



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2001

No. 155

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BLANCHE L. LINCOLN, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in the quiet of this magnificent moment of conversation with You, we dedicate this day. We want to live it to Your glory, alert to the dangers of this time but without anxiety, prepared but not perplexed. We praise You that it is Your desire to give Your presence and blessing to those who ask You. You give strength and power to Your people when we seek You above anything else. You guide the humble and teach them Your way. Help us to humble ourselves as we begin this day so that no self-serving agenda or self-aggrandizing attitude will block Your blessings to this Senate and to our Nation through us. Speak to us so that we may speak with both the tenor of Your truth and the tone of Your grace.

We say with the Psalmist:

God be merciful to us and bless us and cause Your face to shine upon us, that Your way may be known on Earth and Your salvation among the nations. You are our Lord and Saviour.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable BLANCHE L. LINCOLN led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, November 9, 2001.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of Rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BLANCHE L. LINCOLN, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. LINCOLN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, there will be no rollcall votes today, as was announced last evening by the majority leader. This morning the Senate will be in a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each. As under the direction of the majority leader, next week is going to be an extremely busy week. We are going to work on the economic stimulus package, and there are a number of other pieces of legislation we are going to do our very best to complete prior to Thanksgiving.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Alaska.

ENERGY NEEDS AND COMMITMENTS

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I have applauded the actions of my colleague, Senator MURKOWSKI, as our senior Republican on the Energy Committee. Because of my involvement in other matters, particularly appropriations, it has not been possible for me to be here to join him as much as I would like to do so.

I consider the opening of the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge area for environmentally sound oil and gas development to be the issue of highest national security we will vote on this year. The President of the United States shares that view. I believe many in this body do.

Last week President Bush said: It is in "our national interest to get [an energy bill] to [his] desk." I am paraphrasing that. I believe the vast majority of Americans share the President's view. Just last night while speaking in Atlanta, President Bush called upon Congress to send an energy bill to his desk again "to reduce our dependence on foreign oil."

When the President said that, there was such a unanimous outpouring of support from the people in the audience. It was probably the loudest reaction to his whole speech.

I believe that is correct. It is a national concept and there is national support for that goal. Today we still do not have a commitment to bring up and complete action on this energy bill. This morning I rise to again highlight some of the implications of failure to act now.

The stability of some of the nations principally responsible for supplying oil to the United States can no longer be taken for granted. In 1979, when the instability of the Middle East was of paramount concern, we took action to protect Israel. As our major ally in the Middle East, we should proceed with energy legislation not only to protect our own interests but to ensure that we

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S11637

can continue to support Israel as we have agreed to do.

In 1979, our Government entered into a bilateral agreement with Israel to ensure that Israel would have access to the oil it needs to meet its daily requirements. Everyone in the Senate should be familiar with that agreement. We understood then that some Middle Eastern countries had the power to hold Israel hostage by denying access to oil.

Let me read from a relevant portion of the agreement we signed with Israel to protect its supply of oil:

If the oil Israel needs to meet all its normal requirements for domestic consumption is unavailable for purchase . . . the United States Government will promptly make oil available for purchase by Israel to meet all of the aforementioned normal requirements of Israel.

Our Government renewed that agreement in 1994 to ensure that Israel is protected through 2004. When we finally take up the comprehensive energy bill, we should include an amendment to extend that agreement with our Middle Eastern ally, Israel.

The point is, Israel produces less than 500 barrels of oil per day. It consumes nearly 300,000 barrels of oil a day. Regardless of what happens in the Middle East, Israel needs guaranteed access to oil just to maintain its economy. And regardless of what happens in the Middle East, we have to be able to produce and provide to Israel at those 300,000 barrels of oil per day in accordance with that agreement.

My understanding is that Alaska's oil is the oil that would fulfill that agreement because it is the same quality of oil that Israel's refineries run and could be run in those refineries without change.

Given our current dependence on foreign oil, and 57 percent of our oil is imported, Middle Eastern supplies of oil are unstable as far as we are concerned. We have to have a way to fulfill the commitment we have made to Israel, our primary ally in that part of the world.

Our own vulnerability to protect unstable oil supplies is a national security issue for us. Think what it is for Israel.

I am deeply disturbed about our continued reliance upon Saddam Hussein's oil. We are using more than 700,000 barrels of oil per day in this country imported from Iraq. From press reports, we know that one of Osama bin Laden's goals is to overthrow the House of Saud and to gain access to the vast oil reserves in Saudi Arabia.

How secure would those supplies be if that unfortunate event should take place? Today Saudi Arabia is the largest single supplier of oil to the United States. We import over 1.8 million barrels a day from Saudi Arabia.

At the height of the Persian Gulf War, 2.1 million barrels a day were sent through the Alaska oil pipeline. In the time of need, then we had oil to produce. Today, we send just over 1

million barrels a day through that pipeline because we don't have the production necessary to fill the pipeline. Today, our pipeline is half full as the production at Prudhoe Bay declines. As it declines, we send more American money to Saddam Hussein to buy his oil.

We must consider the implications of our Government having just recalled our Ambassador to Venezuela as we consider the stability of our oil supplies. For those who missed it, let me quote from a November 6 story in the Wall Street Journal discussing Venezuela:

Relations have deteriorated steadily since the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States. President Chavez and his ministers have made what U.S. officials have described as "contradictory" and ambiguous statements. In the most recent incident, Mr. Chavez last week criticized U.S. bombing raids in Afghanistan during a televised speech. . . . Venezuela is especially important because it is one of the top three suppliers of oil to the United States market. . .

Madam President, this is the same President Chavez who was the first head of state to break the multilateral sanctions on Iraq by visiting Saddam Hussein after the gulf war. No wonder President Bush has recalled our Ambassador for consultations. Keep in mind that nearly 1.6 million barrels of oil per day come to the United States from Venezuela, and they are subject to the control of President Chavez.

When we talk of potentially unstable sources of crude oil, we cannot ignore Iraq. My colleague, Senator MURKOWSKI, has continued to remind the Senate that the United States now imports 700,000 barrels of crude oil per day from Saddam Hussein. As I said last week, by the end of the year, we will have imported 230 million barrels of oil from Iraq. Over 40 million barrels of that oil went to California to replace oil that California used to get from Alaska. At \$20 per barrel, Americans will send over \$5 billion to Saddam Hussein's terrorism machine by this Christmas—\$5 billion, and hundreds of thousands of jobs that we don't have now because we don't have permission to increase production to continue filling the Alaska pipeline daily.

This year, we have thousands of American troops stationed in the Middle East and around Afghanistan. They risk their lives to protect our interests and our security. I believe we must do something about our growing dependence on these potentially unreliable supplies of oil. We must begin to explore for oil in our own country, and we know where the largest potential supply of oil is. It is in the Coastal Plain of Alaska. We just need the opportunity to go get it.

The Energy Information Agency released a new report last week detailing all of the proven reserves in the United States. That report says in the entire State of Texas there are now 5.27 billion barrels of proven reserves. Texans don't like me to remind them, but that State is less than half the size of Alaska.

The House-passed energy bill, H.R. 4, contains authorization for oil production in the Coastal Plain of ANWR. That Coastal Plain, as designated by the Jackson amendment in the 1980 act, is 1.5 million acres, and it is estimated to contain a minimum of 5.7 billion barrels of oil, with a very good possibility, I am told, of recovering up to 16 billion barrels of oil—enough to fill the Alaska pipeline for another three decades and beyond.

Madam President, people forget when I stood here on the floor and urged approval of the Alaska oil pipeline, the estimate for production from Prudhoe Bay was 1 billion barrels. This year, we have produced the thirteen-billionth barrel of oil from Prudhoe Bay. These estimates are always on the very conservative side.

The House energy bill limits oil production to just 2,000 acres of the 1.5 million-acre area. Remember, the million and a half acres was set aside for oil and gas exploration. Now, if the oil in ANWR could replace our imports from Iraq, Saudi Arabia, or Venezuela—and that is possible—it could produce enough oil to replace at least one of our three largest suppliers. Can anyone really doubt that this is an issue involving our national security?

Madam President, as we approach Veterans Day, I am proud to stand here as a World War II veteran and applaud the veterans groups of our country. They understand the vulnerabilities of our country. They understand the importance of reducing our reliance on the Middle East and increasing our domestic production.

I want to quote from two recent letters. This is an October 26 letter from the National Commander of AMVETS:

Our current reliance on foreign oil leaves the United States vulnerable to the whim of individual oil-exporting countries, many existing in the unpredictable and highly dangerous Persian Gulf. . . . Passage of H.R. 4 would greatly assist in our ability to secure a more dependable and diversified domestic supply of energy.

And I would note that since the Persian Gulf war our security has become more threatened with our dependence on foreign sources of oil growing from 35 percent of domestic supply to nearly 60 percent. AMVETS firmly believes we cannot wait for the next crisis before we act.

I ask unanimous consent that letter be printed in the RECORD following my statement.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. STEVENS. In an October 25 letter, the National Commander of the American Legion said:

War and international terrorism have again brought into sharp focus the heavy reliance of the U.S. on imported oil. During times of crisis, such reliance threatens our national security and economic well-being. It is important that we develop domestic sources of oil, contained within our public lands—such as the supplies within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

I ask unanimous consent that letter and additional letters be printed in the RECORD after these remarks.

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

(See Exhibit 2.)

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, action is required now to protect our national security. The advice of these veterans groups representing the voices of all men and women who have fought for our freedom should be followed. Their advice to increase our economic security by opening the Coastal Plain of ANWR needs to be adhered to.

The advice of organized labor, which wants to see us create hundreds of thousands of jobs by opening this Coastal Plain of ANWR, is also compelling.

Israel needs even greater assurance that we can fulfil our obligations to meet her energy needs. In short, responding to these requests and to the President of the United States to promote our national security by passing the comprehensive energy bill, H.R. 4, containing authorization to proceed to use 2,000 of the 1.5 million acres of ANWR, should be our No. 1 goal before we leave for the holiday.

Passing a comprehensive energy bill that contains environmentally sound provisions by producing the largest single potential oilfield on the North American Continent is a goal of most Americans. If we act now, our men and women serving overseas will know that we stand behind them.

Passing this bill before we go home for the holiday will tell families from New England to Minnesota that the fuel oil they burn in the future, after our Arctic Plain begins to produce, is American oil, not oil from Saddam Hussein, from Iraq, or from any of these unstable sources.

In short, I believe we must act before we go home for this holiday so we will know we have acted to protect the security of our Nation, our total national security. A filibuster against a national security issue involving energy has never taken place in this Chamber. It did not take place when the oil pipeline was built, and there was severe, even worse, opposition at that time than there is now. That pipeline passed by one vote, the vote of the Vice President of the United States.

The opponents at that time knew they could filibuster, but they did not because it was a matter of national security. I call upon the Senate to recognize the tradition of this body and not filibuster a national security issue as we raise H.R. 4 next week.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by the eminent Charles Krauthammer from today's Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 9, 2001]

WAR AND THE POLAR BEAR

(By Charles Krauthammer)

So you thought that Sept. 11 changed everything, that the era of game-show fri-

volity, "Survivor" silliness and general self-indulgence had given way to an era of seriousness. Well, not quite. Here we are, for the second time in a decade, risking American lives in a war against an enemy fueled and fed by oil money. Here we are again decrying our dependence on oil from a particularly unstable, unfriendly part of the world. Here we are in desperate need of both energy conservation and new energy production. And here we see (in the Oct. 30 Post) that we may be prevented from drilling in the single most promising area on this continent because of a . . . polar bear treaty: "New Species Enters Debate on Arctic Oil; Polar Bear Agreement Cited by Drilling Foes."

Now, I like polar bears as much as the next guy. I like pandas and caribou and all the furry cuddles on God's good earth. But I also like people, particularly Americans, and particularly American soldiers. And I do not like seeing them shot and killed in wars that would be both more avoidable and more winnable were we not so disastrously dependent on energy supplies from a nasty part of the world with nasty people who use our oil money for nasty purposes.

At a time when Washington should be working on a crash program of conservation and new drilling, a six-year-old report from the Fish and Wildlife Service is leaked in the hope that a 28-year-old polar bear treaty might derail drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The Outrage! "This is a classic Bush administration strategy of running roughshod over international agreements," charged Kieran Suckling, executive director of the Center for Biological Diversity and leaker of the report. The Interior Department stoutly maintains that the polar bear agreement does not prohibit oil exploration. Alaska's Sen. Frank Murkowski points out that the 25,000 or so Arctic polar bears that he represents seem to be quite happily lolling around the existing oil drilling in Alaska.

I too have little doubt that the polar bears will do fine, just as the caribou have thrived around the Prudhoe Bay field. But the whole debate is surreal. We are at war, are we not? Americans are fighting. In Washington and New York, nearly 5,000 have already been killed. Fifteen of the 19 murderers were Saudi. Their leader is Saudi. Most of their money is Saudi. And that same Saudi money funds the madrassas, the fundamentalist religious schools where poor Pakistani, Afghan and Arab children are inducted into the world of radical Islam and war against the American infidel. And yet we bow and scrape to the Saudis. We beg and borrow. We tolerate their deflecting onto America the popular hatred that would otherwise be directed at their own corruption. Why? Because we need their oil.

The war on terrorism will be fought in many places. Alaska is one. We have known since 1973 that we need to reduce our dependence on Persian Gulf oil. But we have never been serious. It was assumed that Sept. 11 would make us serious. Instead, we are engaged in exegeses on polar bear mating habits and a ridiculous debate that pits conservation vs. drilling. Why one and not the other is beyond me. Of course we need conservation. I have been an advocate of a dollar-a-gallon gasoline tax for 20 years. Whatever it takes: auto efficiency standards, higher taxes, incentives for new fuels.

But why stop there? We need more oil still. Every additional barrel that substitutes domestic oil for foreign oil is a victory. Drilling in the Arctic will involve less than 1 percent of the Arctic Refuge. It might produce an additional million barrels a day. The sea of natural gas beneath could be the largest in North America. And yet the Luddites stand firm, as if Sept. 11 never happened.

Sen. John Kerry vows a filibuster if anyone dares legislate Arctic drilling.

Imagine where we would be if those railing against Arctic drilling today had prevailed 30 years ago and stopped Prudhoe Bay. The million barrels a day we now get from Alaska would be coming from Saudi Arabia. We would be even more in their debt and under their thumb. A concerned citizenry is yearning to do something significant for the war effort on the home front. But this is not World War II. We do not need rubber. We do not need war bonds. We do not need Rosie riveting. We desperately do need energy independence. And that is a home-front battle: conservation—and a willingness to disturb a few acres of snow in a vast wilderness as remote as Afghanistan.

There's a war on, senators. Lets get serious.

EXHIBIT 1

AMVETS,

Lanham, MD, October 26, 2001.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, The U.S. Senate, The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: On behalf of AMVETS, I am writing to encourage you to bring H.R. 4, the Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001, before the full Senate for consideration at the earliest possible moment prior to the close of the 1st Session of the 107th Congress.

As you know, our current reliance on foreign oil leaves the United States vulnerable to the whim of individual oil-exporting countries, many existing in the unpredictable and highly dangerous Persian Gulf. And it cannot be overstated that energy supplies touch nearly every aspect of our lives from our economy to our national security.

Passage of H.R. 4 would greatly assist in our ability to secure a more dependable and diversified domestic supply of energy. And, I would note that since the Persian Gulf War our security has become more threatened with our dependence on foreign sources of oil growing from 35 percent of domestic supply to nearly 60 percent.

