

are generating in revenues is about \$160 billion. Yet, our interest on the accumulated \$4.9 trillion is somewhere in the area of \$350 billion.

You do not have to be an accountant to know that if your interest costs on the outstanding principal that you owe are more in each year and each year you are increasing that by an added debt in the area of \$160 billion, sooner or later you are going to pay the piper, and you are going to pay the piper through the consequences of a loss of confidence in America's monetary system. That lack of confidence is going to be triggered by too much debt. It happened in Central America, it happened in South America, it happened in Europe, and it will happen in the United States if we do not address a meaningful balanced budget.

So as we look at the crucial times ahead, Mr. President, I do not know what we are going to have to do to catch the attention of the administration to get real about this process. Otherwise, we are going to pay the piper. There is a member of my staff whose wife is expecting a baby in April. That child will come into this world with a share of debt in the area of about \$157,000.

Multiply that per capita in the United States—what are we going to do, simply leave a legacy of debt? We must take the medicine now. We must address the hard decisions now. Otherwise, it is simply going to be too late. I wonder if it is not too late now. If we extend the debt ceiling when we come back sometime in the future and we do not have a commitment for a real balanced budget, we are doing a tremendous disservice to the citizens of this Nation.

As a consequence, Mr. President, I think it is time that we go home and reflect on the significance of this crisis. This is very real. Talk to our constituents about the ramifications and share with them the dilemma that is going to be facing us when we come back and we are asked to increase the accumulated debt, the authorized debt, beyond \$4.9 trillion. When the only leverage we have is to suggest it should not be done, it is irresponsible to increase that until we have a commitment for a balanced budget. Only when we achieve a balanced budget can we begin to address that 4.9 trillion dollars' worth of debt, and every Member of this body knows it, but not every Member of this body or the House of Representatives is prepared to take the action. That is where we are today.

#### POLICY AND POLITICS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, another matter I bring before this body concerns the policy and politics related to mining law reform. As chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, I have been working with Senator CRAIG and other members of the committee to craft a mining bill that is realistic, that is responsive to change.

Many know that the 1872 mining law has been a topic of debate in this body for many years. My good friend from Arkansas has spent many hours suggesting reform. The environmentalists continue to cry for reform. This year in an effort to enact a responsible reform we included several mining law provisions in the budget reconciliation package.

What did we send to the President? Specifically, for the first time in history, I repeat, for the first time in history, we required miners to pay a 5-percent royalty. For the first time in history, miners were required to pay a fair market value for patented land, and for the first time in history patented lands used for nonmining purposes would revert back to the Federal Government. Patented land would have to be used for mining. If the land was used for non-mining purposes it would revert back to the Federal Government.

For the first time in history we established an abandoned mines land fund to start the process of cleaning up the old abandoned mines and try and address abuses that had taken place in the past.

We maintained the existing \$100 per claim fee for 3 years and doubled the fees to \$200 per fee starting in 1999. The Congressional Budget Office score over 7 years was approximately \$157 million. This is significant reform.

What happened to the proposal, Mr. President? The President vetoed the reconciliation package. What is the administration's proposal? Pretty hard to get a feel for what they have in mind. Secretary Babbitt, continues to demand mining law reform, yet he does not offer a specific solution. In fact, the administration has failed to submit a comprehensive mining law reform proposal this year.

Now, let me read some comments made by the administration on mining law reform. "This process has gone from distasteful to obscene. We support common sense reform that gets the taxpayers a fair return. Congress could and should act quickly to end this travesty." Secretary Babbitt, December 1, 1995.

Second: "The idea that we are backing off of mining reform, grazing law reform, is just nonsense. We are totally committed to changing the current policy." This was Vice President GORE, May 10, 1993.

Further: "Just recently, a law on the books since 1872 that I am trying hard to change, forced the government to sell minerals worth \$1 billion." President Clinton, November 4, 1995.

By reading these quotes one would think the White House wants action on mining law reform. There is an old saying around here, "actions speak louder than words." In this case I can assure my colleagues we have had no action on mining law reform from the administration this year. What we have had, Mr. President, is a lot of words. There is another old saying around here, "What is good for the goose is good for

the gander." I guess it depends on who is the goose and who is the gander.

