

of giant tax cuts; or the ability of our economy to continue its present rate of growth. Serious doubts have been expressed by many of those testifying and in the Budget Committee, itself, by members on both sides of the aisle.

Yet I believe that the majority fully intends to bring the budget to the Senate floor with the President's tax proposal shrouded in this protective armor of reconciliation, virtually shutting out debate and precluding amendments by the full membership of this body—the full membership of this body.

Why hold these excellent, thought-provoking hearings at all, if that is the plan? Why do we have to have hearings, if that is the plan from the beginning?

Hearings are intended to try to discover the flaws in a proposal, and to help Members make an informed judgment about the wisdom of proceeding with a matter. We who serve on the Budget Committee may have our chance to exercise our judgment on the budget, but what about the rest of the body? There are many, many views in this Senate on both sides of the aisle, and these views deserve to be heard.

We are talking about a gargantuan tax cut—a behemoth, which threatens to eat up the surplus, drain the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, cripple domestic discretionary spending, siphon off needed defense dollars, and leave us fully unprepared to deal with natural disasters or foreign upheavals. We are talking about making very dramatic changes in our fiscal policies based on—what? Based on projections. And your projection is as good as her projection or as good as his or as good as mine—projections which are admitted by the projectors, themselves, to be very, very tenuous, indeed.

I believe that the American people, those people out there, out in the mountains, in the coastal areas, those to the Pacific, to the Atlantic, from the Canadian-U.S. line to the Gulf of Mexico—all of you ought to have the benefit of a full and thorough debate about the choices before us. Do we pay down the debt with surplus monies? Do we reserve some of the surplus to protect the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds? How do we go about creating a wise and thoughtful plan concerning prescription drugs? Do we spend more on education, and public infrastructure? Do we allow more for Defense abroad and anti-terrorism at home? These are questions which need to be put before the full membership of the Senate and the House, and, through spirited debate and the offering of amendments, before the American people.

This Senator just strenuously, strenuously objects to having these far-reaching, critical matters swathed in the protective bandages of a reconciliation process and ramrodded through this body like some self-propelled missile. Nobody who has listened to the testimony in the Budget Committee could possibly claim that the right

choices are clear. They are not clear. There is vast uncertainty and disagreement about nearly every aspect of our future budget policy.

The President's proposals are not an edict, and the Senate is not a quivering body of humble subjects who must obey under any and all circumstances.

I suggest that, if the faint dream of effecting some sort of true bipartisanship in Washington for a time is ever to jell into something tangible, reliance on reconciliation as the torpedo to deliver a knock-out punch for the President is a tactic which must be abandoned.

It is not a fair course. It is not a wise course. And, it is a course which shortchanges the American people.

We must not shackle the intellects of one hundred Members of the Senate in this way.

That is what we would be doing. We would shackle, hand and foot, the intellects of 100 Members. One-hundred representatives of 280 million people would be shackled in this body, and shackled, as well, on the other side of the Capitol in the House.

We must not ignore the viewpoints of millions of Americans. We should not fear the wisdom of open and free-ranging debate about a proposal which is, at best, risky business. Now is no time to circle the wagons. Now is the time to hear all the voices and build consensus among ourselves and among our people.

There will be no victory here, if we make the wrong choices and plunge this Nation back to deficit status. I implore the Leadership to bring whatever tax bill we write to the full Senate as a freestanding non-reconciliation bill for a thorough examination by this body. The President has said that he wants bipartisanship. He has said that he has faith in his plan. There is no need to hide behind the iron wall of reconciliation. Let us not damage the President's leadership with the ruthless misuse of a process in this body, which may hand him a very hollow victory, indeed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I had the opportunity to hear a good part of the statement by the Senator from West Virginia. As on so many important occasions, he has spoken for this institution and for our country. He has reminded us once more that as we care about the sum and substance of an issue, the process can be a more powerful factor and force as it is in this particular case almost on the substance because what we are looking at is a process and a procedure which will deny this Senate its true role as defined by the Founding Fathers when they met in Philadelphia and devised this institution of the Senate to be a place where ideas clash and where the Nation's business is to be considered in an open and deliberate way. That was going to permit the opportunity for the

fashioning and the shaping of the legislation after adequate debate and consideration.

He is reminding us once again about our responsibilities to meet our Founding Fathers' intentions for this institution and how their definition is actually being corrupted by a procedure which is known as the reconciliation process, which is a phrase that is probably not well understood in terms of its significance and importance in the consideration of this tax reduction but will have a very dramatic effect on the opportunity for the American people's will to be expressed by a good debate and by the opportunity for the Senate to work its will.

This is one of the most important speeches we will hear this year.

I commend the Senator for taking the Senate's time in making it. I have listened to him as he has studied the propositions during the past several weeks. I watched him on CNN the other night while he was in attendance at the Budget Committee and listening to those talking about providing adequate defense of our country. I watched him for several hours listening to those presentations. I watched him, as well, in the Budget Committee when he was listening to those who spoke about the economic conditions in this country and about the details of the President's budget. As always, no one studies these issues more deeply and more thoroughly or more comprehensively.

