

These are the elements that could constitute a new tobacco program. Under this proposed program, once the quota holder has received the value of the asset, a new system of regulating the production of tobacco would be created. This approach honors the value of quota, retains the price stabilizing benefits of the tobacco program but eliminates the current costs associated with acquiring quota, making domestic tobacco more competitive in the future. I'd like to acknowledge the insightful contribution of Henry Maxey, a tobacco grower from Pittsylvania County, who first presented this idea to a member of my staff in a meeting a few months ago in the Halifax office of Delegate Ted Bennett. While I've gotten input from an number of people since then, Mr. Maxey should be credited with getting the ball rolling.

*Economic Development.*—I would like to devote \$250 million annually for economic diversification in tobacco-dependent communities. Unfortunately, the biggest export in many of the tobacco-growing regions is the children. They leave the area because there aren't enough high quality jobs in the community. Tobacco legislation provides us a unique opportunity to address this situation. The economic development funds should be used for two purposes: attracting quality jobs and training people to fill them.

I believe that economic development activities are best generated from those most familiar with a community's needs. Generally speaking, I believe that economic development funds should go to counties to carry out those activities that best suit their needs. I would envision that the funds would be distributed to localities based on their proportionate share of the amount of tobacco produced annually, which is a rough approximation of how dependent each community is on tobacco income. In order to foster long-range thinking and coordination in the region, the communities should develop and submit economic development plans. In the case where an independent city is surrounded by a tobacco-dependent county, but doesn't itself produce tobacco, representatives from the city should have a voice in the development of the county's economic development plan, due to the economic interdependence of the two independent governments.

In some circumstances, counties have banded together to form regional economic development commissions, like the A.L. Philpott Southside Economic Development Commission in Virginia. In that case, the commission should be given the authority to coordinate the economic development funds, allowing the various counties to benefit from a regional approach. Such an approach would avoid duplicative efforts to provide the same services or attract the same industries as a neighbor in the region, making the funds more effective. When coordinating the economic development investments, the commission

will be required to target a certain percentage of the funds to the most tobacco-dependent counties as determined by their proportionate share of the amount of tobacco produced annually. This approach combines regional planning with local investment.

The funds can only be used for specific purposes, such as improving the quality of all levels of education in the region, promoting tourism through natural resource protection, constructing advanced manufacturing centers, industrial parks, water and sewer facilities and transportation improvements, establishing small business incubators, and installing high technology infrastructure improvements. We will need to insure, however, that these funds are not used to reduce the amount of funding that would otherwise be provided by the local, State or Federal governments.

Whenever there is a major shift in a program like the one this proposal contemplates, we need to be concerned about providing a smooth transition. In fact, the uncertainty created by the mere possibility of major tobacco legislation will undoubtedly affect tobacco growers next year, who expect a serious decline in quota because these issues remain unresolved. To make sure that current producers can survive until this new system is implemented over the 5-year buy-out period, we should consider giving a minimum of income protection during this period. One option would be to add protections in the event tobacco quota falls by more than 10 percent from 1997 levels. If that occurs, tobacco producers would be eligible for a \$1/pound payment for lost quota from their 1997 level. This is especially important to farmers operating without much margin, as we make the transition to a more competitive marketplace.

I hope that these ideas generate some discussion and ultimately I intend to introduce legislation incorporating these ideas. My purpose is to find a mechanism that recognizes the changes facing the tobacco industry, and provides some degree of certainty to tobacco growers and their communities so they are not faced with cataclysmic upheaval as a result of those changes.

I look forward to working toward this particular goal with colleagues who are interested in this particular challenge.

#### 52ND ANNUAL AL SMITH DINNER

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, for half of our century—52 years—one of the notable events in the life of New York City has been the annual dinner of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation, sponsored by the Archdiocese of New York, and presided over by the cardinal archbishop, most recently by His Eminence John Cardinal O'Connor. The foundation supports the hospitals of the archdiocese.

The centerpiece, if you will, of the evening is the dinner speaker. Over the

years, truly great men and women of our age have appeared in the ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Kings, prime ministers—Winston S. Churchill was the 1947 speaker, in the company of James V. Forrestal—and Presidents or Presidential candidates by the score. It fell to me to write the first draft of Averell Harriman's address when he was Governor of New York; it was, I do believe, a distinction he treasured ever after. And now we have had Buffalo's gift to the Nation, Timothy J. Russert.

This year the speaker was Timothy J. Russert, Moderator of "Meet The Press," which, come to think, is celebrating its 50th anniversary just now. Mr. Russert was by turns irreverent and riotous. But his purpose was profoundly serious and, if you will, reverent. It is something Al Smith would very much wish to have had said. We are just now in a phase of considerable self-congratulation about American society. A world away from the slums and factories that Smith, with his Tammany colleagues Robert F. Wagner and James A. Foley, along with Frances Perkins and, of course, Franklin D. Roosevelt helped transform. A world at once vastly improved, and grossly degraded. For in the course of resolving so many difficulties in our public life, we have seen a near-to-incomprehensible collapse in our family lives. As Mr. Russert states:

At the turn of this century, just three short years from now, there will be seventy million children under the age of eighteen living in the United States. More than a third of them, one in three, nearly twenty-five million, will have been born into single parent households.

This is the central challenge to American institutions in the generation to come. Doubly so in that Congress and the President have chosen to eliminate the Social Security Act provision for dependent children, a drop-dead date not 4 years away.

Can anyone imagine Al Smith or his Industrial Commissioner Frances Perkins doing such a thing! One suspects that neither can Mr. Russert, but this is an unnecessary speculation. What is necessary is that his urgent and cogent words be read and absorbed as widely as possible.

To this end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this year's address to the Al Smith dinner be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ADDRESS BY TIMOTHY J. RUSSERT

What an honor to be here. The roster of previous speakers is filled with luminaries. They are from a world I report on—the world of Washington politics.

But for some curious reason, a strange fate seems to befall those who have spoken from this podium. For example, in 1991, your speaker was former White House Chief of Staff, John Sununu. I should note, six weeks after appearing here, he was forced to resign. As he was contemplating his future, legend has it, he approached the revered First Lady, Barbara Bush, poured out his heart. "Why is

it," he asked, "that people seems to take such an instant dislike to me?" The First Lady looked at him solemnly and said, "Because it saves time John."

In 1993, Bob Dole addressed the Al Smith dinner. Months later, he attended a White House function for former Presidents. He observed a remarkable scene. Three of your former speakers, engaged in private conversation. Jimmy Carter, Gerald Ford, Richard Nixon. That's right. Jimmy Carter, Gerald Ford and Richard Nixon actually talking to one another. In his customary stage whisper, Senator Dole blurted out, "Look at those three. See No Evil, Hear No Evil, and Evil."

In 1950, the year I was born, your speaker was Vice President Alben Barkley. Five short years later, he was the keynote speaker at Washington and Lee University's mock political convention, where he concluded his inspirational address by bellowing, "I would rather be a servant of the Lord than sit in the seat of the mighty." Which was a prudent thing to say, because he promptly dropped dead of a heart attack. But nothing can equal your stellar line up in 1972. Your guest speakers, Kurt Waldheim and Spiro Agnew. Who booked that one? What were you thinking of?

A quick news update. I can report tonight that President Clinton is feeling a little better about Chelsea going off to college. He just figured out it freed up another bedroom for fund raising. It's not fair just to poke fun at politicians. We in television news certainly have our shortcomings. It seems we reduce everything to sound bites, devoid of content or nuance. David Brinkley recently observed, the way television news would report the unveiling of the Ten Commandments in 1997, would be as follows:

"Moses came down from the mountain top today with the Ten Commandments. Here's Sam Donaldson with the three most important."

Yogi Berra said it best after flunking his English exam for the third time. I guess he wanted to go to journalism school. The teacher ran down the aisle, shook him and said, Yogi, don't you know anything? He looked up and said, "I don't even suspect anything." I've had a few of my own humbling experiences. I am a recovering Buffalo Bills fan. For four years I took Meet the Press to the site of the Super Bowl. At the last game, in the Georgia Dome, the studio director was saying in my ear piece, "You have thirty seconds, fill." So I looked into the camera and I said, "Well, now it's in God's hands. And God is good and God is just. Please God, one time, go Bills!"

