

(1) In the second sentence of section 105(a)(2)(B) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619(a)) (as added by section 2(d)), strike “General” and insert “Con-formed General”.

(2) In section 2(e), strike “as redesignated as” and insert “as redesignated by”.

(3) In section 2(f), strike “as redesignated as” and insert “as redesignated by”.

(4) In section 2(g), strike “as redesignated as” and insert “as redesignated by”.

NATIONAL DAY ON WRITING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 298.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 298) expressing support for the designation of October 20, 2011, as the “National Day on Writing.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agree to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, that there be no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 298) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 298

Whereas people in the 21st century are writing more than ever before for personal, professional, and civic purposes;

Whereas the social nature of writing invites people of every age, profession, and walk of life to create meaning through composing;

Whereas more and more people in every occupation deem writing as essential and influential in their work;

Whereas writers continue to learn how to write for different purposes, audiences, and occasions throughout their lifetimes;

Whereas developing digital technologies expand the possibilities for composing in multiple media at a faster pace than ever before;

Whereas young people are leading the way in developing new forms of composing by using different forms of digital media;

Whereas effective communication contributes to building a global economy and a global community;

Whereas the National Council of Teachers of English, in conjunction with its many national and local partners, honors and celebrates the importance of writing through the National Day on Writing;

Whereas the National Day on Writing celebrates the foundational place of writing in the personal, professional, and civic lives of the people of the United States;

Whereas the National Day on Writing provides an opportunity for individuals across the United States to share and exhibit their written works through the National Gallery of Writing;

Whereas the National Day on Writing highlights the importance of writing instruction and practice at every educational level and in every subject area;

Whereas the National Day on Writing emphasizes the lifelong process of learning to write and compose for different audiences, purposes, and occasions;

Whereas the National Day on Writing honors the use of the full range of media for composing, from traditional tools like print, audio, and video, to Web 2.0 tools like blogs, wikis, and podcasts; and

Whereas the National Day on Writing encourages all people of the United States to write, as well as to enjoy and learn from the writing of others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of October 20, 2011, as the “National Day on Writing”;

(2) strongly affirms the purposes of the National Day on Writing;

(3) encourages participation in the National Gallery of Writing, which serves as an exemplary living archive of the centrality of writing in the lives of the people of the United States; and

(4) encourages educational institutions, businesses, community and civic associations, and other organizations to promote awareness of the National Day on Writing and celebrate the writing of the members those organizations through individual submissions to the National Gallery of Writing.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, October 19; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for up to 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the second half; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 2112, the Agriculture, CJS, and Transportation appropriations bill, under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the first rollcall vote will occur at about noon tomorrow in relation to amendment No. 739.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska.

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

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask to speak for up to 1 hour.

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

ALASKA DAY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Today, there is a celebration in Alaska. Tonight is the 144th anniversary of Alaska Day. This is the day that commemorates the first raising of the Stars and Stripes over Lord Baranof's castle in Sitka, AK. At the time, Sitka was called New Archangel. Until that moment, it was the capital of Russian America.

We celebrate Alaska's statehood today, October 18, and we also celebrate our 52-year-old compact with the United States and its promise to grant Alaskans the opportunity to participate equally with the other States of the Union. Together with Hawaii, statehood for Alaska marked the last chapter in America's great westward expansion. Of course, that expansion began well before Alaska's statehood, well before the purchase from Russia. It goes back to Thomas Jefferson's Northwest Ordinance, which promised an equal footing for a State government to stand on its own and to make that leap out of territorial status. This resulted in States such as Ohio and Indiana forming as sovereign governments with the Federal Government, relinquishing almost all control over the lands within those borders. So people came to live, to build their lives in these new States; and with their new lives came the infrastructure—the roads, bridges, factories, and the industry.

That set things in motion for expansion into the Far West frontier States such as Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, and Montana. And then gold in California and Colorado brought an urgency to the expansion. We saw the railroads that helped accelerate and accommodate it.

In times past, the terms began to change. Precedents were increasingly set for vast Federal land withdrawals in the form of national forests, monuments, parks, and preserves. The promise and definition of “equal footing” changed during these times. Ultimately, more States had more of an equal footing than others, as we saw the newest western States would soon have to contend with Federal land managers.

None of this, though, took away from the hope that Alaskans felt when Secretary of State William Seward negotiated the purchase of Alaska from Tsar Nicholas, and he negotiated this purchase for \$7.2 million. We are talking a lot about money nowadays, and usually we are talking in billions rather than millions. Think about it. The purchase of Alaska came at the price of \$7.2 million. That is about 2 cents an acre, which is clearly a deal under anybody's terms.

