meet their financial obligation. However, the mortgage company responded by sending notice to Mrs. Keira Welter that the company had initiated court proceedings to foreclose on her home. You can imagine this lady's distress. Not only is she worried about the safety of her husband in Iraq, she is now faced with losing her home, with three children, the very scenario the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act is designed to prevent.

Not knowing who to turn to—and she thought pretty hard about it and didn't know who to call—she contacted my office and requested our assistance. After numerous conversations with her mortgage lender, Wells Fargo, I believe we have resolved her situation. I remain concerned, however, that those responsible for complying with the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act are not fully educated about their obligations, and that that problem is nationwide.

What is particularly appalling about this situation is that the mortgage company initially claimed they were unaware of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, a law that has been on the books for 40 years. They further claimed that ''they just can't be expected to keep up with everything that goes on in Washington.''

I can appreciate that last sentiment on a lot of different fronts. But ignorance is no excuse. Every financial institution has a compliance officer whose job it is is to ensure that financial institutions comply with laws and the regulations. Lord knows, I often hear from our financial institutions, banks, savings and loans, and others, about the regulatory burden our Government does place on them. Not only do they have to read all of the paperwork and the burdens and regulations; I think they have to weigh them. I appreciate those concerns, especially in the small banking community. I once spent an entire day in my hometown bank in Dodge City learning the ins and outs of what a compliance officer does. She described her job as being a ''bad news bear.'' She had to go to loan officers and say, whoops, here is another regulation you have to put up with. I know that is not an easy task.

However, today's example of egregious disregard for a 40-year-old law, and one we amended 2 years ago to provide additional protection to our military men and women, is simply unacceptable.

Let me be clear. I know our Nation's financial institutions do support our men and women in uniform. That is a given. I am also confident that they understand their obligation and responsibility to comply with this act, and that most do so. In Kansas, I know many financial service providers, and they all know that the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act is not only the law, but it is the morally right thing to do. They live in the same town. They attend the same church. They share the military family's concerns when somebody from their hometown is called to active duty, and they are so rightfully proud when they come home.

I also want to be clear it is not only financial institutions that are responsible for complying with this act. Landlords and other creditors also have certain obligations in this regard as well. I recognize that with many service members called to active duty, raising awareness of the requirements of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act is necessary. We need a lot more education. Congress should encourage anybody who is working with a servicemember called to active duty, or that servicemember's family, to make sure they are aware of their obligation under this act.

Let me also take this opportunity to commend the efforts of many organizations who are working with the military families on base, veterans organizations, support organizations, and others, to ensure they receive the protections that are provided for under this act, and to provide other assistance to families of our servicemembers. That is a real win-win story all across this Nation.

I recently learned from a member of the VFW, who works with military families, who stressed that ''education about the protections that are provided under the act is key.'' Too many military families have experienced instances where a landlord, unaware of this act, sought to evict the family while the soldier was on active duty. That is egregious.

I am calling on the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the OCC. I hope they can see their way clear as to what they should be doing in this regard, and others who have responsibility for enforcing this act—by the way, the acronym is SCRA—to strengthen their enforcement in education of this important law. Any military family who has a mortgage with a national bank and who needs relief under this act can contact the OCC's consumer assistance group if they have difficulty with their bank. That number is 1–800–613–6743. Right off the bat, I can suggest that they need an easier number to remember. I feel as though I am on television trying to sell something here—and I am. It is education for our service members. Again, the number is 1–800–613–6743.

I am also going to visit with my colleagues on the Veterans Committee, the Banking Committee, Armed Services Committee, upon which I serve, and all who have jurisdiction under this act, and ask them to review what Congress can do to ensure that this situation doesn't happen to other military families.

So today I share this story to reassure our military men and women in uniform that we will make certain the protections provided in the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act are enforced. This act is intended to ensure that when a wage earner is called to active duty, their family has financial security and other protections provided for in the act while they are deployed. It means a soldier fighting in Iraq can better focus on his or her mission, without the added stress of wondering if their family is financially secure at home. We owe nothing less to our men and women in uniform who answer the call to duty.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 30 minutes.

