

errors and improve these systems if we understand the failures.

It is reported in the media that the United States, in what would otherwise be a classified figure, may spend \$30 billion per year on intelligence services, including the CIA and the NSA.

The Washington Post reports the FBI counterterrorism spending grew to \$423 million this year, a figure which in the last 8 years has grown by 300 percent. It is not enough to ask for more. It is necessary to assess what went wrong. Did leadership fail? Were the plans inadequate? Did we have the wrong people, or were they on the wrong mission?

Earlier this week, the Washington Post reported that over the past 2 years the Central Intelligence Agency had provided to the FBI the names of 100 suspected associates of Osama bin Laden who were either in or on their way to the United States. Yet the Washington Post concludes that the FBI "was ill equipped and unprepared" to deal with this information.

Some of the allegations reported in the media are stunning and deeply troubling, not simply about what happened but revealing about our inability to deal with the current crisis. Previous terrorist investigations, it is alleged, produced boxes of evidentiary material written in Arabic that remained unanalyzed for lack of translators. During the 1993 World Trade Center bombing trial, agents discovered that photos and drawings outlining the plot had been in their possession for 3 years, but they had not been analyzed.

Since 1996, the FBI had evidence that international terrorists were learning to fly passenger jets at U.S. flight schools, but that does not seem to have obviously raised sufficient concern, and there was no apparent action.

In August, the FBI received notice from French intelligence that one man who had paid cash to use flight simulators in Minnesota was a "radical Islamic extremist" with ties to Afghani terrorist training camps. Regrettably, this intelligence information was apparently not seen in the greater context of an actual threat that has now been realized.

On August 23 of this year, a few weeks before the World Trade Center was attacked, the CIA alerted the FBI that two suspected terrorist associates of Bin Laden were in the United States. The INS confirmed their presence in the United States, and the FBI launched a search. It was obviously unsuccessful.

It is hard to know where to begin. Life goes on, but not so quickly. Who here will come to New Jersey with me and visit these thousands of families who pay their taxes and ask little of their country, maybe nothing of their Government, other than to keep them secure, protect their liberties, and let them live their lives? Somebody failed the American people.

I know my constituents will ask me, as their representative in the Senate,

to authorize foreign military adventures to find those responsible, and I have done that, and the President has my support. They will not want this pain to be shared with other Americans, so they will ask my support financially and by changing Federal statutes to ensure this never happens again, and that will have my support. Some of these children, some of the widows or widowers, are going to ask: Senator, how did this happen? All of this money and all of these resources. Why was somebody not watching to defend my family, my country, my child?

We can postpone that accountability, but it has to happen. These terrorist cells that consumed these lives and shook our Nation to the core and now send us into foreign battle were not organized last month. This attack was not planned on the morning of September 11, 2001. Many of those arrested or detained for this terrorist attack were from the same area and may have had the same relationships to the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center in New York. What level of surprise could this represent? There needs to be an explanation.

On behalf of the people of my State, if I need to return to this Chamber every day of every week of every month, this Senate is going to vote for some board of inquiry. I joined my colleagues after the *Challenger* accident, recognizing that that loss of life, the failure of technology and leadership, indicated something was wrong in NASA. The board of inquiry reformed NASA and the technology and gave it new leadership, and it served the Nation well.

After Pearl Harbor, we recognized something was wrong militarily. We had a board of inquiry. We found those responsible, we held them accountable, and we instituted the changes.

Indeed, that formula has served this Nation for years in numerous crises. Now I call for it again. First, review the circumstances surrounding this tragedy, the people responsible, the resources that were available, where there was a failure of action, and make recommendations and assign responsibility. Second, develop recommendations for changes of law or resources or personnel so it does not happen again. I cannot imagine we will do less. I call upon us to do more. I will not be satisfied with new assignments of powers or appropriating more money. I want to know what went wrong, and why, and who.

Just as we have moved forward, we need to give one glance back over our shoulder and give these families some answers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Having had the opportunity to visit New Jersey last week, I listened intently to the comments of my good friend and must say I was very moved with the presentation made by the various mayors who saw

fit to share the extent of that tragedy—not only the residents of their communities, but the tremendous burden put on these areas to address the recovery efforts associated with the reality that nearly a third of the estimated number lost were residents of the State of New Jersey.

I extend my sympathies and assure my colleague of my willingness to assist him and his constituents in this terrible tragedy.

ENERGY SECURITY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a reality that our Nation is at war. I think we all agree that never before have we been so blatantly or cowardly attacked as a consequence of this new form of terrorism, commercial airplanes having been used as weapons of terrorism. As we propose to prosecute this war, we need to make certain our Nation, our people, and our economy are prepared and ready for the battles to come.

I rise today to discuss one part of how America should work to ensure one portion, and that is our energy security. The reality is that America is dependent today on foreign sources for 57 percent of the oil we consume. Further, we are importing most of this oil from unstable foreign regimes. It is no secret to any Member of this body. I have stood on the floor many times to remind my colleagues that we are currently importing a million barrels a day from Iraq, while, at the same time, the inconsistency of the manner that we are enforcing a no-fly zone; namely, an area blockade, putting the lives of America's men and women at risk in enforcing this no-fly zone. We are funding Saddam Hussein at the time when we consider him a great risk and potentially associated with alleged funding of terrorists.