Back in Sitka today, this day is always commemorated by the town's biggest parade of the year as a time of

celebration, when many Alaskans remember the hope they felt for a brighter future when we became the 49th State in the Union back in 1959. In 1959, I was only a year old, and so when President Eisenhower signed that statehood act into law, it didn't have much of an impression at that point in time. But I have felt—and I still feel—I have grown up with Alaska, that we have both matured over the years. Those who know me know I can go on and on extolling the virtues of my State—something as simple as potatoes. I will brag that while we might not have the biggest potatoes in the country, ours are germ free. We are bigger, better, and we have more sun, more darkness, and it is colder, and it is warmer. We are a land of extremes. We are an incredible place.

Alaska is unparalleled in its beauty and its potential. There has always been something that is very classically American about Alaska. It is truly our Nation's last frontier—a place where it is still possible for adventurous men and women to live the greatest version of the American dream. I think that is what draws so many people to our State. They still believe there is a place where you can live on the edge of a lot of possibility, and that continues to make us a remarkable place to be.

Statehood itself was a dream for many years among our pioneers and native people. It didn't come quickly and certainly not easily. Prior to statehood, we only had territorial status in the United States. That left us without any votes here in the Congress. We weren't entitled to receive funding for many programs, including highways. We were at the mercy of the generosity of the Federal Government. We were at the mercy of those out-of-State interests, which had locked in a foothold over many of our resources.

I was born and raised in southeastern Alaska. My grandparents raised their families there. I can remember the stories about the push for statehood, stemming from the desire to control our fisheries—the salmon wars that went on at that time.

Ultimately, statehood came about after 92 long years and only after heroic efforts from a great many individuals—too many to do justice this evening. But for purposes of my statement tonight, I want to invoke three names that some in this town and some in this Chamber may still remember.

The first is our former Governor and Senator Ernest Gruening, whose seat in this Chamber I am humbled to hold. Senator Gruening was an intellectual titan, the consummate public servant. He was an alumnus of Harvard Medical School, a prolific journalist who served as editor to both the New York Tribune and the magazine *The Nation*. He also contributed to the *Atlantic Monthly*.

In the epic novel "Alaska," written by James Michener, he credited Senator Gruening with publicizing the cause for Alaskan statehood at the national level. He called him "perceptive

and gifted." As a testament to his legacy, Ernest Gruening's statue now stands just a few steps away from here in the Capitol Visitor Center.

Another individual, a man who truly built our State, was Wally Hickel, a former Governor. He was the man with whom President Nixon was so impressed that he named him as his Secretary of the Interior.

Wally was a former boxer from Kansas. He arrived in Alaska with—the legend goes—about 37 cents in his pocket. He rose to prominence in both business and politics. He was at the forefront of negotiating statehood. He understood the critical balance between the Federal interests and the State interests, between the corporate interests and the public interests.

Governor Hickel is important to this conversation because Alaska is where he saw and realized the American dream, all the while with a clear eye and vision toward the future of our State. We lost Wally Hickel last spring, but his writings and his vision clearly continue to guide our State.

A third name I want to bring up this evening is a man I was privileged to work for and to serve with, and that is the late Senator Ted Stevens.

I hold Senator Stevens—or Uncle Ted, as many in the State referred to him—in great personal and professional regard. He was a World War II pilot, a Harvard lawyer, who served as prosecutor in the territorial days. He was a congressional liaison to President Eisenhower. He was an attorney for the Interior Department. Much of the leg work that is associated with statehood was Ted's, and much of what Alaska has become is directly attributable to his work here in this Chamber.

Ted's work and his influence carried so much farther beyond Alaska. His work in matters of national defense, telecom, and fisheries shaped national and global politics. He was truly larger than life. He made Alaska matter in a way that nobody could have imagined. Without him, it is indisputable that we would not have the opportunities we have now.

The reason I invoke these names is to remind my colleagues about the consequential nature, the gravitas of great men and women who made sure that Alaska became our 49th State. These were exceptional Americans with an exceptional vision. They qualified as the founding fathers of my home State. They knew what Thomas Jefferson knew at the time of the Northwest Ordinance—that the new State of Alaska didn't have the population at the time and wasn't likely to get the population; that they didn't have the infrastructure to support an economy, and that it would not succeed without open access to this huge natural resource base. This is why they negotiated 104 million acres of pure State land and a 90-percent share of revenues from resource development on Federal lands, compared to the 50 percent that is enjoyed by the rest of the States.