AMVETS firmly believes that we cannot wait for the next crisis before we act. H.R. 4, as approved by the House, is a critical part of an overall policy America requires to promote dependable, affordable, and environmentally sound production and distribution of energy for the future. We urge your expedited approval of this legislation.

Dedicated to service,

JOSEPH W. LIPOWSKI,
National Commander.

EXHIBIT 2

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, October 25, 2001.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: We write today out of a sense of urgency concerning our national security, as it relates to our need for energy independence. The development of America's domestic energy resources is vital to our national security. We respectfully urge you to adopt the provisions contained in H.R. 4, the "Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001."

War and international terrorism have again brought into sharp focus the heavy reliance of the United States on imported oil. During times of crises, such reliance threatens our national security and economic well being. The import of more than 50 percent of our petroleum from the Persian Gulf further compounds our foreign trade balance at a time when our energy demands continue unabated. It is important that we develop domestic sources of oil, contained within our

public lands—such as the supplies within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Working for a comprehensive energy policy and achieving responsible energy independence are critical national security and economic goals. H.R. 4, as passed by the House of Representatives, is a major step forward to achieving these imperative goals. We strongly urge your support.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. SANTOS,
National Commander.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, October 29, 2001.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: The 2.7 million members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary supports H.R. 4, the "Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001" or SAFE Act of 2001. We applaud the House of Representatives for its bipartisan work in addressing our energy vulnerability by passing H.R. 4. We believe the Senate should consider and vote on H.R. 4 so that our nation has an energy plan for the future and can move forward quickly with a comprehensive plan to develop our domestic energy resources.

Keeping in mind the horrific events of September 11 and mindful of the threats we are facing, we strongly believe that the development of America's domestic energy resources is a vital national security priority. We need to take steps to reverse our growing dependence on Middle East oil as quickly as possible. By passing H.R. 4, the Senate will be supporting our troops serving in combat on Operation Enduring Freedom, the American people, and our national security with a comprehensive energy legislation that is desperately needed to diversify the energy supply for our country and chart a course for the future.

The VFW strongly urges the Senate to consider and vote on H.R. 4 as passed in the House in this session of Congress.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. WALLACE,
Executive Director.

VIETNAM VETERANS INSTITUTE,
October 30, 2001.

MAJOR VETERANS GROUPS ASK SENATE TO QUICKLY PASS ENERGY BILL TO STRENGTHEN AMERICA FOR WAR ON TERRORISM

WASHINGTON.—Major veterans groups—with a combined membership of nearly 5 million—today called on the Senate to quickly pass an energy bill that includes a provision allowing more oil drilling in Alaska to strengthen America's national security and economy for the war on terrorism.

The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, the Vietnam Veterans Institute and the Catholic War Veterans urged senators to accelerate development of domestic energy resources, including the supplies within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) in Alaska, as an urgent matter of national security.

In letters to Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle (D-SD), veterans groups asked Daschle to allow the energy bill passed by the House—H.R. 4—to come to a straight majority vote in the Senate promptly, without a Democratic filibuster that would take 60 votes to break. Daschle opposes the bill's provision allowing oil drilling in part of ANWR.

Secretary of Veterans Affairs Anthony J. Principi and Senators Frank Murkowski (R-AK), Larry Craig (R-ID), Rick Santorum (R-PA) and George Voinovich (R-OH)—who all support the energy legislation—joined the veterans groups at a news conference today.

American Legion National Commander Richard J. Santos wrote in his letter to Daschle: "War and international terrorism have again brought into sharp focus the heavy reliance of the United States on imported oil. During times of crises, such reliance threatens our national security and economic well being. . . . It is important that we develop domestic sources of oil, contained within our public lands—such as the supplies within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge."

Robert E. Wallace, executive director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, wrote Daschle: "By passing H.R. 4, the Senate will be supporting our troops serving in combat on Operation Enduring Freedom, the American people and our national security with a comprehensive energy legislation that is desperately needed to diversify the energy supply for our country and chart a course for the future."

J. Eldon Yates, chairman and founder of the Vietnam Veterans Institute wrote Daschle: "The development of America's domestic energy resources is vital to our national security. We respectfully urge you to immediately pass H.R. 4, the comprehensive energy legislation. . . . Following the horrific events of September 11, 2001, failure to pass this bill would pose a threat to our people, our economy, and our national security, that we all wore the uniform to maintain."

Also attending the news conference was Roger Thomas, 81, of Frederick, MD, who was a Navy radioman at Kaneohe Bay near Pearl Harbor when Japanese warplanes dropped bombs around him on December 7, 1941. Thomas was uninjured and went on to fly combat missions in World War II. "The terrorist attacks of September 11 were worse than the attack on Pearl Harbor, because unarmed civilians were murdered and many more died," Thomas said. "In World War II, America could produce all the oil we needed to fight back and defeat our enemies in battle, but today we're in a dangerous situation because we rely on other countries to provide our oil."

Today's military uses far more fuel than in past wars. For example, the 582,000 U.S. military personnel in the Persian Gulf War in 1991 consumed more oil on a daily basis than the 2 million men of the Allied armies that liberated Europe in World War II.

The United States gets about 55 percent of its oil from foreign nations—up steadily over the years from almost nothing during WWII, to 36 percent in 1973 and 46 percent as recently as 1991. America sends about \$100 billion a year to foreign nations to pay for imported oil.

Experts believe ANWR may contain the largest supply of oil ever found in American history—an estimated 16 billion barrels of recoverable oil, which could be turned into 742 billion gallons of gasoline. That's the equivalent of total U.S. gasoline consumption for nearly six years.

According to an analysis by Wharton Econometrics Forecasting Associates, development of oil reserves in the coastal plain of ANWR could create as many as 736,000 jobs in the United States—most of them outside Alaska—and pump billions of dollars into the U.S. economy.

ANWR covers 19.6 million acres, but the energy legislation before the Senate would open up only 1.5 million acres to exploration. Just a tiny fraction of that—about 2,000 acres of surface land—would experience oil drilling activity if oil were found.

STATEMENT OF OUR NATION'S VETERANS GROUPS

"OUR DOMESTIC ENERGY SECURITY IS OUR NATIONAL SECURITY"

We, the undersigned, representing our nation's veterans, strongly believe that the de-

velopment of America's domestic energy resources is a vital national security priority. The horrific events of September 11, 2001, constitute a threat to our people, our economy, and our nation's security. With U.S. troops actively engaged in combat overseas, we firmly believe that America can and will win this prolonged war against terrorism, using all its resources to defend our nation and the cause of freedom around the world.

Because of these beliefs, we applaud the House of Representatives for its bipartisan work in addressing our energy vulnerability by passing H.R. 4, the "Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001" or the "Safe Act of 2001." It is imperative that the Senate pass the House version of H.R. 4 so that our nation can move forward in establishing our energy security, as well as our defense of freedom at home and abroad. It is essential for us to develop all domestic energy resources including the supplies within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

By passing H.R. 4, the comprehensive energy legislation, the Senate will be supporting our troops in the field, all Americans, their families, and our nation. We, as Veterans, stand united and respectfully request that the Senate vote on and pass H.R. 4.

J. ELDON YATES,
Chairman and Founder, Vietnam Veterans Institute.

JOSEPH SATRIANO,
National First Vice Commander, Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America.

VIETNAM VETERANS INSTITUTE,
October 30, 2001.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, the Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: We write today out of a sense of urgency concerning our national security as it relates to our energy supply. The development of America's domestic energy resources is vital to our national security. We respectfully urge you to immediately pass H.R. 4, the comprehensive energy legislation.

We are pleased the House of Representatives, acting with bipartisan support, addressed our energy vulnerability by passing H.R. 4, the "Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001" or the "SAFE Act of 2001." It is imperative the Senate do the same. Following the horrific events of September 11, 2001, failure to pass this bill would pose a threat to our people, our economy, and our national security, that we all wore the uniform to maintain.

All Americans, as well as our military troops, need this legislation enacted into law. If we intend to rebuild our economy and continue the campaign against international terrorism and those who attack us, we must develop domestic sources of oil contained within our public lands—such as the supplies within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We must be able to rely to the fullest extent possible on our own resources to provide for the maintenance of our economy at home and our prolonged war effort abroad.

By passing H.R. 4, the comprehensive energy legislation now, the Senate will be supporting our troops in the field and all working Americans, including those displaced by this heartless act of aggression. We, as Veterans, stand united and cannot overstate the importance of this legislation, and respectfully request you lead the Senate by voting on and passing H.R. 4 so our nation can move forward in defense of freedom around the world.

We know that when the chips are down, America can and will stand and fight, using all its resources and all its might to defend our nation and the cause of freedom around

the world. Join us in this cause. Pass the comprehensive energy bill and help us rebuild America!

With the support of our members,
J. ELDON YATES,
Chairman and Founder,
Vietnam Veterans Institute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

THE RIGHT MEDICINE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, President Bush's speech to the American people last night was exactly the right medicine. America is truly concerned over terrorism and bioterrorism and what it means to our country.

I listened carefully to the President's speech in Atlanta, GA. I thought he struck the right tone. As concerned as we are—and we should be concerned—we take heart in the fact that this country has been strengthened by this crisis and this challenge. We have come together in what has been called the “re-United States of America.”

Many people understand patriotism from a different perspective than they did just a few weeks ago. We stand in awe, in respect, and in admiration of many heroes in America. The President acknowledged them last night—the firefighters in New York City and across America, the people who are in law enforcement, medical rescue teams, teachers, postal workers, and of course the men and women in uniform who daily put their lives on the line for America. It is appropriate that we remember them as we try to wrestle with our personal concerns about safety and security since September 11.

I thought the President struck just the right chord in calling on America to bring out the very best in our Nation.

Within the last several weeks, Congress has been called on by the President many times to provide him with the authority and the resources to deal with this crisis. Without exception, Congress has responded in a strong bipartisan manner in an effort to make certain the President and certainly the armed services have all they need to execute this war effectively.

This week, the Senate considered the intelligence authorization bill which gives additional resources to the intelligence community. This is an important component of our effective defense of America and defense of our values. As a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I know full well that one of the most heartening events that has occurred since September 11 is the fact that countries around the world are now cooperating with the United States in fighting terrorism. Some of those countries, which have been our closest allies for years, frankly, did not take this subject as seriously as they should have. Now they do. As they cooperate with us, we have an opportunity to reach out and try to stop the spread of terrorism across the world.

CONFLICT DIAMONDS ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, yesterday I had a press conference with two of my colleagues, Senator DEWINE of Ohio and Congressman TONY HALL of Ohio as well. We are cosponsors of legislation which deals with a phenomenon that has become increasingly important in this discussion.

It is not enough we search out Osama bin Laden and his lieutenants in their caves in Afghanistan and stop those cells of terrorist activity around the world. We have to find a way to starve them of the assets and resources they need to succeed. The President made it clear this week that this has to be an immediate response by the United States. So as part of antiterrorism, we have created new authority to deal with money laundering—money laundering and transfers of money that have been used to finance the terrorist network.

A little over a week ago, though, we came to learn that there was another source for the terrorist operation. That source is diamonds. It appears that in west Africa in particular, and in Sierra Leone, where terrorist organizations have taken control of the production of diamonds, they are not only using these diamonds to promote their terrorism in west Africa, but they are exchanging these diamonds in international commerce among terrorist groups.

In Sierra Leone and other countries, we have seen absolutely barbaric conduct by these terrorists in west Africa. We have seen people who have been killed and mutilated, hundreds if not thousands of people who faced amputations of their hands, arms, legs, and feet as terrorist payback for their lack of loyalty to the terrorist cause.

How do these terrorists keep moving along? They are mining diamonds which eventually find their way into some of the most comfortable, democratic, and peaceful parts of this world.

We have introduced legislation, the Conflict Diamonds Act, which will require a certification of the country of origin for diamonds so we can starve out the diamonds that are coming out of west Africa and other places where they are supporting terrorism.

This is so important. It was important before September 11. It is more important now because we have come to learn that Osama bin Laden gathered these diamonds before September 11 as his way of bankrolling his terrorist operation. Diamonds do not leave a paper trail. A person with a handful of diamonds worth many thousands of dollars can stick them in his pocket or in a purse or in a packet and move through any metal detector, any security device undetected. That is a reality.

We have joined in a bipartisan fashion with the jewelry industry and with the diamond industry to promote the conflict diamonds bill to stop this illicit terrorist trade in diamonds.

The United States plays such a critical role when it comes to this issue.

We in the United States import 65 percent of all the diamonds in the world. If we put strong standards in place and our allies who have joined us in this war against terrorism also pass similar standards, we can starve off a source of money, a source of terrorism that is clearly becoming rampant, even as we speak.

Diamonds have always been a symbol of enduring love. Unfortunately, today they have become the currency of terrorism. I know the House Ways and Means Committee had a hearing on this bill last week. I am happy the Senate passed this bill earlier this year, and we are going to have to address it again.

I call on all my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to consider this a matter of great urgency and join us in a bipartisan fashion. Senator FEINGOLD, Senator DEWINE, I, Congressman TONY HALL, and Congressman FRANK WOLF, in a true bipartisan fashion, have tried to move this important issue forward.

I close on this issue by giving special credit to Congressman TONY HALL, who has been a leader on this for years—not for months but for years. It is his good work that has brought us to this point. I am happy to be an ally of TONY HALL in any cause, but when it comes to a cause of this importance, I hope my colleagues will take a close look at this legislation.

AMERICA'S ECONOMY

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, as part of the challenge facing America today, we have to consider the state of America's economy, and it is a sad state of affairs. After almost 10 years of unparalleled prosperity in the history of the United States, during the past year we have seen terrible things occur—a massive growth in unemployment. The number of people who have been laid off across America is now reaching, unfortunately, historic levels. Last month saw the biggest 1-month increase in unemployment in 21 years. Nearly 7½ million Americans are now out of work, and the economists have warned us that a 1 or 2 million more may be losing their jobs over the next 12 months. Small and large businesses have faced this.

A friend of mine who deals with bankruptcies has told me we will be shocked as we hear the names of the major corporations and businesses which are going to go bankrupt in the near future. It is a fact of life this downturn in the economy is touching us in virtually every area of American life.

This is a time of year when many American businesses hope to show their greatest profit and success. This retail season around the holidays means so much to companies across America. Unfortunately, the sales are slow and the indication is clear that the American people are holding back. It is an understandable impulse on

their part, understandable because they are not certain of their own stability in their job or their small business. They are uncertain about the future of our economy and, of course, the war which we are waging has led people to have a certain personal austerity, a little less flamboyance when it comes to their lifestyle. It is understandable. It reflects the spirit of sacrifice.

So what we need to do in Congress is to consider what it will take to turn this around. How can we breathe life back into this economy and get it moving forward? They have called it an economic stimulus package or an economic recovery package. Whatever the description, it is clear to me Congress should do something and do it immediately.

Several weeks ago, I called together business and labor leaders in my home State of Illinois, in the city of Chicago. Some of the largest corporations were represented, as well as small businesses and labor unions, and I said to them: Tell me what the problem is as you see it; what do you think the solution should be.

They came amazingly to a consensus. Seated around this table were Democrats and Republicans and Independents, people in labor, people in business. They said: It is our impression we have too much production in America and not enough consumption. There are too many cars and refrigerators and washers and dryers waiting for buyers. So we need to give the American people the resources and the confidence to take money, go to the store, and make an important purchase. They said that consumer confidence is critical to any kind of economic stimulus; focus on the consumers.

Secondly, they said to do it in a hurry because if there is going to be an impact on this economy, do not wait. Congress has a tendency to identify problems and then spend months, if not years, waiting to respond. Well, when it comes to the economy, we cannot afford to do that.

The third thing they said is, do not do anything today that you will regret tomorrow. Make this a temporary fix so when it is all over, we will not have a problem we have to cope with for years to come.

This is the advice of a diverse group of people who came together in Chicago. It is exactly the same advice which we have been given on Capitol Hill. Economist after economist has come into this building and told us, these are the three things: Help the consumers move forward, do it quickly, and do not do anything that will jeopardize the economy in the long run.

So how do we achieve that? Well, it is very clear to me if we want to move the economy forward and help consumers, we ought to focus on those individuals in our economy who are most likely, with additional resources, to spend them.

My basic course in economics, which I took many years ago at Georgetown,

said people in lower and middle-income groups will spend their money and do it more quickly, and they are more likely to spend it than those in higher income categories.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Did I hear the Senator request an additional 10 minutes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I was seeking recognition and was going to recognize my colleague from Missouri who has to catch an airplane. She needed 5 minutes. I stepped aside for her. I obviously want to accommodate Members and do not intend to object, but what is the order of morning business? Is it 10 minutes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a 10-minute limitation.

Mr. DURBIN. In response to the Senator from Alaska, I gave the same accommodation to his colleague who just left, who asked for additional time to speak, but I do not want to keep anyone from catching their plane.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. My concern was to accommodate the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DURBIN. I want to accommodate my colleague from Missouri, too. I yield 5 minutes to her and then ask for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Missouri.

REVITALIZING THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Mrs. CARNAHAN. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Alaska and my colleague from Illinois for their kindness this morning.

I add my voice to those who believe we must act quickly to revitalize the American economy. Even before the terrorist attacks, our economy was slowing down. New reports now indicate the unemployment rate is rising, that consumer confidence is low, and that businesses are postponing investments. The convergence of these important indicators spells trouble for us in the months ahead. That is why Congress must act now.

The American people expect us to find solutions. All across America, the fires of patriotism are burning brightly while in the Congress we smolder in indecision. In fact, we in this Congress can learn from the unity and patriotism of the American people. They want us to work together across party lines to do the urgent business of this Nation.

Leading economists in the country have repeatedly told us what needs to be done. We can jump-start our sluggish economy, we are told, by providing immediate tax relief and economic assistance targeted to those who are most likely to invest and spend. These economists have also warned us that if we abandon fiscal discipline, long-term interest rates will rise. It is time for us to heed their sensible advice.

The Democratic and Republican leaders of the Budget Committee in both the House and the Senate have laid out very useful principles for an effective stimulus package. They all agree the legislation ought to be immediate, it should be temporary, and it should be focused on individuals and businesses most likely to spend the stimulus dollars. I believe if we abide by these bipartisan principles, we can craft a stimulus package that would give a boost to the American economy, and we can do that without jeopardizing our long-term fiscal health.

Using these guidelines, we can craft a package that will garner support from both parties and one that President Bush can sign quickly. Our goal is to get the Nation back to work again and back to growing again. By getting cash into the hands of businesses, we can create new jobs and new investments in plants and equipment.

A number of promising ideas have been suggested that would provide this needed cash infusion into businesses. It has been proposed that businesses could accelerate the rate at which they depreciate new assets. Doing this would help businesses of all sizes decrease their costs this year and free up investment capital.

For example, let me tell my colleagues about a company in my hometown of Rolla, MO. It is called Brewer Science, Inc. It is a successful and growing company that employs 235 people. It produces the chemicals used in the manufacture of integrated circuits. The proposed increase in allowable deductions would enable this small business to expand faster. Additional cash in this business could be spent on additional research and development, and that is the kind of investment and expansion that will get our economy back on track.

Increasing business investments address only part of the problem. While the economy goes through its natural business cycle, many Americans are facing immediate unemployment. Creating new jobs for these workers is crucial, but it will take some time. In the meanwhile, we must help these families in crisis. Last Friday, the Labor Department released some alarming figures. Seven hundred thousand Americans lost their jobs in October. The unemployment rate surged to 5.4 percent this month. There are now a total of 7.7 million Americans out of work. These are staggering numbers. Families all across America are hurting.

Shortly after September 11, I encouraged my colleagues to act quickly on

behalf of the workers in the airline industry who lost their jobs abruptly. To my great regret, they did not act.

At that time, many in this body claimed it was appropriate to wait. They said we ought to deal with assistance to the unemployed when we consider broader legislation to stimulate the economic recovery. Now almost 8 million Americans are worrying about how they will pay the rent or their mortgage. Millions of American parents have lost their health care insurance, and they are worrying what they will do if a child gets sick. Millions of families are wondering how they will put food on their Thanksgiving table this year. It would be unconscionable to tell these people to wait any longer. Extended unemployment benefits and help with health care coverage must be included in a stimulus package.

By extending unemployment compensation, we will be putting dollars into the hands of people who need the money immediately for their basic needs. The money will be spent quickly, which in turn provides the needed remedy for an ailing economy. We have an opportunity to do the right thing at the right time and for the right reasons. We must act quickly and in a bipartisan fashion. We cannot afford to wait until more people are laid off or more businesses fail. We must not leave our families to struggle without help or without hope.

If we have the will, we can forge a just and reasonable compromise that will ease the pain of this recession. When Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel was asked what was the most important commandment, he replied: Thou shall not sit by idly. That response points up the importance of acting when we have a chance to influence an outcome. During this time of crisis, let it not be said of the U.S. Congress that we sat idly by. Let us act with courage, and let us act now.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I congratulate my colleague from Missouri. She said in just a few moments exactly what we need to hear as we consider this economic stimulus package.

I believe she has put a finger on it: We are being called on, across America, to rally behind our flag, our President, and our cause, that we should make certain when it comes to the economic stimulus package, we also keep in mind that all America is involved. It is the working families in America paying the payroll taxes into the Social Security trust fund who are funding all we are doing. The money we are spending to defend America against terrorism, the money we are spending to rebuild New York, the money we are spending to help the airline industry, the money we are spending for an economic stimulus all comes out of the Social Security trust fund, and all of that money comes from the payroll workers across America.

When we talk about invigorating this economy and getting it moving forward

again, what a difference in approach we have between the two political parties. On the House side, the Republicans came up with a stimulus package which I am afraid doesn't meet the test of encouraging consumer spending, doing it in a timely fashion, and not damaging the economy. Instead, what the House Republican package came up with was, sadly, a great deal of tax relief for the biggest corporations in America. This is profiteering in the name of patriotism.

Consider for a minute that these corporations would receive rebate checks for 15 years' worth of Federal income tax under the stimulus plan supported by the House of Representatives. IBM would receive \$1.4 billion from the Social Security trust fund; Ford, \$1 billion; General Motors, \$833 million. The list goes on and on. Billions and billions of dollars in corporate relief from the House Republican stimulus plan and precious little or nothing for the workers across America.

We know what will get this economy moving again. Give some money to the people who are having a tough time—having just lost their jobs—to keep their families together, and they will spend it. Of course they will. Give the people who just lost their jobs help in paying for health insurance, and they will use that help because they are as frightened as anyone that family members or their children will not be protected with health insurance. Those are the pillars of the Senate Democratic plan for stimulus: That we help those who have just been laid off, who are facing a difficult time.

We also provide tax rebates for 45 million low-income taxpayers who received no rebate earlier this year. People pay payroll taxes, pay into the Social Security trust fund. This time around, we believe they should receive some tax assistance.

We have business tax cuts, as well—a 10-percent bonus appreciation. I heard from businesses across Illinois: Give us some help in depreciating some of the things we purchase and we will purchase more. That can move the economy forward. It is a sensible plan.

We want to extend unemployment benefits an additional 13 weeks in all 50 States. This is not a radical suggestion. This is the course followed by President Bush's father. In the teeth of a recession, he said: We have to stand by the people who have lost their jobs. In America we have 7.5 million Americans who are out of work. We ought to stand by them and any laid off in the near future. We need to expand coverage to the people who do not receive unemployment insurance today.

We also know when it comes to this health insurance, unless we help people buy health insurance once they have lost a job, they will have none; they are not likely to do so. Just do the math. The average unemployment check is \$230 a week; the average payment for private health insurance when you have lost your job is \$588 a month. It just does not work.

We have quite a contrast between the Republican approach of getting this economy moving forward and the Democratic approach. The Republican approach embodies tax cuts for the wealthy and profitable corporations and nothing for homeland security. I hope I get a moment to get to this issue.

When it comes to tax cuts for the wealthy, by speeding up the rate cuts, the Republican plan would give a new \$16,000-a-year tax break to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. Those are people making over \$1 million a year, receiving \$16,000 from the Republican tax stimulus. What a stimulus that is: For citizens making \$1 million a year, we want to give you \$16,000 more. That is not going to put money back into the economy, not nearly as much as helping the economy by giving the money to the average working family, the middle-income family across America.

When we give every millionaire a check from the Treasury for \$16,000, that is money being thrown away that could be used to deal with economic stimulus. That \$16,000 goes right out of the Social Security trust fund. Payroll taxes paid by average workers into the Social Security trust fund are being spent to give a \$16,000-a-year check to the wealthiest people in America—and to do it for 4 years under the Republican plan.

The Republican plan, in addition, with the accelerated tax cuts, costs \$27 billion in 2002—next year—and increases to \$121 billion over 10 years. Remember the advice we receive from people: Don't do anything that will hurt us in the long term. They are going to basically eat up any surplus we have in the future to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in this country. That makes no sense at all.

HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. I have a limited amount of time and will now reflect on the issue of homeland security. There are two ways to move the economy forward: Tax cuts and spending. The faster way, the more effective and immediate way, is through spending because as we spend on important projects and the money is spent, people are employed to do things important for America.

Senator BYRD of West Virginia and others have offered as part of the stimulus package a \$20 billion package dealing with homeland security. Where would that money go? For example, it would go to law enforcement. In my State of Illinois, my Republican Governor has asked me to help come up with \$20 million so we can have a statewide communications network to deal with any emergencies, any crisis, any act of terrorism. This is money well spent. I want to give the Governor that money, but unless Senator BYRD's package moves forward, it is not likely that will happen.

The same thing on bioterrorism: We want to see money going into public health departments, State and local, to help them fight the war against bioterrorism. We need them. We have realized that with the anthrax crisis.

Look at the contrast: What the administration has called for to help public health departments on bioterrorism is \$300 million a year to go to State and local public health agencies. That amount is nothing. Remember, as well, the Republicans, in their stimulus plan coming from the House, want to give \$1.4 billion to one corporation—IBM. To give four or five times as much as might be spent to fight the war against bioterrorism is clearly a loss of our priority.

We also need to put money into security for Amtrak, for our airports, for our highways, for critical infrastructure across America. The money called for by Senator BYRD would go for that purpose. I think that is money well spent and invested in the infrastructure of this country.

People expect us to respond to this crisis with not only tax cuts that will truly move the economy forward but also with a spending package that makes America safer. It doesn't make America safer to give a \$16,000 check to a millionaire out of the Social Security trust fund. It might make America safer if we take that money and invest it in law enforcement, in protecting critical infrastructure such as water supplies, nuclear power plants, and the highways, and infrastructure across America.

Those are the differences, and they are critical differences.

I also make note of the fact that the editorial response to the Republican stimulus package so far has been uniformly negative. As a matter of fact, Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill referred to the House-Republican-backed stimulus package as just so much show business. We don't need show business on Capitol Hill; we need to get down to serious business. That serious business involves responding to our economic crisis and doing it in a timely fashion and a fair manner.

I salute the Senate Finance Committee for moving forward a package yesterday, on a partisan rollcall, I am sorry to report, but one that we will consider next week. I hope the Republicans will work with us quickly pass a bipartisan package. The sooner we can respond to this economy and its needs, the better it will be.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

DEVELOPING ANWR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I listened carefully to my colleague from Illinois. I think what we are going to see next week is almost class warfare on the issue of the stimulus.

What is a stimulus? Stimulus is what really stimulates the economy. I think

as we look at the difference in the positions of both parties, we come to the conclusion that for those who happen to have the circumstances that allow them to have accumulated capital, it is in our interests to encourage them to invest in inventories, expenditures, and so forth, so this economy can move. It doesn't move necessarily simply by government spending. These should be determined to be true stimulus matters.

I would like to reflect, as a member of the Finance Committee, on how we got into this situation relative to putting a bill together, under the Finance Committee leadership of the two leaders, Senator BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY, who had worked together extraordinarily well on the tax package. It was a bipartisan package, so unlike what came out of the Finance Committee yesterday. It seemed as if the Republican participation in the process had been virtually eliminated by the Democratic majority and the Democratic majority leader. In the manner in which he dictated the terms and conditions, there would be virtually no input from the Republicans in that package.

As a consequence, I do admire the chairman, Senator BAUCUS, for insisting that the process at least go through the committee because, unlike what happened in the Energy Committee where the Democratic leader simply pulled the energy bill and there was no committee process; there was no input from the authorization committee, so the committee basically shut down, and the Democratic leader took it upon himself to work up an energy bill that we have yet to see. What we are seeing here is an extraordinary dictate of power from the Democratic leader who says: We are going to do it my way. We are not going to go through the process associated with the authorizing committees.

As a consequence, what happened yesterday in the Finance Committee was a partisan vote. We are going to start in with that package on Tuesday. If we are going to get anywhere, we are going to start in accommodating each other's points of view, working towards a bipartisan solution. Clearly, this country, and the President, wants to have this issue resolved. It should be resolved. But it has to be a true stimulus.

What I am doing is drawing a little bit of a parallel to the power politics of what is occurring here. We saw initially on the energy bill, as I have indicated, where the authorizing committee's jurisdiction was basically eliminated and the chairman of the committee saw fit to simply leave the obligation up to the Democratic leadership. That almost occurred in the Finance Committee but not quite.

As we look at the stimulus, I want to reflect one more time on what true stimulus is. True stimulus is the creation of jobs, the creation of jobs by urging the private sector to invest, ini-

tiate action. There is one issue before this body, and it is either going to be on the stimulus bill or perhaps we can make an arrangement with the Democratic leadership to take it up, debate it, vote up or down, and address the issues as they should be—and that is the issue of an energy bill.

One of the issues in that bill is the contentious issue of ANWR. Should it be opened? Should it not? We have seen the position of our President on numerous occasions who says it is an integral part of the Nation's energy policy to reduce our dependence on imported oil. The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, Vietnam Veterans, the Catholic War Veterans, what do they say? I could go on and on. They have implored the Democratic leader to put this on the calendar, to take it up, vote on it. Their particular view of this issue is they don't believe we should send any more men and women to fight a war on foreign shores.

I am reminded of the comments of a former Member, Mark Hatfield, who was a pacifist. He said: I would vote for opening ANWR any day rather than send another man or woman to fight a war on foreign shores over oil.

I think that says a lot for American veterans. Make no mistake about it; we fought a war over oil in the Persian Gulf. Today we are buying oil from our enemy, whom we basically conquered in that war, Saddam Hussein. We are importing over a million barrels a day. Yet at the same time we are enforcing a no-fly zone over that country. We are putting at stake the lives of American men and women. As we take the oil from Iraq, put it in our planes, and enforce the no-fly zone, we bomb him. The consequence of that is he takes our money, develops a missile capability, maybe a biological capability, and aims it at our ally, Israel. Maybe that is an oversimplification of foreign policy, but it is not too far off.

