

## AMENDMENT NO. 2080

(Purpose: To increase the appropriation for the Promoting Safe and Stable Families program)

On page 43, line 23, after the period, add the following:

"In addition, for such purposes, \$70,000,000 to carry out such section."

## AMENDMENT NO. 2081

(Purpose: To increase the appropriation for the Close Up Fellowship Program)

On page 57, line 24, before the period, add the following: "Provided further, That \$2,500,000 shall be available to carry out part E of title II, including administrative expenses associated with such part."

## AMENDMENT NO. 2082

(Purpose: To make funding available under title V of the Public Health Service Act for mental health providers serving public safety workers affected by the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001)

On page 34, line 13, before the period insert: "Provided further, That \$5,000,000 shall be available for mental health providers serving public safety workers affected by disasters of national significance".

## AMENDMENT NO. 2083

(Purpose: To provide funding for cancer prevention and screening programs under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act Amendments of 2000)

On page 54, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 225. For the Health Resources and Services Administration, \$5,000,000 for grants for education, prevention, and early detection of radiogenic cancers and diseases under section 417C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285a-9) (as amended by the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act Amendments of 2000), of which \$1,000,000 shall be available to enter into a contract with the National Research Council under which the Council shall—

(1) review the most recent scientific information related to radiation exposure and associated cancers or other diseases;

(2) make recommendations to—

(A) reduce the length of radiation exposure requirements for any compensable illnesses under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (42 U.S.C. 2210 note); and

(B) include additional illnesses, geographic areas, or classes of individuals within the scope of compensation of such Act; and

(3) not later than June 30, 2003, prepare and submit to the Committee on Appropriations, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations, Committee on Energy and Commerce, and Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, a report describing the findings made by the Council under paragraphs (1) and (2).

## AMENDMENT NO. 2084

(Purpose: To provide funding for Hispanic education programs)

On page 40, line 16, strike "5.9" and insert "5.7".

On page 54, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 522. Effective upon the date of enactment of this Act, \$200,000,000 of the amount appropriated under section 403(a)(4)(F) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(4)(F)) is rescinded.

On page 54, line 25, strike "\$11,879,900,000, of which \$4,104,200,000" and insert "\$11,912,900,000, of which \$4,129,200,000".

On page 56, line 25, strike "\$8,717,014,000" and insert "\$8,723,014,000".

On page 57, line 18, strike "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000".

On page 58, line 11, strike "\$516,000,000" and insert "\$616,000,000".

On page 64, line 16, strike "\$1,764,223,000" and insert "\$1,826,223,000".

## AMENDMENT NO. 2085

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate concerning research on, and services for individuals with, post-abortion depression and psychosis)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 226. It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of NIH and the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health (in this section referred to as the "Institute"), should expand and intensify research and related activities of the Institute with respect to post-abortion depression and post-abortion psychosis (in this section referred to as "post-abortion conditions");

(2) the Director of the Institute should coordinate the activities of the Director under paragraph (1) with similar activities conducted by the other national research institutes and agencies of the National Institutes of Health to the extent that such Institutes and agencies have responsibilities that are related to post-abortion conditions;

(3) in carrying out paragraph (1)—

(A) the Director of the Institute should conduct or support research to expand the understanding of the causes of, and to find a cure for, post-abortion conditions; and

(B) activities under such paragraph should include conducting and supporting the following:

(i) basic research concerning the etiology and causes of the conditions;

(ii) epidemiological studies to address the frequency and natural history of the conditions and the differences among racial and ethnic groups with respect to the conditions;

(iii) the development of improved diagnostic techniques;

(iv) clinical research for the development and evaluation of new treatments, including new biological agents; and

(v) information and education programs for health care professionals and the public; and

(4)(A) the Director of the Institute should conduct a national longitudinal study to determine the incidence and prevalence of cases of post-abortion conditions, and the symptoms, severity, and duration of such cases, toward the goal of more fully identifying the characteristics of such cases and developing diagnostic techniques; and

(B) beginning not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and periodically thereafter for the duration of the study under subparagraph (A), the Director of the Institute should prepare and submit to the Congress reports on the findings of the study.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2086

(Purpose: To amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a short title for a children's traumatic stress program)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 227. Section 582 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290hh-(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the 'Donald J. Cohen National Child Traumatic Stress Initiative'."

