energy needs. There are a variety of sources for energy production. We need to move ahead on each of them. That is my view.

Mr. REID. There is no magic bullet, not one thing that is going to solve all the problems of energy relating to our country's needs; is that true?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, again, that is certainly my view. There is no single solution to the problem. We need to make progress on increased energy supplies from a great many sources. We need to make progress on more efficiency in various ways. Clearly, we need to do a better job of conserving the energy we do produce.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business has expired. Morning business is closed.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is the matter now before the Senate?

EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 1246, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A motion to proceed to the consideration of (S. 1246) a bill to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American agriculture producers.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have spoken to one of the managers of the bill, Senator LUGAR, for a few minutes. He has now left the Chamber. Senator HARKIN will be here probably around 2:30. Senator LUGAR and I thought it would be appropriate, until the two managers arrive, if anyone wants to speak on this bill or agricultural matters in general, they should feel free to do so.

If not, I respectfully suggest that we should move to morning business until the two managers are ready to move forward on this most important legislation.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

ANWR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, unfortunately, the Senator from New Mexico, chairman of the Energy Committee, is not in the Chamber now. I had hoped to be able to pose a question to him.

That question would have been regarding his comment indicating he was opposed to opening ANWR. He did not give a reason why, nor did he have to. I hope we will have an opportunity on this particular issue to have a good debate, a debate that evaluates the issue in its entirety.

One of the things I keep referring to, with which the occupant of the Chair has some familiarity, is the unique circumstances surrounding a very small number of aboriginal residents of the north slope, the residents of Kaktovik. Their particular plight lends itself to some consideration by this body.

I don't think I will have the opportunity of using the charts, but I can probably show this better if one of the gentlemen will go back and I can get them to show the actual ownership in the 1002 area of the 92,000 acres of land that is owned by these aboriginal people.

This is the historical land of their birthright. It is their village land. As a consequence of the manner in which the Federal Government chose the structure of management of the 1002 area and the surrounding area associated within ANWR, we found an enclave of 92,000 acres of private land that could not be utilized by the villagers who own the land.

One has to address the propriety of what private land is all about, if indeed you can't use it. This particular area is in such a specific directive from Congress that the residents, the owners can't even drill for natural gas to heat their homes, let alone develop any of the subsurface rights for their wherewithal, simply because there is no way to access the area without trespassing on Federal land. This doesn't seem reasonable or fair.

I am sorry to say the charts have gone back to my office. I will have to address this matter again with a visual presentation.

These are the kinds of considerations that aren't addressed and would be addressed in the proposed legislation to authorize the opening of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Why should this group of Alaska Eskimos be denied the birthright to resource their land as any other American citizen would?

This is just one inconsistency associated with this issue. It is a type of issue that would fall on the ears of many in this body who believe in fairness and equity. That is a factor in the consideration of the merits.

I am continually confronted with Members who say: I am opposed to it. They are very reluctant to get into a debate as to why. The rationale is pretty obvious. There is a lot of pressure from America's environmental community. America's environmental community has generated an awful lot of membership and dollars by taking a stand on this issue and laying down a fear that somehow we cannot open this area safely or that somehow it is contrary to traditional use to drill in a refuge.

As I have indicated earlier in my presentation today, we have oil and gas drilling in 30 refuges in this country. We have 118 refuges where there is actual oil, gas, and minerals. There are over 400 wells in the refuges in Louisiana. We have them in New Mexico. Why is it inappropriate to suddenly say we cannot allow drilling in the 1002 refuge area when we have advanced technology? There is no justifiable reason other than the pressure that is brought on Members by the environmental community. That is the kind of debate I hope we can get into.

I would like to see scientific evidence that suggests, if indeed there is a rationale to support it, that we can't do it correctly; scientific evidence to suggest that Prudhoe Bay is not the best oil field in the world in its 30-year old technology; scientific evidence to suggest that this won't create literally thousands of new jobs, such as 700,000, in the United States. Almost every State in the Union would benefit from this.

I would like to hear a debate as to why it is in the interest this country to become more dependent on the Saddam Husseins of this world. That is what has happened. As we know, 6 weeks ago, we were at 750,000 barrels a day. Today we are a million barrels a day. Are we here to do what is right for America or are we here to simply respond to the pressures of America's environmental community as it laments on fear tactics that are not based on any scientifically sound research?

That is the reality with which we are faced. As we look at what is happening in the House of Representatives this week, they are going to take up the issue.

There is going to be a motion to strike ANWR from the energy bill. It is kind of amazing to me to see what is happening over there because organized labor suddenly has said this is a jobs issue; that we are losing jobs all over the United States. But right now the one item that we can identify that would allow for the creation of thousands of new jobs is opening this area. So it is an argument as to whether you can do it safely; whether we can protect the Porcupine caribou herd; whether we can get the oil on line soon enough—in 3½ years—or whether it is a substantial supply.

As I have indicated, if it is there in the abundance it would have to be to replace what we import from Saudi Arabia in a 3-year period of time, can we do it safely? There is no evidence to suggest that we can't. These are the discussions that we will have. I hope every Member will encourage open debate on this floor on the merits of opening ANWR. I have heard people say, ''I would rather this didn't come up'' and ''I would rather we didn't have to vote on this'' and ''it makes me feel uncomfortable.''

We are sent here to do a job, Mr. President; to take tough votes. We are sent here to do what is right for America. If what is right for America is to increase our dependence on imported oil from Saddam Hussein, well, that is beyond my interpretation of what is right for America.

