Mr. President,

yesterday our President, President

George W. Bush, marked the 6-month

anniversary of the terrorist attacks. I

think we would all agree he used some

very strong words for our adversaries.

I quote President Bush:

That was his comment yesterday.

Further, he stated:

Further quoting him:

Further quoting him:

I would refer to that again: ‘‘inaction

is not an option.’’

He added:

The President did not name names,

but it is becoming increasingly clear

that when we talk about targeting terror,

we are talking about targeting

Saddam Hussein’s Iraq.

We know he has chemical weapons

because we have watched him use them

on his own people. We know Saddam

wants nuclear weapons because his

chief bomb maker defected to the West

with a wealth of information on their

program. We know, very well, he has a

missile capability because he fired dozens

of missiles on Israel during the gulf

war.

So what has he been up to? We cannot

say for sure because we have not

had a U.N. inspector there since December

of 1998. So he has had 1999, 2000,

2001—clearly over 31⁄2 years to continue

his development of weapons of mass destruction.

We know that for a fact. We

just do not know what they are, and we

do not know what he is going to do

with them. One can only imagine what

he has been able to accomplish during

that timeframe.

Some of you may have seen the special

on CNN the other day where they

identified clearly the threat of Iraq,

and a historical review from the time

of the Persian Gulf war: His experimentation

of using chemical weapons on

his own people; his arsenal, a portion of

which was destroyed at that time

under the U.N. auspices. Since that

time we have just observed him as he

continues to rule as a dictator, as one

who obviously has seen fit to go to extraordinary

means to ensure his own

safety, by simply wiping out those critics

of his regime.

I am not going to try to typify this

individual. I have met him. I have been

in Baghdad. As a matter of fact, I

think I am the only Senator who is

still in the Senate who met with Saddam

Hussein prior to the Persian Gulf

war. The Senator from Idaho, Mr.

McClure, was with us. Senator Dole

was with us. Also, Senator Simpson

from Wyoming was with us. The Senator

from Ohio, Howard Metzenbaum,

was with us.

It was a very interesting opportunity.

We had been in Egypt and were

advised we should go over to visit Saddam

Hussein in Iraq. We did go over

there. We were met by our Ambassador,

April Gillespie. We were supposed

to meet Saddam Hussein at the

airport in Baghdad. She said that she

was sorry, that Saddam Hussein

changed the itinerary. He was not

there. We were supposed to go up to

Mosul.

So the Foreign Minister, Tariq Aziz,

who is still there, said that Saddam

had sent his airplane down to take us

up to Mosul. We were somewhat reluctant

to get in Saddam’s airplane, as

you might imagine. We said: We will

take our own airplane. We had an Air

Force aircraft. There was some discussion.

Then they came back and said:

No, the runway was under repair. Our

plane was too big; they would not be

able to accommodate our airplane.

Then Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz said:

I am going with you. That made us

somewhat more at ease. Somewhat reluctantly,

we did climb into the airplane

and fly up to Mosul.

It was ironic because, when we landed,

they said: we won’t have to take

you back because we have finished repairing

the runway and your airplane

can come and get you. We knew we

were set up to make a story.

We did go into a hotel and Saddam

Hussein met us and was supposedly

going to host lunch. We had a long discussion

about human rights activities.

We talked about the cannons that had

been found on the docks in London. We

discussed the triggering devices. And

he had an answer for everything. He

would throw out a booklet designed by

the Baghdad Institute of Technology.

At one point he got rather belligerent

and suggested we had no business in his

country talking to him about the attitude

of the people of Iraq.

He asked us to go out on the balcony.

And he said: There are five of you, five

helicopters. You can go anywhere in

Iraq you want and ask what the people

really think of Saddam Hussein. Howard

Metzenbaum declined the invitation

for reasons of security, to put it

mildly. So did the rest of us.

Nevertheless, we had an opportunity

to observe this individual. To suggest

he is unpredictable is an understatement.

He is very unpredictable. His

value on human life, as evident over an

extended period of time, speaks for

itself.

One can conclude that Iraq is a very

unstable area that we are depending on

for oil. As I am sure the occupant of

the chair, the Senator from New York,

recognizes, on a particular day of September

11, we were importing a million

barrels of oil a day from Iraq. At this

time it is a little over 800,000 barrels a

day. Interestingly enough, on that

tragic day in September, that was a

record, an 11-year-old record.

What do we do with his oil? We use it

to drive to work, use it in schoolbuses,

to take our kids, whatever. It is the

fuel the Navy jets use, which twice this

year already bombed Saddam Hussein

and every day enforces a no-fly zone

over his skies. Last year Iraqis shot at

U.S. forces some 400 times. We responded

in force 125 times. I ask, can

we count on his oil if Baghdad is the

next stop in the war of terror?

