

efficient, and financially sounder organization, but only if the United Nations and other member states, in return, are willing to finally become accountable to the American taxpayers.

The reforms proposed by the United States are critical to ensure the United Nations is effective and relevant. We must reform the United Nations now and the United States has the responsibility to play a major role in this effort.

If we do nothing, and the United Nations collapses under its own weight, then we will have only ourselves to blame. So I urge my colleagues to act now, or this window of opportunity may be lost for achieving true reform at the United Nations.

But passing this U.N. package is not just about a series of reforms for the future. It impacts directly on the credibility of the U.S. mission at the United Nations right now.

Ambassador Richardson has been pushing other member states to accept the reforms in this package in return for the payment of arrears. Now that package will not arrive.

At this critical juncture, when the United Nations is facing down Saddam Hussein, and the United States is trying to keep the gulf war coalition unified, it is reckless for the House of Representatives to do anything that would undercut the negotiating position of Ambassador Richardson and Secretary of State Albright at the United Nations. And believe me, the failure to pass this legislation will have a negative impact on the conduct of our foreign policy.

Madam President, the United States does not owe most of these arrears to the United Nations. It owes them to our allies, like France, for reimbursement for peacekeeping expenses.

Under normal circumstances, I am the last one who could be expected to make a pitch for funding for France. But considering that France is one of the members on the Security Council that is going soft on Iraq—soft on Saddam Hussein—depriving the United States Government the ability to use these funds as leverage is irresponsible. After all, our diplomats need carrots as well as sticks to achieve our foreign policy goals.

Madam President, I am hopeful that my colleagues in the House will see the wisdom of adopting measures that will enhance America's ability to exert leadership in the international arena through the consolidation of our foreign relations apparatus and the revitalization of the United Nations.

The State Department authorization bill should be allowed to pass or fail on its own merit—not on the merits of the Mexico City policy. This agreement is in America's best interest, and the best interest of the entire international community.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I see no other Senators wishing to speak, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, is there an order operative at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business until 4 p.m.

Mr. DOMENICI. Are the times limited on speeches?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The special order provides for 10 minutes for each Senator to speak.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield myself the 10 minutes that I am allowed.

THE ANNUAL BUDGETING PROCESS

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I want to talk a little bit about what a joyous day of wrap-up of the Senate in the first year of the 2-year Congress could be if, as a matter of fact, we left here after completing the appropriations bills and went about our business to go home to our home States, had a good Christmas season, worked with all of our constituents, and then came back next year, the second year of a Congress, and the appropriations were already done and the budget was already done. But that is not going to happen.

We just finished appropriations, I assume we will hear shortly. And what has taken up the entire year? I don't have the statistics. But early next year I will put them in the RECORD. But I am just going to ask the Senators who have a little recollection of the year to just think about what we did.

First of all, we worked diligently on a balanced budget. That didn't occur until late May and early June. I am trying mightily to think what was accomplished before that, thankfully. I wish I had a better memory. But I don't think we did a lot. A few bills here and there, but I am sure we didn't have any superb oversight.

People are all waiting for what? For the budget. And then for what? All the appropriations bills that have to come after it. Oh, by the way, in between, we had to implement the budget with those two big reconciliation bills.

So essentially we stand on the threshold of wrapping up the Congress for a year, and we start next year. We are going to anxiously await the President's budget—another 1-year budget. Would it have been better for America, for the U.S. Congress, for all the agencies that are funded, from NIH to some grant to a university, to our Armed Forces, and all the money that they have to spend if they could have a 2-year appropriation? Wouldn't we be better off, in a 2-year Congress—that is what we are, by the Constitution—if in 1 year we did all of the budgeting and all of the appropriations?

I have been working on budgets and appropriations bills long enough to know that there are all kinds of reasons for not doing 2-year budgets. I am an appropriator who thinks we should have a 2-year budget. Maybe many of the appropriators think we are better off sending our little measures to the President every year, and maybe we get more that way.

Just look at the 2-year appropriations. You get 2 years in there because we do 2-year appropriations bills. If you are worried about getting enough things in it, you can do it twice, even as we appropriate only one time for 2 years. But I don't think there is a great majority who are worried about that. I think we just are fearful to break with tradition. Somehow or another we have been appropriating every year.

Then when we wrote the Budget Act not too long ago, we said, "Well, we have to have a budget every year."

