

Valdez, we decreed in Congress—and the State industries agreed—that all new tankers to serve Alaska must be double-hulled. When this great area starts producing oil, 17 new double-hulled tankers will be built to carry the oil coming out of the Alaska pipeline.

The current occupant of the chair didn't see this chart. I want to present it again for his benefit because the two of us served under that great general. This is what he said during World War II to our oil field workers: "Stick to your job. Oil is ammunition."

If the leadership followed the precedent set by Mike Mansfield, who opposed the Alaska oil pipeline amendment when there was a tie vote—they supported the one provision which accelerated the litigation and required immediate construction of the pipeline. Senator Mansfield would not permit a filibuster on the matter involving national security. Senator Jackson was chairman of the committee. And both of them voted against that oil pipeline amendment when it was a tie vote. They did not try to filibuster against that amendment. Had they done so, we undoubtedly would not have the oil pipeline today.

If those two great leaders had opposed the one amendment that accelerated the construction of the pipeline, we would never have had an oil pipeline.

I believe the situation today is an odd one. I am sad that leadership now perseveres in its statement to us that we must have 60 votes.

I close out by saying Alaska Senators are going to try to persevere too. We are going to stay here and the Senate is going to stay here until we get 60 votes next week.

I thank the President for his courtesy.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mr. STEVENS assumed the Chair.)

Mr. INOUE. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. INOUE. Mr. President, I wasn't prepared to present a lengthy argument in favor of or against it, but I must tell you that I support you fully, sir. I support your proposal on ANWR. I did so when the pipeline was proposed many years ago. I still recall that at that time the opponents of the pipeline predicted the caribou herd in Alaska would be decimated. I am a lover of animals. I was concerned. But today I am happy to tell you that instead of being decimated, the herd has increased tenfold. There are more caribou than we ever had in our lifetimes.

The opposition to the use of ANWR at this time comes from many sources.

These sources are my friends. As you may know, Mr. President, I have the privilege of serving at this moment as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs. I am concerned about the plight of the Native Americans. Yes, it is true that there is a tribe—a nation—in Alaska opposed to the use of ANWR for drilling of oil—one tribe. I am pleased to advise you, Mr. President, that the Federation of Alaskan Natives, representing all the other tribes, favors your measure. As chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I feel almost compelled to support you if only on that basis.

But there are other reasons for my support. The next reason was given to me just a few days ago when the dictator of Iraq stated: Why don't we use the oil weapon against the United States?

As long as the present condition continues, we will be hostage to oil, we will be captives to oil. We may find ourselves, once again, going out into the desert to fight for oil, risking and sacrificing American lives. And as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Committee, I am not in favor of that, sir.

So when the time comes, I will be answering "aye" on your measure.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished majority whip.

A SENATE FRIENDSHIP

Mr. REID. Mr. President, while I disagree with the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii and the senior Senator from Alaska on this issue, I am forever amazed at the great relationship of the senior Senator from Alaska and the senior Senator from Hawaii.

We develop friendships in the Senate, and I have no question that my friendship with Senator INOUE is one that will last me a lifetime. He is such a wonderful man. And I also have such warmth and feelings for the senior Senator from Alaska. But with the example that is set by the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii, in friendship and in working together on issues, I am, each year, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, stunned by the ability of these two gentlemen to move through the Defense appropriations bill the way they do. This should take weeks of our debate time in the committee and on the Senate floor, but as a result of their working relationship, it is always held to just a short period of time.

So when the history books are written about the Senate, these two men, who now stand before me and with me in the Senate—Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE—will be known for many things, for doing so many good things for our country and for their respective States, but the thing I am going to remember is the example of friendship that I see between the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from

Hawaii. And I do not mean in any way to demean the Senator from Hawaii because I know he believes in his position not because of friendship but because he believes in the merits of the case, as it has, I am sure, something to do with the friendship they have. But the relationship of the two Senators is, as far as I am concerned, encyclopedic as to how we should work with each other in the Senate.

So on behalf of the Senate, I applaud and congratulate these two Senators for the example they set for the rest of us on how civilly the Senate should be run—a Democrat from Hawaii, thought of as a liberal State in some people's minds, and a Republican from the conservative State of Alaska. What we have coming from those two States is two people to show us that with different ideologies we can still work together for the good of the country.

So I say to both Senators, thank you very much.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to speak on a subject that is very important to the American public—the importance of free trade and how free markets can help the United States and the worldwide economy.