Organized labor is totally aboard. For the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, maritime unions, seafarers unions, operating engineers, plumbers, pipefitters, carpenters and joiners, this is a jobs issue. Where can you find a stimulus that will generate roughly 250,000 jobs—these are U.S. jobs, these are union jobs in this country—other than this particular issue of opening up that sliver of ANWR?

The interesting thing is we are creating jobs. We are also generating revenue to the Federal Government because those lease sales are estimated to generate about \$3.6 billion from the private sector.

What we have here is an opportunity, an extraordinary opportunity to recognize the realities associated with what this stimulus would do to the economy. There is not one other thing any Member can identify that will not cost the taxpayer one red cent and that will employ more people in this country, generate more jobs.

From where do these jobs come? We will have to build another 19 or 20 U.S.-

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 terrorist acts.

Our Nation was having some difficulty even prior to September 11 with an economy that was very weak. 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

American people during an economic downturn.

This is the political system. I don't regret the fact that there is debate about these things. With respect to national security issues, this country has unity. On some of the other issues, we have debate. I don't regret that. It strengthens us. There is an old saying when everyone in the room is thinking the same thing, no one is thinking about much. I don't shrink from debate. We should not shrink from debate. When in debate we get the best of what everyone has to offer, democracy is served.

Groucho Marx once said: Politics is the art of looking for trouble; finding it everywhere, diagnosing it incorrectly, and then applying the wrong remedies.

Groucho Marx was a humorist. Politics takes a lot of humor and should over many years. But politics is the process by which we make judgments and decisions about the country. That is politics; that is the best of the American people. It is what served this country well for a long time. So as we talk now together in this country about how we apply some remedies and develop policies that strengthen America's economy, we have ideas coming from all sides. Let me describe some of them. Some of them are wonderful, challenging, interesting; some of them are nutty—but that is the way the process works.

We have, for example, one piece of legislation that was developed by the other body, and it was described as something that is a stimulus package and is going to help the country. I will give you a couple of examples: They put in a \$21 billion tax piece that benefits many of the largest corporations in the country for the purpose of incentivizing them to move and keep needed investment capital overseas. How would I classify that? Nutty.

Does anybody think that is going to strengthen our country, strengthen our economy, by saying to big companies: What we would like you to do, by the way, is keep investing overseas. We would like you to move capital overseas because we think that is just great.

Well, that is not the way to strengthen our economy, the way to provide a lift and boost and helium to the American economy. But that is exactly what came out of this package from the U.S. House of Representatives. There are so many other items in that bill that it's almost hard to start when you describe things you think are kind of off base.

Another provision would retroactively repeal the corporate alternative minimum tax. That means that IBM, for example, would get a \$1.4 billion tax cut. General Motors would get a \$833 million tax cut.

It seems to me that is kind of larding up a piece of legislation that is supposed to be designed to help our country recover. Instead, it becomes a carrier for the favored old tax cuts for the

biggest and most powerful economic interests among us.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator spoke of "larding up." Would he say that is a cholesterol-laden piece of pork?

Mr. DORGAN. I hadn't thought about that.

Mr. BYRD. When I was a young man, which was quite a while ago, I worked in a meat shop in a coal mining camp. All of the ladies who came to the store, including my mother and my wife's mother, bought lard. Those coal miners, before they went into the bowels of the earth and did that back-breaking work, ate sausage and bacon fried in a deep skillet with lard. We never heard of the word "cholesterol" in those days. That is a new word in my lexicon, coming along probably about in the middle of my life. So I was interested when the Senator used the words "larding up." Was he talking about a spending measure or was he talking about pork? What did the Senator have reference to? I missed that. Would he say that again?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I was actually using that term to describe something done on a tax bill in the other body. I described it as "larding up." It is plugging the arteries of this system by putting in place certain provisions. I will give you an example.

Mr. BYRD. Would that be cholesterol?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes. When I talk about larding up, the Senator from West Virginia is talking about how people always refer to spending bills as pork, but never refer to tax bills as pork. In fact, there is more lard and larding up of tax bills than almost anything else.

The retroactive repeal of the corporate alternative minimum tax in the House tax bill does as I said it would—it provides the biggest tax benefits to the biggest, most powerful corporations in the country.

Here is what the chief economist from Merrill Lynch said about it because, remember now, the only reason we are going through this exercise is to try to determine how we help the American economy. Bruce Steinberg, chief economist, said:

The silliest idea is the retroactive AMT payments. If you want to stimulate spending in the future, you don't give out tax breaks for things that already happened.

It is as simple as that.

Mr. BYRD. That is the epitome of pork, isn't it? It drips with lard.

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator describes it in a way that makes it visual. But it is a slow turn on a medium-hot spit—or "pit." I guess it would be in West Virginia. Let me continue.

Will Rogers said something I want to put up on a chart.

Will Rogers said this a long time ago:

The unemployed here ain't eating regular, but we will get round to them soon as we get everybody else fixed up OK.

Now, while IBM, General Electric, and others are prepared, according to

the House bill, to get hundreds of millions of dollars in tax cuts retroactively, last Friday it was announced that 415,000 people lost their jobs in October. What about those folks? When you talk about stimulating the economy, what about giving the people who lost their jobs some assistance? How about a helping hand to somebody who got a pink slip or a notice that said: By the way, you do a good job and I am glad you are here. It is just that our company is shrinking. We don't have as much business. So guess what, we don't have room for you. Tell your family tonight when you go home and sit at the supper table that you have lost your job. Tell them it is not your fault, that you worked hard, we appreciated you, but you can't go to work on Monday because you no longer have a job.

What about those people? For example, in New York, when that act of terrorism struck the World Trade Center, it is true that the people who were climbing those stairs, even as the buildings were collapsing, were people making \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 a year, willing to risk their lives in public service—firefighters, law enforcement folks, and others. There are a lot of folks around this country of ours who don't have a lot, don't make a lot, and don't ask for a lot. They don't have a million dollars. They are not going to get \$1.4 billion in tax refunds. They are not on this list with K-Mart, American Airlines, and Enron. They are the folks who, last month, had to tell their families they were no longer employed. And if the families asked why, is it a part of a soft economy or part of terrorist acts? The answer is: Yes, it is.

What do we do about that? Do we in the U.S. Congress have a concern about those folks, or is it just about the upper income and the big economic behemoths who really have clout? Is there anybody within 100 yards of this building today, Friday, who is here because they are lobbying on behalf of somebody who lost their job last month? No one. It is just the folks who have a lot of money, a lot of assets and a lot at stake. They are here and they are trying to get more than their share.

I will tell you, they succeeded in the U.S. House. So we are trying to write a stimulus package, something that provides economic recovery.

We have a couple of thoughts in mind. One is there is no quicker or more effective way, and there is no way, in my judgment, that provides more justice to this system as well than to help people who are out of work. They are going to spend that money instantly. When we extend unemployment benefits, that money goes right back into the economy. All economists tell you: Step one, help those who lost jobs because that is stimulative, helps the economy. It is not only just and the right thing to do, it is the most effective thing to provide some lift to this economy.

So we are going to have a debate about that because some don't want to

do much for these folks. That is wrong-headed, in my judgment. We have a responsibility to the country to reach out and tell them they are not alone; we want to help them and we want to help this economy.

Obviously, what we want in the end is for the economy to get back on its feet and for those folks who have lost jobs to become employed once again.

That is what we want. There is no social program much better than a good job. There is nothing like a good job that pays well and has security. What we are trying to do is put together a recovery package that recognizes what is just, what is right, and what will be effective in providing lift to this country's economy.

Extending unemployment benefits, paying for 75 percent of the COBRA benefits—all of that provides lift to this economy and is the right thing to do.

In addition, coming from the Finance Committee, we have put in place some tax provisions we think will provide a lift to this economy. We had a tax cut for people in this country earlier this year. Not everybody got a tax cut. More than 70,000 North Dakotans did not get a tax cut. They did not get a tax cut because it was based on percentage of income taxes paid.

Everybody who works pays payroll taxes. In fact, that is a proportional tax. Everybody pays the same rate; it does not matter how much you make. Yet those folks did not get a tax cut. So we propose a tax rebate for those people. That also will be spent immediately and provide lift to the economy.

We have a whole series of items we have proposed that we think represent the first step in the right direction to provide lift to this country's economy.

Let me make the most important point about all of this. The only way our economy is going to experience a recovery is if the American people are confident about the future. We do not have a ship of state in which there is an engine room with dials, knobs, gauges, and levers and we have some people in there fiddling with the dials, knobs, gauges, and levers and get it just right with tax cuts and move the ship along.

That is not how the system works. What propels this economy is people's confidence in the future. If people are confident about tomorrow, next month, next year, they will do things that represent that confidence. They will take a trip. They will buy a car. They will buy a house. They will make life decisions that express their view about the future.

Confidence means expansion. If they are not confident, they will not take the trip, they will defer the purchase of the car, they will defer the purchase of the house, and our economy will contract.

There is nothing more important than instilling confidence. Our job is to, one, prosecute the war abroad. We

have to do that and support our President doing that—and increase security at home. Part of our economic recovery package is investment in security at home. Senator BYRD has a homeland security proposal that is stimulative. It is not only stimulative and gives lift to the economy because it invests in this country and our security, but it is also the right thing and the necessary thing to do.

When we can marry the right and necessary things to do with actions that will give lift to our country's economy, that is exactly the course people expect us to take.

We need to prosecute the war, increase security at home, and give businesses and individuals the extra incentives they need to make those key purchases and key investments, not 6 months from now, not over a year from now, but now. Now. This needs to be temporary. It needs to have a significant, compelling urge to it to give the American people confidence about the future that we are doing the right thing.

If we err as a Congress, I want us to err on the side of doing something, even doing too much. I do not want to err on the side of doing nothing because there are too many families out of work. Our economy is perilously close to a very deep recession, and it could be a lengthy recession. We have a responsibility to blend good fiscal policy in the Congress with monetary policy at the Federal Reserve Board to say to the American people: We are going to put in place the right plans to give you hope for the future.

Winston Churchill gave many stirring speeches in the Second World War to fire up the interest and urgency of his countrymen to the cause of the war. At one point, he challenged his countrymen to imagine a thousand years in the future and what they would say about that current generation's efforts. He asked that they do things now that would allow people in the future to look back and say that this was their finest hour, even in the face of substantial challenge.

That is what we, it seems to me, need to do now in confronting terrorism, in the challenge to provide economic security. We must fight as hard as we can possibly fight for the right policies now that give this country and economy a chance to do well so all American families can, again, do well and will not have to worry about next week or next month having to tell their family they lost their job.

This is about hope. It is about opportunity. It is about expanding this country's economy. The New York Times last week had the headline: "Attacks Hit Low Paid Jobs the Hardest." I had a hearing 2 weeks ago, and the head of the hotel and restaurant union testified. He had a dozen of his members behind him. Each one stood up and told me their name, told me where they worked, when they got fired, how long they had worked there, and what it

meant to them to lose their job. It was just gripping. It just breaks one's heart to see someone who struggled all their life, found a good job and worked for 8 years or 10 years or 15 years and had a good record and was making it on their own, only to learn a pink slip has come that says this economy has shrunk and you are out of a job.

It requires us to understand this is not about numbers, this is about people. It is about our future. That is why we must get this right.

I am pleased with the work the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS, Senator DASCHLE, all of us have done together to try to get the right solution in place for this country's future. We are going to have a debate about this next week. Let us not shrink from it. Let us not think that debate injures this country or hurts this country. It strengthens this country.

At the end of the debate, I hope we can convince everyone there is a right way and a wrong way. The wrong way leads to economic trouble, and the right way leads to hope, confidence, and economic expansion. That rides on our making the right decision on behalf of the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized at the completion of the remarks by the distinguished junior Senator from New York and that I may be recognized for as much time as I may consume.

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

The Senator from New York.

STIMULATING THE ECONOMY

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and a great leader of this body and our country, for that courtesy. I thank my colleague from North Dakota for very thoughtful and thought-provoking remarks. I join those remarks, and I ask that as we do move toward this debate on how we stimulate our economy and how we take care of our people, we put it in a broader context.

I sometimes worry that talk about economic stimulus, talk about Tax Code provisions, talk about a lot of the issues that come before the Finance Committee and then come before the Senate may not be communicating directly and effectively with the public who need to follow this debate closely because what we will be or will not be deciding over the course of the next several weeks will have profound effects on our daily lives, on our quality of life, on our national security at home and abroad, and on the future of our economic growth and opportunities.

The Finance Committee came out with a package that should deserve the

support of Senators on both sides of the aisle. I am well aware there is a very different point of view on behalf of my colleagues on the other side, so we are going to have a debate. I agree with my colleague from North Dakota; it is an important debate. But we cannot look at what is being proposed today without recognizing several very important factors.

First, we are now moving into deficits. We thought we had deficits tamed. We thought the struggle, sacrifice—economic, personal, political, and public—of the last 8 years meant that we were on strong fiscal footing, that we did have a policy for economic growth that would demonstrate fiscal responsibility, pay down the debt, free up investment capital, and keep this great engine of economic prosperity going.

We did not repeal the law of business cycles, so understandably there will be ups and downs, but we moved the economic plain to a higher level and had a consensus in the country that the smart fiscal policy was the responsible one; that trying to continue to pay down our debt in order to relieve the burdens not only from future generations but from ourselves, not to crowd out investment capital so that businesses could come into the market and have long-term interest rates at an affordable level, meant we knew the direction in which the economy should go.

Now it will not surprise anyone in this Chamber that I ascribe to the Clinton-Rubin economic policies. I happen to think they make sense. I believe in a global economy, fiscal responsibility, investment policies. Making it possible for people to pursue their own futures by creating economic opportunities goes hand in hand with keeping deficits down, in fact keeping surpluses growing and giving us a chance to know we are going to have for the foreseeable future strong economic times.

That is not the philosophy of the other side, and I respect their right to hold that contrary philosophy. So we stand here now in November, having passed a very large tax cut in the spring which undermines our long-term economic future, which demonstrates clearly we are going to have some very hard choices to make even had September 11 never occurred because we had already seen that we were going into deficits, that we were taking from the Medicare and Social Security surplus dollars that hard-working people believed would be there for Medicare and Social Security, and as a result we now are facing much more difficult choices which, had we been more fiscally responsible, we could have avoided.

That is water under the bridge. There is nothing we can do about it. A majority of our colleagues in both Houses voted for a U-turn away from fiscal responsibility. So here we are.

What do we do now? Again, I do not think we can look at this stimulus debate in some kind of vacuum. We were

attacked on September 11. We are at war. We have men and women from Fort Drum in northern New York over in central Asia. We have Special Forces. We have carriers. We have people who wear the uniform of our country who are in full-time service defending us because this is an act of self-defense, attempting to uproot and destroy the terrorist networks. We have many from the National Guard and the Reserves called to duty, disrupting their lives. We know we are at war.

If we go back and look at history, we know when we are at war we have to think differently about our priorities than when we are not at war. So what are those priorities? First, to do everything we possibly can to support the President, to support our military leadership, in waging this war successfully and victoriously. I do not think there is one dissenting voice in this body to that proposition.

We also know this is a war that has been brought home tragically to us, that those on the front lines are not just our men and women in uniform, they are also our firefighters, our police officers, our emergency responders, our doctors and our nurses, our postal workers, men and women who got up on September 11 and in the weeks since to do their job as part of the great American mosaic where people, through their individual efforts, create this extraordinary democracy we so treasure.

We know we have to do more to protect ourselves at home. That is why the President has named Governor Ridge the Director of Homeland Security. So we have to take a very close look at what it is we need, both for our men and women in uniform and on the homeland front to protect ourselves.

