

may not have an idea of where we are vulnerable: Oh, by the way, why don't you try this?

Why don't you come after our ports? I worry a tramp steamer will come into the Port of Baltimore loaded with explosives and blow half of Baltimore away. I worry about my hometown. These are serious threats. We have a lot of work to do.

I have an expectation that we need to ask our law enforcement agencies—the INS, the Customs Service, the FBI, the CIA—how did this happen? Why didn't we know more? Should we have gone to a higher alert? CIA, were you talking to the FBI? We found out we had laws that made it hard for that to happen. We have taken action to make sure they hand off and communicate and use each other's resources.

I have no doubt in my mind the FBI needs a lot of reform. I don't think they are up to date with technology and other problems. But Director Mueller is trying to correct that. Maybe they knew something in Phoenix they didn't know in Washington. Is there a way to integrate everything?

A couple of days ago, the Director said we will have a superoffice to bring in this information and make sure we look at it all and see if there is a pattern.

I think we should ask questions. We have an Intelligence Committee, House and Senate, meeting; Senator GRAHAM, Senator SHELBY, and the House side will get into this. By the way, I think the FBI and CIA should not delay turning over information. They should cooperate. It should not be about blaming someone.

We could say it goes back to the Church Commission in the 1970s. That is when we did damage to the intelligence communities. Or it was during the Clinton administration. The important thing is not how we get there, but what we are going to do. What are we doing about it today? What actions do we take to make sure the intelligence information is properly accumulated and evaluated and we can take action?

Someone deserves a medal for the fact we have not been hit again since September 11. I have been worried thinking something was going to happen. Why hasn't it happened? Because the INS and the Justice Department, the FBI, picked up people. They have taken certain threats seriously. They picked up mules delivering information. Probably there are commendations in order for the last 6 months, but I am worried about what will happen next. It could happen tomorrow. Then we will say it was the Bush administration, when we need to put more resources into it. We need to help our first responders.

The Intelligence Committee voted to add \$1 billion to the intelligence funding. We are still exposed. When we have terrorists, suicide bombers as in Israel, willing to blow themselves up to kill innocent men, women, and children, it is hard to prevent it. When we hear the

noise and daily threat assessments, it is worse, and we do not know which should be taken seriously.

To talk as if our enemy is George W. Bush instead of Osama bin Laden is not right. We get partisan and political sometimes around here talking about a delayed bill or stimulus bill, but in the fight against terrorism we have risen above that, for the most part.

Congressman GEPHARDT said yesterday, this has to be bipartisan, non-partisan. I am disturbed by this attack today that I think is uncalled for. It is very malicious in its sound. I hope we will stop that. Let's not go down that course. Let's keep the pattern of working together. Let's not start impugning the motives of the President of the United States.

Was there anyone here that did not realize we were threatened a year ago by the possibility of an airliner being taken hostage? Hijacked? Who among us thought they might actually use it as a missile to fly into a building? I got a lot of briefings. Is it my fault? Should I have known more? We should knock down the rhetoric. Yes, it is a political season, an election year. But this is serious. We should not be doing this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

#### ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE EXPANSION ACT—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 3433

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will not take more than about 10 minutes. I said to my colleague from Oklahoma as he left, I wanted to respond to his comments. There will be more time for discussion later. What is at issue, the Senator from Oklahoma does not agree with the heart of the trade adjustment assistance package, and he has been clear about this. He does not like the fact that with the trade adjustment assistance we are now going to help people who are out of work, cover health care costs.

People were saying: We are out of work. The COBRA monthly payments could be \$700, maybe \$900 a month, and they cannot afford it, they are out of work.

I heard the Republican whip say this was like the road to socialism. The ideological objection is in the trade adjustment package we are actually going to provide some help for people to be able to afford health care costs. That is a good part of his indignation. He goes on to say we are extending it to steelworkers.

That is true. We are talking about people who have bled for an industry and have been abandoned by trade policies for the last 30 years, including the taconite workers on the Iron Range.

This small, modest amendment says, for 1 year, let's include these retired workers, whose companies, such as LTV, have declared bankruptcy as a result of Government abandonment and

neglect, and who are now under very hard times through no fault of their own. We should at least for 1 year pick up the health care benefits of the retirees because the companies have walked away.

There is a window, all together, 4 years to pick up, if other companies go under; a 1-year bridge for people who are terrified they now are going to incur all the health care costs that they never dreamed they would ever be faced with as they planned the later years of their life.