## Amendment No. 2087

(Purpose: To modify the calculation of State expenditures for eligible

States under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965)

On page 73, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

SEC. 307. The requirement of section 415C(b)(8) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070c-2(b)(8)) shall not apply to a State program during fiscal year 2001 and the State expenditures under the State program for fiscal year 2001 shall be disregarded in calculating the maintenance of effort requirement under that section for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2004, if the State demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Education, that it—

(1) allocated all of the funds that the State appropriated in fiscal year 2001 for need-based scholarship, grant, and work study assistance to the programs described in subpart 4 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070c et seq.); and

(2) did not participate in the program described in section 415E of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070c-3a) in fiscal year 2001.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered en bloc and agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 2076 through 2087) were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. HARKIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now go into a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for a period not to exceed 5 minutes.

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

## THE STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, yesterday and the day before, there were some statements made in Washington that I would like to reflect on for a moment.

Yesterday, the President of the United States came before a group—I am not sure of the name of the group—and said to them at one point, in reflection on the economic stimulus package, that it was time for "Congress to get to work."

I understand the President is prodding us to do our best and to work hard, and we should. But I would say to the President and to any who follow this that Congress has been working, and working hard, with this President since September 11, and before. Since September 11, we have been diligent every time the President has asked us for important legislation, whether it was the money he needed to execute

this war against terrorism or the new authority he needed to execute that war or aviation security. The Senate passed that bill almost 3 weeks ago now by a vote of 100-0.

That was antiterrorism legislation which the President needed so that our law enforcement can ferret out the sources of terrorism in the United States. We moved to that quickly and sent it to the his desk. The Senate and the House have responded and have been working with the President in a bipartisan fashion.

I found his remarks about the economic stimulus package a little puzzling because we have been doing our business. It is true that we have not reported out an economic stimulus bill in the Senate yet. My guess is we will do that as soon as next week.

The House of Representatives has presented a bill called an economic stimulus package.

What did the Secretary of the Treasury, a member of President Bush's Cabinet, say about the House economic stimulus bill? In the words of Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill, he called it "show business."

Across the United States, in publications as conservative as the Wall Street Journal and others of a more moderate and liberal bent, the House effort at an economic stimulus has been roundly criticized.

All of us understand that the American economy is in a sorry state. The report back just recently suggests that in the third quarter of this year the U.S. economy contracted by .4 percent. After we have enjoyed in the last several years 2 and 3-percent growth, it is troubling to see that we are moving backward. Many believe that the actual contraction of the economy and movement toward recession will continue in the fourth quarter. It is almost inevitable when you consider all of the layoffs, the overcapacity of our economy, and the current state of our economic indicators.

That is why it was equally troubling when the same Treasury Secretary, Paul O'Neill, came before the cameras yesterday here in Washington and made a pronouncement. He said if Congress could pass an economic stimulus package, we might be able to avoid a recession.

I think Harry Truman made it very clear when he was President. He put the sign on his desk that said in many respects the buck stops at the White House; the buck stops with the administration. If this is an effort by a Cabinet member of this administration suggesting the recession is a product of congressional inactivity, I think that simplifies and perhaps overstates their position.

So I hope we can reflect for a moment on what this economy needs and what has been proposed. We ought to put it in this perspective: Since September 11, the money we have been spending to execute the war against terrorism, to rebuild the damage

caused by terrorists on that day, and the money that we are proposing to spend on an economic stimulus to get America's economy moving forward is money that is being taken out of the Social Security trust fund and the Medicare trust fund.