We did not have to think about that when this big old tax cut was voted on last spring. Maybe people should have, but nobody really stopped and said, well, we cannot take all this revenue away because Heaven knows we might have anthrax attacks that will cause the Postal Service and the Federal Government and local communities across our country to spend literally millions and billions of dollars to protect themselves and us. We did not imagine that, but now we not only imagine it, we have lived with it. That raises a whole new set of responsibilities that we ignore at our peril.

So part of what we have to figure out how to do is provide enough resources to protect us, to wage the war on both fronts that we are waging, and to create economic opportunities by getting our economy moving again.

I have listened very closely to what my colleagues have said, and I have consulted with people in the business world, people who run big companies, people who are economists, some of whom sit in ivory towers, others of whom actually get out and talk to people on the street about what is happening.

The real core of our challenge is, how do we inspire confidence? How do we

get consumer confidence, citizen confidence up? How do we get people back into the normal give and take of their lives?

When I first joined the Senate last January, and all through the spring and summer, I could not walk through these halls. They were crowded with people, especially school groups. I used to be so thrilled to think I was honored to serve in a body of the greatest democracy in the history of the world that was open, where people could come, like those who are here today but in far smaller numbers than they ever have been.

Now, of course, we can walk through the halls and not see anybody. I do not have young people coming up to me and saying, oh, Senator, what are you doing today? Or, I am from New York. Or, how are you?

They are not here. Why? Because schools do not want children to travel. Parents understandably are concerned. We have not done what we should do to take care of airline security. That is still being debated. So we have to inspire confidence.

How do we inspire confidence? I think there really are several ways we should address it. Some of it does go directly to the points the Senator from North Dakota was making. We have to have a balance. We have to have a balance between what we believe will work for business and what we believe we should do for workers and citizens who themselves deserve both help and motivation to go on with their lives, to be productive.

I think the Finance Committee has struck the right balance. Spending money on unemployment insurance is not only the right thing to do—a lot of people are out of work not because they were sloughing off on the job, not because they did not show up on time, but because we were attacked—we owe an obligation to these people. I think unemployment insurance will enable people to get back on their feet, and if there is any dollar that will be spent immediately to stimulate the economy, it is a dollar in unemployment insurance. There is not an economist in the world who disagrees with that, unless they are blinded by some ideological prejudice. That is what they all tell us.

Health care is increasingly a problematic issue. My colleagues know I have had a few things to say about that in the past, and I am still very concerned about it. I am especially concerned because I see the price of health care going back up. I see employers pushing down on employees and making it more difficult for people to afford health care. We are going to have to address that issue.

What we are worried about right now are all of those people who have lost their health care because it came through employment they no longer have. They cannot afford the COBRA extension. They need help.

We also are stimulating the economy in the Finance Committee package by

trying to do in a targeted way what we have been advised will work in business, not these big, irresponsible giveaways in which the House engaged. I do not understand how with a straight face they can put a provision into their package which pays people back for taxes they paid all the way back to 1985 without a promise that it is going to create a new job, without a promise that it will be invested in a new plant and equipment right now.

As Senator DORGAN rightly pointed out, they actually give an incentive to businesses to move American jobs overseas. What on Earth are they thinking about? That is just unbelievable to me. So I think the Finance Committee, with their vote last night, really struck the right balance. I hope we go forward with that.

I also hope we recognize the additional program that Senator BYRD and Senator REID have advocated is essential. We have not made the commitment of resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. CLINTON. We have not made the commitment of resources we need to our public health system, to our fight against bioterrorism, to the kind of security we need in our powerplants, our chemical plants. I think we have a lot more to do. I commend Senator BYRD for his leadership.

Finally, a special word of appreciation to the Finance Committee for their recognition and support of New York. We know this was an attack on America. The epicenter of the attack was on New York City. It was New York City firefighters who went up those towers when people were coming down. It is the firefighters and the police officers and the emergency responders who have been going to countless funerals. It is the people who worked in those buildings who have scrambled to try to make sense of their lives, to restart their jobs, and many of them are no longer employed. The estimate is about 100,000 have been dislocated.

The ripple effect through the city and the State has been even greater. Because of those 100,000 who directly lost their jobs in lower Manhattan, many of them work for companies that bought from smaller companies, that did work with banks and law firms and advertising agencies that had catering and restaurant business to give out. They no longer do that. We are now looking at a loss of about 250,000 individuals in New York alone by the end of this year.

We have seen unemployment go up around the Nation, but it has gone up even more in New York City. We are not sure the end has been reached. We know this has had a ripple effect through the entire State, not just through the city. In Syracuse we lost 400 employees of USAir when they de-

cided to close a call center after losing so much business. In Buffalo, with the loss of tax revenues—because 15 percent of all the State's tax revenues came from Ground Zero; those are gone—we are looking at laying off up to 500 teachers in Buffalo, which is at the opposite end of the State.

The package coming out of the Finance Committee will help enormously. I am particularly grateful for the tax incentives that will help us rebuild Lower Manhattan, will help us recover some of that lost office space to get back into the business of being the global financial capital of the entire world. It will take a long time. New York will need a lot of help. This is a very welcome start.

The tax credits for employers to keep their offices in Manhattan will help tip the balance in favor of doing just that. Tax-exempt bonding authority for construction will give an extra boost to rebuilding, and reinvesting insurance proceeds will enable people to make that decision. We are still working on something to keep residents downtown, which is a very big challenge, and to provide additional relief for advance refunding for the port authority and the metropolitan transportation authority and for their infrastructure projects.

We lost our subway lines. We lost the PATH Train from New Jersey. We will have a lot of work ahead. I thank and commend the Finance Committee, particularly the chairman, Senator BAUCUS, for a job well done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from West Virginia is recognized for such time as he may consume.

FAST-TRACK LEGISLATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned about the administration's top trade legislation priority: Fast track, known in administration circles as "trade promotion authority."

How crass. How crass. "Trade promotion authority." To denominate fast track as "trade promotion authority" is the acme of crassitude. Hear me down there at the other end of the avenue: The acme of crassitude! To denominate fast-track legislation as trade promotion authority, or by its acronym, TPA, is the acme of crassitude. One might better interpret the acronym TPA as standing for "tactic to prevent amendments"; TPA, "Tactic to Prevent Amendments."

Hear me! Colleagues on the other side of the Capitol Building, where the administration has put on its big push for the acme of crassitude: Fast track authority, calling it trade promotion authority. But it is a tactic to prevent amendments. That is what fast track is, a tactic to preclude Congress from fulfilling its constitutional obligations to debate and, if necessary, to amend.

I hope they can stop this oafish piece of legislation on the other side of the

Capitol. If they can't, then bring it onto the Senate Floor.

Come one, come all,
This rock shall fly
From its firm base
As soon as I!

Yes, come one, come all. Hear me down there at the other end of the avenue, the White House: Bring on your TPA. Yes, "tactic to prevent amendments."

Come one, come all,
This rock shall fly
From its firm base
As soon as I!

Those words from, I believe it was Scott's "Lady of the Lake," are very apropos here. This tactic to prevent Congress from fulfilling its constitutional obligations to debate and, if necessary, to amend trade bills.

The administration hoists its flag on the flagpole of trade promotion authority. This is my flag, the Constitution of the United States! I hold it in my hand. Those who would defy the Constitution will find the battle lines formed here.

I oppose this surrender of our constitutional authority. That is what the White House would have us do. I oppose this surrender. "We've just begun to fight." The authority to "regulate commerce with foreign nations" is granted exclusively to Congress in Article I, section 8, of the Constitution. Congress, the House, and Senate of the United States—not the President—has this authority under the Constitution and has this responsibility under the Constitution.

So let us not be persuaded by administration attempts to promote fast track as an antidote to the events of September 11, 2001. There are those who attempt to promote the idea that, under the rubric of a stimulus bill, Members in the House and the Senate would add language that would promote their pet ideas, their pet projects. Well, under the rubric of "stimulus," the administration is attempting to promote its own pet project—TPA. Trade promotion authority? Fast track. Let us not be persuaded by these furtive attempts.

U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick has stated that fast track is necessary because "we need to strengthen the U.S. and global economies as they reel from the shocks of September 11."

Who is Robert Zoellick? Was he elected by the people of any State? Did he stand before the bar of judgment of the electorate? Is that how he became Trade Representative? No! Yet he, U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick, has stated that fast track is necessary because "we need to strengthen the U.S. and global economies as they reel from the shocks of September 11." I do not understand Mr. Zoellick's logic. Now is the time for the President and the Congress to stand by the Constitution; stand by the Constitution and work together.

Now is the time for Congress to respond to the September 11 terrorist assault upon the American way of life.

This is not the time for us to short-circuit our deliberative processes. Let us debate. Let us debate the trade measures. What are you afraid of, Mr. Zoellick? Moreover, the Ambassador cannot support his attempt to link fast track to global economic recovery. With or without fast track, it is going to take years, not months, for the President to negotiate a new world trade agreement.

I question whether, in the current international climate, we should even desire to have a new global trade round. As the United States forges a coalition to fight terrorism, those countries that have been attacking the framework of fair trade for the past several years have absolutely no incentive to agree to mutually beneficial trade proposals. Rather, they will attempt—as they have in the past—to use cooperation on security issues as a bargaining chip—a bargaining chip to extract trade concessions from the United States.

Just look at the so-called Harbinson text being considered at this very moment in Doha, Qatar. Is there any question that our trading partners are asking that our trade laws be substantially weakened? Is there any question that the administration is indicating a willingness to put those laws on the negotiating table? If we allow our trade laws to be gutted—gutted, what will happen to essential U.S. industries? What will happen to the steel industry? What will happen to other essential U.S. industries that are being picked apart by predatory foreign trade practices?

In any event, it is indisputable that Congress and the President can work together, under the Constitution, to conclude and implement international trade agreements. Immediately after the September 11 terrorist attack, Congress passed the U.S.-Jordan trade agreement, one in a long series of trade agreements concluded and implemented by the United States since fast track lapsed in 1994.

Bring it on. Trade promotion authority—ha, ha, ha—trade promotion authority! Of all the gimmicks that I have heard in my 84 years of life on this Earth, that one takes the cake. It is plain old fast track!

The constitutional system works and the administration has not made the case for tinkering with it.

President Bush claims to need this extra-constitutional negotiating authority in order to exercise leadership in opening up world trade. On June 21, 2001, he sent many of his highest ranking trade officials, including Secretary of Commerce Evans—for whom I have a great deal of respect—and Ambassador Zoellick, to the Senate Finance Committee to testify on the supposed need for fast track. Ambassador Zoellick maintained that fast track is needed in order for the administration “to reassert America’s leadership in trade.”

I remember very well the old-fashioned vaudeville shows where they sold

those patent medicines, that snake oil. This is snake oil that Mr. Zoellick is peddling—snake oil! It will curl your hair. If you don’t have any hair, it will grow hair for you: Snake oil!

The United States can, and should, lead in opening up world trade by offering other countries arrangements that are mutually advantageous, not by undermining a key provision of the Constitution.

Senators might well consider the impact of normal debate and amendment rules on the basic leverage available to U.S. trade negotiators. Normal rules should be a matter of enhanced leverage for U.S. negotiators in terms of including provisions that are of strong appeal to Congress, the people’s elected representatives in the legislative branch, the people’s elected representatives who take an oath when they stand before that Presiding Officer and put their hand on the Holy Bible. They take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Let’s remember that oath.

The threat that an agreement might be amended by Congress to include a provision gives all parties to a negotiation an incentive to conclude realistic and politically viable agreements. If I were a negotiator, I would like to have the leverage of being able to say, “if we don’t include this provision in the agreement, Congress may include it anyway.”

Congress may include it anyway. Fast-track Trade Promotional Authority—TPA—fast track eliminates this form of leverage.

When you go to negotiate over the purchase of an automobile, are you better off going in on your own with your own free will? You can take it, you can leave it, or you can go somewhere else. It is common knowledge that you can strike a better deal if you are able to suggest to the seller that there is someone back home who may amend or modify any agreement that you might reach.

The Administration, I think, has it exactly backwards: instead of concentrating its energies on accumulating as much leverage as possible vis-a-vis our trading partners, it is marshaling those energies to convince Congress to reduce its leverage on behalf of hard-working American families and their communities. This can only hamper our efforts to maintain, and enhance, U.S. leverage abroad.

The Administration is implicitly saying: “If you are for shortchanging the legislative process, you are for opening up world trade and combating terrorism.” That makes no sense to me. I am for free trade that is fair to all parties. What is wrong with that? And I am certainly for rooting out terrorism and enacting measures to ensure our national security. We need not, however, abandon the Constitution in order to achieve these objectives!

I didn’t take an oath up here before this Presiding Officer to abandon the

Constitution. That is what we are doing.

I am not saying we ought to debate every little duty on every little toothbrush that comes into this country, or every little paper clip or every fiddle bow or every violin string. I am not saying we ought to debate the duties on toothpicks if they come from China or wherever. But I am saying, the elected representatives of the people ought not even to be asked to give up the cherished right to debate and amend trade legislation when the people’s interests are involved.

We need not abandon the Constitution in order to achieve these objectives. We Senators need carefully to consider and analyze the claims that we hear about the benefits of fast track.

There may be one amendment or two amendments or three that go to policy when we deal with trade matters. I am not saying, as I have already indicated, that we ought to take a microscope and go over a trade bill and get ourselves involved in the teeny-weeny, itsy-bitsy little pieces here or there. But I am saying that there may be major policy amendments that we may wish to debate or on which we may want to vote.

Now, I have a letter dated June 28, 1993, from then-United States Trade Representative Kantor, urging support for what he called “the fast track negotiating authority needed to complete the Uruguay Round.” He wrote: “As the world’s leading exporter and the world’s most open economy, the U.S. stands to benefit greatly by reducing barriers and opening markets around the world for manufactured goods, agricultural products and services.” How accurate was this prognostication? If, as the former Ambassador suggested, the last round of multilateral trade agreements was focused on reducing foreign trade barriers—not opening up the floodgates to imports—shouldn’t our overall balance of trade have improved in the 1990s?

The facts belie the fast-track sales pitch. That is what it is—a fast-track sales pitch. In the year 2000, the United States ran a trade deficit on the current account of \$435 billion. That is nearly nine times the trade deficit in 1992. How much longer can this go on? Even more disturbingly, it equals 4.5 percent of America’s total national output. On a percentage basis, that is the worst trade performance in U.S. history!

How long can the United States continue to run these deficits? Have the laws of international economics been repealed? Is the so-called “New Economy” a land flowing with milk and honey, in which we no longer need a real economy, that is, an economy that produces goods and services, and employs workers? Have we entered the Promised Land of perspiration-free economics? I am afraid not. Even our foreign trading partners cannot be sanguine as the United States, historically

the engine of growth for the entire world, is left without the means to play that role.

America is becoming ever more dependent on foreign suppliers of basic manufactured products, even in areas—such as steel—where our producers are the most technologically sophisticated and efficient in the world. Has anyone stopped to consider the impact on our national defense of this foreign dependence? Has anyone attempted to determine how our international position will be affected as we become more susceptible to economic blackmail? Has anyone taken full account of how unfair international trade has helped to restrict income growth at home, particularly in the case of middle class families? Many such families now need two incomes—both parents out in the workplace—to maintain the kind of lifestyle that single-earner families could expect a generation ago.

