have drawn strength from

NATO, and for over 50 years we have, through NATO, worked hard for the security of our partners. We cannot, will not, must not stop now.

Let us not forget, in times of crisis NATO has worked for American security as well. In the wake of September 11, 2001, the alliance invoked Article V of its charter for the first time in its history, calling the attack on one member an attack on all. European aircraft helped secure the skies over the eastern seaboard of the United States. Our NATO partners and our partnerships with them continue to be crucial to our Nation's security: the challenges we face as a nation are formidable—terrorism, tyrants, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction among them—and we cannot, we must not, face them alone.

But the world has changed, and so, too, must the alliance. The issues raised by Senators LEVIN and WARNER address some critical questions. As the number of alliance members increases, the ability of the council to act quickly may become harder and harder to realize. That is especially true because every NATO action requires unanimous consent. In addition, we must acknowledge the possibility that with 26 alliance members, the chances that one of them may someday cease to uphold the basic values that the treaty organization is based on also becomes—mathematically speaking, at least—more likely. The amendments request that the North Atlantic Council study how to deal with both eventualities, and I believe these requests to study are both appropriate and timely.

However, while I support these amendments, I am mindful of NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson's recent warnings that developing procedures to suspend members or changing the decisionmaking apparatus of the alliance would be ill-advised at this juncture. Lord Robertson has navigated the Alliance through some perilous waters during his tenure at the helm of NATO, and I see no reason to distrust his counsel now.

The expansion of NATO makes clear that, despite the claims of alarmists, this great alliance is not stumbling into irrelevance. We have had differences with some of our partners, and we will continue to. But with our commitment, the alliance can once again prove its resilience. It can once again demonstrate that common values between nations are the strongest bonds of all. We must not forget that enemies of America are also enemies of NATO, and they see the democratic diversity of our nations as a weakness. They think they can divide us. They are wrong. In our diversity, we find a wellspring of great strength. Standing in the Chamber today speaking for Senate approval of these protocols, I am reminded of the words of the Great Seal of the United States: *e pluribus unum*: "from many, one." I welcome our new European allies into the alliance structure; they will add their

strength to ours, and their addition will make us all more secure.

There are those in this country and in Europe who question the value of strong trans-Atlantic ties; they cite recent disagreements between some European nations and our own government as a rationale for the United States to stride alone into whatever fate holds in store for us all. By way of rejoinder, I offer President John F. Kennedy's words in 1962, when he urged his fellow Americans to "think intercontinentally." President Kennedy continued, "acting on our own, by ourselves, we cannot establish justice throughout the world; we cannot insure its domestic tranquility, nor provide for its common defense, or promote its general welfare, or secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. But joined with other free nations, we can do all this and more. We can assist the developing nations to throw off the yoke of poverty. . . . We can mount a deterrent powerful enough to deter any aggression. And ultimately we can help to achieve a world of law and free choice, banishing the world of war and coercion." President Kennedy called for a trans-Atlantic partnership based on common values and concerns, one that looked outward as well as inward, one that would "serve as a nucleus for the eventual union of all free men—those who are now free and those who are vowing that some day they will be free."

The truth in President Kennedy's words in 1963 has not diminished in 40 years. Although we may disagree with our partners and brothers in peace, our paths have not diverged, and our concerns are tied together still. I applaud my colleagues for their overwhelming vote for the ratification of the Protocols of Ascension that which, once ratified by all 19 NATO members, will allow these 7 nations, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia, to become parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, and full members of the treaty organization.

CUBA TRAVEL

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to speak to the issue of the Freedom to Travel to Cuba Act of 2003, S. 950, introduced by the junior Senator from Wyoming. I am cosponsoring this bill because I do not think the United States Government should tell its citizens where they can and cannot travel. I also think greater people-to-people contacts with societies living under dictatorial regimes can help encourage the spread of democratic ideas. It is for these reasons that I support S. 950.

Lifting our ban on travel to Cuba is not a gift to Fidel Castro, and it should not be interpreted as an endorsement of his regime or as a sign of diminished commitment to improving human rights conditions for the Cuban people. The recent harsh prison sentences meted out to dozens of peaceful political dissenters in Cuba, and the execution of three men involved in a ferry