

these talks. It will be the countries that want to shield their markets from competition that will shape the agenda and the timing of these negotiations.

This would be a devastating situation for America's export-dependent farm economy, and it will cost virtually every farming family in America. Without greater access to world markets, America's family farmers and ranchers will pay more in the form of higher tariffs or taxes than will our competitors. As a result, our farmers will have lower prices, lower income, and lost opportunity.

I thought I would bring to the attention of the Senate a letter that is shown on this chart in its entirety. I am not going to read the letter in its entirety. It is from a constituent of mine. He also happens to be a person I know well, not because I socialize with this person, but because he is an outstanding agricultural leader in my State and, in that capacity, I get to know some of these people who are outstanding farmers, outstanding civic leaders.

I received this letter from Glen Keppy and brought it with me so my colleagues can see how a third generation pork producer from Davenport, IA, looks at the issue of trade and the relationship between trade and the profitability in farming and, more importantly, the strength of the institution that we refer to as the family farmer.

If I can explain what I mean by a family farmer because some think that might be 80 acres or 500 acres. I am not talking about the size of the farm. I am talking about an institution where the family controls the capital, they make all the management decisions, and they provide most or all of the labor. That is a family farm. That can be a 30-acre New Jersey truck garden; that can be an apple ranch in the Presiding Officer's State of Michigan; that can be a ranch, with cattle on thousands of acres, in Wyoming where it takes 25 acres of grass to feed one cow and calf unit.

Mr. Keppy wrote to me about the huge foreign tariffs that are on pork, averaging in some instances close to 100 percent. He also wrote about other foreign trade barriers that hamper his and other farmers' ability to export overseas.

According to Glenn, and I am going to read the first sentence that is highlighted:

The only way our family operation will survive over the long term is if we can convince other nations to lower or remove their barriers to our pork exports.

That comes from some experience. We have learned from some reductions of tariffs going into Mexico since the North American Free Trade Agreement. We are sending more pork into Mexico. As a result of agreements with Japan, more beef is going into Japan. A lot of agreements that were made in the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade proved that as well.

Mr. Keppy knows that where barriers have gone down, it has created opportunities for the American farmer. What he is talking about is that we need to continue opening markets, and trade promotion authority is the tool that we give to the President to negotiate. We give to the President our constitutional power under certain short periods of time with restrictions so the President can sit down at the table and negotiate because, quite frankly, it is not possible for 535 Members of Congress to negotiate with the 142 different countries that are members of the World Trade Organization.

So we give the President this authority. We have done it in the past. It has been very successful. We control the end products because if we do not like it, we do not vote for it, it does not pass, it does not become law.

We also control the process through consultation that we require of the President of the United States. We limit some areas where he might be able to negotiate or not negotiate. We instruct the President to emphasize some things over other things. So we are not giving away any constitutional power. We are asking the President, as a matter of convenience, to negotiate for Congress in the exercise of our constitutional control over interstate and foreign commerce.

I remember in the Senate at the beginning of this debate on trade promotion authority there were some who said it really was not necessary to pass trade promotion authority right away. These critics were wrong then. They are wrong now.

To show how one of my constituents feels about this, this is what this family farmer who emphasizes and specializes in pork production, Mr. Keppy, says, and I would read another sentence:

To the American farmer, despite the pressing need to improve export prospects and consequently, the bottom line for American farmers, no timetable for considering TPA legislation on the floor of the Senate has been set.

That is his way of saying that is not a very good environment for agriculture at the negotiating table as we are right now in Geneva.

He also says in another place in these letters:

To farmers like my two sons and myself, trade is not a luxury. It is a vital ingredient to our success.

"It is the key," Mr. Keppy says, "to our survival."

There are a lot of Glen Keppys whose survival as family farmers depends on trade. So it matters a lot to Mr. Keppy and to all the farmers in America like him when the Senate leadership delays month after month in bringing legislation that is vital to the survival of family farmers to the Senate.

Saying one is for the family farmer and then ignoring or delaying legislation that is vital to the farmers' survival is beyond most farmers' ability to understand. Glen Keppy, his two sons

who work with him, and all the family farmers like them whose survival depends on trade hope the Senate Democratic leadership is listening and will schedule this bill for debate. More importantly, the family farmers of America hope we act on this bill.

