

We have done much to address the issue of exploitative child labor, but I am sorry to say that one of the most important measures that we will be asked to vote on this year or perhaps next year, depending on when it comes here for a vote—this bill, S. 1269, the so-called fast-track bill—does not recognize the depths of the problem of exploitative child labor and does little to help protect them from exploitation.

This bill protects songs. It protects computer chips. Let me read. Intellectual property. This bill, under part B, says, "the principal trade negotiating objectives." There are 15. Principal trade negotiating objectives. The first is reduction of barriers to trade in goods. The second is trade in services. The third is foreign investment. Fourth is intellectual property, and it says:

The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding intellectual property are—

And it has a bunch of things here. It says:

... to recognize and adequately protect intellectual property, including copyrights, patents, trademarks, semiconductor chip layout designs. . .

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes to finish up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. Three more minutes.

Mr. BOND. No objection.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I know people are here to speak. I just want to finish.

We are protecting semiconductor chip computer design layouts. If we can protect a song, we can protect a child. That is my bottom line on this. What do they do with child labor? Oh, it is back here on page 18, "It's the policy of the United States to reinforce trade agreements process by seeking to establish in the International Labor Organization"—the ILO—"a mechanism for the examination of, reporting on"—et cetera, and includes exploitative child labor. It doesn't mean a thing. I know all about the ILO. It is a great organization. It has absolutely zero enforcement powers.

If we can protect a song, why can't we protect a child? Why don't we elevate exploitative child labor to the same status as intellectual property rights? Let's make it a separate principal trade negotiating objective of this Government that when we negotiate a trade agreement with a country, yes, we will negotiate on trade in services and on foreign investment and intellectual property. But let's also put child labor right up there as one of the principal negotiating objectives of our Government.

I have an amendment drafted to that extent. It mirrors exactly what is done in intellectual property. We make this young girl the equivalent of a song or

a computer chip layout design. Anything less than that means that this fast-track legislation ought to be consigned to the trash heap of history. If we are not willing to take that kind of a step to announce it loudly and forcefully to the White House and to instruct the people who are involved in negotiating our trade agreements, then this body has no reason at all to pass fast-track legislation. We must elevate the issue of exploitative child labor to that level. Anything less will not do.

I yield the floor and thank my friend from Missouri for giving me the opportunity to finish my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Missouri.

TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to present to my colleagues what I think is a compromise that will help us get over a very difficult situation. I am very proud to be a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee and to have joined with the leadership of that committee—Chairman CHAFEE, Senator WARNER, Ranking Member BAUCUS, and the other members of the committee, in reporting out what I believe is an excellent transportation reauthorization bill.

I think this is a bill that we need for the next 6 years. We need it for transportation, for safety, for economic development. The simple fact of the matter is, without discussing the whys, the "where we are" is we are not going to get that passed this year. There, in my view, is no way that we can get agreement, get it passed on the floor of the Senate, and agree with the House on a very different approach they are taking prior to the time we adjourn for the remainder of the year.

If we don't—and we had a hearing today in Environment and Public Works—No. 1, the Department of Transportation operations cannot continue, vitally needed safety programs cannot continue, transit programs cannot continue, and many States will not be able to let the contracts they need for major construction projects in the coming months because they will not have the obligational authority.

There is a lot of money in the States—over \$9 billion—that is unobligated that has been authorized, but the problem is very often it is in the wrong category. The States have money, but it may be in CMAQ when they need it in STP or the various different programs.

The question is, what are we going to do about it? Some in the House have presented a proposal that is sort of a 6-month extension. It keeps the old formula and tries to jam everything into 12 months. Frankly, that is very unfair to my State and quite a few other States that are known in this body as donor States.

I can assure you that any time we try to do something in the highway and

transportation area that gets us into a formula discussion, we are going to spend some time at it. I feel very strongly about the formulas, and I intend to express myself about them, as other Members should.

What are we going to do about it? What are we going to do about the fact that safety and transit programs run out and many States will not be able to let contracts they need for major projects at the end of the winter when they have to get ready for the summer construction season?

Today I presented to my colleagues in the Environment and Public Works Committee a compromise which I think enables us to continue these vitally important operations. Certainly highways and transportation are right at the top of the list of things that my constituents in Missouri want to see us do. It will enable us to come back after the first of the year, pass a 6-year reauthorization and do so without penalizing the States and the transit and the safety programs.

What we would do under my bill is provide 6 months of funding for the safety programs, the Department of Transportation operations and transit. For the unobligated balances, we would give the States complete flexibility. If they want to put surface transportation money into construction mitigation, they could do so, and they would be able to continue their operations and issue contracts through March 31.

Some States do not have enough unobligated balances to be able to continue their contracting authority through March 31 at the same rate they had done in this year or the previous year. So for those States, my measure would provide them an advance, an advance against what we are going to authorize in the bill that we must pass and that the President must sign so transportation can go forward in this country.

For most States, it means a small amount, but we would advance fund that money without regard to the formula. Say, for example, you had \$250 million in unobligated balances, but in the first 6 months in one of those years you obligated \$290 million. We would have the Department of Transportation advance \$40 million to that State so that between now and March 31, the State would be able to obligate \$290 million for transportation purposes.

Later on in the year, when that State's allocation is determined and, say, under the formula that State would get \$500 million from probably, say, \$800 million for the year, that \$40 million would be deducted from the allocations under the new authorization, and they would get \$760 million.

What this does, Mr. President, is allow us to keep things operating, keep contracts being let, keep transit programs and safety programs operating without getting bogged down in the formula fight.

As I said earlier, when I say "bogged down," I look forward to the very active discussion of the funding formula.

It is one of the most important things that we need to do around here in terms of economic development, transportation and safety. But it will take some time. I would envision that whenever the majority leader wants to schedule it, it would take at least a couple of weeks and maybe more. So while we are doing that, we should not cut off the transit, the safety, or the contracting obligation that the States would normally do.

As I said, we presented this at the EPW hearing this morning. We had a very good discussion with representatives of the National Governors' Association and the Department of Transportation.

Mr. President, the National Governors' Association has sent a letter signed by 39 Governors. Getting 39 Governors—having been one—I can tell you, to sign on a letter is not easy. But the Governors very simply said:

... it is imperative for the Senate to consider and pass short-term legislation providing funding for highway, transit, and safety programs and to complete a conference on that legislation with the House of Representatives. Such legislation would minimize the interruption in funding to State and local governments. It would also avoid the disastrous effects that a several-month lapse in authorization would have on many States' transportation programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, November 4, 1997.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. THOMAS A. DASCHLE,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LOTT AND SENATOR DASCHLE: Given the very limited time remaining in this legislative session, it is imperative for the Senate to consider and pass short-term legislation providing funding for highway, transit, and safety programs and to complete a conference on that legislation with the House of Representatives. Such legislation would minimize the interruption in funding to state and local governments. It would also avoid the disastrous effects that a several-month lapse in authorization would have on many states' transportation programs.

Sincerely,

Governor George V. Voinovich; Governor Thomas R. Carper; Governor Edward T. Schafer, Co-Chair, Transportation Task Force; Governor Paul E. Patton, Co-Chair, Transportation Task Force; Governor Mike Huckabee; Governor Roy Romer; Governor Lawton Chiles; Governor Philip E. Batt; Governor Terry E. Brandstad; Governor Mike Foster; Governor Parris N. Glendening; Governor Arne H. Carlson; Governor Marc Racicot; Governor Jeanne Shaheen; Governor Jane Dee Hull; Governor Pete Wilson; Governor John G. Rowland; Governor Zell Miller; Governor Frank O'Bannon; Governor Bill Graves; Governor Angus S. King Jr.; Governor John Engler; Governor Mel Carnahan; Governor Bob Miller; Gov-

ernor Christine T. Whitman; Governor James B. Hunt Jr.; Governor David M. Beasley; Governor Don Sundquist; Governor Howard Dean, M.D.; Governor Gary Locke; Governor Tommy G. Thompson; Governor Benjamin J. Cayetano; Governor John A. Kitzhaber; Governor William J. Janklow; Governor Michael O. Leavitt; Governor Roy Lester Schneider, M.D.; Governor Cecil H. Underwood; Governor E. Benjamin Nelson; Governor Pedro Rosselló.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that we have had good ideas from both sides of the aisle in the EPW Committee. We look forward to working with Chairman WARNER, Senator BAUCUS, Chairman CHAFEE, the other members of the committee.

