

party or person, not to any colleague, not to any organization, but answerable only to his own constituents, to his own conscience, and to his own God. He is answerable to his own constituents—the people who trusted his judgment enough to send him here in the first place.

The suggestions which have been made on this floor about the dubious honesty of some Members are more than regrettable. They represent the kind of judgmental rigidity that really has no place in a body such as this.

Let me also say at this point that the threats to run down that last remaining vote so badly desired by the proponents of this amendment by tinkering with language are empty fulminations because this proposal is fatally flawed. It is flawed in a way that cannot be mended because its enactment would forever shift the artful balance of powers crafted by the framers. That is where it is fatally flawed. No language fix can cure the terminal illness of the attempt to write fiscal policy and political ideology into a national charter intended to serve as a guideline for generations. This Senator, for one, will never be a party to grafting this pock-marked monstrosity, largely aimed at adding a star to the crown of one party's political agenda, to the body of our organic law. Now, I realize that several Democrats voted for this amendment. But I don't attempt to be the judge of their vote. Their constituents have that responsibility.

The eagerness to tinker belies the obvious insincerity behind the effort, and the remarks on this floor over the past several days should be enough to convince us all that what is really wanted by some in this body is not the amendment itself, but an issue with which to whip its opponents. This is simple politics, my colleagues. And it is politics at its most unappealing and destructive level.

It is easy to do the obvious thing. It is easy to do the popular thing. What it is not easy to do is to have the courage of one's convictions and to stand up for those convictions. So I say again, thank God for Members such as those who have been so roundly chastised in recent days. Throughout our history, men of courage have made the difference. Cloned sheep who cower at the suggestion of independent thought and action were not what the framers of the Constitution had in mind when they created "the greatest deliberative body" in the history of the world. They had in mind men of courage. Andrew Jackson said, "One man with courage makes a majority." John F. Kennedy wrote a Pulitzer prize-winning book about those Senators who had the courage, on matters of principle, to follow their own convictions. If the advice of some of those who have taken to the floor in recent days had been followed, the pages of that book would be blank and this Senate and this country of ours would never have endured.

Let me close, Mr. President, with the words of Senator William Pitt

Fessenden of Maine, from a eulogy delivered upon the death of Senator Foot of Vermont in 1866, just 2 years before Senator Fessenden's vote to acquit Andrew Johnson brought about the fulfillment of Fessenden's own political prophecy.

When, Mr. President, a man becomes a member of this body, he cannot even dream of the ordeal to which he cannot fail to be exposed;

of how much courage he must possess to resist the temptations which daily beset him;

of that sensitive shrinking from undeserved censure which he must learn to control;

of the ever-recurring contest between a natural desire for public approbation and a sense of public duty;

of the load of injustice he must be content to bear, even from those who should be his friends;

the imputations of his motives; the sneers and the sarcasms of ignorance and malice;

all the manifold injuries which partisan or private malignity, disappointed of its objects, may shower upon his unprotected head.

All this, Mr. President, if he would retain his integrity, he must learn to bear unmoved, and walk steadily onward in the path of duty, sustained only by the reflection that time may do him justice, or if not, that after all his individual hopes and aspirations, and even his name among men, should be of little account to him when weighed in the balance against the welfare of a people of whose destiny he is a constituted guardian and defender.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, am I to be recognized for 15 minutes in morning business under a previous order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. Without objection, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I thank you.

I enjoyed listening to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, Senator BYRD.

Edmund Burke said something similar to the words used by Senator BYRD when he closed, and I do not know them exactly, but he was talking about what a representative in a representative government owes to his or her constituency. And Edmund Burke said something like: Your representative owes you not only his industry but also his judgment, and he betrays rather than serves if he always sacrifices it to your opinion.

I do not know if that is an exact statement, but it is close to the expression of Mr. Burke and I think describes the requirement of someone serving in public office in this country to do what they think is right—not to be a weather vane to analyze what is the prevailing wind on Tuesday or Thursday, but to do what they think is right. That is especially important when we are talking about altering the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

I thank him for reciting this jewel by a great Irish statesman, Edmund Burke, who I believe lost the next election after he had made that statement. He may have foreseen that, but nevertheless he made the statement. It still lives, and it is a very appropriate guiding charter, in my judgment, for those of us in this Chamber today.

U.S. MERCHANDISE TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today because we will be taking up an issue dealing with the confirmation of a nominee for U.S. Trade Ambassador. In conjunction with that will be an issue raised by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] on a matter relating to the negotiation of international trade agreements and whether in those negotiations, agreements can be reached that effectively change U.S. law. I intend to support the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina. I think he is absolutely correct, and I hope to be able to come and speak to that point when he offers his amendment.