His speech today is not one of partisanship but one of statesmanship in reminding the Senate and, most importantly, also the leadership about its responsibilities to the American people. I thank him for making it.

I hope, although this Chamber is not well occupied at this moment, all of our colleagues will take the time to examine this speech in the RECORD tomorrow.

I hope he will continue to press these points as we go through this process in the days and weeks ahead because it is in the interest of this institution and our country.

I thank the Senator for the time he has taken and for the thoughtful presentation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his time, for his waiting, and for his very wise words.

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

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

LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am introducing a resolution, which I send to the desk, that addresses one of the most urgent needs of citizens all across the country. That resolution is cosponsored by Senators SCHUMER, HARKIN, KENNEDY, DURBIN, and BOXER.

What it does is call on Congress to take immediate action to enact supplemental appropriations that will include funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. This program helps more than 30 million of our fellow citizens in low-income households around the Nation to pay rising energy bills. Every one of these households have fixed and low incomes, and many include children and elderly. More than two-thirds of the households eligible for this assistance have annual incomes of less than \$8,000. As energy prices have risen and so have the costs to heat or cool a home, those families face an unacceptable proposition of choosing between their food, medicine, and other basic necessities.

Unfortunately, this program has literally exhausted its funds in a number of States, and it is nearly exhausted in many others. As a result, thousands of households around the Nation—particularly in areas that may face several more weeks of the severe cold weather—are at risk. As many colleagues know, the price of heating oil, natural gas, kerosene, propane, and electricity has risen significantly over the past year and in some areas sharply enough to cause a deep financial burden on many households.

It is my hope that President Bush and the Congress can work together to address this situation. I have talked with many of my colleagues. They share my concern, and they, too, have constituents in need. We are only in the middle of February at this point, and already some States have exhausted their LIHEAP support. March and April can be very cold months in New England, New York, and throughout the Midwest.

This resolution calls on President Bush, who has been a strong advocate for LIHEAP, to work with our leadership to craft and enact legislation that would put \$1 billion into the LIHEAP program to help those in need now when they need it. It also calls on Congress to support supplemental appropriations of \$152 million in weatherization and \$37 million on State energy conservation plan grants. These programs we believe can significantly help reduce energy use and reduce the overall expense of the program.

There has been a lot of talk of bipartisanship in this Congress. I am reminded that bipartisanship really always counts the most when the national needs blur the lines of ideology and party. These are the times when the Senate has been at its very best. I suggest, respectfully, that with Americans struggling with their heating bills, and all of their bills as a result of their heating bills, and with commonsense relief for so many people directly within our grasp, there should not be an excuse for inaction. There would be every reason to act responsibly and rapidly. I hope my colleagues will join us in doing so.

I thank the Senator from Alaska for his courtesy, and I thank the Chair.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, let me thank my good friend from Massachusetts for his concern over energy efficiency and conservation assistance to low-income families. I am sure he will be pleased to know that in my remarks today concerning the comprehensive energy bill that will be introduced on the 26th, Monday, when we come back, about noon, we cover under title VI an extensive area of concern not only to the Senator from Massachusetts, but I think the entire eastern corridor and other parts of the United States that are subject to cold winters and dependent on high-cost heating oil.

I think it is appropriate to also note the study that came out by the CSIS yesterday indicating a reality that some of us hesitate to take seriously, but on the other hand this study has been underway for some 3 years. It simply states the harsh reality that we are going to be dependent on hydrocarbons for the foreseeable future. It was estimated in that study that the increase would go from about 83 to about 90 percent of the energy used in the world would come from hydrocarbons, primarily from the developing countries.

So the reality that we are likely to suddenly relieve ourselves of our dependence on foreign oil, unfortunately, is probably not a reality. The rationale for that is obvious. We don't have the technology, very frankly, particularly in the areas of transportation, for any other mode. That doesn't suggest we should not continue to fund, if you will, alternative energy, renewable energy and so forth, and continue to try to develop technology, such as hydrogen and various other things. But to suggest that somehow out of this energy crisis we can do it through conservation and efficiency alone is unrealistic. I wish that were the case.

I encourage all of my friends to take a look at this report, which is done by an objective, unbiased group.

Let me refer specifically to sections in our draft energy bill, and for the benefit of my friend from Massachusetts, who I see has left the floor, I will start from the beginning rather than what I was prepared to do, which was to comment specifically on the areas associated with the concerns of low-income families and programs on energy efficiency, conservation, and so forth. I will be happy to do that now that I see my friend is back. I think it represents an awareness and an acknowledgment of a situation that simply has to have relief.

In title VI—energy efficiency and conservation assistance to low-income families—we propose an extension of low-income home energy assistance. That specifically extends authorizations for the low-income home energy assistance programs, or LIHEAP, as it is termed, increasing authorized amounts from \$2 billion to \$3 billion, and it increases the authorized emergency funds from \$600 million to \$1 billion annually and extends programs making payments to States.

