

addressed this third category of consequence management.

Unless we support our public health infrastructure, we cannot minimize the vulnerability that is out there today by training those first responders, by making sure that coordination at the local level among various entities is intact. This coordination is not there today because we have underinvested. Finally we must make sure that there is coordination at the State level and then at the Federal level and then across the Federal level, and that there is appropriate coordination without duplication.

I will simply close by saying that now is not the time for individuals to go out and hoard antibiotics or to buy gas masks. Now is the time for us to come together and develop a comprehensive biodefense plan that looks first at prevention to make sure we have the adequate intelligence, the appropriate research in terms of viruses, in terms of vaccines, and in terms of methods of early detection; second to look at preparedness, to make sure we are stockpiling the appropriate antibiotics, that we have a sufficient number of vaccines, which we simply do not have today but we are working very hard to get; and third that our consequence management and crisis management could handle what is called the surge product, the rush of people to emergency rooms, in a straightforward way.

I am very optimistic. We are working very hard over the course of this week on how much money should be put into this effort. We had a good first step last year in the Public Health Threats and Emergency Act. I am very confident that the American public will be very well served by this body and by the administration as we look at this critical area of biodefense.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we are in morning business, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, earlier I was visiting with my colleague from the State of Idaho, who spent this weekend in his home State, and I briefly described to him my travels in North Dakota. All of us serving in this Congress, both the House and the Senate, discover and understand a different spirit in this country since the September 11 tragedies that occurred as a result of the acts of terrorists.

I was traveling down Interstate 94 in North Dakota, on kind of a lonely space of that road, without a building or town in sight. All I saw were prairies and fenceposts. In the middle of that vista was a single American flag, hoisted up on a fence cornerpost, gently blowing in the North Dakota morning breeze—one single American flag.

That morning, I was on my way to an event in Hettinger, ND. There were perhaps 80 to 100 people who came to this event in Hettinger, and the master of ceremonies asked that they open the events with the Pledge of Allegiance. Following the Pledge of Allegiance, it occurred to me that it was the first time I had heard the Pledge of Allegiance by a group of people in which it was something much more than reciting a pledge from memory. It was much more about a pledge than it was about memory.

All across this country, there is a sense of patriotism, a love of country, that has sprung from these tragedies of September 11, and that spirit invades in a good way the work of the Senate and the House as well. We have had more cooperation on a range of controversial issues in the last couple of weeks than I have seen in years in the Senate.

I say that as an introduction. We are now on a piece of legislation that is very important in a time of national security interests and in a time in which we have suffered these terrorist attacks. We have the Defense authorization bill before the Senate. It is stuck. We cannot seem to move it.

Why would we not be able to move something as important as a Defense authorization bill at a time such as this? Some Members of the Senate are insistent on, among other things, having an energy bill as an amendment to this bill, including the energy bill that was passed by the House of Representatives on this Defense authorization bill.

It is certainly the case we ought to pass an energy bill in this Congress. I don't think there is much debate about that. The Presiding Officer, the Senator from New Mexico, is the chairman of the Energy Committee on which I serve. We have been working for some long while to try to find common ground to write a new energy bill for our country. It takes on new urgency to write an energy bill, given what happened in this country on September 11, given the threat of actions by terrorists that could thwart the opportunity to have energy flow to places in this country that need it.

We need to do something with respect to not only energy security but energy supply and conservation and more. How do we do that? We don't do that, it seems to me, by simply taking a bill that was passed by the House of Representatives, and offering that as an amendment to a Defense bill in the Senate, especially in a circumstance where offering that as an amendment holds up a bill as vital to this country as the Defense authorization bill. I urge my colleagues to allow Members to move forward and deal with the amendments on the Defense authorization bill.

We have filed a cloture motion on the Defense authorization bill to be voted on tomorrow, but it is troublesome that we have to file a cloture motion to

try to shut off a filibuster, in effect, on a Defense authorization bill at this time and in this place in this country. We ought to move as one with a new dedication of spirit and new determination to pass legislation as important as this, without hanging it up with extraneous amendments.

