

Domenici	Inhofe	Nickles
Dorgan	Inouye	Reed
Durbin	Johnson	Robb
Enzi	Kempthorne	Roberts
Faircloth	Kennedy	Roth
Feingold	Kerry	Santorum
Ford	Kyl	Sarbanes
Frist	Landrieu	Sessions
Glenn	Lautenberg	Shelby
Gorton	Levin	Smith (NH)
Graham	Lieberman	Smith (OR)
Grassley	Lott	Snowe
Gregg	Lugar	Specter
Hagel	Mack	Stevens
Harkin	McCain	Thomas
Hatch	McConnell	Thompson
Helms	Moseley-Braun	Thurmond
Hollings	Murkowski	Warner
Hutchinson	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—20

Biden	Feinstein	Leahy
Bond	Gramm	Moynihan
Boxer	Grams	Reid
Breaux	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Bryan	Jeffords	Torricelli
Byrd	Kerrey	Wellstone
Campbell	Kohl	

NOT VOTING—2

Coats	Mikulski
-------	----------

The motion to lay on the table the motion to postpone was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. NICKLES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, it appears that the Senator from Texas, Senator GRAMM, is not prepared at this time to give agreement on the DOD authorization conference report.

In an effort to try to resolve the depot issue, it seems to me that having endless motions to postpone consideration of the conference report is not constructive at this time.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Having said that, I now send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 1119, the National Defense Authorization Act:

Trent Lott, Strom Thurmond, Wayne Allard, Pat Roberts, Judd Gregg, Robert F. Bennett, Rod Grams, Spencer Abraham, Don Nickles, John Ashcroft, Rick Santorum, Tim Hutchinson, Paul Coverdell, Bob Smith, James Inhofe, Chuck Hagel, and John Warner.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this cloture vote, for the information of all Senators, will occur on Friday. If cloture is not invoked on Senator COVERDELL's A-plus education savings account bill, all Senators will be notified as to the time of the cloture votes, and we will discuss that with the Democratic leader to be able to inform the

Members on Thursday about what time these cloture votes will occur.

Did the Senator wish to comment?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, for the purposes of scheduling, could I inquire of the majority leader, is this the last vote anticipated tonight, given the schedule?

Mr. LOTT. I believe that would be the last vote tonight, given the schedule.

We have some other matters we are working on on the Executive Calendar that may require some recorded votes. But in view of some other meetings that are occurring, we will have to schedule those. We will try to schedule them early in the morning. I will consult further with you on that.

Mr. President, I now withdraw the motion.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, may we have order?

What was the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion was to withdraw the motion to proceed.

Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask that there be a period for the transaction of morning business until 5:30 p.m. this evening with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAIRCLOTH). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. 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. DORGAN. Mr. President, is the Senate now in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask consent to be allowed to speak for as much time as I consume.

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I know that there is some business that the majority leader will take up in a few moments. When he desires the floor I certainly will yield to him. But I wanted to take this moment to describe a couple of the things that I think we still need to do, unfinished items, before the Senate leaves following this first session of this Congress. Among those is the issue of campaign finance reform, which we have been debating back and forth here for some long while. There is not any reason, in my judgment, that we cannot take up and

at least have a vote on the substance of campaign finance reform.

Second, it seems to me that we cannot leave town without having done something on a highway reauthorization bill. I know there are some who say we brought a highway bill to the floor of the Senate and we had plenty of opportunity and now we had to pull it, but I want to make the point the bill that was brought to the floor of the Senate was brought here under procedures designed to block legislation, not pass legislation. And we have a responsibility, whether it is a 6-month bill or a 6-year bill, we have a responsibility to address the issue of highway construction and the highway reauthorization bill. So my hope is that through negotiation the leaders of the Democrats and the Republicans here in the Senate can deal with both of these issues in a thoughtful way.

But I did want to make the point that we also are probably going to deal with the issue called fast-track trade authority in the coming week or so. To the extent we do that, I want Members of the Senate to understand this will not be an easy issue. There are a number of us here in the Senate who feel very strongly about the issue of trade. It is not a circumstance where we believe that our country should put walls around the country and prevent imports from coming in, or that we should ignore the fact that we now live in a global economy or that we should decide, somehow, that trade is not part of our economic well-being, it is unimportant—that is not the case at all. Trade is very important. It is a critically important component of this country's ability to grow and to prosper. But the right kind of trade is important, not the wrong kind of trade.

