

prevailed. It was a hard fought football game, and I give utmost credit to the Panthers, who were terrific.

This win gave the Grizzlies the privilege of going to the I-AA championship game in Chattanooga, TN. They will play the Furman University Paladins Friday at 5:30 eastern time. Everyone tune in.

In Montana, folks travel from every corner of our big State. We call ourselves the big sky State. We are a pretty large State, at close to 149,000 square miles. People around Montana come from all corners of our State to see the University of Montana Grizzlies, the Montana State University Bobcats. There is a fierce rivalry between the Cat fans and the grizzly fans.

From Eureka to Ekalaka, from Havre to Virginia City, in buses, vans, cars, and trucks, Montanans travel great distances to cheer on their sons and daughters, their friends and neighbors. When our team, the Grizzlies, made it to the national championship, understandably we were a little bit excited. We are very proud of our team. I wish you could feel the energy and excitement going on in Montana right now. We are very excited.

This is not new for the Grizzlies. They have been to the I-AA playoffs 8 out of the last 9 years. Friday's championship game will be the fourth the Grizzlies have been to since 1995 when they won the championship. I will never forget. I was there. Man, did we have fun.

It is also important to note that most of the UM players are from Montana. We are proud of that. They are great athletes, but they are also good students first. The team averages a 2.9 GPA, virtually a 3.0 team average. They are from small towns, rural communities. Some of them came up playing 6- and 8-man ball—football in small towns known as "iron man" ball.

They are excellent student athletes, like big sky defense man of the year and Academic All-American Vince Huntsberger from Libby, MT. I was talking to Vince the other day after a game, and Vince remembers when I walked throughout the State of Montana running for office. He even told me he carried a sign in a parade I was in when he was a little kid.

We have Brandon Neil from Great Falls, T.J. Olkers from my hometown of Helena. Our star quarterback, John Edwards, is from Billings. Then there is Spencer Frederick from a little town called Scobey in the northeastern part of our State. These young people and all the others make us very proud.

If you ask anyone who follows I-AA football, they will tell you that the Washington Grizzly stadium is the premier place to play in the country. I commend the UM president, George Dennison, for his leadership at the university and for investing in the program. Also, congratulations to UM athletic director, Wayne Hogan, and his staff. He came about 7 or 8 years ago

and is doing a great job. He is from Florida. And Grizzly coach Joe Glenn, with his vision, his leadership, that has earned him the big sky coach of the year for the second straight year.

I think all of these individuals have done so well. I thank them for the pride we have.

Finally, I have a wager with my very good friend from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS. If the Paladins win—he went to the University of Furman—I will come to the floor and recite the words of the Furman fight song. If the Grizzlies win, Senator HOLLINGS has agreed to come to the floor and recite the UM fight song. Fair wager, for fun. I will send his office the words to our song so he can get started and get the rehearsal going so he can boom forth with the University of Montana fight song at the next opportunity in the Senate.

SOFTWOOD LUMBER—A CALL TO ACTION

Mr. BAUCUS. I rise today to focus attention on the ongoing softwood lumber dispute between the United States and Canada. I believe we have an excellent opportunity to permanently remove this blemish on our strong bilateral trade relationship.

In the past 3 months, the U.S. Department of Commerce found that the Canadian Government unfairly subsidizes this lumber industry and then dumps those products in the U.S. market, both of which are prohibited by U.S. law. These activities have caused unprecedented upsets in the U.S. market, resulting in record low prices, disruption in supply, mill closures, layoffs, people out of work.

Good jobs in my State of Montana and across the Nation have been put at risk by Canada's foul play. Now is the time to bring this matter to resolution once and for all. The U.S. negotiators have a meeting with their Canadian counterparts to work out what is a desirable solution.

As I have stated many times before, this solution must completely offset the subsidies and dumping. It must bring true competition to the marketplace and must take into consideration the cross-border and environmental issues with the objective of a truly level playing field.