After the tragic and horrifying events of September 11, it is patently obvious that we must now prepare for war, and it is equally obvious that the tools of war are driven by one source of energy, and that is oil. The aircraft, the helicopter, the gunships, and the destroyers do not run on natural gas. They do not run on solar or hot air. In peacetime alone, our military uses more than 300,000 barrels of oil each day. I remind my colleagues that oil must be refined. I can only imagine how that number will rise in the coming weeks, the coming months. Hopefully not the coming years.

It should also be obvious that the country cannot depend on unstable regimes such as Iraq to meet our energy needs without compromising our national security. I have the greatest respect for our friends throughout the world, especially those in this hemisphere, especially my friends in Canada. However, it only makes sense for America to take steps to put its own energy house in order. We need to conserve our energy, improve our energy efficiency, but we also need to produce

as much energy as we can domestically so we can lessen our dependence on foreign sources.

I come today in response to comments by Canada's Environmental Minister, Mr. David Anderson. I will read from an article that appeared in Reuters news service yesterday. I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

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

CANADA URGES AGAINST HASTY U.S. MOVE ON ARCTIC OIL

(By David Ljunggren)

OTTAWA.—Canada urged the United States yesterday not to take a "hasty and ill-considered" decision to start drilling in an Alaskan wildlife refuge, something which Ottawa implacably opposes.

Canada has long objected to U.S. plans to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR), saying it would ruin the calving ground of the Porcupine caribou herd upon which native Gwich'in Indians in both Alaska and Canada depend.

But Oklahoma Senator James Inhofe is threatening to add language this week to a multibillion-dollar defense-spending bill to allow drilling in ANWR as a way to secure future U.S. oil supplies.

"It's particularly important at times when you have a crisis on your hands to make sure you don't make hasty and ill-considered decisions," Canadian Environment Minister David Anderson told Reuters.

"It's also very important at times like this, when energy security is a major issue, that you consider all factors and not go ahead without the normal analysis and the thought that would go into such a decision," he said in an interview.

Canada, which says both countries should provide permanent protection for the wildlife populations that straddle the border, has already slapped a development ban on areas frequented by the Porcupine herd.

"We still believe (drilling) to be the wrong decision, we do not believe the American security situation in any way justifies a change in that position," said Anderson.

Canadian Energy Minister Ralph Goodale last week said there are plenty of other energy sources in North America that could be developed before ANWR needed to be touched. These included the vast tar sands of Alberta, which are believed to be richer than the entire reserves of Saudi Arabia.

Supporters of opening the refuge say U.S. oil supplies from the Middle East are at risk and the Alaska wilderness reserves are needed to make up any possible shortfall.

"That is in our view a highly questionable approach. This should be based on long-term strategic considerations—none of this oil, if it were drilled, is going to come on flow for a number of years," Anderson told Reuters.

He said there was no evidence of a shortfall in supplies from the Middle East and pointed to an almost 15 percent fall in the price of crude oil yesterday as supply fears eased.

Anderson was speaking from the western city of Winnipeg, Manitoba, after briefing provincial ministers on the international efforts to combat global warming.

Delegates from around 180 countries failed in July to agree to changes to the 1997 Kyoto Protocol on cutting emissions of the greenhouse gases blamed for global warming. They are due to try again next month in Marrakesh, Morocco, and Anderson said he expected that meeting to go ahead.

"Our hope is that the civilized world will be able to deal with the issue of terrorism

and still maintain its values in a number of areas," he said.

"We have a large number of global issues, including global warming, which cannot simply be ignored. . . . We have long-term interests as nations and they continue even though we clearly have a major short-to-medium-term problem—I'm talking years now—on terrorism."

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Canada's Environmental Minister, Mr. Anderson, this week urged America not to make hasty and ill-considered decisions to allow oil exploration in a tiny part of the Arctic coastal plain in Alaska just because of the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, which claimed more than 6,000 American lives.

First, I am a friend of Canada. We are neighbors. We are separated from the contiguous States by Canada. I serve on the U.S.-Canada Interparliamentary Conference. I have been chairman of that committee, and I have there a number of friends and associates. I have the highest regard for our relationship with Canada, which is a very unique relationship, very friendly, and one based on healthy competition. For Mr. Anderson to make such a statement, given Canada's current energy policy, is truly the height of hypocrisy.

Let me address this in a series of charts. First, Canada has worked to tap energy from its own Northwest Territories, which, frankly, they have every right to do, and I support. But a good portion of that activity is going on within the migratory range of the Porcupine caribou.

Let me show the division of Alaska and Canada. This map shows the Canadian activity on the Canadian side of the Northwest Territories and recognition of significant offshore activities, as well as onshore activities. This is the general manner in which the Porcupine caribou go across the border. Dempster Highway goes through this area. I show this because it gives folks a bit of geography for the area and a description of what we are talking about.

This is proposed ANWR, and the 1002 area, and the effort to address the authorization by Congress to open 1.5 million acres for exploration. The Canadian activity is in a much broader area. It is, of course, appropriate that Canada makes its own decisions. They certainly have every right to do it. I point out a good portion of the activity is going on within the migratory range of the Porcupine caribou herd and is something our Canadian friends do not want to acknowledge. This is the same herd that occasionally in the last 2 years was on the Alaskan side. Canada claims it wants to protect them, and so do we. But they suggest it be done by preventing oil development in the 1002 region.

Here are the facts associated with the Canadian activity. Canada first drilled 86 wells, exploration wells, in an area finding nothing. This was in the Norman Wells area and they chose to make a park out of it. I admire and appreciate that. It is a small area and if

they made a park out of it after they pretty well exhausted the prospects of finding oil and gas, and I am perfectly willing to make a park out of ANWR after we make a significant determination that there was oil and gas to address the security needs of this country, if that was the will of Congress.