In today's Washington Times there is a very interesting and revealing editorial about Vice President GORE and Secretary Babbitt. Apparently the Vice President's family has an interest in mining property in Tennessee, a family interest I am sure—nothing wrong with a family having an investment in mining property. According to the Washington Times the Vice President or his family receives a 4-percent net royalty from minerals mined on their land.

I find this interesting because Secretary Babbitt has been pushing for a gross royalty as high as 12.5 percent. As everybody knows, I support mining in the United States. I am pleased that the Vice President and his family are in the mining business. What troubles me is this administration continues to demand a gross royalty for miners while the Vice President receives a royalty based on net. I agree with the Washington Times, if a net royalty is good enough for the Vice President, why is it not good enough for the Secretary of Interior Babbitt?

We can take this process one step further. The Vice President apparently supports exploration and development when it benefits his personal interest, yet he opposes it almost everywhere else, particularly on public land, and certainly in my State of Alaska. He opposes logging in the Tongass, he opposes exploration and development of the Arctic, including ANWR, for oil and gas.

Mr. President, what is the difference between mining and oil and gas production? Both are producing something from Mother Earth, providing a return, reducing our dependence on imported resources. It appears to be a rather inconsistent policy, Mr. President.

I think it is appropriate that the Washington Times has highlighted this because the Vice President is known as a champion of the environment. We appreciate his contribution to the environment, however, we are troubled by his strong opposition to oil and gas exploration, mining exploration, logging, grazing, and any other development of our natural resources. Yet here we have a personal interest reflected on the families' ownership of the lead and zinc mine that the Vice President and his family have in the State of Tennessee which has been highlighted in the Washington Times article.

That is why I question, Mr. President, what is good for the goose is good for the gander.

Mr. President, a good deal of this is about politics. The administration sees the environment as a political issue, and they will go to any means to exploit it. We have seen the President's remarks—protect the environment. Many of the issues are not environmental. They are jobs issues. Are we going to have blue collar jobs in this country in our timber industry, in our mining industry, in our grazing industry, in our oil and gas industry? Or are

we going to continue to be dependent to an ever increasing degree on imports? We seem to be importing resources and exporting jobs.

Currently, over 51 percent of our crude oil consumption comes from imported oil. The Secretary of Energy has just come out with a forecast that is truly alarming because it suggests that this is going to increase dramatically in the coming years.

I note for the RECORD in the "Inside Energy/with Federal Lands," of January 22, 1996, a statement from the Secretary of Energy Secretary O'Leary decrying the deficiency budget. She says an oil crisis is "imminent." That is a pretty strong statement.

Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary last week predicted that an oil crisis is "imminent," and called on Congress [this body] to help prepare for it by shifting resources from fossil energy r&d to energy efficiency and renewable energy r&d.

O'Leary, speaking to reporters Tuesday, reiterated concerns about a possible oil crisis stated earlier in the day by Joseph Romm, DOE's Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. . . .

"It's pretty clear there's going to be another oil crisis. I would say, in the next 10 years," Romm said. . . .

O'Leary agreed with Romm, adding, "with the trajectory Congress has us on, we're not allowed to intervene with new technology."

I find that very revealing. It further reads:

"Any interruption in the Persian Gulf or pipeline failures could lead to supply disruptions."

Comparing the situation to the blizzard that afflicted East Coast cities earlier this month, O'Leary said, "I see crisis imminent and something we better take care of."

Asked what DOE could do to avert it, O'Leary responded that the department is "beginning to pull away from the traditional energy supply, shave some resources from unnecessary national security programs and high-tech nuclear programs, and put that effort to deploying energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies. . . .

That sounds great. Some of it is attainable, but not all of it. There are not enough renewable energy resources out there. Yes, we can increase energy efficiency. But to suggest we are moving our focus over there from increasing energy supplies to alternatives is simply unrealistic, and anybody who is in the energy business, having to supply this country with energy, will tell you, "It just ain't so."

"Romm predicted that soon"—and this is the bottom line, and I will urge all my colleagues to reflect on it because one of these days it is going to come around and bite you, it will bite each one of us, because the public is going to say, Where was Congress? Why did Congress not do something to avert this crisis of curtailing a supply of crude oil into the United States?

Romm predicted that soon the Persian Gulf region's percentage of the oil market will surpass its highest level ever, which was 67 percent in 1974. That percentage, he said, "likely will go over 70 percent."

There are solutions to the problem, and the three that are proposed by the

Department of Energy suggest the following: Raise the price of oil, make it scarcer; add to the burden of the family budget, the Northeast corridor that depends on oil for heating. What is that going to do for inflation, Mr. President? They suggest one of the answers is raise the price of oil. Is that not a bureaucratic answer to a shortage? You raise the price. Put in place regulations to increase fuel economy—there is nothing wrong with that, but you can only go so far—and try to improve fuel efficiency technology. We have done that dramatically in our automobiles.

The indication here is that the administration is taking all three of these approaches, but they blame Congress for opposing all three. We do not oppose all three but we are being realistic.

It is interesting, spokesman Romm "downplayed the effect that opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas drilling would have on reducing oil imports. More oil would be saved by implementing DOE's efficiency and renewable energy programs than would be generated by ANWR, he said," if it was opened.

The inconsistency there, and what he does not tell you, is that Prudhoe Bay has been supplying this Nation with nearly 25 percent of its total crude oil production for the last 25 years. That field is in decline. As I have said, currently we are importing 51 percent of our total crude oil. As Prudhoe Bay declines, if we do not find more domestic reserves, we are simply going to import more. It is going to come into this country in foreign vessels, so we are not going to have our U.S. maritime fleet as we have currently in the movement of Alaskan oil which requires that all that oil be moved in U.S. tankers with U.S. crews.

So here we have a situation where, as Prudhoe Bay declines, if we do not find more domestic oil, if we do not look for it in the most likely place where it is likely to be, and that is, the geologists tell us, in the Arctic, we are simply going to be exporting more of our dollars and more of our jobs overseas.

We hear a lot about the deficit balance of payments. That means we spend more than other nations spend buying from us. Half of it is made up in the cost of imported oil. So I find it extraordinary at this time that we have a dire prediction that we are facing an oil crisis and the only alternative that we pursue is greater efficiency and renewable energy and do not prioritize increased domestic production.

This administration is selling America short. America has the technology. America has the engineering know-how to develop oil reserves in those delicate areas and do it safely. We have proven that time and time again.

The difficulty we have in my State of Alaska is we happen to be a new kid on the block. We have only been a State for 38 years. We are trying to develop our land patterns. The rest of the

States did it 100 years ago, Virginia 200 years ago. Prudhoe Bay is the best oil field in the world. Endicott was the 10th largest producing field when it came on line. Now it is the seventh. The footprint is 56 acres. That is the technology we have in industry. If we are allowed to go into ANWR, it will generate \$1.3 billion for the Federal Treasury resulting from those lease sales. Developing the 1002 area could provide nearly 700,000 jobs during the life of the field throughout the country. We do not make pipe in Alaska. We do not make valves. We do not make all the seals, all the things that go into the development. We get these supplies throughout the United States and this means jobs. And the industry says they can do it in 2,000 acres.

What does ANWR consist of? It consists of 19 million acres. Out of that 19 million, 8 million acres have been set aside as wilderness. The rest of it is in refuge, leaving 1.5 million that Congress set aside for determination to be made of whether to allow exploration. Out of that 1.5 million acres only 2,000 acres would see a footprint.

Think of the jobs in this country. Think of the dollars generated. If we lose this opportunity, Mr. President, indeed our only alternative will be to increase oil imports of oil coming in foreign vessels and the export of U.S. jobs and the export of dollars.

So, as we look at the situation in general, and this administrations attitude towards development of public lands, I think we have, indeed, a political situation. This administration sees these issues, and certainly the environmental community does, as causes—causes for membership, causes for more dollars coming in. Because the American people cannot go up and see Prudhoe Bay, see the advances that have been made in the Arctic, see what we have done to increase the caribou herds in the central Arctic that were 3,000 or 4,000, and are now over 20,000.