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

OIL IN ALASKA

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning because of the misinformation being spread, particularly through the press, in the past weeks on what is called ANWR. It is the area in the 1½ million acres of our arctic coast that has been set aside since 1980 for oil and gas development. I have been involved in this issue almost since the beginning of my career. I want to talk a little bit about the history of this area.

In 1923, President Harding withdrew 23 million acres for the Naval Petroleum Reserve Number 4. That did not include the area of the arctic we are dealing with today, but it was the first indication to the Nation that there was tremendous oil and gas potential in the northern region of Alaska. We were a territory then, and this withdrawal came right after the teapot dome scandal. So even then there were indications of places in the United States where there were areas that could be explored or developed for oil.

This withdrawal was important because the Navy used a great deal of oil. They used to take it right out of the ground in Alaska and pump it right into Navy vessels. They burned the real crude oil at that time. It was essential to develop and use the Alaska resources for national defense. The whole concept of Alaska has played a strategic role in national security throughout its history, particularly beginning in 1923. Incidentally, that was the year of my birth. So I have been around during this whole period.

In 1943, as World War II was going on, the Secretary of the Interior issued Public Land Order 82, which withdrew all of the public and non public lands in Northern Alaska—encompassing over 48 million acres. One of the reasons stated by the Secretary at that time was that tremendous amount of oil and gas that might be in northern Alaska were necessary for use in connection with the prosecution of the war.

As a matter of fact, history shows that in about 1919, there was a group of people who went to the northern area of Alaska along the arctic coast and started staking mining claims, claiming the oil in those lands. That led

Congress, in 1920, to enact the Mineral Leasing Act. Particularly the Texans didn't want to see Alaskan oil developed through a patenting process where they didn't have to deal with the national concern.

As a matter of fact, it was, I think, basically the southwestern oil bloc that led to the two orders I mentioned. They were afraid of the real development of northern Alaska. There were oil seeps all the way along the arctic coast. People knew there was oil. The question was, where were the areas which could be commercially developed?

Public Land Order 82 was still in existence when I went to the Interior Department in the 1950s. I was Legislative Counsel and Assistant to then Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton. At the end of the Eisenhower administration, I was the Solicitor of the Interior Department.

I worked with Secretary Seaton at the time he decided to revoke Public Land Order 82 because there were vast areas up there that we thought had oil and gas potential, and we wanted to get to them.

Our Statehood Act, which came about in 1958, required approval of the President of the United States to have any development north of the line, what is called the pick line. The Porcupine and Yukon Rivers basically made that line. President Eisenhower, again, in the interest of national security, said nothing should take place, no action should take place up there of a national nature without consideration of national security. It took approval of the President to revoke that Public Land Order 82 and to start allowing the State of Alaska to select lands.

After Secretary Seaton had issued the order to revoke Public Land Order 82, the State of Alaska did, in fact, select a portion of land between the Naval Petroleum Reserve and an area Secretary Seaton created in 1960 which was the Arctic National Wildlife Range.

Again I want to say, the Range, which included the 1.5 million acres of Arctic coast we are debating today, was created to assure the Fairbanks Women's Garden Club that there would be protection of the flora and fauna of northeastern Alaska. At that time, what was not withdrawn—the 25 million acres on one side of the Naval Petroleum Reserve to the west and the Arctic wildlife range to the east—was a corridor that later became known as the Prudhoe Bay area.

From that area, after discovery of oil in 1968, we have now produced over 16 billion barrels of oil, although at the time the estimate of those involved in making the survey was that up to 1 billion barrels of oil might be recoverable from this area.

When Secretary Seaton revoked Public Land Order 82 in 1960, he also created the 8.9-million-acre Range. I helped draw up that order. That order specifically permitted oil and gas activities to take place under stipulations to protect the fish and wildlife.

After the Eisenhower administration came to an end, President Kennedy was elected. On the first day of that new administration, I visited with Stewart Udall who was to be the new Secretary of Interior. I told him the background of what we had done. His brother was in the House of Representatives. He disagreed with me about what was to happen in that area.

At the time in 1960 when we issued the order creating the Range, the Under Secretary of Interior, Elmer Bennett, who used to be a staff member of the Senate, assured Alaskans that ''this Department has every intention to foster legitimate oil and gas activity within this area, if any potential is discovered.''