By working together to create and foster a free market atmosphere, we can help all nations that actively promote and participate in international trade to improve the economic futures of their citizens. This is good economic policy and good international relations.

As the ranking Republican member on the International Trade Subcommittee and as a member of the Intelligence Committee, I can tell you that international trade has long been one of the most important foreign policy tools of the United States.

Trade was a key component of our post-World War II international political and economic strategy. For more than 50 years, international trade contributed to stability and economic growth throughout the world. It helped lift the nations of Europe and Asia out of the ruins of World War II. And it helped millions of Americans experience unprecedented prosperity here at home.

A large part of the reason that the Berlin Wall fell was the difference in economic performance and promise between a centralized command and central economy and free markets. International trade can play a similar role at the beginning of the 21st century. But, the United States must lead the way.

I am pleased that the administration, led by President Bush, Commerce Secretary Don Evans, and our United States Trade Representative Bob Zoellick, has helped launch a new round of international trade talks. We all have an interest in making the next World Trade Organization ministerial succeed. I believe that success can only

be enhanced if the Congress passes legislation on Trade Promotion Authority.

In my view, the prospects of favorable progress in the next ministerial will increase if the United States signals to the world that—even while we undertake an unprecedented military mission against terrorism—we will continue to give our trade agenda a very high priority.

Although there are some members of Congress who might think otherwise, I believe that the new round of trade negotiation is clearly in our national interest.

Trade creates jobs—both at home and abroad. Trade can also help promote political stability in many regions of the world. It is in our national interest to foster free trade.

Let's look at the facts. Ninety-six percent of the world's consumers live outside our borders. Based on that fact alone, the United States would be foolish not to pursue a vigorous trade agenda. But let me go on. Exports accounted for about 30 percent of U.S. economic growth over the last decade, representing one of the fastest growing sectors in our economy. Almost 97 percent of exporters are small or medium-sized companies and, as my colleagues are aware, small businessmen are the engine of job growth.

In fact, almost 10 percent of all U.S. jobs—an estimated 12 million workers—now depend on America's ability to export to the rest of the world. Export-related jobs typically pay 13 percent to 18 percent more than the average U.S. wage.

There are many reasons to believe that the best is yet to come in this dynamic sector. Economists predict that there could be a 33 percent reduction in worldwide tariffs on agricultural and industrial products in the next WTO trade round. This action alone could inject an additional \$177.3 billion into the American economy in the next 10 years.

I strongly support congressional passage for Trade Promotion Authority legislation this year. TPA will provide a measure of certainty to our trading partners that any agreement reached with USTR will receive timely congressional consideration and will not die a slow death by amendment.

As part of granting this fast track authority, Congress naturally will expect extensive consultation and notification procedures.

Success in passing TPA will require a close partnership between the executive and legislative branches of our government. The Constitution grants Congress the authority to promote international commerce. However, the Constitution also gives the President the responsibility to conduct foreign policy. Thus, the very nature of our Constitution requires a partnership between the executive and legislative branches of Government in matters of international trade negotiations. That is what the trade promotion authority

bill is all about—a partnership between the executive and legislative branches of government to enable U.S. consumers, workers and firms to be effectively represented at the negotiating table. And, I might add, farmers as well.

In my opinion, TPA is an essential tool for sound trade expansion policy, a tool we have been without since its expiration in 1994. For over a decade, the United States has too often sat on the sidelines while other nations around the world continued to form trade partnerships and lucrative market alliances. The lack of fast track has put the United States at a disadvantage during trade negotiations.

As we come out of the economic slowdown, U.S. efforts to expand trade alliances around the world can help accelerate the economic recovery we are all hoping for. TPA can help put wind back into the sails of U.S. trade policy.

Without Trade Promotion Authority, the United States is not the only loser. Since trade agreements must be mutually advantageous, workers in countries that were not able to complete agreements with the United States are also injured. Global economic growth is a tide that will lift many boats.

Trade can be a win-win situation. There will always be criticisms that one side bested the other in any negotiation. Sometimes you come out a little ahead. Sometimes not. One thing is clear: If there is no trade agreement—both sides will lose out on opportunities for their citizens.

Last year, the United States exported more than \$780 billion in goods and services to more than 200 foreign markets. In fact, exports provided more than one-quarter of all economic growth in America. Jobs can be created in agriculture, high technology, manufacturing, financial services and other industries. We know this to be true.

Free trade is not just a matter of economics. It is a fundamental aspect of American foreign policy. Through trade our values are reflected abroad and citizens of developing nations have the opportunity to teach us about their culture and we can all discuss shared values.

