the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Federalism & Property Rights be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on ''Applying the War Powers Resolution to the War on Terrorism,'' on Wednesday, April 17, 2002, at 2 p.m., in SD–226.

Panel: Mr. John Yoo, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC; Mr. Louis Fisher, Senior Specialist in Separation of Powers, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, Washington, DC; Mr. Alton Frye, Presidential Senior Fellow and Director, Program on Congress and Foreign Policy, Council on Foreign Relations, Washington, DC; Mr. Michael Glennon, Professor of Law and Scholar in Residence, The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, DC; Mr. Douglas Kmiec, Dean of the Columbus School of Law, The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC; Ms. Jane Stromseth, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, DC; and Ms. Ruth Wedwood, Edward B. Burling Professor of International Law and Diplomacy, Yale Law School and The Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Washington, DC.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent an intern in my office, Tanya Balsky, be allowed privileges on the floor for the day.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that Christopher Jackson, a fellow in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of the debate on the energy bill, S. 517.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment following the statement of the Senator from Alaska, which is for debate only, as we have discussed.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have been notified there may be another Republican who will speak.

Mr. REID. I am going to include that.

If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the statements of the Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI, and the Senator from Texas, Mr. GRAMM, and that their statements be for debate only.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, let me take a minute and say I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Senator from Alaska. He has been here for days. With his courtesy, I can go home a couple hours before he can, and I appreciate that very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001—Continued

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank my good friend, the majority whip from Nevada. I am sure at some point in time the situation will be reversed, and we will be on a Nevada issue of some torturous nature, Yucca Mountain or some such issue, and he will be here through the evening time.

I recognize the hour is late, and I also recognize the issue before us is the crux of the energy debate. It is the so-called lightning rod known as ANWR.

It has been interesting to be here today and participate with a number of Senators, almost all of whom have never been to my State and visited ANWR. They certainly had some strong opinions about it. One has to question where those opinions may have come from, but I am sure they meant well and their own convictions as they stated them were reflective of information they had.

I am going to spend a little time tonight on information and education. Make no mistake about it, Mr. President, you and I both know we are speaking to an empty Chamber. On the other hand, I appreciate the courtesy of your attention and that of the staff who is still with us.

We have a different audience out there, and we do not know who they are, but I think it is fair to say that from the debate here, a lot of Members of this body are not too well informed on the factual issues in my State of Alaska. Senator STEVENS and I have attempted to change that by a characterization that we think is representative of the facts associated with resource development in our State.

I hope as we address whatever audience may be out there, that they, too, recognize certain realities of those of us who have been elected by our constituents to represent their interests. It is in that vein that I speak to you tonight, Mr. President.

I guess this all started in the sense of a slippery slope when Republicans lost control of this body. We had a vote on ANWR in 1995. It passed in the omnibus bill. President Clinton vetoed it. At that time, control of the Senate was in Republican hands, 55 to 45. Now it is 50 to 49 in favor of the Democrats. This is a clear reality, and I am sure it will be reflected in the cloture votes tomorrow.

One could say that the salvation of ANWR is pretty much directed by the Republican Party. That certainly has been the case in the past, and it appears to be the case today. We will see where it is tomorrow.

The last time we had an ANWR vote, it was a simple majority. We were not faced with a cloture vote. We were not faced with having to overcome 60 votes. Equity is equity and rules are rules, and I understand that. But the manner in which this occurred is particularly offensive to me because I happened to be at the beginning of this year the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. One of my goals, of course, was to present before that committee that I chaired the ANWR amendment, debate it, and vote it out.

Then we had a little change of structure in the Senate in June and, as a consequence, the Republicans lost control of the Senate. I still had hopes because some of my Democratic friends had actually visited ANWR and they were convinced it could be opened up safely. As a consequence of the chronology of that, I had assumed we would take up the energy bill in the committee of jurisdiction, debate it, come up with amendments, and present it on the floor of the Senate.

Had that been done, we would not have been required to have a 60-vote point of order on a cloture vote, and we all know that, but that was not the case because I can only assume through a recognition of the exposure that the Republicans had lost control of the Senate and the recognition of the availability of the rules that the Democratic leadership found a way to get around that.

What they did is they simply took the energy bill away from the committee of jurisdiction and proceeded to introduce it on the floor of the Senate, as is the prerogative of the majority leader.

Whether it is crooked or not, whether you feel bad or not, it is within the rules of this body and, as a consequence, it was done.

That presented the dilemma that Senator STEVENS and I faced in proceeding. It was a little more complex than that because it put a burden on other Members, as well, because the other Members clearly, as we got into the intricacies of the energy bill, were faced with an educational process of electricity, alternative energy sources, some relatively complex issues that ordinarily would be addressed in the vein of the committee process, and go to the floor with specific recommendations and block bases of support.

In any event, to get to the bottom line, we are faced with the reality that we now need 60 votes because it was structured that way. There was no other way to avoid it because we simply could not get a simple majority vote for the reason we had to add the ANWR amendment in, and in so doing, we were under the exposure of cloture.

Had it been in the bill, we would have been faced with the much more favorable alternative of a simple majority. So that is where we are today.

I think it is important to reflect a little bit on where the amendments are relative to what is before us. As I think

everyone is quite familiar with by now, we have a second degree, and the second degree is very specific in its recognition of what it does. It specifically states that any proceeds from the development of ANWR, which would result from the leases and the royalty bids, would go to the steel industry.

I think the rationale for this is quite evident. The steel industry is in a difficult position. We have seen a decline of that industry. People have indicated from time to time there are a couple of things we have to have as a nation. One is steel. One is energy. One is food. We have seen our steel industry reduced dramatically in the last couple of decades to the point where the viability of the American steel industry is clearly in question.

What we had was an opportunity to meld two projects together. This would address jobs, this would address the opportunity to revitalize the American steel industry, because, as has been pointed out, with the discovery of natural gas in Prudhoe Bay, we came across about 36 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

I am going to point out the general area of Prudhoe Bay. As a consequence of that discovery of gas, the question was: When and how can it be developed?

It was found as a consequence of developing the Prudhoe Bay oilfield. As we developed the oilfields, we found more gas. We did not have any way to take that gas to market. So we began to develop some proposals.

The blue line on the chart indicates the proposed route of the TransAlaska gasline. That line is estimated to be about 3,000 miles long. It would go ultimately to the Chicago city gate. It would move about 4 billion cubic feet a day and have a capacity of about 6 billion cubic feet a day. I have to be careful with the numbers because the design capacity is in the trillions. The movement per day is in the billions.

As a consequence, it would be the largest construction project ever undertaken in North America. The cost is estimated to be about $20 billion.

We have had some experience because we built an oil pipeline that traversed a significant portion of Alaska. That oil pipeline is seen on this particular chart. It goes from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez. All of that pipe came from Japan, Korea, and Italy. Why? Because we did not make 48-inch oil pipe.

With this other proposal I have outlined, the obvious opportunity for the American steel industry, for rejuvenation, is, who is going to make this pipe? This is going to be 52-inch pipe. It is going to be X–80 to X–100 steel. That is the tinsel strength of the steel. The significance of that is obvious. Somebody is going to build it. If it is not built in America, where is it going to be built? I assume Japan, Korea, Taiwan perhaps.

Is there a way we could build that steel in this country, stimulate the rejuvenation of the industry and, as a consequence of the opportunity, recognize that we were probably going to generate somewhere between $10 billion and $12 billion over 30 years from the royalties and lease sale of ANWR? Why not put it into the steel industry?

The second-degree amendment that is pending and will be voted on first tomorrow, which should be of great interest to the steel industry and the unions, as well as some 600,000 current retirees who, I understand, are in jeopardy of losing their health care benefits, would be an opportunity to address that.

We structured a revenue split for the second-degree amendment. Initially, it would contribute to the steel legacy program approximately $8 billion. Recognizing that there is a shortfall in the United Coal Mine Workers combined benefit funds, there was a proposal that a billion dollars would go into that fund.

Some people are going to criticize this and say this is a way to buy votes; this is a way to take money from the Federal Treasury.

I encourage Members to reflect a little bit on what our obligation is to those who depend on Medicare. Many of those people will fall into that category, if they are not already there. Obviously, we have an obligation to consider how to take care of those that have contributed into retirement funds and found those funds not adequately funded for the benefits.

So as we address the merits of how this effort is structured, we should consider a more positive contribution, and that is the $232 million that is proposed for commercial grants for the retooling of the industry so they can address competitively a large project like the $5 billion natural gas pipeline, some 3,000 miles of pipeline.

Further, there was funding for $155 million of labor training. There was also another $160 million for conservation programs, for maintenance of park and habitat restoration. That is what the second-degree amendment is all about. It says the money that is recognized from the sale of leases and royalties from ANWR, which is Federal land, will go back and rejuvenate the steel industry so it can get back on its feet and again address its opportunity to participate in the continued development of steel products in this country as opposed to having them imported.

As the Presiding Officer knows, this administration just granted a 30-percent protective tariff on steel. So clearly they have an opportunity, they have kind of a comfort zone, if they are willing to recognize the benefits of this.

I understand some Members said we are going to take this up separately anyway, but the fallacy in that argument is where is the money going to come from? There is no identification of the funds. If we do not open ANWR, we are not going to have that availability of this $10 billion to $12 billion. What is going to be done about rejuvenating the steel industry? What is going to be done about the prospects of a major order for 3,000 miles of pipe? I guess we will just shrug and say: Well, there goes another contract overseas that could have been done by American labor.

So that is the second degree we are going to be voting on first tomorrow.

In line with that, I have been handed a letter from PHIL ENGLISH and BOB NEY, both Members of Congress:

U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC April 17, 2002.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
Senator, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: We write as members of the House with a strong interest in the steel industry to convey our strong support of your efforts to resolve the legacy cost burden of the domestic steel industry, and especially your efforts to assist the steel industry's retirees and their dependents.

As you know, the domestic steel industry has significant unfunded pension liabilities as well as massive retiree health care responsibilities that total $13 billion and cost the steel industry almost $1 billion annually. These pension and health care liabilities pose a significant barrier to steel industry consolidation and rationalization that could improve the financial condition of the industry and reduce the adverse impact of unfairly traded foreign imports.

It has come to our attention that a unique opportunity has arisen in the Senate to remove this barrier to rationalization while assisting the retirees, surviving spouses, and dependents of the domestic steel industry. It is our understanding that you have offered an amendment to the energy bill this week which will break the impasse on the legacy problem.

Once again, we would like to extend our wholehearted support to you in this endeavor. We look forward to working with you to find a viable solution to bring a sense of security to the over 600,000 retirees, surviving spouses, and dependents before the end of the 107th Congress.

Sincerely,

Phil English, Bob Ney, Steven LaTourette, Robert Aderholt, George Gekas, Jack Quinn, John Shimkus, Frank Mascara, Ralph Regula, Alan Mollohan, William Lipinski, and Melissa Hart.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. There is an expression from a dozen or so House Members saying this is an opportunity. You might not get it again. We have identified significant funding to rejuvenate the steel industry, take care of the retirees, and put it back on its feet.

As we address the amendment, I want to make sure everybody understands what is in it. There have been generalizations from the other side that this is simply a second-degree amendment which takes any funds that would open up ANWR and provides for the rejuvenation of the steel industry, while the first degree would be an up-down vote on opening ANWR.

First of all, this amendment does not open ANWR. ANWR would only be opened if our President certifies to Congress that the exploration, development, and production of oil and gas resources in the ANWR Coastal Plain are in the national economic and security interests of the United States.

It is pretty simple. The President of the United States has to certify that

the ANWR Coastal Plain should be open. Then the Secretary of the Interior will implement a leasing program. Then the following will apply.

I don't want to hear any more that this is an up-down vote to open ANWR. It is to give our President extraordinary authority, almost a declaration of war. Don't we trust him and his Cabinet to make a determination that this is in the national security interests of this Nation? I certainly trust our President to make that finding. The President has to certify to us, the Congress, that exploration, development, and production are in the national economic and security interests. I can state now it is certainly in the national security interests relative to the situation in the Middle East where we are 58-percent dependent on imported oil. I will get into that later. The stimulation of the steel industry alone substantiates that particular cover.

We will look at what is in this. There is a Presidential finding. The President has the authority. We are giving it to him. He has to come to Congress and certify, again, production is in the national economic and security interests.

We have mandated a 2,000-acre limitation on surface disturbance. It is that simple. That is what it means, 2,000 acres. We have an export ban. Oil from the refuge cannot be exported.

I heard a conversation the oil will be exported or has been exported. The natural market for Alaskan oil is the west coast of the United States. We have a chart that demonstrates where Alaskan oil goes. It goes to the nearest refining areas. This chart shows Alaska and Valdez. It shows it goes to Puget Sound in the State of Washington, it goes to San Francisco, Los Angeles, and some to Hawaii. We do not see a line to Japan. We exported some to Japan. It was excess to the west coast refineries. That is the economics of it. Why send it further? Can you get more for it? That is kind of hard to figure because you bring it over from Iraq or from Saudi Arabia when you have it in proximity relative to Alaska.

The other thing unique about this oil, it could only go in U.S. ships because of the Jones Act, mandating carriage between two American ports be in U.S.-flagged vessels. These are American jobs. Every one of the ships was built in a U.S. yard. Every one of those is crewed by U.S. crews and carries an American flag. And 85 percent of the total tonnage in the American merchant marine is in the Alaskan oil trade. Bring oil from Saudi Arabia, you could bring it from Iraq, you can bring it in a foreign ship. What happens in Seattle, Puget Sound, San Francisco, Los Angeles? Talk about all the conservation you want, but you will still bring oil because the world and America moves on oil. That is the only transportation method.

This issue of export is not a factor because it is banned. It says it cannot be exported, with one exception, and that is to Israel. We have had with Israel an oil supply agreement that expires in the year 2004. We are extending that to the year 2014.

Where is the Israeli lobbying group? I will throw a few in the Record: the Zionist Organization of America, Americans For A Safe Israel, B'Nai B'rith International.

I ask unanimous consent these letters be printed in the RECORD.

Thee being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA,
New York, NY, November 26, 2001.

Hon. FRANK MURKOWSKI,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI: On behalf of the Zionist Organization of America—the oldest, and one of the largest, Zionist movements in the United States—we are writing to express our strong support for your efforts to make our country less dependent on foreign oil sources, by developing the oil resources in Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

At time when our nation is at war against international terrorism, it is more important than ever that we work quickly to free ourselves of dependence on oil produced by extremist dictators. Such dependence leaves the United States dangerously vulnerable.

Your initiative to develop the vast oil resources of Alaska will make it possible to rid America of this dependence and thereby strengthen our nation's security.

Sincerely,

MORTON A. KLEIN,
National President.
DR. ALAN MAZUREK,
Chairman of the Board.
DR. MICHAEL GOLDBLATT,
Chairman, National Executive Committee.
SARAH STERN,
National Policy Coordinator.

AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL,
New York, NY, November 30, 2001.

Attention: Brian Malnak
Hon. FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
U.S. Senate Hart Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI: Americans for a Safe Israel is a national organization with chapters throughout the country and a growing membership including members living in other countries. AFSI was founded in 1971, dedicated to the premise that a strong Israel is essential to Western interests in the Middle East.

We have many Middle East experts on our committees, who have authored texts on Israel and the Arab states and have appeared in television interviews, forums, and on newspaper op-ed pages. U.S. senators and representatives have been guest speakers at AFSI annual conferences.

Americans for a Safe Israel is strongly in support of your amendment which would permit drilling for oil in the ANWR area of Alaska. Your eloquence in addressing the Senate yesterday and this morning should have convinced the undecided that the arguments offered by senators in the opposition, or by environmental activists, are not based on the facts or realities in the ANWR and of our need for energy independence.

We at Americans for a Safe Israel would be pleased if you would include our organization among American Jewish organizations in support of your amendment regarding oil exploration in the ANWR.

Sincerely,

HERBERT ZWEIBON,
Chairman, Americans for a Safe Israel.

B'NAI B'RITH INTERNATIONAL,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2002.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We write to you as the US Senate debates national energy legislation, a critical national security issue, in support of both modest Corporate Average Fuel Economy increases and the environmentally safe exploration and extraction of petroleum from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Together Washington will lessen the nation's reliance on foreign energy sources, now estimated at close to 60 percent of our consumption.

We endorse the recent compromise proposal to bring required fuel economy ratings for vehicles—including sport utility vehicles now subject to a lower standard—up to 35 miles per gallon by 2015. As you know, under current federal regulations automakers are required to achieve an average of 27.5 mpg for new passenger cars, and only 20.7 mpg for new light-duty trucks. The reinstitution of a meaningful CAFE standard will serve as a hallmark of America's conservation policy; the National Academy of Sciences concluded recently that CAFE requirements have resulted in a savings of ''roughly 2.8 million barrels of gasoline per day from where it would be in the absence of CAFE standards.''

Similarly, it must be recognized that conservation alone is not a meaningful answer to the new realities our nation faces. Ending our dependency on oil and natural gas from dictorial regimes and authoritarian governments that actively sponsor international terrorist groups—including al-Qaeda and other movements that threaten our nation's most cherished principles—requires increasing domestic production, too. Such a plan includes exploration and extraction in the Arctic refuge. While B'nai B'rith International sympathizes with some of the environmental issues that have been raised regarding that area's future, we believe that, in wartime, our number one priority must be to take all credible steps necessary to protect our national security interests. Replacing up to 30 years worth of oil imports from Saudi Arabia or 50 years of oil imports from Iraq will provide critical leverage for American foreign policy in the years to come.

To be sure, it will be several years before both of these important proposals will have a discernable impact on US energy policy. At this time there is every reason to believe that we will still be fighting terrorists who seek to destroy our nation. Accordingly, it is imperative that both measures are enacted into law at the earliest opportunity so that by decade's end America will be less reliant on foreign energy and enjoy greater national security.

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. HEIDEMAN,
International President.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. A few of the national Jewish organizations recognize what is happening currently, and that is oil is funding terrorism.

We all remember September 11 when, for the first time, an aircraft was used as a weapon. Now we have statements from people such as Saddam Hussein. What is he saying? Oil is a weapon.

Are we contributing to those weapons? Yes, we are. Here is, currently, an

example. Perhaps it is extreme and perhaps a little inappropriate, but where and who funds the suicide bombers in Israel? We know who funds them. Oil. Who has the oil? Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein, via American oil purchase. When we go to the gas station, we should think of our responsibility because our responsibility goes beyond filling our gas tank. Where do we get some of our oil? There is 58 percent that comes from overseas.

How much do we get from Saddam Hussein currently? A million barrels. How much did we get September 11? It was 1.1 million on September 11, the highest of any other time.

This is off the Bank of Baghdad, $25,000, which is what he is paying the suicide bombers. He used to pay $10,000. That is an incentive that could reach our shores. That is some of the vulnerability we have as we look at the consequences of increasing our dependence on imported oil.

This Senator from Alaska understands we are not going to eliminate our dependence, but if we make a commitment, we will open ANWR; we will reduce our dependence; we will send a very strong message not only to Saddam Hussein but OPEC and that cartel over there. It is illegal to have a cartel in this country. That cartel over there, we are going to send them a message that we mean business about reducing our dependence.

Do you know what OPEC did not so long ago? They got together, had their cartel meeting, said we want the price to go up, and said we are going to put a floor and ceiling, $22 as a floor, $28 as a ceiling. How do they do it? By controlling the supply. It is just that simple because we are addicted to Mideast oil.

Here is another photo of our friend, Saddam Hussein. Here is where it comes from. It has been increasing all the time—1.1 million, that was from Energy Information, September 2001. Here is where we get our oil: Iraq, Persian Gulf, OPEC. American families are counting on them, I guess.

That is why we have to protect Israel. That is why we are extending, in this legislation, the U.S. oil supply arrangement through the year 2014.

Furthermore, we are going to increase wilderness. What we are going to do is we are going to take the 1002 area, which everybody has concluded is at great risk, although Alaskans believe it can be developed responsibly—that is 1.5 million acres—what we are going to do is add another 1.5 million from a refuge and put it in in perpetuity, so we are going to increase this wilderness area from about 9 million acres to about 10.5 million acres. We think that is a fair trade. Yet not one Member of the other side has acknowledged that is of any significance.

