

Arguing that we have just 2 percent of the world's oil is like arguing that only your checking account, but not your much larger savings account, counts toward your net worth. I will only count what is in my checking account, not what is in my savings account. But in reality, I have all of this; I have the whole combination. The reality is that if you have money in both accounts, neither provides a complete picture by itself. Oil is much the same way.

Between 2008 and 2009, our reserves actually rose by more than 8 percent, even as we produced about 2 billion barrels of oil, and that was made possible by our substantial resource base. So why claim that America is running out of oil when that is not the case?

The easiest explanation is that it is an attempt to turn perception into reality. If Americans can be convinced that we have no oil, we will stop demanding that our government allow access to it. Instead of running out of oil, we will simply stop producing it. In some people's minds, regardless of the economic consequences, the end result will be the same.

The reason I am so encouraged by the CRS resource report and I am encouraging other Members to review it, and the reason I am so disappointed by continued claims that America has nearly exhausted its resources, is that an understanding of our true energy potential helps point the way to a viable national policy. Instead of locking up our lands, we need to open them up and streamline access, streamline permitting, and bring more of our own resources to market. Doing so will not only allow us to increase domestic production but also decrease domestic consumption. These steps are not mutually exclusive. Given our energy and our fiscal challenges, they are actually dependent upon one another. Let me put it into context a different way.

For years, Alaska's congressional delegation has sought to allow 2,000 acres of the nonwilderness portion of ANWR to be opened to development. Usually, when we talk about ANWR, we talk about how much new oil production could result, probably somewhere between 800,000 and 1 million barrels a day—truly, that would help us out at this time. But left out of that conversation are the tremendous revenues that would accrue to the Federal Government. According to CRS, those revenues would reach more than \$150 billion. I will repeat the number because we are looking for dollars. It would reach \$150 billion at today's oil prices. If we use those revenues wisely, we could make great and serious progress on deficit reduction and investment in new technology.

Now, there is a bill from the Michigan delegation that would increase incentives for electric vehicles by an estimated \$19 billion. It is a great idea, but the reason the bill will not go anywhere is that there is no way to pay for it right now.

Think about what would happen if we brought ANWR into the conversation. We could fully fund incentives to put not just a couple million but upward of 20 million electric vehicles on the road. We could help create an entire industry even as we fully protect our most valuable resource, which is the American taxpayer.

At the end of the day, our decision to produce more of our own oil would be matched by a tremendous reduction in our oil consumption, thanks to the advanced vehicles we deploy from the revenues from oil production. But by holding back production, we hold back progress.

For far too long, I believe the antiproduction arguments have prevented Congress from developing a coherent energy policy. We see them again today. They say, "oh, it's the speculators" or "oh, the producers aren't using the lands they have already leased, that's all." But today, we are also seeing the consequences of those arguments: higher gasoline prices, a weaker economy, and a loss of international standing.

The longer our Nation waits to develop its resources, the longer we wait to create new jobs, to improve our energy security, to pay down the debt, and to invest in next-generation technologies. The longer we decide it is acceptable to import oil instead of producing our own, the longer we will continue to export our wealth, export our jobs, and give the benefits of production to other nations.

I think CRS's new report on America's true energy potential should be an eye-opener to us. I intend to circulate a copy to every Senate office. I ask my colleagues to look through this report and understand what it means for our energy policy and then join me to make sure this Congress takes advantage of the opportunity it presents.

#### CONGRATULATING JOHN BAKER

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I have a short statement recognizing the phenomenal historical win of the Iditarod race. John Baker is an Inupiaq Alaska Native and is the first Alaskan Native to win the Iditarod in 35 years, and it has been around for 39 years. He made it to Nome on the thousand mile-plus Iditarod Trail in record time: 8 days, 19 hours, 46 minutes, and 39 seconds on the trail, which is the fastest time in the Iditarod history. We are exceptionally proud of John Baker.

I had an opportunity to be with John Baker and his phenomenal dog team as they were preparing to leave from Anchorage 2 weeks ago, and John said, "It's my time, LISA." He has been in the top 10 for 11 tries now, and we are exceptionally proud of him, but not only proud of John Baker and his approach to the care of his dogs and his team, but we are proud of the canine athletes. He has a couple lead dogs, Velvet and Snicker, that are pretty incredible.