As I walked off the set, my colleague Tom Brokaw said, "You Irish Catholics are shameless. You can't pray on the air." I said, I just did, Tom, and you'll see. Well, the Dallas Cowboys snuck by the Bills, 52 to 17. As I moped back to the hotel, Tom looked up and said, "Hey Russert, I guess God's a Southern Baptist." But by far, the most extraordinary event in my life was when I first joined NBC in 1984 as the executive in charge of the Today program. I had grown up in Buffalo, watching a flickering black and white TV set with then Today cast of Dave Garraway and J. Fred Muggs.

I was determined to reinvigorate the Today Show—to travel the program around the world, to bring people to places they couldn't afford to go, or never see in their lifetime. Steve Friedman, the Executive Producer at that time said, you're right. Where should we go? I said, in the Spring, nothing better than Italy. The vibrancy, the fashion, the music, the art. And if we time it right, perhaps we could bring our viewers behind the walls of the Vatican—where Catholics and non-Catholics would have an oppor-

tunity to see the mysteries of that remarkable institution.

Friedman said, "You're right. Get the Pope." I said, "Get the Pope? Friedman, that's a big booking. I used to be an alter boy, but there are a few steps in between." So I wrote a letter to the Pope, and heard nothing back. I then faxed it to our bureau in Warsaw and had it translated into Polish. I journeyed to Philadelphia and met with the late Joseph Cardinal Krol, God bless him. A close friend of the Pope who is also of Polish descent. He read my letter, was very taken that it was written in vernacular Polish and said, "Are you Polish?"

I realized it would be inappropriate to respond with anything but the truth. And I said, "No, but I'm from Buffalo, some of my best friends are!" Suddenly the phone rang and Cardinal Krol said, "Would you like to come to the Cathedral? The young Diocesan Boy's Choir is preparing for Christmas." I said, "There's nothing I'd rather do than listen to those little cherubs lift the rafters of the Cathedral." We went and they were magnificent. After about fifteen minutes, Cardinal Krol turned to me and said, "You know, Mr. Russert, my dream is to one day have these young men sing for the Holy Father." And I said, "This is a Cardinal!"

And having been trained by the Jesuits and the Sisters of Mercy, I quickly amended my letter to say, if His Holiness accepts our invitation, NBC will of course be accompanied by the Arch Diocesan Boy's Choir of Philadelphia. Who else? Two weeks later the phone rang. It was Cardinal Krol. He asked me to come to Rome and to meet with the Pope's advisors. And it was an extraordinary week as we went from meeting to meeting and ultimately I was lead into a room about this size. It was empty, but for myself. And suddenly the door opened, and there stood, dressed on white, the Holy Father, in my church, the Vicar of Christ.

And as he approached me, my mind quickly turned from NBC's ratings and Bryant Gumbel's career to the prospect of salvation. And you heard this tough, hard-hitting, no-nonsense moderator of Meet the Press begin by saying, "Bless me Father." He approached me, took me by the arm and said, "You are the man called Timothy from NBC."

I said, "Your Holiness, please don't ever forget this face."

He said, "They tell me you're an important man."

I said, "Your Holiness, with all due and deep respect, there are only two of us in this room—and I'm a most distant second."

He put his hand on my shoulders, looked me in the eyes and said, "Right."

His Holiness agreed to greet the Today Show on live American television, a first. And I told Bryant Gumbel and Jane Pauley that this would be different. That they had met Presidents and Kings and Queens and Senators and Governors, but never the Pope. Bryant, who happened to be Catholic said, "Don't worry, I can handle it."

Suddenly the Pope appeared on television. It was Bryant's chance to ask him a question—direct to the people of America. And Bryant said, "Your Holiness, these are pictures of my children. Would you please bless them?"

And Jane Pauley jumping in said, "I have twins!"

An extraordinary week from the Vatican for NBC. I was accompanied by my wife who was pregnant. The Holy Father blessed her womb and said, "Please bring your baby back to Rome next year." We did just that, and as we stood in the first row of the Papal audience, we proudly held our son Luke, who was wearing a white T-shirt with red letters, Totus Tuus. All Yours. That is the Pope's

personal motto, which he uttered to the blessed Virgin after being shot. "Blessed Mother." He said, "if I live, I will rededicate my life to you. Totus Tuus." All Yours.

The Pope spotted Luke, rushed towards him, took him in his arms, held him high, admiring his face, his shirt. Exclaimed over and over again, very nice, very nice. I of course, had an NBC crew standing by, taping the entire event. I dubbed it into slow motion and shipped it to my Italian mother in law. After sharing it with her friends for several hours, even she is willing now to admit, there is some value in having an Irish son in law. But my wish that day in Rome is the same I have tonight. That all our children in New York will be as blessed and loved as my own, as your own.

Tonight you have taken an important first step. Your dinner tickets will fund pre and post natal care for teenage moms and their babies. But this must only be the beginning of our efforts. At the turn of this century, just three short years from now, there will be seventy million children under the age of eighteen living in the United States. More than a third of them, one in three, nearly twenty-five million, will have been born into single parent households. Many of them kids having kids. And we all know what that means for most of them. Your Senator Pat Moynihan warned about this thirty-five years ago, but the nation did not listen.

And now we have a generation of children who will not have a life of love and discipline and values, but an existence of drugs and gangs and sickness, and too often, death. Fifteen children a day are shot dead in the United States of America. The health care facilities of this nation, of this diocese, are going to be overwhelmed by these children. Oh how I wish we could change behavior, and try we must. For these children will either be our future work force who respect people and property and get to work on time, or they will be our future crime statistics.

Hopefully someday our society will proclaim its central mission is to convince our young people to finish school, learn a skill, get a job, get married and then have a baby. In that order. This, I believe, is the most important economic, national security and moral issue facing our nation. But in the meantime, we cannot just ignore the children in need. That is what Al Smith told us. It's what John Cardinal O'Connor has shown us. You won't read about it in the tabloids or see it on TV. He has refused to publicize his compassion, but your Cardinal has personally cared for more than one thousand people with AIDS.

Going alone at night, he holds their hands, empties their bed pans, combs their hair. Simply sitting with them in the final days of their life. It is called living the gospel. Helping the poorest of the poor, the sickest of the sick. That's what Al Smith did, and it's what John O'Connor does. And so must we all. I was hungry and you gave me food. I was thirsty and you gave me drink. I was sick and you took care of me. Words to reflect on as we return tonight to the comfort of the Upper East Side, Westchester, Long Island or wherever. Let us count our blessings but let us share our blessings with vigor and new urgency.

Tutoring, mentoring, being even more generous to the Al Smith Foundation. Catholic charities, the inner city scholarship fund. Together we can redirect lives and probably even save a few souls. Embrace the spirit of the happy warrior, Al Smith, and the holy warrior, John O'Connor. Two men it will always be said, who fought the good fight and who kept the faith. By the quiet eloquence of their example, they have defined our mission here tonight. To nurture and protect the uniqueness, the dignity, and the preciousness of life from beginning to end.

To care and to share. That is our charge. That is our challenge. As we leave the 52nd Annual Al Smith dinner, we remember the words of your speaker from 1960. "Let us go forth asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on Earth, God's work must truly be our own." Thank you.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AL-LARD). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RECESS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 2:30 p.m. this afternoon.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:01 p.m., recessed until 2:31 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ROBERTS).

Mr. ROCKEFELLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

#### FAST-TRACK AUTHORITY

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I feel very strongly that we should give the President fast-track authority before we adjourn. He needs fast-track authority. We are not saying what is going to be in the trade bill that comes after the fast-track authority.

It is extremely important to remember that fast-track authority is something every President has had since 1974. There is absolutely nothing new in it. The idea that we would withhold from the President fast-track authority on the notion that only the Congress can negotiate trade agreements—Lord help us when it comes to the point where the Congress has to negotiate trade agreements. There are some trade agreements where we can put our imprimatur on that trade agreement, for example: NAFTA, which I voted against; GATT, which I voted for; Chile, which would be upcoming; or others.