Again, I know this has been on Senator DASCHLE's list of important things to get done. I know he knows the importance of it because he is one of the 18 who voted to bring this out of our Senate Finance Committee, but it is something we have to get done, even if it takes working extra hours, as we are not tonight. I am not complaining about not working nights because none of us want to work at night, but sometimes we might have to do it to get the job done.

I welcome that opportunity and I thank Senator DASCHLE for his consideration of my request.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT SUBMITTAL

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, in deference to the majority, it will be my intent to send an amendment to the desk. I ask that the amendment be laid over until the appropriate time. This is an amendment that involves sanctions on Iraq.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I do not want to preclude it, but I am not sure as to whether or not it would be necessary to set aside the existing amendment, which is the Iraqi oil import ban. I filed this some time ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On what measure is the Senator proposing to add the amendment?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. It is a specific ban on imports from Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To which bill is the Senator proposing to add the amendment?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. It would be an amendment to S. 517.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That measure is not pending at this time.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent to submit this amendment as if it was in order as a pending amendment.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. My understanding is tomorrow morning is somewhat open because the majority had indicated they were not going to be taking up the boundary issue, and there was some question of taking something else up. So I simply offer this amendment. Obviously, it is going to be up to the leaders if they want to take it, but it would

be my intention to submit it. So my staff has the amendment coming shortly. It has already been filed with the clerk. So let me go into the specifics.

This amendment would basically end our imports of oil from Iraq until certain conditions were met. First would be that the U.N. certifies that Iraq has complied with Security Council Resolution 687 and has dismantled their program to develop and construct weapons of mass destruction. Further, it would end our imports of oil from Iraq until Iraq ceases to smuggle oil in contravention of Security Council Resolution 986; further, that Iraq no longer pays bounties to the families of suicide bombers wreaking havoc in Israel.

Now, I recognize Iraq's oil export program is intended to be used for the benefit of Iraq's suffering people, but my amendment also seeks to ensure the President uses every means available to support the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people notwithstanding our ban on oil imports.

I consider myself somewhat of an internationalist, and I believe firmly in the importance of engagement with other countries, particularly economic engagement. But I am a strong believer, as well, in free trade and in the work that many of my colleagues have done to reform the economic sanctions policy. However, I draw the line on economic engagement when national security is compromised.

I said it before, and I will say it again, our increasing dependency on unstable overseas sources of oil is compromising our national security. In the last week, this Nation has lost 30 percent of our available imports from both Iraq and Venezuela. Last week, Saddam Hussein urged fellow Arab OPEC members to use oil as a weapon—I repeat that: Oil as a weapon. We saw what happened when aircraft were used as weapons in the World Trade Center disaster.

Saddam Hussein did that by imposing a 30-day embargo to halt oil exports to the United States until the United States forced Israel to cave into the demands of the Palestinian extremists.

In 1973, the Arab League used oil as a weapon during a time of similar crisis in the Mideast. Some may remember that. We had gas lines around the block. People were blaming government. That was during the Yom Kippur War.

At that time, we were 37 percent dependent on imported oil. Still, the Arab oil embargo demonstrated how powerful a weapon oil could be, and the United States was brought to its knees at that time in 1973.

Today, we are 58 percent dependent on imported oil. Clearly, the vulnerability is evident. At that time, the national security implications of energy dependence was obvious to everybody. At that time, there was a decision made to build a TransAlaskan pipeline. It was taken precisely because of our national security implications of over-dependency on Middle East sources. That was then and this is now.

I have charts that show the contribution of Prudhoe Bay to decreasing our imports when Prudhoe Bay came online. It was a dramatic reduction in imports. Prudhoe Bay has contributed about 25 percent of the total crude oil produced in this country. Prospects for ANWR are even greater. I suggest there is more oil in ANWR than in the entire State of Texas.