The wrong kind of international trade in this country is trade that results in ever-increasing, choking trade deficits, because those deficits, now totaling nearly \$2 trillion, trade deficits which in this last year were the largest merchandise trade deficits in the history of this country—in fact, that was true for the last 3 years and will be true at the end of this coming year—the largest merchandise trade deficits in this country. To the extent that is the kind of trade we are involved in, trade that is not reciprocal, trade that is not two-way trade that is fair, trade that substantially increases our deficits and takes American jobs and moves them abroad and overseas—that is not trade that is beneficial to our country. Many of us feel it is time for us to have a debate on the floor of the Senate about what is fair and what is unfair trade.

I have said many times that it is very difficult to have a discussion about trade. A discussion about international trade quickly moves into a thoughtless ranting by those who say there is only one credible view on trade and that is the view of free trade. You are either for free trade or you are

somebody who doesn't quite understand. You are an xenophobic isolationist who wants to build walls around America—you are either that or you are a free trader. I happen to believe expanded trade, in the form of fair trade, makes sense for this country, so I am someone who believes that we benefit from reciprocal trade with other countries, that trade with other countries can be mutually beneficial. But I also believe it hurts our country when we have trade circumstances that exist when we trade with another country and they ship all their goods to our marketplace and then we discover what we produce, our workers and our businesses, can't get our goods into their marketplace. That is not fair, yet that goes on all across the world.

I notice today the President of China has arrived in our country. Our country welcomes him. We hope we will have a mutually productive relationship with China. I am concerned about a number of things that I see happening in China—yes, human rights. I was in China about a year ago today, when a young man was sentenced to prison, I believe for 11 years, for criticizing his government. So I think there are serious human rights questions in China. But also, in addition to the human rights issues in China, the Chinese leader comes to our country at a time when they have, with us, a trade imbalance of nearly \$40 to \$50 billion. Last year it was \$40 billion and it is now heading to \$50 billion.

So we have a Chinese Government and a Chinese economy that ships massive quantities of Chinese goods to our country. But when it comes time to buy from our country, things which China needs—wheat, airplanes and more—they say, "Well, we want to ship Chinese goods to your country, but we want to look elsewhere for products; we want to go price shopping for a week with Canada and with Venezuela."

So while we used to be the major wheat supplier to China, we were displaced as the major wheat supplier even as they were running up huge trade surpluses with us or us being in the position of having huge trade deficits with them.

Airplanes. China has obviously the largest population on Earth, and they need a lot of airplanes. They don't manufacture large airplanes. They need to buy airplanes. So, since they ship so many of their products to our country for consumption, you expect they would come to us and buy our airplanes.

They come to our country and say, "We need airplanes, but we'll buy your airplanes if you manufacture the airplanes in China." That's not the way trade works. That's not a mutually beneficial relationship, and that's the thing that I think we ought to be talking to the Chinese leader about.

Yes, we ought to talk about a whole range of other issues—human rights, the transfer of sensitive nuclear tech-

nology and the transfer of missile technology to renegade and rogue nations. Yes, we ought to talk to them about that. But we also ought to talk to them about this huge growing trade deficit.

I hope very much that when President Clinton visits with President Jiang Zemin, he will describe to him a trade relationship mutually beneficial, and it is not one where one side has a huge imbalance, in this case China, and in which case the United States has a huge and growing deficit, which means, in the final analysis, that jobs that existed for Americans are now moving overseas. That is what is at the root of this trade imbalance. Jobs that used to be U.S. jobs, jobs held by U.S. citizens, jobs to help maintain U.S. families are now jobs that are gone.

The same is true with Japan. I happen to be talking about China just because the Chinese leader is in town today. But Japan, we have a growing trade deficit with Japan. As far as the eye can see, it has been \$50 billion, \$60 billion a year. This year, it is expected to be up 20 or 25 percent, probably reaching a \$60 billion, \$65 billion trade deficit with Japan once again this year.

Are there people walking around here saying this is an urgent problem, this is trouble? No, they don't. They say, "Gee, this is just free trade. So what if we have a huge trade deficit." In fact, one person wrote an article in the Washington Post recently and said those folks who talk about the trade deficit being troublesome for our country don't understand it. He said, "Think of it this way: If someone offered to sell you \$10,000 worth of pears for \$5,000 worth of apples, you would jump at it."