I can only assume the other side has been pretty well—I won't say brainwashed, but there have been some convincing arguments from our extreme environmental friends. Somehow, more wilderness is not the answer. It is simply to kill ANWR. And the rationale is obvious: ANWR has been a cash cow and these organizations have milked it for all it is worth.

To give some idea, we have a State that is pretty big. It is one-fifth the size of the United States. We have a map here that gives some idea of the comparison. This is a comparative scale. Alaska over the United States, the comparative scale, it will run roughly from Florida almost to California. It will run almost from the Canadian border to almost the Mexican border. It is a big chunk of real estate. I don't see anybody from Texas here, but it is 2.5 times the size of Texas.

It is a big piece of real estate, and it is an important piece of real estate, but it has a small population, a very small population. As we look at that population and recognize that over 75 percent support opening ANWR, we begin to reflect a little bit on what this debate is all about. It is all about a theory that there has to be somewhere, someplace, in the minds of a lot of Americans, that is untouched, where there is no footprint, that only the hand of God has caressed.

We all respect, obviously, the well-meaning environmental groups. But as far as our State is concerned, we believe we have been overexposed because a few years ago, we counted up the number of environmental groups that had offices in Alaska, primarily Anchorage. There were about 62. The last time I looked there were over 90. These are organizations that are located outside that have offices in Alaska. They have young environmental lawyers who are almost coming up to do a missionary commitment. They file an injunction on any project anywhere, a log dump, a driveway, wetlands—you name it.

As a consequence, we think we have done a pretty good job in Alaska. We think we have responsible development. We think Prudhoe Bay is the best oilfield in the world. I said in this Chamber time and time again: You might not like oilfields, but Prudhoe Bay is the best in the world.

Americans do not seem to care where their oil comes from as long as they get it. If it comes from the scorched Earth fields of Iraq or Iran, it doesn't make any difference. We can do it right. And we have done it right because Prudhoe Bay is the best in the world and it is 37-year-old technology.

We can go to newer fields such as Endicott, 53 acres—that is the footprint. How many acres do we have in Alaska, 356 million?

Here is a State far to the north. Most people have never been to it. Then in our State we have this Arctic area, the ANWR area way up in the top, that ANWR area. If you are going to take a trip up there, you better have $5,000 in your pocket or go on one of the environmental groups' funded trips because that is what it costs to get up after Fairbanks, charter into the area. Have somebody take care of you as you enjoy your wilderness experience because you just don't wander around in that area. It is very harsh.

Here we have this area in the northern part of the United States, and we have the extraordinary outside influences of these outside groups dictating terms and conditions. They made it a business because it is a big business. They generate millions of dollars in membership and dollars.

Why do they do it? Because it enhances their organizations. It gives them a cause, and they make a contribution. I am not suggesting they do not, but it has gotten to be a big business, and as a consequence Alaska is a little overexposed because if you look at this other chart, you can get an appreciation of what was done in 1980. We are recognizing all these areas of Alaska that are scratched in blue are Federal withdrawals. They are parks. They are wilderness. We have 56 million acres of wilderness, more than the entire State of California. We appreciate and manage our wilderness areas appropriately. But that is a pretty good chunk of Federal land to have withdrawn because you happen to be a public land State.

Maybe we should have cut a better deal when we came into the Union in 1959. Maybe we were a little naive. Maybe we trusted big government.

What we got is this, and this was the land claims settlement in 1980. What they did is they were very crafty. They said: All right, you have 356 million acres in your State. We think the State ought to have 104 million acres in the Statehood Compact. They said: Your Native people ought to have 40 million acres, so that leaves you with 250 million acres or thereabouts for the Federal Government.

Instead of letting the new State go ahead and select the land, automatically the lands were frozen under Carter. So the Federal Government got the first selection instead of the State. But here is what I want to point out.

You see that little red line? You see right in between the two blues? That is the only access our State has north and south, the only access, and that is where our pipeline has to go and that is where our gasline has to go because we cannot get access across Federal parks, wilderness areas—refuges. We cannot do it without congressional action and that is what we are doing right tonight. We are trying to get congressional action to open up that little oilfield up there.

That did not happen by accident. That did not happen on the free will of the people of Alaska. That was gerrymandered by people who did not want Alaska developed.

If you go east and west, you can see they almost crossed over. There are a few little areas—we have a mine now. Do you know how many mines we have in Alaska? We have one major gold mine, one major zinc and lead mine, and Red Dog, and at Greens Creek we

have a large silver mine. We have three major mines in this huge area. We used to have four times those in the State.

Do you know how many pulp mills we have? Zero. I don't know how many you have in New York, but I do know that New York cuts more wood for firewood than we cut as commercial timber in the State of Alaska. Yet we have the largest of all the national forests: 16 million acres in the Tongass—all this area. As a matter of fact, we live in the forests. Some people think we live in the dark forests. But Juneau, our State capital, is in the State forest. Ketchikan is in the forest; Wrangell, Petersburg, Haines, Skagway, Sitka, Yakutat, Cordova—they are in the forest.

(Mr. DAYTON assumed the Chair).

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Why didn't we get a land selection there? We thought we could trust the Forest Service. We thought we could work in harmony. We rue the day, but here it is, and we have to live with it. We have to come to the Congress and plead for understanding. We have to, as one State, take on the whole national environmental community that has one cause—stop development in Alaska, because of their membership and dollars.

What we have attempted to do in this amendment is add more wilderness—1.5 million acres. We are adding to the Coastal Plain, as the chart indicates.

What else do we do? We impose strict environmental protections in this legislation.

I don't hear anyone on the other side of the aisle commenting as to the adequacy or inadequacy.

We impose seasonal limitations to protect the denning migration of the animals.

Some ask: What about the polar bear? Are we going to protect the polar bear? The polar bear, for the most part, den on the ice. They do not den on land. The greatest protection we have for the polar bear is the marine mammal law. Polar bears are marine animals. You can't take them as trophies. You can't shoot them. If you want to shoot them, you go to Russia or Canada. But you can't do it in Alaska. These bears get along pretty well. You have seen this picture time and time again. You have been very patient. These are a few of the bears. They do not happen to be polar bears. They are grizzly bears and brown bears. They are walking on top of the pipeline because it is easier for them to walk on the pipeline. They are not threatened. You can't take a snow machine in there. You can't hunt in there. We think these are pretty responsible conservation efforts.

A further provision is that the leasers must reclaim the land and put it back to its prior condition. That means it has to be put back in its natural state.

What does it look like in Alaska after you drill a well? Let me show you what it looks like in the Arctic. The only problem is we only have about 2 ½ months where it looks like this. There is the tundra. There is the little Christmas tree. Where are they talking about these big gravel roads? It isn't done anymore. We use technology. That is it. It is a nice road. There is the well. It is pretty bleak country. Some people say you couldn't find oil in a better place. That is reality.

We require use of ice roads, ice pads, and ice airstrips for exploration. If the oil isn't there, you are not going to see a track. We prohibit public use on all pipeline access and service roads. We require no significant adverse effect on fish and wildlife and no significant impact. We require consolidation of facility siting. Tell me where in the world oil is developed that you have these kinds of restrictions.

Further, we give the Secretary of the Interior the authority to close areas of unique character at any time after consultation with the local community.

Here we have structure. There are two amendments. The second-degree amendment would fund rejuvenation of America's steel industry and address the steel legacy by funding so that our steel industry can resurrect itself, be internationally competitive, and participate in the largest construction project in the history of North America, the building of a 3,000-mile pipeline. The order alone is worth $5 billion.

The first-degree amendment opens the area up so that the leases can be sold and so that the funds can be designated—$8 billion to the legacy, $1 billion to the United Mine Workers, and commercial grants for $232 million to retool the industry; labor training, $115 million; and conservation for National Park Service maintenance and backlog, et cetera. We think that is pretty good balance.

We wish we had a few more days on this issue. We might be able to further communicate to the American public really what we are trying to do.

Again, the first-degree is not an authorization to open. We give that authority to the President. The President has the determination to open it.

We don't have the level of support we had hoped. It is pretty hard for one State to compete with national environmental groups. But we are not giving up because sooner or later ANWR will be opened.

I can only guess, as you can, the consequences of this vote tomorrow because we don't know what the future holds. We do know there is an inferno in the Mideast. We do know we are importing 58 percent of our oil. We know Saddam Hussein is obviously up to no good with the money he generates from oil sales to the United States. We know he pays his Republican Guards to keep him alive. We also know he is developing weapons of mass destruction. We just do not know when we are going to have to deal with it or how.

We are enforcing that aerial no-fly zone over Iraq. We have bombed them three times since the first of the year, and several times last year he attempted to shoot us down. We have the lives of our men and women at risk. We take his oil and go use it to bomb him. He takes our money, pays his Republican Guard to keep him alive, and he develops these weapons of mass destruction.

We look back to September 11 and say: Gee, if we had only had the intelligence, we would have averted that tragedy at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and saved the brave people in the aircraft as they tried to take it over before it went down in Pennsylvania.

We know there is a threat from Saddam Hussein. We don't know when or how. But do we wait?

These are grave responsibilities for our President and the Cabinet and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These are real. But every time we go to the gas station, we are buying Iraqi oil—some of it, at least. He gets billions. What does he do with it?

Here is that check again. We know he is doing that. He has a reward out.

Where is the principle of the United States, for heaven's sake? Why do we succumb to do business with a tyrant? There is a principle involved here. If you or I were in business, we wouldn't do it. We would say: Hey, enough is enough. Let us send a message out here.

We can go down a million rabbit trails for excuses as to why we shouldn't or couldn't open this area. These are all things that are tied together. Some Members obviously don't want to talk too much about it because it is not a pleasant subject. But for the Israelis who are on a bus who are innocent bystanders, and suddenly a young woman gets on the bus rigged with a bomb, and it blows up, believe me, that is a set of facts. That is why so many of the Jewish organizations are saying enough is enough; we ought to stop importing from Iraq.

I have an amendment pending which I am going to bring up. We are going to have a vote on it because the leader gave me a commitment to have a vote on it—that we ought to sanction oil imports from Iraq. Isn't it rather ironic? He has already done it to us, because he said last week he was going to terminate production for 30 days. What happens? The supply goes down and the price goes up.

I don't know, but the way I read it, charity begins at home. We certainly should not be doing business with this guy just because we need more oil.