So, unfortunately, in their efforts to win political points, this Administration is destroying our natural resource industries. These industries have been significantly reduced—driving jobs overseas and increasing our balance of payments deficit.

So, indeed, it is about politics—not policy. I hope my colleagues will see through the smokescreen.

The editorial, which I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD, is about the Vice President's mine, and his interest in that mine. I encourage my colleagues to read the editorial. If it is good enough for the Vice President, it ought to be good enough for the rest of the Nation's miners.

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

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 25, 1996]

BRUCE BABBITT AS GOLD DIGGER

Vice President Al Gore can afford to worry about whether Earth's in the balance. He has a zinc mine at home in Carthage, Tenn., that keeps his checkbook in balance. He gets a

\$20,000 check every year based on a 4 percent net royalty on the value of the minerals mined on the Gores' property.

Now it may seem a little hypocritical for an environmentalist like Mr. Gore to profit so handsomely from a nasty old industry like mining. But the question for the moment is, if the deal is good enough for Mr. Gore, why isn't it good enough for Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt.

For months now, Mr. Babbitt and congressional Republicans have been arguing over plans to reform the infamous 1872 Mining Law as part of the overall budget reconciliation package. The law provides, among other things, that mining companies can get title to government lands for as little as \$2.50 an acre and then mine the minerals without paying royalties.

That doesn't mean the government collects nothing from the operation. Mining companies pay income taxes, company shareholders pay taxes on dividends, and company employees pay taxes on their wages. Such taxes make the government a partner in almost any business enterprise, including mining.

Mr. Babbitt, however, seems to want a gross royalty of 4 percent or higher, a demand to which even the formerly Democrat-controlled Congress would not agree. One says "seems" because it's not clear exactly what percentage he wants. An Interior Department spokesman this week could not provide a figure.

Republicans propose to make companies pay a 5 percent net royalty as well the fair-market value of the land. The 5 percent figure happens to be a percentage point higher than what Mr. Gore gets, but it's not good enough for Mr. Babbitt. A net royalty is "riddled with loopholes," he says. Mr. Babbitt means the kind of loopholes that allow business to deduct the cost of their expenses before paying taxes.

Again, the business dealings of the Gore family are instructive here. So eager were the Gores to capitalize on the assets of Mother Earth that they actually sued the company mining the family farm for cheating it out of royalty payments. It seems that although the company had paid royalties on zinc mined there, it had failed to pay appropriate royalties on the germanium ore it dug up. Arbitrators sided with the Gores.

"My attorney proposed an accounting methodology," the vice president's father said in 1992, "which the arbitrators accepted, to determine the value of germanium produced: Take value of germanium produced from the ore and deduct refining costs, insurance, freight and other charges. That's not difficult accounting." No it's not.

It can cost millions, perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars, to discover, explore and ultimately develop a mine. Refusal to permit companies the same kind of deductions on government lands that the Gores agreed to on their land is simply another way to shut down mining there. That may be what Mr. Babbitt wants, but employees and towns and schools who directly or indirectly depend on mining jobs don't have the luxury of hand-outs from Washington.

There's plenty of "gold" to be had from the Republican mining reform proposal. It would raise an estimated \$157 million in federal revenues. But Mr. Babbitt needn't take Republicans' word when it comes to mining income. All he has to do is ask the Gores.

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

I see another of my colleagues on the floor. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Utah is recognized.

#### DRUG-RELATED CHILD ABUSE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is becoming difficult to open a newspaper without reading another horrifying story of drug-related child abuse.

From Brooklyn, we learn of Elisa Izquierdo, the 6-year-old girl who was born to a crack addicted mother. Elisa's mother allegedly beat her to death, leaving New York's public welfare agencies to engage in the usual finger pointing. [New York Times, Nov. 28, 1995]

In suburban Chicago, a woman and two children are brutally murdered by a trio that includes a convicted drug dealer high on crack. [Time, Dec. 4, 1995].

In Patterson New Jersey, a crack-addicted woman beats her 14-year-old daughter with a three-foot board with a nail protruding, after a dispute over dirty dishes. [New York Times, Dec. 6]

To most of us, horrifying incidents like these seem nearly unimaginable. They demonstrate the incredible dangers of drugs like crack cocaine—drugs so addictive that they could actually impel a mother to kill her own child.