That is a simple and irrelevant example, one I suppose meant to inform those of us from other parts of the country who don't quite get it. Perhaps there is a way to study economics or perhaps there is a school that teaches economics that will tell those people who think that way and write that way that trade deficits represent an export of part of your wealth. Trade deficits will and must be repaid with a lower standard of living in this country's future. Trade deficits are trouble for this country's economy.

People say to me, "Well, if that's true, if trade deficits are troublesome, why do we have an economy that seems so strong?" You can have an appearance of strength. You can live next to a neighbor that has a brand new Cadillac in the driveway, a brand new home and all the newest toys without understanding, of course, that it is all debt financed and that person is about 2 weeks away from serious financial trouble.

So our trade deficit matters, and we must do something about it.

The point I make about fast track, which is the trade authority the President is going to seek, is this: We have massive trade problems, yes, with Japan, with China, yes, with Canada,

with Mexico. And before we run off and negotiate new trade agreements in secret, behind closed doors, let's fix some of the trade problems that now exist.

Senator HELMS yesterday reminded me of an old quote that Will Rogers made that I had read many years ago. He said, "The United States has never lost a war and never won a treaty." That is certainly true with trade.

Recently, we were asked to provide fast-track trade authority so that a trade agreement called NAFTA could be reached with Canada and Mexico. So the Congress dutifully complied. The Congress passed what is called fast-track authority which says, you go ahead, you negotiate a new trade agreement with a foreign country, you can do it in secret, you can do it without coming back and advising us what you are doing; bring it back, and you come to the Senate and House and it must be considered with no amendments because no amendments will be allowed. That is what fast track is.

Fast track through the Senate says that nobody will be allowed to offer an amendment; no amendments at all.

So NAFTA was negotiated. They ran off and negotiated NAFTA, brought it back, and ran it through the Congress. I didn't vote for it, but the Congress passed it. When NAFTA was negotiated, we had an \$11 billion trade deficit with Canada. Then they negotiated NAFTA, which includes Canada, and the trade deficit doubled.

When NAFTA was negotiated with Mexico, we had a \$2 billion trade surplus with Mexico. They negotiate NAFTA and the \$2 billion trade surplus evaporated to a \$15 billion trade deficit.

That is progress? Where I come from it is not called progress. Yet, we are told now, again, we need to have fast-track trade authority.

I come from a State that borders Canada. I just want to tell you that today thousands of trucks come across the border from Canada hauling Canadian durum and Canadian wheat, sold into this country by a state trade enterprise, by a monopoly called the Canadian Wheat Board. It is a monopoly that would not be allowed to sell grain in this country. It would be illegal. It sells its grain at secret prices. Yet, it ships through our backyard enormous quantities of Canadian grain, undercutting our farmers' interests, undercutting our income in our State by \$220 million a year, according to a study at North Dakota State University, and the fact is, we can't get it stopped.

It is patently unfair trade, and we can't get it stopped because all these trade agreements that they have concocted over the years have pulled out the teeth of enforcement of trade treaties in a meaningful way, and so now we can't chew and we are complaining there are no teeth.

I understand what has happened here. What has happened here is we have concocted bad trade strategy, bad trade agreements and bad enforcement of the

agreements that did exist. It is time for us to decide we must insist our country stand up for its own economic interest. Yes, its economic interest is in part served by expanding world trade. We are a leader. We ought to lead in world trade. We ought not close our borders. I don't sound like Smoot. I don't look like Hawley. So those thoughtless people who say, "Well, if you don't chant 'free trade' like a robot on a street corner, we will call you Smoot-Hawley"—that is the most thoughtless stuff I ever heard, but it goes on all the time.

I am not someone who believes we should shut off the flow of imports and exports, but I do believe we ought to stand up to the interests of the Chinese, Japanese and, yes, the Mexicans and Canadians, and other trading partners and tell them it is time for reciprocal and fair trade treatment. If we let your goods into our marketplace—and we should and will—then you have a responsibility to open your markets to American goods.

If we say to our people, "You can't pollute our streams and air when you produce," then foreign producers who want to ship to our country ought not be able to pollute their rivers and streams on Earth through that same production. If we say that it is not fair to hire 14-year-old kids and work them 14 hours a day and pay them 14 cents an hour, then we ought to say to them that we don't want your goods if you are employing 14-year-old kids and working them 14 hours a day. We don't want producers to pole vault over all those debates we had all these years about worker safety, about child labor, about minimum wage, about air pollution and water pollution. We don't want that to be represented as fair trade because it is not if producers find the lowest cost production in the world, locate their plants there and produce their products in those circumstances avoiding all of the problems that exist for them in having to comply with what we know now are commonsense proposals: child labor proposals, minimum wage, environmental proposals and others. That is what this is all about.