As we look at the changing times, we have to recognize certain things stay the same. Nearly 30 years after the Arab oil embargo, we are faced with the same threat we faced in 1973. The difference is that now we are nearly 58 percent dependent on imported oil. The stakes are higher. The national security implications are more evident. I wonder what we have learned. The day before Saddam Hussein called on his Arab neighbors to use oil as a weapon and begin the 30-day moratorium on exports, the United States was importing over a million barrels a day from Iraq. If you filled up your tank on that day, chances are at least a half gallon of your tank came from Iraq. That is dollars to Saddam Hussein. Think about it. This is the same individual who pays bounties to suicide bombers. It was \$10,000; now it is \$25,000. He shoots at our sons and daughters who fly missions in the no-fly zone in Iraq; he has used chemical weapons on his own people and has boasted that he has the weapons to scorch half of Israel.

When we innocently fill up a gas tank, we have paid Saddam Hussein nearly a nickel of every dollar spent at the pump that day—paid, in effect, for the suicide bombers; bought the shells targeted at American forces; paid for the chemical and biological weapons being developed in Iraq which are targeted at Israel.

Have we learned our lesson? I ran across an old Life magazine from March 1991. In a profile of the gulf war, they wrote of Saddam Hussein:

When he finally fought his way to power in 1979, after an apprenticeship of a few years as a torturer, his first order was the execution of some 20 of the highest-ranking government officials, including one of his best friends. He likes to say "he who is closest to me is furthest from when he does wrong." He grew up in dirt to live in splendor. He is cheerless. And he currently possesses Kuwait.

This article should be used as a reminder of the costly mistakes for not dealing with him completely. It is almost a play-by-play review of the gulf war, but new names and a new era from 2002 could just as easily be inserted in that article. These lessons must not be lost. He is our enemy. The world must isolate him, cut him off and coax his regime to an early demise.

We have not learned our lesson, have we? He is still there because we are still buying his oil. Sure, it is masked in an oil-for-food program, but is it really working? He is still there. I know oil for food isn't supposed to work that way. Saddam Hussein is supposed to use the money for oil, for food to feed the Iraqi people, to buy medi-

cine, but he cheats on the program, buying all kinds of dual-use and questionable material and smuggles billions of dollars of oil out of Iraq, which directly funds his armies, his weapons, his programs, and his palaces.

We have had lost lives. A few months ago we had two of our Navy men drown boarding one of his illegal tankers that was going out of Iraq. During the inspection, the ship simply sank.

No matter how you look at it, our purchase of Iraqi oil is absolutely contrary to the national interests of our country. It is indefensible. It must end.

My amendment does just that. It would end the new imports of Iraqi oil until Iraq is proven a responsible member of the international community and complies with the relevant Security Council resolutions.

I begin this statement by affirming my support for economic engagement. I believe deeply in the principles of free trade. I do not believe, however, in economic disarmament. When, as in the case of oil, a commodity is not only important to our economy's health, but it is also important to our military's ability to defend this Nation, self-sufficiency is a critical matter. No country or group of countries should have the ability to ground our aircraft, shut down our tanks, or keep our ships from leaving port. Yet allowing ourselves to become dependent on imports threatens to do just that.

In the case of Saddam Hussein, we are dependent, as I indicated, as a consequence of what has happened with the curtailment of imports and the strikes in Venezuela. Thirty percent of our normal imports have been interrupted, a portion of that by a sworn and defined enemy, Saddam Hussein.

I will show a chart I referred to earlier because I think it addresses and thwarts some of the negative impressions as to how significant any development in ANWR might be.

Looking at history, this particular chart shows, on the blue line, production in Alaska. In 1976 and 1977 it went up dramatically. The red line shows why. We began to build the TransAlaskan pipeline, the TAPPS pipeline, and we see in 1977 at that time imports peaked, and then they dropped dramatically. They dropped in 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, and 1986 because we opened Prudhoe Bay. When critics say opening up ANWR will not make any difference, history proves them wrong. This is the actual reality of what happened to our imports when we opened Prudhoe Bay. The imports dropped in 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, and 1986. Why did they start going up? Obviously, the demand in the United States increased. They kept increasing. If you look at the blue line, Alaska's production begins to decline. It will decline until we face reality and wake up to the fact that we have the capability to develop ANWR just as we did Prudhoe Bay. But there is the reality that the contribution of opening up a field of the magnitude of ANWR

will certainly be comparable to that of Prudhoe Bay. I think that comparison is evident in the range estimated for the reserves of ANWR—somewhere between 5.6 billion and 16 billion barrels.