There was no clear path to Alaska's self-sufficiency without these terms. As a matter of fact, there still isn't. In 1958, the U.S. Senate's official committee report on the Alaska Statehood Act promised Alaska that it would be given great latitude to develop its resources. It read:

Some of the additional costs connected with statehood will be met by granting the State a reasonable return from Federal exploitation of resources within the new State. In the past, the United States has controlled the lion's share of resources and, in some instances, retained the lion's share of the proceeds. This situation, though, has not proved conducive to development of the Alaskan economy. The committee deems it only fair that when the State relieves the United States of most of its expense burden, the State should receive a realistic portion of the proceeds from resources within its borders.

There is more to this. Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton, while in Alaska in the summer of 1958, said that the statehood compact "reaffirms Alaska's preferential treatment in receiving 90 percent of all revenues from oil, gas, and coal leasing on public domain." In Fairbanks, he went further, promising "since early this year, the territory has received 90 percent of all these oil lease revenues, and the State of Alaska will continue to do so."

These statements are remarkably clear. Alaska would be allowed to develop these resources and receive most of the revenues from that development. I truly wish I could stand here tonight, all these years later, and say these promises have been upheld. I wish I could go to sleep tonight or any night knowing the Federal Government had kept its promises to the people of Alaska and that my children and their children will surely see our State continue to prosper and come into its own.

But the reality is that Alaska's relationship with the Federal Government has become strained. The Federal Government has always had a significant presence in the last frontier, from the first Alaska Day to this one. But today, at a time when Alaskans need the Federal Government to act as our partner, it has become an obstacle. Its default position is no longer to enable prosperity for Alaskans. More often than not, the Federal Government now delays or denies those opportunities.

That leaves me concerned about the future of my State, not because of the global economy, not because of high unemployment levels, but because of the treatment we receive at the hands of our own Federal Government.

I am here today to say that this treatment cannot go on like this. I want to ensure that my colleagues in the Senate understand why.

I have asked for a large block of time tonight, and I don't usually take a lot of floor time, particularly to go back into history. But this is important to not only my State's past but my State's future.

I wish to explain some of what we are dealing with. Some of this may not be

easy for some to see. Some believe that Alaska—and the rest of the country, for that matter—is past the point where we need to develop our resources. Many of our newer Members may not understand the promises that were made to Alaska upon statehood. Therefore, they don't understand what has been happening since then.

Adding to the complication is that our resource options have been greatly restricted over the course of decades, not individual months or even years. So to understand what has changed, we can't look back to the start of this administration.

I will not single out the President and the administration and say you are not letting us do something. The fact is that we have to go back many administrations. We have to go all the way back to the late 1970s, a time when much of Alaska had already been withdrawn into Federal wilderness status. President Carter and his Interior Secretary had decided that, well, that wasn't enough. They designated over 56 million more acres of new national monuments, 40 million more acres of wildlife refuges, and 11 million more acres of restricted national forest. Now that in and of itself would have been unprecedented, unprecedented in terms of the amount of land for the Federal Government to unilaterally withdraw if it were nationwide, but this land was all in Alaska. Every acre of it was in Alaska. So, not surprisingly, this came over the State's objection.

Congress reacted to this tremendous Federal overreach so that Alaska's Senators and lone Congressman, together with a few sympathetic colleagues, could at least try to control that impact. That negotiated truce was the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. We call it ANILCA for short. In no uncertain terms, ANILCA was a compromise. It was clearly a compromise.

For his part, when he signed ANILCA into law, President Carter stated:

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

Again, that is President Carter saying that 100 percent of offshore areas and 95 percent of potentially productive oil and mineral areas will be available for exploration or for drilling—a pretty strong statement, and it seemed pretty clear and very reassuring at the time of this compromise. But today it stands as probably the worst broken promise the Federal Government has ever made to the State of Alaska. As the Department of the Interior reported just this past spring, less than 1 percent—less than 1 percent—of Federal lands in Alaska is currently producing oil or natural gas. I would suggest that is an indictment. A significant portion of our lands have been placed off limits, and then where development is allowed, it is often stalled by Federal redtape. That is wrong. It is wrong, it is unacceptable, and it is to

the detriment of both Alaska and our Nation as a whole.

Alaska is nearly 4,000 miles from where we are here in Washington, DC. I know because I log that trip on Alaska Airlines quite frequently. I know that what makes news back home doesn't always make news here. So I would like to use part of my time tonight to provide the Senate with some of the many examples of how resource development in my home State is being held back. Let's start with mining.