I know my critics will say: Well, Senator MURKOWSKI, you are not going to get any relief for awhile. I am talking about sending a message that we mean business about reducing our dependence on Iraq. That is going to be a strong message.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side saying that there is no significant potential in ANWR that would offset our imports. Let me show you a chart. We have lots of charts. This is

going to be a show and tell. We are probably going to go through every chart we have because this is probably going to be the only time we have that opportunity.

But this is a chart that shows what happened to imports when we opened Prudhoe Bay. This might be a little tricky, but let me just show you. The blue line at the bottom is Alaskan oil production from 1973 through 1999. We started small, and the blue line running across the chart shows the production, and then in 1977, more production—and then more production, more production. We were producing 2 million barrels a day. That was 25 percent of the total crude oil produced in the United States. That is how much it was.

As the blue line shows, in 1988, 1989, production at Prudhoe Bay began to decline. And it declined and declined, and now it is a little over a million barrels a day.

So what happened, as depicted by the red line, is interesting, though, because that shows our total imports. We started out, per the chart, at roughly 3 million barrels a day, and we kept going up and up and up; and then, suddenly, at the peak, we opened up Prudhoe Bay. So those who say ANWR is not going to make any difference, I defy them to counter this reality.

Look at what happened to our imports. They dropped. Why? Because we increased production domestically. We did not relieve our dependence on imported oil, no, not by any means, but we clearly reduced our imports.

Now, what has happened? And we have more conservation. You can go out and buy a 50-mile per gallon car. But we are using more. Why are we using more? Well, it is just the harsh reality that oil imports are taking place because other production in the United States is in decline, and we are using more oil. It is just a harsh reality.

As we look at this chart, we recognize that we can refute the generalization that ANWR isn't going to make any difference with the reality that it will make a difference. It will make a big difference.

So let's take that chart down and reflect on how much oil might be there.

We have had some discussion about the Energy Information Administration, the EIA, providing an analysis of the effect of ANWR on U.S. domestic oil production and the net imports of crude oil. And we have had it all over the ballpark.

From the EIA report of February 11, for purposes of addressing ANWR's impact on national security, crude oil imports—which is an accurate measure, since ANWR provides only crude oil—this is what they project regarding domestic production of ANWR. Assuming the U.S. Geological Service mean case for oil in ANWR, there would be an increase of domestic production of 13.9 percent.

I have heard the Senator from Massachusetts communicate some 3 percent. All I can do is submit for the RECORD the EIA USGS mean case of a 13.9-percent increase of domestic production.

Assuming the USGS high case for oil in ANWR—the high case is a 16-billion-barrel reserve—that would be a 25.4-percent increase in domestic production. That is a pretty big percentage. That is about 25 percent.

You have to put this in perspective. I have a hard time doing this with those in opposition because they do not want to sit still long enough to reflect on what this means.

How much oil is it?

For Washington, it is 66 years; for Minnesota, it is 85 years; for Florida, it is 30 years—this is a lot of oil—for New York, it is 35 years; for Rhode Island, 570 years; for Delaware, it is 46 years; for West Virginia, it is 260 years, for Maryland, it is 98 years; for the District of Columbia, it is 1,710 years; for Maine, it is 235 years. I could go on and on. You can all see your individual States. Where is Massachusetts on there? There it is: 87 years. I want to make sure Massachusetts gets in there. I do not want to leave Massachusetts out. For Alaska, it is 87 years.

So there is a lot of oil. But how does it compare, say, with my generalization that Prudhoe Bay has provided, for the last 27 years, somewhere between 20 and 25 percent of the total crude oil? Well, you can only do that by applying the projections associated with ANWR, which are somewhere between 5.6 billion and 16 billion barrels. If you take halfway—10 billion barrels—it is as big as Prudhoe Bay because Prudhoe Bay was supposed to be 10 billion barrels, but it produced 13 billion barrels. So it is significant, make no mistake about it. I want to put that argument to rest once and for all. It will make a difference in reducing our imports.

So, as we talk about this, and we find that most of the critics have never been there, and we look at some of the things that Alaska's oil development does for other States, such as providing them with a secure source of oil, that is defended by the U.S. Navy—I am talking about oil from Alaska and the west coast of the United States—it clearly is a reliable supply.

I have addressed the reality that Prudhoe Bay is the best oilfield in the world.

Do you remember the pictures in 1991, 1992, of the burning oilfields of Kuwait? The fleeing Iraqi troops set more than 600 of Kuwait's 940 oil wells ablaze with explosives and sabotage. Do we have any of those pictures with us? Yes. Do you want to see an oilfield burning, set fire to? Do you know who did it? Saddam Hussein. We have heard of him a couple times tonight, haven't we? Talking about a burn, that burn is all through. It is a tough reality. Was there wildlife there? Camels, goats, other wildlife once lived there. The land is dead. Yet this is where we choose to get our oil.

Our President told Iraqi President Saddam Hussein that the United States will deal with him soon if he continues to produce weapons of mass destruction. I am sure, Mr. President, both you and I have had an opportunity to be with President George W. Bush. I do not think there is any question he means what he says. He says the U.S. ''will deal with him soon'' if he continues to produce weapons of mass destruction.

I guess the question is, When and how?

In Alaska, in the United States, we have the most stringent environmental regulations on Earth. Maybe we are not doing it right, and maybe we can do better, but we are doing it better than anybody else.

Those who suggest that somehow Prudhoe Bay is a disaster fail to recognize that it is still the best oilfield in the world. I am proud to be an Alaskan. I am proud that we can make that commitment as a State because we have two levels of environmental oversight. The State Department's environmental conservation is very prudent, some think too prudent. And we have the Federal Environmental Protection Agency, and others. But they are doing their job, and they are doing the best job in the world because they are using the best technology in the world.

We have heard other Members talk about—I think Senator GRASSLEY—some of the history of Russian oil development. Anything goes. It is to get the oil. It doesn't make any difference how much you spill or how much you drill. Workers drill too fast, too many holes, don't make proper recovery. Do we have any charts on that?

How about this? You would never see anything like that in the United States. You would never see that in Alaska. There is a puddle of oil, a busted pipeline, a disaster.

Does the United States care where America gets its oil? Evidently, nobody really cares if it is there. If it is not there, they scream. If the price is too high, they scream. If they have to wait too long to get it, wait in line around the block, they blame Government.

Since the House passed their energy bill in August, which had a provision for opening ANWR—some say the House of Representatives is pretty representative—America has imported 231 million barrels of oil from Iraq. That fact disturbs me greatly, and I would hope it disturbs my colleagues and addresses their digestion. Some of that money went straight into Saddam's pocket. I would prefer 100-percent homegrown energy because we can do it safer and better here in the United States.

As this debate continues, I hope my colleagues will take a long and hard look at the alternatives to Alaskan oil because that is what they are and what it means to the environment on a global scale. Again, I hope they will recognize Alaskan oilfields are the best in the world.

I will add a little partisan reference here from the Wall Street Journal,

April 16, 2001, just the other day. It is entitled ''Labor Revolt.'' It says:

You might not see picket lines, but a chunk of America's labor movement is staging a notable walkout—against the Democratic Party. The trend is already having consequences in Congress and could echo through November and into 2004.

Leading the revolt is James Hoffa, head of the AFL–CIO's third largest union, the 1.4 million Teamsters. Mr. Hoffa has become a key and very public supporter of [President Bush's] energy plan, which is also backed by a coalition of carpenters, miners and seafarers. He has lobbied inside Big Labor for a more neutral political bent and his officials were recently overheard giving Democrats on Capitol Hill hell for killing jobs.

This gasline and ANWR are jobs issues.

Today, some 500 Teamsters will help present the Senate amendment to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

We had that press conference the other day. We had hundreds of laborers out front on the issue. We had, in addition to the Teamsters, my good friend Jerry Hood. We had Ed Sullivan, president of the Building and Construction Workers, the AFL–CIO, members of the Building Trades Union, the president of Operating Engineers, and the Seafarers Union.

They are concerned about two things: They are concerned about jobs, and, obviously, they are concerned about national security interests relative to our Nation and our Nation's continued dependence on foreign oil. It is very real.

That article goes on to say:

Meanwhile, the United Auto Workers, electricians and machinists have rebelled against Democrats on issues from fuel-efficiency standards to nuclear energy.

That is going to come up at another time as we debate the nuclear industry and the future of it and what we are going to do with our waste. I know my good friend Senator REID is going to be very active in that debate because that debate affects his State. I respect that set of circumstances.

The problem with nuclear waste is nobody wants it. If you throw it up in the air, it won't stay there. It has to come down somewhere. As a consequence, we can't agree where to put it.

In my opinion, there is an answer to it; that is, you reprocess it. By so doing, you recover the plutonium, put it back in the reactors, and you vitrify the waste, which obviously has very little ability for proliferation. That is what the Japanese are doing. That is what the French are doing. Do you know why we can't do it? Because we have such an active nuclear environmental lobby, we don't allow it. So we walk around saying, what in the world are we going to do with our waste? Where are we going to put it? Nobody wants it. Nevada says they don't want it. We have decided to put it there, and so all hell is going to break loose.

Anyway, United Auto Workers, electricians, and machinists have rebelled. Why have they rebelled? They are looking at jobs.

This article goes on to say that this issue has:

. . . alienated many of old industrial unions which grow only when the private economy does. Many of these unions don't share the cultural liberalism of the Washington AFL–CIO elites, who are often well-to-do Ivy-Leaguers.

Well, there is a bit of a change among some of the unions. I suppose that happens around here, too.

But I think it is fair to conclude from this article:

Mr. Hoffa and fellow unions are now doing the same for oil-drilling in Alaska, spending heavily on ads across the country. He's vowed to ''remember'' Democrats who vote against drilling.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 16, 2001]

LABOR REVOLT

You might not see the picket lines, but a chunk of the American labor movement is staging a notable walkout—against the Democratic Party. The trend is already having consequences in Congress and could echo through November and into 2004.