The other portion that we think is important is the energy-efficient schools program, which in draft section 602, which establishes a new program within the Department of Energy making grants to local school districts and improving energy efficiency of school buildings, expands the use of renewable energy, and authorizes \$200 million in fiscal year 2002, increasing in subsequent fiscal years.

We have proposed amendments to the weatherization assistance program which expand eligibility and funding authorization for weatherization assistance—providing grants to low-income households to improve residential energy efficiency.

Then we have a portion that provides amendments to State energy programs. It sets procedures for regular review of existing State energy conservation programs and encourages regional energy conservation and planning.

It sets State energy efficiency goals of reducing energy use by 25 percent by the year 2010, compared to 1990 usage, and expands and extends authorization for State energy programs of \$50 million in fiscal year 2000, increasing in subsequent fiscal years.

I look forward to our discussion when we come back from our recess on various aspects of our comprehensive bill and the bill that has been introduced by my good friend, Senator BINGAMAN, today which covers some of the areas in which the Senator from Massachusetts expressed an interest. Certainly, we have the motivation to try to respond because there is more than a need for LIHEAP. There is a need for more generation in this country to meet the crisis that is evidenced in California.

I am going to proceed with a general outline of the bill at this time.

Mr. KERRY. Will my colleague yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I will yield for a question.

Mr. KERRY. Let me say to my colleague, I very much welcome what he is suggesting, and this is a debate I will welcome and I know many of my colleagues will because there is a great deal of difficulty for the country in deciding what we do about the dependency as described.

I say again to my colleague and to my other colleagues, there is a distinction between the authorization that he is requesting, which is in the next budget cycle, and the supplemental appropriations that we are requesting to deal with the crisis now for families who are out of money and States that are out of money.

Regrettably, what the Senator—and I know the Senator knows the distinction well—is proposing is down the road, whereas we face an immediate crisis in LIHEAP funding at this moment. I think the Senator will agree with me, will he not, that there is that distinction between these bills?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am not going to get into a debate on

the issue now. It was unfortunate today that both sides could not reach a resolve on the resolution concerning energy. It went to the Democratic side, and there was a reluctance on the other side because it did not include redress of the California dilemma, which is very difficult, as you know.

A lot of people are working on that. We have to recognize, first of all, that we have an energy crisis in this country. It is not unique to one area. California needs immediate assistance. All one has to do is talk to the California legislators, and the reality is to sit down in a timely manner and address this with some corrective action, which is going to involve a large segment of examination of not only conservation, weatherization, alternative energy, renewable energy, but making sure we go back to our conventional sources of energy—it has to come from somewhere—and use our technology to produce it in a safer manner with less of an environmental footprint.

As we all know, what we have concentrated pretty much on in the last several years is natural gas at the expense of coal and other things.

I am going to proceed with my remarks. I thank my friend from Massachusetts for his comments.

I alert all Members as to what is in this bill because it attempts, first of all, to address the broad interests associated with the crisis as we see it. It goes beyond the energy crisis because it is affecting the economy of this Nation as we see higher prices, shortages, and we see a growing consumer concern, a lack of confidence. A lot of it stems from the energy situation in this country.

What we are attempting to do, with the efforts of many people, is bring together a comprehensive outline. We will introduce the legislation on Monday the 26th. It will be referred, I believe, under rule XIV to the calendar, and from there it is referred to the two committees of jurisdiction. There is a tax aspect, and I suspect that will move to the Finance Committee on which I serve. The other portion will move to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which I chair.

It is our intention then to begin hearings on this legislation as soon as possible, and other legislation that has been introduced. Senator BYRD has a coal bill. Senator BINGAMAN has a bill affecting LIHEAP. At the same time, I urge Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Finance Committee, to begin holding hearings, as well, on the tax aspects of this proposed legislation.

It is important to note the role of the administration. The Vice President has announced the formation of an energy task force. This task force is unique because it attempts to set energy policy for this Nation—what direction should we go. Unlike the previous effort where the Secretary of Energy, the head of the EPA, and the Secretary of the Interior pretty much went their separate ways, he is attempting to bring them

together to address how we are going to handle resource development on public land for oil and gas, what role the Department of Energy is going to play in coordinating, if you will, an action that EPA may initiate that could put off the ability to produce more oil and gas—a coordinated effort to make policy.

We are going to get that from the administration, I imagine, 40 to 50 days from now. That will be incorporated in either a substitute or amendments to this proposed legislation.

Believe me, the legislation we will introduce is probably not in its entirety the legislation that is going to be adopted. It is going to be massaged, it is going to be cut, it is going to be stricken, it is going to be added to.

We have to start. It is not going to be a piecemeal effort. It is an attempt to address, across the board, in a responsible manner, the concerns affecting the dilemma in this country as we seek energy policy, as we seek relief and address the economy that is being affected by this.

The first title covers general provisions to protect energy supply and security. It involves consultation and reports on Federal energy actions affecting domestic energy security and supply.

Then we have an annual report on U.S. energy independence. The idea is to what extent should we try and maintain a greater degree of independence in this country from the standpoint of our national security.

