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. This plan has apparently now been endorsed and supported by the President of the United States.

The fact that our economy was weakening before September 11th is clear, particularly in the information technology, telecom, and high-tech sectors. But after September 11, unfortunately, the terrorists helped to push the American economy from weakening into recession. That has challenged all of us to regain the kind of psychological, let alone economic, confidence that will once again create growth.

Unemployment has risen now to 5.4 percent. That is a statistic which expresses itself in hundreds of thousands of our fellow Americans being out of work. Demand in the business sector and the personal consumption sector is just not where it was or where we want it to be.

We must always recognize that the American economy is the strongest in the world and that we have the most vibrant, productive private sector in the world—both those who invest and

manage it and those who work in it. In fact, it is from that private sector that the recovery to this recession will ultimately come.

It is also important for us to acknowledge that we in government have some options by which we can facilitate and encourage the private sector to do what it does best in helping to create economic growth.

It is important as we put together a fiscal stimulus package to remember, ironically enough, the Hippocratic oath that every doctor knows very well. It is, ''First, do no harm.'' I say respectfully that the stimulus package passed by the House of Representatives, reflected in part in the Republican proposals that are surfacing here in the Senate, does not pass the test of the Hippocratic oath.

They will harm our economy by not only being unfair but by bringing us further into long-term debt—building, unfortunately, on the precedent set when we passed President Bush's tax cut earlier in the year. That tax cut plan made the most glowing assumptions about the future of the economy, and then spent the revenue that was predicted based on those assumptions. That was not fiscal responsibility. And, of course, now the multi-trillion dollar estimates of surplus on which that tax cut was based have evaporated, have been altered.

The Republican proposals for fiscal stimulus, particularly by accelerating some of the President's tax cuts that were adopted, not only do nothing to increase demand by individuals which will stimulate the economy and create growth and jobs, but they increase America's long-term debt. That means increasing long-term interest rates. And that means inhibiting the flow of capital, money that is the underpinning of growth in the private sector of our economy.

So I say, respectfully, the Republican proposals for fiscal stimulus do harm. Our economy needs help, not harm. Frankly, I believe we would be better off passing no stimulus than passing the package that was adopted by the House of Representatives, because I really believe it will hurt our economy, not help it.

Our economy is ready and waiting for a quick, significant, temporary shot in the arm. But if the Federal Government makes the wrong choices, we will effectively be shooting ourselves in the foot.

In the current economic climate, we need to discard the stale, knee-jerk debates of the past and come together now to craft a commonsense solution that again puts the national interest ahead of narrow partisan or ideological interests, and ahead of the paying of old political debts. We need to act to produce economic growth and to protect jobs.

I want to speak, for a moment, about a very significant event that occurred just over a month ago, on October 4. The chairmen and ranking members of the House and Senate Budget Committees—Democrats and Republicans alike—released basic principles that they thought should guide any economic stimulus proposal. They agreed that the package—and I quote—''Should be based on the recognition that long-term fiscal discipline is essential to sustained economic growth. Measures to stimulate the economy should be limited in time so that as the economy recovers, the budget regains a surplus that is at least equal to the surplus in Social Security. Any short-term economic stimulus should not result in higher long-term interest rates.''

The Republican proposals simply do not meet that test. Given the spending demands of prosecuting the war on terrorism, of upgrading our homeland defense, of rebuilding the City of New York, President Bush initially said he supported enacting a stimulus package of between $60 and $75 billion which would be balanced—half and half—between spending and tax incentives.

The President asked for a finely tuned performance vehicle. Instead, the House has given him a broken-down jalopy. The House Ways and Means Committee reported a $212 billion plan that meets few, if any, of the bipartisan principles of the Budget chairs and ranking members issued on October 4.

At the heart of the House Republican package is a large corporate tax cut, retroactive to 1986—before my youngest child, my 13-year-old daughter—was born. It totals about $25 billion in cost. And $6.3 billion of that ends up in the bank accounts of just 14 large companies.