The actual production of Prudhoe Bay has been a little over 10 billion barrels. So if you apply roughly the same scenario, you are going to see a significant drop in imports from overseas as we increase production in Alaska. I think that chart really needs to be understood.

I wish to conclude by a reference to relying on foreign sources of oil. I think we all agree history shows us it is not risk free. We saw what happened in 1973 during the Arab oil embargo. I think it is fair to say we have a bit of an uneasy relationship with our friends in the gulf, and September 11 clearly demonstrated that our enemies—in staunch allies like Saudi Arabia—may outnumber our friends.

Isn't it interesting the Saudis have indicated they are going to make up the supply that was terminated by Saddam Hussein indicating he is going to cease production for 30 days? I wonder at what price. We already have some form of economic sanction on every single member of OPEC.

Think about that. Here we are, relying on a cartel which is illegal in this country to provide us with our oil. Then we have some form of economic sanction on every single member of OPEC, a reflection on the uneasy relationship we have with those countries.

That is risky, relying on countries such as these to provide for our national security. We have long recognized the folly of importing oil from our enemies. There is lots of oil in Iran and Libya, but we have not imported so much as a drop of oil from those countries in 20 years. Does relying on Iraq make more sense than relying on Iran or Libya? I notice many colleagues advocate production in less risky parts of the globe, including in the United States. The trouble is, you have to drill for oil and you have to go where the oil is. The fact is, the ground under which most of the oil is buried is controlled by unstable, unfriendly, or at-risk governments.

Let me turn for a moment to some of the other areas of the world on which we depend. Take Colombia, for example, the oilfields being developed in this pristine rainforest down there. We get more than 350,000 barrels of oil from Colombia. The 480-mile-long Cano Limo pipeline is at the heart of the Colombian oilfields and the trade. It is very frequently attacked by the FARC rebels. They are anti-capitalist, anti-U.S., anti-Colombian Government rebels. The trouble is, half the country these rebels control has the Cano Limo pipeline running through it, a convenient target to cripple the economy, get America's attention, and rally the troops to their cause.

The countless attacks have cost some 24 million barrels in lost crude production last year and untold environ-

mental damage to the rainforest ecosystem.

Last year alone, the rebels bombed the Cano Limo pipeline 170 times, putting it out of commission for 266 days and costing the Colombian Government and the citizens of that country about \$500 million in lost revenues.

The Bush administration wants to spend \$98 million to train a brigade of 2,000 Colombian soldiers to protect the pipeline and now another rebel faction called the American companies running the pipeline "military targets."

I ask you, is Colombia a stable supply, a stable source of supply?

How about Venezuela? Workers are on strike there. The Government is in turmoil. Production is suspended. Yesterday, labor leaders and Government officials were set to return to the bargaining table. That has broken down today. Instead we have seen riots, 12 to 20 people are dead. Hundreds are injured. We have seen President Chavez resign and then we have seen him come back.

One has to question the absence of Chavez and what does it mean to stability? Does it leave a vacuum? Does it leave more uncertainty?

Between a Venezuelan labor crisis, Colombia's civil war, Iraq's embargo, 30 percent of our oil supply is threatened. What are we doing about it? We are talking about CAFE standards. My colleagues suggest to you if we would only adopt CAFE standards, we would be able to take care of, and relieve our dependence on, imports.

There are two things about CAFE standards. One is the recognition that we can save on oil. But the world moves on oil. The United States moves on oil. Unfortunately, other alternative sources of energy do not move America. They don't move our trains or our boats, our automobiles or trucks. We wish, perhaps, we had another alternative, but we do not. The harsh reality is we are going to be depending on oil and oil imports. The question is, Is it in the national interest of this country to reduce that dependence? The answer is clearly yes.

Are my colleagues truly unfazed about the close connection between oil money and national security? Are we willing to turn our heads while the money we spend at the pump fuels the Mideast crisis? Are we willing to finance the schemes of Saddam Hussein? Are we willing to allow our policy choices in Israel to be dictated by our thirst for imported oil? Are we willing to let oil be used as a weapon against us?