Leading the revolt is James P. Hoffa, head of the AFL–CIO's third-largest union, the 1.4 million Teamsters. Mr. Hoffa has become a key and very public supporter of the Bush energy plan, which is also backed by a union coalition of carpenters, miners and seafarers. He ha lobbied inside Big Labor for a more neutral political bent and his officials were recently overheard giving Democrats on Capitol Hill hell for killing jobs. Today, some 500 Teamsters will help present the Senate amendment to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Meanwhile, the United Auto Workers, electricians and machinists have rebelled against Democrats on issues from fuel-efficiency standards to nuclear energy. They follow last year's resignation from the AFL–CIO by the influential United Brotherhood of Carpenters, along with its half-million members and $4 million in annual dues.

Some of this is issue specific, but it's also a sign of deeper labor tensions. When John Sweeney took over the AFL–CIO in 1995, he turned it in a markedly more partisan and ideological direction. He aligned Big Labor with a coalition of interest groups on the cultural and big government left. This is fine with most public-sector unions (teachers especially), which grow along with government.

But this leftward tilt has increasingly alienated many of the old industrial unions, which grow only when the private economy does. Many of these unions also don't share the cultural liberalism of the Washington AFL–CIO elites, who are often well-to-do Ivy Leaguers. They resent the money being pushed into political campaigns and would rather spend more on shop-room organizing. In Mr. Sweeney's tenure, the union share of the private-sector work force has actually fallen, to 9.1%

All of these tensions have come to the surface in the energy debate, where Democrats have had to choose between the greens (enviros) and blues (unions). Senator (and would-be President) John Kerry thought he could win over the greens and suburbanites by pushing new car-mileage standards, but instead he inspired a labor rebellion. Nineteen Senate Democrats, primarily from industrial states, joined Republicans to kill Mr. Kerry's proposals.

Mr. Hoffa and fellow unions are now doing the same for oil-drilling in Alaska, spending heavily on ads across the country. He's vowed to ''remember'' Democrats who vote against drilling. And he specifically singled out New Jersey's Robert Torricelli (up for reelection this fall) and Michigan's Debbie Stabenow (a top recipient of union cash in her 2000 race). In case they don't' believe him, the Teamsters have already endorsed three GOP Congressional candidates in Michigan.

President Bush has noticed all of this, naturally, and is openly courting union support. Having won only a third of union households in 2000, Mr. Bush knows he has lots of votes to gain. Sometimes his effort runs to schmoozing, as when he made Mr. Hoffa one of his noted guests at the state of the Union. But sometimes he's bowed to political temptation and bent his principles, as with his 30% steel tariff.

Mr. Bush might keep in mind that Mr. Hoffa has helped him even though last year he ignored Teamster objections and fulfilled his campaign promise to allow Mexican trucks into the U.S. The President is also no doubt aware that Mr. Hoffa wants an end to 13 years of federal oversight into his union—which should only happen on the legal merits.

Unions are moving to the Republicans less out of love for the GOP than from disillusionment with Democrats. Democrats had better be careful or they'll give Mr. Bush the chance to form a formidable majority.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. What it does is simply say these are job issues and our business is jobs and productivity for the American people. This has become an issue where, clearly, if you look at the vote the last time that we voted on this issue in the Senate, it was 45 to 55, and ANWR was passed in the 1995 vote on the omnibus act. That is when Republicans controlled the Senate.

Well, that was then and this is now. Now we have a 50–49–1 ratio in favor of the Democrats. Clearly, we are in a situation where we don't have control. As a consequence, ANWR is in trouble because it has to overcome the 60-vote point of order. Make no mistake about that.

We have had quite a discussion throughout the day, but there are a few points that have been overlooked. One of them that bothers me the most is overlooking the people of my State, the people who are affected, the people who live in the Arctic and reside in the Coastal Plain. These are a few of the kids. There is not very many of them. There are about 300 of them in that village. But they are like your kids or your grandkids or mine: Looking for a future, looking for an opportunity for a better lifestyle, educational opportunities, sewer, water—some of the things we take very much for granted.

This is another picture of their community hall. This is Kaktovik. It is of an elder Eskimo, a snow machine, with his grandson, and a bike. That is the way it is up there.

Some Members would have you believe there is nothing there. Let me show you a picture of Kaktovik. It has been portrayed time and time again—a small community, small village. It has an airport, has some radar installations. And it is actually in ANWR. It is

in the Arctic Coastal Plain. It is in the 1.5 million acres. In fact, one oilwell has been drilled in that area.

We have another chart here that gives you a little better idea of that particular geographic area. The thing I want to make sure everybody understands is that all of ANWR, all of that 1.5 million acres is not Federal land.

These Native American citizens own 95,000 acres. That is diagrammed in the square. The only problem is, while they have title to that land, they have no authority for any access—absolutely none. Only Congress can give them that authority. We are going to be addressing that, because to have an aboriginal group of natives, American citizens, and give them land that has been their ancestral land—it has been their land to begin with; that is where they have been for generations—and not allow them to have access because everything around it is Federal land is simply wrong; it is unjust. We would not do it anywhere else in the country. You would say you are entitled to access. I know because I have been there time and time and time again.

I had the Secretary of the Interior, Gale Norton, there with me last year. So was Senator BINGAMAN. The temperature today was 95 here. A year ago, it was 77 below zero there. That caught your attention. It is a harsh environment.

My point is that only through an act of Congress will those people be allowed access to their own land. What would it take? Well, it would take some kind of a corridor across Federal land—maybe 300 feet wide. Access to what? Access just to State land. Where does State land start? Over on the other side of that yellow line. On this side is Federal land. They cannot get from there to the State land unless we do something about it.

Let me read you a little letter. This is from the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation. These are the people who live in that village. I want to show these other pictures. I want you to get the flavor. Nobody has mentioned on that side of the aisle, during the entire debate, the dreams and aspirations of these people. You have kids going to school in the snow. Nobody shovels the snow away. They dress a little differently perhaps. They wear mucklucks. They wear fur. You have some kids up there.

Let them take a peek at that so the kids in the gallery can see it.

This is how the kids in the Arctic go to school. It is a little different. But these kids are American citizens. They are Eskimos. They have rights, dreams, and aspirations. Yet what kind of a lifestyle do they have?

Here is a letter:

> Dear Senators Daschle & Lott:
>
> The people of Kaktovik . . . are the only residents within the entire 19.6 million acres of the federally recognized boundaries of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. . . .

These people live right up at the top of the world in Kaktovik.

The letter goes on to say:

> [The Kaktoviks] ask for your help in fulfilling our destiny as Inupiat Eskimos and Americans. We ask that you support reopening the Coastal Plain of ANWR to energy exploration.

They are asking that we open it.

> Reopening the Coastal Plain will allow us access to our traditional lands. We are asking Congress to fulfill its promise to the Inupiat people and to all Americans: to evaluate the potential of the Coastal Plain.

These people are talking to us as landowners. They go on to say:

> In return, as land-owners of 92,160 acres of privately owned land within the Coastal Plain of ANWR, the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation promises to the Senate of the United States:
>
> 1. We will never use our abundant energy resources ''as a weapon'' against the United States, as Iraq, Iran, Libya, and other foreign energy exporting nations have proposed.
>
> 2. We will not engage in supporting terrorism, terrorist States, or any enemies of the United States;
>
> 3. We will neither hold telethons to raise money for, contribute money to, or any other way support the slaughter of innocents at home or abroad;
>
> 4. We will continue to be loyal Alaskans and proud Americans who will be all the more proud of a government whose actions to reopen ANWR and our lands will prove it to be the best remaining hope for mankind on Earth; and
>
> 5. We will continue to pray for the United States, and ask God to bless our nation.

These are my people, Mr. President. They further state:

> We do not have much, Gentlemen, except for the promises of the U.S. government that the settlement of our land claims against the United States would eventually lead to the control of our destiny by our people.
>
> In return, we give our promises as listed above. We ask that you accept them from grateful Inupiat Eskimo people of the North Slope of Alaska who are proud to be American.

Mr. President, I don't think we would get a letter like this from any other potential supplier of oil in the Mideast. I think you would agree with me. So here we have a situation where my people are deprived of a basic right that any other American citizen would not be. It is very disappointing because the human element was not brought up once.

What we have talked about today is whether ANWR can be opened safely. There is no evidence that it cannot. Is there a significant amount of oil that could make a difference? You bet. There is more oil in ANWR than there is in all of Texas. I think the proven reserves in Texas are about 5.3 billion barrels. What are we talking about here? Are we talking about charades or about some kind of a conveyance, trying to portray to the American people that we cannot open it safely. They say it will take 10 years. We have a pipeline halfway to ANWR. Another 50 miles, we would be hooked up. They say 10 years. Come on, let's expedite the permit.

If anybody wanted to talk about history—and this was not brought up on the other side today—the arguments we are using on the floor of the Senate at 9:35 p.m. are the same arguments we used 30 years ago on the issue of whether or not to open the TransAlaska Pipeline system—not to open but to build it, because the environmental groups weren't as well organized then. But they were making a case. They said: You can't build an 800-mile fence across Alaska because if you do, you are going to build a fence that will keep the caribou and the moose on one side or the other. You are putting that pipeline in permafrost. It is a hot line, and permafrost is frozen. It is going to melt. It is going to break.

The doomsayers were wrong. The same argument here: Can't do it safety. They said the animals—look at the caribou, Mr. President. There are a few of them. That is a new picture. I want to make sure you understand that we have more than one picture. These guys are under the pipeline. Why? Why not? You see the water behind them. They are grazing. That pipeline doesn't offer them any threat.

Somebody said that is an ugly pipeline. Well, I don't know. I guess it depends on your point of view. I could probably take 10 pictures of other pipelines and we could have a contest on whose pipeline is the ugliest. But, you know, you either bury them or put them on the surface. That is all in steel. It is designed to withstand earthquakes. It is the best that the 30-year-old technology had, and we can do better now.

This is another picture. This is real. These are not stuffed. These are caribou. They are lounging around. The extraordinary thing is this is Prudhoe Bay, and we had, I believe, 3,000 animals in the central Arctic herd. Today we have somewhere in the area of 26,000. Why? You cannot shoot them, and you cannot run them down with a snow machine. They are protected. They do very well. The argument is bogus.

They say it is a different herd, a Porcupine herd. We are not going to allow any activity during the 2½ months that is free of ice and snow because you cannot move in that country. We do not build gravel roads; we build ice roads. It represents better and safer technology and does not leave a scar on the tundra.

