

is it in our best interests? Would our troops be placed in harm's way? Would they be placed there as peacemakers or peacekeepers? And I would say as this debate drones on, peacemakers become a lot more dangerous. It is hard to keep the peace where there is no peace.

I am also sympathetic with the President on wanting to do the right thing. I am also sympathetic in that he has the right if he thinks it is right to deploy troops in a peacekeeping mission. But it would be a lot easier if he would come to this Congress and consult with this Congress before he did so and have the support of the American people. It is terrible to order young men and women into harm's way without the complete support of their nation. I will not do that.

There seems to be another situation here, too—the provision of this accord to lift the arms embargo and to arm and train the Bosnians. That does not seem like a peacekeeping mission to me. And I will have to know more about the wording on that and our goal or the ultimate end.

It seems hard to say that if we flood the country with arms and in the next breath we say, "No more war," that seems sort of an oxymoron to me.

In conclusion, it is, like I said, like no other part of the world where you will find people that have a love so deep and a passion so deep for their land but also a hate so deep for their trespassers. And that is the situation we have to deal with. So despite my expressed doubts on the merits of this decision to deploy—we will listen to the debate—but I have no intention of withdrawing my support for our young men and women who will be placed in harm's way in this mission of peace.

I can remember when President Bush came to this body and asked for permission to deploy in the Middle East. We did have a national interest there. How much do we have in this circumstance? We will weigh that decision. And it will probably be, if the President chooses to do so, and I think he will, that he will come to this Congress asking for our support. It will be a very, very tough decision. It could be one of those votes that one never likes to cast either up or down. But the debate must be held, and we must talk about it openly because there are young men and women's lives at stake, and the interest of the most powerful and free Nation in the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would ask, is there an order for the day relative to taking up other legislation at 3 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has been an order entered to that effect, that is correct.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. In view of the fact that I do not see any other of my colleagues calling up anything, I ask

unanimous consent that morning business be extended for approximately 15 minutes so that I may make a statement and enter a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair, and wish the President a good afternoon.

(The remarks of Mr. MURKOWSKI pertaining to the introduction of S. 1425 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

OIL RESERVES IN ANWR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, seeing no one wishing to speak, I would like to address very briefly the matter that I have spoken of on a number of occasions. That is the opening up of the arctic oil reserve known as ANWR. And I would like to submit some particular documentation that has come into my office in the last few days, but I will be specific in my reference.

As the President and my colleagues are aware, the idea of opening up the Arctic oil reserve, or ANWR, is not a new idea. It was left in 1980 to the Congress to make a determination as to the appropriateness of opening up an area in the coastal plain, approximately 1.5 million acres out of the 19 million acres which make up ANWR. Approximately 8.5 million acres of that has already been set aside in a permanent wilderness by the 1980 legislation. Another 9.5 million acres has been set aside in refuge, leaving approximately 1.5 million acres in the so-called 1002 area for the disposition of Congress.

At this time, we are faced with a dilemma as to whether or not, indeed, this is in the national interest. It is a similar argument to that which prevailed in the seventies when there was question as to whether or not the Prudhoe Bay area would be open for exploration and development.

That was over 20 years ago, Mr. President. Prudhoe Bay has been producing approximately 25 percent of the total domestic crude oil produced in the United States over the last 18 years. Today, Prudhoe Bay has declined. The production from that field has dropped from approximately 2 million barrels a day to 1.5 million barrels a day. But the arguments over whether or not we should open up the Arctic oil reserves of ANWR and the arguments that prevailed 20 years ago are basically the same: Can we do it safely? What will be the effect on the caribou? What will be the effect on the moose and the other animals that frequent the area, the bird life and so forth?

We have seen over the last 18 years of operating the Prudhoe Bay field an extraordinary set of events relative to the wildlife. We have seen the caribou herds grow from 3,000 to 4,000 animals to the current level of approximately 24,000 animals. It has been recognized in the oil fields, as in other areas where the caribou frequent that there are ap-

proximately three detractors and a number of animals that can sustain themselves, and those are individually related to the number of wolves in an individual area or other predators such as bear, the winter—the heavy snows take a toll on the caribou—and, of course, overgrazing is also a difficulty. In any event, we have seen the growth of these herds, which suggest, indeed, we have the capability to safely manage with a reasonable amount of development in an area given time.