I look at Saddam Hussein as an enemy. He is attempting to shoot down our airplanes. We are enforcing a no-fly zone. We continue to do that. It is in our national interest. Why should we be importing more and more oil from him? Oil is fungible. If we spilled oil on the desk of the Presiding Officer, it would spill all over the table. If we buy the oil from Saddam Hussein today, we could buy oil from OPEC and let somebody else buy Saddam Hussein's oil. That is one way to dodge this so-called inconsistent bullet. But we don't seem to be doing it.

This Senator is going to—probably on the Jordan bill—bring up an amendment again to terminate our purchase of oil from Iraq. To me, it is absolutely inconsistent that we would depend on that source. It addresses our national security. The national security of this country should not be 56-percent dependent on imported oil.

One thing that continues to frustrate me a little bit is the assumption by many that oil simply comes out of the gas station. You go down there and insert your credit card and fill your tank, and there is very little consideration that somebody has to produce it; that it has to be refined; that it has to be transported; and America and the world move on oil.

We get complacent and somehow we are concerned about electricity. We have a lot of alternatives for electricity. We have hydro, nuclear, natural gas, and coal. But America moves by oil. We have an opportunity to relieve our dependence—not that we are going to eliminate it, but we can relieve it—by coming to America, to my State of Alaska, where we have the technology to do it safely. Again, Mr. President, I will keep this in the perspective of reality. This is a pretty small footprint—about 2,000 acres out of 19 million acres. That is the size of the State of South Carolina. That is what we can do with the technology we have. It is just beyond me that Members fail to want to discuss the merits. They fail to discuss why we should not do it. They are uncomfortable with the issue.

Again, that is not why we were sent here. We were sent here to make hard decisions and vote in the best interest of America. To me, to relieve our dependence on imported oil addresses specifically our national security interest. It is an issue that is coming before this body. It is going to be before the Energy Committee of which I am the ranking member.

I hope Senator BINGAMAN and I, in that committee, can have spirited debates on the specific merits of why it is not in the interest of the United States and our national security to relieve our dependence on these increased sources of oil from the cartels of OPEC, to try to develop sources here at home, keep the jobs at home.

Look at the balance of payments—over half of the balance of payments is the cost of imported oil. We can reduce that. So why should America's labor sources not come to grips with this and begin to lobby it, as they are successfully doing? So this issue is an issue that is timely, an issue that should be addressed fully in an extended debate based on science, not emotion. The emotional arguments have prevailed. They have prevailed very strongly because of an organized, extreme environmental group that fails to recognize that this energy crisis is not going to be solved alone by alternatives, renewables, new technology, solar, wind.

This energy crisis is going to have to be resolved by a balanced process, where we advance, if you will, funding for these new technologies, but they alone can't solve the problem. We are going to have to increase clean coal utilization. We are going to have to address what to do with nuclear waste in this country because nuclear provides us with 22 percent of the energy in this Nation. We are going to have to recognize that we are now using our natural gas reserves faster than we are finding new ones, and we are going to have to again address the realities associated with the generation of electricity from our hydro sources, many of which have not been expanded to any great extent. We are going to need a comprehensive bill, with technology, alternatives, renewables, but it has to have an increased supply. Otherwise, we will go through what we did in 1992 and we will fail. The American people will hold us accountable, as they should.

ANWR is not the total answer, by any means, but it is part of the solution to regaining our independence, reducing the vulnerability of this country, and recognizing that these are real jobs to be created right here at home. I think my friend brought me a chart relative to the ownership by the Native people of Alaska. I started with this, and I think it is appropriate that in the broad scheme of things, the interest of many of the residents is forgotten.

This is the 1002 area here. We have a pointer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent for another minute and a half.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. This is a million and a half acres of the 1002 area. We have here in white the ownership by the residents of Kaktovik. This is 92,000 acres. As you can see, you have no way out. This is all Federal land. In the selection of their Native lands when they had the original village up here, a location that has been there for many centuries, under the land claims legislation, the provision was they could not develop these lands until Congress had made a determination specifically on what to do with this area. Only Congress has the authority to open it up. These residents sit here in an enclave with private land they cannot develop. They cannot even drill for natural gas to heat their homes. That is an injustice. That would be corrected, among many other things, by this legislation that we propose in opening up ANWR.

I thank the Chair for the time allotted me and allowing me to extend my remarks.

I tell everybody that I look forward to a very spirited debate with enough time so we can get into the meat of this issue. I encourage my colleagues who say, ''I am sorry, I can't support it,'' to start giving us reasons why, other than just the rhetoric associated with it.

I yield the floor.

EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The matter before the Senate is the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 1246.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand the parliamentary situation is we are now on the motion to proceed to the agricultural supplemental bill. Is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on the motion to proceed.

Mr. HARKIN. We are on the motion to proceed to the Emergency Agricultural Assistance Act of 2001?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. The vote on the motion to invoke cloture will take place at what time, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 5:30 p.m. today there will be a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed.

Mr. HARKIN. At 5:30 today, for the benefit of all Senators, there will be a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the emergency agricultural assistance bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Presiding Officer for clarifying that.

As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I will take this time to discuss what is in this bill and why we should proceed to the bill and not wait any longer.

We have this week to finish, and I understand then the Senate and the House will be going out for the month of August, at the end of this week. This bill really ought to be done this week. Then we have to go to conference with the House, bring the conference report back and send it on to the President. I am hopeful we will do that because most of the monies that are provided in this bill, which are allocated by the Budget Committee, really do need to get out. The fiscal 2001 funds need to