Back in 2009, the EPA attempted to halt the Kensington Gold Mine from proceeding in southeast Alaska, and this happened after two decades—two decades—of agency review and legal challenges. It happened even though the Supreme Court had ruled that a crucial permit for the mine was indeed valid. But the EPA was so unhappy with this decision, it jumped back in. It sought to nullify the plan that had just held up to the scrutiny of the Supreme Court. This was not the Alaska Supreme Court, this was the U.S. Supreme Court. This was not an effort to protect the environment by the EPA. The EPA proposal was demonstrably worse for the environment. This was an effort to stop the mine at all costs, regardless of the consequences for the local economy or the hundreds of Alaskans who were depending on jobs from this particular mine.

More recently, we have seen Senators within this body from other States challenge a mine that could one day be located in southwest Alaska. Those Senators have asked the EPA to consider a preemptive veto of the mine. This is even before a plan has been proposed. I have said that a preemptive veto makes no more sense than a preemptive approval and that we should provide a robust environmental review when and if a permit application is going to be submitted.

I will remind everyone here that we don't have a habit of hastily approving mines in this country. In fact, we rank dead last—dead last—among all the countries in the world in the amount of time it takes to review permits. This mine will have to secure at least 67 different permits, approvals, and authorizations from Federal, State, and local governments. That represents about 67 chances for the mine to be delayed, modified, or halted. But some apparently believe that process is still not sufficient.

Now let's talk about timber and the wholesale destruction of the timber industry in southeast Alaska. At this point, I feel once again as though I need to put my Alaska bona fides out there and remind everybody how big Alaska is. We are more than twice the size of Texas. People forget that. We have a lot of room up there. We could produce a tremendous portion of our Nation's timber and pulp if we were only allowed to do so. We could do that while leaving the vast majority of our lands untouched. But that hasn't been possible. Southeast Alaska is nearly all

Federal lands, so our ability to conduct logging there is very heavily dependent on the Federal Government's willingness to grant access.

When ANILCA passed, the timber industry, in return for accepting the creation of more than 5 million acres of new national monuments closed to timber harvesting, was assured that the Forest Service would make 450 million board feet of timber available in the future—half of what was being produced prior to the bill's passage. We accepted that as a compromise. ANILCA also guaranteed \$40 million worth of funding each year for road building, for precommercial thinning to allow the existing industry to survive on a smaller land base.

So you might ask the question, what happened? Alaska's timber industry has not thrived. It struggles. Go down to the southeast and talk to people in Ketchikan or out in Thorne Bay, and it is worse than struggling. They are on life support. They are struggling to survive as outside forces repeatedly attempt to shut it down. At the urging of the Washington, DC, environmental community, the funding within ANILCA was repealed and the allowable harvest level was cut in half again over the following decade. But even that reduced amount of logging seems expansive today because the Forest Service has made far less than 50 million board feet available for timber harvest within the past 3 years. So far this year, the Forest Service has amazingly sold just 2 million board feet of new timber offerings. This is a dramatic decline for an industry that once provided thousands of well-paying jobs for residents in southeast Alaska, as well as the revenue that came in and, by the way, some really world-class quality wood and pulp resources for the rest of our country.

Given these restrictions, it probably comes as no surprise that employment in the industry has plummeted from about 6,000 total jobs in 1980 to where we are today, which is about 450, and that includes all of the support structure as well. So for those of us who grew up in the Tonkas—I was born in Ketchikan and raised in places such as Juneau and Wrangell—to see an economy be truly just cut off to the point that it is no longer existent because of Federal policies is very difficult to deal with.

Then, of course, we can take a look at Alaska's oil and gas industry, which currently provides nearly 90 percent of the revenues for Alaska's State budget and historically as much as 20 percent of our Nation's petroleum supply. We are pretty proud of this. We feel as though we have done a pretty good job. Here more than anywhere else we see the scope and the consequences of Federal decisions to restrict resource development.

Just to put things in context so that people know what I am talking about—and I don't have the rest of the country on here, Mr. President, because that

chart is coming later—in understanding where Alaska's resources lie, I think it helps to understand the management and the division within our State in terms of our lands. I don't expect most can see this map, but it is kind of a jumble of colors. What I will direct your attention to—and those who are looking at this—is all of the green areas, which are Forest Service, and the orange and tan areas are our BLM parklands. The areas that are in blue are the State lands. The small areas where you have red are areas held in private lands, whether it is Native lands or whether it is held in private lands.

Up here, in the National Petroleum Reserve at the top of the State, is an area that Congress explicitly designated—they have singled out and explicitly designated—for producing oil. But Federal regulators will not allow a simple bridge to be built over a remote river, and without this bridge, it is not possible or it is exceptionally difficult to begin commercial production. So you have production within a National Petroleum Reserve that is remaining off limits at this moment.

