

facto moratoriums have on the economy. Last Friday, he called the continued delays “ridiculous.”

Just as we should reopen the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico to prudent exploration and development, so too should we lift the moratorium preventing job-creating development of resource-rich areas such as Alaska’s Outer Continental Shelf, as well as oil shale in various Western States.

Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska has pointed out that her State has estimated oil reserves in excess of 65 years’ worth of Persian Gulf oil imports. Yet they are virtually off limits.

As Alaska’s Governor, Sean Parnell, wrote in a recent Wall Street Journal op-ed:

If Americans wonder what our economic Achilles’ heel is, they need look no further than the federal regulatory system that delays permits for domestic exploration and production.

The Federal Government estimates that Alaska’s Outer Continental Shelf holds 27 billion barrels of oil and 132 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. We could be drilling now in the Arctic Ocean off the coast of Alaska if the Environmental Protection Agency would speed things up and issue an air permit. Developing these resources would not only generate vast new supplies but translate to a lot of good jobs. In fact, a new study by Northern Economics and the University of Alaska Anchorage’s Institute of Social and Economic Research shows that development of oil and gas in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas of Alaska’s Outer Continental Shelf would create 54,700 new jobs that would be sustained for 50 years. An estimated \$63 billion would be paid to employees in Alaska, and another \$82 billion would be paid to employees in the rest of the United States.

As the report notes:

Domestic energy production is important for the security and prosperity of the United States. The money spent on domestic energy cycles through the U.S. economy, thereby increasing domestic activity and jobs.

Another resource-rich area in Alaska is ANWR. Despite being one of the largest resources of oil and gas in the United States, Alaska’s ANWR is off limits for energy development. Tapping oil and gas supplies in ANWR would require opening just 2,000 acres of the 19 million-acre Arctic Plain to such development.

Remember, ANWR was specifically set aside by Congress for oil and gas exploration and development. It was specifically created for that purpose. This 2,000 acres would be the equivalent of the airport in Phoenix, called Phoenix Sky Harbor, inside an area the size of South Carolina—hardly noticeable.

Using directional drilling with a small environmental footprint, at least 1 million barrels of oil a day could be obtained from just this one area for the next 20 years. The U.S. Geological Survey has estimated that the area could have up to 16 billion barrels of recover-

able oil, an amount that is equivalent to 30 years of Saudi oil imports.

Analysis from Arctic Power shows that opening ANWR to oil and gas production would create approximately 730,000 jobs.

Those opposed to developing these resources often make the argument that it will take 10 years to open ANWR. But if President Clinton had not vetoed legislation authorizing Arctic development in 1995, oil would likely be flowing from the area today, easing prices and helping to insulate our economy from the whims of OPEC. Continued delay will only put our Nation further at risk.

A few final points about abundant onshore oil resources—permits for which have also been blocked by the administration. In 2009, the administration canceled 77 oil and gas leases in Utah and in 2010 canceled another 61 in Montana. It has been estimated that the United States has approximately 800 billion barrels of technically recoverable shale oil, which is roughly three times more than the proven reserves of Saudi Arabia. Again, it is all off limits.

Finally, a note about the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. In recent days, some of my colleagues have called for tapping into the SPR to bring down gas prices. But this Strategic Petroleum Reserve is a national security tool to guard against an economically threatening disruption in oil supplies. It was never intended to be used to lower gas prices. Our problem today is not a matter of supply. We have plenty of supply.

Since its creation in 1995, a Presidential directed release from SPR has occurred only twice—in 1995, at the beginning of Operation Desert Storm, and in 2005, after the devastation Hurricane Katrina caused in the Gulf of Mexico. The current SPR inventory is 720 million barrels, which equates to about 34 days of oil at current daily U.S. consumption. Tapping the Reserve is nothing more than a short-term political solution to a problem largely of the administration’s own making—its continued refusal to allow access to our Nation’s plentiful resources.

The benefits of increasing domestic energy production are unquestionable, especially at a time when gas prices are soaring and good jobs are needed by many Americans. I urge the administration to move swiftly in favor of issuing more production permits and urge my colleagues to support policies in favor of increased domestic energy production. There is no reason for further delay.

