

consistent with the principles and the rulings of WTO. We are not trying to do anything unfair. We are just trying to be fair and make sure we are protected.

Realizing that many of our trading partners want to weaken our trade laws, I was quite surprised to read that the draft declaration indicated a willingness to renegotiate these rules. This is the draft declaration looking toward Doha.

Why should we do this? What do we gain? Where is the affirmative agenda?

At a minimum, the United States should be seeking to address the underlying market distortions that cause dumping and that cause other countries to subsidize. We should be trying to correct the erroneous WTO decisions that have been handed down for the last several years. Yet all the draft declaration indicates is that we will engage in a wholesale renegotiation of these rules.

I find that very disturbing. I hope our trading partners realize that when it comes to weakening our trade laws through further negotiation they will face stiff, unyielding, and bipartisan opposition in the Congress.

I am also concerned about the declaration's environment and labor provisions.

I was happy to see the reaffirmation of our commitment to the sustainable development, and that the WTO will increase its focus on the relationship between multilateral environmental agreements and trade rules. Both these issues deserve even more attention.

I am concerned, however, about the comments from our negotiators that these are "Europe's issues."

Sustainable development is not a concern of Europe alone. I hope the lessons of Seattle have not somehow been lost on us. These are American concerns—more so now than ever.

So too is the issue of labor and trade. The declaration makes the mistake of suggesting that labor standards are—and I quote—"social issues," appropriately handled by the ILO.

I want to be clear on this point. We have now turned the corner on these issues. As the overwhelming support for the recent United States-Jordan Free Trade Agreement makes clear, environment and labor standards are now a part of the trade dialog. They are here. We passed it; that is, we passed legislation which affirms it.

Finally, I want to express my strong support for Taiwan's accession into the WTO—as a full member of the WTO. This includes the right to challenge the trade practices of China—or any other country—just as other members have the right to challenge Taiwan.

I am concerned about some of the recent reports that China is advocating some kind of lesser status for Taiwan. As an independent member of the WTO, Taiwan should have, and will have, the same rights as every other member. I hope the administration will take a strong stand in this regard.

As we look toward and beyond Doha, I look forward to working with the administration. But I also urge our negotiators not to give up the store. The goal of launching a new round of negotiations is not an end in itself. We must be vigilant in ensuring that we get the best deal for our farmers, our workers, and our companies.

#### ENERGY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise to address the problems we are having getting energy legislation to the Senate floor.

I strongly believe we need to have a comprehensive energy package brought to the Chamber.

My colleagues may remember that a short while ago, I offered an amendment on the Defense authorization bill that would have included a comprehensive energy policy—H.R. 4, the House-passed bill, the bill the administration wants, the bill the majority of people in this Chamber want to pass—in the legislation. I was criticized for that. Yet there is no stronger supporter of the military than I.

Having been chairman of the defense authorization readiness subcommittee for some 5 years, I see energy as a major national security issue. Frankly, it was a wrong decision for the Parliamentarian to say it was not germane.

Let's look at where we are today. Today we are 56.6 percent dependent upon foreign countries for our oil supply. That means we are 56 percent dependent upon foreign countries for our ability to fight a war. What is alarming is that 50 percent of what we have to import is coming from the Middle East. The fastest growing contributor to that amount upon which we are dependent is none other than Iraq. You can say in one-sentence form: It is ludicrous that we should be considered to be dependent upon Iraq for our ability to fight a war against Iraq.

We have a new figure I would like to share with the Senate. In the year 2000 alone, the United States bought \$5 billion worth of oil from Iraq.

Let's look at where we are today. For all practical purposes, not only are we at war in Afghanistan, but also in Iraq. They have shot down three of our Predators. We have no-fly zones. We have our troops who should be better trained when they arrive in the Persian Gulf. Yet we are dependent upon Iraq and the Middle East for our ability to carry out a war. If something should happen, an accident of a tanker coming in, any number of things, it would be an absolute disaster.

I will cite for my colleagues some recent statements that I didn't have at the time to share when I brought up my amendment.