I have asked the question—and it is not a rhetorical question but one clearly worth repeating—if we can't get petroleum from the National Petroleum Reserve, from where can we get it? This is an area that was specifically designated by the Congress. Yet we are being held up from accessing this because we cannot get approval to place a bridge over the Colville River. So we continue to work this because it is extraordinary that we would be held up these many years.

Offshore, in the Beaufort and the Chukchi, are areas estimated to contain more than 20 billion barrels of oil. Production in these areas could help us refill our pipeline, which is running dangerously low, and create many thousands of good-paying jobs. But Federal regulators have held this up over really, of all things, air permits needed for exploratory operations to begin miles offshore in the Arctic Ocean. We have seen some steps in the right direction, and that is good. But the fact is, drilling has been canceled each of the last four seasons, and next year is still uncertain.

I had an opportunity to quiz Director Bromwich today. He is trying to give me the assurance that this might be on track for next season. But it has been almost 5 years and cost almost \$4 billion, all in an effort to get to the point where we can proceed to begin exploration. Alaska has already lost hundreds of jobs and millions in revenues because of these federally imposed delays.

Of course, I cannot not talk about Alaska's oil and gas resources without discussing Alaska's coastal plain, which is this area right over here adjoining Canada. We have an area up north that is estimated to hold 10.4 billion barrels of oil. This is the mean estimate, so it is quite possibly much

more than that. I have sponsored legislation to allow responsible development in the nonwilderness portion—not in the wilderness portion—of ANWR. We are not going to touch the wilderness portion, just the nonwilderness portion of ANWR. I have offered this for several Congresses now.

But even limiting that development to 0.1 percent of the refuge has proven unacceptable to many Members of this Chamber. We repeatedly hear from others that this area is too sensitive, despite Alaska's very strong record of environmental stewardship in nearby Prudhoe Bay. We repeatedly hear it is just going to take too long for this oil to come to market. They will say it is going to take 10 years to get ANWR oil. That is too long.

The "10 years away" argument has been made for over 20 years now. So instead of continuing to delay, let's figure out how we make this happen. But instead of any promotion in Congress and from the Fish and Wildlife Service, we face efforts to put all the Coastal Plain into permanent wilderness restriction.

To anyone who thinks the nonwilderness portion of ANWR was never meant for energy development, I would point you to President Eisenhower's original designation creating not a refuge but the Arctic Range. I would also remind you that President Eisenhower had both an assistant to the Secretary of the Interior Department and a congressional liaison, and that individual was named Ted Stevens. Ted was in the room with Interior Secretary Seaton, drafting the Executive order for the Arctic Range Conservation Program. If you think he would have considered locking up Alaska's resources, I don't think you know him as I did.

The order clearly provided that oil and gas development would be permitted so long as there were reasonable protections in place for the flora and the fauna. I would encourage any of my colleagues, look up this Executive order of December 6, 1960, if you have any further questions.

For all of its broken promises, ANILCA is still law, and it contains two very important provisions that were negotiated by Senator Stevens. The first is for an oil and gas exploratory program to occur in the 1002 Area. This is this small portion of the Coastal Plain that I have sought to open. But I wish to repeat this. Existing law provides for oil and gas exploration, and exploratory drilling has already occurred in ANWR. In fact, in the two winters in 1984 and 1985, seismic exploration was conducted along 1,400 miles of survey lines in ANWR. There were several companies that were also permitted to conduct other geologic studies, such as surface rock sampling and mapping and some geochemical testing. This resulted in a report from the Interior Department based on what it learned about the resource and the ability to develop it responsibly, recommending that Con-

gress take the next step and authorize oil and gas leasing for the entire 1002 Area.

We have to ask the question: Why is this relevant? To begin with, it is worth noting that the current law already provides for exploratory drilling in ANWR. All that is prohibited is development leading to production. I doubt many people realize we have actually already authorized drilling in ANWR, and Congress's real decision is to decide whether we leave the oil in there or whether we let it come to market.

The second major provision in ANILCA is probably better known. It is called the "no more" clause, and we talk about it a lot in Alaska. It is an express prohibition on any more wilderness withdrawals in Alaska. Included is a congressional finding that Alaska has unequivocally contributed enough of its lands to conservation purposes. I am going to quote directly from this law. It has been upheld in court, it remains in place today, and it provides as follows:

This act provides sufficient protection for the national interests in the scenic, natural, cultural, and environmental values on the public lands in Alaska, and at the same time provides adequate opportunity for satisfaction of the economic and social needs of the State of Alaska and its people. Accordingly, the designation and disposition of the public lands in Alaska pursuant to this Act are found to represent a proper balance between the reservation of national conservation system units and those public lands necessary and appropriate for more intensive use and disposition. And, thus, Congress believes that the need for future legislation designating new conservation system units, new national conservation areas, or new national recreation areas has been obviated thereby.