In any event, in the 1970s and 1980s there were 89 wells drilled in this area, including 2 in the exact area that the Nation made into what we call the Ivvavik National Park. That was only after they were dry holes.

Canada built—and I want to show this on another map—the Dempster Highway. This is not a very vivid map. Here again is Alaska, here is Canada, and here is the Dempster Highway, which runs right through the migratory route of the Porcupine caribou. So you see this highway goes right through the range. They did this to facilitate oil-drilling equipment moving into the region and to provide access, which is certainly reasonable.

In the past 3 years, Canada has moved to markedly expand its own oil and gas development in the migratory route of the caribou. As a matter of fact, in 1999 and 2000, Canada, according to a series of articles in the Vancouver Sun newspaper, offered six onshore lease areas for oil and gas exploration in the area. I ask unanimous consent the articles from the Vancouver Sun be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Vancouver Sun, June 11, 2001]

DRILLING FOR OIL ON GWICH'IN LAND

(By Stephen Hume)

TSIIGHEHTCHIC, N.W.T.—Grace Blake pauses in mid-sentence and looks out the window of the Gwich'in Cultural and Social Institute where she's the acting executive director.

Her gaze swings past the white spire of the Roman Catholic Church, past the cemetery's white crosses buried in white snowdrifts and slips over the frozen white confluence of the Mackenzie and Arctic Red Rivers reaching for something beyond what is visible to me.

Despite a bleached, blinding intensity to the exterior landscape that seeps into the emotional landscape the two of us occupy, the moment seems as still as frosted glass, brittle—and it prompts a sudden memory from 30 years before.

"Look for what's whiter than white," the old Gwich'in hunter told me then, teaching me not far from here how to pick-off winter plumaged ptarmigan with the lovely little Browning .22 that I still have packed away in its case somewhere.

"Find a patch of snow that's whiter than the snow—then look for the black dot. That's the eye looking at you. Shoot there, won't spoil the meat."

Tsiighehtchic has always been a point of convergence for the old values, a place where people can still feel profound spiritual connections to the land and anguish at the dislocations of modernity, a place where to be a hunter is not considered backward, but someone to be respected.

The reverence shows in the photographs of elders adorning the walls where Grace supervises the recording of stories and legends and research into the cultural heritage of people whose ancestors might have been among the first peoples to arrive in North America—

maybe 12,000 years ago, maybe 30,000. The archaeology of the Old Crow flats isn't as precise as historians might like, but it was a long, long time before this, anyway.

The first time I was here, I visited sights where the ancient habitation patterns were being uncovered by scholars from the south even as a new way of life swept over the Mackenzie delta. I've come back here to renew my acquaintance with the place on the eve of another petroleum boom, although this time the development may be transformed by the new North as much as it transforms life for the people who live here.

More than a quarter of a century ago, when Grace was a beautiful young woman with her eight children still in her future, Tsiigehtchic represented an oasis of intelligent calm in the petroleum boom that swept over the vast delta of the Mackenzie River.

Back then the bush rang with the explosions of crews shooting seismic surveys. Drill rigs punched more than 250 wells through the permafrost and charted the outline of a Canadian elephant, the nation's second largest reservoir of conventional oil and natural gas—perhaps 1.5 billion barrels of crude and another 10 trillion cubic feet of gas.

Bush planes and corporate Learjets came and went in such numbers that the airport at Inuvik, a town freshly cut from the raw, red banks of the Mackenzie, recorded aircraft movements on a scale with Chicago and Dallas. The town of Old Crow, just across the border in the northern Yukon, population 300, inherited an air strip capable of handling big multi-engine jets.

Up the winter ice highway at Tuktoyaktuk, where the inhabitants still carry the names of American whalers and Scottish traders who arrived under sail, the town was a frenzy of marine activity. There were drilling ships, resupply barges and new islands were even being built out in the shallows of the Beaufort Sea so that rigs could drill without fear of ice floes.

Through the airport lounges came a steady stream of oil workers: geologists still sunburnt from work in the African deserts; helicopter pilots from Vietnam wearing long-billed hats and mirrored sunglasses; toolpushes fresh from Indonesia; consultants with clipboards, bureaucrats with briefcases and seismic crews toting sleeping bags rated for 60 below zero.

The old hunter, now long dead, had laughed at the spectacle as he restrung a pair of long, wide-bodied snowshoes for his nephew: "My great-great-granddad met Alexander Mackenzie. He went. These roughnecks, they'll go. You'll go. But us, we're not gonna go. We'll be here as long as this river."

And he was right. As abruptly as the oil boomers had come, they left. I left. Businesses withered. Towns that had seemed frantic fell into a Rip Van Winkle-like lassitude and the vastness of the Arctic closed over another example of human vanity.

Now, with an energy-hungry America once again eyeing the North as a potential source for its long-term needs, the delta quivers with an eerie sense of anticipation as somewhere over the horizon the second coming of the oil rush and planning for the pipelines required to carry the rich resources south gather momentum.

Inuvik Mayor Peter Clerkson says he expects the number of active rigs in the Mackenzie delta will quadruple next year and double again in 2003.

"This won't slow down for the next three to four years," he says. "If the pipeline decision goes ahead it will project out a long way. That pipeline is very important for long-term sustained growth. We've had booms before. We need long-term growth."

He's optimistic because of aboriginal involvement, not in spite of it.

