

funds if the percentage of the federally impacted population for the whole district is less than 50 percent. That is, obviously, a standard that is much too high.

The bill introduced by me and Senator HAGEL will decrease the district minimum to 25 percent. That will affect a lot of schools in this district.

I have a chart that shows how many States would be affected by changing the eligibility standard from 50 percent to 25 percent. You can see that virtually every State in the Nation would be affected, which means every State gets a little bit, if it is enacted at the \$43 million increase from the current \$7 to \$50 million.

This is obviously a problem in our State. It is obviously a problem in other heavy Federal impact aid States, such as Nebraska, Senator HAGEL's State. But this isn't a parochial problem. This isn't a partisan problem. This is a national problem.

I ask that we step up to the plate, exercise our responsibility and, when we take up the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, make this change so that a needy portion of our school population gets a modicum of assistance. Then after that, I hope we can go further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

#### AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT—Continued

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the trade legislation package which constitutes the manager's amendment to H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act. This trade legislation will provide economic opportunity to millions of people in the United States and throughout the world.

Under this package, African and Caribbean nations will be able to use trade as a tool to spur economic development where foreign aid and other means clearly have not worked. Stronger economies in these two regions of the world will, in turn, lead to bigger markets for U.S. exports, and consequently more and better paying jobs for American workers.

On the issue of open foreign markets for U.S. products, I would like to express my support for an amendment on carousel retaliation being offered by my colleague from Ohio, Senator DEWINE. If the newly formed World Trade Organization and the promise of a rules-based system of international trade is to survive, then we cannot—and should not—tolerate flagrant disregard for internationally agreed trading rules by other WTO members such as the European Union. We need to use the tools that are now available to us to ensure that our trading partners comply with WTO decisions. And it's important to those of us who believe in free trade that the U.S. Trade Representative and the Department of Commerce use all the tools available to

them to guarantee that we have fair trade. Too often we have amendments like Senator DEWINE's amendment—which I have co-sponsored—because the U.S. trade representative has not been as aggressive as they should be and they do not use the tools they have been given by Congress.

This is very important, because trade is the economic lifeblood of the United States. Twelve million American jobs depend directly on exports. And exports are a major reason why our economy continues to do so well. In fact, one-third of our economic growth since 1992 can be attributed directly to exports.

Ohio is a textbook example of why international trade is good for America. When I was Governor, I had four goals in the area of economic development—agribusiness, science and technology, tourism and international trade. We pursued each of these aggressively in order to maximize Ohio's business potential, especially in the trade arena.

For example, Ohio has outperformed the nation in terms of the growth of exports to our NAFTA trading partners. Since 1993, U.S. exports to Canada have grown 54 percent and U.S. exports to Mexico have grown 90 percent, while Ohio exports to Canada have grown 64 percent and Ohio exports to Mexico have grown 101 percent.

Thanks in part to such trade-liberalizing agreements as NAFTA and the Uruguay Round of GATT, overall Ohio exports have risen 103 percent in just the last decade.

And because export-related jobs tend to require higher-skilled workers and provide higher-paying salaries, when America's exports of goods and services increase, so do the number and quality of American jobs. Just in Ohio, the increase in exports has created 182,000 jobs over the past ten years. And these export-related jobs tend to pay, on average, 15% more than a typical private sector job.

Eliminating trade barriers has not only helped Ohio companies sell more overseas, but it has also allowed more foreign companies to invest in Ohio, creating more, good paying jobs for Ohioans. According to Site Selection magazine, from 1991–1997, Ohio had more growth in non-U.S. owned firms than any other state—some 300 new manufacturing facilities and plant expansions took place during that time.

In addition to creating more, better-paying jobs, trade openness has an enormous impact on the earnings for average Americans who invest in companies that increase their international trade presence. These earnings help increase the amount of money people have to reinvest in the growth of our economy or to invest in their savings, retirement and education funds.

This chart lists 35 of the biggest U.S. corporations as measured in market value. None of these companies is majority-owned by a family or individual.

In other words, they are all in the stock market. For 25 of these 35 companies, trade makes up more than one-third of their global operations, and for 12 of these companies, international trade accounts for more than half of global sales or revenues—including Cincinnati-based Procter and Gamble, which can attribute about 51 percent of its global sales to international operations. Thus, in the case of Procter and Gamble, there is a genuine interest on the part of thousands of employees, and even more thousands of individual shareholders, in the ability to expand internationally.

In my State of Ohio, there are many more companies that understand that robust two-way trade is the key to creating more jobs and increased investment. These are companies like—Cincinnati Milacron, Federated, American Electric Power, The Limited, Inc. and Intimate Brands, TRW Inc., Chiquita Brands, The Andersons, Battelle, ElectraForm, General Electric Jet Engines, Lincoln Electric, NCR, R.G. Barry Corporation and hundreds of other small businesses, many of which traveled with me when I was governor, on nine trade missions around the world.

In Ohio and across America, the future of companies like these is a crucial link to the vitality of our communities because of the jobs they support and their contribution to the local tax base. In addition, these companies provide philanthropic support to local hospitals, schools and colleges and universities as well as countless charities and institutions.

The support these companies provide is linked directly to the overall quality of life in many of our communities. For example, Atlanta would be a much different city without the civic and charitable contributions of a company like Coca-Cola. Companies like Coca-Cola—their workers, their stockholders—know that 95% of their potential customers for their products live outside the United States, and that's why trade expansion is so fundamental to the economic future of all Americans.

Many of my colleagues may ask why the average American should care about the importance of trade and the expansion of markets overseas. The reason they should care is because it's average Americans who are the stakeholders—the millions upon millions of individual investors.

Indeed, according to a survey in this past Sunday's Washington Post, nearly half of all Americans are invested in the stock market. Twenty-two million American households, or roughly 22%, are invested in corporate America through employer-sponsored retirement plans. And those Americans referred to as "Generation X"—individuals in their 20s—reportedly hold 80 percent of their assets in stocks. Baby boomers, who own about half of all outstanding stock, have about 57 percent of their assets in equities.

As these figures show, international trade does matter to the average American. The economic stimulus sparked through increased international trade and investment allows millions of Americans to plan for their children's college education, for retirement nest eggs and for long-term financial security.

While the passage of this legislation is important to the economic future of America's workers and citizen stockholders, it will also provide a lasting impact on the economic and political development of our African and Central American trading partners—an impact that is sure to fulfill our hopes for world peace and prosperity.

With respect to increased U.S. trade and investment in the nations of Africa and the Caribbean, it is far better to stimulate the economies of the nations of these two regions than to simply offer these nations foreign aid year after year. Increasing investment and trade opportunities in these regions means that more people can work and raise their own standard of living.

It's like the old adage "give a man a fish, and he eats for a day. Teach a man to fish, and he will eat for a lifetime."

International trade not only allows nations to become productive members of the world community, but it is probably the best way to ensure international stability.

In fact, back in 1994, U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali visited Columbus, Ohio and I said to him that "nations that trade together, stay together and help sustain world peace."

Promoting peace and prosperity through trade was one of the aspects I pursued on each of my nine foreign trade missions when I was Governor of Ohio, including trips to India, Thailand, Chile, Hungary and China.

Unfortunately, that particular aspect of international trade is too often ignored. We ignore the impact of international trade on stability and peace in the world.

What amazes me, Mr. President, is that so many so called protectionists lament about deplorable conditions in the world's poor nations, and this Nation, the United States of America, doesn't respond to the needs of people in Africa and other parts of the world. Yet it is these protectionists who are content to criticize free trade proponents for wanting to take down trade barriers, invest in poorer nations, and provide the tools for economic growth, jobs, and self-reliance in those countries. There is no way the U.S. Government can provide the billions of dollars needed for these countries to develop and raise the standard of living for their people. It can only be done through private investment. The leaders of 47 African nations know this fact, and that is why they want us to support this trade measure.

As Senator BREAUX pointed out earlier today, international trade also

contributes to the political stability of the countries in the world. Think about what has happened in South America since we opened up our economic relationships with them over the last number of years.

This trade legislation will help drive an economic expansion in Africa, as well as for our neighbors in the Caribbean and Central America. In addition, it will provide for the future of an energetic, export-driven American economy. It will sustain and create good-paying, high-quality jobs in Ohio and across America and allow millions of Americans to save and invest for their children's education and their retirement security. This legislative package stands on its own merits. It was unanimously reported out of the committee, and I really believe it deserves the support of our colleagues.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I came momentarily to the floor to hear my distinguished colleague from Louisiana try to justify that Bill Farley article in Time magazine, which I referred to earlier. His justification, of course, was not the matter of campaign finance reform, which is the major thrust of the article; interestingly, the thrust that, look, we ought to be getting rid of these jobs, says that these textile workers now can go to the high-skilled, better-paying jobs, and that is the future of America.

Let me go right to the other comment made by my distinguished colleague from New York, who joined with it, about trade adjustment assistance, and what a wonderful program it is. Thirty-seven years ago, as he said, as Dean Acheson would say, he was at the table. He is right. He had a distinguished career of service there as the Assistant Secretary of Labor negotiating the trade adjustment assistance agreement. Everybody will agree with that.

But 38 years ago, I was at the table, and I was at the table for the seven-point textile program of President Kennedy. It was a very interesting exercise because what we had found out was that they were really about to do away with the industry, we thought, when it included some 10-percent import penetration. I had come up to testify before the old International Trade Commission, and testifying before that International Trade Commission, we thought we had made a good impression.

At that particular time, 38 years ago, we were confronted with Tom Dewey, who was then representing the Japanese. He chased me all around the hearing room, and my friend, Charlie Daniel, at that time an outstanding contractor/builder/civic leader, says: Now, Governor, let's go by and see the chief. That was President Eisenhower. We called on Wilton B. Parsons, and Jerry Parsons ushered us in and President Eisenhower said: Don't worry, you will win that case.

In June, the International Trade Commission ruled against us. At that particular time, we realized we were totally lost unless we could get involved in the campaign, which wasn't too difficult because then-Senator John F. Kennedy from Massachusetts understood very clearly the importance of the textile jobs.

I am going right back to the Senator from Louisiana saying the future of the country is to get rid of these jobs. I am laying the groundwork of the historical record about the importance and the significance of these jobs.

The case was in talking to then-Senator Kennedy. We met with him. And my friend, Mr. Feldman, was his legislative assistant. We obtained a letter on August 30, 1960. You can imagine, this was in the heat of the 1960 campaign between Kennedy and Nixon.

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

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, August 30, 1960.

Hon. ERNEST HOLLINGS,

Governor of the State of South Carolina, State Capitol Building, Columbia, SC.

DEAR GOVERNOR HOLLINGS: I would, of course, be delighted to discuss with you and with textile industry leaders the problems of the textile industry and the development of constructive methods for showing the growth and prosperity of the industry in the future. The critical import situation that confronts the textile industry which you so eloquently describe in your letter is one with which I am familiar. My own State of Massachusetts has suffered and is suffering from the same conditions. The past few years have been particularly difficult for this industry. There seems to have been a basic unwillingness to meet the problem and deal constructively with it. During the first six months of this year imports of cotton cloth are twice what they were during the same period in 1959, the highest year on record. Similarly alarming increases are occurring on other textile and apparel products. Since 1958 imports have exceeded exports by constantly increasing margins. There are now 400,000 less jobs in the industry than there were 10 years ago. It is no longer possible to depend upon makeshift policies and piecemeal remedies to solve the problems which the industry faces.

As you know, I supported the establishment of the Special Senate Sub-committee for the Textile Industry, under the chairmanship of Senator Pastore, of which Senator Strom Thurmond is a member. In an effort to help develop suggestions to improve the competitive position of the industry in the United States and world markets, this Subcommittee for the first time undertook a broad investigation of the problems of the United States textile industry and offered a number of constructive recommendations. With only minor exceptions, the Eisenhower Administration has failed to implement these recommendations.

I agree with the conclusions of the Pastore Committee that sweeping changes in our foreign trade policies are not necessary. Nevertheless, we must recognize that the textile and apparel industries are of international scope and are peculiarly susceptible to competitive pressure from imports. Clearly the problems of the industry will not disappear

by neglect nor can we wait for large scale unemployment and shutdown of the industry to inspire us to action. A comprehensive industry-wide remedy is necessary.

The outline of such a remedy can be found in the Report of the Pastore Committee. Imports of textile products, including apparel, should be within limits which will not endanger our own existing textile capacity and employment, and which will permit growth of the industry in reasonable relationship to the expansion of our over-all economy.

We are pledged in the Democratic Platform to combat sub-standard wages abroad through the development of international fair labor standards. Effort along this line is of special importance to the United States textile industry.

The office of the Presidency carries with it the authority and influence to explore and work out solutions within the framework of our foreign trade policies for the problems peculiar to our textile and apparel industry. Because of the broad ramifications of any action and because of the necessity of approaching a solution in terms of total needs of the textile industry, this is a responsibility which only the President can adequately discharge. I can assure you that the next Democratic Administration will regard this as a high priority objective.

Additionally, we shall make vigorous use of the procedures provided by Congress such as Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Escape Clause in accordance with the intention of Congress in enacting these laws.

Lastly, I assure you that should further authority be necessary to enable the President to carry out these objectives, I shall request such authorization from the Congress.

I hope that these thoughts are helpful to you in your own deliberations and I reaffirm my interest in discussing problems of mutual concern with you.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, in the letter he said he supported the special Senate subcommittee of the textile industry under the chairmanship of Senator Pastore. He said he agreed with the conclusions of the Pastore committee that sweeping changes in our Federal trade policy were not necessary:

Nevertheless, we must recognize that the textile and apparel industries are international in scope and peculiarly susceptible to competitive pressure from imports. The problems of the industry will not disappear by neglect, nor can we wait for a large-scale unemployment and shutdown to inspire us to action. So a comprehensive industrywide remedy is necessary.

They had a national security provision in the law at that particular time. Before then-Senator Kennedy and later-President Kennedy could actually implement any kind of comprehensive industrywide remedy, he had to have a finding that the industry was important to our national security.

We brought the witnesses. It was a Cabinet committee that was formed for the witnesses to attest to. It was Secretary Dean Rusk of the Department of State, Secretary McNamara with the Department of Defense, Secretary of Commerce Hodges, Secretary of Labor Goldberg, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, with whom I served as Governor.

They had the hearings, and they concluded at the close of those hearings that next to steel, textiles was the second most important to our national security. In a line, you needed steel in order to make the weapons of war and the tools of agriculture. Therein lies the steel problem, because that is the World Bank singsong. They run the world around telling these emerging Third World countries that they cannot become a nation state until at first they obtain a strong manufacturing sector, particularly in steel.

That is why, incidentally, you have the dumping. We have an overproduction in the world of steel. They are dumping here in the United States at less than cost. We have had the hearings, and they voted on the House side. We tried to get a vote on this side and get the bill passed for action by the White House itself.