My point is, again, we are reflecting the same arguments that were before us in the seventies, applicable today, but we have the proof, we have the scientific evidence and we have the redundancy, if you will, of recognizing that this population has increased and, with proper management, there can be little effect on the animal population associated with development in the high Arctic.

Further, there has always been a question as to the safety relative to the advanced technology. We have proven that we can limit the footprint dramatically. We have seen an extensive field in Prudhoe Bay reduced as new fields have been found, as stepouts of Prudhoe Bay, approximately 7 years ago, brought in a field known as Endicott which only took in 56 acres of surface land, yet it was the 10th largest producing field in North America. Today, it is the 7th largest producing field.

There was another question as to what effect this activity would have on the residents, the Eskimo people themselves. I quote from a statement, a news release from the North Slope Bureau and the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation:

The Eskimo people are working their way out of Federal dependency. Because of their success, they state they are being opposed at every turn by the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs—

And they named Ada Deer in that regard and suggest she opposes successful native American corporations and organizations. She, in their opinion, wants them to be dependent on the Bureau of Indian Affairs. But they indicate that they are well aware of what dependency brings: a state that kills self-initiative, that breeds a welfare society. They further conclude that they want to follow the American way, the old way of independent self-help and individual responsibility, family values and sense of community.

In other words, Mr. President, they want to have the same opportunities that other Americans enjoy: jobs for their children, tax bases for their communities, running water that other Americans enjoy.

So as a consequence, as we debate the merits of whether ANWR should stay in the reconciliation package, as has been deemed by action taken by both the House and the Senate, we are faced with this question of national security interests as well.

Currently, we are importing about 51 percent of our total crude oil. Back in

1973, we were importing 34 percent. Obviously, we are sending our jobs and dollars overseas and the justification of that, in my mind, is very questionable. If the oil is there, and volumes would have to be, it is estimated it would create 257,000 jobs associated with the life of the field. This would be the largest single jobs producer that we can identify in North America today.

So, as a consequence, if we add up the attitude of the Eskimo people who see this as an opportunity for stimulating their own economic livelihood, the national energy security interests of our Nation, the tremendous number of jobs, the realization that we have been able to develop safely oil and gas in the Arctic, as evidenced at Prudhoe Bay, there is no good reason why this administration should not support opening up ANWR to drilling.

It is anticipated that the lease sale would bring in approximately \$2.6 billion. That would be split 50 percent to the Federal Government and 50 percent to the State of Alaska. As a consequence of that, it would give our engineers, our scientists, our technical people a great challenge to address new technology to make the footprint even smaller.

It has been estimated that if the oil is there, the development scenario can be accomplished in an area of less than 3,000 acres. The first estimate of this given a couple years ago was approximately 12,500 acres. Sometimes it is difficult to generate a comparison, but if one looks at the Dulles International Airport complex, that is about 12,500 acres, and a comparison would be if the State of Virginia was a wilderness. That is, I think, the picture that we can best use as an analogy to try to describe the vast distances associated with the Arctic and the realization that the footprint would be very, very insignificant.

Finally, Mr. President, I refer to an editorial in *Nation's Business* in November 1995. It is entitled "How Energy Policy and the Budget Intertwine." It reads:

Consider a situation in which the central government holds direct ownership of properties containing most of the resources critical to economic growth. It also controls access to vast additional areas holding still more of those resources.

This central government has adopted policies that in effect block the country's citizens from using such materials even as their availability from other sources declines.

The nation fitting this description is the United States. The federal government owns one-third of the lands that hold most of the remaining reserves of oil, natural gas, timber, low-sulfur coal, gold, silver, other minerals, and timber. In addition, our government controls the outer continental shelf (OCS), the undersea area extending from three to 100 miles off the East, Gulf, and West coasts.