One is from Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense. In response to my question, he said:

[It] is a serious strategic issue. . . . My sense is that [our] dependency is projected to grow, not to decline. . . . I think you're

right to point out that it's not only that we would, in a sense, be dependent upon Iraqi oil, but the oil as a weapon. The possibility of taking that oil off the market and doing enormous economic damage with it is a very serious problem.

Senator CARPER, the other day, was in a colloquy and statements were going back and forth, and quoting Mr. Greenspan responding to one of Senator CARPER's questions—this is Greenspan, and we are getting ready for an economic stimulus:

At the moment, the demand for power is pretty soft because the economy is soft. That is going to change. And when it changes, unless we have a long-term focus on how we put our infrastructure together, how we set incentives and rules to, one, maintain energy security while protecting the environment, we are going to run into trouble. And I think unless we give it very considerable thought now—projecting five, six, seven years out in the future—we are going to get sub-optimal solutions.

This is not a new issue. I started on this issue back in the Reagan administration. Nor is this a partisan issue because the Reagan administration, while he was President, refused to have a comprehensive energy policy. Then along came George "the first." He came out of the oil patch, so we thought surely this man would be able to successfully have a national energy policy. And he would not do it. This was at a time when we were nearing a war. This is a national security issue, not an energy issue. During the Clinton administration, he would not do it either.

Now we have an agreement where the leadership on both sides says we need a comprehensive energy policy. We need to have a vote this year to accomplish two things: One, our national security, to get out of this quagmire in the Middle East and to be able to fight a war; two, an economic stimulus. I can't think of anything that would be more positive to stimulate the economy than a national energy policy. It involves some controversial things, yes. ANWR is one small part of this. People keep saying this is an ANWR bill. It is not. We are talking about H.R. 4 over in the House. It has 300 pages. Only 2 pages are ANWR. It includes a comprehensive approach, including nuclear; some of our marginal production in this country that is virtually cut off because of the unpredictability of prices. If you get a marginal operator drilling a well for 15 barrels or less and he is not going to be able to know the price of oil 15 months down the road, he is not going to do it. Consequently, we are not doing it. If we had all of the marginal production that we have ceased to have over the last 10 years in production today, it would equal the total amount we are importing from Saudi Arabia. Consequently, I see this as a critical issue that has to be dealt with this year.

Just recently, I notice almost on a daily basis President Bush expresses the administration's position. This is from the 17th in Sacramento:

I ask Congress to now act on an energy bill that the House of Representatives passed back in August. . . . Too much of our energy comes from the Middle East. The plan I sent up to Congress promotes conservation, expands energy supplies, and improves the efficiency of our energy network. Our country needs greater energy independence. The issue is a matter of national security, and I hope the Senate acts quickly.

We have many other quotes. I will mention a last one from the Secretary of the Interior, Gale Norton, the other day:

The President has said very clearly this is a priority. This situation—

Referring to September 11—

has made it more urgent, and we need to begin moving the process. We have always said that national security is part of the reason we need to get the energy program in place, and we certainly have not backed away from that position now that September 11 has occurred.

So I think there is nothing more important to deal with between now and the end of the session than a comprehensive energy bill. Let's at least bring it up for a vote. That is what this is supposed to be about, so we can debate this issue. We can't really debate this issue, other than the way I am doing it now, in anticipation of a vote, unless we have an opportunity to have a vote. So I think you are going to see this offered again as an amendment. The logical place should be on the economic stimulus package, because this is an economic stimulus issue, as well as a national security issue.

I yield the floor.

#### LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred Jan. 28, 2000, in Boston, MA. A group of high school teenagers sexually assaulted and attacked a 16-year-old Boston High School student on the subway because she was holding hands with another young girl, a common custom from her native African country. Thinking the victim was a lesbian, the group began groping the girl, ripping her clothes, and pointing at their own genitals. Officials said a teenage boy who was with the group allegedly pulled a knife on the girl, held it to her throat and threatened to slash her. The girl later passed out from being beaten. Three high school students were arrested in the attack and charged with civil rights violations, assault with a dangerous weapon, assault and battery, and indecent assault and battery.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out

