

a thing about high prices. We had them cold on what I believe was very close to price fixing. We had them cold on harassing independent station owners who wanted to lower prices. We had them cold on that. But we could not move the regulatory agencies.

One way you fight back is you drive a car that gets 50 miles to the gallon. You can do it. You can buy it pretty cheaply. I encourage people to do that. So I do look forward to taking up the energy bill.

On the issue, again, of stem cell research, this is one that is so important. I have seen a list of the groups that oppose Senator BROWNBACK's 6-month moratorium. I think it is very important because sometimes you learn a lot from supporters and opponents.

Let me read to you the list of opponents to the 6-month moratorium on stem cell research: Alliance for Aging Research, Alpha One Foundation, American Academy of Optometry, American Association of Cancer Research, American College of Medical Genetics, American Infertility Association, American Liver Foundation, American Physiological Society, American Society for Reproductive Medicine, American Society for Cell Biology, American Society of Hematology, Association of American Medical Colleges. All of these, and more, oppose, very strongly, a 6-month moratorium on stem cell research.

Here are some others: Association of Professors of Medicine, Biotechnology Industry Organization, Coalition of National Cancer Cooperative Groups, Cure for Lymphoma, Genetic Alliance, Harvard University, Hope for ALS, the International Foundation for Anticancer Drug Discovery—and it goes on—the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation International—those folks came to visit many of us in our offices—the Kidney Cancer Foundation, Medical College of Wisconsin, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, National AIDS Treatment Advocacy Project, National Patient Advocate Foundation, Research America, Resolve, Society for Women's Health Research, and it goes on.

So the bottom line is, we have a chance today, by voting against the Lott amendment, to send two very important messages: Yes, we want an energy policy, but we want it to be well thought out. There can be differences on whether the Alaska Wildlife Refuge is pristine, whether it is worth saving. I am willing to get into that debate. That is a fair debate. But wouldn't it be an interesting debate to find out what our other options are and then to decide if it is truly worth the gamble? People I know and respect say it isn't worth the gamble. And on stem cell research, clearly, it is time to continue this research while we ban human cloning. The Brownback amendment does not do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I am aware that the other side has until 4:45. I ask unanimous consent to speak as though we had reached 4:45, which starts the time running for our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBER NEW YORK

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise today, as I did several times last week and before, to remind all of us, and especially my colleagues, of the destruction and devastation that took place on September 11, and persists today, nearly 12 weeks after.

Tomorrow will be the 12th week since we were attacked on September 11. The New York City Partnership and Comptroller estimate that the economic impact of the attack will near \$100 billion in damage for New York's economy. Today, 83 days after the attacks on our Nation, thousands of the businesses and residents who were physically displaced by the destruction, by the loss of power and telephone access, by the debris removal efforts, by the poor air quality, by the crime scene designation, are still awaiting some help, any help from the Federal Government.

Our Constitution guarantees to protect every State against invasion. The President said in his joint address to Congress just 10 days after the attacks: We will rebuild New York City.

That same day earlier, my colleague, Senator LOTT said, while visiting New York:

We are here to commit to the people of New York City . . . that we will stand with you.

Congressman GEPHARDT, the House minority leader, said in his weekly radio address:

We will work to make the broken places right again. We will rebuild New York.

Eighty-three days since the terrorists chose to attack America by attacking New York and having lost thousands and thousands of innocent lives, we are still taking stock of the damage that we, as a city, a State, and a country have suffered. We know we can't get those innocent lives back, and every day I and my staff work with the families who lost their loved ones trying to make sure that they do get the help they need.

In addition to the lives that were so brutally taken, those attacks also took many livelihoods. We can do something about that. Yes, we did lose 15 to 20 million square feet of office space; nearly one-third of all space in Lower Manhattan, either completely de-

stroyed or seriously damaged. Yes, we did have extensive damage to our transportation system, and it has been devastating for thousands of people trying to get to work not to have those subway lines, not to have that PATH train coming in right under the river, underneath the World Trade Center. We know the kind of damage that our small business owners have been suffering has been devastating.

What has happened is the attacks, because of the loss of transportation and because of the crime scene designation, have displaced over half a million commuters who travel to Lower Manhattan. We have 10 subway stations that usually handle about 40 percent of the downtown commuters that have been closed throughout most of October. That is why we recognize we can't possibly do this without the help of America.

Estimates to rebuild the 1,700 feet of collapsed tunnel on the 1 and 9 subway lines directly beneath the World Trade Center are in the billions of dollars. The same is true of the estimates to rebuild the PATH train station that brings commuters from New Jersey into Lower Manhattan. We also have been told it will take up to \$250 million to repair the damaged streets around the World Trade Center. And still, as we speak, almost one-third of Lower Manhattan permits only restricted vehicular access because of the crime scene designation.

These are cost estimates only of direct impact and damage, not future losses, not lost revenues. These are the costs for hazardous material removal, for site remediation, for capital costs for rebuilding.

New York City, it is estimated, is likely to lose 125,000 jobs in this fourth quarter. We already lost 79,000 jobs in October alone.

These are staggering numbers, but they only tell half the story because I could literally fill this Chamber with people who have seen their businesses devastated, who have lost their jobs. The quotes we see from so many of our leaders have been comforting and very supportive, but we know that we need more than comfort. We need more than rhetoric. We need tangible support. It is imperative that we get as much of that support as possible.

I personally think it is very similar to the other devastating crises that have hit our country. Most of them were natural disasters, but we also can't forget Oklahoma City. We can't forget the New Mexico fires. If you look at past disasters, the Federal Government, through our Congress, responded appropriately and swiftly. The Congress came together in a time of need, whether it was Hurricane Hugo or the Northridge earthquakes or Oklahoma City.

This chart illustrates the level of Federal response after just a few of a

sample of major disasters. In each case, the Federal response was nearly 40 percent of the estimated economic loss. In New York City, a comparable amount would be 40 percent of the approximate \$100 billion of economic damage. Yet we haven't received, in as timely a manner, the percentage share that others have.

The appropriated assistance that came within 3 to 4 months after the Midwest floods was more than 40 percent. After the Northridge earthquake, 26 days after, more than 30 percent of the total loss had already been appropriated; after the Oklahoma City bombing, within 99 days, more than 40 percent.

What do we have? We have a few billion dollars that have been sent to FEMA to help pay for the costs that have been incurred, and that is it. We don't have a special appropriation that has been passed. We don't have an emergency supplemental. We are counting on getting that in the next few days because we want to be sure that New York gets the money appropriated that we need to have to count on to get about the business of rebuilding and restoring. And 79 days later, when this chart was made—now we are at 83 days—we were below 5 percent, far below the pace of what was done for other major disasters in our country.

If you look at the headlines from other major disasters, "One Month After Hurricane Andrew"—which I visited in 1992, the site of that devastation, "Bush," the first President Bush, "approves \$11.1 billion in Hurricane Aid." It didn't take long at all to get that money flowing. Compare where we are with the damage done to New York.

After the 1993 Midwest floods, 7 months after, "Families Pour Out Praise For Flood Agencies." They not only got the money appropriated, they got the money delivered. And people were satisfied their needs were being met.

The Northridge earthquake, 24 days after that devastating earthquake, "\$8.6 billion Quake Aid Ok'd by Senate." We are nowhere near that pace. We are at 83 days, and although we did—and I am grateful for it—appropriate dollars in the immediate aftermath, we haven't gone back to appropriate them to actually get them out and be spent to take care of the problems we have.

The Cerro Grande fire, which was a fire set by the Federal Government, a fire that was meant to stop other fires—of course, we know the results were disastrous—44 days after that fire, "Los Alamos Welcomes Federal Aid."

I was pleased, both as a citizen and as an onlooker with a great deal of interest over 8 years, to see how well our country came together to deal with our emergencies. Compare those headlines with where we are right now in New York: "New York Needs Help Now to

Rise from the Ashes," November 19; "New York Financial Core Wobbles from Attacks' Economic Hit," November 26; since September 11, "Vacant Offices and Lost Vigor," November 21; "Terror Attacks Have Left Chinatown's Economy Battered," November 25; "A Nation Challenged: Small Shops Feel Lost in Aid Effort."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). The time controlled by the majority has expired.

Mrs. CLINTON. Thank you, Mr. President. Again, I hope that we will respond with equal vigor and expeditious treatment to deal with the problems in New York, as our country always has in previous disasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I inquire as to the time agreement. It is my understanding there are 30 minutes on each side remaining; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this point in time, until 5:10, it is controlled by the minority.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Until 5:10?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The majority leader, then, has 5 minutes with which to close.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Let's run through that one more time. At 5:10, the minority time expires. Then the vote is set for 5:45?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 5:15.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, let me again reflect on where I think we are. We have chosen to try to get an energy bill before this body all year. We introduced an energy bill late in January in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Hearings were held. We had a little change of leadership that resulted in a situation where we could not get the bill brought up in committee. In the meantime, of course, the House of Representatives did its work. It passed H.R. 4, which was an energy bill. It was a good energy bill. It had virtually everything that we felt should be addressed in the body of the bill because it addressed, if you will, not only renewables but alternatives, as well as new sources of energy.

H.R. 4 is the bill that is before us right now, but it is coupled with a cloning bill, and it is on a railroad retirement bill. But I think we should focus on the reality here, which is that the President has asked for an energy bill. The House has done its job. The Senate has yet to do its job.

The ultimate disposition of this vote today is not going to be very meaningful because different Members are going to be able to respond in different ways. Those who are particularly attuned to the cloning issue, obviously—and I share the position of Senator BROWNBACK that we should not be rushing into this. There should be some

evaluation on its ethical and moral aspects. On the other hand, the fact that it is on the railroad retirement bill, which I happen to support, means there is going to be different interpretations—whether the vote is contrary to support for railroad retirement, support for energy, or support for cloning.

I want to focus on the void that will be left after we are through. We are not going to be able to have resolved getting an energy bill up before the Senate. So we are going to have to search for other means, whether it be the Agriculture bill or stimulus bill or holding up a unanimous consent agreement, which I am prepared to do. We have talked about Christmas Eve, about the stockings, and odds and ends; but we have no assurance that the Democratic leadership which controls this body is going to give us a time certain to take up an energy bill and vote up or down on it. That is within the broad support of America's special interest groups—whether it be the labor unions that we have heard from relative to the value of it as a stimulus, or others.

Mr. President, when we look at stimulus bills, where are you going to find a better stimulus? It would create 250,000 jobs, generating \$3 billion in revenues from lease sales, and would not cost the taxpayer a dime. What about the national security interests and America's veterans who fought overseas? I am reminded of my good friend from Oregon who indicated that he would rather vote for an ANWR bill any day than send our men and women overseas to fight a war over oil. That was Senator Mark Hatfield.

So the President has called for an energy bill. We are disregarding our popular President's wish in not addressing it. We have heard from the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Secretary of Labor, who all recognize the importance of this. The Democratic leadership says, no; we are not going to take it up. We are going to take it up later. When? Will he give us a time certain to conclude it and allow amendments and an up-or-down vote? That is all we want.

What is happening here is they are talking on, if you will, the prevailing attitude of America's veterans, organized labor, Teamsters, senior organizations, Jewish organizations, who all understand what national security is all about in relation to the Mideast. We have a bill—H.R. 4—that reduces demand, increases supply, and enhances infrastructure and energy security. So we are very positive. Yet we are going to go out of here today with another situation where we have not reached a resolve. We have talked about energy, and if there is any plus to this, it is that we got the energy bill up for discussion but in such a convoluted way that it is very difficult to address it on the merits for on an up-or-down, clean vote, which it deserves.