Let me talk for a moment about energy. The energy amendment some of my colleagues wish to offer to this Defense authorization bill is not germane to this bill. It has nothing to do with this bill. This bill is about the Defense Department and programs in the Defense Department. Is energy important? Absolutely. Energy is an important subject. There is a way to deal with energy policy in this country. All Members know we need to produce more: produce more oil and natural gas. We will do that. We all understand part of a comprehensive national energy policy is not only production, but it is also conservation. Some have this view that the only energy strategy that exists in America is to dig and drill. Just dig and drill and you will solve America's energy problem.

We need to produce more. I will support additional production. That is part of an energy policy we need. But we need conservation, efficiency, and we need to include renewables and limitless energy sources. All of those need to be part of a balanced energy program.

If we develop an energy policy and bring it to the floor of the Senate, which we should in my judgment, we can have a discussion about the different views of different Members of the Senate about how that mix ought to come together in an energy bill. It does not make sense, and in my judgment, does not help do what we need to do in the Senate to hold up a Defense authorization bill so one can try to offer an energy bill passed in the House of Representatives as an amendment to a Defense bill. That is not the right thing to do at this point.

How do we reconcile this? My hope is those who are holding up the Defense authorization bill will stop and say: Let's work together on a Defense authorization bill that makes sense for this country. We can do that.

We are going to be sending men and women into harm's way in this country. We probably already have. We certainly will in the future. Yet we are not willing to pass a Defense authorization bill without offering extraneous amendments? That is not fair. It is not the right thing to do.

I attended a ceremony in North Dakota on Friday in which I presented medals that had been earned by World War II veterans that they never received. Two were Bronze Stars for members of the 184th Division of the North Dakota National Guard. They fought 600 days in combat. They actually saved Guadalcanal. They got a letter from the Marine commandant saying they wanted to make them honorary marines. These were very brave,

battle-weary veterans when World War II was over. They were much decorated. One of the company commanders had several Silver Stars, several Bronze Stars. These were brave, brave Americans.

As I presented the medal to one of them, he began to cry, thinking back about what his contribution was to this country, what he had done with his buddies, thinking back about the number of friends he had lost in that National Guard unit.

As we now send men and women from our country into harm's way, what we ought to do on defense policy, both with respect to the Defense Authorization Act and the Defense Appropriations Act, is bring these bills to the floor of the Senate, work on them in a spirit of cooperation, and get them passed. That says, with one voice, to those men and women in uniform in this country: We are going to give you all the support you need to do what you need for this country to protect and preserve our liberty and freedom.

We are asking them to find those terrorists who committed these acts of mass murder against American citizens, find those terrorists and punish them, and help prevent these terrorist attacks from ever occurring again. That is a dangerous job.

President Bush has come to the Congress and said in a call to the American people that he needs America to be unified. We should speak as one. We should say to terrorists and those harboring them around the world: This country will not allow that to stand. We will find you and we will punish you.

At this time and in this place, we must, in support of the President and in support of the men and women who wear America's uniforms, we must pass this Defense authorization bill and stop what happened in the last week and a half, stop the blocking of this bill for other issues.

Then let's come back and deal with energy. I have great confidence in my colleague from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN, who now chairs the Energy Committee. My colleague waiting to speak, the Senator from Idaho, LARRY CRAIG, is on the committee. We have a lot of good people on the Energy Committee who can work together for a sensible energy policy for this country. Then let's debate that and have a conference with the House and proceed. Yes, we have security issues with respect to energy. Let's proceed on those and do it in the regular order. We should write that bill in the Energy Committee.

One final point: We not only have security threats with respect to terrorist acts in this country and all the security issues that related to that, we also have some emergency issues dealing with this country's economy. Some of that relates to energy, but some of it relates to general economic circumstances in this country.