But let's understand that in virtually all cases the President could go ahead and negotiate, his people at the U.S. Trade Representative's office could go ahead and negotiate trade agreements, and what the Congress thinks or does not think does not really apply. We would, obviously, watch that, and in the Finance Committee we watch trade very closely.

The whole notion of withholding from the President of the United States, in a highly visible action, withholding fast-track authority from the President of the United States, doing that in the Senate or in the House or

both, is absolutely unthinkable in terms of good judgment, as far as I'm concerned.

I can tell you in my own State of West Virginia which is not exactly located on either the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean, that trade and exports are a tremendous part of our economy. We have tens of thousands of people who are working exclusively because of international trade. We need to be increasing that. We need to be opening up new markets not only as the State of West Virginia but also as a nation. There are about 11.5 million jobs in this country right now which are exclusively related to international trade. We ought to be pursuing that.

One of the people that I work with was talking with somebody from the U.S. Trade Representative's office the other day and that person had just come back from a certain part of the world—I think, South America—and said that other countries are going ahead and making agreements and cutting deals on trade and that they are bypassing the United States because we are withholding fast-track authority. It is expired. It doesn't exist. We have to reauthorize it. We need to reauthorize it.

Somehow, also, the idea that the United States exists all by ourselves in this world doesn't make sense anymore, much less the U.S. Senate being able to sit and determine what will happen in the world. I think the history of the last week and what has happened with the stock markets has shown that transactions are international, they are instantaneous, they are electronic, they depend enormously upon each country taking the maximum advantage of the comparative advantage which it has in terms of goods which it produces. The United States has an enormous comparative advantage. Not to take full advantage of that doesn't make any sense to me.

Actually, it might interest some people to know that West Virginia, which is not thought of as an internationally related State, in fact, is. In terms of the proportion of the jobs in our State which are related to products which are exported internationally, only three or, maximum, four other States export more of what they produce proportionately than does the State of West Virginia. So here is a State in the middle of the Appalachian mountains—not just because of coal, not just because of steel, but because of many things—we are highly dependent on the international trade environment.

Mr. President, I remember several years ago when fast track was still in existence. We had two votes. One was on something called NAFTA; the other was on something called GATT. We could have done neither of those unless we had first made sure that the President had fast-track authority, which he did. I happen to think NAFTA was a bad deal for the State of West Virginia and I think I have been proved correct. I would definitely vote again as I did then, which was to vote negatively.

On the other hand, GATT was tremendously important to the State of West Virginia. As somebody who is interested in trade, I went to Geneva to work with some of the international trade folks where the GATT, the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade, was being negotiated. I worked on anti-dumping. That is central to West Virginia's steel industry. I worked on countervailing duties. That is central to America's trading interests. Also, circumvention. Most people don't know what circumvention is. Here is a good example. Sony television used to make all of its television sets in Japan, and then export them to Mexico with everything done but the front piece glass—not the tube that actually radiates the pictures but the front piece of glass. That would be added on in Mexico and then would be exported into the United States from Mexico, counting as a Mexican import. That is circumvention for the purposes of trade law. In the GATT we were able to stop that. So Sony had to build a plant in America, hiring 1,000 American workers, to do what they had previously done in an entirely different fashion.

Trade law is important. Section 337 has everything to do with intellectual property protection. It is the future of our information technology that is at stake. So we could not even have negotiated the GATT agreement without fast track. I'm saying that the President of the United States and his team of negotiators ought to have the right to negotiate a critical trade agreement as they choose, but then we would have the right to either approve it or disapprove it according to how we felt. I think that is a perfectly reasonable relationship.

The Congress, in a sense, we up or down the trade agreement, but we don't down the process through which the administration can get into the trade agreement. We don't simply say, "fast track you are not going to have," so you can't begin to negotiate a trade agreement.

I think that is totally counter to the purposes of international trade and frankly to the interests of my own State. So I hope that in the Senate and these coming days as we debate this issue that we would give the President of the United States the fast-track authority which President Reagan had, which President Ford had, which President Carter had, which President Bush had, and which President Bill Clinton ought to be able to have.

I yield the floor and 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. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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