One of the most eloquent spokesman for this same point is on the floor, the Senator from Louisiana.

I am happy to yield the floor to her. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to follow the remarks of the Senator from Arizona and associate myself with part of his remarks that have to do with the energy policy of our country.

I am disappointed in the administration’s reluctance to get the Gulf of Mexico back to work. We did have a terrible tragedy in April, almost a year ago, April 20, the Deepwater Horizon catastrophe. For 40 years or longer, 40,000 wells have been drilled safely in the gulf, in shallow water and in deep, since 1940, deep water coming into play in about 1985. Up until the Deepwater Horizon accident, this industry had acted responsibly in large measure with cutting-edge technologies. Yes, we have to continue to investigate what happened, but shutting down so much of our domestic drilling with the unrest in other parts of the world is not the right policy.

I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator on energy as well as tapping into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. This is not a crisis of supply; it is a crisis of pricing. SPR should only be tapped when there is a supply issue. We can get back to drilling more at home and be efficient in other places.

JAPAN EARTHQUAKE

Ms. LANDRIEU. What I really wish to talk about is to give my heartfelt condolences to the people of Japan. We have watched all weekend, my family and I, in horror, watching the scene unfold with the terrible catastrophe that struck Japan on Friday afternoon, following the earthquake, 9.0 on the Richter scale, followed by a terrible tsunami, a wave of water in some places 30 feet high that devastated coastal communities. Some of the pictures are reminiscent of what happened to us on the gulf coast about 5½ years ago when a 30-foot wave came ashore right into Gulfport and Biloxi and the catastrophe of manmade proportion, in our case, when the Federal levy system broke and 1,800 people lost their lives. But this situation in Japan is the worst crisis, according to their Prime Minister, since the Second World War.

It is going to take all of our best efforts, governments around the world, individuals, corporations, and businesses, to be generous. I hope the people of Louisiana and our cities and communities will be generous because we were so benefited by the warm generosity of the people of Japan and many volunteers who came from all over the country and the world.

I hope, as this week of search and rescue comes to a close, there will be time for debris cleanup and rebuilding and mental health counseling—all of the things that go into helping an area of the country survive and grow back. I know the people of Japan were as prepared as any country could be for a situation such as this, but the events of that day have overwhelmed one of the best and most organized governments in the world.

I am heartbroken to hear that thousands of people are yet unaccounted for. Our hearts go out to them. I hope our Nation will be generous in this time, not only from a charitable and

moral standpoint, but Japan is one of the strongest economies in the world.

From the State I represent, Louisiana, we are their second largest trading partner as a State. The people of Louisiana and all of our States have a vested interest in Japan getting back on its feet, getting better and stronger. We are still in the process of rebuilding New Orleans and the Lower Ninth Ward. New Orleans East, Gulfport, and Waveland are still struggling to come back—an important economic center for the country. But most certainly this coastal and industrial community around Sendai and other coastal communities are very important, not just to Japan but to the world.

I hope, with this 9.0 earthquake that hit, I hope people know this is 1,000 times worse than an 8 point on the Richter scale. It is not slightly worse; it is 1,000 times worse. This is a huge earthquake and shift in the Earth's plates—and then the subsequent tsunami.

On behalf of the people of Louisiana, we send special condolences and best wishes to the people of Japan as they recover and bury their dead, heal their injured, and begin to rebuild their cities and communities stronger than they were before. I hope we will all be as generous as we can.

One final point. This is a wake-up call to our country. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, this is a wake-up call because we have not funded adequately our disaster response fund, the DRF. We are actually about \$1.6 billion below where we should be. This is not a wise policy given what happened over the weekend. Catastrophes can strike without warning at any time. If we leave just the amount of money that is in the DRF and something like Katrina or this event were to happen, that money would be used up in 3 days. We have not replenished that fund.

I have called on the President to send a supplemental emergency bill. We can't pay for current disasters out of future preparedness money. That is what the continuing resolution in the House basically does. I strongly object to taking money we have set aside in the event that catastrophes happen to pay for past disasters. That is another reason I voted against the House concurrent resolution.

