

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

timely, given the precipitous calls to expand NAFTA further. I share Senator DORGAN's suspicions, supported by the initial data, that U.S. participation in NAFTA may not have benefited the United States and, in fact, may have harmed the economy of the United States.

I did not vote for NAFTA. I do not regret having voted against it.

The U.S. trade deficit with our NAFTA partners, Canada and Mexico, reached \$16.7 billion in just the first 6 months of 1995. In 1993, before NAFTA, the United States had a small trade surplus with Mexico. Given the rule of thumb that each net export of \$1 billion in goods creates 16,500 jobs, a trade deficit of \$16.7 billion therefore translates roughly into 275,500 U.S. jobs lost as a result of NAFTA.

To be sure, the Mexican peso crisis earlier this year is partly to blame for the sudden shifts in trade with Mexico. With the devaluation of the peso, Mexican exports to the United States are cheaper than ever, while Mexican citizens can no longer afford to purchase U.S.-made products.

The Treasury Secretary's report to Congress for August 1995 indicates that consumer good imports in Mexico fell 29 percent in the first quarter of 1995 and 49 percent in the second quarter of 1995, compared to 1994. Unemployment and underemployment in Mexico grew from 4.5 million in the first half of 1994 to 7 million in the first half of 1995; only employment rates in the low-wage, export-oriented maquiladora sector increased—only in that one sector. Additionally, the number of workers in Mexico who earned less than the Mexican minimum wage rose to almost 11 percent of the work force in May 1995. Decreasing already low wages only encourages further job flight from the United States to Mexico.

Passage of NAFTA was supposed to be in recognition of Mexico's strong economic performance over the last decade. But the economic crisis this year suggests that Mexico was not ready to participate in a "predictable commercial framework for business planning and investment," as NAFTA purported. The Mexican crisis has also pointed out some flaws in the NAFTA that Senator DORGAN's bill attempts to correct. NAFTA must be renegotiated in order to correct for large trade deficits; it must be corrected to adjust for currency distortions; and it must be adjusted to prevent unfair displacement of agricultural products. These changes will help to make this flawed agreement less disadvantageous to the United States.

Additionally, Mr. President, Senator DORGAN's bill requires a number of certifications from the President and members of his Cabinet regarding a number of issues. These certifications provide a review of NAFTA and its effects on the U.S. economy and its effect on U.S. workers. They include issues like job losses and gains, U.S. purchasing power, trade flows, environ-

mental and safety standards, the drug trade, and democratic reforms in Mexico. These are reasonable standards by which to measure the costs and benefits of continued U.S. participation in NAFTA. If NAFTA is not providing all the benefits that its sponsors promised, we should know that and we should act accordingly, even to the extent of withdrawing from an agreement that does not meet our needs. We certainly should not consider expanding this agreement until we have concluded that it provides more good than harm.

Mr. President, I congratulate my colleague, Mr. DORGAN, on his foresight in introducing this legislation. I am glad to be a cosponsor of it. I hope that it will receive the careful consideration of the Senate and that the Senate will act accordingly in view of the needs for action.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, was leaders' time reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

#### THE MONEY TRAIN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, thousands of concerned citizens all across America are now joining the chorus of voices speaking out against an entertainment industry that too often glorifies mindless violence, and peddles its harmful wares relentlessly to our children. These citizens understand, as I do, that images of senseless violence—repeated over and over again and showing murder in ever more graphic detail—debase our culture and affect people's attitudes and conduct, especially the attitudes and conduct of our impressionable young.

Regrettably, a shocking incident reported in today's New York Daily News, New York Post, and New York Times seems to confirm the accuracy of this observation.

This past Sunday, two men squirted a bottle of flammable liquid into a token booth at a subway station in Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant neighborhood. They then lit a match, igniting an inferno that blew the token booth apart and sprayed broken glass and splintered wood throughout the subway station. Trapped inside the token booth at the time of the explosion was its operator, 50-year-old Harry Kaufman, who miraculously survived with his life but who nonetheless suffered second- and third-degree burns over nearly 80 percent of his body. Mr. Kaufman normally works only weeknights, but made the fateful deci-

sion to work the overtime shift on Sunday because he was trying to save money to send his son to college.

This incident—committed by two men whose depravity is beyond description—is remarkably similar to incidents depicted in a new movie called "The Money Train," produced by Columbia Pictures. Although I have not personally seen "The Money Train"—and after Sunday's subway attack I have no intention of patronizing it—the movie apparently contains two scenes that occurred nearly identical to the one that occurred in Brooklyn on Sunday. In the movie, a pyromaniac named "Torch" squirts flammable liquid through the slot in the token booth and then ignites the booth. Unlike Mr. Kaufman, the fictional token-booth operator escapes unscathed from the ensuing explosion.

Are "The Money Train" scenes and the real-life tragedy in Brooklyn just a coincidence? Perhaps. But, apparently, this is not the view of New York City Police Commissioner William Bratton, who says, "There seems to be some connection between the movie and the explosions." Or as Alan Kiepper, the head of New York's Transit Authority, points out: "We know from experience that when you get movie and television depictions of criminal activity, it is often copycatted."

Copycat or no copycat, the individuals who committed this unspeakable act must be held accountable for their crimes. We are all responsible for our own actions. To say that a movie caused this senseless act in Brooklyn gives it a logic and dignity it does not deserve and cannot have. There can be no excuses for criminal behavior, whatever the motivation may or may not be.

But, at the same time, those who work in Hollywood's corporate suites must also be willing to accept their share of the blame. For those in the entertainment industry, who too often engage in pornography or violence as a way to sell movie tickets, it is time for some serious soul-searching. Is this how they want to make their livelihoods? Is this their contribution to society?

Those who continue to deny that cultural messages can and do bore deep into the hearts and minds of our young people are deceiving themselves and ignoring reality. They are ignoring what happened this past June when a group of teenagers killed a Massachusetts man claiming they were natural born killers. And, yes, they are ignoring the senseless act that occurred this past Sunday morning in Brooklyn.

In fact, news reports indicate that transit authority officials had reviewed "The Money Train" script before the movie was filmed and had objected to the token-booth arson scenes. The film's producers decided to create the scenes anyway—on Los Angeles soundstages. We may never know the true impact of this decision.

Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to convey my thoughts and