As we begin talking about the nomination of the U.S. Trade Ambassador, I want to take a moment to mention something that occurred about 2 weeks ago which passed almost unnoticed in this town, and it relates to the issue of trade. It relates to the kind of trade ambassador we have and relates to the kind of trade policies we employ.

A couple of weeks ago, we learned that in this last year the merchandise trade deficit experienced by the United States of America was \$188 billion—a \$188 billion trade deficit. This makes 21 consecutive years of U.S. merchandise trade deficits, with a cumulative total of nearly \$2 trillion.

We have spent a lot of time in recent days with books stacked on books 8 feet high in this Chamber showing fiscal policy and budgets. Perhaps we should have a chair or a table that stacks piles and piles of trade agreements and trade deficits one on top of another to show what we owe others in the world from an accumulation of nearly \$2 trillion in trade deficits.

That is the other deficit, the deficit no one wants to talk about, the deficit no one wants to address. And yet, it is a deficit that predicts a weakness and a continual weakening in America's manufacturing base. That which we used to produce at home is now all too often produced abroad. That which was manufactured here is manufactured somewhere else. Good jobs that paid well with good benefits here are now offshore. And that is what this deficit spells.

No country in history that I am aware of has long remained a strong, dominant world power without retaining its core manufacturing base, for economic health in any country is not what you consume but, rather, what

you produce. What you produce is measured by the strength and the breadth and the dimensions of your manufacturing base. This trade deficit is injuring our country. No one seems to care much about it or be willing to do much about it.

Six countries comprise more than 90 percent of our current trade deficit: Japan, nearly 30 percent of the deficit; China, 24 percent of the deficit; Canada and Mexico, which represents NAFTA, the NAFTA trade agreement, that is 24 percent of the deficit; Germany and Taiwan together, about 16 percent of the deficit.

NAFTA was one the most recent trade debates we have had in this Chamber. We were told that if we have a free trade relationship with Mexico and Canada, our two nearest neighbors, we would have new vistas of economic opportunity and create hundreds of thousands of new American jobs. Well, NAFTA was passed—not with my vote, but NAFTA was passed. The NAFTA bill was enacted, it is now law, and now we are choking in trade debt with our two neighbors.

The architects of NAFTA knew what they were doing. They constructed a kind of economic cow that feeds in the United States and is milked by both neighbors. No one that I know of can credibly come around to this Chamber who had advertised the virtues of NAFTA and now do anything but be embarrassed with what has happened. What has happened is injuring this country. Giant trade deficits with Canada and Mexico are hurting this country.

Mexico now sends more automobiles to the United States than the United States exports to all the rest of the world. Let me say that again because I think it is important. Mexico now ships more automobiles into the United States of America than the United States of America exports to all of the rest of the world.

We were told: Well, NAFTA, that's just a little old thing so that some of those low-skilled jobs can go down south. They could do some of those low-skilled jobs at lower labor costs down south. So, what are the largest imports into the United States from Mexico today? The product of low-skilled jobs? No. Electronics, automobile parts, automobiles. Exactly the opposite of what was predicted.

My point is that we must be concerned about this, we must be vigilant about it, and we must try to do something about it. We must have the same energy in this Chamber on this issue as there has been exhibited on the issue of fiscal policy, the budget deficits that result from fiscal policy that is out of balance.

There is merit, enormous merit in requiring that we march toward a balanced budget in the fiscal policy in this country because you cannot keep saddling your children and grandchildren with consumption that you now have and saying, well, we are going to con-

sume, but you pay the bills. That is not fair, it is not right, and it is not healthy for this country's economy.

There is something else that is fundamentally unhealthy about this country's economy, and that is our trade relationships that result in this enormous trade deficit that we have, a merchandise trade deficit of \$188 billion. I could spend hours talking about the specifics, and I cannot and I will not because I do not have the time. Let me just mention one item, and I will bet not many people understand.

For example: Let's talk about T-bone steak that is shipped from the United States to Japan, just to demonstrate the low expectations we have of those with whom we trade. Some while ago there was a negotiation on beef from America to Japan, and at the end of the negotiation there was a day of feasting, people believing that those who engaged in these negotiations had just won a gold medal at the Olympics. Enormous success, we were told. They crowed about the successful negotiation on beef.

Well, where are we now some years later? We are getting more beef into Japan. That is true. So they all say that is enormously successful. Guess what. There is a 50 percent tariff on American beef being sent to Japan. Does anybody under any set of circumstances believe that is success, that we now are able to get beef into Japan with a 50 percent tariff, and therefore we ought to say, "Hosanna"?