Mr. REID. If my friend will yield, I got a call from one of the secretaries, so why don't you give your statement.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank the leader. I will share it with you, and I appreciate the indulgence.

Again, I speak on behalf of not only John Baker as a great athlete but his canine athletes. When the mushers leave out of the start in Willow, they leave with about 16 dogs on the team. These are remarkable animals that love nothing more than to be on the trail and to be mushing. His team demonstrated a resolve and a commitment and a dedication to not only their musher, Mr. Baker, but to what the whole sport of dog mushing is all about. For those who follow the Iditarod Trail, you know this is not for the weak. This is over exceptionally rugged terrain, oftentimes in exceptionally rugged circumstances where you have Arctic winds howling down off the coast, blizzards that provide for whiteouts, going down passes that cause encounters that flip you over and break sleds and break bones. It is not for the timid.

But Alaska brings out some exceptional individuals. There were 62 teams that mushed from Willow to Nome this year. They are still out there on the trail as we speak. We wish those who are still coming in well along the way. We had some accidents, but there is never an Iditarod when we do not seem to have Mother Nature intervening in one way or another. The good news for us is that those who have had a happenstance, whether it was a broken collarbone or a happenstance with a knife, those men are doing fine and the dogs, again, are coming in and doing fine.

Again, Madam President, I am thrilled to congratulate Alaskan dog musher John Baker and his exceptional team of dogs, who carried him across the Iditarod finish line for a first place finish in Nome, AK, at 9:46 a.m. Tuesday morning. The Iditarod is not for the faint of heart—the trail is made up of some of the harshest terrain in North America spanning over 1,000 miles of rugged mountains, frozen tundra, and dense forests. Baker and his team made history yesterday beating every Iditarod record after racing eight days, 19 hours, 46 minutes, and 39 seconds on the trail—the fastest time in Iditarod 39-year history by 3 hours.

John Baker is a hometown hero in Kotzebue, a small northwest Alaskan community that rests roughly 33 miles north of the Arctic Circle on the Chukchi Sea. Yup'ik drumbeats and seal calls welcomed John, an Inupiaq Alaska Native and the first Alaska Native Iditarod champion in 35 years, as he and his team raced into Nome yesterday.

The Iditarod is the world's longest dog sled race. It requires mushers to have tenacity and a sort of fearless courage, but even those qualities will not make a winning team. Extraordinary leadership is just as essential of the lead dogs who must guide their

team through the toughest of conditions for days on end. Together, man and dog are pitted against nature and the raw elements of the Last Frontier. John Baker's team of canines is truly the cream of the crop.

I have had the pleasure of meeting his lead dogs Snicker and Velvet. Together, Snicker and Velvet guided the Baker team across frozen lakes and tundra, through freezing temperatures, winds, and snow. Although yesterday was the first time Snicker and Velvet have been draped in flowers and adoration at the finish line in Nome—this is not their first run at the Iditarod. Baker has run the Iditarod 15 times before and amazingly garnered 11 top 10 Iditarod finishes. This was their year—and Alaskans are celebrating with them across the State. John and his team have trained for this, they have fought for this, and they have made history.

I am proud to congratulate the Baker team on this extraordinary victory and I send my best wishes to John and his family today as they celebrate this well-deserved victory in Alaska's great race.

Mr. REID. Will my friend yield for a question?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. REID. They had a great piece on public radio before the race started—it was very good—as to why the race takes place. I want to find out if what I understood from that radio piece is valid.

Wherever the race winds up, there was a place badly in need of some kind of serum because there was an illness there, diphtheria. I do not really remember. They had no way of getting the medicine there. Some person decided what they could not do with machines they could do with dogs. They took the medicine and saved all these lives. Is that valid?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. The majority leader watched that report well—

Mr. REID. I listened to it. It was on the radio.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. The Senator listened to it well. He heard it right. It was an outbreak of diphtheria in Nome. There was no way to get the diphtheria serum to the residents of Nome. It was a true and honest scare in the middle of the winter. The concern was that if they were to take it through a regular route during the winter months, it would not get there in time to save the residents of Nome.

The airfields were not sufficient. They could not travel by air because we did not have the airfields back in the twenties. It was a team of dogs that did a relay across the State. They delivered the serum in time and saved the town.