But back to the second most important industry that I would like the Senator from Louisiana to remember, because I remember when he had a substantial investment by Fruit of the Loom down there in Louisiana before it left, and now it looks as if it has all gone to the Cayman Islands. But you couldn't send them to war in a Japanese uniform. This is back in 1960. Today, you might say a Chinese uniform, because the Chinese have gone just 8 years ago from a \$5 billion deficit in the balance of trade to a \$55 billion deficit in the balance of trade, mostly in textiles and clothing.

So we have to go to conflict with our friends in the People's Republic. We have to call up Beijing and say: Wait a minute. Before we have this standoff, please send us some uniforms because we have to be prepared in order to go to battle. We can't go in Chinese uniforms. We have to be able to distinguish the troops.

As a result of that finding, then-President Kennedy, on April 24, 1961, promulgated his seven-point program.

He did all of the things that dealt with that and followed on into the Kennedy Round, as the distinguished Senator from New York has pointed out, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act, one-price cotton, and reciprocity, which stabilized the industry for several years ongoing until really the 1970s, and then, of course, the 1980s and early 1990s with all the vetoes by President Reagan and President Bush. There has just been a deluge. With President Clinton, the deluge turned into a waterfall more or less with NAFTA.

For those who say that these things, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio said, are going to create millions of jobs in the United States and the world around, let us be accurate. It will create millions of jobs in the world around. It is going to create millions of "jobless." We have lost over 1 million manufacturing jobs since NAFTA here in the United States. There are 420,000 textile jobs lost all over the country, 31,700 in the State of South Carolina alone.

There is no education in the second kick of a mule.

What we have on foot is another NAFTA without the advantages. At least in NAFTA, we had the side agreements on labor rights. At least in NAFTA, we had the side agreements on the environment. At least in NAFTA, we had reciprocity.

Now this one-way street down to the Caribbean and over to the Sahara is totally out of the whole cloth. It will start a deluge. We know about the Chinese and their influence in the sub-Saharan.

I will never forget, 5 years ago we had a resolution brought up about human rights. They had voted in the assembly to have hearings on human rights in the People's Republic of China. The Chinese representatives went down into Africa where they have some influence. I was there 25 years ago. They were building the railroad from inner Zaire, the old-time Belgian Congo, out to the coast. They had their work crews all over, their minions all over. They have influence, and it was proved at that time because they changed the vote. They never had that hearing that the United Nations wanted to have on human rights in the People's Republic.

We know, looking at Matsui, the shirts coming through at this moment from Matsui. There is not a shirt factory there. They have been inundating the American market.

We go to Customs. They say: Senator, they have been inundating the market, but we restrict it. Customs agents ask if we want to stop drugs or stop textiles. Of course, the obvious answer is, heavens, stop the drugs. They say: Until you get the other agents, that is about all we can try to keep up with.

The Customs Department has estimated \$5 billion already in transshipments, illegal entry of textile goods in the United States, as we speak. We know the sub-Saharan is not going to benefit by it at all with respect to the jobs. It is going to be similar to our minority business enterprise section in the Department of Commerce. They immediately got minority, a black front; then they got the white money and the folks behind it. And with the front, they make a lot of money and get the set-aside contracts through hard experience in Mexico.

I refer particularly to the fabric manufacturers down there. The Senator from Louisiana says we ought to be getting rid of the industry. We ought to remember we are going to get something we didn't have before; namely, with all the cotton goods and everything else we are sending, our fabric and the apparel, shirts for example, will come back with American-made fabric. That is what can come back free of duty, free of restriction. But so can the Chinese-made fabrics. So can the Taiwanese. So can the Korean.

All one needs to do is cross the border at Tijuana in lower California into

Mexico and one will think they are in Seoul, Korea. They are not at all bashful about investing there.

The Fabric Resource List of Mexico, appearing in Davison's blue book, I refer to pages 345 to 358 under Fabric Resource List.

Mr. President, we can see the opportunity and to whom it is being given. Very interestingly, the commitment when we passed NAFTA, from the individuals at the time that the ATMI came in, they say they are not going to take their plants down there.

I refer to an article in the Capital City's Media, back in 1993. The lead article and lead sentence of the article entitled 'Hell No, We Won't Go':

That was the battle cry Monday by the directors of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, who in a last-ditch effort to solidify congressional support for NAFTA, pledged not to move any jobs to Mexico if the act was passed. The ATMI board, made up of firms representing every facet of the textile industry, voted 37-6 in favor of the resolution which said companies would not move jobs, plants or facilities from the United States to Mexico as a result of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Just in the past year Dan River built an integrated apparel manufacturing plant in Mexico. Another U.S. corporation, Tarrant Apparel purchased a denim mill in Pueblo, Mexico; DuPont and Alpek built a plant in Altimira, Mexico, and formed a joint venture with Teijin; Guilford and Cone Mills created a Mexican industrial park known as Textile City; and Burlington Industries is to build a new Mexican plant to produce wool products.

It reminds me of John Mitchell, the former Attorney General. He said: Watch what we do, not what we say.

Now we know what they do. They go down into Mexico and they invest very heavily. Our friend from Louisiana says the jobs are not important and they moved to higher skilled jobs. I know we have restrictions on the importation of cotton because he says: Look at the cotton. They have quota programs and they have payments they receive for the use of U.S. cotton. That goes back to the One Price Cotton Program we got way back under President Kennedy.

The statement made by the Senator from Louisiana is that we are going to get something that we didn't have. The Caribbean and sub-Sahara are going to get something they didn't have. We are going to lose. Yes, we have protection for American cotton producers and they are buying from American cotton producers. But if you go down into Mexico and the plants all go down there, they don't have to worry about coming back in with respect to American-made fabric because they can go ahead and produce it and bring it back in any way. We are going to be losing that business. Last fall, they had section 807 and 809 and everything else the companies themselves approved. That is not productive at all because they are moving down there. That is why they are moving the fabric plants. And

there are no restrictions on those under the NAFTA agreement.

With respect to the export nature of the job, there is a book written by our friend, Eamonn Fingleton. He wrote the book some 10 years ago entitled "Blind Side." He pointed out at that particular time that the little country of 125 million Japanese was outproducing the 260 million productive Americans. In manufacturing today, Japan still outproduces us. They were talking about the growth of the economy because they know how to build up an economy.

Who predicted by the year 2000 the GNP, or gross domestic product, of Japan would exceed that of the richest United States of America? They still could reach it in spite of the turndown of the banking industry and otherwise. They haven't yielded one bit on market share this past year in spite of the turndown in the Japanese economy, the automobile industry. The Japanese automobile industry has taken over again a larger share of the American market. They continue to do so and they continue to invest here, as we know, because we have the Japanese plants in my State of South Carolina.

We continue to weaken what President Kennedy and others knew was necessary to build a strong economy, as if resting on a three-legged stool. One leg is our values; that is unquestioned. The second leg is the military strength, which is unquestioned—the remaining superpower. The third leg, economics, having been fractured in the last 10 years. We have gone from 26 percent of our workforce and manufacturing is down to 13 percent. We are losing and hollowing out the industrial center, the middle class of America. I do not have the ratings of the particular jobs they have at Amazon, but I have a good idea of it. I do not believe they are paying as much at Amazon and these other industries as they are in textiles. The average textile wage in the United States is around \$8.37 an hour. The needle trades, Senator BREAX pointed out, in Kentucky, Fruit of the Loom eliminated more than 7,000 jobs in the past 6 years. Here, "Would-be workers attend a job fair held by the new arrival, Amazon."

You do not stand in line to get a job at Microsoft. They have 22,000. You stand at the bank or you stand at the country club. You have to not only have the high intellect, but you have to have the connections. Anybody who is lucky enough to get a job at Microsoft, they ought to go say their prayers at night and thank heavens because it is wonderful. Every one of those 22,000 are millionaires.

That is not the jobs we are talking about, those superduper jobs. We are talking about the 250,000 working at General Motors. We are talking about the 1.6 million still left, maybe 2 million—I can't get the exact figure—of textile jobs left in America. These jobs are important to our national economy. They not only have a national se-

curity portion of being able to produce the garments and the uniforms but more particularly to maintain middle America. That is where it is so important. I am going to get the exact pay scale there. I know PSC Corporation, in my own capital city of Columbia, SC, has already shipped out some 500 jobs to India. I forget the exact name of the town. But they can start up the computers in India and get the information back there, and they tell me my light bill is being processed over in India for me right now. That is the trend, the global competition. That is the global development. That is the reality. How do we confront it? Do we maintain a strong manufacturing sector and strengthen that economic leg to our national security?

Go right back to Alexander Hamilton in the earliest days. In the earliest days, you had that doctrine of market forces, comparative advantage, and David Ricardo. That is what they said, Adam Smith—you go ahead, the little fledgling colony that now had won its independence, you produce best what you can and ship it back to the mother country and the mother country in turn will produce and ship back what we can produce best—the doctrine of comparative advantage.

Alexander Hamilton said, "No way." He wrote the book, "Reports On Manufactures." In that particular book he told the Brits to bug off. He said: We are not going to remain your colony.

As a result, the second bill that ever passed this national Congress, in which we stand this afternoon—the first being the U.S. seal—the second bill on July 4, 1789, was a tariff bill, protectionism of a 50-percent tariff on 60 different articles, including our iron and textiles and other things we were beginning to build up—our manufacturing capacity.

Now we hear, to my amazement, the cry on the floor of the Senate: Get rid of it. We are going to become a service economy. We are going to have nothing but software. We are going to have millionaires and country clubs and bread lines and that is going to be America. They had that right after World War II. They told the Brits: Don't worry. Instead of a nation of brawn, we are going to be a nation of brains. Instead of producing products, we will provide services. Instead of creating wealth, we are going to handle it, become a financial center.

The mother country has gone to hell in an economic handbasket. London is nothing more than an amusement park. They do have the two levels of society and they put it on every night on educational TV, public television: "Upstairs Downstairs." Everybody grins and smiles and says: Oh, those were wonderful days. We can all be maids and servants in the kitchen or we can be plantation owners. That is where we are headed. That is where we are headed with this cry of "free trade, free trade," that is enunciated by everybody who does not have an interest in the future of the United States.

That “everybody” includes the banks. They first financed these companies, these multinationals, under the Marshall Plan that we sent overseas. Then the think tanks and consultants, then the lawyers, then the retailers. “You can get a cheaper product,” and everything else of that kind. Then the consumer groups and what have you. So they all come in and say “free trade, free trade,” until you get to intellectual property and “Oh, no, wait a minute. We have to have trademarks; we have to have copyright; we have to have protectionism.”

They are for protectionism. Jack Valenti in the movies, he will run over here and knock down the desks and everything else. Wait a minute, Hollywood is the biggest protectionist center in the world; protectionism, as they spew out their violence. They killed our TV violence bill momentarily. We keep coming back and we will bring it back again. But I can tell you here and now they want protectionism for the banks, for the insurance companies, for the rich, for the software people but nothing for the sweat of the brow. That is what gets me, when the Senator from Louisiana says now what we need to do is go get a high-skilled, better paying job. That is the future of America.

There is a different future. I hate to disabuse his mind on that particular score. There is a book written about this. As Fingleton points out now in his more recent book, “In Praise of Hard Industries,” he takes down, chapter and verse: With respect to exports, there is no contribution whatsoever. It is almost negligible. The idea of the software and the high-tech industry—in fact, it was going broke itself in semiconductors until, what did we do? We gave them aid. We put in Sematech and we put in voluntary restraint agreements—give President Reagan credit for that—to save that particular industry, or you would not be seeing any Intel on that stock market, going up yesterday. The Government gave it a chance to survive. That is all the textile industry is asking this afternoon is for a chance to survive.

Two-thirds of the clothing I am looking at is imported. Do we want to send the rest of it down there? We have shown all the fabric plants they can manufacture if they go down there, and they will go. Do they want to do that for the sub-Saharan, not having any side agreements or understanding about labor rules, not having an understanding about the environment, not having any reciprocity?

Let me get to the restrictions. This industry is terribly restricted. They should understand it right now. That is, I hold in my hand “Foreign Regulations Affecting U.S. Textile and Apparel Exports.” That was, a few years ago, in one book. Now they put it out in different, separate items with respect just to the United States, and they do not put it in a book because they think we were the only ones who

had any restrictions whatsoever. But can’t we do away with the restrictions, not only on the textile industry but the restrictions that they have with respect to the Caribbean Basin Initiative? I have the various products.

Mr. President, knit fabrics, Rwanda. Of course, 100 percent on knit fabrics, 100 percent on apparel. Mali, we have restrictions there. You can turn to the restrictions with the other countries: Gabon, 30 percent on apparel compared to our 10 percent in the United States; Ethiopia, 80 percent compared to our 10 percent. We have already given them the advantage by far.

My hangup is, we have given the advantage to the Koreans, the People’s Republic of China, the Taiwanese, the Japanese, the Malaysians. They have the investments in these countries, and they will have a few jobs to give out, but they will literally take the remaining one-third of the American market and put out of business a wonderful basic industry important to our national security.

I say “a wonderful” because I watched in the early days when they got the dust and lint in their faces and hair. That is why they called them lint heads. That is not the case anymore. There is no one in the card room. It is mechanically, electronically controlled. In the weave room, where they had 125 people, there are fewer than 15 now. They have modern machinery.

The main point is it has afforded jobs for minorities and for women. You hardly found women in the fabric or textile plants; you found them in sewing. Now they represent over 50 percent of employees. It is a good paying job. If the husband has a job and if a woman can make \$8.30 an hour, that can help put the boys through Clemson University. That is what they are doing in my backyard in South Carolina.

They have invested, on average, \$2 billion a year for some 15 years. But now they look at this measure—which is really foreign aid, a giveaway to make a record to build a library for the President and for the idle rich over on the other side of the aisle who believe in money and market and not the country itself. They will give anything away. All they want now, like their software crowd after we started the Internet, after we gave them the education at Stanford, after all the other protections, now they want to do away with the estate tax, do away with the capital gains tax, do away with the immigration laws; let them all come in so we can get them even cheaper labor; let’s do away with State tort laws, Y2K; let’s just do away with the Government. That is the crowd over on the other side of the aisle. I take the floor because that is where we are headed. This industry is watching closely because they do not want to be in a position of not getting their money back.

We have these wonderful textile shows—the machinery boys come from all over the world—in Greenville, SC, at the center. They want to stay ahead

of the curve, and they want to be productive, and they are productive, and they do compete. I categorically claim the U.S. textile industry is the most productive in the entire world, bar none. But they cannot afford to remain productive with this initiative because they will not get their money back.

They know the transshipments. They know how the Chinese built these parks in Vietnam. That is why you find the Burlingtons and the Cone Mills and the Guilfords all going down there because they want to stay in business and they have to make money. So they have to break their pledge not to move plants, not to move jobs, and they all are headed down there.

I do not know who is going to be able to hold on in the United States if this measure passes. The ATMI—that crowd is defunct, I can tell you that. I can say that advisedly because I have gotten every award they give. Otherwise, the AAMA, the American Apparel Manufacturers Association—and a man by the name of Larry Martin, a wonderful individual, with whom I have worked for the enactment of textile bills over the last 30 years—ought to be renamed the Central American Apparel Manufacturers. They do not have U.S. apparel manufacturers.

It is just like our friend from the Cayman Islands. It is gone. Fruit of the Loom, Sara Lee, Limited—“The fruit of its labor, the politics of underwear.” That is the particular article that came out. They are ready to go. They are now in the Cayman Islands. And I will ask Janet Reno to look into this: I say to the Senator from North Dakota—they are talking about Chinese contributions. I am wondering about these Cayman Islands contributions. I don’t think George W. knows, but he already has \$400,000 from Bill Farley and Fruit of the Loom, according to this article. They are down in the Caymans.

Don’t give me this cheese board they have up here, how wonderful this is and everybody but HOLLINGS is for the measure. Why do you think they could not get the black caucus over there or why couldn’t they get JESSE JACKSON, Jr., for this bill? Why not go for the Jackson bill? That is what he was for, not for this particular measure. Why did the black ministers in Boston march on the industries? Because they are not taken over with the bum’s rush of that corporate business banking crowd that wants to make an even bigger profit.

Former Secretary of Labor, little Bobby Reich, put out a book. I wish you all would read that book. On page 179, you will find out the Fortune 500 has not created a new job in the United States of America in the last 10 years. That book is about 6 or 7 years old, but is still on point, and will be for sometime to come. They are not creating the jobs. They are firing everybody. The companies I am referring to are all listed on the charts. They are getting

rid of the jobs and getting rid of the industry. That is what we have in the balance this afternoon.

I emphasize that it is one way, and it is not NAFTA and the nice plea that it has worked so well down in Mexico so let's extend it to sub-Saharan, let's extend it to Central America. We are not, if I have anything to do with it, going to pass this Kathie Lee sweatshop measure. It has not worked in El Salvador.

The Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN, wanted to put a child labor amendment on this measure. Of course, now that they have filled up the tree and have given fast track to this measure, we cannot offer an amendment for labor rights, for the environment, for reciprocity. We are going the way of Mexico.

Let me momentarily hold up with one observation about NAFTA because the claim was made at that time in the debate that they would create 200,000 jobs. It has not created new jobs. We have lost 420,000 textile jobs. They said we are going to have better wage rates. Actually, the take-home wage of the country we were trying to help, Mexico, is less in 1999 than in 1994 and 1995 when we passed NAFTA.

Then they said it was going to help the immigration problem because they are going to have so many jobs. The immigration problem has worsened.

I know better than any. I handle the immigration appropriation. We have a school for the Border Patrol agents. We have literally graduated thousands of Border Patrol Spanish-speaking agents for the Border Patrol down in my hometown. And the immigration problem is, again, even worse. Ask the Senators from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN and Mrs. BOXER.

And then drugs. Oh, yeah, we were going to solve the drug problem. That has gotten worse.

So NAFTA is not a good example of a positive experience with a trade agreement. It is like they keep talking about deregulation of the airlines. I could go on for 2 or 3 hours about that one. We are in an FAA authorization bill now.

We used to come specifically with the town, the mayor, the tax base, build the airport, get the facilities, go out and get Captain Rickenbacker and Eastern Airlines, and come to the CAB and get the rights; and it was a working deal. You got good service. The community controlled the so-called slots, and everything else of that kind. It worked.

But they got this urge to deregulate, deregulate, and we have now come full swing, full circle. The regulated are buying up the deregulated. You don't get the service. You have all kinds of costs.

I bought a ticket a few weeks ago for my wife. The day before we did not think the plane was going to fly on account of Hurricane Floyd. We found out it was, so we bought the ticket. It was \$748, round trip, from Washington,

DC, to Charleston, SC, and back—\$748 dollars. I will show you the ticket.

So don't talk about the improvements, and everything else like that, with either deregulation or this singing the money crowd puts on with respect to NAFTA and how well it has worked and how everybody is for it.

Everybody is not for this. Those who are looking and have studied and worked in the trade field realize we are going the way of England and that we just can't afford it any longer. I almost say we, more or less, have given away the store, as they say, in the community chest. As they said to me back in those Governor days: Governor, what do you expect them to make? The airplanes and the computers? Let them make the shoes. Let them make the clothing. And we will make the airplanes and the computers.

My problem is they are making the shoes, they are making the clothing, they are making the airplanes, they are making the computers. That Boeing crowd from Washington is beginning to sober up because their bus is being dumped. Ask these airlines whether they are buying Boeing or Lockheed. No, no, no. They are being dumped on account of the price and financing, and everything else of that kind. And the competition is government; and the policy is set by that government.

Senators say look before you open up Conrad Manufacturing. You have to have a minimum wage, clean air, clean water, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, safe working place, safe machinery, plant closing notice, parental leave—I could keep going on and on. They can go down to Mexico now for 58 cents an hour, and there is none of that.

So what is happening in the job policy where you can save as much as 20 percent on your manufacturing cost, which is 30 percent of volume? If you move your manufacturing to a low-wage country, and just keep your executive office and your sales force, and you have \$500 million in sales, saving 20 percent moving to that low-wage country, before taxes you can make \$100 million. Or you know what, you can continue to work your own people and go bankrupt.

That is the job policy of the national Congress. That is the job policy we are discussing this afternoon on the floor of the Senate. That is what we are talking about: How can we say this is for the people, how we say this is going to create jobs, knowing full well it is going to result in a loss of jobs.

That is why the labor people, and that is why so many African Americans, that is why all are beginning to get stirred. That is what makes Pat Buchanan make sense until lately when he began to talk that nonsense about Hitler. That is the worse thing that ever happened to this particular debate because he was talking sense at the time before he wrote his silly book about Hitler and all these other things.

But he is talking about the passing army. That is labor in America. They realize they are hearing all this pretty talk from Washington and how we are going to do this and how we got to go do that—global economy, global competition, and everything else of that kind—and they keep losing out.

They are wondering what is happening when the Republicans and Democrats say the same thing. And so Buchanan comes out, and was the best voice we had in a national sense. I have been talking trade while that boy was in Gonzaga. Is that the name of the high school around here, Gonzaga High School? Gonzaga High School—I was working on this when he was at Gonzaga High School beating up everybody. I know him and like him. I get along with him very well. But he has poisoned the well on this particular score because he loses credibility on the most important issue next to the budget. The second most important is the economy and trying to maintain middle America.

And they tell me—the Senator from Louisiana—all they have to do is get in line and go to Amazon. The fact is that those jobs are not paying as much. These retail jobs just do not provide the same pay. In fact, they make them independent contractors to avoid paying their health costs and everything else.

In fact, take the example—and I will sit down and yield to my colleagues because I have plenty more to cover—with respect to Oneida knitting mills down in Andrews, SC, they had to close the first of the year. We bought them less than 35 years ago, a fine little plant. They had 487 employees, with the average age of 47 years old.

Tell them to get retrained and get skilled tomorrow morning—Washington's approach and the approach of the Senator from Louisiana—get that skill as a computer operator and go apply to Amazon as a 47-year-old. Do you think Amazon is going to employ the 47-year-old or the 21-year-old computer operator? They are sidelined, deadlined. They are out.

This is the issue they ought to be debating in this Presidential race. But since the pollsters are all on education, education, education, and the Governors, education, education, the size of the class, more this, more that, re-educate, reteach, everything else like that, they are not talking about the real problem that we at the Washington level are talking about.

On education, the federal government only spends 7 cents on the dollar; the other 93 cents comes from the local level. So we are not going to do much on that. But here, when we can do something, we are doing the wrong thing and going in the wrong direction.

They put up these cheese boards around how the Citicorp and that rich crowd is all for it. All they are doing is trying to make money. They are not trying to create jobs.

Read Bobby Reich's book. He's right, the Fortune 500 are not creating jobs at

all. We supposedly are trying to, but at the same time we are canceling out these efforts with this job policy.

We have to phase out right now the Multifiber Arrangement. We are going into the fifth year of it. The real hard part is going to be hitting. I can tell you right now, after this election in November 2000, the next President who is going to come on is going to have some real problems. And, Senator, you and I, hopefully, if the Lord is willing, will be here. And we ought to be doing something about it now.

We certainly ought not to be taking this bum's rush that comes out of the Finance Committee. Because that is what they do to me every time. That is what they did on NAFTA. That is what they did on GATT. They wait until the last 10 days of a particular session. Then they come out and they grease it and they give it fast track. They file it. They put in two amendments. They fill up the tree. They file cloture. And say: Ha, ha, ha, we are going off to the party. Struggle as you will. But we have it fast tracked. And this is going to pass whether you like it or not.

We have to get out here and get at least some amendments with respect to the labor and environmental rights, with respect to the reciprocity. I hope we will look closely at what has happened here.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the 1998 Ratios of Imports to Consumption from the International Trade Commission, this two-sheet listing.

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

*1998 ratios of imports to consumption*

[In percent]

Certain industrial thermal-processing equipment and certain furnaces .....	48.9
Textile machinery and parts .....	67.0
Metal rolling mills and parts thereof .....	46.6
Machine tools for cutting metal and parts .....	48.1
Machine tools for metal forming and parts thereof .....	55.3
Semiconductor manufacturing equipment and robotics .....	51.9
Boilers, turbines, and related machinery .....	44.4
Electrical transformers, static converters, and inductors .....	43.2
Molds and molding machinery .....	44.8
Aircraft engines and gas turbines .....	70.3
Automobiles, trucks, buses, and bodies and chassis of the foregoing .....	40.6
Motorcycles, mopeds, and parts .....	48.5
Aircraft, spacecraft, and related equipment .....	45.7
Office machines .....	47.2
Microphones, loudspeakers, audio amplifiers, and combinations thereof .....	77.9
Tape recorders, tape players, video cassette recorders, turntables, and compact disc players .....	100.0
Radio transmission and reception apparatus, and combinations thereof .....	57.9
Television apparatus, including cameras, camcorders, and cable apparatus .....	68.5
Electric sound and visual signaling apparatus .....	49.9

*1998 ratios of imports to consumption—Continued*

Electrical capacitors and resistors .....	69.5
Diodes, transistors, integrated circuits, and similar semiconductor solid-state devices .....	45.2
Electrical and electronic articles, apparatus, and parts not elsewhere provided for .....	49.1
Automatic data processing machines .....	51.6
Optical goods, including ophthalmic goods .....	51.5
Photographic cameras and equipment .....	63.8
Watches .....	100.0
Clocks and timing devices .....	62.2
Drawing and mathematical calculating and measuring instruments .....	71.4
Luggage, handbags, and flat goods .....	79.7
Musical instruments and accessories .....	57.2
Umbrellas, whips, riding crops, and canes .....	81.1
Silverware and certain other articles of precious metal .....	59.9
Precious jewelry and related articles .....	55.8
Men's and boys' suits and sportcoats .....	47.5
Men's and boys' coats and jackets .....	52.5
Men's and boys' trousers .....	50.4
Women's and girls' trousers .....	56.4
Shirts and blouses .....	62.9
Sweaters .....	76.4
Women's and girls' suits, skirts, and coats .....	59.0
Robes, nightwear, and underwear .....	68.8
Body-supporting garments .....	42.8
Neckwear, handkerchiefs, and scarves .....	46.7
Gloves, including gloves for sports .....	76.1
Headwear .....	54.1
Leather apparel and accessories .....	67.2
Fur apparel and other fur articles .....	81.7
Footwear and footwear parts .....	84.2

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, you can go down this list: textile machinery and parts, 67 percent; certain industrial thermal processing equipment, 48, 49, 50 percent; machine tools, 55.3 percent; semiconductor manufacturing, 51 percent; aircraft engines, gas turbines, 70 percent; microphones, loud speakers, audio amplifiers, 77.9 percent; tape recorders, tape players, video cassette recorders, turntables, compact disk players, 100 percent; radio transmission and reception apparatus and combinations, 57.9 percent; television apparatus, including cameras, camcorders, cable apparatus, 68.5 percent; electric sound and visual signaling apparatus, 49.9 percent; electrical capacitors and resistors, 69.5 percent; diodes, transistors, integrated circuits, 45.2 percent; electrical and electronic articles, apparatus and parts not elsewhere provided, 49.1 percent; automatic data processing machines, 51.6 percent; optical goods, including ophthalmic goods, 51.5 percent; photographic cameras and equipment, 63.8 percent; watches, 100 percent—I don't know about Timex; I guess they just repair them—100 percent for watches—they have gone to Korea—clocks and timing devices, 62.2 percent; drawing and mathematical calculating and measuring instruments, 71.4 percent; luggage and handbags, flat goods, 79.7 percent; musical instruments and accessories, 57.2 percent; umbrellas, whips, riding crops, canes, 81.1 percent; silverware, certain other articles of precious metals, 59.9 percent; precious jewelry, related articles, 55.8 percent;

men's and boys' suits and sport coats, 47.5 percent; men's and boys' coats and jackets, 62.5 percent; men's and boys' trousers, 50.4 percent; women's and girls' trousers, 62.9 percent; shirts and blouses, 76.4 percent; sweaters, another 76 percent; women's and girls' suits, skirts, coats, 59 percent; robes, nightwear, underware, 68.8 percent; body supporting garments, 42.8 percent; neckwear, handkerchiefs, scarves, 46.7 percent; gloves, including gloves for sports, 76.1 percent; headwear, 54.1 percent; leather apparel and accessories, 67.2 percent; fur apparel and other fur articles, 81.7 percent; footwear and footwear parts, 84.2 percent, on down the list.

I was listening to my distinguished friend from Ohio, Senator VOINOVICH. He was talking about exports and how he got Ohio, as Governor, prepared for exports. As a Governor, I have done the same thing. For both Ohio and South Carolina, there isn't going to be anything left to export. This was last year's statistics. I can tell you the trend is overwhelming in the wrong direction.

Look at the deficit in the balance of trade. It is going to approximate this year \$300 billion. We are not talking about exports as a wonderful thing. Let's look, as they used to say when my children were growing up, Big John and Sparky, all the way through life, make this your goal; keep your eye on the doughnut and not the hole. We have the eye on the hole.

Export, export, that is the singsong. Citibank, Citicorp, and all those other financial institutions listed up there, that banker board and what have you; export, export. What we have to watch is the imports. That is the doughnut. That is the problem we have.

When you are spending over \$100 billion more than you are taking in, you're going to create a huge economic problem. We should know: the fiscal year just ended, September 30, less than 30 days ago, and we have spent \$103 billion more than we took in, we are still running over \$100 billion deficits, deficits, deficits. All right. We finally got on to that at least to save Social Security. Now they are talking exports, when they ought to be talking imports because with this particular trend, we don't have anything to export.

Exporting movies, exporting software, exporting insurance policies, exporting bank accounts—come on—where is the work there? All you have is this computerization and everything else. You will have your country terribly enfeebled. It is all a bum's rush to let us help the sub-Saharan foreign aid, let us help the Caribbean Basin nations. But they won't have reciprocity down there. They will all move in on those poor little islands, like we called up that little Felicia in Antigua after the poor airmen got killed in the barracks. Don't you remember, at Lebanon? The marines, I should say, got killed in the barracks at Lebanon.