Madam President, I am all for tax cuts, as I know you are, including tax cuts for business. But if our goal is to jump-start the economy now, these big tax breaks to a select group of our largest companies simply make no sense. In the first place, they will not get their refunds until next year. Even then, there is no guarantee they will spend the money, which is what we need to spur economic growth. There is no guarantee they will invest in acquiring new equipment and funding the kind of research and development that will support economic growth. We are just going to have to cross our fingers and hope they use it in the right way, and don't use it to pay off their debts or buy back stock. It's the wrong strategy.

The same is true, as I said briefly earlier, of the House Republicans' plan to accelerate the reduction in income tax rates adopted earlier this year. That is not going to prime the pump; it is simply going to pump up the incomes of those who need it least. It is not likely to spur new investments or job growth, but, instead, to reward past success—which is not what our economy needs now. It is not the quick action we need, but a slow road to budget deficits and higher interest rates.

There are only two provisions in the House fiscal stimulus bill that meet the agreed-upon, bipartisan standards: A grant of rebates to those working Americans who did not receive them this summer, and accelerated depreciation for companies, businesses that buy and place in service new equipment in the coming year. Those are both good ideas. They are the beginning of the basis of an agreement. And they are both contained in the Senate Finance Committee's package that was reported out yesterday.

This is not the time for serving old, stale, narrow party and ideological agendas. It is the time for unity, for leadership, for discipline, and for bipartisanship.

I think the Senate Finance Committee has reported a bill that meets those standards. It is focused. It is disciplined. It is short term. It is a real stimulus. It will cost $75 billion over 10 years. It contains no permanent changes in law. It has minimal negative out-year impact on our budget.

And, unlike the House Republican bill, it includes reasonable and effective assistance to those who are unemployed or are about to lose their health care benefits. In fact, half of the cost of the bill goes to temporarily extending and expanding unemployment insurance and a subsidy for COBRA health insurance premiums. That gives balance to the proposal. It gives heart to the proposal. And it will help to stimulate the economy because every additional dollar that goes to an unemployed worker will surely be spent.

Over the last couple of weeks, I have been talking to workers who are unemployed and those who fear they will soon be unemployed.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for two additional minutes.

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

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I find that the greatest fear of those who are currently unemployed or who fear that they will, in this recession, be unemployed, is: How in the Good Lord's name am I going to be able to continue health insurance for my family?

I spoke to one couple last weekend who said their health insurance premiums are $600 to $700 a month. How can they afford to pay those premiums through COBRA to keep their insurance going?

The Senate bill, in an act of not only humaneness but an expression of classic American values, said why would we not want to help working families who, through no fault of their own, have been laid off, to at least cover the cost of health insurance for their families? The Senate finance bill will do that up to the tune of 75 percent.

This is a good, balanced program. It is the medicine our economy needs to help it grow. I hope we will not find the debate on the stimulus to be rigid, to be unthinking, to be unyielding. I think we need to be open-minded because the threat to our economy is real and profound.

The American people not only need help, but they will not tolerate a partisan debate that ultimately produces sound and fury but nothing to help them hold their jobs or help their families.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. RES. 28

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 10:30 a.m. Tuesday, November 13, the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 219, S.J. Res. 28; that the statutory time limitation be reduced to 2 hours, with the time equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the joint resolution be laid aside, and the vote on final passage of the joint resolution occur immediately following the vote on confirmation of the Executive Calendar No. 511, with no intervening action or debate.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the previously scheduled debate and vote on Executive Calendar No. 511, Edith Brown Clement, be changed to reflect that the debate time occur at 4:45 p.m. and the vote on confirmation occur at 5 p.m., with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect, with the above occurring without further intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, on Tuesday, as a result of this unanimous consent agreement, there will be no votes until 5 o'clock. There will be a number of matters, as indicated in the unanimous consent request, taken up. That is the beginning of the time also for the debate on the stimulus package. We are going to be very busy Tuesday, but the first vote will not occur until 5 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I rise to talk a bit about the economic recovery plan.

I begin by saying that yesterday, I chaired a hearing dealing with the U.S. Postal Service. My colleague, Senator BYRD from West Virginia, attended the hearing and asked the Postmaster General a series of questions. As with a lot of areas in our country since September 11, the U.S. Postal Service has been dramatically affected, perhaps more so than others. They have had postal workers die as a result of terrorists who used the system as a delivery mechanism for terror and death from the anthrax spores sent through the mail.

I told the Postmaster General that this country expresses its sorrow for what has happened to the Postal Service workers. These are wonderful people.

I mentioned one of the stories about the two Postal Service workers who died which described both of them in quite remarkable terms. One of them had worked 15 years on the night shift and had never, in 15 years, used 1 day of sick leave. One should not judge someone by whether or not they use sick leave. The point is, this person's neighbors talked about what a wonderful human being this person was.

The U.S. Postal Service is populated with men and women who do their job, as we say, in rain, sleet, and snow; regrettably now with anthrax, which has taken the lives of a couple of them.

I told the Postmaster General yesterday about a town meeting I had in Glenburn, ND, a small town with hundreds of people. At my town meeting, a fellow stood up and said: There is a lot of criticism about things and good government. I want to give you one piece of good news about the U.S. Post Office.

I asked: What is that?

He said: I got a letter out at my farm that was addressed ''Grandpa, Glenburn, ND.'' It was from my grandson.

I asked: How on earth could that have been? How would you have gotten a letter addressed ''Grandpa, Glenburn, ND''?

He said: You can ask the postmaster over there.

So I asked the postmaster: How would that have happened?

He said: We got the letter that said ''Grandpa, Glenburn, ND.'' We looked at the postmark and it was Silver Spring, MD. We knew the only person around here that had relatives in Silver Spring was Frank, so we sent it out to Frank's farm. Sure enough, it got to the right grandpa.

I told the Postmaster General that story. So many others like it describe quite a remarkable system that has worked for a long while and one that we must preserve and keep and nurture and protect during these difficult times.

I rise to talk about all of the challenges, not just to the U.S. Postal Service but to our country. We face several challenges now. One is the challenge dealing with national security. One is a challenge dealing with economic security. And another is the challenge dealing with energy security. Some of my colleagues spoke about that earlier.

National security doesn't need much more description. Most of us understand that some sick, twisted minds hatched a plot that murdered thousands of Americans in cold blood. Terrorism has visited our land in a manner that we never thought before possible. Now this Nation is one in its determination to find and bring to justice those who committed these acts of terror.

It is a different time. There is a pre-September 11 and a post-September 11. We have a President who has spoken to the American people about putting the men and women in America's uniform in harm's way to try to find the terrorists and bring them to justice, to root out the terrorist cells formed around the world who would commit acts of these types. This country supports our President and the men and women in uniform who are risking their lives to do that.

I toured Ground Zero in New York about a week after the tragedy. I saw on the highest twisted metal beam yet standing where an iron worker had climbed and attached an American flag to that highest metal beam. As we came upon that tragic site, that is what we saw, carnage, destruction, but also an American flag gently blowing in the breeze that morning.

Two days later, I was in North Dakota driving between Bismarck and Dickinson, ND, on interstate 94, a patch where you couldn't see a structure of any kind anywhere, just rolling prairies. Someone had taken a flag pole with a flag on it and attached to it a fence post there in the middle of the prairie where you could see nothing that was made by human hand except from this fence post—a single American flag also blowing in the gentle morning breeze in North Dakota.

The connection between the flag and the Trade Center and the flag in North Dakota was a connection of unity of spirit and one Nation doing what it needs to do to protect itself and to bring to justice those who committed these terrorists acts.

Our Nation was having some difficulty even prior to September 11 with an economy that was very week. Our economy had softened a great deal and people were beginning to lose jobs. Our economy was losing steam and strength. September 11 cut a hole right through the belly of this country's economy.

The news since that time has been more layoffs. Hundreds and hundreds of thousands of Americans have lost their jobs. They, too, in many ways are victims of terrorist attacks.

What do we do about the soft economy in the aftermath of these terrorist attacks? We are unified as a Nation in going after the terrorists and trying to prevent terrorist action from occurring again. Are we unified with respect to how we come together as a nation to try to provide a boost to the American economy?

The answer to that is, no, not so unified these days. We have a lot of different ideas about how you promote economic growth and how you help the