Those of us who voted for it understood full well that in time of war we need to give the men and women in uniform the resources they need in order to protect themselves and defend America. I voted for it, understanding that money was coming out of the Social Security trust fund. It is to be repaid, but the money is coming out of that trust fund as we spend it on this war and on rebuilding the damage caused by terrorism. Similarly, the money being spent on the economic stimulus is also coming from that Social Security trust fund.

The reason I raise that point is this: How does money get into the Social Security trust fund? Every worker in America, rich or poor, pays payroll taxes, known as FICA taxes, every single pay period into the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. So the money that is building up in those funds comes from the working people of America. Their payroll taxes are financing our war effort overseas as well as all the other efforts to protect America.

The working people of America and their payroll taxes are paying for the rebuilding of New York and that which was damaged on September 11. The working people of America and their payroll taxes will pay for any economic stimulus package which Congress enacts.

The reason why that is significant is twofold. First, as every economist worth his salt has told us, to get this economy moving again, you have to put spending power back in the hands of consumers. Consumers have lost confidence. In losing confidence, they are not making key purchases. So there is an overcapacity of production, and people are not buying enough. They are holding back.

The reasons are many. They are uncertain about the economy. They are uncertain about their jobs. They are uncertain about America's security. They are holding back. And this reticence on the part of Americans has led to the slowdown in the economy.

The same economists say, if you want to turn this economy around, you have to give the resources back to the people who will spend it: the consumers who need the money in hand to make the purchases to get the economy fired up and moving forward. I have not heard a credible economist yet not reach that conclusion.

I pulled a group of business leaders together in Chicago several weeks ago. We had representatives of labor and business, small and large, and we sat down. I said, open ended, what do we need to do to get America moving again? They all came to that conclusion: Give the consumer more spending power.

Second, they said: Do it in a timely fashion. If Congress should decide not to do it, or put it off, then, frankly, we are going to be in a position where it does not make much difference.

Third, they said: Make certain it is temporary, that whatever you do is focused on resuscitating this economy, and it isn't a long-term commitment. I thought those were pretty sound principles.

We should consider not just what is most efficient and efficacious in terms of moving the economy forward, but, secondly, what is fair? If the money we are spending on an economic stimulus is coming from the working families in America, out of their payroll taxes, isn't it fair, in light of that first observation about what is needed for the economy, that the money be at least returned to working families across America?

I think that is eminently sensible. But look at what the House of Representatives comes up with by way of an economic stimulus. They come up with a proposal that takes the payroll taxes paid into the Social Security trust fund and redistributes them to whom? The wealthiest people in America. Forty percent of the economic stimulus coming out of the Republican-controlled House of Representatives goes to the top 1 percent of wage earners.

Think about "Reverse Robin Hood." Here we have the average person working hard, paying 7.5 or 8 percent in payroll taxes out of every single paycheck sent to Washington so that the Ways and Means Committee in the House of Representatives can take that money and give it to whom? Not back to the same workers—no—but to the wealthiest people in America.

What is even worse is a proposal coming out of the House of Representatives in the name of economic stimulus which would, in fact, literally give back billions of dollars to corporations for taxes they paid as long as 15 years ago. That, to me, is an outrage.

That money coming out of the Social Security trust fund will go to wealthy, prosperous, and profitable corporations to reimburse them for taxes that were paid as long as 15 years ago. That does not make sense. It does not make sense from an economic viewpoint if we accept the premise that we need to give consumers spending power to get this economy moving forward, and it certainly does not make sense in the name of justice that we would take payroll taxes and give them back to wealthy people in America and profitable corporations. That is exactly what the House of Representatives has proposed. And it is exactly what Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill called "show business." I think he was too kind. I could come up with a few other ways to describe it.

It is far more important for us, as part of an economic stimulus, to get to the root cause of our economic problem, to address it in a timely fashion,

to avoid, as much as possible, long-term deficits, and to make certain this is a temporary fix that really resuscitates the economy, as it needs to be.

Currently, the Senate Finance Committee, under the leadership of Senator MAX BAUCUS, is considering a stimulus package. This package is good in many respects. All the tax and spending proposals are temporary in nature. More than 100 percent of the 10-year cost occurs in the year 2002—immediately.