My colleague has trouble with the numbers. Last week, the administration came out and said it would be \$800 million in 1 year, and now we have, from the Joint Tax Committee, \$180 million over 10 years.

My colleague from Oklahoma says: Why should we be spending this kind of money? We are helping people. This is the road to socialism. We are helping people. If we help these people, there might be other help for other people on health care benefits.

Maybe someday we will have universal health care coverage, health security for all. Most citizens in the country want that.

I say one thing to the Senator from Oklahoma—and I am sure we will pick up on this debate tomorrow—any day of the year I will stake my political reputation, being a Senator from Minnesota on \$180 million over 10 years to help steelworker retirees, people who have given a lot of blood, sweat, and tears to our country over \$108 billion—I didn't say \$180 million—\$108 billion to do away with the estate tax, with the vast majority of the dollars going to millionaires.

Those are the priorities we have here. I hear my colleague say: By gosh, we don't have the money. We are running into budget problems and the question of the deficit. Vote for tax cuts; Robin Hood in reverse; 40, 50 percent to the top 1 percent, and then eliminate the alternative minimum tax; more loopholes for multinationals. On the House side, do an energy bill of \$32 billion; about two-thirds of the benefits going to energy companies, oil companies, that made \$40 billion in profits; then talk about completely doing away with the estate tax. Give it all away. Then bleed the economy further of another \$400, \$500 or \$600 billion over the second 10 years and then say: We don't have the money. We can't possibly help people who are out of work. We can't help the retired taconite workers. We can't help people who do not have any health care coverage. We can't help senior citizens on prescription drug benefits.

I heard my colleague say we should do that together. Yes, we should. But you watch and see what it is going to be. What I hear so far coming from Republicans is: We will help only those who are low income; we will not help the other 75 percent of senior citizens; and/or: The premiums will be too high, or the copays will be too high, or the deductibles will be too high, or it will

not be catastrophic coverage. And they will say we cannot afford to do it and we cannot afford to provide help for education for our schools, for our kids in Minnesota or anywhere in the country. Each time, it is the same argument: We do not have the money.

Here is what is going on tonight. You basically do tax cuts so you don't have the resources, and then you come out and say we don't have any money. Then you come out and say you are opposed to this because it is the road to socialism because you don't like the trade adjustment assistance package because it provides some help for people who are out of work so they can afford health care coverage.

The most terrifying thing for people when they are out of work, next to losing the job, is they know, depending on their seniority, in 6 months or a year they are not going to have any health care coverage. That is one of the best things to this bill. We come up with a small amendment saying we represent steelworkers, taconite workers, and we have this crisis, and we have this industry that has been torn asunder as a result of horrible, horrendous trade policies.

People who bled for the industry, bled for the country, worked hard all their lives, now are terrified. They never thought these companies would declare bankruptcy and walk away from them. Can't we provide them with some help for 1 year?

You would think, from listening to my colleague from Oklahoma, this is just about the most irresponsible, horrible thing that could ever be done on the floor of the Senate. I disagree. I think it is a good thing to help hard-working people. I think it is a good thing to help families. I think it is a good thing to help retirees who now no longer have their health care benefits because the steel companies, the LTVs of this world, have declared bankruptcy and have walked away from them.

I think it is a good thing to have trade adjustment assistance. I think it is a good thing that it is more generous. I think it is a good thing to help people who are flat on their backs through no fault of their own, not because they are slackers or lazy or don't want to work—just the opposite. I think it is a really good thing. I think this should be what our priorities are about. I think it is all about values. I think it is all about helping people.

So I beg to disagree with the Senator from Oklahoma. He has a passion for his point of view. I have passion for my point of view. He argues his case well. I give him full credit. I think it is important that people do that. But any day of the year—any day of the year—I would rather be out here for taconite workers on the Iron Range, as would the Presiding Officer, Senator DAYTON. Any day in the year, I would rather be out here talking about health care benefits and prescription drug benefits, affordable housing, education—and, yes, we have a difference of opinion.

I am sorry my colleague from Oklahoma is not here right now. We will debate it more. I will never say this in a shrill way. I think my colleague from Oklahoma—listening to what he said—states his ideological position. And I don't mean that in a bad way. That is to say he has a set of beliefs which basically say that when it comes to many pressing issues of people's lives, there is not much that government can or should do. I think that is what his position is.