Perhaps there's a signal here for British Columbia, where land claims settlements are stalled, uncertainty stunts investment potential and Premier Gordon Campbell is contemplating what promises to be a divisive referendum on the issue, however bland the final question.

Yet in the Northwest Territories, generous land settlements have had an enormously positive impact on natives and nonnatives alike, the mayor says.

"You've got land settlements, the aboriginal groups are in charge and the Inuvialuit have basically gone out and joint-ventured with everyone. It's a much different game. It really changes things. It's not only because they are aboriginal, it's because they are local. This is their home. The money stays in this economy."

Over at the Gwich'in Tribal Council, newly-retired executive assistant Lawrence Norbert, born 42 years ago in Tsiigehtchic, says he's been "grinning from ear-to-ear since I got back."

"It's much different doing business with governments and corporations now," he says. "It's like there's a new sheriff in town and they realize that the old way of doing business is over for good. That's the up-side. We all know where we stand now."

As he and other aboriginals wait, the new drill rigs are ready to rumble north. These units are equipped with special design features that enable crews to work in the harsh winter environment—captured engine heat is recirculated to keep roughnecks' feet warm in temperatures cold enough to freeze exposed flesh in minutes, for example.

The rigs can require 80 or more trucks to move their components and cost up to \$50 million each to construct. That was the price tag on each of three just built in Edmonton by Akita Drilling Ltd. and bound north for next winter's exploration season.

As with northern Alberta and northeastern B.C., the financial stakes are mind-boggling.

N.W.T. Finance Minister Joe Handley says it's estimated that if all reserves in the Arctic are fully developed, they will be worth \$400 billion with royalties of \$76 billion flowing to Canada, another \$11 billion to the N.W.T. and billions more to the First Nations on whose treaty lands the development will occur.

Even more than in northern Alberta, the term "Kuwaitification" sidles into conversations about the future implications. The entire population of N.W.T. would leave empty seats around the end zones if it were to meet in B.C. Place. And although the North's aboriginal population of 21,000 forms the majority, in total it's smaller than Langley's.

The corollary is that when the new oil rush reaches its zenith, the entire weight of it is likely to descend upon the inhabitants of Tsiigehtchic. The village has the misfortune to sit in an oil patch so rich that crude seeps out of the river banks to stain the river. And the first rig into the delta in a decade has already been drilling a few kilometres away.

So this remote village of just over 170, as far north from Vancouver as Mexico is south—this is where I decide to begin the Arctic leg of my energy odyssey, talking about the looming future with Grace, who is old enough to remember the last big boom and wise enough, after an 11-year term as chief, to worry about the next one.

I find her on a Saturday morning at the back door to her log cabin, the ground freshly splattered with the bright crimson but already-frozen blood of a caribou from the immense Porcupine Herd that migrates between here and its calving grounds in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge where U.S. President George W. Bush wants to begin exploring for oil.

She'll talk, she agrees, but she won't invite me in. It's an act of hospitality.

"I was skinning this animal last night," she says. "Goodness, I've got hair all over everything in there." And she leads the unexpected visitor down to the institute offices, instead, to talk about how things have changed—and not changed—with respect to petroleum development.

Almost 30 years ago, northern aboriginal communities presented an opposition to the building of pipelines to carry northern oil and gas down the Mackenzie Valley that was so eloquent and united in purpose that a commission on the matter headed by Tom Berger called for a 10-year moratorium on development.

With no way of transporting the resource to markets in the south, further exploration guttered out just about when world markets entered a period of oil glut. Prices fell. The boom ended.

Today, northern aboriginal leaders, including the Gwich'in, are receptive rather than hostile, Grace says.

"People are pretty open to development now, but they want control. They don't want anybody to disturb certain selected lands that they consider a priority. They want control, that's their only stipulation and this time around, people need to listen to us in the communities."

Last time, she says, what happened in other northern communities provided a textbook example for what to avoid this time—but she wonders if anybody really took note.

"Do they even know? Do they care about the potential loss of a way of life for our people? Why haven't we studied the social impacts on Inuvik, Tuktoyaktuk and Aklavik so we can learn what to avoid? How do we protect our way of life? We don't want to lose our way—that's all we are saying. We are the last people living on the Porcupine caribou herd. We don't want to lose that."

"The Berger Report lays out everything the people want, so we don't have to reinvent the wheel. Do it right, that's what people are saying. Do it, but just do it right—meaning we are the inhabitants of this country and we deserve to be respected. And not just our leaders, the common folk."

That's a view I'll hear corroborated by Fred Carmichael, chair of the Gwich'in Tribal Council in Inuvik, who says the sea-change in attitudes has a simple basis: the affirmation of aboriginal title through land claims and the opportunity to take equity positions in any development.

In fact, northern aboriginal leaders have hammered out a tentative deal with energy companies to acquire as much as one-third ownership of a proposed \$3-billion pipeline down the Mackenzie Valley to hook up with North America's supply grid in Alberta.

"The difference is that back then, we weren't the landlords. Now we are the landlords and that's a big difference. At the time of the Berger hearings, we wanted a 10-year moratorium while we got ready. We just weren't ready then. Well, we got our 10 years and now we are ready."

One of those who's preparing to reap the bonanza is Paul Voudrach, a renewable resource officer at Tuktoyaktuk.

He and his wife Norma are in the process of buying out the nonnative owners of the Tuk Inn, a 16-room hotel and coffee shop, so that he can qualify for the preferential bookings that will come the way of a registered Inuvialuit under agreements hammered out during land claims.