I have charts here that clearly show

the increase of Iraqi oil production in

the Mideast, and you can see 1.1 million

barrels of Iraqi oil—this is where

American families get their oil—the

Persian Gulf, almost 3 million barrels;

OPEC, 5.5 million barrels. Oil has

jumped up to the highest price in 6

months. It is a little over $24.50 a barrel.

Gasoline prices are at the highest

they have been in 6 months. This is indicative

of particularly the power of

the OPEC cartel, which, by controlling

the supply, clearly controls the price.

We have other charts here that I

think show a significant figure. We in

this country have been able to do a

pretty good job of conserving through

higher efficiency. As this chart shows,

consumption per thousand Btu has

dropped from about 18 down to about 11

in the period of 1973 through the year

2000. That is a 42-percent decline. While

conservation has made significant advancements,

we still are significantly

dependent on imported sources of oil

for the reason that America and the

world moves on oil.

Here is a chart that is relatively new.

It shows crude oil imports from Iraq to

the United States in 2001. This is by

month, January going over to September.

That was an all-time high.

That was at a time where the terrorist

activities took place in Pennsylvania

and Washington and New York.

It is very significant to recognize

that we will have to deal with Iraq, and

the President has kind of laid down a

card that suggests we want to have

U.N. inspectors in Iraq.

Saddam Hussein laid down his card

yesterday. His card was quite expressive

of the prevailing attitude of his regime.

No, we are not going to let U.N.

inspectors into Iraq.

So what are we going to do? It is our

move next. We waited too long to deal

with bin Laden. We waited too long to

deal with al-Qaida. So this is a scenario

that won’t be over this week or next.

We cannot afford to wait too long to

deal with Saddam Hussein. As long as

he is in power, he will continue to

threaten the world as a member of the

axis of evil. All the tools he needs are

now within his grasp.

Reducing foreign dependence on oil

can lessen the influence and reach of

Saddam Hussein. There are solutions

that must begin right here at home.

Doing so will not only help ensure our

energy security; it will further ensure

our national security.

Again, I make another appeal to my

colleagues to recognize the role that

Alaska could play by opening up the

Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. On

each desk of Members, we have a series

of exhibits that highlight the reality

associated with opening up this area. It

is still very difficult to get Members to

focus on a couple of stark realities.

I point out again the size of the area

in question in the green. That is 1.5

million acres. That is the only area up

for proposal. ANWR itself is a much

larger area. It is a 19-million acre area

consisting of 8 million acres of wilderness

and 9.5 million acres of refuge.

The green area is the area in question.

Then the idea is what would be the

footprint there? In the House bill, H.R.

4, the footprint is 2,000 acres. That is a

conglomeration of just a combination

of drilling activities on land plus developing

pipelines.

It cannot go over 2,000 acres. That is

pretty insignificant considering using

an area of 1.5 million acres.

As we look at the merits, the question

is, Can we do it safely? The answer

is, yes, because we use new technology

now. We have ice roads and these ice

roads don’t require gravel. They are

simply a process where you lay water

on the tundra, it freezes, and then you

can move the vehicles, you can move

drilling rigs and so forth.

That shows a typical drilling rig. Beyond

the area up on the top you see the

Arctic Ocean. You can see an ice road

leading from the platform. That is the

new technology. To suggest we are

going to leave a scar on the tundra in

the summertime, which is quite short—

and I will show you a picture of the

summertime, this area, which clearly

is a result of the technology. There is

a well that has been spudded in. You

can see there are no roads to it because

there was an ice road only during the

winter.

Winter is pretty long up there. It is

about 101⁄2 months a year. There are

only about 40 days of ice-free time

when the Arctic Ocean is open.

Nevertheless, in spite of the facts relative

to being able to open ANWR,

America’s environmental community

has latched onto this, and they have

misrepresented issue after issue. The

issue they continually propose is that

there is only a 6-month supply. We

don’t know what is in ANWR and they

don’t know. The range is from 5.6 billion

barrels to 16 billion barrels. If it

were somewhere in the middle, it would

be as big as Prudhoe Bay, and Prudhoe

Bay has contributed 20 to 25 percent of

the total crude oil production in the

U.S. in the last 27 years.

Those are facts. If you look over here

on this chart, you will see the 800-mile

pipeline. That infrastructure is already

in place. That is one of the construction

wonders of the world. As a consequence,

it has been able to move this

volume of oil. It is only utilized to half

of its capacity. It is currently carrying

a little over a million barrels a day. It

can carry as many as 2 million barrels

a day. So if oil is discovered in this

magnitude, you would be putting a

pipeline over from the ANWR area to

the 800-mile pipeline down to Valdez,

and it is a relatively simple engineering

operation.

The question is, Do we want ANWR

open and do we want to avail ourselves

of the likelihood of a major discovery?

