

trade promotion can keep pulling more and more along. They are going too far. This is terrible policy.

I used to run a company that had the steelworkers in our plan. I have negotiated steelworker plans, so I know a little something about health care costs and I know a little something about plans. You can negotiate contracts you cannot afford. That is an easy thing to do. You go along to get along. You sign contracts. You have peace and harmony, and all of a sudden you have a contract you cannot afford, and you go bankrupt. Why in the world should the Federal Government be bailing out?

I do not think you can do that. If you do it here, why don't you do it for every other union contract that has found itself on the wrong side of the economic chain? Why don't we pick up the health care costs for railroad retirees? We took up their pension costs. Why don't we do their health care costs? Why don't we do that for other unions? I do not know where you would stop if we agreed to this.

We have already had a battle on, are we going to have wage insurance on this bill? Unfortunately, Senator GREGG's amendment did not pass. Wage insurance, which is about as socialistic a direction as one could go, was put on this bill. It is almost like people are saying we are going to keep loading up trade adjustment assistance, where we know they cannot swallow it, where we know we are going to bog down this bill, and the bill will not pass. This bill is just going to be loved to death. We are going to keep piling it on, piling it on, and piling it on.

I hope people will step back a little bit and say a couple of things are happening. One, we happen to have a deficit. We do not have a surplus. So we are going to be taking taxes and we are going to be borrowing money to pay for a brandnew benefit for one little group of workers. Now, maybe that group of workers has a lot of political clout, maybe they contribute to a lot of campaigns, maybe they have a lot of influence, but I do not see why we should do it for this group and not do it for others.

Maybe some people think we should do this for everybody. Maybe that is the objective. I do not know. But I do not think it is affordable when I start looking at the costs.

The Senator from Minnesota was very generous to say the cost of COBRA is typically about \$700. That is for a family plan. Then you multiply it by 12, and that is \$8,400. Seventy percent of that is about \$6,000; \$6,000 per year for which Uncle Sam is going to be writing a check. That is a lot.

The reason I was trying to compute this was, well, \$125,000, and it is going to cost \$179 million. Trying to figure that out, it is a lot less than that. The difference is, three-fourths of these people are already on Medicare. They already have health care. They happen to have the same health care my moth-

er has, but my mother is going to be paying taxes so some individuals can get their Medicare supplement? I do not know that that is right.

I do not know why the worker in Wal-Mart, who may not even have health care, has to pay taxes so somebody else can get not only Medicare but a Medicare supplement. This is pretty much a stretch.

There are 40 million Americans who do not have health care insurance. They have health care, possibly through the emergency room or something, but a lot of them pay taxes. They may not be able to afford their own health care, but we are going to increase their taxes or make them go into debt so they can provide health care for somebody else who already has health care, who is already paying a lot because they get Medicare.

Medicare is not a perfect system. I think it needs to be reformed. It needs to be fixed. It needs to include prescription drugs, and we ought to be doing that this year. We ought to be working in a bipartisan way to make it happen. To say we are going to be increasing taxes or debt on the rest of America so one group can have their Medicare supplement or people in their thirties or forties can get health care for a year—and we all know the original proposal was 2 years. I also happen to believe that some people are going to try to extend this year after year, after year, after year. If they get it for 1 year, they will be fighting to get it extended for the next year. I am just guessing that might happen.

I am going to work very hard to see that this bill does not happen, so we will not get started down that slippery slope of ever increasing entitlements, ever increasing expansion of spending, ever increasing loading up the trade promotion authority with things that are not affordable, that frankly should not become law. My guess is that if this amendment is adopted, we will not have trade promotion authority passed this Congress.

Maybe that is the sponsor's objective. Maybe not. I do not know. But some people are trying to kill trade promotion authority. They are trying to load it up with too much. This amendment is too much, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment when we vote on it next Tuesday.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I do not know if the other side has had an opportunity to speak. I know they have had an exchange of questions. I need 3 or 4 minutes, if I may, and I will use my leader time for that purpose.

I enjoyed Senator NICKLES' remarks, and I associate myself with them. I agree with him, and I certainly hope we can prevail in not adding this amendment to this legislation. It would be a further blow to the legislation that has certain problems now. We need to get the trade legislation done

and not further encumber it with other issues such as this one. One can argue about the steel legacy costs one way or the other, and I am sure we could get a pretty good debate here. I personally think we should not go down that trail, certainly not on this legislation.

#### QUIETING TERRORISM RHETORIC

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I did not intend to use my leader time for any purpose today other than to honor a true American hero: Ronald Reagan. We just had a fantastic ceremony in the Rotunda of the Capitol presenting Mrs. Reagan the Congressional Gold Medal for President Reagan and for Nancy Reagan. It was a beautiful ceremony attended by Republicans and Democrats. I think we all agree that he was an unusual President and a great President. He did make us proud again. Democrats were there, and they said, while we may not agree with him philosophically, we agree that he did a great number of good things during his time as President, and I am glad we honored him and Mrs. Reagan this afternoon.

President Reagan lifted our country when we had a lot of despair, morale was low, and freedom was kind of under attack. He banished that. He rose above it. He made us proud again, and he led the way in getting rid of the "blame America first" crowd. He said: That is poisoning the American spirit; let's not do that.

Much to my outrage today, I have heard a chorus reminding me of that "blame America first" that I thought President Reagan had helped us put on the ash heap of history and get rid of once and for all. I think there is nothing more despicable—and that is a tame word compared to what I really feel—in American politics than for someone to insinuate the President of the United States knew that an attack on our country was imminent and did nothing to stop it.

Now, there is a lot of revisionist history, people insinuating that President Roosevelt knew about Pearl Harbor. I do not know all the facts of what went on then, but I do not believe that. I would never believe that. I have to say, does anybody really think that this President, or any President of either party, at any time, would know that we were going to be attacked and not take necessary actions to try to deal with it? I do not believe the American people really think that. I know it is not accurate.

The President, Members of Congress, the Intelligence Committee, leadership, we get threat assessments daily. They come in every day, and they get to be pretty depressing if you get to reading them. When getting the briefings every day, you have to assess them: Are they serious, not serious? Should we take actions? Do we put out a notice? What do we do with them?

I get nervous that we put too much in the press. We tell the terrorists, who

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