With that said, the offers of our neighbors to the north have been, to date, short of the mark. If we are serious about resolving the issue, the Canadians need to put something on the table, something that reflects a true, open, competitive market for softwood lumber. Some in Canada would prefer to let international tribunals decide this matter. I think they misjudge both the legal strength of their position and the underlying merits of their case. At no other time in history have the facts been so squarely in favor of the U.S. industry—no other time in the many years this dispute has been ongoing. At no other time have we been so

close to a detente. Let's not forget, many of the reforms are beneficial and cost effective to the Canadian softwood industry as well as to Canadian taxpayers.

That said, the clock is ticking. Unfair Canadian lumber imports are hurting our American producers. In a regrettable setback on December 15, the preliminary countervailing duties expired temporarily. It is my understanding that due to a customs reporting loophole, Canada was able to avoid paying payment earlier than the duties' temporary expiration. This is wrong. It emphasizes the need to close the gap from now until final determination.

The statute does not require that this case drag on until next spring. There is simply no reason for further foot dragging. The U.S. lumber industry cannot afford to suffer further injury. Neither can our remanufacturers, who are at the mercy of Canadian blackmail threats to cut off supply if we do not support Canada's position.

Simply put, if a decision cannot be reached in the next few weeks, the Commerce Department should accelerate their final determination.

That said, I would like to begin 2002 with this matter resolved. After two decades of fighting, it is time for a durable solution to the softwood dispute. I hope our administration and my Canadian friends will rise to the occasion. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

FOOTBALL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I compliment the University of Montana. They did, in fact, play well—too well—against the University of Northern Iowa.

Before I had bragged to Senator DASCHLE 2 weeks ago about how we were going to show the University of Montana how to play football, I wish I had researched how they have done so well in the last few years. I probably would not have been so boastful. But we had just come away from a tremendous victory, the UNI Panthers over the University of Maine Black Bears, just the week before. I thought if the Panthers could beat the Black Bears, they could surely beat the Grizzlies. But it did not turn out that way.

You played tremendous football, and I thank you very much for being so temperate in your remarks about the Panthers of the University of Northern Iowa.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, before the Senator begins a more serious discussion, and I will wait my turn, may I intervene to discuss this issue for just a moment, coming from a State that has won Division II championships more than any of you, and one that this year for the first time in a long while did not make it in the playoffs.

I want my friend from Montana to know I warned my seatmate from

South Carolina about you all. We understand about the Grizzlies in Delaware. They have been a very powerful Division I-AA team actually the last—almost the last decade, the last 8 years or so. I just want you to know that, even though the Presiding Officer is from a State that has a team called the Spartans—and they only get 100,000 folks or so to show up to their games; they don't understand, as the Presiding Officer prior to this, from the University of Michigan and Michigan State, where they get 110,000 people—they don't understand real football that the three of us understand.

At some point we should have a more far-reaching discussion about football as it is really still played, where there are student athletes who take seriously that undertaking, as they do their football.

I want to say that people who do not follow and understand that—and many do not because of the media—who do not follow Division II football, should understand there are some very serious ballplayers. It is very good football, high-caliber football. And, in any given year, such as this year, a team such as the Grizzlies is able to compete with Division I teams. They couldn't do it day in and day out. They could not do it 10 games a year. But it is very serious football.

I have been through these bets myself over the last 29 years here because my alma mater has been engaged in this national championship more than once. Delaware this year had a lousy season, relatively speaking—a winning season but a lousy season. But we have a coach who this year made it to the ranks of only 6 coaches in the history of college football to win over 300 football games.

I just want to rise and salute Division II football, where it is not a 40-hour-a-week job to attend school, but it is serious, serious football. I would argue the pressure on some of the fine athletes at Northern Iowa and the University of Montana, the University of Delaware, to play this caliber football and what is also expected of them off the field, is a real strain, a real burden on some of them because they do not get the same opportunities, same scholarships, same treatment, on occasion, that some of the major Division I school athletes do.

I salute the Grizzlies. They are one tough team. When I told my friend from South Carolina about your record, because I was very familiar with it, he blanched and said, as only he could say because he is one of the most humorous guys here: My Lord, if that's the case and they lose, and I have to recite that, they should change that fight song.

Having said that, I yield the floor and wait my turn to speak on a more serious subject.