So what do we do? We do that. It is almost like we get started next year, and we are right back at the budget, which many people think we just finished. Sure enough, in the middle of the year, some appropriators will start looking at their bills, and sure enough, we will be back here, predictably—if not at this time a little later—and we will still have two or three appropriations bills that we can't get completed. Why? Because they are being held up by authorization riders that are very, very much in contention.

I ask, wouldn't we be better off if we had that kind of argument, be it on the money that we now refer to as the "Mexican issue" with reference to birth control and the kinds of family planning that we put money into foreign countries for, wouldn't we be better off if we voted on that only once every 2 years? It would have exactly the same effect. In fact, we could fight just one time out of 2 years. We could send these little bills back and forth between the President and the Congress with these little 1-day extensions of Government. We could do that only 1 year out of 2, and everybody could make the same vote. Everybody could make their case in the same way. But who would gain?

I believe the institution known as the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives would gain immensely. In fact, might I suggest that what it means to be a U.S. Senator would be dramatically changed if we had 2-year appropriations, a 2-year budgeting, because, if we did these every 2 years, we would be able to have oversight and see what is happening to the programs that we fund and the programs that we put in motion through the process called authorization.

Then, Madam President and fellow Senators and anybody interested in good government, we have not yet been able to encapsulate into our thinking what the executive branch of Government wastes by having to produce a budget every single year with budget hearings at the OMB, with people who

are planning over at the National Institutes of Health to get a program going that is going to be 10 years in duration and come and present this 1-year part of that every single year. As a matter of fact, there would be twice as much time to do the things we are neglecting—to debate foreign policy in a real way, to have a 2- or 3-month debate on tax reform where people would really spend time. And day after day we could be on the floor instead of in some little room under the threat of a bill reconciliation measure from the budget process telling you to get it done in 25 days. We could have people looking at education, at the myriad and scores of bills that are already out there that are funding programs. Instead of finding new ones every year and new problems, we would go back and look to see what the whole entourage of education money looks like. Are there programs there that aren't working? But you need a lot of time to do that. You can't be getting up and running to the floor to vote every single year on 50 to 60 budget amendments, all of the appropriations bills with their attendant amendments, and then have to have your staff focus on what is in each one of those bills only to find you are back again in 6 months doing the same thing over again.

As a matter of fact, the more I think about that and the more I talk about it, the more I think I am prepared to say for us to appropriate and budget annually when the Constitution says Congress lasts for 2 years, that it is absurd from the standpoint of modern planning with the modern tools we have to do the estimating that we are doing every year instead of doing it for 2 years.

Some are going to say you are going to have to have a lot of supplemental appropriations. I am sure the occupant of the chair is already hearing that when she speaks about 2-year appropriations and 2-year budgets. Let me tell you, even with 1-year appropriations, we have to have supplementals because some few things break in the Government, and we are not quite right on, and we have to go fix them. But there is a way to limit the supplementals even in a 2-year process to no more than we are doing now.

Once I asked four different departments of Government, as they reported to the Appropriations Committee, to give us information on the appropriations before us on that particular year and asked how much of it is similar if not exactly the same as last year's. You would be surprised. As much as 90 percent of appropriations bills are the same year after year. Isn't it interesting? We debate them all over again. We mark them up all over again, and we add these amendments that cause us to debate ad infinitum, which could just as well be 2-year amendments as 1-year. But we do it to ourselves by making sure we go through this kind of difficult confrontational atmosphere every single year.

Put yourself in the position of those in America that we have said should get some Government money for something. I have spoken to large groups of scientists from our universities, from our hospital research centers, from our laboratories, and they all want more certainty of funding. Of course, they would all like more funding. But they shout to the rooftops when you say, wouldn't you prefer to have 2 years instead of 1 year as your appropriation? Could you manage it better? Could you be more efficient? The answer to all of those questions is "absolutely." Yet, we remain stuck in the mud of tradition saying we have to do it every single year.

There is a bill pending. It has cleared the Governmental Operations Committee 13 to 1—S. 261. It is here. It is at the desk. I am thankful that since we have a 2-year Congress, it is still at the desk. Congress isn't finished until next year come January.

I am going to work very hard with others in this Senate to urge that our leader schedule early a lengthy time on the floor in the early days of the Congress to debate this issue. Thirty-three Senators from both sides of the aisle cosponsored the measure before it cleared Governmental Operations. I believe, if I had enough time to circulate it even more among Senators, that I would have had more than 50 Senators supporting it. It might be because of the processes around here that there will be a Senator who will object, and we might have to get 60 votes, because obviously changing the budget to 2 years and the appropriations for 2 years could be a controversial issue.