We have made great advances as a consequence of our lessons, but it is beyond me to reflect on the opposition here other than its core opposition: We are opposed to it. The rationale behind it lacks an indepth understanding. Here is the new technology. We do not drill the way we used to. They do not go out and punch a hole straight down, and if they are lucky enough, they find oil.

We have directional drilling capability. We can drill under the Capitol and come up at gate 4 at Reagan National Airport. That is the technology we have.

We can hit these spots that are under the ground with this 3–D seismic, one footprint. That is the change. We have proven it because we built Endicott.

Nobody wants to talk about Endicott on the other side: 56 acres; produced over 100 million barrels.

I also want to touch on another myth that the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New Mexico used several times relative to why do you want to go to ANWR when there are other areas. If you are going to rob somebody, you might as well go to the bank; that is where the money is.

We have the greatest prospect for discoveries, and that area is specifically in ANWR. We have what they call National Petroleum Reserve, Alaska. We have pictures of that area. This chart is a bit of a contrast because this shows the top of the world. I want to reference this with this big map. I want to reference where this area is.

Point Barrow is at the top. That is one of our Eskimo communities, and the nice thing about Point Barrow is you cannot go any further north. You fall off the top. The Arctic Ocean is right ahead. This is the National Petroleum Reserve, Alaska. It used to be Naval Petroleum Reserve, Alaska. I wish the cameras had the intensity to pick up on this to see all this gray/blue area. These are lakes within the reserve.

This is ANWR. Mr. President, do you see any lakes on the Coastal Plain? This is strategic from an environmental point of view, from the standpoint of migratory birds. Where do they go? They do not squat on the land. They go to the lakes. This is a huge mass of lakes.

The opponents are suggesting we go over there. That is fine except from an environmental point of view, we are not going to get permits in many of these areas. While there have been some discoveries right on this line within NPRA, this is where the oil happens to be because that is where the geologists tell us it is most likely to be.

We will put up lease sales in these fringe areas, but we are not going to get anything around the lakes. To suggest this area is already open is contrary to reality.

Another thing the Senator from Massachusetts says is instead of opening ANWR, we should drill anywhere but Alaska. I find that incredible. We have the infrastructure. We have an 800-mile pipeline, and we are drilling on land.

Do my colleagues know what we are doing in the Gulf of Mexico? We are in 2,000 feet of water. We have had 8,000 leases in the gulf, many of which are not currently producing. There are a lot of endangered and threatened species, including marine mammals, sea turtles, and coastal birds. I cannot fathom why the Senator from Massachusetts believes it is better to drill where there are endangered species than where we have a thriving wildlife population that obviously we take care of, as they do in the Gulf of Mexico.

What stuns me is it seems to me common sense we should develop areas where people support the development. Many of these leases sit off the coast of Florida are objectionable to the people of Florida, and I respect their objections. Yet the people of the Alaska Coastal Plain overwhelmingly support development in Alaska.

Even the Teamsters who support development in Alaska disagree with the Senator from Massachusetts that we ought to massively increase our drilling in the Gulf of Mexico overnight.

We have a lot of species in the Gulf of Mexico that are threatened or endangered: The blue whale, fin whale, humpback whale, the northern right whale, sei whale, threatened endangered sea turtles, green sea turtles, hawksbill, loggerheads, endangered beach mice which I am not familiar with, the Florida salt marsh vole, the piping plover, and the brown pelican. I am not going to bore you with these, Mr. President.

The point is, that is tough drilling in 3,000 feet of water. There is a lot of risk. On land you can contain the risk. We have done a pretty good job of it in Alaska. They have done an excellent job in the Gulf of Mexico, make no mistake about it.

As we look at some of the suggestions that are made in general, such as we go someplace else in Alaska, remember, NPRA has 90 percent of the birds on the North Slope and over 90 bird species, millions of shore birds. There they are, Mr. President. They are not in ANWR. I just do not understand why Senators suggest they will not support development in an area with more oil and less wildlife diversity. It does not make any sense at all other than those Senators have been influenced by some of the groups that clearly are using ANWR as a symbol.

Others suggest that the development of Alaska's gas—for example, I think the chairman suggested we face a growing threat from foreign dependence on natural gas. Without going into that in too much detail, we only import 15 percent of our natural gas needs compared with 58 percent of dependence on foreign oil.

Let us take a look at that because I am all for alternatives, but don't believe they do not leave a footprint. I have a chart that shows the San Jacinto. If you do not know where this is, if you are driving from Palm Springs to Los Angeles and you happen to go through Banning, the pass, this is it. It is probably the largest wind farm in the world. Look at the little windmills in the back at the bottom. There are hundreds of them. They call it Cuisinart for the birds because a bird that gets through there is lucky—if he is flying low.

There is an equivalent energy ratio. This wind farm is about 1,500 acres and produces the equivalent of 1,360 barrels of oil a day. Two thousand acres of ANWR will produce a million barrels of oil a day. There is the footprint.

How much wind power does it need to equal that of ANWR's energy? About 3.7 million acres, equivalent to all of Rhode Island and Connecticut. If one put them all on a wind farm, then they would equal about what ANWR's energy input is capable of. We have a couple more of these charts so we might as well show them.

When we talk about the Sun, we naturally think of solar. Solar is worthwhile, but it is not very good in Point Barrow, AK, because the Sun only rises in the summertime. I should not say that but in the winter it is dark for a long time.

Two thousand acres of solar panel produce the energy equivalent of 4,400 barrels of oil a day. Two thousand acres of ANWR will produce a million barrels of oil a day. So it would take 448,000, or two-thirds of Rhode Island all in solar panels to produce as much energy as 2,000 acres of ANWR.

Solar panels do have a place in Arizona, Florida, New Mexico, and other areas, but do not think America is going to be moved on solar panels.

There has been a lot of discussion taking place on ethanol. Ethanol is an alternative made from vegetable products, corn and other products that come from our farmers. Two thousand acres of ethanol farmland produce the energy equivalent of 25 barrels of oil a day. Two thousand acres will produce 25 barrels of oil equivalent a day. Two thousand acres of ANWR will produce a million barrels of oil a day, and that source is the national renewable energy lab.

Make no mistake about it, a byproduct is produced with the corn, which is the corn husk. I am not sure what one does with them, but we could speculate. It would take 80.5 million acres of farmland, or all of New Mexico and Connecticut, to produce as much energy as 2,000 acres of ANWR. So we could plant New Mexico and Connecticut in corn, I guess. The point is, these all have footprints.

We have often talked about size when we talk about Alaska. We have talked about the fact that our State has 33,000 miles of coastline. ANWR is 19 million acres, as big as the State of South Carolina. We talked about the attitude of Alaskans in supporting exploration. About 75 percent of our people support it. Why is it that the people who want to develop oil and gas are not given the opportunity? I do not know. I find it very frustrating.

I listened to some of the debate by some Members relative to domestic oil production vis-a-vis subsidized oil. They talked about the rip-off that the oil industry allegedly is guilty of in this country, but we still have the best oil industry in the world. It is a relatively high-risk oil exploration. You do not know if you are going to find it. You better find a lot of it.

Somebody suggested that it is comparable in some manner to making sewing machines, that somehow there is a relationship relative to risk. Well, if one is making sewing machines, they know what their market is. They know what it is going to cost. But when one goes out and drills for oil, they do not

know if they are going to find it. There is a lot of risk there.

As we import foreign oil, we do not know what the true cost is because there is no environmental consideration associated with the development.

I do not think anyone recognizes what we enjoy in this country as a standard of living. The standard of living is brought about by people who have prospered and have become accustomed to a standard of living that is high. The convenience of having an automobile that can accommodate a family comfortably on a long trip; modest gasoline and energy prices, that is as a consequence of the structure of our society and the makeup of the United States.

The question comes about, Do we want to substantially limit that standard of living by taxes or various increased costs of energy? I do not think so. I think those kinds of things were evident in the debate that we had earlier in the week relative to CAFE standards.

One of the things that can certainly undermine our recovery is high oil prices. Our friend Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Fed, is taking a more guarded outlook on the U.S. economy compared with the comments he made last month about the possible consequences of sustained high oil prices on the economic recovery.

This influential gentleman told the Congressional Joint Economic Committee on Wednesday that energy prices had not yet risen to a point that would seriously sap spending but warned that a lasting surge in the cost of oil could have far-reaching consequences.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from Oil Daily be printed in the RECORD.

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

GREENSPAN: HIGH OIL CAN UNDERMINE RECOVERY

(By Sharif Ghalib)

Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan appears to be taking a more guarded outlook on the US economy compared with more sanguine comments he made last month amid the possible consequences of sustained high oil prices on an economic recovery.

The influential central bank chief told the congressional Joint Economic Committee on Wednesday that energy prices had not yet risen to a point that would seriously sap spending, but warned that a lasting surge in the cost of oil could have ''far-reaching'' consequences. He told the committee he was in no rush to raise US interest rates.

Greenspan's apparent step back may well have reflected mixed signals from recently released economic indicators and, perhaps more importantly, the recent surge in crude oil prices, which have risen nearly $2 per barrel this week.

While the preponderance of the latest economic indicators point to a faster than previously expected economic recovery in the US, recent data released on the labor market showing a slight rise in unemployment shed some doubt on the speed of the recovery.

The reported rise in unemployment was followed this week by a suggested slowdown in the US housing market, which had been expanding strongly, and—arguably more alarming—a slowdown in consumer spending. Manufacturing activity, however, has turned in its strongest expansion in almost two years.

While the so-called core rate of consumer price inflation, excluding energy and food prices, rose by a mere 0.1% in March, gasoline prices rose by a sharp 8%, the largest monthly change in six months. Fuel oil prices jumped by 2.2%, the strongest since last December.

These increases are in line with higher crude prices, reflecting mainly tensions in the Middle East, Iraq's unilateral 30-day oil embargo, and export delays in Venezuela.

Should the current oil rally continue for much longer, Opec will face mounting pressure to ease the reins on production. The group will meet in June to discuss production policy for the second half of 2002. But Iraq's embargo call, which has fallen on deaf ears among producers inside and outside Opec, may make it politically difficult for Saudi Arabia and other Muslim Opec members to increase production while fellow members Iraq withholds exports to pressure Israel.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. We have talked about oilfields. We have talked about the Arctic. We have talked about the wildlife. We have talked about the oil reserves. We have talked about the safety of development. I think we have responded to the myth that some suggest we are going to industrialize the Arctic.