After we lost some 278 marines, they ran down and got suits off the Gulf coast and said: We are invading Grenada because Antigua asked us to.

We know what is going to happen. Look at the sheet: Kathie Lee sweatshop in El Salvador. If you try to get a union there, they will kill you. They will kill you. I can tell you right now. Workers fired and blacklisted if they tried to defend their rights. Workers paid 15 cents for every \$16.96 pair of Kathie Lee pants they sold; starvation wages, locked bathrooms, forced overtime; pregnancy tests; workers illegally fired and intimidated; death threats. To have the audacity to stand on the floor of the Senate and call this a win-win bill.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I've already stated my opposition to this Africa trade bill. At best, it does virtually nothing for Africa, and at worst it actually harms African economies while doing little for the United States.

Instead, the Senate should support legislation that works with the countries of Sub-Saharan Africa to diversify and strengthen African economies and fight the real enemies of economic progress on the continent: the overwhelming debt burden and the devastating AIDS epidemic.

There are many sound policy reasons for opposing this bill, which carries the slightly Orwellian title, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act or AGOA. These reasons have been well articulated during this debate.

But today I come to the floor to talk about who supports AGOA—a long list of wealthy corporations who will reap huge benefits if AGOA becomes law.

I don't think my colleagues will be surprised to learn that many of these corporate interests are also powerful political donors who know how to use the current campaign finance system to lobby Congress when their interests are at stake.

Many supporters of AGOA can be found among the members of Africa Growth and Opportunity Act Coalition, Inc. I'm not making this up Mr. President. This corporation was established, according to its website, to "demonstrate to the United States Senate that there is significant public support behind enacting the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (H.R. 434)."

I argue that the support this coalition really demonstrates is not broad-based support from the American public, but the very narrow support of the few but powerful members of the coalition themselves—Amoco, Chevron, Mobil, The Gap, Limited Inc., Enron, General Electric, SBC Communications, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Caterpillar and Motorola, to name just a few.

Our campaign finance system allows these companies to be heard on the issue of Africa trade not only because

of their business concerns, but because of the legal loophole they have at their disposal to influence this policy debate—unregulated, unlimited soft money contributions.

This coalition has the weight of millions of dollars of soft money behind it, Mr. President.

We know these corporations have the wealth and clout to be heard in Congress on this bill, so the only question is—what does AGOA offer them?

AGOA provides millions in benefits to help corporations invest in Africa—corporations that are often already investing there in the first place, and many corporations that, not coincidentally, comprise the AGOA coalition.

AGOA is a huge windfall for many American corporations, but it does little or nothing for African nations or African people or working Americans.

It doesn't make an effort to stimulate African economies by helping small businesses in Africa, or adequately guard against transhipment of goods through Africa, which will rob Africans of the benefits AGOA is supposed to intend.

Essentially it offers the status quo, plus a multi-million dollar bonus in tariff reductions for American corporations that already do business on the continent.

Mr. President, just to give an idea of the soft money donations that give the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act Coalition, Inc., so much clout, I'd like to Call the Bankroll on this industry coalition, as I do from time to time on this floor, for the benefit of the public and my colleagues.

First the total numbers. The companies that are members of this coalition gave a total of \$5,108,735 in soft money to the political parties in the '98 election cycle. Over \$5 million in one cycle, Mr. President. That is an extraordinary figure. Our parties have received over \$5 million in financial support from this industry coalition that was organized to lobby for this bill. Are we really comfortable with that? Does that not give us just a little pause?

Two major U.S. retailers and coalition members, Gap Inc. and The Limited Inc., have a particularly strong interest in passing AGOA, since they can benefit from importing cheap textiles. Let's look at their soft money contributions specifically.

During the 1997-1998 election cycle, Limited, Inc. gave the political parties \$553,000 in soft money donations, and in just the first six months of 1999, Limited Inc. gave the parties more than \$160,000 via the soft money loophole.

The Gap also played the soft money game during this period, with more than \$185,000 in the 1998 election cycle and nearly \$54,000 already during the current election cycle.

And that's not all, Mr. President, not by a long shot.

I'd also like to turn my colleagues attention to the wealthy donors who would like to secure enactment of the Caribbean Basin Initiative or "CBI",

which was combined with the AGOA in the managers' amendment.

The soft money donations from one donor with a huge stake in seeing CBI passed are particularly interesting, and bear mention during this debate.

Fruit of the Loom stands to gain \$25 to \$50 million from so-called CBI-NAFTA parity, which essentially removes tariffs on the goods Fruit of the Loom imports from its places of production in the Caribbean basin.

Fruit of the Loom stands to gain at least \$25 million, Mr. President, and the loss from eliminating duties on apparel from the Caribbean will run U.S. taxpayers at least \$1 billion in lost revenue over five years, according to an article from this week's Time Magazine.

Mr. President, this article, entitled "The Fruit of Its Labor," has already been printed in the RECORD. I ask my colleagues to read it.

What might a corporation do to lobby for this kind of major change in our trade laws, Mr. President?

Under today's campaign finance rules, they might consider making some hefty soft money contributions, and in fact that's just what Fruit of the Loom did.

Fruit of the Loom gave nearly \$440,000 in soft money during the last election cycle.

The company has been an active donor in the current election cycle as well, especially surrounding key moments in the life of CBI legislation.

On June 14 of this year, just over a month before CBI-NAFTA parity legislation was introduced in the Senate on July 16, Fruit of the Loom gave \$20,000 to the Republican Senate-House Dinner Committee.

On July 30, 1999, two weeks after the bill was introduced, the company gave the National Republican Senatorial Committee \$50,000.

I state these facts for those who might wonder whether political contributions are ever intended to effect what we do here on this floor, and for those who question whether there is an appearance of corruption caused by the soft money system.

I offer up the facts, and I ask my colleagues and the public to be the judge of a system that allows these unlimited soft money contributions to occur—contributions that would appear to any logical observer to have a potentially corrupting effect on this vitally important trade debate.

Now, one might think, Mr. President, that the business community would be solidly behind this soft money system that allows it so much access and opportunity to influence the legislation that comes out of this body. The amount of money that businesses spend on political donations is a small investment indeed for the kind of return that legislation like the AGOA and the CBI offers.

But recently we have seen some very significant cracks in business community support for this system. Perhaps

most notable, was the emergence this year of the prestigious business and academic think tank, the Committee for Economic Development, as a supporter of reform.

The CED came out in March with a strongly worded report that denounced our current system and proposed a series of reforms. Its comprehensive report and recommendations reached the following conclusion: "No reform is more urgently needed than a ban on national party 'soft money' financing."

When we debated the McCain-Feingold soft money ban recently, the Senator from Kentucky dismissed the CED report. He called CED and I'm quoting here, a "little known business group" and "a business group which until a few months ago no one had ever heard of."

Let me tell the Chair and my colleagues a little about the CED, this "little-known" group.

CED was founded in 1942. Its trustees are chairmen, presidents, and senior executives of major American corporations, along with University Presidents. CED's early work was influential in shaping the Bretton Woods Agreement, which established the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. CED Trustees were prime movers behind establishing the Marshall Plan, the President's Council of Economic Advisors, and the Joint Economic Committee.

With respect to the Marshall Plan, the Senator from Kentucky might be interested in knowing that the President's Committee on Foreign Aid, established by President Harry Truman and led by Averell Harriman, included five CED Trustees. Among these was Paul G. Hoffman, chairman and President of The Studebaker Company who happened to be the founder of CED. Hoffman was ultimately selected by President Truman as the first administrator of the Marshall Plan.

Interestingly, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, a prime mover of the Marshall Plan in Congress, rejected President Truman's first choice of Undersecretary of State Dean Acheson as the plan's first administrator. He argued that the person in that post needed "particularly persuasive economic credentials" and that Congress wanted an administrator from "the outside business world . . . and not via the State Department." In the end, Senator Vandenberg himself selected Paul Hoffman to run the Marshall Plan, noting that he was to be the "business head of a business operation."

According to SEC Chairman Arthur Levitt, "CED has played a leading role in fostering public sector policies and private sector policies that have helped make America's economy the strongest in the world and its companies the most competitive."

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters praising CED's work from Presidents Eisenhower, Johnson, Carter, Reagan, and Bush.

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

GETTYSBURG, PA.  
October 1, 1963.

Hon. SIGURD S. LARSON,  
*Chairman, Information Committee, Committee for Economic Development, New York, NY.*

DEAR SIG: I am delighted to respond to your query. The Committee for Economic Development provides a means by which many able and public spirited men in American business can join their talent and experience to advance the economic welfare of the country. For 20 years the business leadership represented by C.E.D. has sought out the best experts it can find on each given problem to help them develop the best ways to promote a growing and stable economy and rising living standards. I thought its contributions to the nation invaluable when I was in the White House, today I believe they are equally so.

With warm regard,  
As ever,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, December 10, 1964.

Mr. ALFRED C. NEAL,  
*President, Committee for Economic Development, New York, NY.*

DEAR MR. NEAL: Thank you for your kind letter of November 25. I have enjoyed and profited from my contacts with the Committee for Economic Development, and I am pleased to know that this feeling is shared by you.

Whenever the CED feels that it can be helpful to the country and the Administration, I hope that you will not hesitate to communicate your views.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, November 8, 1978.

Mr. ROBERT C. HOLLAND,  
*President, Committee for Economic Development, Washington, DC.*

To ROBERT C. HOLLAND: The Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, which I signed into law earlier this month, will make possible the first overhaul of the Federal personnel system in 95 years.

This historic step would not have been possible without broad public support. The statement by the Committee for Economic Development on "Revitalizing the Federal Personnel System" was an especially timely and thoughtful contribution to the national debate on civil service reform. The trustees of CED can be justly proud of their accomplishment.

I wish you and your fine organization continued success in bringing a responsible perspective to the public dialogue.

JIMMY CARTER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, May 14, 1982.

I welcome the opportunity to extend my congratulations to members of the Committee for Economic Development as you commemorate your fortieth anniversary.

These four decades since your organization's founding encompass a period of economic growth unequalled in our country or anywhere else in the world, and the value of the free enterprise system as a system which can spread its benefits across our entire society has been demonstrated.

One of the reasons for our achievements is the opportunity we have in this nation to examine and discuss economic issues freely. In the public forum, we accept ideas from all sides, and we share, sift, propose, and criti-

cize, thereby unlocking the ingenuity and initiative of our best minds.

I applaud the timely focus of the Committee for Economic Development on the issue of productivity as the key to the economic future of the United States. My Administration's economic recovery program includes strong incentives for business investment to modernize plant and equipment. Our aim is higher productivity, more jobs, and increased competitiveness for American industry in markets at home and abroad.

One of the great glories of America is the willingness of busy citizens to take time from their important personal interests to devote their energies and abilities to the public welfare.

The CED is a prime embodiment of this spirit of voluntarism. Your members bring priceless knowledge and experience from corporate and academic life to our public policy forums.

I share your pride in forty years of valuable service to the nation and know that you will use this celebration to renew your dedication to the progress of our country.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, May 21, 1992.

Greetings to all those who are gathered in New York to celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the Committee for Economic Development. I am pleased to join with America's former Secretary of State, George Shultz, in welcoming our visitors from abroad.

From its inception in 1942 through the recent end of the Cold War, the CED and its trustees have made significant contributions toward the social and economic development of the United States and other nations around the globe. After World War II, your recommendation proved valuable in assessing the needs of postwar Europe and in formulating the Marshall Plan. Today, your support of both current and prospective international agreements on trade is helping to promote greater economic opportunities for peoples in both hemispheres. Because America's productivity, prosperity, and strength depend on a well-educated and highly skilled work force—one that will be able to compete in the expanding global marketplace—I especially applaud your support of education programs such as Head Start and America 2000.

As with the end of other epic struggles, new opportunities and challenges lie ahead now that America and its allies have won the Cold War. Indeed, your work remains very important as we chart a new course for ourselves in an increasingly interdependent world.

Barbara joins me in congratulating the Committee on its anniversary and in sending best wishes for the future.

GEORGE BUSH.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, let me quote from President Bush's letter, sent on the occasion of CED's 50th anniversary in 1992. He said: "From its inception in 1942 through the recent end of the Cold War, the CED and its trustees have made significant contributions toward the social and economic development of the United States around the globe."

So, far from being little known and obscure, CED has been a leading voice of the business community in its interaction with government for over 50 years. It is a nonpartisan group that has had a significant role in government policy in education, job training

and employment, international economics, and budget and fiscal issues. CED Trustees have held numerous high level government posts, and come from both political parties. The current Chairman of CED, Frank Doyle, is the retired Executive Vice President of General Electric, who has served as a U.S. Representative to the OECD and the European Community.

It's also fascinating, Mr. President, that the Senator from Kentucky implied during our campaign finance debate that CED's endorsement of campaign finance reform was insignificant because he has gone to great lengths to try to dissuade it from its view. Indeed, this summer, the Senator from Kentucky wrote to up to 20 business executives to urge them to resign from CED because of its position on campaign finance reform. The Senator from Kentucky charged that CED's position was part of a campaign to "eviscerate private sector participation in politics," and "ban corporate political activism." He criticized CED for aligning itself with groups like the Sierra Club on this issue.

The chairs of the subcommittee that developed the CED report, which by the way was adopted without dissent either from the subcommittee or from the 56 member Research and Policy Committee that gave it CED's official imprimatur, replied to the Senator from Kentucky that they thought it "entirely appropriate for groups with diverse interests to speak out jointly on an issue that they believe threatens the vitality of our participatory democracy." And they flatly rejected the charge that they want to silence the private sector.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator McCONNELL's letter, along with the response from the CED's leaders, as printed in the New York Times, be reprinted in the RECORD along with a New York Times news story and editorial about this exchange. I also ask unanimous consent that a New York Times story concerning the president of CED, Charles Kolb, who was a lawyer in the Office of Management and Budget and in the Department of Education under President Bush, also be printed in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 1, 1999]

#### A LETTER AND ITS RESPONSE

*Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee, wrote to 10 business executives on July 28 suggesting that they resign from a group promoting overhaul of campaign finance laws, which prompted a reply on Aug. 23 by three leaders of that group. Following is a letter sent to an executive, with the recipient's name deleted by the advocacy group, the Committee for Economic Development, and the group's reply:*

#### MR. MCCONNELL'S LETTER

I was astonished to learn that . . . has lent its name, prestige and presumably financial backing to the Committee for Economic Development in its all-out campaign to eviscerate private sector participation in politics, through so-called "campaign reform."

This week, the Committee for Economic Development joined hands with Ralph Nader

and the Sierra Club in taking out a full-page ad in The Hill, demanding new campaign finance laws that would ban corporate political activism and render the Republican Party powerless to defend probusiness candidates from negative TV attacks by labor unions, trial lawyers and radical environmentalists.

