

drilling. While I agree that it is high time we developed a strategy to reduce our dependence on imported oil and secure the Nation's energy resources and infrastructure, we should all know by now that developing ANWR will not achieve this goal.

I have followed the Arctic debate closely for many, many years. I've spoken to this body on a number of occasions about this subject. The facts and best evidence on the main points at issue persuade me, as they have in the past, that drilling in the Arctic is both unnecessary and unwise.

First, there is no oil bonanza in the Arctic that will impact or enhance the Nation's energy security, and neither the Senate nor the Nation should be rushed to an ill-fated judgement based on wildly inflated claims to the contrary.

At peak production, many years down the road, the arctic coastal plain might at best replace about 5-9 percent of the foreign oil imported by the U.S. Oil from the arctic refuge will not have any meaningful impact on either the price of gasoline or on our demand for imported oil. It would do nothing to secure energy independence for our Nation.

Arctic oil is also expensive to produce and transport to the lower 48. Which is why, until Congress banned oil exports, the oil companies shipped a lot of that oil to foreign markets. If those exports bans are ever lifted, we'll likely see any oil from the refuge shipped overseas. There's a reason America imports so much OPEC oil, it's cheap.

In short, our energy security lies in reducing our dependence on oil, period. The more efficiently our Nation uses oil, gas and other energy resources, the more we depend upon alternative energy resources and renewable resources, the less vulnerable our country will be to oil supply disruptions and price spikes.

Moreover, the arctic refuge's coastal plain is the last 5 percent of the entire Alaskan coastal plain that is not already open to oil drilling. The remaining 95 percent of the Alaskan coastal plain is not only open to drilling, but vast tracts of it have yet to be explored for their potential oil reserves.

What's so special about this last 5 percent, preserved since the Eisenhower Administration? It's the heart of all the wildlife diversity in the entire Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. That 5 percent is the central calving ground for the porcupine caribou herd, the exact same landscape that would be scarred with oil wells, drill pads, roads and pipelines if drilling is allowed. That 5 percent is essential migratory habitat for 135 species of birds and waterfowl. That 5 percent is home to polar bears, musk oxen, grizzly bears, wolves, 36 species of fish, and more than 100 other species of wildlife. In fact, ANWR is the most important polar bear denning area in Alaska.

That 5 percent is also a desert compared to the rest of the arctic coastal

plain. I have yet to hear a satisfactory explanation from the oil companies about how they will deal with the fact that there is not enough water to build ice roads in ANWR. If you can't build ice roads that "disappear" in the spring, you have to build gravel roads. Given what we have been told about the dispersed nature of recoverable oil in the refuge, the oil companies will need to build a lot of roads, roads that will crisscross the refuge, disrupting the natural flow of water during the spring, marring the wild character of the refuge and interfering with wildlife migration patterns.

In Montana, we know we must have working landscapes where we encourage oil and gas development, promote timber harvest and grow our Nation's food and fiber. We know such landscapes, if carefully managed, can also produce abundant wildlife populations and much recreational opportunity. Balancing appropriate development with the need to protect special places, for ourselves and for our children, is a dance Montanans know well.

So too the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We have far too many other options open to us right now to secure our energy future than any that may or may not materialize from drilling in ANWR. Americans aren't ready to drill, and America doesn't need to. I hold that the Arctic refuge is too wild to waste.

I would also like to address briefly some concerns I have with some of the energy proposals made by our colleagues in the House. I am particularly concerned with provisions that affect oil and gas leasing procedures on public lands.

The House suggests that we replace the current public process surrounding oil and gas leasing on public lands with a centralized federal mandate that would remove any meaningful public involvement from oil and gas leasing decisions on national forest lands.

In the 1980's, many Montanans traveled to Washington, DC to urge passage of legislation to bring the public into oil and gas leasing decisions on national forest and public lands. Their efforts and those of many others resulted in the passage of the 1987 Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act.

Under current law, the forest supervisor analyzes likely impacts, considers surface resources and consults with the public before determining (1) where Federal oil and gas leasing is authorized and, (2) under what circumstances it should occur. Even if a lease is offered, it often contains provisions to protect wildlife and the environment through stipulations that limit roads and other industrial developments.

Legislation endorsed by our colleagues in the House would eliminate the existing public involvement process.

That legislation would strip national forest supervisors of existing authority to make decisions regarding oil and gas

leasing. The local supervisor's authority would be transferred and centralized under the Secretary of Agriculture who is directed to "ensure that unwarranted denials and stays of lease issuance and unwarranted restrictions" on all oil and gas exploration or development operations "are eliminated" from oil and gas operations "on Federal land." This seems out of character with the often repeated pledge from the Administration and others, that local communities should have a greater voice in the public lands decisions that directly affect them.

Other language would direct the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to order a rewrite of oil and gas leasing plans to remove limits or restraints on oil and gas exploration and development. This would include local Montana decisions that limit oil and gas development designed to protect native trout streams.

Still more language would give the oil and gas industry the power to force a review of previous decisions to limit oil and gas development on national forest and BLM lands, including written explanations showing "whether the reasons underlying the previous decision are still persuasive."