I will show a chart of the Arctic in the wintertime. This area cannot be industrialized. It is just simply too harsh. Some of this is untouched because it has to be. To suggest we can have an industrial complex is totally unrealistic.

I often take this picture because it shows the harsh Arctic on a day when it is clear, but it is not clear all the time. Sometimes we have a whiteout. We can turn this picture upside down, but it is even better to turn it around because that is what it looks like when it is snowing. This is a whiteout. A lot of people do not know what kind of a condition that is. That is when one cannot tell the sky from the land because it is all the same color, and you better not fly into it. If you fly into it, you better be proficient as an instrument pilot or you will not make a round trip. That is the harsh reality.

That is what it looks like during a whiteout, which is a good portion of the time. When there is snow on the ground, there is snow in the air and no visibility. Somebody told me it is one of the best charts we have.

We talked about the footprint, talked about the accountability and how the vote will be scored. We know how the union will score the vote—as a jobs issue. We know how the environmentalists will score it—as an environmental issue. I hope Members will score it as to what is best for America. That is the issue. That is why we are here.

I have talked about jobs. If we open ANWR, we will build new ships, 19 new tankers. We will build them in California, the National Steel yard. We will build them in the South; hopefully, in Maine. This is big business, several thousand jobs in the shipyards, $4 or $5 billion into the economy alone, construction jobs, good-paying jobs, union jobs. It is not just what is in the national security interests of our Nation.

We can argue about how many jobs will be created, whether it is 50,000 or 700,000. What difference does it make? These are good jobs. We should regard each for what it is worth, providing each family with an opportunity to educate their children and provide a better life.

Speaking of a better life, those kids I talked about in Kaktovik have dreams and aspirations. Their dreams are more simple than ours. Maybe it is Halloween night. Do you know what their dreams and aspirations are? How about a little running water instead of the water well. How about a sewer system instead of a honeybucket? Do you know what a honeybucket is? We will show an arctic honeybucket. It costs about $17.

I didn't have any conversation over there as to why my people aren't entitled to running water, sewer, disposal. It is not a pleasant reality, but it is a reality. My people are tired. They want to be treated like everybody else. That is why this issue of opening ANWR has more to do than just the environmental innuendoes. It affects real people in my State. It is time they were heard.

I listened to the Senator from Massachusetts. He made a statement that he attested was made in a quote by our current Governor, which I don't believe. The quote was:

Evidence overwhelmingly rejects the notion of any relationship between Alaska North Slope crude and west coast gasoline prices.

I know the Governor doesn't believe that, and I want to make sure the record was corrected. Think for a minute what would happen to prices on the west coast in California if we cut off North Slope oil; if we do not continue to supply California, Washington, Oregon with refined product and crude oil. It would impact the west coast. It would impact the entire country.

The Senator from Massachusetts made this reference. I heard it and I thought it was a mischaracterization, so I looked in the RECORD. He made the statement and attributed it to the Governor of Alaska:

Evidence overwhelmingly rejects the notion of any relationship between Alaska North Slope crude and west coast gasoline prices.

I encourage the Senator from Massachusetts to correct that statement.

We have heard time and time again the statement that the United States has only 3 percent of the world's oil and we use 25 percent of the energy. Yet we produce 35 percent of the world's gross national product. We can argue that. We are getting a return, certainly, nearly a third of the world's domestic product is produced by the

United States which has 3 percent of the world's oil and uses 25 percent of the world's energy. That is part of our standard of living.

I talked about ANWR doubling our reserves. I talked about the fact we have to address conservation. We are doing it and continue to do it and we can continue to do a better job. Nevertheless, we live from day to day. Our farmers are dependent on low-cost energy.

We have a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation in support of ANWR. I ask unanimous consent to have that printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2002.

Hon. FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI: America's farmers and ranchers are users, and increasingly producers, of energy. We believe that passage of a comprehensive energy bill is of vital importance to agriculture and to our nation. We urge the Senate to pass an energy bill with the hope that the President will soon sign into law legislation that will address our country's energy security.

Our organization along with other ag groups, the petroleum industry, and environmental groups have reached a bipartisan agreement on renewable fuels. This agreement, contained in Majority Leader Daschle's bill, provides that our nation's motor fuel supply will include at least five billion gallons of renewable fuels by 2012. The Renewable Fuels Standard adds value to our commodities, creates jobs in rural America and provides a clean-burning, domestically produced fuel supply for our nation. We urge you to oppose any amendment that undoes this agreement.

Production of food and fiber takes energy—diesel in the tractor and combine, propane to heat the greenhouse, natural gas as a feedstock for fertilizer and electricity for home and farm use. Our members believe that we must have affordable and reliable energy sources. American Farm Bureau policy has long supported environmentally sound energy development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR). We ask that you support a cloture vote to allow the Senate to vote on this issue and to support expanding our domestically produced energy sources.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. As we look at other aspects of the debate in the limited time we are going to have tomorrow, I hope we would not rest our laurels on simply increasing CAFE standards. We had a very healthy debate on that. We sacrificed CAFE standards, to a degree. We did it for safety. We heard from people, from mothers driving children to school or soccer games; they want a safe automobile.

The statistics we heard suggested there was a compromise between CAFE standards and safety. We chose to err on the side of not reducing CAFE standards to the levels we could have. That is a responsible decision.

That does not mean new technology will not help, but to suggest we can make up the difference of what we import from Saddam Hussein, nearly 1.1 million barrels a day on CAFE, is not realistic. We gradually improve our CAFE standards as we have over a period of time. To suggest we can make up the difference is poppycock. It can't be done. We can begin to do better and we will do better. But America moves on oil. You don't run an aircraft on hot air. You don't fly an auto in Washington, DC, on hot air. You do it on oil. We are moving on oil. We will continue to do that. I am all for conservation, for renewables, but I am all for reality.

This chart is ironic. It shows the New York Times editorial positions from time to time. This was the 1987, 1988, and 1989 position, the New York Times editorial board. They said in 1989:

Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the most promising refuge . . . of untapped resource of oil in the north.

In June of 1988:

. . . The potential is enormous and the environmental risks are modest . . .

Further,

. . . the likely value of the oil far exceeds plausible estimates of the environmental cost.

. . . the total acreage affected by development represents only a fraction of 1 percent of the North Slope wilderness.

. . . But it is hard to see why absolute pristine preservation of this remote wilderness should take precedence over the Nation's energy needs.

March 30, 1989:

. . . Alaskan oil is too valuable to leave in the ground.

. . . The single most promising source of oil in America lies on the north coast of Alaska.

. . . Washington can't afford to treat the [Exxon Valdez] accident as a reason for fencing off what may be the last great oil field in the nation.

Now they say:

Mr. Murkowski's stated purpose is to reduce the Nation's use of foreign oil from 56 percent to 50 percent partly through tax breaks.

The centerpiece of that strategy, in turn is to open the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

This page has addressed the folly of trespassing on a wondrous wilderness preserve for what, by official estimates, is likely to be a modest amount of economically recoverable oil.

What a contrast. January 2001, the country needs a rational energy strategy, but the first step in that strategy should not be to start punching holes in the Arctic Refuge.

They have gone from 1987, 1988, 1989 to 2001, in March and January—a complete change of position. I asked the editorial board of the New York Times: Why? They said: Well, Senator, the former head of the editorial board moved to California so we have changed our position.

We have another one here from the Washington Post that is even more ironic. In 1987 and 1989 they said:

Preservation of wilderness is important, but much of Alaska is already under the strictest of preservation laws. . . .

But that part of the arctic coast is one of the bleakest, most remote places on this continent, and there is hardly any other place where drilling would have less impact on the surrounding life. . . .

That oil could help ease the country's transition to lower oil supplies and . . . reduce its dependence on uncertain imports. Congress would be right to go ahead and, with all the conditions and environmental precautions that apply to Prudhoe Bay, see what's under the refuge's tundra. . . .

Then on April 4, 1989, it says:

. . . But if less is to be produced here in the United States, more will have to come from other countries. The effect will be to move oil spills to other shores. As a policy to protect the global environment, that's not very helpful. . . .

. . . The lesson that conventional wisdom seems to be drawing—that the country should produce less and turn to even greater imports—is exactly wrong.

Here we are in February 2001:

Is there an energy crisis, and if so, what kind? What part of the problem can the market take care of, and what must government do? What's the right goal when it comes to dependence on overseas sources?

America cannot drill its way out of ties to the world oil market. There may be an emotional appeal to the notion of American energy for the American consumer and a national security argument for reducing the share that imports hold. But the most generous estimates of potential production from the Alaska refuge amount to only a fraction of current imports.

Did we say it might be as much as 25 percent?

December 2001, the 25th, Christmas Day:

Gov. Bush has promised to make energy policy an early priority of his administration. If he wants to push ahead with opening the plain as part of that, he'll have to show that he values conservation as well as finding new sources of supply. He'll also have to make the case that in the long run, the oil to be gained is worth the potential damage to this unique wild and biologically vital ecosystem. That strikes us as a hard case to make.

Isn't it ironic that these editorial boards of two of the Nation's leading papers could change their minds so dramatically? I did meet with the Washington Post editorial board and I asked them why they had changed their position. They were relatively surprised I would ask them that kind of question, and their response was equally interesting. They said they thought George W. Bush was a little too forceful in promoting energy activities associated with his particular background. In other words, I was politely brushed off.

This happens to be a Washington Post story. It is interesting because this is the newest deal that we developed. It is the Philips field, the Alpine project in Alaska's North Slope, and right on the edge of the National Petroleum Reserve, Alaska.

You can see that is a whole oilfield. That is it. That is producing somewhere around 85,000 to 100,000 barrels a day.

You know there is one thing you see and you see a little airstrip and that is all. There is no road out of there. There is a ice road in the wintertime, but in the summertime you have to fly to get

in and out of there. The interesting thing about the Washington Post is—we used to have laws around here when I was in the banking business called truth in lending. You had to tell the truth to a borrower if you were going to lend him money. Those particular polar bears are warm and cuddly, but they are not in ANWR. We know where the picture was taken. It was taken about 500 miles away near Point Barrow. Nevertheless, it was a Park Service photo. It looked good. They just used it and wrote us a nice letter and said thank you.