I don't think it could be any more clear than that. It troubles me a great deal when people in Washington then take it upon themselves to look for more wilderness in Alaska.

In 2004, the General Services Administration reported that more than 60 percent of Alaska was owned by the Federal Government—about 250 million acres in total. Again, if we look at the map, outside of the blue areas, pretty much all that we are seeing the green, the kind of tan, the orange, these are all Federal areas. So about 250 million acres are owned by the Federal Government. Compare that with some of the other States.

I don't mean to pick on the smaller States, but Connecticut, 0.4 percent of Connecticut, about 14,000 Federal acres. New York is 0.8 percent, about 230,000 acres. Illinois is 1.8 percent. They have about 640,000 Federal acres. But, again, according to that report, the State of Alaska has about 250 million acres of land under Federal control.

So we would say: Where are their private lands? Less than 1 percent of Alaska's lands are privately held. People have a tough time with that because they think: They have so much land. They have so much acreage. It is so huge. Surely, they must have some of that in private land.

It is less than 1 percent. It begs the question, when we are looking to add more wilderness, how fair is it to look to Alaska for more wilderness, when we have some 250 million acres in Federal control already, more wilderness in Alaska, in one State, than in the rest of the Nation combined? It is an important question to be asked.

We would at least suppose that the vast areas where Alaska cannot develop our resources would give us a silver lining of more recreational access. I know the Chair enjoys the great outdoors, as do I, and we like to get out and hike and be part of what we have with the land. But with Alaska's land management, even access to our lands makes it complicated, and that promise too has been broken.

Under ANILCA, Alaska's outdoor recreational enthusiasts were promised access to the 120 million acres of new parks, refuges, and wilderness areas. Again, whether it is our Forest Service lands, our Park Service lands, our refuge lands, it was all promised that, OK, it is there. It is for all to enjoy. But as we feared, soon after the bill was passed, after ANILCA passed, Federal agencies closed access. They closed access by snow machines, they closed access by road, and they closed access by plane to some of the lands. In other words, we can enjoy access, we can enjoy this if we can walk there. That is good for those of us who are still able-bodied, and we are much stronger when we are going up those mountains. But the fact is, it is limited if we can't access it by any other means other than walking there.

The access further went when Glacier Bay was shut off to commercial fishing entirely. It especially hurt where Alaskans, whose property then became in-holdings within these new conservation areas, they faced regulations just 5 years after this law was passed that made permission for access into their lands much more difficult, clearly, much more expensive, and sometimes shutting them out altogether. To this day, I deal with constituents who are out here in the McCarthy area, a great park area, but there are in-holdings, private in-holdings. But in order to gain access to their property that is rightly theirs—and the Federal Government recognizes it—they say: They can be there, but we are going to make it extraordinarily difficult for them to gain access to their own property.

So the promise that we as Alaskans would be able to enjoy this incredible land we have, even that has been hindered.

I have chosen to speak about these broken promises today because I wish to make clear that both history and the law point squarely to Alaska's right to the use and enjoyment of its lands. While the law should be well enough, we can't forget why good public policy weighs in favor as well.

The decisions to block Alaskan development have come to a head at the worst possible time. We have high un-

employment. We have record Federal debt. We have global financial distress. Alaska could help on all these fronts. We stand ready to create tens of thousands of jobs. We can create hundreds of billions of dollars in new Federal revenues. We can help relieve the staggering costs our Nation pays for foreign oil, but we need permission from the Federal Government.

At times it seems that many in this Chamber have forgotten why we need to produce our natural resources in the first place. The answer is pretty simple: It leads to economic growth, it leads to prosperity, and it helps us compete in a rapidly changing world. But because we have slowed down resource production, because we have locked down so much of our lands, our Nation is increasingly—and I believe needlessly—facing scarcity issues and dependency, dependent on foreign sources, for so many of the resources we depend upon. In terms of many of these crucial resources, whether it be energy, timber, minerals, Alaska is not just the last frontier; it is truly the best option.

I am not overstating the case to say that much of our Nation's competitiveness rests on our ability to access our resources. Right now, though, we are constantly blocked. Production is happening all around us. Just look at what is going on. We had a hearing today in the Energy Committee discussing what is happening offshore of Cuba. It is not just happening offshore of Cuba. It is offshore in Russia. It is offshore in Canada. It is down in Mexico. It is in Cuba. We can look to China for our rare earth elements, but why would we do that when we have the prospects in this country in Alaska? Alaska has these resources.

