

This is something that will benefit the country; it is something we can do in the Senate; and we can do it on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves, I ask if he will respond to a question I have about the energy bill.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I am pleased to respond.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, through you to my friend from New Mexico, I was speaking with Senator LUGAR. One of the things that has so intrigued me about the legislation you will mark up is that there is a section in the bill that deals with renewables; is that right?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, we will have a section in the bill dealing with renewable energy production. The one we are marking up this Wednesday deals with research and development and training programs. When we come back in September, we expect to have a section dealing with renewable energy production.

Mr. REID. There isn't any one answer to the energy problem, is there? It is a combination of solutions that you have talked about, such as renewables. It is going to take a lot of cooperation and partnering to be able to answer the energy needs of this country; is that right?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator, he is exactly right. There are a variety of technologies that can help us to meet our 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 where-withal, 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.