of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

#### ASKING SAVES KIDS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, PAX is an organization that promotes practical, non-political solutions to the problem of gun violence. Asking Saves Kids or ASK is a national advertising campaign, developed by PAX in collaboration with the American Academy of Pediatrics. The ASK campaign urges parents to ask their neighbors if they have a gun in the home before sending their child over to play. To help parents with what is a difficult question, the ASK campaign has developed a "Parent's Help Kit". The kit contains tips on how to ask the question about guns in the home, a sample letter to mail to other parents, and non-confrontational ways to respond to friends and relatives who may take exception to the question. The Help Kit is an invaluable tool in the fight to protect children from gun violence and I encourage parents to visit the PAX web site and download a copy of the Help Kit. The web site address is [http://www.gunviolence.org/pdf/ASK\\_Kit.pdf](http://www.gunviolence.org/pdf/ASK_Kit.pdf).

#### IN MEMORY OF KATHY T. NGUYEN

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, yesterday, we received tragic news: Kathy Nguyen, a 61-year old Bronx woman who worked at the Manhattan Eye, Ear and Throat Hospital on East 64th Street, passed away from inhalation anthrax. Her death, she is the fourth person in our country to die from anthrax, has saddened New York, and our entire country. Ms. Nguyen, who worked at the hospital since 1991, was a clerk in the stockroom in the basement of the hospital.

Ms. Nguyen came to America from Vietnam in 1977 with the help of a New York City police officer. Like many refugees from Vietnam, she left without any money, and started a new life for herself in America. She settled in the Bronx' Crotona Park East area near the Bronx River. She married an American, but later divorced. They had a son, who tragically died in a car accident years ago.

Ms. Nguyen's friends and neighbors have spoken kindly about the tiny, generous woman who had no family of her own, but always inquired about their families. She enjoyed cooking meals for her neighbors and their families, even sharing Thanksgiving dinner, and was known for her fondness for offering coworkers food.

Working afternoons and evenings at the Manhattan Eye, Ear and Throat Hospital, Ms. Nguyen was responsible for stocking the emergency room and operating rooms with medicine and instruments. She sometimes returned

home as late as 11pm. Her neighbors noted her late working hours and said that she was planning on retiring. Although she did not handle mail, it has been reported that the supply room where she worked was adjacent to the hospital's mailroom.

Last Thursday night, Ms. Nguyen complained to her neighbors that she was feeling ill, but she brushed it off as a cold. She went to work as usual on Friday, but by Sunday night, she felt worse and the superintendent of her building brought her to the emergency room at the Lenox Hill Hospital. She was in critical condition in the intensive care unit with pneumonia and was placed on a respirator. Initial tests showed anthrax and additional tests confirmed the diagnosis on Tuesday afternoon. Although she fought hard to battle this terrible infection, she passed away.

Ms. Nguyen was too ill to aid investigators who sought to retrace her movements before she became sick to determine the source of the anthrax and it remains a mystery. Federal and local health officials are vigorously pursuing all avenues to uncover the source of the anthrax that sickened Ms. Nguyen.

I know that Ms. Nguyen's friends and neighbors will miss her greatly. Her kindness and concern for her neighbors were a special part of the Bronx neighborhood where she lived. Her everyday courtesies, in a city that is known for its anonymity and incredible size, made the world a little smaller, and a little nicer, for her neighbors.

#### COMBATING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it has been seven weeks since the horrifying attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, and the crash of the plane in Pennsylvania.

We have all struggled with a flood of thoughts and emotions about the frightening and tragic loss of life, the national response to this cruel, mindless assault on innocent people, and where we go from here.

My wife Marcelle and I have received hundreds of phone calls, letters and e-mails from people who have offered thoughtful suggestions, and I have read many articles, opinion pieces, and heartfelt letters to the editor of the national and local newspapers.

I do not pretend to have all the answers. No one does. The United States military is carrying out bombing missions against the Taliban and terrorist sites in Afghanistan. The situation is unpredictable, and we are learning more each day. But I do want to express some of my thoughts at this time.

First and foremost, my thoughts are with the victims' families. It has been hard, very hard, to see the images of the families as they try to come to terms with the loss of loved ones.

I also share the pride in how our firefighters, police and other emergency