People ask, why ANWR? That is the

area where geologists tell us is the

greatest likelihood for the greatest discovery

in the entire continent of North

America. So to suggest it is a 6-month

supply is unrealistic and misleading. If

we didn’t import and produce any oil,

theoretically, it might be a 6-month

supply. On the other hand, it is just as

probable to suggest it would supply the

Nation with 20 to 25 percent of its total

crude oil for the next 30 or 40 years. If

it comes in in the magnitude that we

anticipate, it would offset imported oil

from Iraq for 40 years and from Saudi

Arabia for 30 years. The other issue is

that it would take an extended timeframe

to get on line. I remind colleagues

that in 1995 we passed ANWR.

It was vetoed by the President. If we

would have that on line today, we

would not be as dependent on Iraq as

we are currently. So it is a matter that

will come up before the Congress as

part of the energy bill.

The House has done its job; it has

passed H.R. 4 with ANWR in it. It is up

to us to address this issue now. I encourage

my colleagues to try to reflect

accurate information, not misleading

information that would detract from

the knowledge that we have gained in

new technology in opening up this area

safely and protecting the caribou.

There is always a new argument. New

ones continually pop up. One is the

question of the polar bear. Most of the

polar bears are over by the area near

Barrow, as opposed to the ANWR area.

We acknowledge that there are a few in

the ANWR area. But the point is, under

the marine mammal law, you can’t

take polar bears for trophies in the

United States. That has significantly

increased the lifespan of the polar bear.

If you want to hunt polar bear, go to

Russia and Canada. You can’t do it in

the United States. These are facts that

are overlooked as we look at the arguments

against opening this area.

The last point is, why disturb this

unspoiled, pristine area? The fact is,

this area has had the footprints of man

on numerous occasions. It was an area

where there were radar stations, an

area where there is a Native village

called Kaktovic, which has roughly 280

people. This is a picture of the village.

This is in ANWR—physically there.

There is an airport and radar stations.

You can see the Arctic Ocean. We have

pictures of the local community hall

with kids on a snowmobile. This is village

life in Arctic Alaska, way above

the Arctic Circle. We have a picture

showing kids going to school. These

kids have dreams and aspirations just

as our kids. They are looking for a future—

jobs, health care, educational opportunities.

They are the same as anybody

else. Nobody shovels the snow

here; nevertheless, it is a pretty hardy

environment. To suggest that somehow

this land is untouched is totally unrealistic

and misleading.

Speaking for these children, I think

we have an obligation to recognize

something. I have another chart that

shows the Native land within ANWR

and the injustice that is done to these

people, and I think it deserves a little

enlightenment.

This is the map that shows the top,

and there are about 92,000 acres in

ANWR that belong to the Native people

of Kaktovic. It is a smaller chart. We

should have that chart. What we have

here—and let’s go back to the other

chart that shows Alaska as a whole because

I can make my point with that

one. Within this area of the green,

which is the Arctic Coastal Plain, up

top we have the village of Kaktovic,

and that little white spot covers the

land that they own fee simple—92,000

acres. They have no access across Federal

land, which is what ANWR is.

They are landlocked by Federal ownership.

So as a consequence, the concept

of having fee simple land really doesn’t

mean very much if you can’t use the

land and have access, and so forth.

They believe there is an injustice

being done here in their Native land.

While it is theirs, it doesn’t provide

them with any access—here is the

chart I am looking for. Madam President,

we have the specifics here. This

general area that you are looking at in

pink is what we call the 1002 area. That

is a million and a half acres, where we

are talking about providing leases. The

Native area is the white area. This is

the 92,000 acres. You can see the area

offshore; that is the Arctic Ocean. It is

free of ice for only about 40 days a

year.

The problem the Native people have

is access because they cannot have any

surface access outside their 92,000 acres

of land. If they wanted to move over to

where the pipeline is, they would move

west and beyond the area on the chart.

The question is, Is it fair and equitable

that these people are prevented from

having access?

We think there should be some provision

in the ANWR proposal to allow the

Native residents of this area to have

access across public land for their own

benefit. We intend to pursue this in

some manner in this debate as we develop

the merits of opening up ANWR.

If we were to open it up for exploration,

this would not be a question.

Clearly, there is a lack of support by

Members, based on information from

the environmental community that

this area is undisturbed and should not

be initiated for exploration of oil and

gas, even though geologists say it is

the most likely area for a major discovery.

Still we have an injustice and

an inequity to these people. I don’t

think there has been enough attention

given to the plight of these people who,

as any other aboriginal people, are ensured

certain rights under our Constitution,

and those rights have not

been granted them.

As a consequence, there is an injustice

to the people of the village of

Kaktovic and members of the Arctic

Slope Aboriginal Corporation, which is

the governing body in that area.

With that explanation, I encourage

Members to think a little bit about

fairness and equity and what we owe

these aboriginal people. We certainly

owe them reasonable access out of the

lands they own fee simple.

Madam President, nobody else is requesting

recognition, so I suggest the

absence of a quorum.