The question will be, in my judgment, for the next couple of weeks, Will we need a stimulus package in

order to provide some lift to the American economy? Shall we develop an economic stimulus package? If so, what will that package be? Senator Daschle and I have written to a dozen or so of the leading economists in this country last week, and we asked if they would share in a letter an analysis of whether they believe we need a stimulus package; if not, why not, and if so, what should that package include.

I will release to my colleagues today a special report that describes the response of the leading economists in the country in which they describe how they believe we ought to proceed; what kind of stimulus package, if they believe we should have one, would provide a lift to the American economy; what kind of an approach we should use during this period. We have the Federal Reserve Board working on monetary policies. They are obviously furiously trying to cut high interest rates. We are working on fiscal policy issues in the Congress.

Specifically, the question with respect to fiscal policy is, Will we need a stimulus package? And if so, what will that package be? I will release that report this afternoon. It contains a fascinating analysis by the leading economists, including Nobel laureates, the leading economic voices in America.

We need to get this right, as well. We need to work in a spirit of cooperation, between Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, to join hands and see what we can do to provide some lift to this American economy and give the American people some confidence that tomorrow is going to be better than today; that they can have confidence in the future. We will have economic growth and opportunity in this country's future.

All of those are issues that have relationships to each other. But let me just come back to the point I was making originally. We need to do business in this Senate the right way. The Defense authorization bill ought to be passed. We ought not block that legislation. Blockage of the Defense authorization bill has not been good for this country. Let's back away, debate the issues that are relevant to that bill, pass that legislation, and then let's move on to the other critical issues our country faces.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I come to the floor in morning business to talk about National Public Lands Day, but before I do that I want to respond to my colleague from North Dakota, ever so briefly, to suggest that the Defense authorization bill can and should move on the floor just as he said.

There are not a lot of amendments that are holding it up, but there is one important one—that has not yet been offered—in an effort to try to cause the

Senate to shape a direction and establish a time certain when the Senate can debate a national energy policy.

The Presiding Officer happens to be chairman of the Energy Committee in the Senate. He and I have worked long hours already, trying to determine what might go into a national energy policy bill that could come from his authorizing committee.

As we know, the House acted before the August recess on a national energy policy. At that time, the American people said we ought to have a national energy policy for the stability and strength of our economy, because of the long-term need for energy, and, last, because of national security needs.

Since September 11, there has been a literally cataclysmic change in the thinking of the American people as it relates to energy. Issues that once resided in the 35-percent positive range are now at 65-percent positive, relating to certain aspects of energy and energy development. I say that because in looking at a poll that was taken on December 15 and 16, the pollster told me—the poll is still sequestered yet for certain purposes—that in his opinion the events of September 11 changed the mindset of the American public in a greater way than ever in the history of modern-day polling.

No longer is energy an issue of economic stability. It is now, by a factor of 15 points, an issue of national security. Why? Because the American people now well understand we are nearly 60-percent dependent upon foreign oil, and a dominant amount of that oil comes out of the Middle East. In fact, just last week the OPEC ministers decided not to turn down their valves to force up the price of crude oil because they were afraid they would dump the world economy. That was exactly their thinking. I had a phone conversation with our Secretary of Energy, Spence Abraham, who had gone to Vienna to talk to the ministers. They had concluded they would not force the price up by forcing the volume down.

If we are going to decide we cannot deal with a national energy policy for the next 3 or 4 months when in fact we have already spent 2 years looking at policy before the committee—the Presiding Officer, the chairman, has a bill out, the ranking member has a bill out, and there are other versions. We might not be able to do a large bill that is fully comprehensive. But I believe in this time, when America is asking us to unite and stand together and has said that energy is now a national security issue of the utmost importance, that we in the next 2 weeks on the Energy Committee, if we chose to work 4 or 5 days a week and have our staffs working hard, could do just that: Produce a comprehensive energy bill, bring it to the floor, vote on it, and begin to work with the House to find out our differences.

If we recess in late October or early November—or adjourn, whatever our