ANWR—100 percent homegrown American energy.

That is like homegrown corn.

The exploration and development of energy resources in the United States is governed by the world's most stringent environmental constraints, and to force development elsewhere is to accept the inevitability of less rigorous oversight.

This is a gentleman, former executive director of the Sierra Club, Doug Wheeler.

We can do it right. Give us a chance.

Washington Post, February 12, 2002:

Our greatest single failure over the last 25 years was our failure to reduce our dependence on foreign oil . . . which would have reduced the leverage of Saudi Arabia.

Richard Holbrooke, Ambassador to the United Nations in the second Clinton administration.

February 13, 2002:

The Bush administration's defense of the leases shows ''disregard for both our precious California coastline and the right of states to make decisions about their environment.''

This was our good friend, the junior Senator from California, BARBARA BOXER, commenting on the issue of States having a determination as to what should prevail in their State. She further said:

We're going to swap [oil leases] so that the oil companies can drill where people want them to drill.

That was February 15. Of course we would like to have them drill in our State. I think it is important to reflect the inconsistency associated with some of the statements.

This happens to be back in Eisenhower's time. This was a Petroleum Industry War Council poster:

Your work is vital to victory. Our ships, our planes, our tanks must have oil.

You do not sail a Navy ship by wind. You do not fly the planes on hot air.

This is by Reuters:

Iraq urges use of oil weapon against Israel, U.S.

''Use oil as a weapon in the battle with the enemy (Israel),'' Iraq's ruling Baath party said in a statement published by Baghdad media Monday.

''If the oil weapon is not used in the battle to defend our nations and safeguard our lives and dignity against American and Zionist [namely Israeli] aggression, it is meaningless,'' the Iraqi statement said.

''If Arabs want to put an end to Zionism, they are able to do so in 24 hours,'' Saddam told a group of Iraqi religious dignitaries Sunday night.

''The world understands the language of economy, so why do not Arabs use this language?'' he asked.

''Saddam said if only two Arab States threatened to use economic measures against Western countries if Israel did not withdraw from Palestinian-ruled territory, ''you will see they (Israelis) will pull out the next day.''

That is the kind of threat being used today.

Let's take a look at where the Iraqi oil is currently going. It is going to California. This is 287 million barrels that we shipped out: Minnesota, Midwest, all the States in the red on this chart. Do not think we are not getting some Iraqi oil.

This is what occurred in the world when the United States said it was out for the Easter recess. This is a little note to the American people and the Senators. What happened April 9, while we were out? We had Saddam Hussein impose a 30-day oil embargo; oil jumped $3 a barrel; Saddam was paying the Palestinian suicide bombers an increase from $10,000 to $25,000; Iraq and Iran called on countries to use ''oil as a weapon'' against the United States and Israel, and Libya happened to agree with that; the Iraqis—there was a plot, I think it was reported in the Christian Science Monitor, to blow up a U.S. warship; the price of gasoline moved up.

So it is happening. Here is our friend Saddam Hussein, very blatantly stating ''Oil Is A Weapon.''

Again, we have seen this check that he is offering suicide bombers—$25,000.

This is reality. That is what is occurring in the world today. I do not know how the American public feels, but I am fed up.

The last one I will show again. It is the frustration associated with the people. You have seen this before. We all appreciate the sanctity of wilderness, parks, and recreation areas. But all those areas in Alaska are federally established withdrawals. They are wilderness areas, wildlife areas, and national parks. We are proud of them. But we are entitled to develop and prosper as a State, to provide educational opportunities for our children, sewer and water, and jobs.

When we look at an area one-fifth the size of the lower 48 and recognize we don't have one year-round manufacturing plant in the entire State, with the exception of an ammonia plant, that really can be considered a manufacturing plant—all of their products are exported outside of Alaska. We have oil and we have gas. As you know, once oil and gas are developed, they are not very labor intensive. There is a lot of maintenance. There is new exploration. The oil industry has done a responsible job. But it is not a resident oil industry. We don't have small resident companies in our State. We wish we did. We have Exxon, we have British Petroleum, we have Phillips, and a couple of others. It is all outside capital. The people who contribute to the industry are the best, but for the most part they are transient.

The wealth of an area is in its land. If the land is not controlled by the people, then the wealth belongs to government. In our State, for the most part it is the Federal Government, and to a lesser degree the State government. The only exception we have to that is the land that is owned in fee simple by our Native residents and their efforts to try to develop the resources on this land.

But I could go very easily right down the list. We have the potential for oil and gas. We are blessed with that. It is in the Arctic. It is in the Cook Inlet area. It is down around Anchorage, and it is higher up.

We have some other companies. Unocol is down in the Cook Inlet area. But for the most part, it has just been the major oil companies. We really don't have a significant locally owned, Alaskan-domiciled oil company of any competitive magnitude. I wish we did. But people come up and exploit the resources. Most of the profits are taken down below to Texas, simply where the oil industry is located. We have even seen Phillips move down to Texas as well. That is a corporate decision; that is their own business.

Oil and gas have tremendous potential. The only way the citizens of Alaska and the Government can participate in that is through employment and through revenues from the taxes of those resources.

We go to the timber resources. As I have indicated time and time again, there is more timber harvested in the State of New York for firewood than is produced commercially in the State of Alaska in the largest of all our national forests because we don't have State forests of any consequence, it is all Federal. Try to get a timber sale on the Federal forest today, and you will find yourself sitting on the courthouse steps—one injunction after another. As a consequence, I think we have one sawmill perhaps still operating in Ketchikan, one perhaps still operating in Klawock, and one perhaps still operating in Wrangell. That is virtually it.

We have 33,000 miles of coastline. There is a lot of fishing. We have a tough time marketing our salmon, which are wild Alaska salmon, because our salmon are seasonal. They start running in May and run through August and September. Our competition is now fish farming in Chile and Canada. We can't quite comprehend that in Alaska because, first of all, we don't know what we would do with our fishermen and coastal communities which are the backbone of our State. We think we have a superior product. But they can provide the fresh product year round in the market.

We have a problems with our fisheries. We are going through a transition. We don't necessarily know what the answer is. We have a lot of halibut, a lot of cod, and a lot of crab.

We are tremendously blessed with minerals. We have no transportation. We haven't built a new highway in our State since we opened up that highway to Prudhoe Bay to build the pipeline.

We have no way to reach across our State from east to west. We have no highways throughout southeastern Alaska. We have a ferry system.

As you look at minerals, if you look at that map and try to figure out how you are going to get through some of the Federal withdrawals located nearby, indicated on the colored charts, you get a different picture of that wide open space up there and all those resources. How are you going to develop them? Anything we develop we don't market in our State because we don't have a population concentration. We have 660,000 people, or thereabouts, with half of them in Anchorage. Everything we produce has to be competitive with the other countries that develop resources and sell on the markets of the world. For all practical purposes, our world markets, with the exception of oil and gas, are in the Orient—Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and China to some extent.

That is a little bit of a rundown of Alaska today. That is why we believe, for the benefit of our State, our State government, and for our people, that it is imperative we be allowed to develop this area for the national security interests of this Nation.

There is a technical paper I came across which was sent to me on the physics of oil and natural gas production. It addresses the relationship between Prudhoe Bay and ANWR. It is two paragraphs. I think it is important. It is written by the professor of geological engineering and chairman of the Department of Mining and Geological Engineering, School of Minerals and Engineering, University of Alaska, Fairbanks. I am sure he would agree to have that go into the RECORD.

It states:

> Due to the physics of oil and natural gas production, the natural gas resources in Prudhoe Bay can now be produced since there has been a significant reduction in the oil reserves—

In other words, the oil has been pulled down.

He goes on to say:

> Due to the physics of production, the concurrent production of oil from ANWR with the production of natural gas from Prudhoe Bay can result in the optimum utilization of these energy resources. Without concurrent production there will be a significant time interval after the depletion of the natural gas in Prudhoe Bay before any gas is produced from ANWR. The interval could be as much as 30 years. Assuming only 16 billion barrels of recoverable oil in ANWR, and an excess capacity of 800,000 barrels per day in the Trans-Alaska pipeline, it would take 55 years to utilize this petroleum resource. Thus, natural gas from ANWR could not be optimally utilized for 34 years after the natural gas in Prudhoe Bay is depleted. There is more than adequate time for both Alaskans and those outsiders in the ''lower-48'' to freeze in the dark. ANWR petroleum must be utilized now in order to have ANWR gas available when Prudhoe Bay gas is depleted.

So he is making the case that as we developed Prudhoe Bay, we found the gas. We used the gas for recovery of the oil. Now that the oil is in decline, we can use the gas. But the same is true in ANWR. If we develop ANWR, and begin to produce oil, as the oil declines, we will use the gas for reinjection, and then we will have the gas available.

So there is a logical sequence in the manner in which you develop these fields and provide the continuity of oil, followed by the continuity of gas.

I must also indicate that as a professional engineer, Paul Metz is providing his opinion and not the opinion, necessarily, or endorsement of the University of Alaska, or the engineering department. But I think it puts a different light on the logic of the sequence of development of a huge hydrocarbon field such as we have in the Alaska Arctic today.

Mr. President, you have been very gracious with your time. It is 10:30 at night. I think we started this debate very early. Somebody said 8:30. It has been a long day. But I felt it necessary to give Joe an opportunity to show his charts, and he has done a good job of that.

I say to you, Mr. President, you have been gracious with your time. And the clerks, and the whole Senate professional staff have been very generous.

Again, I would appeal to those of you who are about ready to go to bed, to those staff people who are watching, to consider, one more time, the human element. Put aside, for just a moment, the environmental considerations that have gone into this debate. Consider the people of Alaska. Consider those kids—their hopes, their dreams, their aspirations for a better life, an opportunity for sewer and water. It looks like the middle child shown in the picture missed the dentist. But, in any event, they are American citizens. They are Eskimo kids who live in our land, and I think they have a right to look to us, look to those of us in this body for some disposition of their future so they can enjoy the opportunities that we take for granted.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 9:45 A.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:45 tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:33 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, April 18, 2002, at 9:45 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 17, 2002:

THE JUDICIARY

LANCE M. AFRICK, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA.