

tricity; advanced turbines that harness the power of the wind; and new ways of producing ethanol and methanol for our cars and trucks.

It's easy to criticize and complain that we're not doing enough in promoting renewable energy. We will leave that to others, while we quietly have done the hard work which will make renewable energy technologies a reality in the marketplace.

Much of this progress - I call it outstanding progress - has been accomplished in Golden, Colorado, at the Department of Energy's Solar Energy Research Institutes - SERI. SERI has excelled in R&D and in technology transfer. This year SERI scientists have won four of the prestigious R&D 100 awards.

In recognition of SERI's success and its important role in strengthening our energy future, I am pleased to announce the elevation of SERI to the status of a national laboratory. SERI, which will now be known as the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, joins an elite group of our nation's finest scientific facilities.

This designation symbolizes our commitment to finding new ways to produce and use energy that is cleaner, more efficient and more sustainable.

So once again, thank you all for joining us this morning to mark this special occasion. And let me end where I began with congratulations to Secretary Moore - Henson Moore - and Dr. Duane Sunderman. Thank you very, very much. (Applause.)

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (SENATE)  
October 2, 1991  
Page S14232

#### GWICH'IN PEOPLE OPPOSE ALASKAN OIL DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I want to address a dimension of the national energy strategy that deserves serious attention in this body: the threat to the culture and way of life of the Gwich'in Indians posed by plans to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to oil exploration and development.

I have had the honor of meeting with representatives of the Gwich'in people this past week, and I wish every Senator had been there to hear their story. They are a people who

have lived in northeast Alaska and northwestern Canada for thousands of years - perhaps as long as 20,000 years. They are the most northern Indian peoples in the United States today, and there are only about 7,000 remaining people living in 17 small towns and villages in Alaska and the Yukon. They are truly an endangered native people.

The Gwich'in are a caribou people - most of their food comes from caribou hunting, and their entire culture and identity revolves around the caribou. They are as dependent on the caribou as the Plains Indians once were on the buffalo in the lower United States. And to put this question in some historical perspective, I would like to ask my fellow Senators what we would have done a century ago if the remaining chiefs had come to us and pleaded with us to stop the slaughter of buffalo. Would we have done it? If we had it to do over again, would we do it? Would we be willing to protect the buffalo from virtual extinction and prevent the destruction of Indian cultures in the West?

Today we are faced with a similar question in regard to oil development in ANWR. The Gwich'in tribal leaders are adamantly against oil development on the 1002 Coastal Plain because they are convinced it will destroy the calving grounds of the Porcupine Caribou herd on which their whole way of life depends. The calving grounds are not just economically important to the Gwich'in people - they are sacred. They fear that any disturbance of this sacred area will lead to decline of the caribou herd and changes in migration patterns that will doom their way of life as well.

Consequently they have filed a lawsuit against the Secretary of the Inte-

rior on grounds that oil development in ANWR could deprive them of their inherent right to continue their own way of life, a right recognized by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and also on grounds that a full environmental impact statement has never been done on the 1002 area. I myself raised the issue of the inadequacy of the old 1002 report during committee markup, but I now realize that the issues go even deeper - they go to the very survival of native peoples threatened by ecological destruction. This is an issue of human rights.

The reply of those who want to develop the Arctic Wilderness no matter what is that enough studies have been done to be confident that development of oil fields does not significantly disrupt caribou migration and calving patterns, and that in fact the experience of Prudhoe Bay and the Alaskan pipeline is that the caribou herds have multiplied since construction. They point to the growth of the central caribou herd in particular.

The Gwich'in people and others now challenge these claims. It is true that all caribou herds have grown in recent years, but they have observed that only the central herd that is impacted by the Prudhoe Bay developments has sharply declined in the past year or so. Gwich'in hunters have observed many dead and diseased animals, and a clear decline in successful calving this year. They are convinced that the same thing will happen to the Porcupine Herd if they are forced out of the 1002 area into less healthy calving grounds.

We have heard a lot about support for ANWR development by the Eskimos living in the village of Kaktovik on the north coast. Some of them

have come down to Washington to testify also. But I have heard from many sources that the people of Kaktovik are in fact deeply divided over this, and that many are too intimidated to speak up against tribal leaders. Be that as it may, the Gwich'in people deserve at least an equal voice and they are solidly united against oil development. It is simply not true that the Native peoples support this.

The Gwich'in believe that if their way of life is changed by the oil companies, it can only be for the worse. The alternative to preserving their identity and way of life is a host of social problems that have beset other Indian communities, including alcoholism and welfare dependency. They do not want this - they are fighting for their most fundamental right to exist as an indigenous people who are an integral part of the landscape, of the unique ecology of this region.

We cannot condemn the Gwich'in as a people; we must respect their right to survival. We cannot ignore their rights the way we did in the last century. We cannot sacrifice them for the greed of a few oil companies or for a few months' supply of oil.

This is one of the reasons I will oppose S. 1220, the so-called National Energy Security Act. I will speak on other reasons to oppose this bill later; but before we even think about other provisions, let us get our values straight. What is it that we as a nation aspire to be? What are our basic values? Have we learned anything in the past 100 years? Or are we doomed to repeat the mistakes of the past? I believe we must listen to what our elder brothers, the Gwich'in, are telling us and find a way to meet our energy needs without destroying this

unique community of land, animals, and people.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (SENATE)  
October 3, 1991  
Page S14259

#### NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, S. 1220 was introduced by my distinguished colleague from Louisiana on June 5. It is now October, and the majority leader has indicated that we in the Senate have had time to study this legislation, and perhaps in a few weeks we will be called upon to act on this bill.

Soon we will be engaged in a historic debate, and I say historic debate with no exaggeration. My colleagues should know that some Members of this body will object to any unanimous consent request to proceed to the consideration of S. 1220. We do not object simply to obstruct. We do so to promote a vital debate.

We seek a debate, Mr. President, in the United States highest deliberative body, the U.S. Senate about the direction of our Nation's energy policy. This should not be a debate about details, not about Federal energy regulatory policy, not about standards or about how you calculate the full cost of energy. This should be a debate, and it must be a debate, about priorities and direction. Such a debate, Mr. President, is proper, and it can only effectively be engaged by challenging the motion to proceed.

When the Senate begins this debate, I will be joining with several of my colleagues to express our current opposition to the current direction of our Nation's energy policy, a direction which S. 1220 simply continues, a direction which leaves for future gen-

erations serious problems which this legislation simply addresses in no substantive way.

The proposals before us in S. 1220 are serious proposals with enormous consequences for people's lives. Before we get into the specific discussions of these proposals, if we do, some basic questions about this legislation can and must be asked.

To what end do we propose to spend billions of taxpayers' dollars, to rewrite dozens of laws, to confer privileges on some and burdens on others? What are the problems we face? What are we trying to solve? What do we need to have a credible, workable national energy policy?

Mr. President, I believe there are two overarching problems which any legitimate national energy policy must address: The economic and the security problems facing our Nation due to declining fossil fuel resources, and the potential environmental catastrophe facing this Earth by global warming, warming which is caused primarily by the buildup of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. These are the two most compelling national and international problems directly related to our energy use which we must confront as a Nation, and if we do not confront these problems as a Nation, we will imperil future generations.

In my own examination, S. 1220 does little to address either of these problems. As I pointed out to my colleagues in July, all 16 titles of S. 1220 will produce only 3 percent of the oil savings that would result if this bill had strong fuel efficiency standards as proposed in the legislation introduced by my colleague, Senator Bryan from Nevada.

There is tremendous potential for energy efficiency and renewable re-