Whatever the outcome of the ANWR debate which we are going to start tomorrow, we should stop relying on Saddam Hussein. It is simply a matter of principle. The United States is a principled nation. We should not allow our national security to be compromised. I have heard time and time again, on the other side, my friends dismissing ANWR as a solution to the national security dilemma of overdependence on

foreign oil. But I have not heard of a good, sound alternative solution.

Our military cannot conduct a campaign of conservation. Our aircraft do not fly on biomass. Our tanks do not run on solar. Wind power has not been used by the Navy in 150 years.

I sympathize with the desires to eliminate the use of fossil fuels. I believe we will get there through continued research in new technologies. But, in the meantime, the United States and the world moves on oil. As the developing nations develop their economies, they are going to require more oil. I certainly understand the urge to deny the importance of oil in the national security equation, but all my colleagues, I think it is fair to say, will eventually have to look themselves in the mirror after this debate and ask whether we have sacrificed our national security in order to appeal to the fantasies of extreme but well-funded environmentalists.

Whether or not we do the right thing for this country and open up ANWR to safe, effective exploration, we should not compromise our national security by continuing to rely on our enemies. That is just what we are, evidently, doing at this time.

Finally, let me again point out something that we have been having a hard time communicating; that is, the reality associated with the ANWR issue. The fact is, this is a significant size—roughly 19 million acres, the size of South Carolina. We have already made specific land designations. Congress made these. We have roughly 9 million acres in a refuge, 8.5 million acres in wilderness, and this is the Coastal Plain, 1.5 million acres in green that potentially is at risk. But the House bill only authorized 2,000 acres, that little red spot there. So that is the footprint that would be authorized in the Senate bill.

We have the infrastructure in. We have an 800-mile pipeline that was built in the early 1970s from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez.

Having participated in that discussion, it is rather interesting to reflect that 27 or 28 years later we are still arguing the same environmental premise on whether or not this can be done safely. The argument then was that we were going to build a fence across 800 miles of Alaska; that we were going to separate two parts of the State by building a fence; and the animals were not going to cross it—the polar bears were not going to cross it, and the moose were not going to cross it. That proved to be a fallacious argument.

The other argument was you were going to put a hot pipeline in permafrost which would melt the permafrost, and the pipeline was going to break. All of those naysayer scenarios were false.

The same argument is being made today—that somehow we can't open this area safely.

I will show you a couple of pictures of some of the animal activity up

there. I think it warrants consideration. We have already seen the growth in the caribou herd relative to Prudhoe Bay. There were 3,000 to 4,000 animals in 1974-1975. There are about 26,000 today.

The Porcupine herd traverses Canada. There is a large number taken for subsistence in that particular area. It is a different herd. But we are not going to develop this area in the summertime. The development will be in the winter.

Here is a little idea of the caribou. These are not stuffed. These are real. These are caribou traversing the Arctic oilfield of Prudhoe Bay. They are not shot at; they are not run down. You can't take a gun in there. You can't hunt. They are very docile unless they are threatened.

Here is a picture of what happens when the bears want to go for a walk. They walk on the pipeline because it is a lot easier than walking on the snow. I think many of my colleagues would recognize that these are bears which are smarter than the average bear. Let us just leave it at that.

As we get into this debate tomorrow, I hope my colleagues will recognize again the magnitude of this area, the very small footprint, and recognize that this area is known to contain more oil than all of Texas. There is absolutely no question about that. The question is, What are the extremes? Again, it is as big as Prudhoe Bay. It will supply this Nation 25 percent more of its total crude oil consumption, and the infrastructure is already built.

Let me conclude with one other point. As the occupant of the chair is well aware, all of the oil from Alaska is consumed on the west coast of the United States. There hasn't been a drop of oil exported outside of Alaska since June 2 years ago. That was a little which was in excess for the west coast. This oil moves in U.S. tankers down the west coast. A significant portion goes into Puget Sound in the State of Washington where it is refined. Oregon does not have any refineries. A portion of the Washington-refined oil goes into the State of Oregon. The rest of it goes down to San Francisco Bay or Los Angeles where the balance is refined. A small portion goes to the refineries in Hawaii.

That is where Alaskan oil goes. When Alaskan oil begins to decline as a consequence of the decline of the Prudhoe Bay field, where is the West going to get its oil? Is it going to get it from Colombia or it is going to get it from Saudi Arabia or Iran or Iraq or wherever. It is going to come in in foreign ships because the Jones Act requires that the carriage of goods between two American ports be in U.S.-flagged vessels.