We hear a lot about the projected economic benefits of fast track. Of course, this administration does not dare call it fast track. No, it is “trade promotion authority”—“trade promotion authority.” That is an attempt to hoodwink those who would fall for it; fast track!

We hear a lot about the projected economic benefits of trade promotion authority, fast track. Yet, as a recent study by the Economic Policy Institute pointed out, the forecast model most frequently cited by fast track advocates relies on unrealistic assumptions. For example, the model assumes that there is no unemployment here or anywhere else in the world and that there are no national labor or environmental standards. Moreover, the model assumes that denying elected officials the authority to set the rules of the marketplace has no costs either in terms of the functioning of the global economy or the achievement of domestic economic and social objectives. These assumptions tell us more about the prejudices of a global trade elite than they do about the economic circumstances in which we find ourselves.

Let us have a trade policy for the new millennium. Let us demand that trade negotiations become a two-way street, both in form and in substance. Let us make it clear to our trading partners that we will not be duped by those who would grant America the mantle of “leadership”—the mantle of “leadership”—only in exchange for unilateral concessions. All countries stand to benefit from expanded international trade, and all countries should bear the costs of constructing the framework of that trade. American workers should no longer be left holding the bag in international trade negotiations. The steel workers have been left holding the bag all too long, the textile workers have been left holding the bag all too long in international trade. The automobile workers have been left holding the bag all too long in international trade negotiations.

U.S. trade negotiators need congressional input. Let's debate it. Let's talk

about it, and, if necessary, let's amend it. U.S. trade negotiators need congressional input in the negotiating process. Remember the ad? “Do it here. Do it now.” The same with trade negotiations. U.S. trade negotiators need congressional input. Enhanced legislative participation will help them in their efforts to reinforce the framework of fair trade. Is it only fair trade when the United States continues to run up huge deficits in the billions of dollars or in the hundreds of billions of dollars? It will give the results of trade negotiations greater legitimacy and increase public understanding of the costs and benefits of globalization. The Constitution—ah, there is the Rock of Gibraltar, the Constitution—the Constitution requires that we make this effort, and the American people expect it.

Mr. President, toward the end of his life, in a letter to Henry Lee, Thomas Jefferson brilliantly analyzed the fundamental issue upon which the debate over fast track turns. This is what he said:

Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties: Those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes, and, Those who identify themselves with the people. . . . In every country these two parties exist; and in every one where they are free to think, speak, and write, they will declare themselves.

Mr. President, from 1974 to 1994, Congress was, unfortunately, asleep at the wheel as the one-sided trade jalopy—I wonder if our little pages here have ever heard that word, “jalopy”?—as the one-sided trade jalopy rumbled down the fast track. The people's branch of Government—ha, ha, ha—let's let that other branch of Government down the avenue become aware again that there is the people's branch, that does not bend before any President, that isn't elected by any President, that isn't sent here by any President, that cannot be fired by any President—let them hear it from Capitol Hill. Bring on your trade promotion authority. You will get your fight right here.

The people's branch of the Government—the Congress—allowed itself, I am ashamed to say, to be shunted aside in the process of formulating and implementing U.S. trade policy. Let us resolve to seize the day, to restore the constitutional balance—bring it on; there isn't enough time left in this year, if we did nothing else, to pass it in this body—and to make international trade agreements reflect the interests of hard-working Americans. There is not enough time left in the year to pass “fast track” here, unless I am very, very badly and sadly mistaken.

Now is the time to move past the failed trade paradigm of recent administrations, both Republican and Democratic. Now is the time to restore the people's faith that they can have an impact on the policies that shape their lives. Mr. Zoellick, we are talking

about the people's lives. “I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him.”

Mr. President, I come to bury fast-track authority, not to praise it! Now is the time to reject fast track and to embrace republican self-government as it has been bequeathed to us by the Framers of the Constitution, by those who debated the Constitution, by those who ratified it in the State conventions.

We must be steadfast in our loyalty to the Constitution. Forget about political party. Think of the Constitution and think of the people who send us here. We are not to be yeasayers or naysayers. We are here to debate and to amend and to render our considered judgment on behalf of the people who send us here, who pay our salaries, and who can bring us back home when the day of judgment comes.

We must be steadfast in our loyalty to that Constitution. Here it is in my hand, the Constitution. There is my trade promotion authority! See it? There is my trade promotion authority, my TPA, the Constitution of the United States!

We must be steadfast in our loyalty to the Constitution, that exquisitely balanced instrument of the people, by the people, and for the people. We must stand together and resist the temptation to once again ignore the clear dictates of our most fundamental law.

IN THE COMPANY OF HEROES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the nights are growing chilly, though the days remain warm and dry—dry for too long, really, over in McLean. The brilliant crimson maple and bright yellow poplar leaves have nearly disappeared, replaced by the more somber late autumn tones of deep bronze oak and rich golden hickory leaves falling in swirling waves across the road to join the drifts of leaves awaiting the rake.

The more subdued coloring is in keeping with the holiday that approaches this Sunday. For, despite any attempts to mask the nature of this holiday behind sales and pre-Christmas hype, Veterans Day remains true to its purpose. It was the old Armistice Day when I was a boy—Armistice Day, November 11.

To say Veterans Day is to hear the haunting echo of taps being played on a lone trumpet on a West Virginia hill far away—I can hear its tones being wafted by the autumn air to this Capital City—and the sharp report of a 21-gun salute ricocheting across a field of sad white crosses. Out of the corner of one's eye is glimpsed the silent rank and file of heroes who came home, some whole and some not, but all remade by the shared experience of warfare.

On Veterans Day, we travel in the company of heroes. Veterans Days, Armistice Day. My mother died on the eve of Armistice Day 1918; my mother, whom I never saw, as far as my recollection is concerned—the 11th hour of

the 11th day of the 11th month, the day on which the guns fell silent at the end of the war to end all wars, World War I.

Today it honors the veterans from all wars, and, sadly, there have been far too many of those: World War II, the cold war, the Korean war, the Vietnam conflict, the Persian Gulf war, and none-too-peaceful peacekeeping missions around the globe. America has in the last century been embroiled in some form of conflict far more often than she has known peace.

No conflict is ever truly finished. In addition to the troops we leave buried in foreign soil, a living guarantor remains behind to protect each fragile and precious truce. United States forces remain in Europe, in Korea, a legacy of this war or that war. United States troops stand at the frontier between the two Koreas. They were there when I looked with binoculars at the Communists just across the dividing line in Korea 46 years ago this month. They have been there since the 1950s.

More United States troops remain in Saudi Arabia and Turkey, vigilant against further aggression from Iraq. In these last months, the United States has been thrust unwillingly but unhesitatingly into a conflict of a new and more ambiguous kind, the war against terrorism. Already this conflict has added new names to the honor roll of heroes whom we honor on Veterans Day. Already active-duty Reserve and National Guard troops have responded to this latest call to arms. Much rides on their shoulders, beyond an understandable thirst to avenge the senseless slaughter of innocent men and women, leaving innocent widows and orphans behind. This war on terrorism must succeed.

The New Testament's—"testament" meaning covenant—admonition to turn the other cheek does not work here. The New Covenant's admonition to turn the other cheek does not work here, but rather we must hew to the Old Testament's—Old Covenant's—harsh warning regarding an eye for an eye. This attack must be answered or the scope and scale of terror attacks worldwide will be forever increased. That universal understanding is reflected in the broad consensus supporting the current U.S. military action and in the concerted efforts to cut off funding for terrorists. So this year, as we honor the veterans of past wars, it is appropriate to salute those who are still in uniform and to give them our support.

In 1961, a veteran of World War II gave his Inaugural Address, his first speech as the new President of the United States. He said, in part:

Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe. Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight

struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation,"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

To President Kennedy's list of the common enemies of man, we can now add terror.

Though we may hope for a quick and conclusive end to this new struggle, we must be prepared for the long haul, for a "long twilight struggle, year in and year out . . ." and for eternal vigilance. We have but to look to our own history to know that we can muster the will, we can muster the determination, we can muster the perseverance to achieve our goal and to preserve the liberty that this Nation has held dear through long centuries.

In the wake of September 11, Americans have rallied by proudly flying American flags on their homes, on their mailboxes, on their cars, yes, and on their lapels. On November 11, those flags fly in remembrance not only of those who so recently lost their lives in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania, but also for all those men and women who have struggled or died to defend our freedom, our liberty, our Nation through the years. I am proud to salute them all, to remember them all, to honor them all. No amount of bloodshed and no amount of fear can turn this great Nation from the ideals that were forged in war in 1776, 1777, 1778, 1779, 1780, and 1781, and defended ever since. Our flag—there it is standing beside the presiding officer's chair, in all of its grandeur, in all of its state-ly magnificence, in all of its quiet beauty. It still flies!

Mr. President, I close with one of my favorite poems, by Henry Holcomb Bennett, entitled "The Flag Goes By." It eloquently puts words to the message being sent by the many, many flags now bedecking our Nation.

Hats off!
 Along the street there comes
 A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums,
 A flash of color beneath the sky:
 Hats off!
 The flag is passing by!
 Blue and crimson and white it shines,
 Over the steel-tipped, ordered lines.
 Hats off!
 The colors before us fly;
 But more than the flag is passing by:
 Sea-fights and land-fights, grim and great,
 Fought to make and to save the State;
 Weary marches and sinking ships;
 Cheers of victory on dying lips:
 Days of plenty and years of peace;
 March of a strong land's swift increase;
 Equal justice, right and law,
 Stately honor and reverend awe;
 Sign of a nation great and strong
 To ward her people from foreign wrong:
 Pride and glory and honor,—all
 Live in the colors to stand or fall.
 Hats off!
 Along the street there comes
 A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums;
 And loyal hearts are beating high:
 Hats off!
 The flag is passing by!

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, before proceeding, I wish to express on behalf of the majority leader and myself our profound gratitude to the Presiding Officer for his patience and for his equanimity and for his good humor always, for the work he has done on behalf of his country today, sitting in the Chair for longer than he should.

A NEW COMMITMENT TO AMERICA'S VETERANS

Mrs. CARNAHAN. Mr. President, in the past few weeks, I have often thought of that scene in one of Shakespeare's plays where two friends meet, but one does not recognize the other. One explains: "Grief hath changed me since you saw me last." Yes, grief has changed the face of America. We are tear stained by tragedy, but we are triumphant in spirit.

It has been nearly 60 years since we experienced such a lethal and cowardly attack on our Nation. Though I was a young child at the time, I still remember the shock and sadness of Pearl Harbor. But I also recall the spirit of unity and patriotism that swelled up within us following that attack.

At a time when half of our Navy lay at the bottom of the ocean, President Roosevelt spoke of our "inevitable triumph." He placed his confidence in what he called "the unbounding determination of the American people."

We all pulled together in the years that followed. We conquered fascism and communism, we rescued democracy, and we built a better world. America's veterans led the way.

Today, our President has called us to a similar resolve. And we will answer that call again. We must start by making a new commitment to all those who serve today, and to every one of America's veterans.

I have proposed legislation that would extend Tri-Care benefits to our citizens soldiers for up to four months after they return from active duty. It has passed the Senate, and I am working to make sure it becomes part of the Defense bill.

I also support a bill to provide Tri-Care for life to every American veteran, because I think we owe them that much.

I believe we should extend the Montgomery G.I. bill, and allow veterans to transfer half of their education benefits to their family.

I also support the President's efforts to improve the Veterans' Administration's response to benefit claims. It is shameful that someone who risked their life for our country should have to wait for months, even years, to get the benefits they deserve, the benefits they have earned.

There might be those who say we can't afford to care for our Nation's veterans, that the price is too high. But I say, if we don't stand by those who fought for us, we are unworthy of their sacrifice.

So on the Veteran's Day 2001, a day of remembrance and commitment, we salute the fighting men and women of our Nation, active duty, reserves, and veterans.

We look to them in our time of national need. They have never let us down. We pledge our support in the defense of freedom. We declare to them, we declare to each other, we will not allow the American dream to be diminished by fear, or our eyes dimmed by tears.

From the ashes of terrorism, we will build a new tower to freedom that will cast its light around the world. With God's help, we will prove again what the poet Carl Sandburg once said: "We are Americans. Nothing like us ever was."

VA-HUD APPROPRIATIONS

WATER PROJECTS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the conference report includes funding for water projects in the Ketchikan Borough. While the project will be located in the borough, technically the funds would be administered by the city of Ketchikan. Does the distinguished ranking member share my view that EPA should issue the grant to the city of Ketchikan which has agreed to administer the funds?

Mr. BOND. I agree that EPA should make the funds available to the city of Ketchikan, not the borough government.

NOBEL PRIZE TO DR. LEE HARTWELL

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to share with the Senate and the American people the remarkable work of Dr. Lee Hartwell, a respected scientist in Washington State. Dr. Hartwell was recently awarded the Nobel Prize for his groundbreaking research in cell division and cancer.

I'm especially proud that Dr. Hartwell conducted much of his research at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center in Seattle, where he serves as president and director.

On October 8, 2001, the Nobel Assembly announced that Dr. Hartwell, along with Paul Nurse and Timothy Hunt, has won the 2001 Nobel Prize in physiology or medicine. The award honors Dr. Hartwell's more than 30 years of pioneering work in yeast genetics. Dr. Hartwell's research into cell division has helped scientists throughout the world to better understand cancer and has laid the foundation for future cancer treatments.

Dr. Hartwell leads one of the finest research teams in the world at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Cen-

ter. In the past five years, I've worked in Congress to double funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH). This investment is intended to support the kind of groundbreaking research being conducted at the Research Center. In fact, as a member of the Senate HELP Committee and the Senate Labor, H.H.S. and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, I often point to the lifesaving research and care the center provides as an example of why this investment in NIH is so important.

Dr. Hartwell is not just a talented scientist. He is a real champion for cancer patients and their families. During consideration of a Patients' Bill of Rights, Dr. Hartwell often spoke out on behalf of cancer patients and explained the importance of access to clinical trials, which is sometimes the only hope for patients. Thanks to the advocacy of cancer researchers like Dr. Hartwell, the final legislation included this protection for patients.

Dr. Hartwell was born on October 30, 1939 in Los Angeles, California. He earned his Bachelor of Science in 1961 from the California Institute of Technology and his Ph.D in 1964 from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. From 1965-68, he served as Associate Professor at the University of California. In 1968, he joined the faculty of the University of Washington and became a professor of genetics in 1973. In 1997, he became President and Director of the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center. In 1987, he became a member of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. He has received numerous honors including: the General Motors Sloan Award (1991), Gairdner Foundation International Award (1992), Genetics Society of America Medal (1994) and the Albert Lasker Basic Medical Research Award (1998).

Dr. Hartwell will be presented with the award on December 10, 2001, which is the 100th anniversary of the death of Alfred Nobel, after whom the award is named. The Nobel Committee has recognized what we in the Northwest have known for a long time; namely that because of Dr. Hartwell's hard work and dedication, the world is a better place. It is an honor and a distinct pleasure to join with the Nobel Committee in formally recognizing Dr. Lee Hartwell's many accomplishments.

KOREAN WAR VETERAN 1ST LT. LEON J. JACQUES, JR.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the late 1st Lt. Leon J. Jacques, Jr., of Milford, NH, for his heroic services to the United States of America during the Korean war.

Leon was a graduate of Saint Anselm College and the United States Military Academy at West Point who also attended the Ground General School at Fort Riley, KS and the United States Army Infantry School at Fort Benning, GA.

He was assigned to the 21st Infantry Regiment, 24th Infantry Division in

Kumamoto, Japan. After the outbreak of war in Korea on June 25, 1950, Leon was committed to combat in Korea. During the first two weeks of combat, more than forty percent of the men fighting were killed, wounded, prisoners of war, or missing in action.

