to the ANWR each year to give birth to their calves? How can we price the culture of the Gwich'in people who have been in northeast Alaska for 20,000 years? How can we price an entire ecosystem that is the life support of over 165 different species?

Mr. President, inclusion of the ANWR provision in our budget reconciliation plan is unacceptable. It is not fair to our children and future generations to come. I urge the conferees to drop this ill-advised antienvironment provision from the bill.●

SOCIAL ROULETTE

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the appropriate place.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1995]

SOCIAL ROULETTE

The spread of legalized gambling is the political issue that has yet to roar, but may do so soon—and should. In a decade, casino gambling has spread from two states to at least 35. Gambling is done on riverboats, on Indian reservations, in well-established downtowns. Native American tribes (including some that have rediscovered their existence for the primary purpose of setting up casinos) are the best publicized entrepreneurs in this field, partly because they can operate free of many regulations. Estimates on how much money is involved here are all over the lot, depending on what sorts of gambling are counted in, but a study by U.S. News & World Report concluded that counting state lotteries and the like, $330 billion was wagered legally in 1992, up 1,800 percent since 1976.

Rep. Frank Wolf (R–Va.), along with Sens. Paul Simon (D–Ill.) and Richard Lugar (R–Ind.), thinks the country ought to take a long look as it hurtles toward turning itself into one gigantic open town. They have introduced useful bills to create a national commission that would undertake, as Mr. Wolf puts it, ''an objective, credible and factual study of the effects of gambling'' on communities, including its impact on crime rates, political corruption and family life, and also to examine its economic costs and benefits.

Those pushing casinos into communities make large claims about their economic benefits, but the jobs and investment casinos create are rarely stacked up against the jobs lost and the investment and spending forgone in other parts of a local economy. The Commission's study could be of great use to communities pondering whether to wager their futures on roulette, slot machines and blackjack. The Wolf bill wants a report from the commission in three years; the Simon-Lugar bill wants it in half that time. We're inclined to think the quicker the better.

The ''gaming industry,'' as it calls itself, is fighting these proposals. One hopes that at next week's House Judiciary Committee hearing on the Wolf bill, gambling's representatives will be asked why they fear a national commission. If all their claims about gambling's beneficial effects are true, a commission would presumably verify them. If critics of gambling are wrong in seeing it as being linked to crime, corruption and social breakdown, the commission would presumably find that out too. Could it be that those with an interest in the spread of gambling fear what a fair study will find?

True to form, gambling now has its own trade association, and gambling interests—tribal and others—have stepped up their campaign contributions to both parties. To pick a few examples: Golden Nugget, the well-known Las Vegas casino, gave $230,000 in ''soft money'' to the Republican Party last year; Frank Fertitta Jr., chairman of Station Casinos Inc., also gave $230,000 to the GOP; the Mashantucket Pequot Tribe gave $365,000 to the Democrats in the 1993–94 election cycle and covered its bets with $100,000 to the Republicans in November of 1994.

The country is in the presence of a powerful and growing industry and an important social phenomenon. At the least, the federal government should help the country figure out what is going on, which is why what Mr. Wolf, Mr. Lugar and Mr. Simon are doing is so important.●

THE MILLION MAN MARCH

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the significance of the Million Man March in Washington will be debated a year from now, and perhaps then with greater understanding. But we should not wait a year to learn from it.

From my perspective there was both good and bad to the assemblage. The good included:

Hundreds of thousands—the latest estimate is 800,000—of African American men came to Washington to send a message to the Nation and to their black male counterparts. To the Nation the message of the gathering was simple: There is still too much racism and injustice. To other African American men: We must do better.

To have close to a million men as part of a demonstration and not have a single incident that called for police action is a tribute to participants and to those staging the event.

Those cleaning up the inevitable debris from such a huge gathering, I am told, found not a single beer can. These were men gathered for a mission, not a party.

The size of the crowd, coupled with the decision in the recent O.J. Simpson trial and the Rodney King episode, has the Nation talking about race more candidly, though the barriers of prejudice or embarrassment or awkwardness make candid talk between whites and blacks less common than it should be.

Inevitably, comparisons are made with the 1963 throng that Martin Luther King addressed. The 1963 gathering had these advantages over the recent gathering:

It was inclusive. It was a call for the Nation to come together. Both the crowd and the message were impressive. And partly as a result of that gathering, great strides were made against the cruder forms of segregation and injustice. In a brief message, Dr. King called upon all of us—across the barriers of race and sex and religion and ethnic background—to do better.

The anti-Jewish message that Minister Farrakhan has delivered—though not at this gathering—should be offensive to all thoughtful people.

I am old enough to have been part of the civil rights efforts of the 1950s and 1960s. The whites who were with us disproportionately in that struggle to secure opportunity for African Americans were not Lutheran, which I am, not Catholic, which my wife is, nor Methodist nor Presbyterian nor Baptist, but Jewish. The Jews have experienced centuries of discrimination, and rose in significant numbers in behalf of others discriminated against. It is ironic that people of little understanding but large ambition have mistakenly believed that you can build blacks up by tearing Jews down.

My son is a professional photographer. He took pictures at this event, and when one of the marchers saw his credentials and read the name ''Martin Simon,'' he asked my son: ''You're Jewish, aren't you?'' And not in a tone of pleasant inquiry. We are not Jewish, but what if we were? Should that make any difference?

In contrast to Martin Luther King, Minister Farrakhan delivered a lengthy speech with no coherence. He had an opportunity to ask the nation for two or three things of importance, but he muffled the opportunity. That he is a person of considerable ability, no one can question. Like all of us, he can grow in the future—away from some of his prejudices. He accurately sensed the dissatisfaction level among African American men. The 1963 gathering will be remembered for the huge crowd and the message. The 1995 gathering will be remembered for the huge crowd.

One other concern: The anti-white and anti-Jewish inflammatory rhetoric of some of the pre-march rallies led by Minister Farrakhan's followers will do nothing for either blacks or whites. At one meeting, which David Jackson, a white reporter for the Chicago Tribune, attended—and was the only white at the gathering—a speaker said, ''We ought to just turn the lights out and boot your * * * out.'' A small group grabbed him and roughly threw him out of the meeting. That type of conduct does no one any good.

Let me add, I am not anti-Muslim. I sponsored the first Muslim to lead the Senate in prayer. I recognize the discrimination that Muslims encounter, and like all forms of discrimination, it is wrong.

What all of us must do: Talk candidly about the injustices that still exist in our society. And talk not just with ''our'' group.

Recognize that U.S. poverty exceeds that of any other Western, industrialized nation. Poverty falls disproportionately on minorities and women. We act as if being poor was an act of God, rather than what it is, flawed policy.

Support those who would bring us together as a Nation, and be wary of those who would further divide us.●