To legitimize its claim to represent the corporate community in advocating anti-business speech controls, the Web site of the Committee for Economic Development prominently lists . . . as one of the trustees that is "engaged in implement[ing] their policy recommendations."

If you disagree with the radical campaign finance agenda of the Committee for Economic Development and resent its abuse of your company's reputation, I would think that public withdrawal from this organization would be a reasonable response.

Thank you for considering my great concern over these developments.

#### THE COMMITTEE'S LETTER

We are responding to your letter of July 28 to several trustees of the Committee for Economic Development (C.E.D.) urging them "to resign from C.E.D." because of our recent policy statement on campaign finance reform.

Your letter refers to a full-page ad that C.E.D. and other organizations sponsored urging the Senate to work toward meaningful campaign finance reform. We make no apologies for expressing our views and associating with groups such as AARP, the League of Women Voters, and the Sierra Club. In our view, it is entirely appropriate for groups with diverse interests to speak out jointly on an issue that they believe threatens the vitality of our participatory democracy. In fact, we find it ironic that you are such a fervent defender of First Amendment freedoms but seem intent to stifle our efforts to express publicly our concerns about a campaign finance system that many feel is out of control. Efforts to secure funding for the Republican Party should not be based on silencing other organizations.

You also accuse C.E.D. of an "all-out campaign to eviscerate private sector participation in politics." We respectfully submit that you have misread our report. First, it is disingenuous to imply that a business organization such as C.E.D. wants to silence the private sector or is anti-business. Second, if C.E.D.'s recommendations were enacted tomorrow, there would be more, not less, money available to finance elections. These funds would come primarily from individual contributions—either directly or through political action committees—not through loopholes in existing laws that have created today's unregulated, apparently limitless, flood of soft money. Our proposal would restore the principle that campaign contributions should be made by individuals not corporations or unions.

We know that a majority of the House and the Senate supports campaign finance reform. That sentiment is also shared by a growing number of business community leaders. We hope that you will reconsider your opposition and enable the issue to be discussed and voted on this fall in the Senate.

Those of us at C.E.D. applaud your many years of public service. We respect and share your commitment to the First Amendment. However, many of our trustees happen to disagree with you on this issue.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 1, 1999]

#### DEFYING SENATOR, EXECUTIVES PRESS

#### DONATION RULES CHANGE

(By Don Van Natta, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, Aug. 31.—Leaders of a committee of business executives who have en-

dorsed a ban on unlimited campaign contributions said today that their members would not be intimidated by an aggressive letter-writing campaign led by Senator Mitch McConnell, one of the Senate's most ardent opponents of a bill that would overhaul the campaign finance system.

In the letters, Mr. McConnell, a Kentucky Republican, accused the group of trying to "eviscerate private sector participation in politics" by imposing "anti-business speech controls."

"I hope you will resign from C.E.D.," Mr. McConnell scribbled near the bottom of one letter sent to an unidentified senior executive of a telecommunications corporation.

Leaders of the organization attacked by Mr. McConnell, the Committee for Economic Development, which includes executives of General Motors, Xerox, Merck and the Sara Lee Corporation, refused to identify the executive or the corporation in the letter. But they did say that Mr. McConnell wrote letters to executives who work for companies that have significant issues pending before Congress.

None of nearly 20 members of the Committee for Economic Development planned to resign from the committee, as Mr. McConnell urged in the letters sent late last month, committee leaders said.

Edward A. Kangas, a co-chairman of the C.E.D. committee that studied the campaign finance system, said today that Mr. McConnell's letter confirmed for him that the organization, which has enlisted more than 100 current and retired executives to endorse new campaign finance rules, was beginning to shape the contentious debate on the subject on Capitol Hill. The letter was first reported on Sunday on the editorial page of The New York Times.

"What we've been doing as a group of business leaders is obviously beginning to have an impact," said Mr. Kangas, the chairman and chief executive of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu, the accounting and consulting firm. "If we weren't having an impact, he would not be communicating with us."

In his public statements, Mr. McConnell argues that current campaign-finance legislation would infringe on free speech protections of the First Amendment. Critics of the Republican Party's position on the issue, however, say that Republicans are motivated by the knowledge that they hold a commanding advantage in raising campaign money from the private sector.

In the letter, Mr. McConnell also wrote that he was "astonished" that the corporation of the recipient had "lent its name, prestige and presumably financial backing" to the Committee for Economic Development, which he said was lobbying on behalf of a "radical campaign-finance agenda." Mr. McConnell argued that the executive's alliance with such a group had consequently damaged the reputation of the executive's employer.

Mr. McConnell wrote the letters in his role as chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee, the party's major fundraising group for Senate candidates. His spokesman, Robert Steurer, said that Mr. McConnell was unavailable for comment, and referred questions to the National Republican Senatorial Committee.

Steven Law, executive director of the National Republican Senatorial Committee, issued a brief statement tonight, in which he said: "Nearly all the companies we contacted had no idea that C.E.D. was throwing their name around in connection with campaign-finance reform and they were outraged that C.E.D. had hijacked their corporate identity to sell a position with which they sharply disagreed."

The executives on the C.E.D. committee are speaking for themselves, and not necessarily on behalf of their companies. Most

of their corporations still continue to give large sums to political parties and candidates.

Mr. Kangas and other committee leaders said they had recruited more executives in the past several days. They said their goal was to have 300 executives endorse their campaign finance proposals by late autumn.

"I think most of the people at C.E.D. have figured out just how corrupt the campaign finance system is, and this letter is just an example of what they already knew," Mr. Kangas said. "Actually, we are broadening the constituency of business leaders who recognize that the campaign finance system is a real problem. Senator McConnell's letter has not had much impact."

The letter was seen by some as an attempt to intimidate the members with the implied message: Resign and keep quiet or don't count on doing business with Congress. "The reaction was interesting," Mr. Kangas said. "These guys are running big enterprises of their own. They are not easily intimidated. They looked at the letter and most of them just chuckled and filed it away."

The committee is a 60-year-old business-led public policy and research association based in Manhattan. Its leaders pride themselves that it is fiercely non-partisan.

The executives on the committee are urging Congress to prohibit soft money, the unlimited donations that corporations give to political parties. The committee also advocates increasing the limit on individual contributions to \$3,000 from the current limit of \$1,000.

"The business community, by and large, has been the provider of soft money," said Charles Kolb, the committee's president. "These people are saying: We're tired of being hit up and shaken down. Politics ought to be about something besides hitting up companies for more and more money."

The committee's members studied the campaign finance system for two years. Committee members said they were horrified at the public perception that big donors receive special favors in Washington. In a report released in March, the committee wrote: "The suspicion of corruption deepens public cynicism and diminishes public confidence in Government. More important, these activities raise the likelihood of actual corruption."

In a response sent to Mr. McConnell last week, leaders of the committee wrote: "We know that a majority of the House and the Senate supports campaign finance reform. That sentiment is also shared by a growing number of business community leaders."

Both Warren E. Buffett, the acclaimed value investor and chief executive of Berkshire Hathaway, and Jerome Kohlberg, a founder of the leveraged buyout firm Kohlberg Kravis Roberts & Company, have tried on their own to persuade chief executives of businesses to embrace campaign finance reform measures. But many, though sympathetic, refused to speak out because they do not want to rattle the legislators on whom they depend.

Mr. Kangas said he disagreed with Mr. McConnell's position that campaign contributions were protected by the First Amendment. "I was a little disappointed that he would suggest that freedom of speech does not apply to us, but it applies to the people who agree with him," Mr. Kangas said.

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

[From the New York Times, Oct. 17, 1999]

SOFT MONEY'S MULTIFACETED FOE

(By Don Van Natta, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Charles Kolb may be this city's most unlikely champion of campaign

finance reform. A conservative lawyer who worked on domestic policy in the Bush White House, Kolb acknowledges that he never expected to be doing what he is doing now.

As president of the Committee for Economic Development, a group of chief executives and academic leaders committed to public policy changes, Kolb leads its fight against soft money, those unlimited contributions to political parties that have come to exemplify the capital's cash-flush influence industry.

"I personally came at this with a deregulatory viewpoint," explained Kolb, who is 48. "But the more I studied it, the more concerned I became about the appearance of influence-peddling, the quid pro quo. There should be access to politicians, but I don't think you need to pay a toll to get it."

He paused to catch his breath. "I have become something of a radical on this subject," he said.

Trim and energetic, Kolb may look like just one more sharp-dressed politician or lobbyist—until he opens his mouth. He speaks in eloquent, perfectly formed paragraphs about the need to change a federal election system that some analysts say may cost \$3 billion in 2000.

As the leader of a fiercely nonpartisan group, Kolb says the organization does not reflect his biases. "If it did, I wouldn't be doing my job," he said. Still, his friends are not surprised that, as a champion of noble causes, he has embraced its position on campaign finance reform.

Upon leaving the Bush administration, where he was deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy, Kolb wrote a book whose title communicated its author's intense disappointment: "The White House Daze: The Unmaking of Domestic Policy in the Bush Years" (Free Press, 1993). The path that led Kolb to his current post also wound through law and charity.

"I've never worried about answering the question, 'What do you want to do with your life?'" Kolb said. He has a one-word explanation for his good fortune: serendipity.

Business executives consider it serendipitous that Kolb took the post at the Committee for Economic Development in September 1997. He is its fourth president in 57 years, and his predecessor held the job for 31 years. Several trustees credited Kolb with invigorating the organization.

The committee is an independent research organization that recommends economic and social policies. Its board includes executives of General Motors, Xerox, Merck and Sara Lee.

Despite the organization's growing momentum, Kolb has occasionally found it difficult to persuade executives to publicly endorse a soft-money ban. They worry that their endorsement will hurt their corporations on Capitol Hill.

"When Charlie talks with most CEOs, they are very sympathetic, very supportive," said Michael J. Petro, the committee's director of business and government policy. "But then they say, 'Let me put you in touch with our Washington guys,'" who often try to kill the idea.

Kolb blamed what he calls the capital's cottage industry of money and influence. "The people who favor the status quo are the people who hand out the checks and the people who cash the checks," he said.

Kolb always wanted to practice law. It was what other men in his family had done. He went to Princeton, then to Balliol College at Oxford University, where he received a master's degree in philosophy, politics and economics.

At Oxford, he met the academic who had the most influence on his life, Sir Isaiah Berlin, the renowned historian who died in 1997

at 88. "What he taught me is there is no excuse for arrogance," Kolb said. He once invited Berlin to tea in Kolb's dormitory room. "And for four hours, the leading philosopher of this century sat on my bed and sipped his tea and talked with me."

Kolb earned a law degree at the University of Virginia, and after practicing at two Washington law firms, joined the Office of Management and Budget. He then moved to the Education Department, where he met his wife, Ingrid. (They now have a 2-year-old daughter, Charlotte.) In 1990, he joined the White House, working on domestic economic, education, legal and regulatory issues. After that, he spent five years as general counsel of the United Way.

On his desk, Kolb displays evidence of his freedom from partisanship: a canceled check for \$250 that Kolb wrote on Nov. 1, 1996, to the re-election campaign of Sen. Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., an ardent opponent of changes in the campaign finance laws.

Last summer, McConnell took on Kolb's organization, writing a blistering letter to as many as 20 executives who had endorsed a soft-money ban. McConnell accused the group of trying to "eviscerate private sector participation in politics" by imposing "anti-business speech controls."

At the bottom of most letters, McConnell scribbled a message that some executives regarded as a threat: "I hope you will resign from CED."

Kolb responded sharply. "I think it was an abuse of senatorial authority," he said. "It did a lot to convey to the public what this fight is all about."

In the end, McConnell's smash-mouth tactics backfired. Publicity about the letter helped the organization recruit more executives, doubling its ranks. Now, 212 executives have endorsed the soft-money ban. And not one executive resigned.

With a smile, Kolb said, "It is far better to be attacked than to be ignored."

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, far from having its intended effect, the Senator from Kentucky's letter, which many believe smacks of intimidation, seems to have emboldened CED and its membership. At last count, 212 business and civic leaders have endorsed the CED report, and not a single member of CED has resigned in response to the Senator from Kentucky's tactics. Not a single one.

It was amazing to me, Mr. President, that we heard Senators on the floor during the campaign finance debate questioning whether our current system is corrupting. But the Senate has heard me talk about the corruption of the system a lot. It's no surprise that I think this system has a corrupting influence on the Congress. But for those who are skeptical of this view, perhaps the words of the CED trustee who chaired the subcommittee that developed CED's recommendations on campaign finance, will carry more weight. Listen to the words of Mr. Edward Kangas, who is the Chairman of Global Board of Directors of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu, in an opinion piece in the New York Times that appeared after the first days of our campaign finance debate here in the Senate.

"You could almost hear the laughter coming from board rooms and executive suites all over the country when Senate opponents of campaign-finance reform expressed dismay that anyone

could think big political contributions are corrupting elections and government.” Mr. Kangas continues: “For a growing number of executives, there’s no question that the unrelenting pressure for five- and six-figure political contributions amounts to influence peddling and a corrupting influence. What has been called legalized bribery looks like extortion to us.”

Mr. Kangas doesn’t mince words on how the system appears to someone who has been part of it. He says:

I know from personal experience and from other executives that it’s not easy saying no to appeals for cash from powerful members of Congress or their operatives. Congress can have a major impact on businesses. The solicitors know it, and we know it. The threat may be veiled, but the message is clear: failing to donate could hurt your company. You must weigh whether you meet your responsibility to your shareholders better by investing the money in the company or by sending it to Washington.

This is an incredible indictment of the system that a minority of this Senate is preserving through a filibuster. These words from a business leader plainly and powerfully answer the arguments from the Senator from Kentucky and others that there is nothing corrupt or corrupting about soft money. This is not some liberal “do-gooder” speaking here. This is a respected business person, chairman of the Board of Directors of an international accounting firm, a participant in this system.

He says, “The threat may be veiled but the message is clear. Failing to donate could hurt your company.”

I ask unanimous consent that the full op-ed by Mr. Kangas appear in the RECORD.

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

You could almost hear the laughter coming from board rooms and executive suites all over the country when Senate opponents of campaign-finance reform expressed dismay that anyone could think big political contributions are corrupting elections and government. On Tuesday, those opponents prevailed, blocking a final vote this year on banning soft-money contributions. But the innocent and benign system described by the Senators arguing against reform hardly passed the laugh test for those of us on the receiving end of the soft-money shakedown.

For a growing number of executives, there’s no question that the unrelenting pressure for five- and six-figure political contributions amounts to influence peddling and a corrupting influence. What has been called legalized bribery looks like extortion to us. The Senators who oppose reform would be far more credible and receive a sympathetic ear if they admitted the high cost of campaign force them to focus on large contributors, rather than defending the system.

Congress passed laws that would put corporate executives in jail for offering money to a foreign official in the course of commerce. Now some of its members express bewilderment when people note that there is something unseemly about making large payments to the campaign committees of American elected officials.