Mr. BAUCUS. If I may ask the indulgence of my good friend, one of the teams in the home State of the Presiding Officer, of course, is the Badgers.

For the previous occupant of the chair, it was the Wolverines, and the Grizzlies of Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELLSTONE). The Chair would observe the team in Minnesota is the Gophers. The Badgers are Wisconsin.

Mr. BAUCUS. So we have the Gophers, Wolverines, Panthers, Grizzlies, and Maine has the Black Bears. I am going to ask my good friend from Delaware, whom do we have in Delaware?

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, Delaware has proudly named after the strongest group of revolutionary fighters in the Revolution from the State of Delaware. Back in those days, cock fights were very much in vogue. The toughest of those competitors were the Blue Hens of Delaware. I want the record to show the Blue Hens have taken Panthers, Badgers, and Bears in their stride, including the Black Bears of Maine. We are little, but we are very strong.

I often wish the mascot in the Revolutionary War for the Delaware regiment had been a panther or a lion, but it happened to be a blue hen. So we are the Delaware Blue Hens, and proud to be such.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I will bet they are the strongest, toughest Blue Hens that have ever existed on this Earth.

Mr. BIDEN. That is a fact.

Mr. BAUCUS. I look forward to next year when the Senator from Delaware stands in the Chamber and gives a recitation of the Grizzlies' fight song. I hope we can come to that day.

I thank all Senators for indulging me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa with the good-looking holiday sweater.

THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the session is about to end. I would like to call to the attention of colleagues one proposition that I hope comes before the Senate before we adjourn. That is the so-called economic stimulus package. You might call it an economic security package.

Nothing I say is going to in any way detract from the working relationship that I have with Senator BAUCUS as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

Maybe in this instance we did not reach an agreement involving he and I having complete agreement on a final product. There were other factors that came into play that maybe kept those negotiations from being one-on-one negotiations where people could freely negotiate and reach an agreement as you should in a conference. But all of this discussion, plus other forums I have been in with Senator BAUCUS as chairman of that committee, have been very cordial and productive sessions, even when they have not come out with a product.

I only wish that when the stimulus package comes to the floor I have the

privilege of doing as we did last spring defending that package, along with Senator BAUCUS, with the two of us working together to get it through the Senate. Hopefully that can still happen. It may not happen, but it doesn't mean that Senator BAUCUS has not worked hard to help that happen. Hopefully, we can continue next year to do some things in other areas that fall within the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee that will bring bipartisan bills to the Senate floor for successful passage by the Senate.

Probably what we are ending up with here, instead of what might come out of the conference committee which I was referring to in my work with Senator BAUCUS, is kind of a hybrid that involves some individual negotiations and some people who aren't even on the Senate Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over most of the product. But this is a bill that is going to be introduced in the House. It is my understanding that it is a bill in which I will have some input, and the White House, and a group in the Senate called the centrists, a bipartisan group of Democrats and Republicans who might call themselves kind of middle-of-the-road types. It is an economic stimulus package presumably passing the House and coming to the Senate. I hope people will see it as a very rich proposal that will help displaced workers and give a boost to the economy.

Since September 11, we have focused on dislocated workers and unemployed people who have been hurt. But there are also a lot of people who are working and who are in anguish over what the future holds for them. Even if they have very good jobs, that might be the case because things aren't the same since September 11.

When we talk about an economic security package, even though we might tend to concentrate on the dislocated workers, we are concerned about all workers because people have some questions about the future. Because of what happened on September 11, they see the future a little differently with a little less security than they did prior to that time.

An economic security package addresses the needs of people who are working as well as people who are dislocated. It does what we can to help those who are dislocated through troubled times. But it also is meant to give some confidence to those who are working and to beef up the economy so we will be able to find jobs for people who are dislocated.

We are in a state of war. We don't know how long that state of war will be there. But it is not going to end when we find the last Taliban in Afghanistan, or the last al-Qaida member. It isn't going to end when we find bin Laden and other leaders responsible for what happened on September 11. How long the war is going to go on I do not know. But it is not over.

We are talking about America being in a state of war since September 11.