The bill costs \$70 billion this year and \$40 billion more over 10 years. It includes a \$14 billion rebate and \$33 billion in worker relief, targeted to low and middle-income Americans who are more likely to spend it. And it has virtually no effect on the surplus after this next fiscal year.

Contrast that with the proposal that we now have from the Senate Republicans, from Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa. Senator GRASSLEY's proposal has \$143 billion in tax cuts that are permanent, not temporary but permanent, representing 82 percent of the total net cost of the Republican economic stimulus package. Nearly 48 percent of the 10-year cost of the package occurs after the first year. So it is not a stimulus package. Almost half of it does not occur until a year from now.

The bill costs \$78 billion in fiscal year 2003 and \$60 billion in fiscal year 2004. The bill costs \$91 billion in this next fiscal year and \$175 billion over 10 years—\$175 billion in comparison to the \$70 billion cost of the bill that is coming out of the Democratic side.

Listen to this part. Remember, the money we are talking about comes out of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds from payroll taxes paid by working families across America. That is what is providing the money. That is the source of the money.

What would the Republican Senators have us do with that money from these workers? Forty-four percent of the Republican tax cuts would go to the wealthiest 1 percent of taxpayers. Only 18 percent of the total amount of economic stimulus goes to the bottom 60 percent of employees and taxpayers across America.

From where I am standing, this does not make any sense at all. This, by any standard, is a failing proposal on the Republican side. For the President to say to us, it is time for Congress to get to work, it is also time for this administration to stand up behind sound economic principles that really will move this economy forward, and do it in a fashion that is fair—fair to every American.

We had a meeting yesterday with some friends and representatives of working people across America, and a point was made very effectively: When it comes to waging wars in America, the working families are usually the first in line, not just with their tax payments but with their sons and daughters who serve our Nation so well, so valiantly. Isn't it nothing short of amazing that when it comes to

stimulating the economy of this country that we forget that lesson?

Since September 11, everywhere you turn, you see the phrase "United we stand." And thank God for it, that this country has come together in a spirit of patriotism and community and togetherness in a way I have never seen in my natural life. But when you look at these bills that have been proposed on the Republican side of the House and Senate for stimulating the economy, it is not motivated by the motto "United we stand."

It is motivated by the motto "divided we stimulate." When it comes to putting money back in the economy, these proposals turn their back on the same people paying the payroll taxes, the very same people making the sacrifice over and over again, day in and day out in America.

Senator TOM DASCHLE is majority leader. He has said, as part of our economic stimulus, there are several things we should do. I will refer to a couple of them.

One of the actions needed, and I certainly agree with this, is to extend the unemployment insurance available to workers across America. This temporary extension and expansion of unemployment insurance is not unprecedented. In fact, former President George Bush, at a time of recession in America, called for the extension of unemployment insurance benefits. Unfortunately, his son, now President of the United States, has not made the same commitment in terms of the number of people to be helped, how much they would be helped, and how quickly the assistance would be available.

By allowing 13 weeks of extended benefits to anyone with benefits expiring after September 11, we are saying to families: We are going to give you the safety net, the helping hand. What is unemployment insurance worth if you have lost your job? About \$230 a week. That is the average. It is not enough for a person to live in the lap of luxury. It is enough for some families to squeak by using their savings, cutting corners, and trying to get by.

There is also a proposal that we help these same families who have lost their jobs and are on unemployment insurance to pay for health insurance. Imagine that you have lost a job you have held for a number of years—and that has happened to hundreds of thousands of Americans in the last year—that you are now trying to keep your family together with unemployment checks of about \$230 a week, and when you try to buy the health insurance your family now needs in the private marketplace, it costs you \$500 to \$700 a month. Those figures are not outlandish; they represent the average.

So it is not a surprise to many that the unemployed people drop their health insurance, which, of course, causes a great deal of worry over the coverage of the family and, in the worst-case scenario, pushes these unin-

sured, unemployed Americans into a health care system which is forced to absorb them in charity payments.