The positive benefits that would result if we reversed the current dynamic are not up for debate. Countless studies clearly show that development in Alaska, because of its grand scale and high resource values, will create jobs and economic benefits for literally every single State—for the Chair's State of Colorado, for all our States. This does not require clear-cutting the State or drilling every inch of our State or every acre or every region—not even close. We are asking to pursue development on a very small amount of land, especially when we consider Alaska's prolific standards.

To put it into context of the whole, and I hope everyone can see the outline of the lower 48 States here and Alaska is superimposed. I didn't put Alaska in the middle there because it looks better in the middle. What I am trying to show is, this is a proportionate picture of how Alaska, if it were superimposed over the lower 48—where we extend to: all the way in southeastern Ketchikan over here, which sits in Florida, to fully the furthest part of the west coast, which is the Aleutian Islands, all the way down here, going all the way up to the North and into the South.

The reality is, Alaska is a State the size of which can't easily be measured

or even understood. As I mentioned, its most distant points stretch from Florida to California. Lay it across the continental United States like this, and people say we must be making it up.

Mr. President, you have had the opportunity to travel to my State. You appreciate that when you are flying in an airplane for hours and still looking down and realizing, I am still flying over the same State—you can appreciate the size and scope of what we are dealing with. Within this area lies a tremendous natural resource base, conventional and nonconventional, renewable and nonrenewable.

When you see Alaska on a map, you never see it represented in proportionate size. You never realize just how unbelievably large it is. Unfortunately, for years when I was in school, Alaska was always in a little box down off of California or off of Mexico, that little piece down there. Our kids did not know where the exact spot on the map was. They did not know the size. We are continuing to educate and educate in an important way because it does make a difference.

Before I go off this chart, I want to again put in context the management issues we deal with. Look at this green area. This would be about 64 percent of Alaska under Federal management. State management is about 24.5 percent, about 90 million acres; 10 percent is Native held; and then less than 1 percent, about 1 million acres, is in private hands. That gives you an appreciation of what it is we are dealing with.

Mr. President, you and I have had an opportunity to talk about some of the truly magical places you have enjoyed in Alaska. I appreciate your perspective and the special places you have been. There is no argument—you will not find argument from this Alaskan—that major portions of Alaska are truly worth protecting and should not be developed. Those are some pretty spectacular areas. You may see them advertised. Oftentimes you will have environmental groups that will advertise them. The photographs may or may not always reflect the actual proposed sites, but they are beautiful. We will not ever dispute that they are beautiful.

The current Deputy Secretary of the Interior has said we are not going to drill in our pristine wilderness any more than we are going to build a dam in the Grand Canyon. We are not proposing that, not by any legal or commonsense definition.

We have in our State five major oil-bearing regions that remain nonproducing. We have a pipeline that is dwindling at one-third of its capacity. This pipeline literally bisects the State of Alaska. It is the spinal cord of our State's economy. It is a critical artery for America's energy security. Right now, that pipeline is running low, it is running slow, and we are being prevented from accessing the resources to

build it up. We have negotiated, pleaded, and begged for access to our resources for more than a generation. We have even been willing to sacrifice some of the revenues Alaska is clearly entitled to by law, and it has fallen on positively deaf ears here in Washington, even at a time when those dollars would mean quite a lot in terms of avoiding painful tax hikes or program cuts. When you look back on the past 50 years, it is more than a little astonishing that opposition to development continues to be so just dug in.

I think what has been borne out from Alaska's resource development is a very strong record of environmental stewardship. We have produced our natural resources for generations. For my entire life there, we have been producing our resources, whether it is our timber, whether it is our fisheries, whether it is mining and now oil. We have produced them for generations, and we have preserved our pristine qualities and the natural beauty perfectly. We are a world-class vacation destination for everyone who wants to come up on the big cruise ships, to those who want to do the ecotourism. We are a genuine paradise for the trophy fisherman, for the hunters who want to come to Alaska. We have a fish and game management program that is the most productive, the most sustainable model for the entire world.

I have people tell me: The one thing I want to do before I die is go to Alaska and see it. So if we have been producing all of our resources for all these years, for all these generations—if we really had been doing that terrible of a job, why does everybody want to see this incredibly beautiful land we have? I suggest it is because we have been doing a pretty good job of resource development as we have gone along the course.