There is no question about it, the Eisenhower administration strictly approved the concept of setting aside an area to protect the fish and wildlife but also mandated in the order that oil and gas leasing would be protected.

I was appalled this last week when some of the Eisenhower family came forward and sort of indicated that it was the intention of President Eisenhower that this area be a wilderness. Nothing is further from the truth. That is not the truth at all. We did not withdraw a wilderness; we withdrew a wildlife range.

I believe there is no question about this: We are heading into an area about which people ought to know the history. Let me go further than that. As Assistant to the Secretary and then Solicitor, I studied the Alaska Native claims. I was from Alaska, and Secretary Seaton, on the floor of this Senate, as a Senator, made only one speech, and that was a speech to urge Congress to admit Alaska into the Union as a State. He was committed to Alaska statehood, and he asked me to come down and join him in the Department. I readily did that. Elmer Bennett, who was the Under Secretary, was a friend of mine. We started off to develop the concept of getting Alaska into the Union.

Section 4 of the Statehood Act, which I also helped draft along with my predecessor Senator Bartlett, who was a delegate from Alaska to the House of Representatives, specifically required that Congress take action to settle the Alaska Native land claims.

I say parenthetically, prior to that time, Alaska statehood was defeated because the Alaska Native people and their representatives opposed statehood because they had substantial claims against the United States and they were afraid of concepts of land grants to the new State that might harm them. We wrote in section 4 of the Statehood Act that Congress would take that act, and nothing in the Statehood Act would expand or diminish the claims of Alaska Natives against the Federal Government.

During this time, my predecessors, Senators Gruening and Bartlett, introduced bills to try to settle these claims. They were not enacted because they were not acceptable to Alaska Natives. When I came to the Senate in 1968, I started participating in the activity and introduced the bill to settle Alaska Native land claims.

I met with President Nixon later in 1970, along with representatives of the Alaska Natives, in order to urge the President to come forward and support an enormous land settlement. President Nixon, to his credit, did do that. He agreed with us. With me at the time was a person named Don Wright, who was a member of the State legislature when I was there, a distinguished leader of the Gwich'in community.

We developed the concept of settling the land claims by the State and Federal Government participating together in a billion-dollar cash settlement and the Federal Government recognizing that entitled Alaska Natives to 44 million acres and that those lands would come ahead of the statehood selections under the Statehood Act.

We proceeded with the land claim settlement, and by 1971 we had a bill which was a very good bill. It required the approval for the first time of Alaskans, who voted to accept that bill to become a State. We, in fact, developed a compact with the United States in our statehood process.

At the time in 1958 when we required the settlement by Congress, we recognized there were valid claims of the Native people. My bill, along with my colleague, then-Senator Gravel, brought about the settlement of those claims.

A byproduct of that was we created a series of regional corporations for the Alaska Native people. Those corporations and their village corporations also—the land was separated between the village corporations and the regional corporations. The net result of it was that the regional corporations were subject to one unique provision I authored, which was that any regional corporation that received income from resource development—it is called 7(I) in that 1971 act—was required to share those revenues with the other 11 regional corporations.

This was very important because Don Wright, who had been with me at the time of the meetings with President Nixon and represented the Gwich'in people, decided they did not want to share. They withdrew from the settlement in terms of being an area subject to the concept of a regional corporation, and they took the title to their lands, subject only to the control and advice of the Secretary of Interior. But they did not participate in the settlement in any other way. They were allowed to take their lands, and they got some of the cash, but they did not come under 7(I).

I mention that because often the representatives of the Gwich'in people visit this city. The Gwich'in people live on the South Slope of Alaska. It is the North Slope that has the oil. It is the North Slope that had Prudhoe Bay. It

is the North Slope that has the Arctic coast. But the Gwich'in people, particularly the Arctic village people, withdrew from the settlement for the reason they thought they had the oil. They immediately tried to lease their lands, and no one wanted them. They also had coal, and they thought they should have coal development. They urged for coal development. No one wanted to develop their coal. Where they are located, it is almost impossible to have a corridor to the south without going east and then south. It was just not economically feasible. It might be sometime in the future.