On July 12, 1950, Leon and his men were captured as prisoners of war and it was later learned that Leon had been killed by the enemy. He was in charge of several soldiers who were harassed by the enemy. Leon demanded that they stop and for making this statement, he was killed. According to a report received, "Lt. Jacques' complete disregard for his personal safety and valor in response to enemy aggression were in the finest tradition of military service and reflected great credit upon himself, the 21st Infantry Regiment and the United States Army."

Thanks to the generous efforts of Colonel Phil Day US Army (Ret), Leon has been honored with ten award medals including: Bronze Star Medal with "v" device, United Nations Service Medal, Presidential Unit Citation and the combat infantryman badge.

As the son of a World War II Naval aviator who was killed in a war related incident and a veteran of the Vietnam war, I empathize with the Jacques family. Leon is an American hero whose selfless dedication to his State and country has benefitted his fellow citizens with the blessings of freedom and liberty. It is truly an honor and a privilege to represent his family in the United States Senate.

RECOGNIZING THE HEROES OF THE ALEUTIANS CAMPAIGN

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to share a story about a remarkable group of veterans that fought for our freedom over 50 years ago. During October 4-7, 2001, a small band of World War II veterans and their families gathered in Anchorage for what was probably their last reunion. They shared the common experience of having fought an air war in one of the most difficult theaters of operations during World War II, the Aleutian Islands.

For those of you who have not had the opportunity to visit the Aleutians, let me tell you what you are missing. Some of the harshest and most unbearable weather exists in this region of my State. Some call the Aleutians the birth place of the winds. It is my honor to recognize these fine men who fought to protect our nation.

These courageous individuals are also the founders of today's Eleventh Air Force. Appropriately, those who spent their youth defending Alaska elected "Back to Our Roots," as their reunion theme.

The men and women of the Eleventh Air Force served their Nation well, helping drive the Japanese from the western Aleutian Islands of Attu and Kiska during the Aleutian Campaign. It was the only campaign fought on the

North American continent during the war. It was also the first time since the War of 1812 that a foreign military force had occupied North American soil.

Later, the men of the Eleventh Air Force flew some of the war's longest missions against Japanese installations in the northern Kurile Islands from bases on Attu and Shemya Islands. During the Aleutian Campaign, the veterans of the Eleventh Air Force flew 297 missions and dropped 3,662 tons of bombs on Japanese installations on Attu and Kiska. One hundred and fourteen men were killed; another forty-two were reported missing in action and another forty-six died as a result of accidents.

Following the end of the campaign, the Eleventh Air Force was reduced in strength from a high of 16,526 in August 1943 to a low of 6,849 by the war's end. The two bomber squadrons that remained along with Navy air units flew bombing and reconnaissance missions against Japanese targets in the northern Kurile Islands. The military used the highly classified operation, code named Wedlock, which also involved submarine patrols and shore bombardment, to divert Japanese attention north and mislead them about U.S. strategy in the Pacific.

It succeeded in its objective. The Japanese increased their garrison in the northern Kuriles from 8,000 in 1943, to 41,000 in 1944. They maintained 400 aircraft there in anticipation that America was planning to invade Japan by a northern route.

During this time, Eleventh Air Force bombers flew 276 missions, losing 74 crew members killed in action and 11 taken prisoners of war, of which 3 died in captivity. Another 179 were interned in the Soviet Union—where they landed after experiencing difficulties returning to their home bases. They were among the 291 young American aircrews who temporarily wound up in Soviet hands as the result of the air war in the Pacific.

Unlike other World War II theaters of operations, the Aleutians has not been properly recognized. The men and women who served on those wind swept and hauntingly beautiful islands have not been forgotten. Alaskans are grateful for what they did to defend our freedom and land. Their efforts, and those who served elsewhere in the territory, contributed immeasurably to the growth and development of my State. They helped provide the foundation that ultimately led to the achievement of statehood.

Those who fought for our Nation's values during a difficult time in the Aleutians and the North Pacific Theater are truly heroes. It is my honor to say thank you and recognize them on this Veterans Day.

VETERANS DAY, 2001

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is my privilege to rise and thank the

men and women who have served in our Nation's armed forces. This Sunday, November 11, 2001, our country takes a moment to recognize the men and women who have made our country a free Nation for over 225 years.

Veterans Day is a day that is as diverse and as rich in history as the many battles that were fought defending our freedom. November 11, 1918 is the date most remembered as the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month. This day began with the laying down of arms and blowing of whistles. Impromptu parades were held and shops closed for the day to honor veterans. 83 years ago November 11 became known as "Armistice Day."

For 16 peaceful years following World War I, the United States along with other countries such as Canada, Australia and Britain celebrated this day. A moment of silence at the allotted hour of 11AM was held to remember the sacrifices that men and women made in order to ensure that freedom reigns.

Sadly, as we all know, war is a part of our lives. Around every corner adversity and evil exists. However, Americans being steadfast and always determined to live life peacefully continued to observe a day of remembrance and appreciation on November 11.

In 1938 Congress passed a bill that November 11 "shall be dedicated to the cause of world peace and . . . hereafter celebrated and known as Armistice Day." But shortly thereafter World War II broke out. Over Sixteen million—I repeat, over sixteen million—Americans took part in World War II. Veterans Day was officially recognized in 1954 when the late President Eisenhower signed a bill that proclaimed November 11 as Veterans Day.

We also pay tribute to those soldiers who made the ultimate sacrifice. In 1921 an American soldier, whose name was "known but to God," was buried at Arlington National Cemetery. This soldier became the personification of dignity and reverence for America's veterans. In 1958, two more unidentified fallen American soldiers from World War II and Korea were interred next to their comrades of World War I. These brave soldiers, and all those who have died on the battle field who have never returned home for a proper burial, are guarded day and night by men and women in the armed services.

Today America is facing a new kind of war, one that does not quickly assimilate with previous conflicts our soldiers have faced, a war that is being fought by men and women who, as thousands before them, have answered the call to duty to protect and defend our freedom.

Our military is engaged in conflict overseas with a vile and inhumane enemy, an enemy that lives in shadows, strikes at innocent civilians, and finds victory in terror. It is a new kind of war. But one thing remains the same. Our armed forces carry on the fight for freedom.

On September 11, our world changed. Once again, we are a nation at war.

Once again, our troops are engaged in conflict overseas. And once again, they will prevail.

It is my sincere honor to thank all veterans who have served in our armed forces.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD A. LAURIE

• Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Edward Laurie of Enfield, NH, an exemplary public official who dedicated himself to serving the people of New Hampshire for more than 26 years. As chief of police for the city of Lebanon since 1991, he has brought to the office the professional skills and knowledge of law enforcement which has benefitted the citizens of Lebanon and the entire State.

Edward began his career as a patrol officer in 1975, and was promoted through the ranks of the Lebanon Police Department serving positions including: police sergeant from 1984-1985, police lieutenant from 1985-1986, police captain from 1987-1991 and police chief from 1991-2001.

He was an active member of the law enforcement who participated in programs including: chairman of the New Hampshire Regional Drug Task Force, executive board member of the New Hampshire Attorney General's Drug Task Force, president of the New Hampshire Police Association, associate of the FBI National Academy, and member of the New England and Grafton County Chiefs of Police Associations.

Edward was active in the Lebanon community and provided dedicated service to area charities including the New Hampshire Special Olympics and Lebanon Lions and Kiwanis Clubs.

Throughout his career, Edwards has served the city of Lebanon and the State of New Hampshire with dedication and pride. The people of Lebanon owe a debt of gratitude to Edward for the contributions which he has made making the city and the State a safer and more pleasant environment in which to live.

It is an honor and a privilege to represent Edward Laurie in the United States Senate. I wish him and his family Godspeed in his retirement and in all of their future endeavors.●

VETERANS DAY, 2001

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, as we again approach Veterans Day, it is vital that we pause, more so than on any Veterans Day in recent memory, to give tribute to the more than 48 million heroic veterans who have served in our military since the start of the Republic and who have fought so that the freedom and safety of this great Nation would not be compromised. We owe our veterans our heartfelt gratitude for answering the call and serving us all in the United States Armed Forces.

Today, as it should be, military service is being held in high esteem. The events of September 11 have renewed America's sense of gratitude toward the men and women of the Armed Forces for the great sacrifices they make everyday on behalf of our Nation. America has been steadfast in its commitment to the world to be a beacon for freedom. Our military personnel have honored our commitment to the world, time after time, in every part of the globe.

At present, the members of our Armed Forces are fighting the terrorist regime responsible for the deaths of thousands of Americans on September 11th. We will win this fight. And once again, our men and women in uniform will honor our commitment to the world. What strikes me with enormous poignancy is the age of those who have answered the call to duty throughout our history. In this war, as in those of our past, we send our young to honor our commitments abroad and to protect our great Nation. They are the best of the best. Their motto might well be, in the words of Alexander Pope, "Act well your part, therein all honor lies."

As we observe Veterans Day, let us remember that we owe our veterans our gratitude and appreciation year round, and not merely on the day set aside for the commemoration of their service and sacrifice. It would be truly disgraceful if veterans were made to feel forgotten except for this one day per year. Indeed, our gratitude should be as steadfast as the great monuments that Americans have built in commemoration of the very service and sacrifices our veterans made. There should be no ambivalence in our attitude toward those who serve in the United States Armed Forces.

I am proud to represent the State of West Virginia in the Senate. West Virginia has one of the highest veteran populations per capita of any State. The deep patriotism and loyalty to our country of the people of my State of West Virginia fills me with gratitude, and inspires me in my role as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs. In that position, I am fortunate to represent not only the veterans of West Virginia, but veterans all over our country.

As Chairman, I have fought very hard for improvements in benefits and services to veterans. We have made significant strides this year in fulfilling the pledge of Abraham Lincoln, "to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphans."

A critical need for veterans is long-term care. Our veteran population is aging rapidly and it is our responsibility to care for them. I am dedicated to this need, and in groundbreaking legislation, I was able to secure a significant expansion in the eligibility for and types of treatment that will soon be available to veterans.

It is my belief that the Montgomery GI Bill must be sufficient to recognize

the commitment and sacrifices that individuals make to serve in the military. In keeping with that belief, the Committee has endorsed legislation under which the basic rate of the MGIB benefit will be raised over the next 3 years. In addition, accelerated payments of MGIB benefits will be authorized to accommodate the compressed schedule of courses that leads to employment in a high technology industry. We should make every effort to accommodate the educational needs of our veterans, and this change is an important step in doing so.

Additionally, the Committee endorsed legislation under which the maximum amount for the popular VA home loan guaranty will be increased. It will now be within the reach of veterans to buy homes in major metropolitan areas where home prices have skyrocketed. Many years have passed since a VA home loan guaranty increase, and high housing costs in certain areas had put homeownership beyond the reach of our veterans who live in those areas. This increase will add value to the existing benefit.

Today, and everyday, we should honor those who have worn the uniforms of our Nation. All those who served deserve our appreciation, our respect, and our compassion. They are indeed, the best of the best.●

TRIBUTE TO JESSICA CATANESE

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Jessica Catanese, of Groton, MA for being honored as the 2001 recipient of the Veteran's Affairs Hands and Heart Award. The award is an annual recognition given to one employee in each VA medical facility whose "sustained, compassionate, direct patient care is exceptional."

Jessica is a recreation therapist for the Manchester VA Medical Center Nursing Home who provides emotional support, help and guidance to patients above and beyond the call of duty. I comment Jessica for the caring and professional expertise she provides to VA hospital patients.

Staff and volunteers from the Manchester VA facility were included in the nomination process and all agreed that Jessica is an outstanding asset to the nursing home who consistently demonstrates courteous, friendly, and respectful care for the patients.

Jessica has served the veterans of the Manchester VA Medical Center Nursing Home with dedication and concern. As a veteran of the Vietnam war and senior member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I applaud her achievements and professionalism. The citizens of New Hampshire own Jessica a debt of thanks for her exemplary services.

I wish Jessica continued success in her professional endeavors at the Manchester VA Medical Center Nursing Home. It is truly an honor and a privilege to represent her in the United States.●

MISSOURI STATE SENATOR PAULA CARTER

● Mrs. CARNAHAN. Mr. President, today I rise to honor the memory of a fearless leader and influential figure in Missouri politics, State Senator Paula J. Carter.

A native of Saint Louis, Senator Carter got involved in politics in the '60s. Her rise from Democratic precinct worker to an influential figure in the Missouri General Assembly clearly demonstrates the fact that one person can make a tremendous difference in the lives of all.

During her tenure in the Missouri House and Senate, she was a fierce defender and protector of peoples' rights. To her it never mattered who her foes were. At a time when many accepted inequity and injustice as the way it always was, she saw them as challenges to be overcome. When other politicians asked, "Can we win?" Senator Carter asked "Should we fight?" More often than not, the answer was a rousing "Yes!" Her efforts on behalf of women and minorities will never be forgotten.

In addition to her legislative and civic successes, Senator Carter was proud of her role as a mother and grandmother. Wardell, Gregory, Keena, and Willie Christopher will attempt to carry on their mother's tradition, each in their own way, as will, also, her seven grandchildren.

Though there are still causes to champion and battle to fight, this tireless advocate has been called to rest. May we all find inspiration in her deeds and renew our commitment to public service, a calling worthy of our lives.●

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

● Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred September 6, 1996 in Washington, D.C. The assailant, Michael J. Monts, 29, was charged with simple assault and assault with a deadly weapon for allegedly attacking a gay man in July 1996. Monts was ultimately convicted of assault with a deadly weapon in connection to that crime.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.●

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY MOBILE HEALTH AND WELLNESS UNIT

• Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. President, I rise this morning to pay tribute to the Western Kentucky University, WKU, Mobile Health and Wellness Program. I worked vigorously to secure funding for this important initiative which will provide needed health care services to the families of rural Kentucky. I am pleased to announce that the WKU Mobile Health and Wellness Unit will be dedicated this afternoon in a ceremony in Morgantown, KY.

America has led the world in developing exciting medical advances and innovations during the last decade. New diagnostic tools, like PET Scans and MRI's, allow physicians to detect serious diseases in their earliest stages and treat patients before they become seriously ill. Advancements in pharmaceuticals, biotechnology, and medical devices also allow doctors to successfully cure illnesses that would have been fatal just a few years ago.

Unfortunately, many of the miracles of modern medicine are not always available to the citizens of rural Kentucky. For far too many rural Kentuckians, economic and geographic barriers impede access to even the most basic medical and dental screenings. As a result, these men, women, and children frequently lag behind their peers in many accepted measures of general health.

Western Kentucky University recognizes that limited access to health care services is a critical problem confronting the people of south-central Kentucky. To address this problem, WKU decided that if families living in rural communities are not able to travel to receive adequate care, then WKU should bring health care services to rural communities through a Mobile Health Clinic.

When Dr. Gary Ransdell, President of WKU, approached me with the idea for their mobile health program, I was immediately impressed by the potential of this vehicle to bring quality health care to the citizens of rural Kentucky. Our shared vision is that such a clinic can provide basic health care services such as physicals, well-child check-ups, PSA's, mammographies, and basic dental screenings. With that in mind, I was proud to use my position on the Senate Appropriations Committee to secure \$700,000 for this important initiative in the Fiscal Year 2001 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Appropriations Bill.