I hope this is something that we could agree on and move forward on quickly so that our States and the traveling public will not suffer while we go through the very important discussions on coming up with a new highway funding formula.

I invite comments. I look forward to working with my colleagues. This one I hope we can do on a bipartisan basis without the regional differences that will inevitably arise when we begin discussion of the funding formula.

Mr. President, I appreciate the time, and I yield the floor.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, November 3, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,427,078,768,247.28 (Five trillion, four hundred twenty-seven billion, seventy-eight million, seven hundred sixty-eight thousand, two hundred forty-seven dollars and twenty-eight cents).

Five years ago, November 3, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$4,068,937,000,000 (Four trillion, sixty-eight billion, nine hundred thirty-seven million).

Ten years ago, November 3, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,392,685,000,000 (Two trillion, three hundred ninety-two billion, six hundred eighty-five million).

Fifteen years ago, November 3, 1982, the Federal debt stood at \$1,142,065,000,000 (One trillion, one hundred forty-two billion, sixty-five million).

Twenty-five years ago, November 3, 1972, the Federal debt stood at \$435,625,000,000 (Four hundred thirty-five billion, six hundred twenty-five million) which reflects a debt increase of nearly \$5 trillion—\$4,991,453,768,247.28 (Four trillion, nine hundred ninety-one billion, four hundred fifty-three million, seven hundred sixty-eight thousand, two hundred forty-seven dollars and twenty-eight cents) during the past 25 years.

ENSURING THE HEALTH OF INTERNATIONALLY ADOPTED CHILDREN UNDER 10

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise to express my support for H.R. 2464,

legislation to exempt internationally adopted children under age 10 from the immunization requirement that was contained in last year's immigration bill.

Mr. President, in my view it is important that the Federal Government not unnecessarily burden American parents who adopt foreign born children. The process of adopting a child abroad is already quite arduous and involves great emotional risk. The Federal Government should not make that process yet more difficult. It is particularly important that we not endanger the health of these children.

Last year's immigration bill unnecessarily and unintentionally made the process of adopting foreign born children more difficult.

I am, however, concerned that this bill did not go far enough. There are adopted children 10 years of age and older who do not need to be treated differently than those under 10 years old. Moreover, the problems with infected needles in many countries should give us serious pause as to whether immigrant children who are not adopted are undergoing undue risk.

I also want to call attention to a provision that I would have preferred not be in this bill—the provision requiring that parents of the exempted adopted children must sign an affidavit promising to vaccinate their children within 30 days or when it is medically appropriate. I think we do not want to imply in this or other legislation that the Federal Government cares more about children than parents do and, unfortunately, I think that is what this provision says.

Despite these reservations, I think that this is a good bill and it is an important bill for the many Americans who will be adopting children internationally both this year and in the years to come. I want to commend the sponsors of the bill and commend the leadership on this issue of the two Senators from Arizona, Senator KYL and Senator MCCAIN, who have helped see to it that this important correction in law will become a reality and thus help ensure the safe adoption of foreign-born children by American citizens.

ONE-CALL NOTIFICATION PROVISIONS

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. I would like to clarify the intent of the Commerce Committee's ISTEIA transportation safety amendment as it relates to State one-call—call-before-you-dig—programs. It is my understanding that the one-call provisions of this amendment are the same as the provisions of S. 1115, the Comprehensive One-Call Notification Act of 1997.

Mr. LOTT. The Senator is correct. The minority leader and I introduced as S. 1115 on July 31. Thirteen of our colleagues have joined us as cosponsors to the bill, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation held a hearing on the bill on September