That is not fair trade. That is not free trade. That is not open trade. It is not fair for this country. It is not fair for our beef producers. And I can go through line after line and example after example. T-bones to Tokyo. They ought to go there without a 50-percent tariff on them to be fair to our producers. We purchase much of what they export to us. They ought to purchase what we export to them without impediment.

I do not want to go on. I would like to talk about trade in some more detail, with my colleague from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, and Senator HOLLINGS and others. I would say, for myself, and I expect I could say on their behalf, we do not complain about this as people who believe that we ought to put walls around our country.

I believe in expanded trade. I believe in expanded opportunity. But I darned sure believe in retaining a manufacturing base in this country, insisting that trade around the world be fair trade. Nobody in this country working in a manufacturing plant ought to have to compete with a 14-year-old working 14 hours a day making 14 cents an hour. Nobody under any condition ought to be expected to or ought to have to compete with that, and it happens every day in every way under our trade agreements.

I am just saying the other deficit, nearly \$2 trillion at this point, with this year's trade deficit being one of the largest in history, that deficit we

ought to care about and ought to do something about.

Ambassador Barshefsky—we are going to vote on her. She is tough. She has confronted a number of other countries on trade relationships in a significant way. I appreciate that. But she is only as tough as the administration will allow her to be in demanding fair trade. The last several administrations, the last four administrations, in fact, have been disappointments to me on trade, including this one. They have done better than previous administrations, but not good enough. It is not good enough for this country.

It used to be, we could handle international competition with one hand tied behind our backs because we were the biggest, the best, the most. That is not true anymore. We face shrewd, tough, international competitors and it is time we understand that trade relationships must be fair and must be balanced, and must care about this country's productive sector as well.

I am not going to speak at length about the amendment offered by Senator HOLLINGS. I do intend to support it when he offers it. I hope to be able to come down and speak about it. But I did want to say a few words, just as a precursor to a discussion we will have about the confirmation of another trade ambassador.

We have had trade ambassadors. We have confirmed them. We have heard the talk about straightening out some of our trade relationships. But year after year, the merchandise trade deficit continues to grow with almost no notice and almost no one seeming to care about its impact on this country.

Mr. President, I expect to come back later in the day when we debate these issues. With that I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Roberts). The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for just 1 minute?

Mr. DEWINE. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. MCCAIN. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota. The fact is, it is hard for me to understand the argument when the American economy is the best it has been, in the opinion of any expert, in a long, long time. Our unemployment is low, our trade continues to grow, our economy continues to grow. It is a direct result of free trade. How can we make the argument, which will be done later on, that somehow we should be reraising barriers that are protectionist and isolationist when it flies in the face of what every outside expert says has been the main engine of growth of the American economy, and a that is free trade?

What Ms. Barshefsky has just done, in the negotiation of the telecom agreement, is a signal, an important and remarkable advance to the effort of free trade in allowing American companies and corporations into foreign markets so we can hire more

Americans and continue to have this remarkable growth in our economy and a bright future for Americans. The debate will be drawn, time after time, and has been, between protectionism, between the desire to raise those protectionist barriers, to go back to the good old days of Smoot-Hawley or whether we are going to move forward with free trade and reduce barriers.

I believe the American people and those people who are engaged in business, those who are in the business of doing business, will strongly support the position that the administration holds of free trade and reduction of barriers for competition.

I yield back to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent the period of morning business be extended until the hour of 1:30 and I be permitted to speak for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. Reserving the right to object, I am wondering whether I could reserve 8 minutes of that time, between now and 1:30, as part of the unanimous consent agreement?

Mr. DEWINE. I have no objection.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I wonder if my friend from Ohio will yield me just 1 minute of that time now while the Senator from North Dakota is on the floor, to react to his comments?

Mr. DEWINE. I will be more than happy to do that.

Let me just state the topic I want to talk about is going to take awhile. So I will be more than happy to yield. If you go on too long, I will simply come back later on. That will be fine.

Mr. LEVIN. I just ask if the Senator will yield 1 minute, and then I will yield the floor and come back for the remainder of my 8 minutes. But while Senator DORGAN is on the floor, I just wanted to comment for a few seconds. I just wanted to compliment Senator DORGAN for his comments. His speech is a free trade speech. We all have to listen carefully to what he said. That 50-percent tariff on American beef going to Tokyo—it is absurd that we tolerate it.