As President Bush stated in his address on trade issues on April 4:

Fearful people build walls around America. Confident people make sure there are no walls.

... I am confident. I'm confident in America products, I'm confident in American entrepreneurs, I'm confident in the American worker, I'm confident in the American know-how, I'm confident in America's farmers, I'm confident in America's ranchers. We need to be a trading nation.

I could not agree more with the President. Market-opening trade pacts with developing nations not only present an opportunity for the United States to increase American sales of U.S. goods and services abroad, they also can serve as a catalyst to bring stability and prosperity to economically stagnant nations of the world.

America's engagement in world affairs and trade can project to our

strengths and values. Vigorous efforts to forge free trade alliances between the United States and developing countries will help to foster respect for the rule of law, competition and free-market principles in the developing world.

As Majority Leader DASCHLE noted in a floor speech on March 21 in support of Trade Promotion Authority legislation:

Expanding trade also offers national security and foreign policy benefits because trade opens more than new markets. When it is done correctly, it opens the way for democratic reforms. It also increases understanding and interdependence among nations, and raises the cost of conflict.

I think that Senator DASCHLE makes a compelling point. We need to keep up strong, international economic leadership and help more nations become prosperous. Trade can help us create new jobs, both at home and abroad, and help change the conditions that breed poverty and instability overseas.

TPA is also good for Utah. The fact is that TPA can help bring new jobs into Salt Lake City and across my State. Here are the facts: trade has benefitted my home State of Utah. For example Utah's manufacturers produced and exported \$2.52 billion worth of manufactured items to 164 countries around the world. In fact, an estimated 61,400 Utah jobs are trade dependent and one in every six manufacturing jobs in Utah—approximately 20,300 jobs—are tied to exports. Furthermore, the bulk of international trade and export in Utah benefits small and medium sized companies. About 80 percent of Utah's 1,894 companies that export are small and medium sized businesses. Our record is good, but we can do even better.

TPA is good for America. The passage of TPA improves the quality of life for American consumers by providing a greater choice of goods at better prices. Past agreements have benefitted the typical family of four an estimated \$1,300 to \$2,000 a year. Future agreements stand to save Americans thousands more every year. TPA also builds on previous market-opening successes such as the North American Free Trade Agreement that generates \$1.2 million a minute in trade for American exporters.

While we have important foreign policy goals that can be advanced through a rigorous program with respect to international trade, let us not forget Tip O'Neill's famous observation: "All politics is local."

So, for both economic and foreign affairs considerations, I am hopeful that before our work is completed this fall, we will have taken up the bill that the Finance Committee approved—by the overwhelming margin of 18-3 I might add—and send it forward to the President for his signature.

The Finance Committee has done its work. I want to commend Chairman BAUCUS and ranking Republican member GRASSLEY for leading the way for this bipartisan achievement. I also

want to recognize the efforts of Senators BOB GRAHAM and FRANK MURKOWSKI for their important contribution to achieving this consensus.

I urge the majority leader and Republican leader to act in a way that will advance American interests abroad by bringing the TPA bill up for debate and action.

I recognize that the reality is that the Senate will in all likelihood also act favorably on Trade Adjustment Assistance legislation—TAA—or the TPA bill will stall. So be it. I am for both TPA and TAA in any order, tied or untied. But let me be clear, I am not for a loaded up TAA bill with health care provisions.

Let's get the job done for the American people. My constituents from firms like Geneva Steel need assistance to cushion their loss of jobs lost through trade. But in addition to TAA, we need TPA to open new markets for the workers of Utah and others throughout the United States.

Now is the time for the Senate to take up and pass Trade Promotion Authority. Now is the time.

The longer we wait to come together on fast track authority—authority that will undoubtedly provide billions of dollars to our economy through increased trade—means the longer that American families will have to endure a less than optimal economy. As the President noted "Every day we go by without the authority is another day we are missing opportunities to help our economy, to help our workers, to help our country, to relate to our friends around the world." President Bush is right on target.

In closing, I urge passage of the Trade Promotion Authority legislation. It is my hope that the majority leader will give us a date certain when the Senate will have the opportunity to act on this important legislation. I hope that we pass TPA before Memorial Day.

CLONING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in the next few weeks, the Senate will debate the important issue of cloning. Using cloning to reproduce a child is improper and immoral—and it ought to be illegal. I think that every member of the Senate would agree on this point.