Paul endured the last boom.

"What came with it was a lot of social problems," he says. "We had a huge amount of money coming in and people who didn't know how to handle it. But our leaders are knowledgeable about these things now. They

felt the impact last time. This time I think it will be something that will benefit the community."

Yet there's something grim about the atmosphere. Norma's face is tight and nine-year-old Trish is inside despite the fact that the town's annual jamboree is on.

Paul's son, John, he tells me, was killed the week before on the ice highway from Inuvik. The 25-year-old was helping his boss at a local transport company bring a new pickup truck back from Edmonston when it collided with one of their own loaded gravel trucks hauling to one of the oil camps.

"We were just sitting here waiting for him to come home. We heard that he was stranded at Eagle Plains (on the Dempster Highway) waiting for the road to open after a storm. Then we heard he had been in an accident and had been killed."

It's a reminder for everyone in the community, he says, that the kind of boom that's coming will be tempered with things that nobody expects, good and bad, half a dozen of one to six of the other when it comes to benefits and problems.

"What just happened to us, it opens your eyes. You think there's going to be a tomorrow but there isn't. One minute you are here, the next you are not. All your plans don't mean anything. At least people here are a bit more aware now that when the oil company comes with a job, that job can disappear pretty fast."

Maria Canton, filling-in as editor at The Drum newspaper in Inuvik while she waits to take up a new post at the Calgary Herald, is equally cautious.

"The streets are lined with shiny new pickup trucks that belong to workers from the south," she says. "There are crews driving up and down the street all day long, all night long. The bars fill up."

"I guess you'd have to say that when they are here it's good for the economy. They have lots of money and they don't mind spending it. You have to remember that to them this is just a camp. They don't think of it as home. They don't seem to grasp that people actually live here all the time and have no plans to leave. But when the job is done, they're gone and Inuvik is left to clean up everything that comes after."

One who's determined that this time things will be different is Nellie Cournoyea, the tough, former leader of the N.W.T. government who now directs the Inuvialuit Regional Development Corporation, the powerful business entity born of the treaty agreement with Canada.

Outside her office, a poster confronts every visitor: "Piiguqhaililugit uqauhiqput. Uqaqta Inuvialuktun uvlutaq.—Do not forget our language. Let's talk Inuvialuktun every day."

"I always look at the up-side," Nellie says of the coming boom. "A lot of people talk about social problems—we already have social problems. We just have to learn to deal with social problems as they arise. Jobs and income are a wonderful antidote to problems with self-esteem."

"We have a lot of working age people and they have to go to work. The socialist system (of welfare) is not a good system to follow. We've always been supportive of development—but we've always wanted to be meaningful participants." It's when I ask Grace about this coming transition from traditional hunting and fishing to a wage economy, the sacrifice of a life governed by the rhythms of the seasons for one governed by a clock, that her gaze wanders off into the white landscape.

And now the silence in the room is deepening like the snow drifting up around the log cabins, snow that has already filled the canoes, piled up on the tarps over stacked

firewood, smoothed all the indentations out of the landscape like God's giant eraser applied to all sharp edges.

I wonder to myself where her gaze has gone.

Perhaps over the bluffs and up the river to Teetchikgoghan, "bunch of creeks piled up in one place," where she was born in the bush almost half a century ago.

Perhaps she is remembering those summers as a little girl growing up in the care of her grandparents, Louis and Caroline Cardinal, playing beside the river, a force of nature that only someone born to it can fully understand, the kind of presence that T.S. Eliot described as a strong, brown god, coiled for release, never the same from one moment to the next and yet containing everything changeless and eternal.

Grace told me earlier how she'd go back there in her imagination to escape the pain and loneliness of residential school, where "every little thing that I knew about myself was just torn right out of me and I used to pee my pants right where I sat, I was so frightened."

So she'd go inside herself, back to that camp where she was left to roam the shore and hillsides.

"My grandmother raised me as an Indian woman," she'd said. "The moment I went out into the world, as you call it, I was supposed to erase all those experiences. It was like my life wasn't my own."

So I ask about the changes that now seem inevitable, the end of a hunting economy and its replacement with market labour and she slips away from the conversation, disappearing into some deep introspection.

And begins to weep without sound, great, round, sudden tears rolling down her face.

"Why I'm crying today is because my eldest son committed suicide in January," she finally says.

"Mum, I'm just tired," he said. "I'm just tired of everything. I'm tired of mad, sad faces. Nobody speaks respectfully." He just saw everything so clearly and it blew his mind.

"He was the father of five little children and he didn't have a steady income. His dad taught him how to trap and how to hunt and how to fish. Then he listened when they talked about jobs. He got his heavy equipment licence and left the bush. But they only wanted him when they needed him, not when he needed work. He couldn't go back to the bush and he couldn't support his family," she says. "We don't have a big bank account like you—we have our own bank account. Our bank account is the land, the animals, the fish in the rivers. You can't just come and empty out our bank account without asking us."

She gestures to the window and the rig that everyone knows is there but can't see. There are still beaver to trap, she says, but there are no muskrats. It could be a natural cycle but maybe it's a bigger thing, maybe it's because the lakes are dying. The development boom is coming and there have been no baseline studies of traditional environmental knowledge done, she says. None. And that arrogance, that assumption that the experts know best, shows the real relationship between her world and the corporate world.