Resource production has yielded substantial social and economic benefits to the State. More than 16 billion barrels of oil have been sent to the lower 48, with minimal environmental impact. Our oil also supplies refineries near Fairbanks and Anchorage. It allows us to serve as an international cargo hub. Our refineries produce the fuel for fighter jets and other military needs at our four bases. The strategic value of Alaska's geographical position—we sit literally at the top of the world there—for military purposes alone is sufficient to justify access to the resource, even if we were to ignore the jobs, ignore the revenue and the energy security benefits that come along with it. Yet, as I stand here today, virtually every extractive industry in Alaska has been disrupted by the Federal Government. Mining, timber, oil and gas—all these productions are well below or well behind the levels that would best serve Alaska and our country. No matter the project, it seems we have to fight the Federal Government for access and permission every single step of the way.

Federal agencies are attempting to subvert Supreme Court decisions. Sen-

ators from other States are attempting to halt mines that have not even been proposed. Permits are delayed, they are withheld, and they are outright refused. Drilling cannot take place in places Congress has explicitly designated for drilling, including our National Petroleum Reserve.

At the root of these troubles really is Alaska's treatment by the Federal Government. Because we have so much land and because we do depend on the development of these lands to thrive as a State, Alaska's future truly rests in the Federal Government's hands. But at the very moment—at the time when we most need the Federal Government to be acting as our partner, it has become an obstacle to progress and to our prosperity. The promises that were made at statehood and under ANILCA seem to be remembered only by Alaskans.

So it is apparent to me that the system of Federal land management and land use that used to work has now turned against us. Instead of facilitating new development and working to ensure it is carried out responsibly, the Federal Government now routinely denies our opportunities and locks up Alaska's lands. No matter where we look, we face this gauntlet of land use and environmental statutes that have been twisted into permitting delays, project denials, endless litigation. Put at risk is the sound economy we have worked very hard to build, the livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of Alaskans, and our ability to live up to our obligation at statehood to remain financially solvent as a State. We are in this position for, I believe, one reason, and that is because the promises that were made to Alaska by the Federal Government have been broken. We have asked nicely—perhaps too nicely—for a long time for those promises to be honored.

So, before I close, I would like to draw one more quotation from Senator Gruening, of whom I spoke earlier. This is a rather lengthy quote, but it is one worth hearing. Senator Gruening states:

We Alaskans believe passionately that American citizenship is the most precious possession in the world. Hence we want it in full measure; full citizenship instead of half-citizenship; first class instead of second class citizenship. We demand equality with all other Americans and the liberties long denied us that go with it. To adapt Daniel Webster's famous phrase uttered as a peroration against impending separatism, we Alaskans want "liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever."

But the keepers of Alaska's colonial status should be reminded that the 18th century colonials for long years sought merely to obtain relief from abuses, for which they—like us—vainly pleaded, before finally resolving that only independence would secure for them the "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness," which they felt was their natural right.

We trust that the United States will not, by similar blindness to our rights and deafness to our pleas, drive Alaskans from patient hope to desperation.

That is pretty lofty language, I grant you, but I think it is suited. I think it is suited to this conversation this evening. Just as Ernest Gruening had to have this same fight from this same Chamber over 50 years ago, I am compelled to remind this body that the greatness of this Nation, the ultimate and true greatness of the experiment, depends on the greatness of the individual States which comprise it. As we look at our States and what they are capable of achieving, I would bet Alaska's potential against any other.

Today, on the 144th anniversary of Alaska Day, I ask the Senate to just think, to consider the promises that were made to the State of Alaska, to realize that those promises have not been kept but broken to the detriment of both Alaska and our Nation as a whole. This must be changed with the realization that partnership, not abject denial, is truly the best path forward. If the Federal Government keeps its promises, Alaska will realize its potential, grow as a State, and secure its future.

We would not be doing this just for Alaska alone. The rest of the Nation will benefit greatly as well. That is something we need. It is something we should all agree to work for. There is probably no better time to start than today as we recognize Alaska Day.

I thank the Chair for the attention of the Presiding Officer and for the opportunity to share a little bit of Alaska's history and our frustration with the present.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:37 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 19, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

WENDY M. SPENCER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE, VICE PATRICK ALFRED CORVINGTON, RESIGNED.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

ALFREDO J. BALSERA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2014, VICE ELIZABETH F. BAGLEY, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GINA K. ABERCROMBIE-WINSTANLEY, OF OHIO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MALTA.

JULISSA REYNOSO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ORIENTAL REPUBLIC OF URUGUAY.

ROBERT E. WHITEHEAD, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE TOGOLESE REPUBLIC.