I know from personal experience and from other executives that it’s not easy saying no

to appeals for cash from powerful members of Congress or their operatives. Congress can have a major impact on businesses. The solicitors know it, and we know it. The threat may be veiled, but the message is clear: failing to donate could hurt your company. You must weigh whether you meet your responsibility to your shareholders better by investing the money in the company or by sending it to Washington.

Increasingly, fund-raisers also make sure you know that your competitors have contributed, implying that you should pay a toll in Washington to stay competitive.

Unlike individual donations, most large corporate contributions aren’t made as gestures of good will or for ideological reasons. Corporations are thinking of the bottom line. Will the contribution help or hurt the company? Despite the protestations of some Senators, everyone knows big checks get noticed.

Like most Americans, corporate executives also now know the issue isn’t really free speech. (You’ll notice that the First Amendment argument is more often made by the listeners, the politicians, then by the speakers.) Companies don’t question their ability to speak forcefully. We have lobbyists and trade associations, and we provide many jobs—all of which help us to be heard. And, as salesmen, we resent the ideas that the only way we can get a chance to make an effective pitch about legislation is to pay a large fee.

One clear sign of the growing dissatisfaction of corporate leaders with this pressure is the endorsement by more than 200 business and civic leaders of a campaign finance reform plan made by the Committee for Economic Development, a group of chief executives and academic leaders. This group, of which I am a member, is not saying that all political contributions are bad or corrupting. We know campaigns cost money.

But we see what should be obvious to everyone. There’s a big difference between a \$1,000 contribution—the current limit on individuals’ donations to a campaign—and a \$50,000 or \$1 million check filtered through a party as “soft money.” The potential for corruption is minimal at \$1,000, or even at the \$3,000 level to which our reform plan would raise individual contribution limits. But the unlimited amounts that pour through the soft-money loophole are dangerous.

Americans understand the influence of money. It’s time to give elections back to democracy’s shareholders—the voters.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, CED is not the only business organization that supports campaign finance reform. The Campaign for America is an organization founded by Jerome Kohlberg, former founding partner of the firm of Kohlberg, Kravitz. That organization sent us a letter during the recent campaign finance debate, signed by, among others, Warren Buffet, Arjay Miller, who is the former President of Ford Motor Company and Dean Emeritus of Stanford Business School, and Bob Stuart, former Chair of Quaker Oats. These prestigious business leaders write: “We believe the current soft money system works against the public interest and against the interests of business. . . . [B]usiness and industry must have access and say in policy-making. But soft money distorts the process.”

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Campaign for America and these business leaders appear in the RECORD at this point.

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

CAMPAIGN FOR AMERICA,  
Washington, DC, October 18, 1999.  
Hon. RUSS FEINGOLD,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINGOLD: As the Senate debates reforming the way federal officials finance their campaigns, we hope you will consider what the appropriate relationship between government and business should be. We believe the soft money loophole creates an improper conduit for corporate and union money to flow in unlimited amounts through increasingly murky channels into the political system. Speaking as business people and as citizens, we urge you to support the McCain-Feingold bill.

We believe meaningful reform will require fuller and more timely disclosure of contributions and expenditures. It will require all organizations trying to influence the outcome of elections to play by the same rules as candidates. Above all, meaningful reform will close the soft money loophole. Does McCain-Feingold cure all the ills of our current system? No, but it is a crucial first step.

We believe the current soft money system works against the public interest and against the interests of business. Congress must have input from business or it risks legislating in a vacuum; business and industry must have access and say in policy-making. But soft money distorts the process.

American business traditionally places its faith in the market. And while it is naïve to think that the government won’t play a role in shaping the market, the soft money system encourages companies to seek government intervention in the market in an arbitrary and unfair way.

Congress enacted a law in 1907 to prevent corporations from using corporate money to exert an undue influence on the political process. In 1947 the Congress passed a similar restriction on unions. The soft money loophole subverts these laws. If soft money contributions are capped rather than banned, the subversion of the principles behind these laws will continue.

Some opponents of reform would have you believe the parties will wither and die if the flow of soft money contributions is cut off. But the soft money loophole can be closed without starving candidates or parties of needed resources by adjusting the hard money limits.

The Senate has an opportunity to find a consensus on the appropriate process for financing federal campaigns. We urge you to return to our citizens a system that is fair and equitable. We urge you to oppose a filibuster and allow the Senate an opportunity to vote for the McCain-Feingold bill.

Respectfully,  
George T. Brophy, Chairman, President & CEO, ABT Building Products Corporation; Warren Buffet, Chairman & CEO, Berkshire Hathaway Inc.; William Coblenz, Attorney at Law, Coblenz, Patch, Duffy, and Bass; William H. Davidow, General Partner, Mohr, Davidow Ventures; E.C. Fiedorek, Managing Director (Retired), Encap Investments L.C.; Alan G. Hassenfeld, Chairman & CEO, Hasbro, Inc.; Ivan J. Houston, CEO (Retired), Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Robert J. Kiley, President, New York City Partnership; Jerome Kohlberg, Jr., Kohlberg & Company; Robert B. Menschel, Senior Director, Goldman, Sachs Group; Arjay Miller, Former President, Ford Motor Company, Dean Emeritus, Graduate School

of Business, Stanford University; Thomas S. Murphy, Chairman & CEO (Retired), Capital Cities/ABC, Inc. Raymond Plank, Chairman & CEO, Apache Corporation, Sol Price, Price Entities; Arthur Rock, Arthur Rock & Company; David Rockefeller; Ian M. Rolland, Chairman & CEO (Retired), Lincoln National Corporation; Richard Rosenberg, Chairman & CEO (Retired), Bank of America; Jim Sinegal, President & CEO, Costco Companies, Inc.; Bernard Susman, Bernard M. Susman & Co.; Donald Stone, Former Chairman & CEO, MLSI, Former Vice-Chairman, New York Stock Exchange; Robert D. Stuart, Jr., Chairman Emeritus, The Quaker Oats Company; Dr. P. Roy Vagelos, Chairman & CEO (Retired), Merck & Co., Inc.; A.C. Viebranz, Former Senior Vice President for External Affairs, GTE Corporation; Paul Volcker, Former Chairman, Federal Reserve.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, business support for campaign finance reform is real and it is growing. Businessmen are tired of being the fall guys of American politics. They are tired of seeing politicians with their hands out for money. They are tired of the ever increasing demand for ever larger checks. They are tired of the feeling like they are being shaken-down for their contributions, like political donations are a form of protection money.

They are tired of the public's perception that when business wins an argument in Congress it wasn't because its position was right but because they gave big soft money donations to the political parties. That is certainly a risk with this particular Africa trade bill, as my Calling of the Bankroll at the beginning of this presentation showed.

I want to commend the leaders of the business community for joining this cause, and standing up to the pressure from those who want to preserve this corrupt system. In the end, they are on the right side of the issue, not only for business, but for the American people.

I have to ask my colleagues, Mr. President, how can this body continue to allow soft money contributions to flow to the political parties' war chests—unregulated, unchecked, and doing untold damage to the public perception of the way we do business in this Chamber?

How long can we expect the public to put up with a U.S. Senate that refuses to shut down such an egregious loophole, and chooses instead to perpetuate a soft money system that taints everything we do on this floor?

That's right. I'll say it again. Everything we do on this floor is called into question by the soft money system. And that includes this Africa and Caribbean trade bill. The \$5 million in soft money contributions by the industry coalition created supposedly to show public support for this bill casts a shadow on this debate. It's the 800 pound gorilla, as I've said before, that is sitting over there on the floor and that we all ignore.

Until we close the soft money loophole, the shadow will get darker and

darker, and the gorilla bigger and bigger. Until we close that loophole, our constituents have every right to be skeptical of whether we work for them, or for the big contributors. Until we close that loophole, the concept of one person, one vote—a basic and fundamental tenet of our democracy—is in serious jeopardy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment No. 2335 be temporarily laid aside in order for Senator ASHCROFT of Missouri to offer an amendment.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I object.

Mr. ROTH. I would say, if I might, to my distinguished colleague that while it takes unanimous consent for me to ask this, the leader of course could come down and accomplish the same result. So I hope the distinguished Senator will not object.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I regret that objection because I think it is important that we be able to proceed with this most important legislation.

This is legislation that has the support of both the Republican and Democratic leadership. It has the support of the White House and the President. I am disappointed that we are unable to reach agreement to begin the amendment process so that this most important legislation can be acted upon in the remaining days.

I point out to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that this legislation was reported out by the Finance Committee in June of this year. We had hoped action could be taken earlier, but the schedule did not permit that.

Does the Senator from Missouri wish to speak?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Senator from Delaware for his leadership, and I thank him for making the attempt to increase our capacity to serve America by allowing me to offer an amendment.

The measure that I am offering today is a measure that Democratic minority leader Senator DASCHLE, 31 cosponsors, and I had introduced as free-standing legislation earlier this year. All of the cosponsors of the measure have been strong advocates on behalf of American agriculture. We are addressing the ability of American agriculture to be represented effectively in trade negotiations.

Currently, there is a temporary American Ambassador for agriculture in the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative so that America's farmers and ranchers always have a representative at the table when the United States enters large trade negotiations. If we are worried about the United States' balance of payments, we ought to elevate and try to increase our number of exports.

Our farm community outproduces and outworks any farm producers around the world. When trade agreements are negotiated, we need our farmers to be represented there by a consistent, strong voice for agriculture.

The Senate Democratic minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, and I and 31 cosponsors introduced this free-standing bill, S. 185, because we thought it is essential to U.S. farm and trade policy. It is a bill, which as an amendment to this measure, ensures that our Nation's farmers and ranchers have a permanent trade ambassador in the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. Let me express that once more to be very clear: We want to have a permanent agricultural trade ambassador in the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative so whenever our Trade Representatives are making considerations about the kinds of agreements that will govern the relationships between the United States and other nations as they relate to trade with agricultural products, an expert, clearly focused on, committed to, trained in, and abreast of the circumstances in the agricultural community, will be right there at the table advancing our interests.

This is very important, especially as we understand that our agricultural productivity far exceeds our ability to consume. In my home State, between a quarter and a third of all the agricultural products produced must go into the international marketplace. I heard the Senator from Illinois the other day talk about how that in his State over half of all the products are grown for shipment overseas. For some commodities, such as soybeans, over half of those commodities must be exported.

This is a simple concept. The placement in the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative of a permanent trade ambassador for agriculture has broad bipartisan support in the Congress. It is supported by more than 80 national farm organizations. And the administration supports it.

I talked recently with U.S. Trade Ambassador Charlene Barshefsky in a meeting with the congressional "WTO Caucus for Farmers and Ranchers." Let me explain. Senators LARRY CRAIG and BYRON DORGAN have assembled people in the Congress who are concerned about agriculture's capacity to trade effectively and to get our products overseas. We have organized with their leadership this caucus, consisting of both Senate and House Members, to address agricultural issues in the upcoming World Trade Organization Seattle Round.

This fall in Seattle we are going to launch a new round of trade negotiations. We have been seeking as a caucus of Members of the Congress to work with our trade ambassador, Ambassador Barshefsky, to say we want to make sure we in the Congress cooperate so that when any trade agreements are finally reached, the Senate is in a better position not only to understand

them but also to approve them if at all possible.

I was delighted that when we discussed this need for a permanent agricultural trade ambassador within the Office of the Trade Representative, Ambassador Charlene Barshefsky endorsed the program fully. She said this initiative is very important.

I described the fact we have the WTO round of trade talks starting in late November in Seattle. I want to communicate the urgency to get this provision we are offering today enacted into law before the Seattle Round kicks off. I think Senator DASCHLE understands, the other 31 cosponsors understand, the members of the WTO trade caucus understand, and the White House understands the urgency of having agricultural issues fully represented at the table. That is why the administration supports this. That is why I am pleased to have been an original cosponsor with the minority leader, TOM DASCHLE, on this proposal in February because we all understand the importance of this proposal.

Ambassador Barshefsky went on to say:

Ensuring that the United States has a permanent trade ambassador will put U.S. farmers in a stronger position in the Seattle round of the WTO negotiations that will begin late this fall.

Ambassador Barshefsky pointed out that when she assumed the position of the U.S. Trade Representative, she appointed Peter Scher as a special trade negotiator for agriculture. He has been the voice for America's farmers and ranchers at the negotiating table, and he has been doing a wonderful job advocating positions that will advance the strength of their interests internationally. However, his position was an administration decision and an appointment as opposed to being a permanent position in the law.

The bill we introduced and the amendment I am offering today makes his position permanent, subject to Senate approval, of course. Our farmers need a representative in the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative who will focus solely on opening foreign markets, ensuring a level playing field for U.S. agricultural products and services, and representing the interests of American farmers, the most productive of all of our sectors of our economy. The opportunity to do that is not only ripe and ready, it is necessary now because we are looking the WTO round in the face. We need to achieve this objective.

In September 1998, American farmers and ranchers faced the first ever monthly trade deficit for U.S. farm and food products since the United States began tracking trade data in 1941. This sounds an alarm for States such as my home State of Missouri. We receive over one-fourth of our farm income from agricultural exports. Already this year the U.S. Department of Agriculture has reported the value of agricultural exports has dropped by over \$5 billion since this time last year. We

need to be promoting and developing ways of exporting more of the food and fiber we grow in this country. At best, the total agricultural exports will be \$49 billion in 1999. This is a reduction from total agricultural exports of \$60 billion 3 years ago. We cannot afford to be in a situation where we are vastly increasing productivity and production and curtailing our farmers' amount of exports opportunities. We desperately need to enhance the level of exports for our farmers. We need to make permanent the position of agricultural trade ambassador within the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

Also, our agricultural trade surplus totaled \$26.8 billion just 3 years ago. By last year, that amount had dropped by almost 50 percent. This year, our annual agricultural trade surplus will have dwindled to about \$12 billion.

The bottom line is we need more attention focused on farmers' competitiveness overseas. We need to make this a policy priority. Our priorities need to be reflected in the level of the resources we deploy to do this job of opening markets for farmers and ranchers.

When I am thinking about the Nation's trade policy, especially about agriculture, I ask myself what is good for the State of Missouri. In some significant measure, Missouri happens to be a leader in farming. We are the State with the second highest number of farms—second only to Texas. We have just about every crop imaginable. Missouri is among the Nation's top producers in almost all crops. We are second in terms of beef cows. We are second in hay production. Missouri is one of the top five pork-producing States. Missouri is also among the top 10 States for the production of cotton, rice, corn, winter wheat, milk, and watermelon. With 26 percent of the income in our State coming from exports, our Missouri farmers, like farmers from sea to shining sea, need to know that their ability to export will expand over time rather than become subject to foreign protectionist policies that choke them out of their market share.

During the 1996 farm bill debate, in exchange for decreased Government payments, our farmers were promised more export opportunities. It is time for us to deliver on that promise.

America's farmers and ranchers need a permanent agriculture ambassador who will represent their interests worldwide, especially as we face more negotiations in the World Trade Organization, and also as we have regional negotiations with both Central and South America progressing. There are a lot of opportunities that could be opened up to our farmers and ranchers in the coming years. We need to have someone at the door, always pressing for those opportunities.

Under the legislation which the minority leader and I and 31 others introduced this year, the agricultural ambassador would be responsible for con-

ducting trade negotiations and enforcing trade agreements relating to U.S. agricultural products and services. Also under the legislation, the ambassador must be a vigorous advocate on behalf of U.S. agricultural interests.

It is imperative, in my judgment, that U.S. interests always have a strong, clear voice at the table in international negotiations. Foreign countries will always have agriculture trade barriers. We need to send the message to foreign governments we are serious about breaking down barriers to their markets, so that our farmers and ranchers will be put on more of a level playing field.

Canada and Mexico have already concluded free trade agreements with Chile, for example. Farmers in Canada can send their agricultural products to Chile, and in most instances Canadian farmers face a zero tariff level. Our farmers, on the other hand, are confronted with an 11-percent tariff. That makes it very difficult for us to be competitive. The E.U. is negotiating a trade deal with Mexico, Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay. Thus, these countries will give European farmers more access to their markets at the expense of U.S. farmers and ranchers. We can not afford to wait. America must lead, not follow, especially in our own backyard in the Western Hemisphere, but certainly even around the world.

The agricultural ambassador amendment we are offering today is supported by more than 80 agricultural trade associations. Additionally, State branches of these national associations such as the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation and the Missouri Pork Producers Council are weighing in with their strong support.

We need to utilize every opportunity we have to help our farmers and ranchers in America. Making permanent the position of U.S. Trade Representative for agriculture, we are guaranteed the interests of American farmers and ranchers will always have a prominent status and will ensure that our agreements are more aggressively enforced.

It is with this in mind, and because of what I believe is the overwhelming consensus on this measure, the bipartisan nature of it, and the pressing need for it for this year's WTO round, which will begin in Seattle later this fall, that I wanted to bring this amendment to the floor and offer it. I believe this Senate will overwhelmingly endorse this commonsense proposal which has such strong bipartisan support, which is supported by the Administration, and which would render such great service to the farmers and ranchers of the United States of America who lead America in productivity and who can lead America in terms of our balance of trade and exports.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter detailing the list of the national organizations, American farmers, and ranchers supporting the amendment, and I yield the floor.

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

OCTOBER 19, 1999.

Hon. JOHN ASHCROFT,  
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR ASHCROFT: Thank you for introducing S. 185 which establishes a permanent Chief Agricultural Negotiator in the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR). Agriculture plays a significant and positive role in the balance of U.S. trade. As we prepare for the next round of negotiations in the World Trade Organization (WTO) it is important that the interests of U.S. agriculture be given special emphasis.

Agricultural trade will be a primary focus in the next WTO round. U.S. farmers and ranchers are dependent upon the continued expansion of agricultural exports and opening of foreign markets. The issue of foreign agricultural trade barriers continues to grow and is often unique and difficult to resolve. The result of the next round of negotiations will have a major effect on the future of U.S. agriculture. The enactment of this legislation will send a message to the member countries of the WTO that the U.S. is serious about agriculture. It will place a permanent advocate and specialist at the negotiating table on behalf of U.S. agricultural interests and establish a position that will be responsible for enforcing trade agreements relating to U.S. agriculture.

We pledge our support for S. 185 and look forward to working with you to ensure its passage.

Sincerely,

American Cotton Shippers Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Feed Industry Association, American Meat Institute, American Soybean Association, Animal Health Institute, Cenex Harvest States, CF Industries, Chicago Board of Trade, Corn Refiners Association, Inc., Farmland Industries, Inc., Florida Phosphate Council.

Idaho Barley Commission, International Dairy Foods Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Association of Animal Breeders, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Chicken Council, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Farmers Union, National Grain Sorghum Producers, National Grange, National Milk Producers Federation.

National Pork Producers Council, National Sunflower Association, Nestle USA, Northwest Horticultural Council, Novartis Corporation, The Fertilizer Institute, United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, US Apple Association, US Canola Association, US Dairy Export Council, US Rice Producers Association, US Wheat Associates, US Rice Federation, Wheat Export Trade Education Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, first of all, let me commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri for his leadership on agricultural trade issues. I congratulate him for his knowledge, for his leadership on these issues, and the effectiveness with which he deals with them. I want him to know I rise in strong support of his amendment.

The USTR has had an agricultural ambassador at USTR. In my judgment, it has been a most effective tool for furthering our agricultural trade interests. It is my position that making this

a permanent position would be good policy, well deserved by the agricultural sector which, of course, has consistently fought for trade liberalization.

Again, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Missouri and say I look forward to working with him on this critical issue.

Mr. President, I will take this opportunity to address some of the arguments that have been raised during the debate today and earlier. They were worthy arguments that merit our attention. But I do believe the proponents of this legislation have a more than adequate response.

One of the questions that has been raised is, Why take this bill up now? Some of my colleagues have questioned why we are. Let me help them by putting this in context.

Section 134 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, which passed the Congress in 1994, just 5 years ago, directed the President to develop a comprehensive trade and development policy for the countries of Africa. That provision originated with Senator DASCHLE, now the distinguished minority leader. In the statement of administrative action that accompanied the act, the President made it very clear the first measures he intended to consider in complying with that congressional mandate were measures to:

... remove impediments to U.S. trade with and investment in Africa, including enhancements in the GSP program, for the least developed countries.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished leader here. I am happy to yield to the distinguished leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 2335 WITHDRAWN

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now withdraw the pending amendment, No. 2335.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 2340 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2334

(Purpose: To establish a Chief Agricultural Negotiator in the Office of the United States Trade Representative)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator ASHCROFT and others and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] for Mr. ASHCROFT, for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ROBB, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. HELMS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. THOMAS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BOND, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CRAPO, proposes an amendment numbered 2340 to amendment No. 2334.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. . CHIEF AGRICULTURAL NEGOTIATOR.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF A POSITION.—There is established the position of Chief Agricultural Negotiator in the Office of the United States Trade Representative. The Chief Agricultural Negotiator shall be appointed by the President, with the rank of Ambassador, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) FUNCTIONS.—The primary function of the Chief Agricultural Negotiator shall be to conduct trade negotiations and to enforce trade agreements relating to U.S. agricultural products and services. The Chief Agricultural Negotiator shall be a vigorous advocate on behalf of U.S. agricultural interests. The Chief Agricultural Negotiator shall perform such other functions as the United States Trade Representative may direct.

(c) COMPENSATION.—The Chief Agricultural Negotiator shall be paid at the highest rate of basic pay payable to a member of the Senator Executive Service.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, before I yield the floor for discussion of this amendment, let me reiterate to my colleagues my hope we can continue to consider trade-related amendments to this important African trade CBI legislation.

I know earlier Senator REID offered and debated a trade-related amendment. I think that was the right approach. I thank him for doing that. I encourage all Members who have amendments relating to the pending subject to work with the managers who are here, ready to work, have their amendments offered and disposed of.

Again, this amendment has, I believe, very broad support across the aisle. I think it is the right thing to do, and I am still anxious for us to find a way to get to cloture so we can have the final amending process and debate on this bill and pass it.

This would be a major step for the Senate. Of course, then we still have to go to conference with the House, which has a very different approach from ours to this legislation. It will be a tough conference. But this legislation is supported by the managers on both sides of the aisle, by myself, by Senator DASCHLE, I believe, and by the President. I hope we can continue to look to find a way to move this legislation to a conclusion.

We can get cloture on Friday, and then I believe by Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, we could be completed with this legislation. We will continue to work to seek a way to achieve that. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I share the majority leader's desire to finish this legislation. I have indicated publicly I want to work with him to find a way to resolve the matters that are outstanding so we can get to final passage. It is regrettable that the tree was filled before a single amendment could be debated and disposed. The majority

leader and I have had conversations in the past, and he is, I am sure, sensitive to the knowledge that this tactic compels Democrats to oppose cloture in order to protect the right of Members to offer an amendment.

Filling the tree actually frustrates the majority leader's stated intention of speedy passage. We could have had a number of amendments today. That has been precluded now because we are in this situation where Senators are prohibited from offering amendments. It is pointless to fill the tree now. We could have allowed amendments for at least 2 days while cloture ripened. If amendments and a good debate and votes were allowed, I think we could have built support for cloture. Under the circumstances, however, there will continue to be a pent-up frustration due to the inability on the part of Senators on both sides of the aisle to offer amendments.

In a sense, filling the tree plays into the hands of the opponents of the legislation. Democrats can never support preemptive filling of the tree or preemptive filing of cloture because I think, in large measure, it is a real affront to the rights of every Senator who wishes to play a part in any debate in this body. While I oppose many of the amendments that could be contemplated and could be offered, I support a Senator's right to offer them.

The majority leader said today he believed he only filled the tree once before in 1999. In fact, this is the seventh time this year he has resorted to this approach. There were six previous occasions: March 8, 1999, S. 280, the Education Flexibility Act; April 22, 1999, Social Security lockbox; April 27, 1999, the Y2K Act; April 30, 1999, S. 557, Social Security lockbox; June 15, 1999, Social Security lockbox; and July 16, 1999, Social Security lockbox.

In addition, of course, the majority leader has twice preemptively filed cloture on measures immediately after calling them up and then moved to other business in order to prevent amendments or debate. That occurred on June 16, 1999, on H.R. 1259, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Act, and on September 21, 1999, on S. 625, the Bankruptcy Reform Act.

After using these coercive tactics on all of these occasions, I would hope we might learn that they do not work. We do not operate under the rules of the House. We must insist on Senators' rights to offer amendments, even if we ultimately will reject those amendments.

That is not to say that dilatory tactics that go on and on are something that I will support. I will support cloture at some point. But I also support strongly the right of a Senator on the other side of the aisle or a Senator on this side of the aisle to offer an amendment, relevant or not relevant, at least initially.

I respect the Senator's decisions as I always do. I just differ with him in this case. It seems to me if we want to kill

this bill, this is the way to do it. If we want to pass the bill, then it seems to me the majority of Democrats will join with the majority of Republicans in finding a way with which to deal with these amendments and ultimately pass this legislation. We can do it, but if we are going to do it, we have to take down this tree. It has to happen sooner rather than later so we do not waste any more time than we have already.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I can respond for a moment further, this is a trade bill. This is a bill the Senate would like to pass, I believe. We tried to do fast-track legislation. I believe that was last year or maybe the year before. We did not quite get that done.

This is a major opportunity for us to do something that will be good for America, good for our individual States and constituents, I believe, and good for the Central American countries, the Caribbean area, and Africa.

It is a trade bill. The idea that Senators on both sides of the aisle would bring up issues which would clearly deadlock the Senate and make it highly unlikely that we could get to a reasonable conclusion at a time when we are approaching the end of the session—I have already been told of Senators' desires to offer an amendment dealing with sanctions and their support for a sanctions bill on this side. I understand Senators on the other side said: If you don't offer it, we will offer it.

Clearly, that is an issue we do need to get into. The question of how we deal with sanctions, particularly agricultural sanctions, needs to be thought through carefully. The relevant committees would get into that, have hearings, give thought to it, and have a bill reported out which we could take up, in and of itself, separately in the next session of this Congress next year.

I had a Senator indicate he wants to offer fast track to this bill which, by the way, I support. At least it is a free trade amendment. It clearly is one that will cause a great deal of consternation on the Democratic side of the aisle, perhaps on both sides of the aisle.

Plus, I was told by Senator WELLSTONE he wanted an agricultural amendment. I have been told there is a gun amendment pending, even though we spent 2 weeks debating juvenile justice and gun amendments earlier this year. I was told three Senators might be looking at campaign finance reform again.

Basically to empty our out basket on issues we have already voted on this year causes tremendous problems and delays in completing this very important trade legislation.

I will be glad, once again, to enter a unanimous consent agreement that we go forward and consider first-degree amendments, relevant amendments, on the trade bill. There are a lot of amendments that Senators want to offer that relate to the bill before us.

To the American people, do you understand me? The complaint is: We cannot debate gun amendments, agricultural sanctions, and farm amendments on a trade bill, on a bill that has bipartisan support and Presidential urging. I realize it may be within the rules, but I do not think it is a way to get this bill done.

I hope we can keep looking for a way to move it forward. I do not want to be in a position of trying to give aid and comfort to the opposition to this legislation. Obviously, that is not my preference, but Senator HOLLINGS is going to avail himself of the rules and he will be very willing to help other Senators who want to offer extraneous amendments if that will be helpful to his cause.

He is smiling and I am smiling because I know exactly what he is up to. He is doing an excellent job in trying to stop this legislation he has made clear he is opposed to. That is the way the Senate works. If one feels strongly and one Senator is willing to spend the time and use the rules, he can cause problems and delay a bill.

As far as using the tree, I did not invent the process. I must confess, I was surprised it has been used as much as it has this year. It has been a longer year than I thought, perhaps, or maybe it is a better tool than I had remembered.

Still, I will work with the managers of the bill and Senator DASCHLE, and if there is a key to unlock this bill to get it to its conclusion, I am willing to look for it. I hope we will not, though, as I said, empty out our baskets on both sides of the aisle and come up with everything we have been harboring in our heart of hearts over the past weeks or months.

Let's keep our eye on the bill. This is a big, important bill. There are countries all over the world looking at us saying: Will they keep their word? The President has gone to Central America, I believe, twice—I know for sure once—and said he wants this; we want to help the Caribbean Basin countries and the Central American countries.

I know he wants to do that, and so do I. I have been there. I have met with the Presidents. I have met with the Ambassadors. They are desperate for help. The good thing about it is this is a way we can help them and help ourselves.

In my State, we are going to produce the cotton. We are going to put the fabric together and ship it to Central America through a port. They are going to finish off the product, send it back to the port, and it is going to be available to the American people at a reasonable price.

Everybody wins: American product, American workers, American dock workers, Central American jobs, then back to America where American consumers will get a fair price for this material. That is just one example. And there are many others.

So I certainly understand what Senator DASCHLE is saying. I know there is

a pent-up demand to offer these various and sundry amendments. I understand that, but I do not feel I have any particular obligation to go out of my way to accommodate that.

Sooner or later, the time will come when these things are going to come up, one way or the other. I indicated to Senator WELLSTONE, I would like to know the details of what his amendment is to see if maybe it could be brought up freestanding. I am not so sure we would not want to just say, OK, bring it up. Let's have some limited debate and vote on it. But if you open that door, where and when does it end?

To spend a week on this bill, I was prepared to do that. To spend 2 weeks on it, I am not sure we want to do that. We have to be able to bring an end to this by Tuesday or Wednesday of next week.

That enables and strengthens the hand of the Senator from South Carolina. He knows that we are not willing to run this train endlessly. If we had 2 or 3 weeks, we could grind it down. But I hope that we would not have to do that because we do have some other issues that people on both sides of the aisle do want to do. We need to try to see if we can work out a way to do it.