So I am prepared for the 60-vote requirement. But even at that, I want to say to those who oppose it, who oppose this modernization, this bringing into modern times of our processes around here, that I believe there are more than 60 Senators if they hear the debate and if we configure that debate so as to make the Senators feel just like we are finished here today instead of next February or March, we could be saying if this 2-year budget, 2-year appropriations bill, had passed, we would be finished for a full year. We could do other things, and the departments of our Government could go about their business without preparing yet another budget and going through all of the rigor, time, effort, and lack of efficiency that comes with that.

So, Madam President and fellow Senators, I just want to make two wrap-up points. I believe anybody watching this year, if presented with a real opportunity to go through this only once every 2 years instead of twice and have time for other things, we would probably have a huge, huge plurality voting with us.

The American people can't get excited about process issues, but if they understood what we go through and what we have assigned to ourselves, to the executive branch and to all those that we fund by way of making it dif-

ficult and tough and inefficient by doing the same thing over each year, then I think the American people would be excited by this reform. If the people knew we could do it for 2 years at a time, if we could just get that out there, get that debated in a very open manner that everybody understands, then we might have kind of a birth of modernization, kind of a ray of light shining on these processes, and I believe the American people would gain.

I believe we would do our jobs better. I believe we could do oversight; we could have more hearings; we could actually, every couple of years, take a month or two and go out in the hinterland and hold hearings in our country which wouldn't be all that bad. How are we going to do it under the current annual process? Somebody think of that around here and the first thing you know there will be five appropriations bills ready for the normal 50 votes, or a budget resolution taking 2, 3 weeks, taking vote after vote after vote, half of them being sense-of-the-Senate issues which shouldn't be even allowed on a budget resolution, but that is the current process.

So that is one point. We would be doing the American people a better job if we could do that.

And second, the Senate and House would be better places within which to do business for the American people if there wasn't so much redundancy and waste of time and effort. So we are going to try to see if we can accomplish both of those goals which I think are rather admirable.

I do not want to leave the wrong impression for those who seek to defeat this measure that it violates the Budget Act. The bill is not subject to a 60-vote point of order. It just takes a simple majority. It has been in both committees. That is why we went through that. It's gone to the Governmental Affairs Committee. Then it went to the Budget Committee, which was discharged, and so it is here as any other normal bill. So if we get that magic 51 votes, we can change this process.

I just want to put in the RECORD the major legislation that passed this year and even some of our authorizing processes were very late for one reason or another. While a great deal of legislation has passed, we only will clear about three major authorization bills for the President's signature: DOD authorization, FDA reform, SBA reform. The compelling amount of time and the overwhelming majority of effort was spent on the budget resolution, two reconciliation bills, and 13 appropriations bills. And we haven't quite done that; six continuing resolutions before we're done tonight. I do not blame anyone for that. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee this year has been a stalwart in trying to get the appropriations bills done on time. He has not benefited from the two Houses being able to agree on four or five issues and a majority in the House being on the opposite side of the President on two or three issues.

Besides appropriations, we spent a great deal of effort on the budget resolution and the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997—the two reconciliation bills called for by the balanced budget agreement and the budget resolution. And frankly, hardly any time was left for other major bills to be debated for any length of time, and I think we can do our job a lot better than that.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until the hour of 6 p.m. under the same terms as previously ordered.

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

FAST TRACK

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, a little over a week ago, I stood to introduce the Finance Committee's fast track bill. On that occasion, I made it clear that fast track authority is important to America's future. I advocated the need for American leadership if we are to make progress in expanding economic opportunities for individuals and families here at home.

I emphasized that America has always been a trading nation. From colonial times to the creation of the post-World War II international economic order, the United States has pressed for open commerce, free of discriminatory preferences and trade-distorting barriers.

From battles with Barbary pirates on the shores of Tripoli to the arduous negotiations that led to the signing of the Uruguay round agreements in Marrakesh, Morocco, we have promoted and defended open, fair, and unfettered trade.

The United States has been a driving force for expanding world trade and the prosperity it yields, particularly over the last six decades. From the creation of the GATT, to the initiation of each successive round of multilateral trade negotiations, to the political will to conclude the Uruguay round, America has taken the lead.

