

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

consistent with the principles and the rulings of WTO. We are not trying to do anything unfair. We are just trying to be fair and make sure we are protected.

Realizing that many of our trading partners want to weaken our trade laws, I was quite surprised to read that the draft declaration indicated a willingness to renegotiate these rules. This is the draft declaration looking toward Doha.

Why should we do this? What do we gain? Where is the affirmative agenda?

At a minimum, the United States should be seeking to address the underlying market distortions that cause dumping and that cause other countries to subsidize. We should be trying to correct the erroneous WTO decisions that have been handed down for the last several years. Yet all the draft declaration indicates is that we will engage in a wholesale renegotiation of these rules.

I find that very disturbing. I hope our trading partners realize that when it comes to weakening our trade laws through further negotiation they will face stiff, unyielding, and bipartisan opposition in the Congress.

I am also concerned about the declaration's environment and labor provisions.

I was happy to see the reaffirmation of our commitment to the sustainable development, and that the WTO will increase its focus on the relationship between multilateral environmental agreements and trade rules. Both these issues deserve even more attention.

I am concerned, however, about the comments from our negotiators that these are "Europe's issues."

Sustainable development is not a concern of Europe alone. I hope the lessons of Seattle have not somehow been lost on us. These are American concerns—more so now than ever.

So too is the issue of labor and trade. The declaration makes the mistake of suggesting that labor standards are—and I quote—"social issues," appropriately handled by the ILO.

I want to be clear on this point. We have now turned the corner on these issues. As the overwhelming support for the recent United States-Jordan Free Trade Agreement makes clear, environment and labor standards are now a part of the trade dialog. They are here. We passed it; that is, we passed legislation which affirms it.

Finally, I want to express my strong support for Taiwan's accession into the WTO—as a full member of the WTO. This includes the right to challenge the trade practices of China—or any other country—just as other members have the right to challenge Taiwan.

I am concerned about some of the recent reports that China is advocating some kind of lesser status for Taiwan. As an independent member of the WTO, Taiwan should have, and will have, the same rights as every other member. I hope the administration will take a strong stand in this regard.

As we look toward and beyond Doha, I look forward to working with the administration. But I also urge our negotiators not to give up the store. The goal of launching a new round of negotiations is not an end in itself. We must be vigilant in ensuring that we get the best deal for our farmers, our workers, and our companies.

#### ENERGY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise to address the problems we are having getting energy legislation to the Senate floor.

I strongly believe we need to have a comprehensive energy package brought to the Chamber.

My colleagues may remember that a short while ago, I offered an amendment on the Defense authorization bill that would have included a comprehensive energy policy—H.R. 4, the House-passed bill, the bill the administration wants, the bill the majority of people in this Chamber want to pass—in the legislation. I was criticized for that. Yet there is no stronger supporter of the military than I.

Having been chairman of the defense authorization readiness subcommittee for some 5 years, I see energy as a major national security issue. Frankly, it was a wrong decision for the Parliamentarian to say it was not germane.

Let's look at where we are today. Today we are 56.6 percent dependent upon foreign countries for our oil supply. That means we are 56 percent dependent upon foreign countries for our ability to fight a war. What is alarming is that 50 percent of what we have to import is coming from the Middle East. The fastest growing contributor to that amount upon which we are dependent is none other than Iraq. You can say in one-sentence form: It is ludicrous that we should be considered to be dependent upon Iraq for our ability to fight a war against Iraq.

We have a new figure I would like to share with the Senate. In the year 2000 alone, the United States bought \$5 billion worth of oil from Iraq.

Let's look at where we are today. For all practical purposes, not only are we at war in Afghanistan, but also in Iraq. They have shot down three of our Predators. We have no-fly zones. We have our troops who should be better trained when they arrive in the Persian Gulf. Yet we are dependent upon Iraq and the Middle East for our ability to carry out a war. If something should happen, an accident of a tanker coming in, any number of things, it would be an absolute disaster.

I will cite for my colleagues some recent statements that I didn't have at the time to share when I brought up my amendment.

One is from Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense. In response to my question, he said:

[It] is a serious strategic issue. . . . My sense is that [our] dependency is projected to grow, not to decline. . . . I think you're

right to point out that it's not only that we would, in a sense, be dependent upon Iraqi oil, but the oil as a weapon. The possibility of taking that oil off the market and doing enormous economic damage with it is a very serious problem.

Senator CARPER, the other day, was in a colloquy and statements were going back and forth, and quoting Mr. Greenspan responding to one of Senator CARPER's questions—this is Greenspan, and we are getting ready for an economic stimulus:

At the moment, the demand for power is pretty soft because the economy is soft. That is going to change. And when it changes, unless we have a long-term focus on how we put our infrastructure together, how we set incentives and rules to, one, maintain energy security while protecting the environment, we are going to run into trouble. And I think unless we give it very considerable thought now—projecting five, six, seven years out in the future—we are going to get sub-optimal solutions.

This is not a new issue. I started on this issue back in the Reagan administration. Nor is this a partisan issue because the Reagan administration, while he was President, refused to have a comprehensive energy policy. Then along came George "the first." He came out of the oil patch, so we thought surely this man would be able to successfully have a national energy policy. And he would not do it. This was at a time when we were nearing a war. This is a national security issue, not an energy issue. During the Clinton administration, he would not do it either.

Now we have an agreement where the leadership on both sides says we need a comprehensive energy policy. We need to have a vote this year to accomplish two things: One, our national security, to get out of this quagmire in the Middle East and to be able to fight a war; two, an economic stimulus. I can't think of anything that would be more positive to stimulate the economy than a national energy policy. It involves some controversial things, yes. ANWR is one small part of this. People keep saying this is an ANWR bill. It is not. We are talking about H.R. 4 over in the House. It has 300 pages. Only 2 pages are ANWR. It includes a comprehensive approach, including nuclear; some of our marginal production in this country that is virtually cut off because of the unpredictability of prices. If you get a marginal operator drilling a well for 15 barrels or less and he is not going to be able to know the price of oil 15 months down the road, he is not going to do it. Consequently, we are not doing it. If we had all of the marginal production that we have ceased to have over the last 10 years in production today, it would equal the total amount we are importing from Saudi Arabia. Consequently, I see this as a critical issue that has to be dealt with this year.

Just recently, I notice almost on a daily basis President Bush expresses the administration's position. This is from the 17th in Sacramento: