and renewable energy sources; and, No. 4, protects the environment and public health.

The inclusion of renewable energy sources is vital because I believe energy sources, such as wind, geothermal, solar, hydropower, and biomass, along with energy-efficient technologies, will help offset fuel imports, create numerous employment opportunities, and actually enhance export markets.

Finally, I would like to address my particular concerns about opening up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling.

Earlier this year, my colleagues who supported ANWR drilling argued that U.S. gas prices were out of control and therefore ANWR needed to be drilled immediately. Since then, gas prices have fallen dramatically, despite the war in Afghanistan. In fact, over the Thanksgiving holiday, I returned to Georgia and I routinely saw gas prices in Georgia substantially below $1 a gallon. As a matter of fact, I did see some prices at 76 cents a gallon. Those prices have not been seen at the pumps in more than a year.

Since September 11, the price per barrel of oil has dropped $12 to the current price of $18 per barrel. ANWR does not need to be drilled but rather protected so generations from now can see its beauty as we see it today.

I will support efforts to protect ANWR from drilling, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut, Mr. LIEBERMAN, is recognized.

DRILLING IN ANWR

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I come to this Chamber—and I am pleased to do so after the excellent statement by my friend and colleague from Georgia—to speak about the addition of the House energy bill to the railroad retirement bill before us. This amendment is the wrong amendment offered at the wrong time.

The House energy bill, with all due respect, is, in my opinion, an unwise proposal that was written really for a different time, as Senator CLELAND's remarks not only suggest but illustrate quite specifically. The bill proposes to open the Arctic Refuge for drilling, which is bad environmental policy and bad energy policy.

We will soon have the opportunity to give our Nation's long-term energy strategy the thoughtful consideration that it deserves and that the American people deserve. I look forward to the introduction by the majority leader, soon, of his balanced, comprehensive energy bill, and I look forward to debating it when we return after the first of the year.

We should not be attempting to pass such significant legislation dealing with so fundamental and complicated a problem as America's energy needs and systems in such a summary fashion as an amendment to a bill of this kind. We should, and I am confident will, give it the thorough, thoughtful, balanced debate after the first of the year.

We owe it to the American people to determine whether the measure before us is a responsible and responsive solution to our energy needs or simply a distraction. To determine that, we do not need to hold up pictures of baby caribou or mother polar bears, although I find those pictures not only attractive but moving. We only need to ask a very businesslike question: What do we gain and what do we lose from drilling for oil in ANWR?

I think, when we work that question back dispassionately to an answer, we see the error of the proposal to drill in the Arctic Refuge that is before the Senate today and will be voted on on Monday, procedurally at least.

I can tell you what we gain in probably less than a minute. It would take days to catalog what we lose. I am prepared, if necessary, if the occasion arises, to take days to talk about and catalog what we will lose as a nation if we drill in the Arctic Refuge.

So let me start with what I believe, in fairness, we would gain.

Even if oil companies started drilling tomorrow in the refuge—which, of course, is never going to happen that quickly—even if we mistakenly adopted this legislation, it would take at least 10 years for any crude to be delivered to refineries. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates there is, at best, a 6-month supply of economically recoverable oil—a yield that would be spread over 50 years.

What are the costs?

The visible damage, of course, would be substantial: An environmental treasure permanently lost, hundreds of species threatened, international agreements jeopardized, oil spills further endangering the Alaskan landscape, and an increase in air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, among other costs.

The unseen damage of drilling would be just as real: A nation lulled into believing it has taken a step toward energy independence—arguably, by its supporters, a large step—when, in fact, it has done no such thing; a nation believing it is extracting oil in an environmentally sensitive way, when, in fact, no methods have been discovered that can avoid damage to this beautiful, untouched wilderness area of America; all in all, the American people misled on a host of critical issues. Finally, this plan would threaten something even more precious than what I have mentioned; that is, some of our most treasured American values, including the fundamental American value of conserving, conservation, conserving what the Good Lord has given us in natural treasures in the 50 American States.

The first claim that my colleagues make is that drilling in the Arctic is a necessary part of a balanced, long-term energy strategy. But, respectfully, calling this part of a strategic energy plan is as if to call crude oil a beverage; it is literally and figuratively hard to swallow. This ill-considered plan will do nothing to wean us from our dependence on foreign oil.