But some want to use our opposition to human cloning to advance a more sweeping agenda. In the name of banning cloning, they would place unwarranted restrictions on medical research that could improve and extend countless lives. In a letter to the Congress this week, 40 Nobel Laureates wrote that these restrictions would "impede progress against some of the most debilitating diseases known to man." I am saddened that the President has endorsed these restrictions to the detriment of patients across America.

Senator ARLEN SPECTER, Senator DIANE FEINSTEIN, and I have developed legislation that bans human cloning,

but allows medical research to go forward with strict ethical oversight. I am confident that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this balanced and responsible bipartisan approach—rather than voting to ban an area of medical research that holds such great promise.

We must not let the misplaced fears of today deny patients the cures of tomorrow.

The recent announcement that rogue doctors may have initiated a pregnancy through cloning shows how urgently our legislation is needed. Such actions should be a crime, and our legislation will make human cloning punishable by fines and imprisonment.

But we must not confuse human cloning with medical research using the remarkable new technique of nuclear transfer. One creates a person and should be banned. The other saves lives by helping doctors find cures for diseases that deprive people of their dignity, their careers or even their very lives. We owe it to our fellow citizens to do everything we can to encourage this extraordinary research that brings such great hope to so many Americans. Medical research using nuclear transfer does not reproduce a child or create carbon copies of ourselves.

But this debate isn't about abstract ideas or complex medical terms—it's about real people who could be helped by this research. Dr. Douglas Melton is one of the nation's foremost researchers on diabetes. For Dr. Melton, the stakes involved in this research could not be higher. His young son, Sam, has juvenile diabetes, and Dr. Melton works tirelessly to find a cure for his son's condition.

One of the most promising areas of research on diabetes involves using stem cells to provide the insulin that Sam—and thousands of children like him—need to live healthy, active lives.

But a shadow looms over this research. A patient's body may reject the very cells intended to provide a cure. To unlock the potential of stem cell research, doctors are trying to reprogram stem cells with a patient's own genetic material. Using the breakthrough technique of nuclear transfer, each one of us could receive transplants or new cells perfectly matched to our own bodies. Can we really tell Sam Melton, and the millions of Americans suffering from diabetes, or Parkinson's disease or spinal injuries that we won't pursue every opportunity to find a cure for their disorders?

Some have said that this research will put women at risk by subjecting them to undue pressures to donate eggs. Our legislation addresses this concern by applying to all nuclear transfer research—whether publicly or privately funded—the same strict ethical standards used in research funded by the NIH. These protections guarantee ethical review, informed consent, and respect for the privacy of donors.

Congress has rejected calls to place undue restrictions on medical research

many times in the past. In the 1970s we debated whether to ban the basic techniques of biotechnology. Some of the very same arguments that are raised against nuclear transfer research today were raised against biotechnology back then. Some said that the medical promise of biotechnology was uncertain, and that it would lead to ecological catastrophe or genetic monsters.

Because Congress rejected those arguments then, patients across America today can benefit from breakthrough new biotechnology products that help dissolve clots in the arteries of stroke victims, fight leukemia, and help those with crippling arthritis lead productive lives.

When in vitro fertilization was first developed in the 1980s, it too, was bitterly denounced. And once again, there were calls to make this medical breakthrough illegal. Because Congress rejected those arguments then, thousands of Americans today can experience the joys of parenthood through the very techniques that were once so strongly opposed.

Congress was right to place patients over ideology in the past, and we should do the same again today.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

JESSE SEROYER

• Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, the people of the great state of Alabama are going to benefit from the wisdom of President George W. Bush in appointing Jesse Seroyer as their United States Marshal. I came to know Jesse well when I was elected Attorney General of Alabama in 1994. My respect for him grew continuously. Jesse had one primary motivation—to do the right thing. He was proud of his work and wanted the Alabama Attorney General's office to be the best it could be. His focus was always on the right goal—investigating cases thoroughly, clearing the innocent and prosecuting the guilty. Jesse leads by example. He works hard, does the right thing and expects others to do the same. While he is cooperative and a team player, he will not participate in or condone wrongdoing.

Jesse's career began with the Opelika police department in 1976. He worked vice and narcotics and worked with many different law enforcement agencies making cases all over Alabama. In 1987 he joined the Attorney General's office as chief investigator. During his time with the Attorney General's office Jesse has been invaluable in a host of important cases and activities. He has investigated white collar crime, corruption, voter fraud, and violent crime cases. In addition, he trained other investigators in his unit, conducted investigations of judges for the Alabama Judicial Inquiry Commission, provided security and protection for the Attorney General and others, conducted all investigations under the Alabama