In Montana, such decisions authorized millions of acres for leasing while protecting municipal drinking water sources for Helena, Red Lodge, and East Helena, popular hunting areas, key habitat and wild lands in the Elkhorns Wildlife Management Area, Line Creek Plateau and along Montana's Rocky Mountain Front. Montanans invested years in each of these decisions. They have been well debated, they have withstood legal challenge. They do not need to be reopened by Congress.

In short, I want to express my opposition to any similar provisions that may arise in the Senate. As I have outlined above, what may seem like obscure language to other members of this body is vitally important to Montanans, and could have an enormous impact on my state, and the landscapes Montanans have declared too precious to develop.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred June 15, 2000 in Denver, CO. First-degree murder charges were filed against Samuel Grauman, 21, who was accused of killing, Daniel O'Brien, 36, because O'Brien was gay. Grauman and another man were believed to have befriended gay men they thought would be easy robbery targets.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

FIFTY CALIBER—WEAPON OF CHOICE FOR CRIMINALS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor S. 505, a bill introduced by Senator FEINSTEIN to strengthen the regulation of long-range fifty caliber sniper weapons. These weapons are among the most powerful, and least regulated, firearms legally available. Information provided by the Violence Policy Center demonstrates why Senator FEINSTEIN's legislation is so important.

According to the VPC's analysis, the ease with which fifty caliber weapons are purchased has made them popular with criminals and fringe groups. For example, in February of 1992, a Wells Fargo armored delivery truck was attacked in a "military style operation" in Chamblee, Georgia, by several men using a smoke grenade and a fifty caliber sniper rifle. Two employees were wounded. And according to the General Accounting Office, fifty caliber sniper rifles have been found in the armories of drug dealers in California, Missouri, and Indiana.

In March of 1998, in my home State of Michigan, Federal law enforcement officers arrested three members of a radical group known as the North American Militia. The men were charged with plotting to bomb Federal office buildings, destroy highways, utilities and public roads, and assassinate a number of Federal officials. A fifty caliber sniper rifle was among the weapons found in their possession.

Fifty caliber weapons are too powerful and too accessible to be ignored any longer. Tighter regulations are needed. I urge my colleagues to support Senator FEINSTEIN's bill.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL JAKE SHUFORD

• Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Rear Admiral (Select) Jake Shuford, United States Navy, for the outstanding performance, dedication, and leadership he has exhibited over the last two years as the Director of Senate Liaison for the Navy. Admiral Shuford is a sailor's sailor.

Since receiving his commission as a Naval officer over 27 years ago, Jake Shuford has distinguished himself through his tactical acumen, seamanship, and "can-do" attitude. He commanded the hydrofoil USS *Aries*, PHM 5, the guided missile frigate USS *Rodney M. Davis*, FFG 60, and the guided missile cruiser USS *Gettysburg*, CG 64.

During Admiral Shuford's command of the *Gettysburg*, the ship won the prestigious Battle "E" Efficiency award while successfully firing 69 Tomahawk missiles during strike operations in Iraq and Kosovo.

Admiral Shuford took the conn of the Navy's Senate Liaison Office in September 1999, earning the admiration of Senators who have worked with him. Admiral Shuford epitomizes what is best in our Navy and in America, and the Senate, the Navy, and the American people are indebted to him for his many years of distinguished service. He will soon leave the Senate for his first flag officer assignment in charge of duty assignments for all 375,000 officers and enlisted personnel in the Navy. As he departs Washington, D.C. and the Senate, I know that my colleagues wish the very best for Jake, his wife, Cathy; their daughter, Campbell; and their sons, Bennett and John.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON A DRAFT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO IMPLEMENT THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF TERRORIST BOMBINGS AND THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE FINANCING OF TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 51

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

To the Congress of the United States:

Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a legislative proposal to implement the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings and the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. Also enclosed is a detailed explanation of the bill's provisions.

Title I of the bill is entitled the "Terrorist Bombings Convention Implementation Act of 2001." It would implement the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, which was signed by the United States

on January 12, 1998, and which was transmitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification on September 8, 1999. In essence, the Convention imposes binding legal obligations upon State Parties either to submit for prosecution or to extradite any person within their jurisdiction who unlawfully and intentionally delivers, places, discharges, or detonates an explosive or other lethal device in, into, or against a place of public use, a State or government facility, a public transportation system, or an infrastructure facility. A State Party is subject to these obligations without regard to the place where the alleged act covered by the Convention took place. Twenty-eight States are currently party to the Convention, which entered into force internationally on May 23, 2001.

Title II of the bill is entitled the "Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism Convention Implementation Act of 2001." It would implement the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, which was signed by the United States on January 10, 2000, and which was transmitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification on October 12, 2000. The Convention imposes binding legal obligations upon State Parties either to submit for prosecution or to extradite any person within their jurisdiction who unlawfully and wilfully provides or collects funds with the intention that they should be used to carry out various terrorist activities. A State Party is subject to these obligations without regard to the place where the alleged act covered by the Convention took place. The Convention is not yet in force internationally, but will enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval, or accession with the Secretary General of the United Nations.

I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this proposal.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 25, 2001.

REPORT ON A PROPOSED PROTOCOL AMENDING THE AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF MOROCCO CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 52

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123b. and 123d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)) (the "Act"), the text of a proposed Protocol