"We are the first and the last people of this frontier," she says. "People are supposed to be valued. Human beings have the highest value. But we see that it's not like that. This corporate guy told us they will encourage kids to stay in school—if they don't go to school they won't hire them. That is the most foolish thing I have heard. You don't encourage people by telling them they aren't good enough. Our culture is not like that. We don't push people out of the way—we take them in, we make a place for everybody, not just the best."

I thought then about the boom that's necessary to feed the American superpower and her point about its structural disregard for the genius of her culture, these amazing people who learned to survive in the sparse boreal forest with not much more than a string of animal sinew and their creative imaginations.

This time, will things really be different as the politicians and executives promise?

Or is there a deeper truth in the cry of grief from women like Norma Voudrach and Grace Blake, already, in their own ways, bearing the quickening burden of change?

"My son was the first suicide in this community. The first ever. It's not the people, it's the system that makes us like this," Grace says. "When things start to move too fast and people don't feel in control of their lives, that's when they turn to drugs and alcohol. And suicide is the final act of control, isn't it?"

"We're being made to participate in our own destruction. What happened to my son happens to everyone, can't you understand that? When you are destroying us you are destroying yourselves."

Outside, a glossy black raven flopped in the snow, pecking at the caribou blood turned to ice on her doorstep and I found that my questions for Grace about the coming oil boom and what benefits it might bring to her community had all dried up.

[From the Vancouver Sun, June 11, 2001]

MASSIVE HERD REMAINS SOUL OF NATIVE BAND: DEBATE RAGES OVER THE ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS OF DRILLING IN REFUGE

(By Stephen Hume)

OLD CROW, YUKON.—The pilot, the reporter, even the two biologists sent to do the aerial count 30 years ago, all fell into that profound silence that accompanies the total failure of words.

What could be said? As far as the eye could see, the tundra below rippled and undulated with more than 160,000 caribou. The Porcupine herd on the move covered more than 60 square kilometres, one of the natural wonders of the world.

It may be decades since I watched that herd in awestruck silence but today it is no less crucial to the survival of Gwich'in tribal culture here in Old Crow, a remote village 770 kilometres north of Whitehorse and 112 kilometres north of the Arctic Circle.

The 300 people who live here, accessible only by air or by canoe from Alaska when there's open water, represent one of the last true hunting societies on Earth.

People here depend upon the Porcupine herd for sustenance, so not surprisingly, it's here, where the herd winters each year in the trees that edge the Mackenzie River delta and the northern Yukon, that an American debate over whether or not there's to be drilling for oil in Alaska's Arctic Wildlife Refuge is watched with intense interest.

There's been an effort to join forces with the Old Crow Gwich'in to lobby the U.S. senators not to open the Arctic Wildlife Refuge," says Grace Blake, former chief in Tsiighehtchic, a village in the Northwest Territories that also relies on the herd. "It's not a big movement yet, just pockets of people. We need to educate the Americans about how important this is to us."

As one of the last near-pristine and contiguous wilderness regions in the United States, the more than eight million hectares of the AWR encompass the complete migratory routes and summer calving grounds of the Porcupine herd.

Each year the caribou, identifiable by the stark silhouettes of the antlers on mature bulls, make one of the most remarkable journeys on the planet. Sustained only by a

winter diet of sparse lichens, they swim freezing rivers, climb snowy mountain ranges and cross the blackfly- and mosquito-infested tundra on the way to the coastal plain where cold winds sweeping in from the Arctic Ocean's pack ice keep the blood-sucking insects away from newborn calves. Then, when they've fattened up on succulent new vegetation, they retrace their route to the winter shelter of the boreal forest before temperatures plunge below freezing and wind chills render the open country uninhabitable to all but the snowshoe hare, the muskox, the wolverine and the barrenground wolf. Fifteen years ago, when then-U.S. president Ronald Reagan expressed sympathy for an oil industry lobby that sought access to the region which lies adjacent to the Yukon border, the Gwich'in allied themselves with the powerful U.S. environmental lobby to successfully block development.

Now, with consumers complaining about gasoline prices and a former Texas oilman in the White House in the form of George W. Bush, the prodevelopment lobby which has been biding its time in Alaska and the Lower 48 states has reemerged with a vengeance.

Taking point for the development lobby is Arctic Power, ostensibly a grassroots citizens group which favors oil and gas exploration in the protected area. It's an organization which has hired professional lobbyists in Washington, D.C., and was recently granted almost \$2 million in funds by the Alaska state legislature to do more of the same.

Rallying on the other side are organizations like the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society and nearly 500 leading U.S. and Canadian scientists who have called on President Bush to stop trying to change the law that prohibits oil extraction in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

They include world-renowned naturalist George Schaller, Edward O. Wilson, winner of the National Medal of Science and two Pulitzer Prizes for books on biology, David Klein, a noted Arctic scientist at the University of Alaska and 50 other Alaska scientists.

One major difference in the political jockeying this time around is that the dispute has become an exercise in political cyberwar.

Arctic Power has a sophisticated web site which purports to explode the "myths" of the Arctic Wildlife Refuge. Their opponents have launched their own information sites at which they argue that the amount of oil available from drilling in the refuge—which is the last five per cent of Alaska not available to the resource industry—would meet less than two per cent of U.S. annual needs even in its peak year of production, which couldn't come before 2027.

Citizens are invited to register their opposition with an e-mail petition.

Meanwhile, important as oil might be to the U.S. economy, the fate of the Porcupine herd is just as important to the social and economic fabric of the Gwich'in. And the First Nation's fears for the fate of the herd are growing rapidly.