It covers the National Strategic Petroleum Reserve and requires a study and report. As my colleagues know, we try to keep a 90-day supply. Today, we have about a 56-day supply, and the merits of having that should our imports be interrupted is paramount.

We have a study of existing rights-of-way to determine capability to support new pipelines or electric power transmission. It is just not enough to have energy. We have to transport it. Some of our pipelines are old. Some of our transmission facilities are inadequate. We have problems with eminent domain. How do you get there from here? How do you cross public lands?

We have a section covering the expanded use of Federal facilities to generate hydropower. We have a section requiring a nuclear generation study. Twenty percent of our energy comes from nuclear energy, and we have yet to deal with the nuclear waste issue. We were one vote short of a veto override in this body last year. We still, very frankly, are seeing the nuclear industry strangling on its own waste and our inability to address it with resolve. The French adopted in 1973 a nuclear program and they are almost 90 percent dependent on nuclear energy. They recover the plutonium, reinject it in the reactors, and address the waste in a responsible way. We cannot seem to get over that hump, yet we are 20 percent dependent.

We have a section on development of a strategy for spent nuclear fuel.

We have a section to study the status of the domestic refining industry. It is interesting, during a portion of our previous discussion on this topic, when we brought 30 million barrels out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, suddenly we found out our refineries were at full capacity. We have not built a refinery in 20 years. What a rude awakening.

We have a section to review the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's annual reports on the availability of domestic energy resources to maintain the electric grid, a study of financing for new technologies, a review of regulations to eliminate barriers to emerging energy technology, interagency agreements on environmental review of interstate natural gas pipeline projects, a program for pipeline integrity safety and reliability, and research and development for new natural gas technologies.

For clean coal technology, we have cost and performance goals. We have technological research and development programs, authorization and appropriations for R&D power plant improvement initiatives, various coal mining research and development provisions, and programs to improve railroad efficiency.

For oil and gas we have deepwater and frontier royalty relief which has been so beneficial in the Gulf of Mexico where we have seen drilling take place now in 3,000 feet of water. Lease sales are going as deep as 6,000 feet. The technology has been developed rapidly and successfully.

Some in the media have picked this up and said this is a boondoggle for big oil. There is no alternative minimum tax here. This isn't something for big oil. Big oil can do very well on its own. It does not need assistance. However, the small guys do. The stripper wells do. Some of the independents do.

So we have a use of royalty in kind to fill the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We have improvements to Federal oil and gas lease management. We have a royalty reinvestment in America provision. On nuclear, we have the Price-Anderson amendments which address the liability on the nuclear plants. We have a nuclear energy research initiative, nuclear energy plant optimization programs, nuclear energy technological development, nuclear energy production incentive, and nuclear energy improvements.

We have a provision for the Arctic Coastal Plain Security Act Of 2001 which proposes opening up ANWR, which I will discuss in my concluding remarks because that seems to be the lightning rod in the whole bill.

I mentioned when my friend, Senator KERRY from Massachusetts, was here, the title on energy efficiency conservation assistance to like families. We have covered that. We also have enhancement and extension of authority relating to Federal energy savings, performance contracts, Federal energy efficiency requirements, energy efficiency science initiatives. We also have

an alternative fuels and renewable energy section, a significant section. We have an exception to HOV passenger requirements for alternative fuel vehicles. If you have an alternative fuel vehicle, something that doesn't run on gasoline, you can take it on the HOV lane all by yourself. We have alternative fuel credits for qualifying infrastructure, State and local governments use of Federal alternative refueling requirements, and mandates on Federal fleet fuel economy, and use of alternative fuels.

If we are going to mandate things, the Government ought to lead the way, not the public. Our bill requires Federal agencies to increase the fuel economy of newly acquired Federal fleet passenger cars and light trucks by at least 3 miles per gallon by the year 2005. We are putting government where it ought to be, leading the way.

We have local government grant programs, extension of special treatment of dual-fuel vehicles under Department of Transportation fuel economy standards. We have renewable energy programs for residential, access to renewable energy resources. We have hydroelectric relicensing reform, which includes processes for consideration of Federal agencies on the condition of licensing of various facilities, including hydro dams, coordinating environmental review processes, and a study of small hydro projects. This bill helps ensure electric energy transmission reliability, and repeals PURPA mandatory purchase and sale requirements. We also repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act, and encourage emission-free control measures under the State implementation plans.

On the aspect of taxes, we have enhanced oil recovery credit extended to certain nontertiary recovery methods, such as horizontal drilling. We have extension of Section 29 credits for producing fuel from nonconventional sources. We have 10-year carryback for a percentage of depletion for certain oil and gas properties. We repeal the current net income limitation on that percentage depletion. We clarify the definition of a "small refiner" as used in an exception to the oil depletion deduction, and we accelerate depreciation of oil and gas pipelines, petroleum facilities, and refineries. We also have capital construction funds for U.S. drilling vessels. We provide credits for investment to qualifying clean coal technology.

Regarding coal, we have huge coal reserves in this country. We could reduce our dependence on imported oil but we have not built a new coal-fired plant since 1985 because you cannot get a permit. We've used natural gas for electric energy producing capability, but we have the coal here. We have the technology to clean it up, and we should use it. We may have to adjust the permitting process to expedite it, but not at the sacrifice of the environment by any means.