We are looking at jobs here. We are looking at jobs in the Pacific Northwest, in California. The significance of maintaining those jobs is very real to the American merchant marine.

Primarily, 80 percent of the tonnage in the American merchant marine

today is under the American flag—U.S. tankers. They are in need of replacement. It is estimated that if we open up ANWR, there will be 19 new tankers built in U.S. shipyards employing U.S. crews. If it isn't, you are going to see the oil come into the west coast ports in foreign vessels from foreign ports. Obviously, that will affect our balance of payments and result in sending dollars overseas.

As we begin the debate, I hope my colleagues will recognize that America's environmental community has been pushing very hard on this issue because it has been an issue that has allowed them to raise dollars and generate membership. And they really milk it for all its worth.

I hope Members will reflect on the debate itself, the merits of the debate, and not be prepositioned by having given certain commitments to one group or another.

This is a big jobs issue. About 250,000 U.S. jobs are associated with opening up the ANWR field, the tankers, and the operation. When we get into the debate, hopefully we will have an opportunity to respond to those who have expressed concerns about safety, those who have expressed concerns about the adequacy of the reserves, and those who have expressed concern over how long it would take to get on line.

With this pipeline here, and the proximity, it is estimated that we could expedite the permits and have oil flowing within 3 years. Those are basically the facts from one who has spent virtually his entire life in the State of Alaska.

I can assure you that the Native people of Kaktovik—300 residents—support the issue. As a matter of fact, they are in Washington right now making calls on various Members.

I hope we will do what is right for America in the coming debate; that is, authorize the opening of ANWR.

I yield the floor. 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. REID. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

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

AWARDING OF SOLDIERS MEDAL TO DONALD S. "STEVE" WORKMAN

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, on April 26, U.S. Army Sergeant First Class Donald S. "Steve" Workman will be awarded the Soldiers Medal for his

courageous actions at the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. The Soldiers Medal is awarded to members of the U.S. Army who distinguish themselves by heroic acts that do not directly involve actual conflict with the enemy.

When you hear Steve's story, I am confident that you will agree that his selfless actions indeed merit this award.

As all of us vividly remember, a hijacked plane crashed into the Pentagon on the morning of September 11, 2001. Instead of leaving the Pentagon, Steve risked his life by reentering the building to help other survivors. He struggled through intense fires, sparking electrical wires, and pools of jet fuel and eventually came upon Navy Lieutenant Kevin Shaeffer, who had been blown to the floor—by a gigantic fireball—from his desk in the Navy Command Center.

After finding Kevin, Steve guided him through flames and dense smoke to one of the infirmaries inside the Pentagon. When they reached the infirmary, Steve realized Kevin was going into shock so he immediately elevated Kevin's legs using a trash can, loosened his belt, and gave him small drops of water. After helping a nurse administer an IV and painkiller, Steve grabbed a small tank of oxygen and led Kevin outside to wait for an ambulance.

Once ambulances began arriving, Steve helped place Kevin in one of them and they rode together to Walter Reed Army Medical Center. En route, the ambulance's oxygen tank ran empty so the small oxygen tank Steve took from the Pentagon infirmary was a godsend. Kevin recalls that the two men talked during the trip and he remembers giving Steve his wife's name, Bianca—also a Navy Lieutenant—and phone number.

When the ambulance arrived at Walter Reed, Steve turned Kevin over to the medical personnel and helped the hospital staff contact Bianca. He then returned to the Pentagon to help anyone else needing it.

Kevin later learned that he had suffered second and third-degree burns over 41 percent of his body. During his three month stay at Walter Reed, Kevin and Steve, and their families, stayed in close contact with each other and have developed a strong relationship. Kevin and Bianca have stated that they consider Steve to be a member of their family.

SFC Steve Workman is a brave, courageous soldier whose actions helped save the life of a fellow servicemen. He is a true hero.

TAX DAY 2002—PROGRESS AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, on this April 15, Congress and the President have solid achievements to be proud of. But there is also much work that remains to be done on a tax code that is still too burdensome and complex.