Numbers of Porcupine caribou have now declined by approximately 20 per cent—to the present total of 129,000 animals—even without the added stress of additional oil exploration activity in the herd's calving grounds on the North Slope of Alaska.

And as an example of what development might mean in the future, green opponents of drilling point to Prudhoe Bay, less than 100 kilometres to the west. There, they argue, 2,500 square kilometres of fragile tundra has become a sprawling industrial zone containing more than 2,400 kilometres of roads and pipelines, 1,400 producing wells and three airports.

"The result is a landscape defaced by mountains of sewage sludge, scrap metal,

garbage and more than 60 contaminated waste sites that contain—and often leak—acids, lead, pesticides, solvents, diesel fuel, corrosives and other toxics," says the NRDC.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Again, Canada has every right to develop its energy. They are a formidable competitor to our own domestic production, and we enjoy access to that market and want to encourage it. But I resent the pot calling the kettle black, so to speak.

There is another chart that generally shows the extent of the activity, again in a little more detail. Here is the Alaska side. This is the Canadian Northwest Territories. This is the identification of wells that have been drilled and off-shore activity. You can see, as it moves through this area, the Porcupine caribou move through this area and it has significant exposure. And the Dempster Highway runs from Norman Wells on up to Inuvik.

The point I want to make is that as we look at the companies coming in, Anderson exploration and Petro-Canada, we can identify the companies that bought up the leases. Anderson alone has done nearly 600 square miles of 3-D seismic testing over the past three winters. Petro-Canada has already drilled exploratory wells outside of Inuvik, where Anderson now plans to drill in the Eagle Plain area. That is again shown on this chart, in this general area. It is a very significant area associated with the migratory path of the caribou.

Are these exploration plans "hasty and ill-conceived"? I question that because these are the words of Mr. Anderson, the Canadian Environmental Minister. I am sure the answer would be no; in his opinion they are not ill-conceived. That is their opinion and I do not challenge that. But neither is America's plan to allow careful and environmentally sensitive exploration in only 2000 acres, in the sense of any permanent footprint occurring in the Alaska Arctic Coastal Plain. That is less than .01 percent of Alaska's wildlife refuge, which is much broader than that, containing about 17 million acres.

Mr. Anderson would say Canada's drilling is OK because it doesn't disturb the caribou calving, but he didn't and doesn't mention that Canada is drilling in the midst of the herd's mating area. He doesn't mention that Canada is drilling in the calving area for its own herds.

He doesn't mention that Canada's action after building the Dempster Highway has probably done more to harm the health of the Porcupine herd than anything that America would ever consider.

Consider for a moment, again, this chart and what this highway has done. It has provided access. There is nothing wrong with access. Here is the Eagle Plains. Here is the highway. This is the migration route.

In the past decade, Canada reduced the previous 8-kilometer hunting area on both sides of the Dempster Highway, dropping it to a 2-kilometer zone.

Thus, Canadian hunters who want access have now access to shoot the Porcupine caribou after only a short stroll from the shoulder of the Dempster Highway. The herd has fallen from 180,000 animals to its current 129,000. That drop certainly has not been caused by any American activity.

The Canadian Environmental Minister, Mr. Anderson, in the past has complained opening Alaska's Coastal Plain would be unfair to the Gwich'in Indians of Canada and Alaska who oppose the development, but they certainly do not oppose it any longer in Canada. Canadian Gwich'in members are clearly supporting oil and gas exploration, probably now because they will have a financial benefit, certainly the benefit of jobs and better housing, better social care, and better medicine following the completion of their land claim settlement.

Let me share a quote:

The difference is that back then—

Meaning previous years before the land claims—

we weren't landlords. Now we are the landlords and that is a big difference. . . . Now we are ready for development.

This was Fred Carmichael, the chairman of the Gwich'in Tribal Council in Canada. This article, again, came from the Vancouver Sun, the quote to which I am referring.

Could Mr. Anderson's opposition to Alaska's environmentally sensitive oil development be caused by Canada's desire to have a ready market for its Mackenzie Delta oil finds in America? I hope so. We would welcome it.

But according to Canadian press, Inuvik Mayor Peter Clerkson predicted oil drilling would quadruple in this area in the winter and double again next winter. Again, this level of activity certainly indicates that.

The Northwest Territory Finance Minister has just been quoted as hoping oil finds will generate \$400 billion for Canada, all money being transferred to Canada, mostly from the pockets of American consumers as we look to Canada for energy needs.

Call it what you will, it is healthy competition. Mr. Anderson, the Environmental Minister, in his fears about American oil exploration, ignores that the legislation currently pending to open the Arctic Coastal Plain fully protects the environment and the Porcupine caribou, and to all wildlife on Alaska's Coastal Plain. The House passed language, as you know. The House did pass H.R. 4. That energy legislation authorizes the opening of ANWR. It limits development to a 2,000-acre footprint out of the 19 million-acre refuge. That would leave nearly 100 square miles of habitat between each oil-drilling pad, more than enough for the caribou to pass through, given the new advances in directional drilling, 3-D seismic.

So I think if we compare what Canada's footprint in the Canadian Arctic is, and our own, the technology would speak for itself. Further, we propose to

limit development so there will be no disturbance to calving during the June-July calving season. This is not about protecting the environment and the caribou that live in it. Mr. Anderson's objection must be about something else.