We have new credits for investment for qualifying advanced clean coal

technology, credits for production for qualifying advanced clean coal technology, and provisions relating to private loan financing for long-term natural gas contracts. We include the electric power industry's agreement on so-called "private use restrictions": tax-exempt bond financing of certain electric facilities, and we allow expensing of costs incurred for temporary storage of nuclear fuel. We have tax incentives for energy efficiency: credits for distributed power and combined heat and power property, a tax credit for energy efficiency improvements to existing homes and for construction of new energy-efficient homes, a tax credit for energy-efficient appliances and motor vehicles, and we have a credit for alternative fueled vehicles and for qualified electric vehicles, credit for retail sales of alternative fuels as motor vehicle fuel, extension of deductions for certain refueling property, and an additional deduction for the cost of installation of alternative fuels.

For renewable energy, we make modifications to the Section 45 credit for electricity produced from renewable resources, and extend it to include waste energy, and we establish a new tax credit for residential solar and wind property. Finally, we treat facilities using bagasse, sugar cane waste, to produce energy as solid waste disposal facilities.

Now if your particular area of interest is not in here, let us know and we will include it. This is a comprehensive bill. I remind all of my colleagues, this is an effort to start a process to address a problem that is affecting not only our economy but is creating a growing energy crisis moving from California across the country.

One of the lightning rods in the bill is the issue of ANWR, which is in my State of Alaska. I have tried several times, but I can't seem to get across the significance of trying to put this in perspective. I am happy to say that the occupant of the Chair is not from Texas because Alaska happens to be 2½ times the size of Texas. Put this in perspective: If we overlay Alaska on the United States, we get a picture of how big Alaska is. In the north it would touch Canada, and in the south it would touch Mexico; on the right it touches Florida, and on the left it goes to California. It is a big hunk of real estate.

What does it consist of? Anchorage is our largest city. In the upper right-hand corner is an area that is magically called ANWR. What does ANWR mean? It means the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. That sounds pretty significant. What does ANWR consist of? Congress in 1980 made significant decisions in determining what this area would consist of and be used for. Out of the 19 million acres in ANWR, they determined they would designate 8.5 million acres of it as pure wilderness—that is the area in black with the slashes—8.5 million acres wilderness, no track vehicles, no activity of any kind. Visi-

tors can go in on foot, and that is it. They decided to make 9.5 million additional acres a refuge. This area below was designated a refuge, even though the whole 19 million acres is classified as a refuge. But they did one other thing. They left out the Coastal Plain. This is the area in tan. That is 1.5 million acres. If you add all that up, you get 19 million acres. That is all of ANWR. But the difference and the point is, there cannot be any development in the wilderness. There cannot be any development in that refuge where the pointer is.

Congress has, solely, the authority to open up the ANWR Coastal Plain area. It is important to note what is in there because some people say it is the Serengeti of the West; it is the Grand Canyon—whatever. There is an Eskimo village there. People are living there. There are about 227 residents of Kaktovik.

Let me show you some pictures of Kaktovik. Here are some kids going to school in Kaktovik in the morning. You notice they didn't do a good job shoveling the walks. It is pretty harsh. It is winter about 10 months of the year. The kids are happy. One of them is getting some new teeth. You wonder why they are in the Eskimo parkas. Those ruffs are wolf ruffs. Do you know why they wear wolf ruffs? Because the breath doesn't freeze on wolf fur, but it freezes on others.

Here is what it looks like in the summertime. To suggest this is a pristine wilderness with nothing on it is a bit misleading. People live there. They hunt.

You can see the radar site. That is the radar site, in part. That is the DEW line, and the Arctic Ocean, and the ice is out there. There is an airfield and a couple of hangars, schools, little stores, and so forth.

We have another picture of Kaktovik. But my point in going through this is to illustrate that, indeed, in ANWR there is a designated area with only the authority by Congress to open it up, and it is that tiny fraction. Let's go back to the map again, the tiny fraction that we are considering, and that is the Coastal Plain.

If we do the arithmetic, we have already said it is 19 million acres in the ANWR area, and we are talking about leasing 1.5 million acres. And then the question is, What happens if you do that?

Let me show you a couple of things.

You see over on the left is what they call the Trans-Alaska pipeline. That is a 800-mile, 48-inch pipeline. It was built about 26 years ago and runs from Prudhoe Bay the length of Alaska. That goes the whole length of the State, 800 miles down to Valdez. That is where the oil flows. That is already there.

It comes, you will notice, from Prudhoe Bay. Prudhoe Bay is the largest oilfield in North America. It has been producing about 20 percent of the total crude oil produced in the United

States for about 26 years. That pipeline was built so we could move that oil to market.

