

As I said, I didn't support fast-track authority for President Clinton. I don't support it for President Bush. What I support is for this country to be hard-nosed, to have a backbone, some nerve, some will, and to insist with China, Japan, Europe, Canada, Mexico, and others that we want trade agreements that are fair to American producers and to American workers. If the trade agreements are not fair, then they ought not be made. I know my colleague from New Mexico is waiting. Let me make a final comment to describe the circumstances. If I might ask if my time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERRY). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me describe the last big trade debate before the vote on GATT; it was NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement. Is there anybody left in this Chamber who thinks that made any sense? We were promised 350,000 new jobs in a study that all of the business interests held up to say look at how great this is going to be. We passed the NAFTA trade agreement, and we turned a trade surplus with Mexico into a huge growing deficit very quickly. We turned a deficit with Canada that was not so awfully large into one that was very large.

So NAFTA—the U.S. trade agreement with Canada and Mexico—turned both of these trade relationships into huge deficits. How can that be in this country's interest? We were told, well, the situation with Mexico will be simple. We will be the beneficiaries of the products of low-wage, low-skilled labor from Mexico. Guess what the three largest imports from Mexico are to the United States? Automobiles, automobile parts, and electronics. All are the products of high-skilled labor—all of them.

In fact, those who sold us on NAFTA were dead wrong. I am hoping if we ever have a debate on trade promotion authority—which I hope we can defeat—that we can hear from some of the same folks who extolled the virtues of a trade agreement that was so bad for this country and American producers and workers. My point is, I don't want a harmful trade agreement to happen again. We have done the United States-Canada free trade agreement, NAFTA, and GATT, all of which led to bigger and bigger trade deficits year by year. The trade deficit has grown to \$452 billion. Every day, over \$1.5 billion more in goods are coming into this country than we are able to export. No country will long remain a strong economic enterprise if it sees its manufacturing base dissipating. That is exactly what is happening as a result of these trade deficits.

My point is that the House can have another celebration at the end of this

week if they pass trade promotion authority, but they should not think it is going to happen quickly in this Congress. I and others will steadfastly oppose trade promotion authority in the Senate.

What I want is negotiators who might decide to put on a uniform. We send people to the Olympics with uniforms. They actually wear a jersey that says "USA." It would be nice to have a trade negotiator put on a jersey so they understand who they are representing when they get behind closed doors in a negotiating room, and it would be nice if the next agreement is fair to this country, fair to our producers, and fair to our workers. It has been a long time. I hope we might see that in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

#### RAILROAD RETIREMENT

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I want to speak for a few minutes on the main legislation that is pending before the Senate, the Railroad Retirement and Survivors Act of 2001. The procedures that we follow in the Senate sometimes obfuscate or make it impossible to determine exactly what it is we are debating. We have so many different issues that we are debating all at the same time. I wanted to bring the focus of the Senate back for a minute to the main issue that we should be debating, and that is the pending railroad retirement legislation.

There is an amendment that has been offered to the railroad retirement legislation by Senator LOTT, and it involves an effort to pass the House-passed energy bill, H.R. 4, and also an effort to have the Senate on record on the issue of so-called therapeutic cloning. Someone might ask, How do therapeutic cloning and an energy bill relate to each other, and how do those two items happen to be related to railroad retirement?

Well, there is no relationship. Essentially, what we are going to decide shortly after 5 o'clock is, Are we in fact going to pursue passage of this railroad retirement bill and keep these extraneous matters to the side so they can be dealt with under different circumstances, with full debate, later in this Congress, or are we going to get sidetracked and essentially get off track on dealing with railroad retirement?

It is very important, in my view, that we deal with railroad retirement. This is the opportunity, this is the chance we have. There are 74 cosponsors. I know that has been mentioned several times on the floor. I am one of those cosponsors. This legislation did pass the House of Representatives by 384 votes in favor, 33 against. While clearly I respect the rights of colleagues to express the concerns and interests of other Senators in bringing other matters forward, I think it is high time we went ahead and passed

this bill and sent it to the President. A great deal has changed since we began providing benefits to railroad employees back in the 1930s. We have tried to update this retirement system to reflect some of the changes in the cost of living and lifespans of former employees and their spouses.

Several years ago, Congress told the railroad companies and the unions to sit down and work out their differences on this legislation so that we could get a set of proposals that Congress could consider.

This bill—the railroad retirement bill before us today—is the product of those negotiations. It deserves our attention and our support. The country owes a great deal of the growth and dominance we have had in the industrial and agricultural sectors to the railroad industry and to the employees of that industry. We need to be sure that these men and women receive retirement and disability benefits to reflect what they have accomplished, what they have done for this country.

This legislation tries to allow those employees with 30 years of employment in the industry to retire at age 60 without a reduction of their benefits. It would also provide the surviving spouse of a railroad worker with a benefit that appreciates the cost of maintaining a household and is not cut in half when the first spouse dies. Under current law, a widow or widower receives half of their tier 2 annuity, which, in most cases, will not be enough to pay for the basic necessities of life.

This legislation also allows current railroad employees to have their retirement benefits vested after 5 years rather than after 10 years, which is the current law.

Finally, the legislation repeals the maximum benefit ceiling that is currently in place and allows the amount of benefit to be based solely on the existing formula of the highest 2 years of income over the past 10 years.

These are reasonable changes, they are fair changes. I believe very strongly we should in these final days of this first session of the 107th Congress pass this bill. We should send it to the President for his signature, and we should resist the efforts we are seeing in this Chamber today to bog this down by attaching other very controversial legislation by the amendment process.

I hope cloture will be invoked on the amendment that Senator LOTT has offered and that it can be withdrawn. We can then proceed to vote on the railroad retirement bill and pass it and have that one piece of very constructive legislation sent to the President before the week is out.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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. DAYTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### EXPLORATION FOR OIL AND GAS IN THE ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong opposition to exploration and drilling for oil and gas in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, or ANWR, region of Alaska. On two occasions, I have visited this remote and rugged wilderness region. In the summer of 1996, my then-16-year-old son Eric and I joined my good friend, Will Steger, an internationally renowned Arctic explorer, and two other men, on a two-week expedition in the Brooks Mountain Range of ANWR.

On the evening of June 30, we pitched our tents on the icy tongue of an enormous glacier. The next morning, we awoke to find ourselves in a snowstorm. We trekked through fresh snow above our knees through near-white out conditions to the top of the Continental Divide. Then we slid down the other side, frequently using our backpacks as toboggans and our boot heels as runners. It was an adventure I will always remember.

The northern slope of this mountain range initially resembled a lunar landscape. Giant boulders and other, smaller rocks covered the surface, which was otherwise devoid of plants and wildlife. As we continued, however, we reached the beginning of the grassy plains, which are the homes of millions of wildlife.

What impressed me most is how vast and untouched the ANWR region is. From the time we were dropped off by one bush pilot until the time we were picked up 2 weeks later by another, we encountered only one other group of human beings. For the rest of our time, our companions were one bear, a few caribou, who had not moved on to the coastal plains, and several quadrillion mosquitoes. This region is totally untouched by human beings and by their industrial and technological intrusions. It is there for anyone and everyone who wish to encounter it on its terms, rather than on their own.

My second visit to the ANWR region occurred last March, at the invitation of my distinguished colleague, Senator FRANK MURKOWSKI of Alaska, who was then the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Senator JEFF BINGAMAN, then the ranking member and now the chairman of the same committee, and I joined Senator MURKOWSKI, along with Secretary of the Interior Gale Norton; Ms. Mary Matalin, special assistant to the Vice President; and several committee staff.

We flew first to Anchorage, where we were greeted by Alaska's Governor, Tony Knowles, a college classmate of mine, and other Alaskan government and business leaders who outlined to us the enormous economic importance of oil production to Alaska. We then flew to Valdez, the southern end of the

trans-Alaskan oil pipeline, where I gazed in awe at magnificent snow-covered mountains, which arose from sea level to encircle us, and viewed enormous oil tankers being carefully escorted into and out of their ports.

From there, we flew up to the Prudhoe Bay region on Alaska's northern coast, where about one and one-half million barrels of oil a day flow into the trans-Alaskan pipeline. After viewing some of the first drilling sites, we traveled to the nearby Alpine field, which is the newest and most technologically advanced of the Alaskan drilling operations. The Alpine field, which was only discovered in 1996, is located to the west of Prudhoe Bay, right on the coast of the Beaufort Sea. At 365 million barrels of recoverable reserves, it is one of the largest discoveries in the United States in recent years. We toured this very modern and technologically advanced facility, and I could not help but be impressed by the extensive efforts made to assure its safety of operation and its ecological compatibility. It was obviously built to be much more compact than the earlier operations, so as to leave a smaller "footprint" on the terrain. In fact, one of the Alaskan government officials, knowing that I come from Minnesota, had thoughtfully taken the time to investigate and discovered that the size of the Alpine complex was almost exactly the same as our famous shopping mall, the Mall of America. Alpine encompassed 97 acres, 1 acre smaller than Minnesota's mega-mall.

Our trip concluded with our final night in Barrow, AK, which is the northernmost town in our United States of America. We awoke Sunday morning, April 1, to an outdoor temperature of -35 degrees, which dropped to a -65 degrees, with the wind chill. I felt like an April Fool, as I walked the outdoor airport tarmac to our plane for our return flight.

This trip gave me an invaluable opportunity to see firsthand the region about which there has been so much debate in this Senate in recent months. I thank Senator MURKOWSKI for inviting me, while knowing that I was an announced opponent of oil exploration and drilling in ANWR. Yet he and our other Alaskan hosts were most respectful, as well as most persuasive, as they presented their case.

The debate over whether to open ANWR to oil and gas exploration and drilling pits two enormously important national interests against each other. One is our need to find and develop domestic energy resources. Much more is unknown than is known about the full extent of ANWR's oil reserves. The U.S. Geological Survey has produced a range of estimates of the amount of oil which is technically recoverable. Their mean estimate is 7.7 billion barrels.

As we were informed on our trip last March, the oil industry's proposal to drill for and extract these reserves involves the construction of up to 20 drilling complexes, each one approxi-

mately the size of Alpine, along the coastal plain of ANWR. Thus, the legislation which passed the House last summer permits 2,000 acres of ANWR's coastal plain to be open for oil drilling. However, as I understand the House version, these 2,000 acres are not limited to one area. Rather, the legislation permits what the oil industry described to us last March: a chain of up to 20 Alpine complexes connected by oil pipelines extending along the coastal plain for as far as discovered and recoverable oil reserves are found.

In my visualization, this enormous and vast industrial project would resemble 20 Mall of America-sized structures being built at various junctures along the coastline of this wilderness area. That, remember, is the size of one of these drilling facilities.

Now, for those who have not yet visited our Mall of America—and I certainly encourage you to do so—it is the largest shopping mall in North America and, perhaps, the world. Tourists fly into Minnesota from all over our country and from cities throughout the world to shop there. Each of its four quadrangular concourses extends for slightly more than a mile, and its four shopping levels rise to the height of a typical seven-to-eight-story building. Like Alpine, it is a relatively compact structure; however, it is by no means a small "footprint" on the landscape.

So, I ask myself, how would the construction of up to 20 of these Mall of America-sized drilling complexes, each one encompassing almost 100 acres, connected to one another by a large oil pipeline, which also must be built and maintained along this corridor—how would this affect a wildlife refuge, with its hundreds of thousands of migrating caribou, and all the other wildlife that has existed here in ecological balance for thousands of years without the intrusion and interference of all the rest of us?

I must conclude that, however well-designed and constructed, however carefully and safely operated, and however environmentally well-intended, this project could be, it will have an enormous and irrevocable impact upon the essential purpose for which ANWR was designated and for which it must be protected: as a National Wildlife Refuge. In fact, by its very definition, a national wildlife refuge area is antithetical to the 20 large and interconnected industrial complexes, which this oil drilling would entail. As such, a vote to permit oil drilling in ANWR is a vote for the destruction of ANWR.

I returned from my trip last March wondering if there was any way to reconcile these two choices: To develop domestic oil reserves and to protect this valuable national preserve. Upon reviewing the maps provided on our trip, I was surprised to notice for the first time a large region located to the west of Prudhoe Bay and Alpine, called the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. This area was scarcely mentioned during our visit to ANWR, and we visited none of it. Upon further research,