

Currently, some 40 homes in the Frost Road community are being monitored for MTBE and so far, seven treatment systems, including one in the Miller home, have been installed in homes on and around Frost Road.

In April of last year, while Mrs. Miller was pregnant with Nathan, a water sample from the Miller well showed a high MTBE contamination level, and due to this discovery, the Millers began receiving bottled water from the State to replace the contaminated drinking water.

But while bottled water is fine for drinking, Mrs. Miller pointed out that it doesn't help with other daily needs such as: bathing; washing fruits and vegetables; and cooking.

There is also the potential health concerns associated with the contamination and not much is known about the health affects of MTBE—but when you have a new born, as the Miller's do with Nathan, the health uncertainties add to the already existing anxiety.

The State has installed a treatment system in their basement and it is a large, cumbersome intrusion in their house—it is also expensive.

This system consists of a residential air stripper and two carbon filter units and while the State is currently paying for the system, there is the concern about how long this will last and whether they will pay for any upgrades as well.

Needless to say, with the MTBE contamination and the presence of a large treatment system in their home, the Millers' are quite concerned with impact on the home's resale value.

What adds to the concerns is that the State still has not been able to determine the source of the MTBE.

It is a bad situation—one that begs for a remedy and the people of Derry are looking for help and relief from this federally mandated gas additive that has caused so much pain.

This problem is not unique to new Hampshire, it exists in Maine California, Nevada, Texas, New York, and on and on.

In fact, in Maine, one single car accident rendered 12 drinking wells unusable—just like that—we must do something.

I have a bill that has been reported out of committee two years in a row—briefly, the bill will: Authorize \$400 million out of the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Fund (LUST Fund) to help the states clean up MTBE contamination; Ban MTBE four years after enactment of this bill; Allow Governors to waive the gasoline oxygenate requirement of the Clean Air Act; Preserve environmental benefits on air toxics, and; Provide funds to help transition from MTBE to other clean, safe fuels.

Also, I am very pleased to be joining our subcommittee ranking member, Senator CHAFEE in introducing a new

underground storage tank bill that includes MTBE cleanup funding.

The time to act is now—Just as I said yesterday, I will continue to come to the floor until the Senate acts on this issue. It is time to help out the families who have fallen victim to a Federal mandate.

PORT AND MARITIME SECURITY ACT

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, we worked hard with the administration to incorporate many of their suggested changes in this bill to sharpen the policy and create a better legislative product. I had intended to work with Chairman LEAHY of the Judiciary Committee to modernize and update some of our maritime criminal laws to reflect the realities following the attacks of September 11th, and to strengthen our laws to protect against maritime terrorism. Unfortunately, the administration did not consult or share with the Judiciary Committee the changes in criminal laws and other matters within the Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction that were provided to me. I ask the chairman of the Judiciary Committee if he would be willing to work to work with me and Senator MCCAIN next year to consider whether new criminal provisions are necessary to enhance seaport security?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am also very concerned that we develop policies to more adequately protect our maritime vulnerabilities and protect the public from the threats emerging as a result of maritime trade. I would be happy to work with Chairman HOLLINGS and Ranking Member MCCAIN next year to evaluate whether any gaps in our criminal laws to protect our maritime safety and seaport security exist and the appropriate steps we should take to close those gaps.

Additionally, I have expressed to Chairman HOLLINGS my concerns that we properly limit access to and use of sensitive law enforcement information relating to background checks which are provided for in this bill. Chairman HOLLINGS has assured me that the bill sets strict and appropriate limits as to both when such access will be required and how the information will be used once obtained. I would like to ask Chairman HOLLINGS if he could explain those provisions?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I share Chairman LEAHY's concern that we provide adequate safeguards for both access to and use of this sensitive information. That is why we have included important protections and limitations for such use and access in the bill. Background checks will be limited to those employees who have access to sensitive cargo information or unrestricted access to segregated "controlled access areas," that is defined areas within ports, terminals, or affil-

ated maritime infrastructure which present a demonstrable security concern. In addition, under this bill the use of such material, once it is obtained, will be restricted to the minimum necessary to disqualify an ineligible employee. In other words, only the minimum amount of law enforcement information necessary to make eligibility decisions will be shared with port authorities or maritime terminal operators.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER ON PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY

• Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I commend to my colleagues a recent column by Charles Krauthammer entitled "Unilateral? Yes, Indeed." It ran in the December 14 issue of the Washington Post.