My only concern is this: I want us to have a fast track trade debate in which we are able to offer amendments, able to have a lengthy and thoughtful discussion about our trade policies and able to have an opportunity back and forth in this Chamber to describe what kind of trade policies will best advance this country's economic interests.

If and when the legislation comes to the floor of the Senate, and we will begin with a motion to proceed at some point, when that happens, some of us will be on the floor of the Senate insisting that we have a full, a fair and a thoughtful debate about this country's trade policy. At least those of us, including myself, who believe very strongly that a trade policy that produces the largest trade deficit in the history of this country is not moving

this country in the right direction, we will be here demanding that kind of aggressive debate.

What does our trade strategy now produce and what kind of trade strategy would represent better economic interest for this country? Not protectionism, but an interest of expanding the American economy and expanding American opportunities as we move ahead.

So let me conclude—I know my colleague has things that he wants to say on education issues—and let me once again indicate that I hope very much that prior to getting to fast track, which I expect will probably happen the end of this week or the first part of next week, that we can also address the issue of campaign finance reform with a real vote, and we can also extend the highway reauthorization bill.

Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from Vermont for his patience and thank him for the wonderful work he does on education.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank my good friend from North Dakota for his remarks.

The subject I will talk about I know the Presiding Officer does not need to hear. He is well aware of what I am talking about and I know agrees with me that we have to take action.

CONGRESS IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SCHOOLS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to the attention of the Senate the tragic situation we have going on right now in the school system of the Nation's Capital.

Nearly every day for the past month an article has appeared in the Washington papers portraying the State of emergency and dysfunction in the District of Columbia's public school system—the shutting down of schools.

Here are some of the facts:

For the fourth year in a row the schools in this city have opened late by at least 2 weeks. This year they are continuing to be closed by the fact that there are repairs that are essential and necessary to be made.

The reason they have opened late is because of an infrastructure emergency—repairs and renovations. These needs are estimated by the GSA to be about \$2 billion. And this is almost all for code violations. It has nothing to do with their acceptability from educational function purposes.

The Congress of the United States is responsible for the schools of the Nation's Capital, the students who depend on these schools, and the repairs these schools need.

What are we doing about this?

I, for one, am ashamed of the way we have not done anything that is responsible to this point, other than what the Appropriations Committee has done

out of necessity but not the way that it ought to be done to be responsible.

I ask my colleagues to take a look at the human result of schools opening late and then closing again.

I ask you to take a look at this. This came from the Washington Post. I will read it to you. The sign says, "Why should students suffer? For adult incompetence."

Those adults are us. We are the ones that have the primary responsibility for the city. We took it back. We took home rule away basically.

This student is from a senior high school and holds a sign. These students were all forced out of their school and forced to be trucked, bused, whatever else, to some other place to be able to receive education until such time as that school is fixed. All this student wants to do is to go to class and start paving the way for her future. Who are the adults that this poster refers to? They are us. We cannot deny that. I hope we begin to understand that.

Times have changed. We took back home rule basically.

Why is the city in this mess? Why can't they get the revenue stream they need to bond so that they can responsibly repair these schools on some sort of a schedule, to get them all done so they can be done when the school year opens, and to do it not in a piecemeal fashion as the Appropriations Committee has been forced to do by having emergencies to appropriate money to do this?

We have to have a plan. If somebody else has a plan to do it, fine. But we cannot let this situation go on where year after year we are going to be doing this, shutting the schools down and trying to find ways to open them. We created this problem. This is another important thing to remember.

In 1974, when we gave home rule to Washington, DC, a very, very astute Member of the Virginia delegation—I commend him for his foresight because Lord knows what would have happened if they had all this additional money to spend with what they did have—but he got legislation passed which said that you can't tax the nonresidents that are working in your city. This is the only city in the country under this situation that does not have that authority.

Sure, the District could levy an income tax on its own residents, but due to the inability to tax the nonresidents, and especially because of the situation in the city—the workers were fleeing out of town; crime was the No. 1 issue; schools second—people were leaving in droves. A lousy educational system, a lousy police system, and so we went from about 50 percent of the workers being residents down to about 30 percent. As money drained from the District, crime went up, as I said, and the school system deteriorated causing the well-known national phenomenon known as "urban flight."

But the urban and middle class population stayed close to the District of Columbia in the suburbs because it is