

should be, with putting troops in harm's way. Frankly, often troops are in harm's way. That is what troops are for. The issue is not harm's way; the issue is why they are there. If the troops are there with a bona fide national interest, then we try to avoid harm's way. But that is not the criteria. The cost. When you talk about \$1 billion, \$2 billion, I think we spent that much in Haiti. Can you imagine that this will cost less than Haiti? I do not believe so. Is it in the national interest to spend \$3 billion, \$4 billion? That is a question.

Maybe more important than anything was the lack of specific goals. In the hearing that I mentioned with the Joint Chiefs, the general said we will get the job done. I believe that. I believe our Armed Forces will get the job done. I ask, how will you know? What is the job that is to be done? Frankly, I do not think anyone knows precisely.

Pull out in 1 year? I have a hunch that is a little bit political, that the notion is that we know you cannot leave troops there very long.

What if you are not through in a year? How do you know you are through? What is it that signifies having the job done? We were very concerned when we talked to the command. What do you do in this zone? Do you have check points with half a dozen soldiers—I do not know—that are subject to raids by small bands? Do you put them in large groups and patrol? The notion was, if you are fired on, you get to fire back. That is right, the way it ought to be. It was also, if there is an attack, we should withdraw because we are not there to fight but to keep peace. If there is no peace we would not be there. Sort of a conundrum.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that it is an almost unsolvable situation. I think we can be involved. I think people want us to be involved. I think we indeed have been involved. The question of 20,000 troops is quite a different matter. I have to say, in the time I was in Wyoming, I really did not find anyone who supported that idea.

So we have a situation of 43 months of war in the former Yugoslavia, more than 250,000 people killed, an ethnic war, a continuation of something that has gone on a very long time. The question is, do we place ourselves in the middle of this, between the Serbs?

One of the things that has happened, I believe, partly as a result of this body's taking action on lifting the arms embargo, is that we did tend to equalize the forces. Croats and Moslems got together in the federation which sort of leveled the playing field of the Serbs, and then NATO's airstrikes completed that job. You noticed a great change in what was happening.

So we are faced with an ancient ethnic and religious conflict. Frankly, it is hard to know who is on what side.

Another obstacle is to overcome how you handle the United States and Russia being there at the same time. Rus-

sians will not be under the control of the NATO but still want to be in a segment. The winter is certainly a worry. I know we can handle it, but nevertheless it is tough.

Mr. President, I do not believe there has been demonstrated—and quite frankly I do not believe there will be demonstrated—an indication that placement of these troops in the former Yugoslavia is in the international interests. I think that ought to be the criterion. That ought to be the measurement. In the next few weeks we will need to make that measurement.

All of us need to be involved whether we are in the Senate, whether we are citizens, whether we vote. This is a U.S. decision, and it will have to be made by all.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEBATE ABOUT BOSNIA

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, as we go into this very busy week, coming on the heels of the Thanksgiving break, I do not know of a time that we have had so many issues at the forefront that are so important to this country—not only the debate on the budget, how do we balance it, how do we stay on track to balance the budget in 2002 and how important that is to our children and grandchildren, the business of reforming welfare to make it work for people rather than lock them into certain circumstances, and now the situation as it is developing and unfolding in Bosnia.

There are a lot of folks, including some who are running for public office, by the way, who do not even know where Bosnia is. But the debate, I am sure, this week will boil down to be a three-pronged debate: Is it in our national interest to deploy troops as peacekeepers or peacemakers, and there is a difference; will there be a clear and concise mission with hardly any opening for mission creep, and that is kind of tough to define, and it is kind of tough to stop—we learned that in Somalia; and is there at some time certain a withdrawal plan or some avoidance to deal with maybe an endless mission.

One has to read the history of that part of the world to really understand it. I have been there, spent quite a lot of time on the Dalmation coast in Croatia, and I will tell you that the passion and the love for their land runs as deep as their hatred of their trespassers.

In Bosnia, is it a holy war? One would like to think not. But I think it is part of the equation. An ethnic war? Of

course it is because of the ethnic cleansing that has been carried out. The carnage that has been thrust upon this country is almost unspeakable and unheard of.

Is it a civil war? Yes, it is a civil war. Is it a war that goes across borders? It is that, too. But it has been waged for generations. And just since our history or our recollection or our generation, 250,000 people have perished at the hands of those who would be in the business of ethnic cleansing. The atrocities are unspeakable, and they are there.

So we have to look at that situation as we try to define our responsibility in that equation. I give high marks to this President, my President—we only have one at a time—in bringing the warring parties together at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio, and the amount of resolve that was placed on this to come out of there with some kind of an agreement that would be good for everybody.

We have seen cease-fires, and we have seen agreements that were drawn up and concluded within Serbia and Croatia and in Bosnia, but they did not last very long. I am wondering how long this will last. Does everyone who is a party to that accord or that agreement that was signed at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio really, really agree on peace? Are their leaders really 100 percent dedicated to it? Is everyone ready to stop the fighting?

It would seem to me that after a while you would just get tired of killing one another. That has not been the case in this particular corner of the world. I would also ask, after the accord was signed in Ohio, what has been the part for the rest of the international community? Have they stepped forward? And how much pressure have they put on the parties, the three main parties in that part of the world to work out some sort of a peace? How heavy has the international pressure been? Has it been as intense as it has from this country? Because I happen to believe in the American way. I have always said our greatest trait as a people is most times our undoing because we are a caring people. No catastrophe happens around the world that we do not react in a very positive way to help people. We care. And also when we see the atrocities on our television screens every night during the nightly news, it moves our conscience. And we are a nation with a conscience. No person can stand to one side and not feel for those people who have been victims of unspeakable atrocities.

But those folks who have pledged troops into NATO as a peacekeeping force, how many of those people have really stepped up and said this is wrong, and how much pressure have they put on their folks that this must stop? If the Bosnian Moslems and the Serbians and the Croats do not think this peace agreement is in their best interests, then we would question,

is it in our best interests? Would our troops be placed in harm's way? Would they be placed there as peacemakers or peacekeepers? And I would say as this debate drones on, peacemakers become a lot more dangerous. It is hard to keep the peace where there is no peace.

I am also sympathetic with the President on wanting to do the right thing. I am also sympathetic in that he has the right if he thinks it is right to deploy troops in a peacekeeping mission. But it would be a lot easier if he would come to this Congress and consult with this Congress before he did so and have the support of the American people. It is terrible to order young men and women into harm's way without the complete support of their nation. I will not do that.

There seems to be another situation here, too—the provision of this accord to lift the arms embargo and to arm and train the Bosnians. That does not seem like a peacekeeping mission to me. And I will have to know more about the wording on that and our goal or the ultimate end.

It seems hard to say that if we flood the country with arms and in the next breath we say, "No more war," that seems sort of an oxymoron to me.

In conclusion, it is, like I said, like no other part of the world where you will find people that have a love so deep and a passion so deep for their land but also a hate so deep for their trespassers. And that is the situation we have to deal with. So despite my expressed doubts on the merits of this decision to deploy—we will listen to the debate—but I have no intention of withdrawing my support for our young men and women who will be placed in harm's way in this mission of peace.

I can remember when President Bush came to this body and asked for permission to deploy in the Middle East. We did have a national interest there. How much do we have in this circumstance? We will weigh that decision. And it will probably be, if the President chooses to do so, and I think he will, that he will come to this Congress asking for our support. It will be a very, very tough decision. It could be one of those votes that one never likes to cast either up or down. But the debate must be held, and we must talk about it openly because there are young men and women's lives at stake, and the interest of the most powerful and free Nation in the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would ask, is there an order for the day relative to taking up other legislation at 3 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has been an order entered to that effect, that is correct.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. In view of the fact that I do not see any other of my colleagues calling up anything, I ask

unanimous consent that morning business be extended for approximately 15 minutes so that I may make a statement and enter a bill.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair, and wish the President a good afternoon.

(The remarks of Mr. MURKOWSKI pertaining to the introduction of S. 1425 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

OIL RESERVES IN ANWR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, seeing no one wishing to speak, I would like to address very briefly the matter that I have spoken of on a number of occasions. That is the opening up of the arctic oil reserve known as ANWR. And I would like to submit some particular documentation that has come into my office in the last few days, but I will be specific in my reference.

As the President and my colleagues are aware, the idea of opening up the Arctic oil reserve, or ANWR, is not a new idea. It was left in 1980 to the Congress to make a determination as to the appropriateness of opening up an area in the coastal plain, approximately 1.5 million acres out of the 19 million acres which make up ANWR. Approximately 8.5 million acres of that has already been set aside in a permanent wilderness by the 1980 legislation. Another 9.5 million acres has been set aside in refuge, leaving approximately 1.5 million acres in the so-called 1002 area for the disposition of Congress.

At this time, we are faced with a dilemma as to whether or not, indeed, this is in the national interest. It is a similar argument to that which prevailed in the seventies when there was question as to whether or not the Prudhoe Bay area would be open for exploration and development.

That was over 20 years ago, Mr. President. Prudhoe Bay has been producing approximately 25 percent of the total domestic crude oil produced in the United States over the last 18 years. Today, Prudhoe Bay has declined. The production from that field has dropped from approximately 2 million barrels a day to 1.5 million barrels a day. But the arguments over whether or not we should open up the Arctic oil reserves of ANWR and the arguments that prevailed 20 years ago are basically the same: Can we do it safely? What will be the effect on the caribou? What will be the effect on the moose and the other animals that frequent the area, the bird life and so forth?

We have seen over the last 18 years of operating the Prudhoe Bay field an extraordinary set of events relative to the wildlife. We have seen the caribou herds grow from 3,000 to 4,000 animals to the current level of approximately 24,000 animals. It has been recognized in the oil fields, as in other areas where the caribou frequent that there are ap-

proximately three detractors and a number of animals that can sustain themselves, and those are individually related to the number of wolves in an individual area or other predators such as bear, the winter—the heavy snows take a toll on the caribou—and, of course, overgrazing is also a difficulty. In any event, we have seen the growth of these herds, which suggest, indeed, we have the capability to safely manage with a reasonable amount of development in an area given time.

My point is, again, we are reflecting the same arguments that were before us in the seventies, applicable today, but we have the proof, we have the scientific evidence and we have the redundancy, if you will, of recognizing that this population has increased and, with proper management, there can be little effect on the animal population associated with development in the high Arctic.

Further, there has always been a question as to the safety relative to the advanced technology. We have proven that we can limit the footprint dramatically. We have seen an extensive field in Prudhoe Bay reduced as new fields have been found, as stepouts of Prudhoe Bay, approximately 7 years ago, brought in a field known as Endicott which only took in 56 acres of surface land, yet it was the 10th largest producing field in North America. Today, it is the 7th largest producing field.

There was another question as to what effect this activity would have on the residents, the Eskimo people themselves. I quote from a statement, a news release from the North Slope Bureau and the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation:

The Eskimo people are working their way out of Federal dependency. Because of their success, they state they are being opposed at every turn by the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs—

And they named Ada Deer in that regard and suggest she opposes successful native American corporations and organizations. She, in their opinion, wants them to be dependent on the Bureau of Indian Affairs. But they indicate that they are well aware of what dependency brings: a state that kills self-initiative, that breeds a welfare society. They further conclude that they want to follow the American way, the old way of independent self-help and individual responsibility, family values and sense of community.

In other words, Mr. President, they want to have the same opportunities that other Americans enjoy: jobs for their children, tax bases for their communities, running water that other Americans enjoy.

So as a consequence, as we debate the merits of whether ANWR should stay in the reconciliation package, as has been deemed by action taken by both the House and the Senate, we are faced with this question of national security interests as well.

Currently, we are importing about 51 percent of our total crude oil. Back in