

would go to law enforcement. In my State of Illinois, my Republican Governor has asked me to help come up with \$20 million so we can have a statewide communications network to deal with any emergencies, any crisis, any act of terrorism. This is money well spent. I want to give the Governor that money, but unless Senator BYRD's package moves forward, it is not likely that will happen.

The same thing on bioterrorism: We want to see money going into public health departments, State and local, to help them fight the war against bioterrorism. We need them. We have realized that with the anthrax crisis.

Look at the contrast: What the administration has called for to help public health departments on bioterrorism is \$300 million a year to go to State and local public health agencies. That amount is nothing. Remember, as well, the Republicans, in their stimulus plan coming from the House, want to give \$1.4 billion to one corporation—IBM. To give four or five times as much as might be spent to fight the war against bioterrorism is clearly a loss of our priority.

We also need to put money into security for Amtrak, for our airports, for our highways, for critical infrastructure across America. The money called for by Senator BYRD would go for that purpose. I think that is money well spent and invested in the infrastructure of this country.

People expect us to respond to this crisis with not only tax cuts that will truly move the economy forward but also with a spending package that makes America safer. It doesn't make America safer to give a \$16,000 check to a millionaire out of the Social Security trust fund. It might make America safer if we take that money and invest it in law enforcement, in protecting critical infrastructure such as water supplies, nuclear power plants, and the highways, and infrastructure across America.

Those are the differences, and they are critical differences.

I also make note of the fact that the editorial response to the Republican stimulus package so far has been uniformly negative. As a matter of fact, Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill referred to the House-Republican-backed stimulus package as just so much show business. We don't need show business on Capitol Hill; we need to get down to serious business. That serious business involves responding to our economic crisis and doing it in a timely fashion and a fair manner.

I salute the Senate Finance Committee for moving forward a package yesterday, on a partisan rollcall, I am sorry to report, but one that we will consider next week. I hope the Republicans will work with us quickly pass a bipartisan package. The sooner we can respond to this economy and its needs, the better it will be.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

#### DEVELOPING ANWR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I listened carefully to my colleague from Illinois. I think what we are going to see next week is almost class warfare on the issue of the stimulus.

What is a stimulus? Stimulus is what really stimulates the economy. I think as we look at the difference in the positions of both parties, we come to the conclusion that for those who happen to have the circumstances that allow them to have accumulated capital, it is in our interests to encourage them to invest in inventories, expenditures, and so forth, so this economy can move. It doesn't move necessarily simply by government spending. These should be determined to be true stimulus matters.

I would like to reflect, as a member of the Finance Committee, on how we got into this situation relative to putting a bill together, under the Finance Committee leadership of the two leaders, Senator BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY, who had worked together extraordinarily well on the tax package. It was a bipartisan package, so unlike what came out of the Finance Committee yesterday. It seemed as if the Republican participation in the process had been virtually eliminated by the Democratic majority and the Democratic majority leader. In the manner in which he dictated the terms and conditions, there would be virtually no input from the Republicans in that package.

As a consequence, I do admire the chairman, Senator BAUCUS, for insisting that the process at least go through the committee because, unlike what happened in the Energy Committee where the Democratic leader simply pulled the energy bill and there was no committee process; there was no input from the authorization committee, so the committee basically shut down, and the Democratic leader took it upon himself to work up an energy bill that we have yet to see. What we are seeing here is an extraordinary dictate of power from the Democratic leader who says: We are going to do it my way. We are not going to go through the process associated with the authorizing committees.

As a consequence, what happened yesterday in the Finance Committee was a partisan vote. We are going to start in with that package on Tuesday. If we are going to get anywhere, we are going to start in accommodating each other's points of view, working towards a bipartisan solution. Clearly, this country, and the President, wants to have this issue resolved. It should be resolved. But it has to be a true stimulus.

What I am doing is drawing a little bit of a parallel to the power politics of what is occurring here. We saw initially on the energy bill, as I have indicated, where the authorizing committee's jurisdiction was basically eliminated and the chairman of the committee saw fit to simply leave the obligation up to the Democratic leadership. That almost occurred in the Finance Committee but not quite.

As we look at the stimulus, I want to reflect one more time on what true stimulus is. True stimulus is the creation of jobs, the creation of jobs by urging the private sector to invest, initiate action. There is one issue before this body, and it is either going to be on the stimulus bill or perhaps we can make an arrangement with the Democratic leadership to take it up, debate it, vote up or down, and address the issues as they should be—and that is the issue of an energy bill.

One of the issues in that bill is the contentious issue of ANWR. Should it be opened? Should it not? We have seen the position of our President on numerous occasions who says it is an integral part of the Nation's energy policy to reduce our dependence on imported oil. The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, Vietnam Veterans, the Catholic War Veterans, what do they say? I could go on and on. They have implored the Democratic leader to put this on the calendar, to take it up, vote on it. Their particular view of this issue is they don't believe we should send any more men and women to fight a war on foreign shores.

I am reminded of the comments of a former Member, Mark Hatfield, who was a pacifist. He said: I would vote for opening ANWR any day rather than send another man or woman to fight a war on foreign shores over oil.

I think that says a lot for American veterans. Make no mistake about it; we fought a war over oil in the Persian Gulf. Today we are buying oil from our enemy, whom we basically conquered in that war, Saddam Hussein. We are importing over a million barrels a day. Yet at the same time we are enforcing a no-fly zone over that country. We are putting at stake the lives of American men and women. As we take the oil from Iraq, put it in our planes, and enforce the no-fly zone, we bomb him. The consequence of that is he takes our money, develops a missile capability, maybe a biological capability, and aims it at our ally, Israel. Maybe that is an oversimplification of foreign policy, but it is not too far off.

Organized labor is totally aboard. For the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, maritime unions, seafarers unions, operating engineers, plumbers, pipefitters, carpenters and joiners, this is a jobs issue. Where can you find a stimulus that will generate roughly 250,000 jobs—these are U.S. jobs, these are union jobs in this country—other

than this particular issue of opening up that sliver of ANWR?

The interesting thing is we are creating jobs. We are also generating revenue to the Federal Government because those lease sales are estimated to generate about \$3.6 billion from the private sector.

What we have here is an opportunity, an extraordinary opportunity to recognize the realities associated with what this stimulus would do to the economy. There is not one other thing any Member can identify that will not cost the taxpayer one red cent and that will employ more people in this country, generate more jobs.

From where do these jobs come? We will have to build another 19 or 20 U.S.-flagged vessels, tankers, to move the oil because we have to move it in a U.S.-flagged vessel. They are going to be built in U.S. yards with U.S. workers. We don't make steel or pipes or valves in Alaska. They are built all over the United States. This is real stimulus.

The Hispanic community, the Latin-American Management Association and Latino coalition, the United States-Mexico Chamber of Commerce, all support this. We even have the seniors organizations and of course the American businesses, manufacturers, and so forth.

What is this all about? This is an issue that America's extreme environmental community has latched onto over a period of time, generated a lot of revenues and a lot of membership, and they are going to hang onto this issue because they recognize the value of it.

Some Members, obviously, are looking to the political support from these issues. I think we have to stand up for what is right for America.

We see a remark made by a spokesman for the Democratic leader:

Everyone knows we will not get a drop of oil out of Alaska for a decade, and it won't last more than a few days.

That is a statement made by a person who obviously has no knowledge of reality. The reality is, if it ranges between the estimates of 5.6 billion and 16 billion barrels, it would be as much as we import currently from Saudi Arabia over 30 years and as much as we are now importing from Iraq for 50 years. That is reality.

How can we frame this in any sense?

Let's look at Prudhoe Bay. Everybody is somewhat familiar with that. That came on line 27 years ago. The arguments today against opening up ANWR are basically the same that existed 30 years ago when we were talking about opening Prudhoe Bay. We built an 800-mile pipeline along the length of Alaska. Is it going to be a fence? Are the animals going to be able to cross it? Is it a hot pipeline over permafrost. Will it melt? Will it withstand earthquakes? It is one of the construction wonders of the world.

Prudhoe Bay was supposed to provide 10 billion barrels. It has now produced 13 billion barrels. It is still producing 17 percent of the total crude oil produced in this country today. Those are the realities.

I am very disappointed that some people who have never been up there speak with such eloquence and knowledge. They do not know what our Native people want. Our Native people want a lifestyle that provides better job opportunities and better health care. The people in my State of Alaska within that 1,002 area of ANWR own 59,000 acres. It is their own private land. They can't even get access to drill for gas on their own land. This is an injustice.

There is a rather interesting dichotomy here because we are all concerned about public opinion. The New York Times, in 1987, 1988, and 1989, supported opening this area. I will read a little bit from the New York Times, April 23. It says:

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge has the most promising untapped source of oil.

It further states:

This area could be opened up safely, and we could avoid any disaster associated with the dangers.

Further, in 1988, they say:

The potential is enormous. The environmental risks are modest.

In March of 1989, they say:

Alaska's oil is too valuable to leave in the ground.

That is where they were then. Of course, they are in a different position now. They say now that we shouldn't open it.

The Washington Post, April 23, 1987:

Preservation of wilderness in Alaska is important. Much of Alaska is already protected under the strictest of preservation. That part of the Arctic coast is one of the bleakest, most remote places on this continent. There is hardly any other place where drilling would have less impact on the surrounding wildlife.

In April 1989, they said:

If less is produced here at home, more will have to come from other countries. The effect will be to move oil spills to other shores. As a policy to protect the global environment, that is not very helpful. The lessons of conventional wisdom seem to be drawn . . . that this country should produce less and turn to greater imports is exactly wrong.

How quickly we change with no explanation. It is just the influence of America's environmental community on these newspapers. But that is a turnaround.

My colleague this morning entered an excerpt from the Washington Post by Charles Krauthammer entitled "War and the Polar Bear." It is very interesting. I advise all people to read it.

But I will again reflect on reality. Thirty years ago in this Chamber we were arguing the issue of opening Prudhoe Bay. It passed by one vote. The Vice President broke the tie.

The same issues prevail today. Now, in a time of war, when do we face up to reality and address the opportunities to open this area and reduce our dependence on imported oil and stimulate our economy? It is not a few days' supply. It is the largest potential oil field that we could possibly find in North America. It can flow within 18 months of opening as a consequence of the process simply of moving the permitting. We all know this.

Let's get on with the stimulus at hand and recognize the greatest single stimulus that we can identify. That is simply opening up ANWR.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I thank the Chair. I have come to the floor to speak this morning about the various ideas proposed to help our economy recover from the recession that we are in currently.

I say to my friend and colleague from Alaska that he will not be surprised that I respectfully disagree with most of what he just said about drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. But I have the feeling that either next week or sometime soon we will have the opportunity to debate these matters at length. I look forward to a good, constructive debate.

#### A SENSIBLE ECONOMIC STRATEGY

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I do want to go back to the fiscal stimulus and put it in the context of where we are now.

America is a nation at war. It is a war that challenges our values and our security as fundamentally as the great wars we fought in the last century against Nazism and communism. So a war of this kind naturally affects most everything else we do in ways that we may not yet see in America. That includes the ways we in Congress conduct our business.

It is a time to put national interests ahead of narrow partisan or ideological agendas. But when there are important disagreements, we cannot sweep them under the rug. After all, democracy, in all its fractious glory, is one of the most fundamental values that unites us. It is a value that we are fighting to defend in the current war against terrorism. The moment we stop practicing democracy is the moment we start giving in to the terrorists.

It is in that spirit that I wish to speak today—not negatively, but constructively, and not divisively, but I hope in a spirit of what I take to be the national interest.

I want to speak in disagreement with the fiscal stimulus plan passed by the House of Representatives, which is really a House Republican plan passed almost entirely on partisan grounds.