Drilling in the Alaskan national wildlife refuge is, in fact, a pipeline dream, a decision that will produce just a slight uptick in our oil production 10 years down the road and at considerable cost to our environment, our values, and our policies. It will create far fewer jobs than dozens of smarter alternatives which depend on American technology and American innovation and American industry.

The much quoted study indicating that Arctic drilling would result in 750,000 jobs has since been widely discredited. Even its authors have acknowledged that its methodology was flawed. Now the agreed-upon job creation figure is much closer to 43,000, and all of those jobs are short term, as opposed to the permanent jobs that would be created through the development of other alternative, innovative forms of energy, including conservation.

This plan also does not move us one step closer to the very valuable, critical goal of energy independence. First, it will take at least a decade to bring to market any oil that might be discovered in the refuge, making it useless in the context of the current international crisis. Incidentally, there is a conservative estimate from the Department of the Interior during the administration of former President Bush that has since been reiterated by many people, including oil industry executives, and that is the 10-year lead-in time.

Secondly, we should realize that Alaskan crude oil is not shipped east of the Rocky Mountains, meaning that none of this oil is refined into home heating oil that is used in the entire Northeast and other parts of Middle America. Further, oil supplies are not needed for the production of electricity. Nationwide, only 2 percent of electricity is generated by oil.

Finally, let's realize that increasing our dependence on oil as a source of energy is no way to wean ourselves off foreign oil in the long run. The statistics repeated frequently make it clear that we cannot drill our way into energy independence. The United States uses about 25 percent of the world's oil but possesses only 2 percent of its reserves. So the way to energy independence is clearly through conservation, through using less than 25 percent of the world's oil and for the development of new technologies that will provide genuine energy independence.

The most important step, of course, we can take is reducing oil use in the transportation sector, which is responsible for over two-thirds of the oil consumed in the United States, and it is climbing. We can do that with technological methods that are in reach. Many of them are in our grasp already in our vehicles.

Arctic Refuge oil is simply not the most secure source of energy for the Nation. Of course, I am not suggesting that those who support drilling in the refuge are in any way neglecting our Nation's energy security. None of my colleagues would say that of those of us who oppose drilling in the Arctic Refuge. We all agree that we want to achieve energy independence and greater energy security. Our difference is about the methods and means for doing so.

At the same time, we have to realize the irony of the present situation. Just as we enter an age of heightened awareness regarding potential security risks at our nuclear plants and our other energy production centers, many Members of Congress are set on pursuing an alternative that, on top of its other liabilities, happens to be less secure than many other options. They are more difficult to secure than many other options. The fact is that the 25-year-old Trans-Alaskan Pipeline itself is vulnerable to disruption. More than half of it is elevated and indefensible. It has already been bombed twice years ago and shot at more recently. And the pipeline today is beset with accelerated corrosion, erosion, and stress.

There is, of course, one other critical reason we oppose this plan, and that is the damage it will do to the Arctic Refuge itself. We should not countenance such a blatant broadside on one of the jewels of America's environment. This threat, to me, is made even more frustrating by the claim that supporters of drilling have made that the refuge can be opened up to oil exploration in an environmentally sensitive manner. The Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge is known as the American Serengeti. It is inhabited by 135 species of birds, 45 species of land mammals. The plain crosses all five different echo-regions of the Arctic.

It is a very beautiful picture—until you add oil exploration. I urge my colleagues to look very carefully at the suggestion that the result of oil drilling in the refuge would just be a small blemish on the grand landscape of the refuge—a little worm hole on a nice red apple. First, there will be a series of blemishes—dozens of holes that will be connected together by roads, pipelines, and other infrastructure; spidering out from these blemishes would be an elaborate additional infrastructure of roads, pipelines, air strips, and processing plants.

The web would almost certainly include permanent facilities, such as roads, airstrips, docks, staging areas, central processing facilities, gathering centers, compressor plants, seawater injection plants, gas processing plants, power stations, guard stations, housing and maintenance facilities, utility lines, garbage disposal sites, gravel pits, and more. In the end, it would make a terrible change in this refuge.

Mr. President, the House bill, as you know, limited development in the refuge to 2,000 acres. But it is critically important for my colleagues to understand that that figure expressly excludes roads and pipelines and fails to define the acreage as contiguous. So the illusion of minimal impact is just that; it is an imaginary landscape painted in oil.

Quite simply, we are forced to make a choice between this magnificent piece of America and its preservation for all the generations that will follow us as Americans and the development of this refuge for oil. I have made mine, and I believe the American people support it. Why? Because conserving our great open spaces is fundamentally an affirmation of our core values.

Conservation is not a Democratic or Republican value; it is a quintessential American value. The ethic of conservation tells us that it is not only sentimentally difficult to part with beautiful wilderness, it is practically unwise because in doing so we deny future generations a precious piece of our common culture.

Let's remember, in the aftermath of September 11, that most Americans have been stepping back and asking themselves what is important, what do we value. I believe that millions of our fellow Americans have, among other things, come to the conclusion, alongside family and faith, that they value America's great natural resources.

Let me recall, finally, the words of the great President Teddy Roosevelt, who, back in 1916, seemed to understand this issue very clearly. He wrote:

> The ''greatest good for the greatest number'' applies to the number within womb of time, compared to which those now alive form but an insignificant fraction. Our duty to the whole, including the unborn generations, bids us to restrain an unprincipled present-day minority from wasting the heritage of these unborn generations. The movement for the conservation of wildlife and the larger movement for the conservation of all our natural resources are essentially democratic in spirit, purpose, and method.

I could not say it more eloquently or more directly than the great TR.

I thank my colleagues. I hope they will vote this amendment down and we will return to a full and wholesome debate of our energy policies after the first of the year.

I thank the President and yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wonder if I could enter into a colloquy with my friend from Connecticut.

The Senator from Alaska would inquire whether the Senator from Connecticut has ever been invited up to the area by the Native people of Alaska and the residents of Kaktovik who are in a position where they have 95,000 acres of their own land. They have the village of Kaktovik, and they don't even have the authority to drill for natural gas to heat their homes.

I noted in the presentation from the Senator there was no reference to the interest of the people who live in the area. And for his edification, we have pictures of those communities and those children and the hopes and aspirations of those individual Alaskans who are looking for a better way of life, looking for alternative jobs, better health standards, and better education, and it seems to me that we ought to have some concern for their livelihood.

They support opening this area. Yet all the emphasis seems to be on the environmental issues associated with ANWR. It appears in almost every presentation we have heard on the other side of this issue that the needs of the people are overlooked.

This is a picture of the town hall in Kaktovik. We have children on a snow machine and a bicycle. The point of these pictures is that there are real people living there. There is very little consideration given to their wishes or views.

These are the kids going to school. You notice that they are Eskimo children. They, too, have hopes and aspirations.

Now, if I can show you the next chart, perhaps my friend who has never been there can understand this area over here. This undeformed and deformed area consists of 1.5 million acres of ANWR. Now I know the Senator knows there are 19 million acres in ANWR. So this is the only area at risk. But as you see over here, this is the 95,000 acres that are owned by the Natives of Kaktovik, but they are precluded; they have no access.

Now, I would ask the Senator if that is a fair and equitable solution to keep any American citizen bound, if you will, by Federal restrictions that don't allow them to develop their own land.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, in responding to my friend and colleague from Alaska, it is my conclusion that the Native peoples of Alaska are of mixed opinion on this question of drilling for oil in the Arctic refuge. We have certainly heard testimony here in the Senate from differing points of view. I hear what the Senator said about this group of Native people. Obviously, we have heard very eloquent testimony from representatives of the Gwich'in people in the area who have made a different choice and want to preserve what they have described as part of not only the beauty of the environment but part of their spiritual heritage as a source of life in that area.

So I would say my judgment is that opinion is mixed, and my opinion is that, having made this choice, it would be a shame to have to do the damage that oil exploration would do to the refuge to find adequate and uplifting employment for the people to which the Senator from Alaska refers. There ought to be a better way.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I would certainly agree there ought to be a better way. Perhaps the Senator is not aware of the public opinion on this issue and how it has changed rather dramatically.