I believe that all Kentuckians, whether they live in the smallest hollows or the biggest cities, should have access to basic health care services and the most modern screening technologies. WKU's Mobile Health and Wellness Program, which will be dedicated today, is an important step in that direction. I look forward to working with Western Kentucky University on this and other successful programs designed to improve the lives of Kentucky's citizens.●

TRIBUTE TO BAE SYSTEMS

• Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Business Unit of BAE Systems of Nashua, NH, for being named as one of five companies in the country to receive the Pro Patria Award. The award is given to companies which are supportive of military reservists.

The Information and Electronic Warfare Systems business unit received the award on October 11, 2001, at a ceremony at the Pentagon following a presidential proclamation ceremony in the Rose Garden of the White House.

BAE was nominated for the Pro Patria Award by Pete Kilger, department manager for BAE's Systems Engineering in the Information Dominance Systems area and a member of the Naval Reserve. BAE was chosen for the prestigious award because of its outstanding support and understanding for employees in the military reserves.

BAE does work for the U.S. military services and values the exemplary contributions of employee reservists and the contributions they make to New Hampshire and the country. BAE is one of the largest employers of reservists in the state providing benefits including paying reservists on military duty the difference between their military and civilian pay.

I commend BAE Systems for the many contributions they have made to the defense industry. Their concern for company employees who are reservists in the United States military is exemplary. The people of New Hampshire and the country owe a debt of gratitude to BAE Systems for the economic and defense benefits provided by their hard work and dedication.

BAE will continue to provide expertise which will be of benefit to the military personnel in the country with its involvement in the production of the next generation fighter jets. BAE Systems will have two teams working on electronic warfare systems for the F-35, also known as the Joint Strike Fighter. The contract won by BAE will eventually lead to the replacement of fighter planes used by the U.S. Navy, Air Force, and Marines and Britain's Royal Navy and Air Force. It is truly an honor and a privilege to represent BAE Systems and their employees in the United States Senate.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF IRAN EMERGENCY DECLARED ON NOVEMBER 14, 1979 IS TO CONTINUE IN EFFECT BEYOND NOVEMBER 14, 2001—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 56

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iran emergency declared by Executive Order 12170 on November 14, 1979, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2001, to the *Federal Register* for publication. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on November 13, 2000 (65 Fed. Reg. 68061).

Our relations with Iran have not yet returned to normal, and the process of implementing the January 19, 1981, agreements with Iran is still underway. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared on November 14, 1979, with respect to Iran, beyond November 14, 2001.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 9, 2001.

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF EMERGENCY REGARDING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DECLARED ON NOVEMBER 14, 1994 IS TO CONTINUE IN EFFECT BEYOND NOVEMBER 14, 2001—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 57

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication. The notice states that the national emergency with respect to the unusual

and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States posed by the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons (weapons of mass destruction) and the means of delivering such weapons declared by Executive Order 12938 on November 14, 1994, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2001. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on November 13, 2000 (65 Fed. Reg. 68063).

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared on November 14, 1994, regarding weapons of mass destruction, beyond November 14, 2001.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 9, 2001.

PERIODIC REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE 1979 IRANIAN EMERGENCY AND ASSETS BLOCKING FROM THE PERIOD BEGINNING MAY 2001 THROUGH OCTOBER 2001—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 58

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 9, 2001.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 10:41 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 768. An act to amend the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 to extend the favorable treatment of need-based educational aid under the antitrust laws, and for other purposes.

At 11:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 264. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress to welcome

the Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, on the occasion of his visit to the United States, and to affirm that India is a valued friend and partner and an important ally in the campaign against international terrorism.

The message also announced that pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2501, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission: Mr. BLUNT of Missouri.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761 and clause 10 of rule 1, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the British-American Interparliamentary Group in addition to Mr. PETRI of Wisconsin, Chairman, and Mr. GALLEGLY of California, Vice Chairman, appointed on May 1, 2001: Mr. BERUTER of Nebraska, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HORN of California, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT of South Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. POMEROY of North Dakota, Mr. CLYBURN of South Carolina, and Mr. ALLEN of Maine.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1238(b) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-398), the Speaker appoints the following member on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States-China Security Review Commission to fill the existing vacancy thereon: Mr. Larry M. Wortzel of Alexandria, Virginia.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-4556. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Trip Limit Adjustment" received on November 8, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4557. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the General Counsel, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rehabilitation Short-Term Training (National Rehabilitation Leadership Institute)" (CFDA No. 84.246D) received on November 7, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4558. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the United States Participation in and Support of Operation STABILISE; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4559. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001,

a report relative to the Study on Impact of Foreign Sourcing of Systems dated October 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4560. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the report of a certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or services sold commercially under a contract in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more to the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4561. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the report of a certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles or services sold commercially under a contract in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more to France; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4562. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the report of a certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or services sold commercially under a contract in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4563. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the report of a certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or services sold commercially under a contract in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4564. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Review of the Restrictions on Persons of Italian Ancestry During World War II"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4565. A communication from the Attorney General, transmitting, the Department of Justice Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2001-2006; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4566. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; Interim Final Determination the State Has Corrected the Deficiencies" (FRL7102-4) received on November 8, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4567. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan for Montana; Revisions to the Missoula City-County Air Pollution Control Program" (FRL7086-3) received on November 8, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4568. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clean Air Act Final Approval of Operating Permit Programs: Tennessee and Memphis-Shelby County" (FRL7103-2) received on November 8, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4569. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Delegation of National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for

Source Categories; State of Arizona; Arizona Department of Environmental Quality" (FRL7100-4) received on November 8, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4570. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Request for Qualifications and Preliminary Proposals for Training and Outreach Coordination Support to the Chesapeake Bay Program" received on November 8, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4571. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, California State Implementation Plan Revisions; San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, and South Coast Air Quality Management District" (FRL7100-6) received on November 8, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4572. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2000 Annual Report on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-4573. A communication from the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the suspension of operations on Sunday, September 30, 2001 at 12:00 PM; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-4574. A communication from the Director of the Office of Procurement and Assistance Management, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1988, a report on the annual list of government activities not inherently governmental in nature; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-4575. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report for the Office of Justice Programs for Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-216. A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Yuma County, Arizona relative to September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-217. A resolution adopted by the County Commission of Baldwin County, Alabama relative to Supporting Defense Against Terrorists Attacks; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-218. A resolution adopted by the Council of Berkeley County, South Carolina relative to September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment.

S. 1274: A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide programs for the prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of stroke. (Rept. No. 107-97).

By Mr. BAUCUS, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

H.R. 3090: A bill to provide tax incentives for economic recovery.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KERRY:

S. 1670. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 with respect to subsidy fees; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1671. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) for certain hand-knotted or hand-woven carpets and leather gloves; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

S. 1672. A bill to prevent terrorist hoaxes and false reports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HELMS, Mr. MILLER, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. BREAUX):

S. 1673. A bill to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon:

S. 1674. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue marketing orders for cranberries; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. Res. 177. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that United States Postal Service employees should be commended for their outstanding service and dedication since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 980

At the request of Mr. FITZGERALD, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. CARNAHAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 980, a bill to provide for the improvement of the safety of child restraints in passenger motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 990

At the request of Mr. REID, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 990, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to improve the provisions relating to wildlife conservation and restoration programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to promote the economic security and safety of victims of domestic and sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 1274

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1274, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide programs for the prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of stroke.

S. 1377

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1377, a bill to require the Attorney General to establish an office in the Department of Justice to monitor acts of inter-national terrorism alleged to have been committed by Palestinian individuals or individuals acting on behalf of Palestinian organizations and to carry out certain other related activities.

S. 1479

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1479, a bill to require procedures that ensure the fair and equitable resolution of labor integration issues in transactions for the combination of air carriers, and for other purposes.

S. 1522

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1522, a bill to support community-based group homes for young mothers and their children.

S. 1578

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1578, a bill to preserve the continued viability of the United States travel industry.

S. 1618

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1618, a bill to enhance the border security of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1643

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. CARNAHAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1643, a bill to provide Federal reimbursement to State and local governments for a limited sales, use and retailers' occupation tax holiday.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon:

S. 1674. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to authorize the

Secretary of Agriculture to issue marketing orders for cranberries; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1674

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MARKETING ORDERS FOR CANEBERRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608c), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended—

(1) in subsection (2)(A), by inserting “caneberries (including raspberries, blackberries, and loganberries),” after “other than pears, olives, grapefruit, cherries,”; and

(2) in subsection (6)(I), by striking “tomatoes,” and inserting “tomatoes, caneberries (including raspberries, blackberries, and loganberries),”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8e(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608e-1(a)), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended in the first sentence by striking “or eggplants” and inserting “eggplants, or caneberries (including raspberries, blackberries, and loganberries)”.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

S. 1672. A bill to prevent terrorist hoaxes and false reports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Punishing Terrorist Hoaxes Act of 2001.

In the days since September 11, all of us have learned that anthrax hoaxes are no joking matter. They are acts of terror in the true sense of the word because they inflict great fear and anxiety on innocent people. In addition, these hoaxes drain resources from police and emergency workers—resources desperately needed not only for the real war on terror, but for all of the ordinary emergencies that continue to arise every single day.

According to recent reports, there have been some 160 anthrax and other terrorism hoaxes since September 11. In Connecticut, one hoax triggered the evacuation of 800 government employees for two days. Hoaxes in Virginia and Oregon have shut down post offices. In my State of North Carolina, from Greensboro to Chapel Hill, hoaxes have targeted and terrified workers at family planning medical clinics—workers who already must live with death threats day in and day out.

I have spoken with law enforcement officials in North Carolina who believe we need new Federal legislation specifically to fight hoaxes. At a hearing of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism, and Government Information earlier this week, officials from the Bush Administration requested that legislation. In response to several questions that I asked, they articulated the very

real need: Current law prohibits terrorist “threats,” but terrorism hoaxes may not always be viewed as threats because the people perpetrating the hoaxes are not able and do not intend to carry out actual terrorist acts. Yet these hoaxes must be punished.

The legislation I propose builds on proposals by other Senators on both sides of the aisle, including Senator LEAHY, Senators BIDEN and HATCH, and Senators SCHUMER and DEWINE. There are two things that distinguish the legislation I propose, and I want to highlight those.

First, my proposal includes “findings” about the need for this legislation. In recent decisions holding that Federal laws are not proper exercises of Congress's “commerce clause” power and therefore are not constitutional, the Supreme Court has said that “findings” about a real Federal need are important. Although I don't agree with those recent cases, I want to do everything I can to make sure this statute is upheld in the courts. The addition of findings is one way to do that while still enacting the ban we need.

Second, my proposal establishes two Federal hoax crimes, not just one. All persons who perpetrate hoaxes are punishable by up to two years in prison. In addition, persons who perpetrate hoaxes with intent to cause fear, in a manner reasonably likely to cause an emergency response, are punishable by up to five years in prison. The line we are drawing is a line between people who really and truly think they are “just joking” and people who want to terrorize others.

Both kinds of hoaxes should be felony crimes. And the person who wants to inflict fear deserves a stiffer sentence than the person who does not. That is a line we regularly draw in the criminal law. We punish people with evil motives more than people who are reckless or stupid. Federal law makes that distinction in the Bomb Hoax Act, 18 U.S.C. §35, which sets up a lesser offense requiring no criminal intent, and a greater offense requiring that the perpetrator act “maliciously.”

I ask the Congress to enact the Punishing Terrorist Hoaxes Act of 2001. And whether we enact this legislation or one of my colleagues' proposals, I ask the Congress to enact an anti-hoax bill before we go out of session. We owe it to police officers, public health officials, and the American people.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 177—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE EMPLOYEES SHOULD BE COMMENDED FOR THEIR OUTSTANDING SERVICE AND DEDICATION SINCE THE TERRORIST ATTACKS OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. AKAKA) submitted the following resolution;

which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 177

Whereas on September 11, 2001, the Nation was victimized by a horrific terrorist attack, the likes of which have not been seen in United States history;

Whereas terrorist attacks continued on United States soil after September 11, 2001, in the form of anthrax-tainted letters;

Whereas these anthrax-tainted letters have led to the deaths of 4 individuals, including 2 United States Postal Service employees;

Whereas numerous United States Postal Service employees are currently taking antibiotics to protect them from potential anthrax exposure; and

Whereas the United States Postal Service continues to deliver mail, on the order of approximately 680,000,000 pieces per day, to ensure that the daily operation of our citizens and our companies may continue unaffected, despite these dangers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the men and women of the United States Postal Service for their outstanding service, hard work, and dedication during this time of national emergency; and

(2) will continue to work with the United States Postal Service to ensure the safety and well-being of postal workers as they carry out their duties and responsibilities.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Order Nos. 541 through 546; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table; that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Kimberly Terese Nelson, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Eric M. Javits, of New York, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the Conference on Disarmament.

Sichan Siv, of Texas, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Sichan Siv, of Texas, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during this tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Richard S. Williamson, of Illinois, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations.

Richard S. Williamson, of Illinois, to be Alternate Representative of the United States

of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

SENSE OF CONGRESS TO WELCOME THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 264 just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 264) expressing the sense of Congress to welcome the Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, on the occasion of his visit to the United States, and to affirm that India is a valued friend and partner and important ally in the campaign against international terrorism.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to; that the preamble be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 264) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE COMMENDATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 177, submitted earlier today by Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 177) expressing the sense of the Senate that United States Postal Service employees should be commended for their outstanding service and dedication since the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and

the preamble be agreed to, en bloc; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements and supporting documents relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 177) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRINTING

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from consideration of H. Con. Res. 130 and that the Senate then proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 130) authorizing printing of the book entitled "Asian and Pacific Islander Americans in Congress."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, with no intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 130) was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO REPORT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance have until 4 p.m. today to report the economic recovery stimulus bill, notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate.

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

AUTHORITY FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN UNTIL 2 P.M.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open today until 2 p.m. for the submission of statements and the introduction of legislation.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2001

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 10:30 a.m., Tuesday November 13; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that the Senate begin consideration of S.J. Res. 28; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly party conferences.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I again remind our colleagues that the next rollcall votes will occur at 5 p.m. on Tuesday next.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2001

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:09 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, November 13, 2001, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 9, 2001:

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

CHERYL FELDMAN HALPERN, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2004, VICE DIANE D. BLAIR.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

MARGARET S.Y. CHU, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE IVAN ITKIN, RESIGNED.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ADOLFO A. FRANCO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE MARK L. SCHNEIDER.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

COLLISTER JOHNSON, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2001, VICE LOTTIE LEE SHACKELFORD, TERM EXPIRED.

COLLISTER JOHNSON, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2004. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

EDWARD J. FITZMAURICE, JR., OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2004, VICE ERNEST W. DUBESTER, RESIGNED.

November 9, 2001

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S11663

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by
the Senate November 9, 2001:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

KIMBERLY TERESE NELSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE
AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRON-
MENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ERIC M. JAVITS, OF NEW YORK, FOR THE RANK OF AM-
BASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS U.S.

REPRESENTATIVE TO THE CONFERENCE ON DISAR-
MAMENT.

SICHAN SIV, OF TEXAS, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE ECONOMIC
AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH
THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

SICHAN SIV, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REP-
RESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO
THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE
UNITED NATIONS DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED
NATIONS.

RICHARD S. WILLIAMSON, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AN AL-
TERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF

AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF THE UNITED NATIONS DURING HIS TENURE OF SERV-
ICE AS ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS
IN THE UNITED NATIONS.

RICHARD S. WILLIAMSON, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE ALTER-
NATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE
UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT
TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO RE-
QUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY
CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.