That is not my position. I think this philosophy when it comes to the most pressing issues of people's lives—and we are talking about a very pressing issue for retired taconite workers on the Iron Range, and for retired steelworkers, that there is nothing the Government can or should do—I think it works well when you own your own large corporation and when you are wealthy, but it does not work well for the majority of people in the country.

So I think it is a very good thing we are doing here. I hope we will get support against what is an effort to filibuster this amendment.

Again, I finish tonight because we are going to debate on another bill and this amendment will be out here until Tuesday. Frankly, steelworkers, I will tell you what. Union people, workers, other neighbors, families, hard-working people, people who believe that something ought to be done to help people who are really hurting right now, you are going to need to be in touch with Senators because right now we have a majority of votes but they are filibustering this amendment. They do not want this amendment to pass. I think in the next several days there will be a very important debate, and I hope we will have strong support from our colleagues.

I am delighted there are Republican Senators who are supporting this amendment. Frankly, I think—I hope and pray—almost every single Democratic is supporting this amendment. I think it is very consistent with what Democrats believe.

Maybe that is what this debate is about. Maybe it is just a good, honest difference of opinion between Democrats and Republicans. We believe there is a role for government to provide help for people. We believe it is a good thing to do. Government can play a positive role.

This is 1 year, and, God knows, Senator MIKULSKI was saying we have an identification and connection to people here and we are not going to let up on it.

So I have spoken my piece in response to what the Senator from Oklahoma said. I know there will be more debate and discussion. I know there are Republicans who support this amendment. We are dealing with a filibuster in an effort to block this. We have a majority vote, Senator MIKULSKI, I believe, but now we have to continue to work hard, and I think working families all across the country are going to

have to be heard from over the next several days. I believe that will help.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota. I thank him for his passion. I thank him for his persistence. I thank him for his eloquence on this issue and others on behalf of people from his own State and all over our country who feel pretty powerless. They feel powerless because of forces outside of their control, such as unfair trade practices. We thank you for speaking up about this. I look forward to our continued debate.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland and tell her there is nothing I am more proud of than to be on the floor doing this amendment with the Senator from Maryland and Senator ROCKEFELLER and Senator STABENOW and the Presiding Officer, Senator DAYTON, Senator SPECTER, and others.

Ms. MIKULSKI. We know there is an important debate on NATO, so we are not going to continue this discussion until later on, over the weekend.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Yes.

Mr. REID. I wanted to get your attention and that of the Senator from Minnesota before he leaves. I have watched this debate all day. Of course, I have listened to these Senators many times off the floor, both of them, as it relates to steelworkers. I would say the same thing on behalf of Senator ROCKEFELLER.

We do not make steel in Nevada. We have some retired steelworkers in Nevada who have conversed with me, and this issue is important to them. But I want everyone within the sound of my voice to understand how the people of Maryland, West Virginia, and Minnesota should feel about the advocacy of these three Senators on this issue.

I haven't been in Congress as long as the Senator from Maryland, but I have been in Congress a long time. I have not seen the passion on an issue, that I can recall, that I have seen on this issue with these Senators. If these three Senators are not true believers on this issue, they do not exist on any issue in the world.

I cannot say enough: I support what you want 105 percent. You have made a case so clear that I cannot imagine that people would in any way want to stop these steelworkers from getting what they are entitled to—what I believe they are entitled to. They went to work for these companies in good faith. I think they should get what they deserve.

I just didn't want these two Senators to leave—I am sorry Senator ROCKEFELLER is not here—without speaking for virtually every Democratic Senator and a few Republican Senators who are supporting us on this issue: I think it is too bad there is a filibuster.

I think it is too bad. I hear all the time—I spend a lot of time on this floor—"give us an up-or-down vote."

That is what we want, an up-or-down vote. That is what we want on this issue.

Let's come out here. They are always saying: Let us have a vote. I want to have a vote on this. I would like to test this to see how many votes we can get. I think it is too bad we are going to be forced to try to get 60 votes. And I think, for the work that has been done on this issue, it is too bad.

But I hope with the time that goes by, that by next week people in these States will rise up and say: You better vote for this. I am not counting out, by one second, the fact that we can't get 60 votes. I think we can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for not only his kind but encouraging words. You see, I agree with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will please suspend.

Anyone else who wants to have a conversation, leave the floor. The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Again, I know Senator BIDEN is bringing a very important NATO debate here, and I do not want to delay it.

What concerns me about our amendment is that we are not going to get an up-and-down vote. It is going to be hidden behind parliamentary procedures. We thank Senator NICKLES for coming and at least engaging in an honest set of questions with us. They were questions worthy of debate: How much does it cost? Is a 35-year-old eligible? All those questions.

But to have an empty Chamber, to threaten a filibuster, and not even come here and talk, and then, again, hide behind a filibuster, where we have to get cloture, and go through so many hoops, I think the discussion of trade is important, I think our amendment is a critical one, but let's have it, and get rid of all this hiding behind parliamentary maneuvers that require 60 votes.

So we really ask our colleagues who agree with us to come to the floor. And for those who don't, let's just have it out. We respect them. We respect their opinions. We think ours are the best. We hope we prevail. We think the Senate way, the American way is, let's just come and let the majority prevail and not need a supermajority to overcome a parliamentary obstacle. Let's have a majority vote on a policy issue.

I thank the Chair and look forward to continuing this conversation later on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank both Senators.

I say to the majority whip, Senator REID, that the thing I like best about his comments—and I appreciated them all—is that I, too, think we can get to 60. That is now what we have to do be-

cause there is an effort to filibuster this bill. But we are going to do everything we can.

There are a lot of working families who are going to be heard from over the next several days. And that is what we are going to do. I appreciate so much what he said. We have the majority.

Now we have to deal with an effort to block this with a filibuster. There will be more debate and more discussion. Believe me, this is going to go on for some time.

I know we are going to move on to other important legislation for tonight.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

COMMENDING THE PRESIDING OFFICER

Mr. REID. I would just comment, I appreciate very much your presiding. You have done such a great job upon coming to the Senate and presiding. You make sure that the Senate has the dignity that it is supposed to have. And I know you were taught by Senator BYRD. And he is the best teacher we have for Senate procedures.

I personally appreciate your action taken just a few minutes ago. And everyone should understand, the Senator from Minnesota is bipartisan in keeping this place quiet. Whether it is a Democratic Senator or a Republican Senator, Republican staff member or Democratic staff member, you treat them equally. I appreciate that very much. And I speak for all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, now that the debate has concluded—and under the previous order, it indicates that when the last vote occurred, we would move to the NATO matter—I ask the Chair to call it up.

#### GERALD B.H. SOLOMON FREEDOM CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 282, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3167) to endorse the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call that I will suggest in just a moment not be charged against the bill. There is 2½ hours. It is not to be charged.

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

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, may I ask what the business before the Senate is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is H.R. 3167.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to support H.R. 3167, the Gerald B.H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001. This bill adds Slovakia to the countries eligible to receive assistance under the NATO Participation Act of 1994 and authorizes a total of \$55.5 million in foreign military financing under the Arms Export Control Act to seven countries—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, and Romania.

This bill is a symbolic one. It authorizes funds that have already been appropriated, repackages them in order to highlight the ongoing process of NATO enlargement. Symbolism, however, in this case matters. Millions of central Europeans and east Europeans, and millions of Americans of central and eastern European descent, will welcome this restatement of NATO's so-called open-door policy—the policy of the Clinton administration and which had been continued by the current Bush administration.

At the end of March, Prime Ministers and Presidents of all the NATO candidate countries, plus several leaders from current alliance members, met in Bucharest, Romania, to discuss the next round of NATO enlargement. Deputy Secretary of State Armitage led a high-level U.S. delegation to the meeting, which was characterized by a spirit of cooperation among the aspirant countries, many of which had been ancient rivals, which itself validated the process of enlargement, in my view.

Parenthetically—I note that I have said before—even if the expansion of NATO in the last round did not materially impact upon the capacity of NATO and security of Europe, it did one incredibly important thing: Each of the aspirant countries, in order to be admitted to NATO, had to settle serious border disputes that existed; had to make sure their militaries were under civilian control; had to make sure they dealt with, in some cases, decades-old open sores within their society in order to demonstrate that they were part of the values, as well as the capacity, of NATO; that they shared the values of the West.

I would argue that much of this would not have happened were it not for the aspirant countries seeking so desperately to become part of NATO. I think that, in and of itself, would be rationale enough to move. Much more than that has occurred.

Four years ago, I had the honor of floor managing the resolution of ratification of an amendment to the Washington Treaty of 1949 whereby Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic were admitted to membership in NATO. On the night of April 30, 1998, in a dramatic rollcall vote in this Chamber,