We tried to move it by tanker. We built the Manhattan and thought we would take it through the ice to the east coast. It did not work. The ice is simply too thick, so we built a pipeline. But the interesting thing is that the environmentalists said: If you build that pipeline the length of Alaska, the moose and the caribou are going to be divided. They will not be able to cross it. It is going to be an environmental disaster. That is a hot pipeline because that oil is hot when it comes out of the ground, and if you put the pipeline in permafrost, frozen ground, it is going to melt the ground, it is going to break, and you will have a mess on your hands.

All those doomsayers were wrong. It didn't happen. These are the same arguments being used today. They are saying if you go up there and open up that area, you are going to have a disaster.

What you have is interesting. You already have, between Prudhoe Bay and ANWR, an area—BP has a discovery in Badami. Badami is about 40 miles from Prudhoe Bay towards ANWR. There is a pipeline that goes out to Badami. Another 40 miles of pipeline added to that 20 and you will be in ANWR.

Another significant thing, there was one oil well drilled in Kaktovik, drilled there before 1980. It is what is called a tight hole. No one knows what is there other than Chevron and BP, but the geologists are excited because they say this area could contain a major discovery of a magnitude of ranging anywhere from 3.2 billion to 16 billion.

When you look for oil, you usually don't find it. If you look for it in Alaska, you better find a lot or we can't develop it. If we can't get 5,000 barrels, forget it; it will not be economically viable. That is where Prudhoe Bay has been so prolific. If it is not there in the magnitude it has to be, then the whole argument is academic. The question is, How significant is it?

I want to show a couple of photos of what the pipeline is used for. It has a dual use.

Here are three bears going for a walk on the pipeline. The reason they are walking there is it is easier than walking on the snow. It is like a paved highway. Nobody is bothering them, nobody is shooting them.

Here is a picture of what happens in Prudhoe Bay in the summertime, which doesn't last very long. These are the caribou. These are not stuffed; they are real. Nobody is bothering them, shooting them, running them down. This herd was 3,000 animals in the central Arctic when we started Prudhoe Bay. There are 26,000 caribou there now. We are doing fine.

We talk about the polar bear. Let's show an ice picture. It is mostly ice up there, but here is a nice picture. That is a nice ice picture. That is the harsh, bleak ANWR area in the wintertime, 10

months of the year. They say the polar bears are there—they are not there, they are out at sea.

Talk about polar bear, the U.S. has the greatest conservation for polar bear of any of our Arctic neighbors. If you want to trophy hunt polar bears, you can go to Russia or Canada, but you can't do it in the United States. It is prohibited. You can't take them. The Natives can take them for subsistence. So that is a bogus argument. There is a new study out and the number of polar bears have increased dramatically.

Here is a picture of the technology we have today, as far as drilling in the Arctic. You notice the ice road? There is no gravel road. They pour water on the snow, it freezes, and bingo, you have a road. OK?

That is a drill rig out in the middle of nowhere. You see the cars moving, you see the Arctic Ocean out there. That is the footprint. That is directional drilling. We have technology that lets you drill 100 wells through one of these, one spot, with directional drilling. It is not like in the old days.

What does it look like in the summertime? It looks like this for about 2 months. There is the tundra and that is what comes out, and the footprint is pretty small.

This is the drilling technology. This is out of the New York Times about 2 weeks ago. It shows you how they drill from one spot and go into various areas because they have a technology that they call 3-D seismic. It used to be 2-D. They can look down now and spot these little spots. Where they used to, if they hit the big one on the right, they were lucky, but now they can go after those little ones and get greater recovery through this from directional drilling technology. So you don't get a footprint all over the place, but the footprint is estimated to be 2,000 acres out of 19 million.

We asked the geologists to tell us—Prudhoe Bay is a big oilfield—we asked what the footprint is total, all the pipelines, the gathering stations, the bunkhouses, the various things. I think the figure was about 6,000 acres, but they said if they were going to do it today, they could do a field the size of Prudhoe Bay with a technology of 1,000 to 2,000 acres. So we are looking at the increasing manageability of the footprint.

I think I said enough about the technology. I think I have given you a picture of what ANWR consists of in the 19 million acres. I have tried to portray what is at risk here, 1.5 million acres.

But I will conclude with a little reference to some of my colleagues, some of whom said if this comes up, we are going to filibuster the issue.

Let me remind my colleagues. Don't they have an obligation to come up with an alternative? What are the alternatives? If we look at reality, we have to admit that with a 56-percent dependence on imported oil, and the reality of EIA saying that is going to in-

crease to 70 percent by the year 2010, or thereabouts, and the CSIS study that says unfortunately we are going to become more dependent on the world for hydrocarbons and oil, that suggests there is not much relief in sight; we are going to continue to become more and more dependent.

I was asked while giving a speech the other day: Senator, since it was 37 percent in 1973 and now it is 56 percent, at what point do you believe our national security interest is compromised? I thought about it for a minute. I said: The best answer I can give you is that in 1991 we fought a war. We fought a war over oil. We fought a war against Saddam Hussein to stop him from invading Kuwait. And ultimately his mission was to go into Saudi Arabia and control the world's supply of oil. That is how important it was. Was it a national security issue? Sure, it was. We don't want Saddam Hussein to control the oil. Where would we be today if Saddam Hussein controlled the oil?