We have pursued this course in our own economic and political self-interest. In purely economic terms, the United States is the world's largest trading state and the largest beneficiary of the international trading system. We lead the world in both exports and imports.

Thirty percent of our current annual economic growth depends on exports. Eleven million jobs are directly tied to those export sales.

According to the Federal Reserve, our two-way trade, both exports and

imports, have played a major role in the 7 years of sustained, noninflationary economic growth we enjoy today. And no other nation in the world is so well positioned to bless its citizens through open trade than America. Our Nation, better than any other, is situated to succeed in a global economy.

We have the diversity of cultures, the most advanced technology, the most efficient capital markets, and a corporate sector that is constantly innovating and has already gone through substantial restructuring that is necessary for global competition. We have a single currency, a common language, and the important blessing of geography: we are a nation—a continent—that looks both to Europe and to Asia.

No other nation is so well positioned to reap the blessings of a global economy. As Thomas L. Friedman suggested in the *New York Times*, America, as a nation, almost appears to have been designed to compete in such a world.

Having said this, let me be clear that we have not pursued the goal of liberalizing trade solely because it is in our own economic interest to do so. We have pursued that goal because it is in our political and security interests as well.

It is worth noting, in the shadow of the Veterans Day remembrance, that conflicts over trade in the 1930's deepened the Great Depression profoundly and fostered the political movements that gave us the Second World War. Our own revolution was fought in large part because of the constraints Great Britain imposed on the colonies' trade. Indeed, it is difficult to recall any great conflict in which trade did not play a part.

In my view, prosperity is the surest means to secure peace, both because it strengthens our capacity to maintain our defense and because it reduces the causes of conflicts that lead to war.

In this Chamber, we have had a spirited debate that has raised a number of significant issues—from alleged flaws in our trade agreements, to the causes and consequences of the trade deficit, to the issues of labor standards and the environment. We have benefited from this exchange of views on both sides. And, I was heartened by the vote in the Senate to move to proceed to debate the Finance Committee's bill extending fast track negotiating authority—a vote that commanded a majority of Members from both sides of the aisle.

As heartened as I was by our vote, I was as disappointed in the President's decision to ask that the measure not be put to a vote in the House. It is clear, from all reports, that the President was unable to move a sufficient number of Members of his own party to join in the effort to promote American economic and political interests abroad.

My first thought on hearing of the President's decision, however, was not about the past. My first thought was for the future.

I say this because I happen to believe that we are on the edge of an era of un-

paralleled prosperity, not just in the United States, but throughout the world. But the realization of such prosperity will depend on conditions. It will depend on our making the right kinds of choices.

It will depend on our ability to advance the cause of open markets and the freedom to compete fairly throughout the world.

Walter Lippman coined the term the "American Century" to apply to the decades from the turn of the century during which the United States grew to a position of unrivaled economic, political, and cultural strength. I happen to believe that we are now entering a second "American Century," if we have the courage to embrace the challenges and opportunities of international leadership that our greater destiny offers us.

We will not advance our own cause if we shirk that responsibility. Nor will we serve the generations of Americans that follow us if we shrink from an expansive vision of what we can accomplish together if we, as Americans, remain united in a common purpose.

In the abstract and arcane world of international trade, there is little that is not subject to debate and differing points of view. One exception, however, is that for the world to make progress, the United States must lead.

This is the essence of the fast track debate—whether we would offer the President the means by which he can exercise American leadership on the trade front. Absent fast track, he will not have a seat at the table. The rules of the road will be written without our full participation. History tells us that, when that happens, the world does not move in the direction of open, unfettered commerce, but in the direction of preferential trading systems often designed to exclude the United States.

There are a series of negotiations on the horizon within the WTO and other forums. They will redefine the rules in areas like agriculture, financial services, and basic customs rules applicable to every product imported into, or exported from, the United States.

They will proceed without us and in a direction we will not like if the President lacks the authority to engage and lead. And if that is the case, we are certain to lose a great deal. For example, Charlene Barshefsky reminds us that in the area of negotiating market access to government procurement, there is over a trillion dollars at stake in Asia alone. In services, there is over a \$1.2 trillion global market, and in agriculture over \$600 billion.

I doubt whether the farmers of America will believe that it will be a sufficient response to say that we failed to act on fast track because we did not understand the true cause of our trade deficit and therefore left it to others to define the rules that will govern our agricultural trade into the 21st century.

For that reason—for what is at stake for Americans, for our families, for