This race has been resurrected, if you will, to commemorate the Great Serum Race to Nome, as it is called, to commemorate the delivery of the serum, an act that would save that community. It is quite a remarkable story in our State's history.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I hesitate saying this because I will probably get in trouble, but this is a good reason why the House vote was bad today to disband public radio.

It was such a wonderful piece. I did not know that.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I, too, will take an opportunity to plug public radio because the majority leader heard the piece on NPR, but in my home State and in many of the villages we are talking about where these teams will go through on their way to Nome, it truly is the public broadcast system that is their means of communication.

Mr. REID. I heard Ted Stevens talk about this in the past.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mukluk Telegraph is what he would call it. It was a way to convey birthday greetings to people in the next village. It was a way to say: I made it back from hunting camp safely. It is a way of communication. People do not often recognize that in many parts of our State, and certainly along parts of where these teams are traveling right now, we do not have a level of communication that we see in Washington, DC, or in most parts of the country.

That is our plug for public radio. I appreciate that bit.

Mr. REID. The only radio station I can get in the daytime in Searchlight is public radio.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. There you have it.

Madam President, I appreciate the indulgence of the majority leader. Again I send my warmest well wishes to John Baker and his team. I will be greeting the mushers in Nome on Sunday at the mushers banquet, and I can't wait.

I thank you for the time you have given me. I yield the floor.

#### TRADE AGENDA

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, we were considering, earlier this morning, when I was presiding—and through much of the morning—the Small Business Innovative Research bill. Senator LANDRIEU and Senator SNOWE are leading very well on that issue.

I would like to speak for a moment about another important issue for small businesses and workers everywhere; that is, our Nation's trade and globalization agenda.

As my colleagues are aware, the Generalized System of Preferences, the so-called GSP, the Andean Trade Preferences for Colombia and Ecuador, and the 2009 reforms to the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program all expired in mid-February.

I do not think too many people are happy about that. I am certainly not. I have offered amendments with Senator CASEY and requested unanimous consent to pass both the Andean Trade Preferences and the Trade Adjustment Assistance, but my Republican colleagues objected.

Others, such as Senator MCCAIN, requested a unanimous consent on only

the Andean Trade Preferences, and I have objected. I have objected because we cannot turn our back on American workers who lose their jobs through no fault of their own, only to, then, help workers in other countries.

Since Congress made reforms to the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program in 2009—trade adjustment assistance has been with us since the Kennedy administration. It clearly works. When workers lose their job through no fault of their own, they get some assistance from the government to go back to school to get retrained so they can be productive workers again. Again, they lost their jobs through no doing of their own.

But since Congress made the reforms in 2009, 170,000 additional trade-impacted workers became eligible for training under the TAA for Workers Program. So if somebody loses their job because of a trade agreement we pass in this institution—trade agreements that I think were wrongheaded: NAFTA, CAFTA, PNTR with China, other kinds of trade agreements with Australia and Jordan and Panama and Peru—when workers lose their job because of these agreements, we at least owe it to them to help them with trade adjustment assistance.

But since this program expired last month, we have shut out service workers, we have shut out manufacturing workers who lost their jobs to countries we do not have a free-trade agreement with. So we do not actually have a free-trade agreement with China or India. We did something called PNTR with China.

So if a worker in Dayton or Toledo or Findlay or Zanesville loses their job because of a trade agreement to China or India, they are out of luck. They do not get TAA. How awful is that? They worked at a plant, where that plant moved because of trade being moved to China, but they do not get any kind of assistance. It was not their fault.

It should not work that way.

In addition, improvements to the Health Coverage Tax Credit Program also expired. HCTC helps trade-affected workers purchase private health coverage to replace the employer-sponsored coverage they lost. Again, they lost their job because of a trade agreement because they do not have much money and they get some tax credit from the government to help them be able to afford this health care. It has helped thousands of workers manage hospital costs, medication, and necessary doctor visits. Without it, not only do Americans lose their jobs, but they are at risk of losing their health insurance. They generally cannot afford their health insurance, which also may lead them more likely to lose their home and suffer from foreclosure.

TAA—trade adjustment assistance—and HCTC—health coverage tax credit—have both expired. They must be renewed regardless of whether this Congress considers or passes any new trade agreement.