In NAFTA, we permit, for 25 years, Mexico making it a crime to sell an American used car in Mexico. That is part of NAFTA. NAFTA, for 10 years, restricts American-assembled automobiles from going into Mexico. So, what the Senator from North Dakota is pleading with us to do, is to insist that we have as much access for our manufactured goods and our agricultural products to other countries as they do to our country. I commend him on his remarks and I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator from Ohio yield 30 seconds to me?

Mr. DEWINE. I will be more than happy to.

Mr. DORGAN. I will not engage the remarks of the Senator except to say we should reserve the decision on this point. One can drive down a street and see a Cadillac in front of an expensive house, and if you do not understand the debt that will be used to repossess the house and the Cadillac, you don't understand the financial position there. The same with our country. The fact is, our abiding trade deficits are undermining our country's long-term economic future and we had better not decide to ignore them. We had better confront them on behalf of American producers and on behalf of this country's interests. This is a debate we must have soon.

I appreciate very much the indulgence of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized again.

DISASTERS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, let me start by expressing on this floor, as I did this past Monday, my sympathy for the families who have lost loved ones in the last week due to tornadoes, due to flooding and other natural disasters. This has been a very, very tough week. In my home State of Ohio, we are experiencing a flood of once in the last 30 or 40 years magnitude—we have not experienced anything like this since the 1960's. Not only is my home State of Ohio experiencing this, but, of course, Kentucky and Indiana is as well. Vice President GORE is, as I speak, in Ohio, having the opportunity to view firsthand the damage. We appreciate his visit. We welcome it.

We also appreciate the prompt action by President Clinton in designating 14 Ohio counties, to make them eligible for disaster assistance. Governor Voinovich has now made an additional request to the President to add two additional counties, Hamilton County, Cincinnati, as well as Clermont County. Both these counties have been hit exceedingly hard by the flooding. In fact, we have yet to see the high-water mark, which should not occur for a few more hours in Cincinnati and Clermont County, the Richland area—that part of our State.

We really have an area in Ohio from Monroe County, up river, all the way down to Hamilton County. What we have seen is what we always see during tragedies such as this. We see Americans responding. And, in the midst of the tragedy, the suffering, what we see is neighbors helping neighbors and people out there just making a difference. We have Red Cross volunteers. We have emergency department volunteers. We have fire department volunteers. The National Guard is actively involved. But most of all, we have people who are just volunteers, who are just out there making a difference, who do not necessarily belong to any group except they are Ohioans or Kentuckians or Hoosiers from Indiana, and they are out there making a difference in their

local communities. So let me pay tribute to them.

The work that we have at hand is going to continue. Once the spotlight of CNN and the network news goes off Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana and goes off the river communities, the work is going to have to continue. We will have to be hanging in there and doing what we can.

I appreciate the prompt response of FEMA and the Federal officials who were in Ohio yesterday, traveling with Lt. Gov. Nancy Hollister. I appreciate their prompt response and prompt recommendations to the President. I look forward to working with them, as well as working with the local communities, in the weeks and, frankly, months ahead.

We are seeing not only a tremendous amount of damage, in the millions of dollars, to homes, trailers, people having to be relocated, but we are also seeing an immense damage to the infrastructure of the southern part of the State of Ohio. I don't think any of us know what this is going to amount to. We won't know until the river goes back and things begin to get back to normal before we can assess the full damage. When you look at some of the counties in southern Ohio, there is not a one of them that has the capacity to respond, as far as dollars are concerned. This is something that cannot be budgeted. We, of course, will be looking forward to working with FEMA and other agencies to get assistance in there to those counties.

HAITI

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I had intended to come to the floor today and talk about Haiti, a long way from Ohio. I have had the opportunity to visit Haiti three times in the last 18 months. I have had the opportunity to meet with our Ambassador, to meet with President Preval in Haiti, to meet with our members of the Armed Forces that we still have in Haiti, doing an absolutely fantastic job. One of the nice things about having the opportunity to travel to other countries and to see what is going on is the opportunity to see U.S. troops and to see the tremendous job that they do. It is just one more inspiring thing a Member of Congress can do.

As I said, I intended to come to the floor today and talk about what I think is important in regard to Haiti. We have invested \$2 billion. We have risked U.S. servicemen's lives. We still have United States service men and women in Haiti. Haiti is our neighbor. What happens in Haiti will impact us. Haiti is not of strategic importance to the United States, but Haiti, because of geography, because of historical ties, will continue to have an impact on the United States.

If we want to search for examples to prove this theory, we don't have to think back too far in recent history when we had thousands of Haitian boat