Once again, Krauthammer has done a fine job of articulating sentiments shared by many of us regarding the President's conduct of foreign policy. The essence of the issue can be summarized in one word: leadership. Since the start of his presidency, George W. Bush has been the target of innumerable criticisms emanating from his approach to the conduct of foreign policy. Greatly exaggerated fears of isolationism have been voiced by the president's critics, both at home and abroad. With the conduct of the war against terrorism and the decision to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, however, the President has demonstrated not isolationism, but leadership. Leadership, as defined by the willingness to make unpopular decisions and accept the consequences out of a conviction that the decisions in question are in the best interests of the United States.

Pre-war concerns that the entire Muslim world would rise up against us if we went after Al Qaeda and its Taliban protectors have proven unfounded. Worst-case scenarios surrounding the President's decision to withdraw from the ABM Treaty have similarly failed to materialize. There are consequences to both decisions, but they were the right decisions and the consequences are far less than the benefits accruing to the United States from their having been implemented.

I urge my colleagues to take a minute to read the article by Charles Krauthammer. It articulates better than could I the importance of leadership in international affairs, and I highly recommend it.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 14, 2001]

UNILATERAL? YES, INDEED

(By Charles Krauthammer)

Last month's Putin-Bush summit at Crawford was deemed an arms control failure

because the rumored deal—Russia agrees to let us partially test, but not deploy, defenses that violate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty—never came off.

In fact, it was a triumph. Like Reagan at the famous 1986 Reykjavik summit, at which he would not give up the Strategic Defense Initiative to Gorbachev, Bush was not about to allow Putin to lock the United States into any deal that would prevent us from building ABM defenses.

Bush proved that yesterday when he dropped the bombshell and unilaterally withdrew the United States from the treaty, and thus from all its absurd restrictions on ABM technology.

This is deeply significant, not just because it marks a return to strategic sanity, formally recognizing that the ballistic missile will be to the 21st century what the tank and the bomber were to the 20th, but because it unashamedly reasserts the major theme of the Bush foreign policy: unilateralism.

After Sept. 11, the critics (the usual troika: liberal media, foreign policy establishment, Democratic ex-officials) were clucking about how the Bush administration has beaten a hasty retreat from reckless unilateralism. President Bush "is strongly supported by the American people," explained former Senate leader George Mitchell, "in part because he has simply discarded almost everything he said on foreign policy prior to Sept. 11."

Bush had wanted to go it alone in the world, said the critics. But he dare not. "It's hard to see the President restoring the unilateralist tinge that colored so many of his early foreign policy choices," wrote columnist E. J. Dionne just two months ago. "Winning the battle against terror required an end to unilateralism."

We need friends, they said. We need allies. We need coalition partners. We cannot alienate them again and again. We cannot have a president who kills the Kyoto Protocol on greenhouse gases, summarily rejects the "enforcement provisions" of the bioweapons treaty, trashes the ABM Treaty—and expect to build the coalition we need to fight the war on terrorism.

We cannot? We did.

Three months is all it took to make nonsense of these multilateralist protests. Coalition? The whole idea that the Afghan war is being fought by a "coalition" is comical. What exactly has Egypt contributed? France sent troops into Mazar-e Sharif after the fighting had stopped, noted that renowned military analyst Jay Leno. ("Their mission?" asked Leno. "To teach the Taliban how to surrender.") There is a coalition office somewhere in Islamabad. Can anyone even name the coalition spokesman who makes announcements about the war?

The "coalition" consists of little more than U.S. aircraft, U.S. special forces, and Afghan friends-of-the-moments on the ground. Like the Gulf War, the Afghan war is unilateralism dressed up as multilateralism. We made it plain that even if no one followed us, we would go it alone. Surprise: Others followed.

A unilateralist does not object to people joining our fight. He only objects when the multilateralists, like Clinton in Kosovo, give 18 countries veto power over bombing targets.

The Afghan war is not a war run by committee. We made tough bilateral deals with useful neighbors. Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Russia. The Brits and the Australians added a sprinkling of guys on the ground risking their lives, and we will always be grateful for their solidarity. But everyone knows whose war it is.

The result? The Taliban are destroyed. Al Qaeda is on the run. Pakistan has made a historic pro-American strategic pivot, as have the former Soviet republics, even Russia itself. The Europeans are cooperating on prosecutions. Even the Arab states have muted their anti-American and anti-Israeli rhetoric, with the Egyptian foreign minister traveling to Jerusalem for the first time in three years.

Not because they love us. Not because we have embraced multilateralism. But because we have demonstrated astonishing military power and the will to defend vital American interests, unilaterally if necessary.