Now with the visual of this horrific tragedy unfolding in Japan, with the tsunami, the destruction of the cities, the two nuclear powerplants under extraordinary pressure, it does no good to take money out of paying for current disasters, paying for the past damage.

I have sent a letter to the President asking him to send up an emergency bill. It would be wise for us to pay for past emergencies off-budget and then to use our homeland security bill to budget as effectively and as appropriately as we can for disasters that may occur.

I am proud to say that the Democratic leadership has doubled the

amount of money we are setting aside in case these things happen. It used to be only \$800 million a year. Now we are budgeting close to 1.8 or 1.9, thinking that in the event that something happens, we want to be prepared.

In 48 States, disasters have been declared in the last 2 years, not just along the gulf coast. We have had flooding up in the Northeast. We have had flooding in the Midwest. We could potentially have—we had some flooding this weekend. I am not sure how widespread it was, but in New Jersey, there were scenes throughout the weekend about rivers overflowing as the spring approaches.

So let us, as we mourn for Japan and are in solidarity with them through this crisis, use this as a reminder to get our business straight, to get our budget straight and not mess around with our disaster relief fund. Let's pay for past disasters we owe the communities—we have pledged to help them rebuild—and set aside the appropriate money in the regular budget to take care of things that might happen this year as we advance.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed in morning business for 20 minutes instead of 10.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. And, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after my opening statement, my colleague from Connecticut be allowed to give his statement, and then I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut and I be allowed to engage in a colloquy. And I understand the Senator from Connecticut may be using his 10 minutes. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Thank you, Mr. President.

LIBYA

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, today my colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN, and I are preparing to submit a resolution on the situation in Libya.

Mr. President, is it allowed to send to the desk a resolution even though we are in morning business and its consideration be delayed until the appropriate time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will then be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the wording of the resolution is a sense of the Senate. It is pretty simple and straightforward. It calls for a recognition of the provisional revolutionary government in Libya, and it calls for placing as rapidly as possible a no-fly zone over Libya. It has some other language associated with it, which I would go into later on. But the fact is, what it does is urge the President of the United States to take long-overdue action to prevent the massacres that are taking place in Libya as we speak. At this moment, opponents of Colonel Qadhafi and his supporters are fighting for their very survival.

The demands of the Libyan people began much like those of their neighbors in North Africa and the Middle East—for the protection of their universal rights, for greater political freedom and representative government, for justice and opportunity. But the response of Qadhafi and those still loyal to him stands in stark contrast to the inspiring events of what some are calling the Arab spring. Qadhafi has unleashed a merciless campaign of violence against the Libyan people, including civilian noncombatants, using every tool at his disposal, from artillery barrages, to airstrikes, to the employment of foreign mercenaries. As President Bill Clinton correctly stated last week, "It is not a fair fight."

It is not a fair fight, and now the hour is growing dark. Over the past week, the momentum has increasingly shifted away from the opposition and toward Qadhafi—showing once again what a lot of us understand about warfare: that a smaller well-trained, well-equipped force can usually prevail over a larger less-trained and less-equipped force.

One by one, towns that had been liberated by the opposition are now falling to Qadhafi's forces. We are only now beginning to learn the savage cost of those losses, especially on the civilian population—the women, children, and elderly who could neither fight nor flee Qadhafi's rampage and, of course, those brave Libyan rebels, or the many suspected of aiding their cause, who face certain death or perhaps a fate worse than death. We are horrified by what we have learned already, but what we have yet to learn and what we could still witness if Qadhafi's forces are allowed to finish this unfair fight will shock and offend the conscience of the entire world.

Last week, in a hearing in the Committee on Armed Services, the Director of National Intelligence said that absent outside assistance to the opposition, "I think over the long term that the [Qadhafi] regime will prevail." And yet it is the policy of the United States, as stated by the President, that "Qaddafi must step down from power and leave." That is the right policy, but it is increasingly at odds now with the facts on the ground.

So we face a stark choice: either the President and the United States take