But the Gwich'in people lost out by their decision to go it alone. They now come to the Congress and say do not allow the Arctic coast to be developed for oil—just a few of them, not all of them. They should not be listened to. The people who should be listened to are the people who live in the area. One of the reasons they oppose oil and gas development in the Arctic plain is that they say it might hurt the porcupine caribou herd that comes over their lands. Those herds go over to the traditional area. Only a portion are Canadian natives who migrated to Alaska. In Canada, that same caribou herd is subject to commercial hunting. It is being depleted because of the practices in Canada, not because of any problem in Alaska. As a matter of fact, there are years during which the caribou do not even go to the North Slope in Alaska because of the problems they face in Canada.

When the Alaska oil pipeline was authorized by Congress in the seventies, we heard these same arguments: The development of the pipeline is going to destroy the caribou; it is going to destroy the environment. None of that has been true. The same people who made the arguments then are making them now. The same organizations that collect money from Americans throughout the country now—''send in your money and help save the Arctic''—tried that then. The 3,000 caribou in the area of the pipeline are now 32,000. They have not been harmed at all. Alaskans do not allow our wildlife to be harmed. We will protect the caribou when they do come to the Arctic coast.

I wonder, Mr. President, if you know that there is no oil and gas drilling activity in the summertime. If there have been production facilities put in during the wintertime, you can produce oil in the summertime as long as you do not interfere with the wildlife. The oil industry wants to do it in the wintertime because the lands are frozen. They can take equipment across the lands easily. They can build ice roads. They can develop whatever they want and put them on pads, and when they leave, they remove the pads, and the roads thaw in the summertime.

I challenge anyone to come up and find where the camps were to build the Alaska oil pipeline. When we hear these extreme environmentalists talk, one would think developing the oil and gas of the Arctic plain would harm it. That is not true at all. The new technology we are using in oil and gas in Alaska will take an area smaller than Dulles Airport to develop this 1.5 million acres. But that is another thing.

We experienced an oil crisis in the 1970s precipitated by the Arab oil embargo. At that time, we were importing about a third of our oil, and the embargo devastated our economy. Today, we import 60 percent of our oil. Imagine the consequences of an embargo now.

In the wake of this energy crisis, Congress debated the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act. During this debate, there was an understanding on both sides of this aisle, no filibuster.

The final pipeline was approved when the Vice President of the United States cast his vote to break the tie of 49 to 49, but there was no hint of filibuster from either side. There were people on both sides who disagreed with the pipeline, but they said it has to be an up-or-down vote. This was important for our national security.

It was a national security issue because our nation needed oil. And the debate we are currently having now is about oil from this area that is known as ANWR. It is not part of a refuge. It will not become a part of the refuge until the oil and gas development phase is completed. Sometime when we have exhausted the oil resources, it will become part of the refuge. But today it is managed with the intent that there will be oil and gas leasing there as soon as Congress approves the environmental impact statement that was passed. That was the compromise that came about in 1980. So I want to skip from 1971 to 1980 by saying that in the Alaska Native Land Claim Settlement Act, section 17(d)(2) required that there be a study of Alaska's lands in order that we might determine what lands should be withdrawn.

That debate started in 1972 and did not end until 1980. It was a battle between the forces led in the House by Mo Udall and in this body by Senators Jackson and Tsongas. I and my colleague, Senator Gravel, tried our best to represent Alaska. We had a bill almost completed in 1978. It had passed the House and the Senate and gone to conference.

Both Senator Gravel and I had participated in that conference. Even though I was not a member of the committee at the time, they permitted me to be in that conference for a long period of time. After the bill had passed the House in the waning moments that ended the 1978 Congress, Senator Gravel blocked that bill. So when we came back in 1979, we had to go back and deal with it again.

After Senator Gravel blocked the bill, President Carter withdrew 100 million acres of Alaskan land under what is called the Antiquities Act. Congress had to pass a bill to lift that withdrawal made by President Carter in order that we might proceed with the development of Alaska and allow Alaskans to select statehood lands and the Alaskan Native people to get their land claims to those lands.

We worked very hard and we finally got a bill that passed the Senate and passed the House, went to conference, and came back to the Senate. This is 1980. It passed the Senate as a conference report and went to the House. President Carter asked the House not to pass it before the election because he disagreed with section 1002 that created the 1.5 million acres in which oil and gas development was permitted.

After that election, which President Carter lost, President Carter then asked the House to pass the bill. That bill was signed by him after the election and before he left office. In that election, Republicans gained a majority of the Senate. My constituents asked me to do everything I could to block that bill. It had already passed the Senate. When the President signed it, it became law.

The ink was not dry before President Carter tried to renege on the law that he had just signed. Even today a letter has come now to us from President Carter. It is a letter that I am appalled at, as a matter of fact. For a President to have signed a law and said he was part of the development of that law, but then urge us not to follow the law is amazing to me.

There has been a similar letter come to me, and that I have shared with the Senate, and that happens to be the letter from former Senator Jim Buckley. In the 1970s, Jim Buckley, as he left the Senate, became one of the opponents of the development of this area. As a matter of fact, he had voted against it while in the Senate.

Unsolicited, on January 24, former Senator Buckley, now Judge Buckley, sent me a letter. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STEVENS. He pointed out:

> Twenty-six years ago, after leaving the Senate, I was a lead signatory in full-page ads opposing oil exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve that appeared in the New York Times and the Washington Post. I opposed it because, based on the information then available, I believed that it would threaten the survival of the Porcupine caribou populations in the areas of Prudhoe Bay and the Alaskan pipeline have increased, which demonstrates that the Porcupine herd would not be threatened, and new regulations limiting activities to the winter months and mandating the use of ice roads and directional drilling have vastly reduced the impact of oil operations on the Arctic landscape.
>
> In light of the above, I have revised my views and now urge approval of oil development in the 1002 Study Area for the following reasons.

He lists the three reasons, and he specifically says, as he closes:

> Having visited the Arctic on nine occasions over the last 13 years (including a recent

camping trip on Alaska's North Slope) I don't think I can be accused of being insensitive to the charms of the Arctic qua Arctic. I just don't see the threat to values I cherish.

It is signed ''Sincerely, Jim.''

Now, that represents an informed point of view. I am now in a position where I think we must address what has been said in the newspapers and so many areas about the value of the oil in this area.

The coastal plain of ANWR is not a wilderness area. There was a test well drilled in this area, the results of which remain secret under an agreement between the oil industry and the Federal Government. It was drilled near Kaktovik.

When we hear people such as Senator FEINGOLD say ANWR should not be in the budget resolution because the land does not have any value, he is wrong. The land does have value. As I said before, when we were trying to develop Prudhoe Bay, the estimate was made that there was a billion barrels of oil at the most in Prudhoe Bay.

After producing 16 billion barrels, we know there is oil on the coastal plain of ANWR. There is no question that we have a duty, in the interest of national security, to drill in this area.

The budget that is coming before us, and I will be speaking again next week on this, has a provision which deals with the estimate of the amount of money received by the Federal Government and the State in the first 5 years of the development of this area. I believe that is $5 billion. Those revenues would be split between the State and the Federal Government. In the process of valuing what the oil might be worth, the value of $25 a barrel for oil has been used. I asked the CBO: Why do you not use the actual amount of oil today, which is over $50?

They said that was the amount used when they first made the study, and they have not had any studies to justify raising that now. As their baseline for oil, they are using $25 a barrel.

So anyone who says this is not a valuable thing in the budget because of the money that is going to be raised ought to understand the minimum that will come in will be twice that amount. People are going to base their bids on the value of the oil that might be produced.

I will speak longer on this at a later date, but I want to say one thing. At the time President Carter signed this bill in 1980, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, I was urged to block it. President Carter had received about 90 percent of what he wanted in this bill. By preserving rights of access to Alaskans, the right to use traditional means of transportation, and protection of native peoples and communities, Alaskans got 10 percent. The only major difference was the 1002 area.

The amendment that provided for the 1002 area was authored by Senator Jackson and Senator Tsongas, not by me. It was authored by them as a compromise with Alaska, and it guaranteed that we would be able to explore this area that is so valuable to our future. This is the area that former President Carter asks Congress now to take back, and some members of the House want to turn it into a wilderness area now.