Federal lands, notably the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR), and areas under federal jurisdiction, notably the OCS, contain vast reserves of oil and natural gas. But national policy has been to keep those resources locked up, and the nation's depend-

ence on imports continues to grow as domestic production declines.

The United States now relies on imports for more than half of the crude oil it consumes, and much of that comes from countries with long records of political instability. Within 20 years, imports will represent 60 percent of domestic consumption. Given such dependence, even a slight drop in the supply from overseas could inflict severe economic harm.

The consequences of excessive reliance on imports were starkly demonstrated in the 1970s, when foreign manipulation of supplies and prices caused economic disruptions that continued into the next decade.

There are, however, grounds for optimism that the nation will not be held hostage to political events in the oil-exporting nations. Congress is considering legislation to permit exploration for oil and natural gas in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and development of sites deemed productive. With a membership far more attuned to economic realities than its predecessors, this Congress might be the one that adopts the rational energy policies the country has long needed.

Environmentalists are predictably sounding alarms that ANWR development would destroy vast areas of pristine natural beauty. The facts show otherwise. The refuge consists of 19 million acres, and the development "footprint"—the visible results of development—would affect 15,000 acres, one-twelfth of 1 percent.

Oil exploration and production activity would be limited to the coastal plain area, which is by no means a pristine sanctuary but contains, among other things, abandoned military bases. Even then, the footprint would affect only 1 percent of the designated coastal area.

Advances in oil-production technology, such as horizontal drilling, would further minimize the environmental impact. Horizontal drilling, with pipes stemming underground from a single pad, sharply reduces the number of traditional oil rigs needed to produce from a wide area.

Given the economic necessity of developing the nation's oil reserves and the negligible environmental consequences, the proposal to open a relatively tiny portion of the ANWR should command broad support in Congress—broad enough to override the veto that has been threatened by President Clinton because of pressure from environmentalists.

There is an additional benefit from opening that small portion of the ANWR: The federal government would realize \$1.3 billion in oil royalties over seven years, money that would help achieve the goal of a balanced federal budget.

The revenue potential of resource development on other government-owned and/or government-controlled lands in one that should be taken into consideration as Congress seeks ways to achieve its goal of a balanced budget by 2002. Such land use not only could help meet crucial resource needs but also could help achieve a fiscal policy that would provide a tremendous boost to the economy generally.

Although the federal government holds the legal title to one-third of U.S. lands the key to offshore resources, the officials who make up that government have failed in the past to recognize that they were actually trustees and that ultimate ownership and control was held by the American people.

Those people want wise use of their properties. Such use includes preservation where warranted and economic utilization where that is warranted.

A Congress under new management appears to be aware of that distinction. The president should also grasp it.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, the last item I want to submit for the RECORD is a letter dated November 10, 1995, to the President of the United States from Mr. George Duff, president of the Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

GREATER SEATTLE
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
November 10, 1995.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce continues its support to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge's (ANWR) Coastal Plain to environmentally responsible oil and gas exploration, development and production. The Advanced technologies of the oil companies have proven that opening ANWR would be environmentally safe and wouldn't endanger wildlife habitat. In 1987 after extensive examination of this issue the Chamber adopted a formal position supporting the opening of ANWR.

The Chamber believes that national security and economic stability depend on sufficient ongoing quantities of domestic oil production. Increased domestic oil production minimizes the possibility of economic disruption due to dependence on foreign oil and decreases the nation's trade deficit.

The Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce urges you to approve the federal budget bill containing a provision to open ANWR's Coastal Plain to oil and gas exploration and development.

Respectfully,

GEORGE DUFF,
President.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

TIME TO EVALUATE NAFTA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on last Thursday, Senator DORGAN, my friend from North Dakota, introduced a bill to assess the impact of the NAFTA to require further negotiation of certain provisions of the NAFTA and to provide for the withdrawal from the NAFTA unless certain conditions are met.

That bill is S. 1417. I am pleased to cosponsor the bill introduced last Thursday by my friend from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN. This bill calls for an evaluation of the effects of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, known as NAFTA, on the U.S. economy and work force. It is very