Look at the objections that opponents voice to exploring in ANWR. One is that it is an insignificant amount of oil, not worth developing. If it isn't, we will make a park out of it. But that is nonsense. The USGS estimates Alaska's portion of the Coastal Plain—I would say the occupant of the chair has been up there—the estimate is it contains between 6 and 16 billion gallons of economically recoverable oil. If it is 10 billion barrels alone, the average, it is equivalent to 30 years of oil we would import from Saudi Arabia at the current rate, and 50 years equal to what we import currently from Iraq.

By the way, 16 billion barrels is 2.5 times the size of the published estimate of the new Canadian reserves in the Mackenzie Delta area, here. It is absurd to think that ANWR only represents a 6-month supply of oil as some opponents say. That would assume that ANWR is this country's only source of oil.

Some say it will take too long to get ANWR oil flowing. But it certainly will take less time to produce than some of the potential deposits in Canada. And if we are truly at war against terrorism, we have the national will to develop Alaska oil quickly, while still protecting the environment.

We built the Pentagon in 18 months, the Empire State Building in a year and built the 1,800-mile Alaska Highway in 9 months. Oil could be flowing out of ANWR quickly if we made a total commitment to make that happen. I believe we could do this in 12 months instead of the five years, some predict.

There are many other misstatements about Alaska's potential for oil development. We will have time to discuss those in this body as we work on a national energy policy that makes sense for America. That debate must occur soon; we must give the President the tools he needs to ensure our energy security. I know members on both sides of the aisle are anxious to make this happen.

But I wanted to come and respond to the comments made by Canada's environment minister, because they were horribly unbalanced in light of Canada's oil drilling program in the migratory route of the Porcupine caribou herd.

I encourage an opportunity to debate Mr. Anderson, and I stand behind my assertion that, indeed, his comments don't reflect the reality nor the true picture of what is going on in Canada.

Again, I have fondness for our Canadian friends and Canada itself. I am not saying they are harming the environment in the least. I am pointing out what they are doing. The Members of this body need to know that as well.

I welcome additional oil production in North America, as long as it is done in an environmentally sound manner. Again, I remind all of us that we give very little thought to where our oil comes from as long as we get it. We should do it right in North America, Canada, and Alaska, as opposed to it coming from overseas, over which we have really no control.

I find the objections to be unbalanced and grossly unfair since they totally ignore the environmental issues involved in oil development in the Arctic.

I also find the Environment Minister's statement just days after the tragedy in New York and Washington not only untimely but unfortunate.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor. I wish my colleagues a good day.

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the energy policy-related amendments filed by the Senator from Oklahoma. While I support moving forward with comprehensive national energy policy, the underlying bill is too important to our national security to bog it down with controversial amendments.

There are many substantive problems with these amendments, not the least of which is their probable negative impact on public health and environmental quality. They take us back to the polluting past, rather than forward into a cleaner, more efficient and sustainable future.

There are also serious procedural problems with moving on these amendments. The committees of jurisdiction, including the Environment and Public Works Committee, have not completed work on important parts of comprehensive energy legislation.

Also, I would remind Senators that the administration has completed very few, if any, of the reports recommended by the Vice-President's National Energy Policy Development group. I believe these reports were intended to inform and justify to the public and Congress the need for any changes to existing law and programs.

These amendments drive us further and further away from making the truly fundamental changes in our national energy policy that are necessary to address global climate change.

The amendments will dramatically increase U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. That further violates our commitment in the Rio Agreement to reduce to 1990 levels.

The next Conference of Parties to the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change begins in late October. Despite the terrorist attacks on our Nation, the attendees will hope for U.S. leadership to combat global warming.

Whatever the administration may present, I hope the message from the U.S. Senate will not be the recent adoption of a national energy policy that blatantly undermines our Senate-

ratified commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The underlying bill already sets us up to violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense Treaty. That is enough to weigh down one bill.

We should not further encroach on the good will of our global neighbors at a time when we are seeking their support in our efforts against terrorism. I urge the defeat of these amendments when and if they are offered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. INHOFE. Is the Senator aware that since back to and including the First World War the outcome of every war has been determined by energy? Is the Senator aware that we are now 56.7-percent dependent upon foreign countries for our ability to fight a war and that half of it is coming from the Middle East? And is the Senator aware that the largest increase in terms of our dependency on any one country is Iraq, a country with which we are in war right now?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I am aware of the situations the Senator describes. I am just concerned about the methodology being utilized to try to solve that. I would like to work together with the members of the committee to try to see if we can find common ground.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Chair.

EVENTS OF THE LAST TWO WEEKS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to reflect on some of the experiences I have had over the last 2 weeks, and also the activity of the U.S. Congress, and in particular the Senate.

It is hard to believe it has only been 2 weeks and 1 day since the tragedy of September 11. It seems such a longer period of time because of all the emotions and all the experiences and all the visual images which have been burned into our minds and our hearts.

I think so many times of that day and what happened to me. Yet when I meet anyone on the street in Chicago or any part of Illinois and Springfield, they all go through the same life experience. They want to tell me where they were and how their lives were touched and changed by September 11. It was a defining moment for America. It is one which none of us will ever forget.

Over 6,500 innocent Americans lost their lives on that day—the greatest loss of American life, I am told, of any day in our history, including the battles of the Civil War.

Of course, we weren't the only country to lose lives in the World Trade Center. It is reported in the papers today that more German citizens lost their lives to terrorism on September 11 at the World Trade Center than in any of the terrorist acts on record in Germany. The stories are repeated many times over.

Yesterday, the father of one of the victims of American Flight 77 that