When you look at 56 percent and the reality of our increased dependence, the idea comes across that maybe we ought to try to reduce our dependence on imports. Then the question is, How do you do it? Before I tell you how to do it—I will conclude with that. My wife keeps reminding me: You keep saying that, and you never keep your word.

That reality is associated with where we are now acquiring our greatest increase in imported oil. It is from Iraq. We fought a war in 1991. We lost 147 lives. We had 400-some wounded. We had 23 taken prisoner.

Let's look at our foreign policy and try to make it simple so it is understandable, because we are flying sorties over Iraq; we are bombing. He sells us 750,000 barrels a day. It is increasing, I might add. I met him. He is not a nice guy. You try to kind of figure out what he is up to, and you generalize by saying he is up to no good. We are getting 750,000 barrels a day. We are sending our money over there. We get his oil, put it in our airplanes, and go bomb Iraq. We do it again the next day. If you believe it, we have flown hundreds and thousands of sorties. We are buying his oil, giving him the money, putting it in our airplanes, and bombing him. I kind of question that foreign policy. It may seem a little oversimplistic.

Let's ask Saddam Hussein what he is doing with the money. He is building a military capability, a missile delivery capability, a biological capability, and where is it aimed? Our greatest ally, Israel.

If I have made a full circle, which has been my intention, I hope I have been able to communicate what I consider a terrible inconsistency.

What we have in this bill is a commitment and a goal to reduce our dependence on imported oil to 50 percent, or less, by the year 2010. We can do it in a combination of ways. One is by opening up the area of ANWR. One is

opening up the overthrust belt in Montana, in Wyoming, and Colorado—areas that have been withdrawn by the previous administration by the roadless policy. There are 23 trillion cubic feet of gas taken off commercial availability by that roadless designation in those States.

We can do something about reducing our dependence. Then we can bring on our improved technology of our conventional resources, such as nuclear, by addressing what we are going to do with nuclear waste; bring on our coal by developing our clean coal technology; and we can reduce our dependence, because it is in the national security interests of our Nation to reduce our dependence on the Mideast.

One thing the CSIS study points out is that for the foreseeable future the world will be looking at energy sources from unreliable, unstable areas of the world that foster terrorism. I get the message. I am sure you do, too.

The reality is that the argument against opening up this area is absolutely bogus. The bottom line is, the extreme environmental community needs an issue. And ANWR is their issue. It raises dollars. It raises membership. It raises fear. It never addresses the advanced technology and whether we can do it safely. Of course we can. We have had 30 years of experience in the Arctic. The footprint is smaller. The technology is better. But they need an issue that is far away, that the American people and most of the press can't afford to go up and look at.

I have pleaded with Members to come up before they speak as experts on what should be done in my State and look at it—take a look at it objectively. One Senator said to me after we landed and got out of the helicopter, after he looked around: All right, FRANK. Where is the wilderness? It is a mentality. Where is the wilderness? That is the wilderness. It is like there ought to be a sign that says "Wilderness 2 miles around to the left". You see. But I can't get Members to go.

We have a trip coming up. I implore those of you who feel strongly about this issue to find out something about it, because your information is coming from one source—America's environmental community. And this is their fight. They have to have it. It is their bread and butter. And they use scare tactics.

I am going to mention one more thing. This is a Canadian issue. We had the Canadian Minister on Environment here. He says to his Foreign Minister that we ought to oppose opening this area. He went down and talked to the Canadian Ambassador. Then he talked to our new Secretary of State. Canada looks on Alaska as a competitor for energy. That is neither here nor there. We get a significant amount, and a growing amount, of our energy from our good neighbors in Canada. But they do not practice what they preach, and they don't tell you the truth, unless you ask the right questions. Being on

the Intelligence Committee, you know how that works.

Let me show you what this is. You see Alaska on the left. Over on the right is Canada. That green line divides them. You see the Arctic Coastal Plain up at the top. This is the route of porcupine caribou, which is a different herd from the pictures I showed you before. These animals migrate through northern Canada on that route that shows the tan area that moves around.

Up at the top, you see a lot of little things. Those are oil wells that the Canadians have drilled in Canada. There are about 89 of them. You see them particularly up at the top. They made a park out of that area because they did not strike any oil. That is Canada's own business. I admire them for making a park out of it. But the caribou were going through there when the oil wells were being drilled. The pregnant cows were going through there and going back to the calves. That is neither here nor there—just to point out an inconsistency.

They said they made a park out of it and that we ought to make a park out of ANWR. They don't tell you they built a highway through there. There it is—the Dempster Highway right through the migration of the caribou. It doesn't bother them. Trucks stop, and so forth. The greatest danger to the caribou is people running them down with snow machines and shooting them.

We have what we call the Gwich'in people. They are a fine group who live partially in Canada, at Old Crow, and over at Fort Yukon on our side. So they cross the border. This group many years ago proposed to lease some of their land on the Alaska side for oil drilling. We have the situation of the individual members on the leases. Unfortunately, there was not any interest because the geology wasn't very promising. So the oil industry did not choose to take them up on their leases. Of course, now they don't acknowledge they were ever willing to lease their land.