We believe, on the Democratic side, that in addition to extending unemployment insurance, we should also extend coverage for health care benefits for those unemployed workers. That is sensible. It gives them the peace of mind and protection they need for their families.

Senator DASCHLE has said that will be an essential part of any economic stimulus package that comes out of the Democratic side of the Senate.

These are reasonable and responsible things to do. We have traditionally committed ourselves to small business, and that commitment could be realized as part of the economic stimulus package in terms of allowing some bonus depreciation, some expensing, so that there can be purchases made that help businesses and that will help those who supply them. That is sensible.

This small business approach costs a great deal less than what has been proposed in the House of Representatives, which rewards some of the largest corporations in America.

That is what we face in terms of an economic stimulus package on the tax side. Our colleague in the Senate, Mr. ROBERT BYRD, has suggested that in addition to the \$70 billion as part of our tax package, that we also put in about \$20 billion in spending. Some will say: There they go again. At a time of national emergency, they are making proposals to spend more Federal money.

Before you reach that conclusion, take a look at what Senator BYRD has proposed, cosponsored by Senator HARRY REID of Nevada. The proposal is to provide additional funds to Federal, State, and local antiterrorism law enforcement. We just had a meeting of our homeland defense coordinator for the State of Illinois, Matt Battenhausen, and our bipartisan delegation to talk about the urgent need to create a communications system in our State of Illinois and many other States so that police departments and fire departments can be in communication in time of need. That seems very basic to me.

Senators BYRD and REID, in this spending proposal for homeland defense, would provide resources for that opportunity. The FEMA firefighters grant program is another program that has provided for an update in the equipment and resources and materials at fire stations all across America. It has been an extremely popular program. They have called for \$600 million on that. I am certain that could be used very effectively, if for no other reason than to give local firefighters some familiarity with dealing with hazardous materials and the threat of bioterrorism. That is something that is absolutely essential.

When it comes to infrastructure security, highway security, and clean and safe drinking water, if you think

about this, we have made it clear that we not only should focus on aviation security and airport security but on all transportation. Investing money now to protect those resources is going to thwart any efforts by terrorists to turn them against us.

There is money included as well for bioterrorism prevention and response and food safety. This is an issue about which I feel strongly. We need to put the resources into bioterrorism.

Today, we had a presentation to many Democratic Senators from Dr. Anthony Fauci, who is with the National Institutes of Health. He talked to us about anthrax, with which we have become increasingly familiar on Capitol Hill because of the threats against our Senators, as well as the many people who work and visit here.

It is clear to me there are things we absolutely essentially have to do to protect America. How will they get done? How can we make this difference? We certainly can't make the difference unless we are prepared to provide money to those units of government and others that need it to protect us against bioterrorism. Border security, \$1.6 billion: Would anyone argue against the idea of putting more people on the borders to make certain that those who have a suspicious background or involvement in terrorism cannot get into the United States?

Mass transit, Amtrak, and airport security: all of these are easily defensible and suggest that there will be money spent for good purposes to protect and defend America and at the same time to invigorate this economy.

It is a very positive combination to take the tax benefits being offered by Senator BAUCUS's bill as well as the homeland defense spending that has been suggested by Senator BYRD. Coming together, it will not only help the economy; it will make America a safer place.

We can say to the working families across America who pay the payroll taxes that are being spent through the Social Security trust fund that the money is being spent for their purposes to help them, to help this economy, to turn America around.

The President has said it is time for Congress to get to work. I accept the challenge. I think it is also time for the administration to get to work, for them to reject the show business, as Secretary O'Neill has called the Republican bill that is before us, and to come forward with a more sensible and responsible and manageable approach. If the President will step up and with his leadership create a bipartisan coalition for an economic stimulus that is truly in the best interest of America, I guarantee him this: The same spirit of bipartisanship we have seen in Washington for the last 7 weeks will continue in this important chapter of America's history as well, as we respond to this recession with a positive program, a program that will truly help America get back on its feet.