After we were elected to the majority and getting ready for the session in 1981, I was assistant leader. Senator Baker was the majority leader. I had calls from home: Change this law and change it now. I said, no. In Alaska we have a saying from Robert Service: A promise made is a debt unpaid.

I entered into an agreement with Senator Jackson and Senator Tsongas that we would accept what they and President Carter wanted, conditioned upon Alaska retaining its rights to explore and develop the Arctic coast of Alaska. In 1981, we could have changed it. I was urged to change it.

Now, after 24 years of arguing over this issue, and it has been before this Congress and this Senate every year since 1981, I told a group the other day I am distressed that I must argue again and again for Congress to keep its promise to the Alaskan people. This year I will argue that again.

My mind goes back to those Alaskans—they put a full page ad in the paper saying: Ted, come home. You no longer represent Alaska. Come home so someone else can change that law and get some of the things we did not achieve under the 1980 act.

Now all we are asking is for the Congress, and particularly this Senate, to follow that law to allow us to proceed with this development. But what do we face? We face a filibuster, something that was unheard of when the oil pipeline was considered. We now have the issue of oil exploration and development before us, and in an area even more promising than Prudhoe Bay, in my judgment. We know it is a larger structure under the Earth. It could contain more oil than even Prudhoe Bay, although the estimates are lower.

When we look at it, the simple question before the Senate, in my mind, is, Is this a national security issue? Is the ability to fill the Alaskan oil pipeline a national security issue?

During the Persian Gulf war we sent 2.1 million barrels of oil a day to what we call the South 48, the continental U.S. Today we are sending 900,000. The pipeline is not full. The pipeline cannot be full again unless we obtain the oil from the Arctic coast.

It is still a matter of national security. I challenge my friends who want to filibuster this. I challenge the necessity to try to get 60 votes to make this become a reality. That is why we have to use the Budget Act to try to avoid that threat of a filibuster, which did not exist in this Chamber on the Alaskan oil pipeline.

I will be back again and again, because this may be my last stand at trying to convince Congress to keep its word. It is getting more difficult to serve in a Senate that cannot—cannot, and will not, carry out commitments that were made by previous occupants of this body.

Thank you very much.

EXHIBIT 1

January 24, 2005.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR TED: Twenty-six years ago, after leaving the Senate, I was a lead signatory in full-page ads opposing oil exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve that appeared in the New York Times and the Washington Post. I opposed it because, based on the information then available, I believed that it would threaten the survival of the Porcupine caribou herd and leave huge, long-lasting scars on fragile Arctic lands. Since the, caribou populations in the areas of Prudhoe Bay and the Alaskan pipeline have increased, which demonstrates that the Porcupine herd would not be threatened, and new regulations limiting activities to the winter months and mandating the use of ice roads and directional drilling have vastly reduced the impact of oil operations on the Arctic landscape.

In light of the above, I have revised my views and now urge approval of oil development in the 1002 Study Area for the following reasons:

1. With proper management, I don't see that any significant damage to arctic wildlife would result, and none that wouldn't rapidly be repaired once operation ceased.

2. While I don't buy the oil companies' claim that only 2,000 acres would be affected, even if all of the 1.5 million-acre Study Area were to lose its pristine quality (it wouldn't), that would still leave 18.1 million acres of the ANWR untouched plus another five million acres in two adjoining Canadian wildlife refuges, or an area about equal to that of the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire combined. In other words, it is simply preposterous to claim that oil development in the Study Area would ''destroy'' the critical values that ANWR is intended to serve.

3. In light of the above, it is economic and (to a much lesser degree) strategic masochism to deny ourselves access to what could prove our largest source of a vital resource.

Having visited the Arctic on nine occasions over the past 13 years (including a recent camping trip on Alaska's North Slope), I don't think I can be accused of being insensitive to the charms of the Arctic qua Arctic. I just don't see the threat to values I cherish.

With best regards,

JAMES L. BUCKLEY.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE REAL CRISIS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this week there has been more discussion in the newspapers and around the country about the issue of Social Security. As you know, the President continues to move around the country holding forums on Social Security.