This is a poll that was done by IPSOS-Reid firm, well-known, and the highlights of the poll indicate 95 percent of Americans say Federal action

on energy is important, and 72 percent say passing an energy bill is a higher priority than any other action Congress might take. Seventy-three percent of Americans say Congress should make the energy bill part of President Bush's stimulus plan, and 67 percent of Americans say exploration of new energy sources in the United States, including Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, is convincing reason to support passing an energy policy bill.

I would be happy to provide this to the Senator from Connecticut because I think it provides some reality of the interests of our State in reference to development possibilities. Connecticut is a developed State, in population and land patterns, and so forth. But if you had had an opportunity to visit Alaska you would get some idea that we are a pretty big hunk of real estate. We have 365 million acres in our State.

When you use the phrase ''this huge area at risk,'' I think you are being a little incomplete in your reference to what Congress has already restricted in this area. The ANWR area is 19 million acres. That is the size of the State of South Carolina. If you look at the map, you will see where it is as far as its makeup in comparison with the entire State. But what we have done, what Congress has done I think is a pretty good job of conservation. Out of the 19 million acres, they have made 8½ million acres into a wilderness in perpetuity, and they left this other area untouched by Congress when they set aside the coastal plain specifically for determination back in 1980 because of the prospects for major oil and gas discoveries. Now the footprint here, as you indicate in your statement, under the current bill, H.R. 4, is 2,000 acres. That is not very much. But when you indicate ''all this development'', this is written obviously by some of the environmental groups, and they are very much opposed to this because we have an infrastructure already built, 800 miles of pipeline.

If the Senator from Connecticut had been here and debated the issue of whether or not to open up Prudhoe Bay, we would be dealing with exactly the same issues, only some that are more complex, because the concern was: What happens when you build an 800-mile pipeline across the breadth of Alaska? Are the animals going to cross under it, over it, or will there be a fence? Will it be a hot pipeline? In permafrost? Will it melt, and so forth?

This pipeline is owned by the three major oil companies in the country: Exxon, British Petroleum, and Phillips Petroleum. It is in their best interest to keep it up. So these allegations that somehow this is unsafe—they continually maintain it. As you know, in any industrial activity, there is a certain amount of wear and tear, and so forth. But it is one of the construction wonders of the world. It is already in. So this infrastructure you are generalizing is not going to occur.

You have the airport here in Kaktovik. You have the residents there, but the technology is different currently because we use ice roads. We don't use permanent roads. That is the technology that is developed. This picture shows the kind of ice road that we do in Alaska. We do it all in the wintertime. As consequence, there is no gravel. Most of the pipeline construction that will take place will be on the surface. But if you look at the compatibility of what happens with the pipeline, it is very friendly to some of the wildlife.

I think the Senator from Connecticut perhaps has seen this. This is a picture of Prudhoe Bay, and these are not stuffed animals. They are real. Here is another one relative to what the bears are doing to the pipeline. It beats walking in the snow.

So a lot of these generalizations are exaggerated. What is not exaggerated is there is no sensitivity to the residents of the area. To suggest somehow the Gwich'ins, who are a population based mostly in Canada, are opposed entirely to oil and gas exploration is a bit extreme. Three-quarters of the Gwich'ins live in Canada, and the Gwich'ins in Canada have developed a corporation and are now drilling on Gwich'in land in Canada, and the Gwich'ins in Alaska for the most part are funded by the Sierra Club in their efforts to terminate this. I have copies of the leases they signed. The Native village of Ekwok—which is adjacent to the route of the Porcupine caribou—they have sold their own leases for oil and gas exploration in Alaska. They are looking for jobs as well. There is more to this than meets the eye.

I wonder if the Senator is aware that the Gwich'ins have leased their land previously in Alaska, and they leased it specifically for oil development back in, I think it was 1984?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I had not heard that, of course, but I am glad to pursue the question. What I have heard is the very fervent and, I found, compelling testimony of the Gwich'in people who have come to Congress to speak to us against drilling in the refuge.

I will say a few words in response, if I may, to what the Senator from Alaska said. Alaska is a big piece of real estate. I believe those were the words used. Connecticut is a small piece of real estate. It is more developed, although the last time I looked, more than two-thirds of our State of Connecticut and the great popular sentiment in the State was to limit development, to preserve those natural spaces. For the same reasons, there is a national movement of support for preserving the great, very unusual, natural spaces in Alaska.

I say also, from the experts I have talked to, the area involved is really unique. The coastal plain is the biological heart of the whole refuge. So it has to be given a special status.

I quote from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, that the effects of disturbance and displacement of the Porcupine caribou herd are likely to occur more rapidly and at a much greater scale if oil development is allowed in the refuge. The accumulative effects of reduced access to the coastal plain habitat caused by industrial development would be a major adverse impact on the herd. Notwithstanding the pictures we have seen, that is the expert judgment given in a letter to our colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN.

Finally, most every poll I have seen still shows American public opinion opposed to drilling in the refuge, even at a time when concern about energy has risen. I suppose this gets to a point that sounds like the old line about economists, that if you lay them end to end across the world, they would not reach a conclusion.

I will present other polls. The most recent I have seen taken by the Mellman Group, based on a national survey of 1,000 U.S. voters that was conducted in early October, found that 57 percent of Americans did not believe drilling in the refuge would reduce our dependence on foreign oil. An independent poll taken by Gallup from October 8 to 11 showed a majority of Americans, 51 percent, opposed oil exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Beyond the polling, as I said earlier, to me this is a matter of national principles, national values, national policies, what makes common sense in terms of achieving energy security and energy independence, energy efficiency, which my friend from Alaska and I, and I presume all Members of the Senate, have as common goals.

While public opinion is significant—and I am glad, according to the polls I cited, it is on our side in the debate—about whether to drill in the Arctic Refuge, ultimately I think we all have to make our judgment about what is best for our country. My judgment is that drilling in the Arctic Refuge for oil would not be best for our country.

I apologize to my friend from Alaska that I have a previous commitment and I have to leave. I have a feeling we will return to this debate again after the first of the year and probably at length. I have great respect for the Senator from Alaska, so I look forward to that debate. Hopefully the result will be more knowledge and perhaps even a bit of wisdom.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I appreciate the comments. I can assure the Senator from Connecticut that the Senator from Alaska intends to bring this matter up to a vote, as does my Senate colleague, Senator STEVENS.

The frustrating thing is we are always put in a position of having to identify with detail and rationale the reasons we believe the 1002 Area could be opened safely. Of course, we come from the State and we know something about the State and the factual information. What we have attempted to do over the years is to encourage Members to come and see for themselves so they can make a fair evaluation, because

the action taken by the mass will determine what happens in our State.

It seems to put us in a position where what is best for Alaska and what is best for our constituents based on what they tell us they want is somewhat overridden by the dictate of those outside the state. We happen to be the only State still under development. We came in with Hawaii, but obviously we are a State with huge resources. We have 56 million acres of wilderness in our State. I think somebody figured out how much oil there is in ANWR and the comparison of whether it is a viable supply. They did a calculation, and based on 10 billion barrels, it would amount to a supply for Connecticut for 126½ years.

I see my colleague has had to leave to take a phone call, but I am going to be answering throughout the day some of his generalizations because, frankly, they do not hold water, and they certainly do not hold oil. He indicated a willingness to proceed on a very studied and timely process he hopes will be reflected in the bill we understand is coming down, not from the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee but, rather, from the majority leader.

We have been working on this legislation in committee for several years. We have held extensive hearings. So it is not something that has not had a great deal of forethought, has not had a great deal of consideration. It was removed, through the dictates of the majority leader, from the committee of jurisdiction. It has been taken away from the committee, and whatever bill we will be seeing will not be representative of a bipartisan effort but strictly the result of Senator DASCHLE and I assume others on their side of the aisle. So we will be right back in the same position we were on the Finance Committee relative to the manner in which the stimulus package was submitted. It was submitted on one side, and the Republicans had no input into it.

The point is this Nation needs a policy, regardless of what poll we see, on the issue of national energy security.

There is virtually total support we should have an energy bill.

Now the merits of ANWR obviously get us into a discussion, but we believe that dramatically there has been a turnaround in public opinion. One of the reasons that turnaround has occurred is the realization of what happened off Iraq a few weeks ago where we were boarding a tanker. We had the U.S. Navy inspecting the tanker for the specific purpose of determining whether Saddam Hussein was exporting oil above and beyond that of the guidelines of the U.N. They boarded this ship. The ship sank. Two American sailors died. That might not have been necessary had our previous President not vetoed a bill in 1995 that would have allowed the opening of ANWR because that did pass this body in 1995.

These are what ifs, I know, but nevertheless, to suggest somehow we cannot do this safely is basically incorrect. That we would not get oil for 10 years is totally incorrect. We will have oil within 18 months to 2 years because we only have about 60 miles of pipeline. To say it is a 6-month supply is not accurate because that would presume no other domestic production anywhere in the U.S., and no imports of oil. Under what realistic circumstance would all other oil production be terminated in the United States as well as imports coming in? ANWR is estimated to hold between 5.6 and 16 billion barrels. If it is half that, it will be as large as Prudhoe Bay, which has supplied this Nation with 25 percent of its oil for the last 27 years. Many of the opponents who are going to speak against this have not been up there. They have not met with the Native people who are affected. Our people in Alaska, as American citizens, deserve that consideration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the Senator from Alaska and I thank the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Hawaii, who is kind enough to stay a couple of moments extra before I take the chair so that I might make a couple of remarks.

I compliment and encourage the bipartisan efforts among the leadership in meeting with the President to discuss how to best proceed on an economic stimulus package.

The efforts of those negotiators, in the framework set out last night whereby the top elected leadership of both parties in this Chamber will approach their efforts with the leadership in the House of Representatives and come to an agreement with regard to a stimulus package and taxes, is clearly a step in the right direction. We do need a stimulus package. We need it as soon as possible. We need it operative by the end of this year.

A few days ago, the National Bureau of Economic Research declared the U.S. economy has been in a recession since March. Some have responded to that announcement by saying since 6 months have already transpired, and since our average recession is typically less than 11 months, there was not a need to pass an economic stimulus package. They would say our economy at this point would likely recover on its own.

I disagree with those conclusions. That is why I think we ought to move ahead with a stimulus package. That has all the more been brought to light by virtue of the announcement made by the administration yesterday that indeed the surpluses we were counting on projecting over the next several years are not going to be there. In fact, the sad news was that we were going to be in deficit financing; that is, spending more in any one year than we have had coming in tax revenue.

How quickly things have changed. Just a few months ago we were still talking about the beneficence of projected surpluses over the course of the next 10 years and how we were going to be able to take care of a lot of the spending needs, including—this was prior to September 11—the increased defense costs that clearly were a priority, and still be able to have substantial tax cuts and preserve the integrity of the Social Security trust fund surplus so it was untouched. Therefore, that surplus was going to pay off the national debt over the course of the next decade.

Now all of that has been knocked in a cocked hat because of the slowed economy, the lessened surplus projected over the next decade, and then because we enacted a huge tax cut, a tax cut that over 10 years was in excess of $2 trillion. The effect of that has led to the present economic malaise and economic projections so that now the administration is saying we will have deficit spending over the next 3 years.

It is with a heavy heart suddenly we have to face these new conditions. It is all the more important to have a stimulus package. Clearly, in my State, the State of Florida, we are feeling the effects big time. We are feeling the effects big time also because of September 11, the fear factor out there of people not wanting to get on an airplane. I have said many times from this desk—and I fly every weekend at least twice—I think it is safe to fly. However, there are still a lot of people who do not think it is safe to fly. As a result, they will fly for business reasons, but they will not fly for leisure and vacations.

There are parts of this country that are highly economically devastated. One such place is the capital city of the State of the Presiding Officer, Honolulu. Another is the largest tourist destination in the world, Orlando, FL.

Another is Miami, with its robust cruise tourism business. Another is Las Vegas. We can look at the list of cities that as part of their economy are inextricably entwined with travel and tourism. We can see the economic devastation. When the leisure travelers are not flying, they are not getting into the hotels; when they are not getting into the hotels, they are not going into the restaurants, they are not going into the gift shops, and they are not going to the tourist attractions. As a result, we see the economic devastation.

As wartime conditions continue, we should expect to see a continued loss of tax revenue due to the precipitous drop in travel and tourism and the overall economic activity. While every State has been affected to some degree, and travel and tourism is one of the top 3 industries in 30 of our 50 States, clearly States such as the State of the Presiding Officer and my State of Florida have been uniquely impacted due to the significant presence of the tourism and aviation industries in those States.