That is the challenge before us. I certainly hope as the Senate Finance Committee brings its bill to the floor and searches out 60 Senators in support of it, it will be a bipartisan bill. If we are going to be asked to accept without change, take it or leave it, the proposal on the Republican side to provide most of the benefits for the wealthiest people in this country and for the wealthiest corporations, it should be summarily rejected.

As Secretary of the Treasury O'Neill said: The Republican version coming out of the House is a bad idea. It would be a bad idea coming out of the Senate as well.

I could not in good conscience support a bill in the name of economic stimulus which takes money from the Social Security and Medicare trust funds and spends it; instead of creating an economic incentive, it spends it instead on benefits for those who are frankly very well off and not very pained in today's economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELLSTONE). The Senator from Illinois.

#### APPRECIATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. DURBIN. A few weeks ago my colleague, who is now presiding, the Senator from Minnesota, introduced a resolution in the Senate acknowledging the hard work of the Capitol Police and all the security forces around Capitol Hill. I was happy to join with him and all the other Senators in that resolution.

A few days ago, with the assistance of Jeri Thomson, who serves as the Secretary of the Senate, we prepared these buttons which are small and probably cannot be seen by anyone following this debate. But the word on them is "heartfelt" thank you to the Capitol Police. Most of these men and women have been working 12-hour shifts at least 6 days a week since September 11.

I just had a few words with one of the officers at the Dirksen Building. She told me that while she is working 6 days a week 12 hours a day, her husband is working for the Red Cross 7 days a week and 12 hours a day. They have two children—3 years old and 5 years old. I said: Did you have any chance to go trick or treating with the kids? She said, she didn't get home until 8:30; they would just have to wait until next year.

That is part of the sacrifice by so many people who don't receive recognition in the Congress but deserve it.

For those men and women who are standing out there protecting this House that belongs to the American people and this building that symbolizes so much in our democracy, I want them to know that from all the Members of the Senate this expression of gratitude is heartfelt.

Thank you so much for all you do every single. I hope we can find a way to bring some relief to your life soon. I

hope as well that we can see some relief in the lives of all Americans who have been troubled and worried over the events since September 11.

#### LOOKING PAST DOHA

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the upcoming WTO meeting in Doha. I want to express my very serious concerns about the direction I believe these negotiations are heading.

Let me start with the area with which I have the most serious concern; that is, protecting U.S. trade laws. Enforcement of our trade laws is one area where the administration and the Congress have recently worked very closely together.

On issues such as softwood lumber and steel, Congress and the administration have worked together to ensure that our companies and workers are protected from unfair trade practices. It has been working well.

Recent lumber decisions by the National Trade Commission and by the Department of Commerce, as well as the free trade decision on steel dumping onto U.S. markets, are areas where the administration and the Congress worked together on enforcing our trade laws against unfair foreign trade practices.

These cases demonstrate why our trade laws are critical, and also why the case for defending trade laws is one that has always been bipartisan. Indeed, earlier this year I was joined by 62 of my colleagues in a letter urging this administration not to weaken our trade laws.

I again urge the administration to accept the inescapable fact that our trade laws are part of the political bargain on trade. Without assurances that America has the laws to protect itself against unfair foreign trade practices, future trade agreements will be very tough to sell.

Americans are not wanting to buy into a trade agreement if they are not assured the trade laws are protected and upheld so we can protect ourselves against other countries' foreign trade practices.

Recent history demonstrates why we should be concerned. Both NAFTA and the recent GATT and WTO negotiations have significantly undermined enforcement of America's trade laws.

There have been suggestions that we use WTO negotiations as an opportunity to address due process and transparency concerns in the application of other countries' trade laws.

These are problems of compliance with existing WTO rules and not problems requiring us to revisit the rules themselves.

Indeed, our existing international rules are constantly under attack. Countries are now trying to achieve through litigation what they failed to achieve in previous negotiations.

Remember that our trade laws are WTO legal. They conform with and are