These may be extreme cases, but they are instructive because they represent the extreme end of the kind of pressures facing young people today.

Indeed, sometimes it almost seems to me as if our culture is dedicated to separating children from their innocence. A recent Carnegie Foundation report put it this way:

Barely out of childhood, young people ages 10 to 14 are today experiencing more freedom, autonomy, and choice than ever at a time when they still need special nurturing, protection, and guidance. Without the sustained involvement of parents and other adults in safeguarding their welfare, young adolescents are at risk of harming themselves and others. [Report of the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development.]

Lately, the harm referred to in the Carnegie report has been taking the form of increased drug use. A few numbers tell the story:

Last year the number of 12- to-17 year-olds using marijuana hit 2.9 million, almost double the 1992 level [National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, Nov. 1995].

LSD use is way up among high-school seniors—11.7 percent of the class of 1995 have tried it at least once. That is the highest rate since recordkeeping started in 1975. [Monitoring the Future Study, released Dec. 11, 1995]

A parents' group survey released this November found that 1 in 3 high school seniors now smoke marijuana [Survey released Nov. 2, 1995 by Parents Resource Institute for Drug Education].

Unbelievably, another survey shows that young people are more likely to be aware of the health dangers of cigarettes than of the dangers of marijuana [May 1995 survey by Frank Luntz].

As I said, kids have it rough today. They are faced with adult choices at an ever-earlier age, as the culture surrounds them with hedonistic messages. And it bothers me, frankly, when I read that sometimes our mass media, our educators, and our public officials are making things even worse.

Take the recent advent of rap and hip hop music, a kind of music that enjoys great popularity among young people. A lot of hip hop music is perfectly unobjectionable, although I have to admit it is not what I listen to.

But take a look at these lyrics by the hip hop group Total Devastation and tell me if you hear what I hear—kids as young as 10 being encouraged to take drugs. Chart No. 1 reads:

When it comes to puffing blunts [blunts are a kind of marijuana cigarette] I'm a 12-year vet.

And I wasn't 10 yet when I took my first hit. I was headed out the house to school one day,

And guess what I found in my dad's ashtray

Now there's only three things in life that I need

Money, safe sex, and a whole lot of weed. Total Devastation, "Many Clouds of Smoke"]

If my colleagues believe that this is an isolated phenomenon, let me quote from some other songs. This is "Hits From the Bong," by the group Cypress Hill. Chart No. 2 reads:

Pick it, pack it, fire it up,  
Come along, take a hit from the bong. . . .

[Cypress Hill, Black Sunday, Hits From the Bong]

Of course, for those of you who have led sheltered lives, a bong is a plastic pipe used for smoking marijuana. This is what our kids get hit with every day.

This last chart has an excerpt from a No. 4 hit song by performers known as "Channel Live" and "KRS One". Chart No. 3 reads:

Wake up in the mornin' got the yearning for herb

Which loosens up the nouns, metaphors and verbs

And adjectives ain't it magic, kid

What I'm kickin'

Multiflower bags and seeds for the pickin'. . . .

[Group: Channel Live and KRS One; Song: "Mad Izm"]

This is not just talk, either. The author of this hit song told High Times magazine: "I love marijuana." "Anything that gives a good feeling the youth are going to gravitate towards. Period. Drugs are part of the human experience." [High Times, May 1995, p. 66]

From Atlanta we get the Black Crowes, known for unfurling large banners on stage emblazoned with a marijuana leaf and bearing the words "Free Us." Crowes lead singer Chris Robinson explained to a reporter: "Everybody in this band smokes weed. . . . We did 350 shows, smoked every night, and never got busted." [Hartford Courant, Mar. 12, 1993]

If you think it is easy to do something about this stuff, think again. Baltimore deejay Marcel Thornton lost his job after he stopped playing songs like "First of the Month," by Bone Thugs-N-Harmony, a song which according to the Washington Post talks about "getting high and selling crack to welfare recipients." [Washington Post, Dec. 2, 1995]

According to the Post, Thornton, who attended the Million Man March,