I just point that out as a bit of inconsistency. It is just part of the history, and we move on from there. But the difference is the Gwich'in people are two groups: The Gwich'in people themselves and the Gwich'in steering committee, which is funded by the national environmental groups, such as the Sierra Club. They, unfortunately, have a significant voice. And much of that voice is fear. They put fear in these people; that if we have this development up in ANWR, the livelihood and the dependence on the porcupine caribou herd will be sacrificed to the point they will lose their subsistence.

The other group is a little more open. To make my point—and I think it is important—if you look at the other map, the one showing the top of the world, you will see Alaska over here, and you see Barrow above Prudhoe Bay. This is our northern most community. It is a large Eskimo village.

What they have been able to do is, they formed a borough or a county. They formed their regional corporations. They formed their village corporations. They tax the oil activity. They tax the pipeline. They have the finest schools in the United States. They have indoor recesses. You can't believe it. They have health care.

Every child has an opportunity for a full-blown college education from the revenues that come in to the Eskimo people. They manage. They have become the strongest capitalists that I have ever seen. They do not have time for the inefficiencies of the Federal Government. It has been an extraordinary transition because they have a revenue stream. Their traditions of whaling are maintained.

What they have done is, they have invited the Gwich'ins up to see their standard of living on three occasions. The Gwich'ins almost came the last time, until the Gwich'ins' steering committee said: You can't go. You can't break the heritage. This is the influence, if you will, unfortunately, that exists.

Because the Barrow people now have educational opportunities, they have a choice. They can follow subsistence—hunting and fishing—they can go to college; they can move into jobs in the oil industry. There is very little employment in the Gwich'in area. That is their own business. I respect their choice. What I don't respect is the influence of the outside groups that use them. That is what I object to.

That is what a lot of this debate is all about because, as I said before—and the bottom line is—the environmental community needs this issue. They are milking it for all it is worth. A few of us are trying to bring in the realities that the arguments today against opening ANWR are the same arguments that were used against opening Prudhoe Bay 27, 28 years ago.

That is the extent of my harangue at this late hour, to try to put in perspective the debate. When my colleagues come to this floor and say: I am going to filibuster the issue, I think they ought to address the issue. I think they ought to go up and see for themselves. And I think they have an obligation to address the alternatives because you are not going to conserve your way out of this energy crisis. I think all of us who are realistic recognize that. We are going to need all of our sources of energy. We are going to need all of our technology. We are going to have to come together on reality.

There are two other things I wish to say. One is people might say, Senator MURKOWSKI, this is only a 6-month supply based on the reserves.

First of all, nobody knows what is in there. But let's say it is a 6-month supply. When you say that, that is assuming there is not going to be any other oil produced in the whole United States, in the gulf, or any place else for 6 months—pretty significant—no trains, no boats, no airplanes.

If you turn it around—and from my point of view—if we do not allow the development, that is like saying this country is not going to have 6 months' worth of oil for its trains, so forth and so on.

So you can flip that ridiculous argument around and it still comes out a ridiculous argument. So I do not put much significance in it, but, nevertheless, it is one of the arguments that is used.

Remember Prudhoe Bay? Ten billion barrels was the estimate. They have gotten 12 billion barrels already, and they are still kicking 1 million barrels a day. The technology is there, and certainly the need is. Again, I appeal to my colleagues who are still with us at this late hour, and all my colleagues, to recognize the national security interests of this country. And when—and at what point—we become vulnerable to imports, we have to consider what it does to the security of this Nation. We have already fought one war over oil. To me, that sends a pretty strong message.

I will simply recall the remarks of our friend and former colleague, Senator Mark Hatfield, who said: One of the reasons I support opening ANWR is I will never support sending another member of our Armed Forces into harm's way in the Mideast in a war over oil.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY
26, 2001

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous

consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 12 o'clock noon on Monday, February 26. I further ask consent that immediately following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and immediately following the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address by Senator ALLEN of Virginia, the Senate then proceed to a period of morning business until 4 p.m., to be divided in the following fashion: First, Senator MURKOWSKI will have from the completion of the Farewell Address to approximately 2:30 p.m.; Senator MILLER, 2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.; Senator Cleland, 3:30 p.m. to 4 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MURKOWSKI. When the Senate reconvenes on Monday, February 26, Senator ALLEN will be recognized to read Washington's Farewell Address. Following the address, there will be further morning business until 4 p.m. During Monday's session, the Senate may also consider any legislative or executive items available for action.

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL OF
H.R. 2

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Fi-

nance Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2 and that the bill be referred jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, to the Committees on the Budget and Governmental Affairs.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
FEBRUARY 26, 2001

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the provisions of H. Con. Res. 32.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:27 p.m., adjourned until Monday, February 26, 2001, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 15, 2001:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

PAUL D. WOLFOVITZ, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE RUDY F. DE LEON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SEAN O'KEEFE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, VICE SYLVIA M. MATHEWS.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 15, 2001:

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

JOE M. ALLBAUGH, OF TEXAS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY.