

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 destroyed 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 Octo-

ber. 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.

The Democratic leadership has chosen to ignore, if you will, the responsibility that this body has to address a request of the President. We are going to go off now and simply look for another day. Well, I am going to look for another day. I don't want to disrupt the body, but I am telling you that we have to have assurances that we are going to get an energy bill up, under some time agreement of some consequence that would be meaningful to dispose of the issue once and for all. Any Member can justify his vote today, not on the issue of an up-or-down vote on energy but on cloning or his particular position on the issue of railroad retirement.

We need to have the Members stand up and be counted on whether or not it is in our national security interest to have an energy bill and have an up-or-down vote and have amendments and include, if you will, the ANWR issue.

This isn't a vote on an energy bill today. It is not a vote on ANWR. This is a vote to address a procedural process that is very gray in the interpretation because nobody is going to be able to clearly define just what they are for and what they are against.

I see my friend from Kansas who wants to speak on the cloning. We have

little time remaining. I will reserve 5 minutes of my remaining time and allow Senator BROWNBACK to have the difference.

I inquire of the time remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

MORATORIUM ON CLONING

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I am caught in a position similar to that of the Senator from Alaska. I support what he put forward on the energy bill. It is of utmost urgency. We are so dependent upon unreliable sources of energy that we will look back and say we wish we had done something when we had a chance to do it. We are not doing it.

I have put forward the moratorium on cloning. To clarify, where some have said this is about stem cells, it is not about stem cells. It is about cloning—taking a human individual and creating them by cloning technology, similar to what was used with Dolly the sheep. That is not stem cells. That is about cloning. It is a moratorium on cloning—a 6-month timeout. Let's wait a little bit and think about what we are actually getting into as the world contemplates this matter. Yet technology is diving into it in the United States, as we saw announced a week ago the first human clone ever in the world by a Massachusetts company.

Let's think about this. That is why we brought up this issue on this procedural vehicle, saying let's get a clear vote on a 6-month moratorium. It is not an outright ban on everything for all time. It is 6 months where we hold hearings, do a thoughtful process. The House already has voted on the issue by over a 100-vote margin. They voted to ban cloning altogether. The President is pleading for a bill on banning cloning altogether. We weren't even going that far. We are saying a 6-month moratorium while we think about it, instead of letting private companies basically decide a huge issue for humanity.

Right now we are letting private companies decide if they think it is OK to clone humans or not by their own privately hired ethics board. Do they think it is fine we clone humans or not. They are making the decision when this is something that should be in the public purview and public domain after thoughtful conversation.

We are pleading for the time to do that. That is why I put the amendment together with the energy bill. We are getting toward the end of the session, and we need some discussion and clarity on this issue. Where the House has acted and the President is seeking a bill, we are in difficulty getting the bill done.