Where is the great Bush retreat from unilateralism? The ABM Treaty is dead. Kyoto is dead. The new provisions of the totally useless biological weapons treaty are even dead: Just six days before pulling out of the ABM Treaty, the administration broke up six years of absurd word-mongering over a bio treaty so worthless that Iraq is a signatory in good standing.

And the world has not risen up against us—no more than did the "Arab street" (over the Afghan war), as another set of foreign policy experts were warning just weeks ago.

The essence of unilateralism is that we do not allow others, no matter how well-meaning, to deter us from pursuing the fundamental security interests of the United States and the free world. It is the driving motif of the Bush foreign policy. And that is the reason it has been so successful.●

RUSSIA AND ENERGY SECURITY

● Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise to point out that while the attention of the world is now rightly focused on Afghanistan and the war against terrorism there, we should not forget that a large part of the oil and gas consumed by the United States and the rest of the industrialized world comes from the conflict-ridden Middle East.

In addition to addressing the issue of energy independence through new domestic sources of supply, conservation, and the development of renewable energy resources, it is imperative for us to be thinking about the best possible way of protecting the security of alternative sources of oil and gas outside the United States. The Caspian Sea is also on Russia's doorstep, and we should encourage development that will foster positive political as well as economic relations with the world's second largest oil exporter.

Russia's recent refusal to follow OPEC's lead in slashing production is one more example of its ability to play a positive role on world oil markets, and the recently opened \$2.5 billion Caspian oil pipeline, Russia's largest joint investment to date, and one in which U.S. firms hold more than a one-third interest, is an example of the kind of project that will encourage Moscow to continue to look westward.

Akezhan Kazhegeldin, an economist, businessman, and former prime minister of oil-rich Kazakhstan, has written a thoughtful article on these subjects that appeared in the Russian journal *Vremya Novostei* on October 15, 2001. In his article, Dr. Kazhegeldin

states that oil and gas from Kazakhstan and the other energy producing nations of the former Soviet Union could provide an important backup source of energy, complementing what now comes from the Persian Gulf countries.

Moreover, referring to the debate surrounding the route of future, additional pipelines carrying oil to consuming countries, Dr. Kazhegeldin asserts that there is no reason for the West and Russia to be at loggerheads now that the Cold War is over. He goes on to describe how the West and Russia could, in his view, work together on a comprehensive pipeline solution that would benefit everyone.

Some of Dr. Kazhegeldin's ideas will undoubtedly elicit healthy debate. I urge my colleagues to read his provocative article, and I ask that the text be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows.

[From *Vremya Novostei*, Oct. 15, 2001]

"GLOBAL ARC OF STABILITY: THE WAY RUSSIA AND THE CASPIAN CAN MAKE THE WORLD STABLE"

(By Akezhan Kazhegeldin)

The September 11 tragic events and launching of the Afghan campaign, seen as the first stage in "the global war against terror", have changed the world dramatically. Protection of peaceful citizens from possible terror acts appears as just a tip of the huge pyramid of new problems. We are facing an acute and more global problem, the problem of ensuring the industrial world's economic safety.

The supply of the developed nations' energy, above all, oil and gas, is a critical and vulnerable element in the world's economic relations. A great part of the developed oil fields are concentrated in the highly insecure and conflict-ridden Middle Eastern region, which makes the threat of oil blockade and energy crisis for the industrial countries, the main oil and gas consumers, a perpetual nightmare. Unpredictable dictators are no less dangerous than terrorist groups. Should the interests of both in the region coincide, the rest of the world would find itself in an impasse.

Even if everything goes very well and the antiterrorist campaign ends quickly, the community of industrial countries will have to make sure that the threat of energy blackmail is ruled out in principle. In the global energy system, it is necessary to use reserve and back-up methods in order to ensure safety. Caspian oil reserves can play a major role here.

For the past decade, politicians and journalists have been debating about the problem of Caspian oil perhaps more heatedly than the industry professionals. It has almost been made into a stake in the new Great Game, the U.S.-Russian rivalry over the control of the region and its riches. This confrontation has become the legacy of the old "bloc" model of the world. Wayne Merry, a former U.S. State Department and Pentagon official, now a senior associate at the American Foreign Policy Council in Washington, describes its sources: "... Washington concentrated its efforts on one great strategic project to assure US primacy in the region. ... The idea was to bypass existing pipelines in Russia, squeeze out Iran, bring energy supplies from the Caspian region to a