Well, I am repeating myself. I understand what Senator DASCHLE is saying, and I understand the frustration. But the way to get this done is to continue to see if we can work out an agreement, and then get cloture Friday. Sixty votes; we are going to get probably 52, 53 Republicans who will vote for cloture to go on to the substance of the bill. If we can get 6 or 8 or 10 Democrats—just 6 or 8 or 10—that is all it would take, and we would be on this bill, and we would be done with it by next Wednesday. That is a worthy goal. I hope we can achieve it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me make the majority leader an offer.

He says, if there is a way to work this out, we can do it. I think he could get 30 Democratic votes, maybe even 40, on cloture on Friday if we tear down the tree and allow amendments to be offered.

We are talking about two things. We are talking about a Member's right to offer amendments, but we are also talking about the worthiness of the amendment on this particular issue, as the majority leader has stated now on several occasions, rightfully so.

I would be willing to join with the majority leader in doing one of two things. Our predecessors came up with some ingenious ways with which leadership can deal with amendments they don't want to see added—tabling motions and second degree amendments.

I would be willing to work with the majority leader on tabling motions and on second degrees in order to deal with amendments that he and I do not believe are meritorious. And I can al-

ready see the wheels turning. He is thinking: Well, there's going to be a difference between what he thinks and I think. But I believe we can work that out. I think we could have an understanding, even ahead of time, about what that means. But it would give Senator HOLLINGS, it would give Senator WELLSTONE, it would give Senator ASHCROFT, it would give everyone who has an amendment the opportunity to offer amendments. The relevant ones, the pertinent ones, we ought to support. The ones that are not in keeping with the spirit of this legislation, we might choose to oppose.

I am prepared to work with the majority leader to see if we might find a way to accommodate that. I want to see this bill pass. The President has insisted that we do all that we can to pass it. Our ranking member and the chairman have done all that they can to get us to this point. It passed by voice vote out of the Finance Committee. There ought to be a way we can get this done, if not in the timeframe that the majority leader has suggested, certainly in not too long a period after that.

But I have to oppose cloture under these circumstances. And there will not be, I would hope, a Democratic defection on cloture because we are not talking now about CBI; we are talking about a Member's right to offer an amendment. And I hope there isn't a Democrat who will say that that right isn't worth protecting under any circumstances.

So that is my offer. I am prepared to sit down this afternoon. We can find a way to do this. This isn't it.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 2340

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to address the pending amendment put forward by Senator ASHCROFT.

Both leaders were previously up and talking on the floor about moving the bill forward. I think the underlying Ashcroft amendment is actually a pretty good way to move things forward.

It is something about which most of the parties agree. It is about an ambassador position at the U.S. Trade Representative's Office. I think that is an important and worthy goal. I do not know of anybody here who actually opposes it. I know the chairman of the Finance Committee has spoken already in favor of it. Here is a way maybe we can start to move this train forward.

I want to address it from a couple of perspectives, if I could, because I think this is an important aspect for my colleagues to listen and learn a little bit about.

This is at the U.S. Trade Representative's Office, which is our lead trade negotiator. We are going into the Seattle Round, which the United States will be hosting, of the World Trade Organization. This is the premier set of trade talks.

Agriculture is the lead issue that is going to be discussed during this round of trade talks. We do not have a permanent ag negotiator at the U.S. Trade Representative's Office. So we are going into trade negotiations, which the United States is hosting, where the lead issue is agriculture and we do not have an ambassador with permanent status.

That amendment is something I think most people in this body would actually support, perhaps unanimously. I hope we can move this bill forward.

I am glad that we are having some discussions about how we might be able to move this bill forward.

Here is a pretty simple, common-sense amendment. Most of our States have some agriculture in them. Here would be a representative who could help us make that trade go forward.

This position within the U.S. Trade Representative's Office has been established on an interim basis. It was not put in on a permanent basis. It was thought: Let's try this for a little period of time. It has proven to be effective.

My State of Kansas is a major agricultural exporting State. I think we are sixth in the country as far as agricultural exports. It is a key part of our economy. Being able to export food products is an important part of what we do, as well. So to be able to have somebody with an ambassador status to be able to address these sorts of trade negotiating issues at the USTR is important to my State. It is very important.

It is particularly important now when we are having so much difficulty with farm prices. Almost all of that is due to our inability to crack into markets around the world. Whether it is dealing with China and some of their trade barriers, whether it is dealing with the Europeans and their trade subsidies, their export subsidies, whether it is dealing with tariffs globally, the United States faces high agricultural tariffs around the world.

The United States has some of the lowest agricultural tariffs. This trade ambassador would make this a central focus. It would be her or his job to make sure we keep focused on that particular issue. That is an important one. It is vitally important in this body. It is important across this country, and it is certainly important to my State.

I think it would be an important signal for us to send to the other countries around the world that will be convening in Seattle the latter part of November, the first part of December; that the United States values agriculture; that the signal we are sending is: We are going to beef up the status of the people who we have negotiating agricultural issues. We are going to do so on a permanent basis.

I think, to date, a lot of times other countries have doubted our resolve on some issues, maybe questioned our willingness to hang in there. And here

is the signal to send: No. This is important. We are going to stay in there. We are going to stick with this particular issue.

This is another way we can send that signal. This amendment makes this a clear priority for the United States; that we establish this on a permanent basis.

Agriculture is a lead export industry for the United States. Some have different figures, but either the top or the second leading export of the United States is agriculture and food products. One would think you would have somebody of an ambassadorial status who would be our lead negotiator and could speak with some authority and have not only the title but the status to be able to do so. This amendment is straightforward. This person will exist at the U.S. Trade Representative's Office and have a permanent ambassadorial rank.

It sends an important signal, not only to our trade opponents agriculturally around the world; it sends an important signal to our agricultural producers in this country. My parents, my brother who farms full time, we say to them, it is important we have somebody of status dealing with agricultural trade upon which you are so dependent for your livelihood.

I think many times farmers in this country, particularly after the passage of the Freedom to Farm Act, said Freedom to Farm won't work unless you have freedom to aggressively market. Freedom to market means we have to pound open doors around the world to let our farmers and producers have a fair shot. This helps send a signal to our farmers that we meant it.

We meant it when we said freedom to farm also means we are also going to push freedom to market. Freedom to market means you have to be able to get your foot in the door. Right now they can't get their foot in the door in a lot of places. We have sanctions on a number of countries around the world. We also have high tariffs on a number of places around the world. This sends a signal to our farmers, the agricultural industry, to our agricultural processors, and our agricultural exporters that we deem this to be an important topic as well. I think it is altogether appropriate for us to want that.

We do have people at the U.S. Trade Representative's Office who are very supportive of agriculture, but there are thousands of different issues to deal with of an export nature. They go across many different industries. It is impossible for the U.S. Trade Representative to constantly keep a strong focus on the lead export industry in the country. They have a lot of other matters with which to deal. This will help keep that focus there within the U.S. Trade Representative's Office as well and do so on a permanent basis.

I rise to speak on behalf of this particular industry, on behalf of this particular position. I think it sends the right signal to our opponents who are

against us in agricultural trade. I think it sends the right signal to our allies who want to open up agricultural trade opportunities that we think it is important. I think it sends a good signal to our agricultural producers that we deem this as important and that freedom to farm, to work, has to have freedom to market on top of that. I think that works well.

Clearly, a majority of the body wants to pass this bill. A supermajority of this body wants to pass this bill. This is an important trade initiative the chairman and ranking member have put forward. This amendment could help us move forward because it is an amendment which is probably unanimously supported. So as a facilitating effort, to try to move the total package forward, I think this one is a good start. I submit to my colleagues and to the leadership it is a good possibility.

I commend the chairman of the Finance Committee for the excellent work he has done on agricultural trade issues, which is important to his State as well, supporting this particular amendment and putting together a very important trade bill. I hope to be a part of the process to make sure it moves forward. I hope those who seek to stop it can be heard, but let us have a clear vote on this particular issue so we can have the will of the body be done.

I congratulate the chairman and thank him for his efforts and work.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished leader came to the floor to withdraw his amendment and substitute the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. He remarked, in the first instance, that we have to hasten it along. We would like to have had the bill up. We would like to have had fast track.

Then he insists on fast track on this particular bill. He filled the tree right back up again; namely, we cannot offer amendments. So in one breath he says he would like to have fast track and he is instituting fast track on this particular trade measure. He is an outstandingly talented individual, a fine looking gentleman, and so he stands there with that smile, so reasonable and says: I would like to be sure to check these amendments; we have to make sure they are relevant; I will go along with the Ashcroft agricultural amendment, but I haven't gone along with the Wellstone agricultural amendment.

We heard earlier this morning, of course, that the Wellstone agricultural amendment is not relevant. You can look at this bill. You can go right on down the list. You can find out that it is trade benefits for the Caribbean Basin Initiative. They have cover over of tax on distilled spirits, Generalized System of Preferences, trade adjustment assistance affecting the welfare of America's workforce. Nothing in here on agriculture for the CBI and the sub-Sahara.

Senator WELLSTONE, who has been trying since January to get up an agricultural amendment, has been put down. He tried all day yesterday and was put down this morning.

But if you want to take one of my friend's agricultural amendments—namely, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who is running for re-election—well, wait a minute now, let's withdraw that last amendment I had and let's put up the irrelevant agricultural amendment of the Senator from Missouri. Irrelevant absolutely.

Anybody knows a measure of this kind would go before government ops about an agriculture negotiator in the trade office.

And then the argument: We have the President and the leaders and otherwise and so many cosponsors. Well, I have the minimum wage amendment the President has been trying to get up all year long. I have the minimum wage amendment the minority leader would like to have a vote upon. I have a minimum wage amendment that doesn't have 31 but has 27 cosponsors.

It sort of fits the pattern, is my point, of the reasoned argument of the distinguished majority leader. But no, not that Wellstone agricultural amendment. That is irrelevant, and we don't want to waste the time because we would be here 2 weeks. We would be here 2 months. We are not going to stand for that, but let us have the agricultural amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Well, that is why I was smiling at my distinguished leader. I was smiling at his duplicity. There it is. You can see it for yourself. I hate to use the word "arrogant," but there is an element of that in this particular procedure. What it insists upon is: I want my way. I am going to control it. You can't put up your amendment.

And then they act dismayed when we don't vote cloture. Well, we just won't vote on the agricultural amendment now. We can keep on debating, if that is the procedure they want to continue and insist upon.

There isn't any question in my mind about agriculture. I will never forget, some years back we had \$21—it got up to \$23 billion—the best plus balance we have ever had of any commodity is America's agriculture. We have soybeans. I put in a grain elevator when I was Governor so I know about farmers. I know about soybeans. I know about cotton.

I know about exports, and everyone is for America's agriculture, except we oppose that Freedom to Farm thing that wrecked American agriculture—free market forces, free market forces. So they grabbed it up, and all the farmers took the money and ran 3 years ago. Now, the price has gone down and they are broke and they need assistance. That is why the Senator from Minnesota has been on the floor, to try to get some help for America's agriculture, not that bureaucracy over in the office of the Trade Representative

for the purpose of adding another payroll over there. That is the typical Washington political solution: Give another title, add another payroll; just move another little bit on the special trade representative.

And everybody knows that when we come to agriculture, we go to the Secretary of Agriculture, and he is there at every table every time we debate because he is steeped in the agricultural needs of the United States of America, and that is why we made good agricultural agreements. I want them to point out a bad agricultural agreement, other than, of course, NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, which has the Senators from North Dakota on durum wheat all over the floor here. They are trying to keep them from dumping on the North Dakota wheat farmers. We all know that. It hasn't worked, and everything else like that, but that is exactly what they want—like they are dumping my textiles, killing 420,000 textile jobs since NAFTA. And there it goes.

Then they come around, and let me say that I am glad they removed that sandwich bowl. I will yield in a second. I know there are important statements to be made, and I need help in trying to stop this freight train, stop this steamroller. I have been up here 33 years, and I am still the junior Senator, and I have been trying to get a point of importance with respect to the budget, and nobody listens to me on that. I keep calling it a deficit. The Congressional Budget Office keeps reporting it as a deficit.

The law—section 13.301 of the Budget Act—says that the President and the Congress cannot report a budget with the Social Security moneys in it that would cause it to be a surplus. They violate that, and nobody pays attention to us. Of course, they come up and say the interest payments, which exceed the defense budget and the Social Security budget, and all other budgets—a billion dollars a day. When President Johnson balanced the budget, it was only \$16 billion for the entire year. In 200 years of history, the cost of all the wars, from the Revolution right up to World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, we still had less than a trillion-dollar debt, and the interest cost was only \$16 billion.

Now, without the cost of a war since that time—the gulf war incidentally was taken care of by the Saudis and others—what has it soared to? To almost \$5 trillion or \$6 trillion, or something—a trillion-dollar debt and an interest cost the CBO reports as \$356 billion. But with interest rates and Mr. Greenspan, it is bound to go up. We are seeing all the signs about consumer confidence. We know it is going to be over a billion a day.

So we have fiscal cancer. So we go down this morning at 8 o'clock and borrow a billion and add it to the debt. Tomorrow morning, Friday morning, Saturday morning, Sunday morning, every day for this fiscal year 1999, I

will make a bet with anybody, and let them pick out the odds, that they will see a billion dollars a day. Why? Because we are not willing to pay for the Government we are getting. We were willing to, again, add another \$100 billion to the deficit just as the year ended, not even a month ago, September 30 of this year—\$103 billion more. They won't call that bill the Balanced Budget Act or the Social Security lockbox. I will put it in a lockbox. I got together with the Administrator of Social Security and I said: Write me a bill that will be a true lockbox. I have it. It is hidden in the Budget Committee. They know how to hide it. They don't even want to talk about it. I can't get a hearing on it. I have asked for a hearing. They totally ignore you.

But this one says you take that money and immediately redeem it to the credit of Social Security. And don't put in an IOU the first of the month every month. Put the money back into the Social Security trust fund, just as corporate America is required.

Now I am back to my friend, Denny McLain. We passed the 1994 Pension Reform Act and we said: Look, these fast takeover artists come in and pay off the company debt with the pension fund and then take the rest of the money and run. People who have been working 30, 40, even 50 years, are left high and dry with no pensions. So we put in the Pension Reform Act of 1994 making it a felony to pay off the company debt with the pension moneys.

Unfortunately, one of the all-time great pitchers—which is significant during this World Series fever—Denny McLain of the Detroit Tigers, became head of a corporation and paid off the debt with the company fund. He was sentenced to a prison term for a felony. If you can find little Denny in whatever cell he is in, tell him next time to run for the Senate. You get the good government award when you take the pension money of the people's Social Security fund and pay off your debt, so that you can talk about surplus, surplus, surplus, surplus when you are spending \$100 billion more than you are taking in and you have got deficits, deficits as far as the eye can see.

That is why I told the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee I would jump off the Capitol dome when he put up that plan called the Balanced Budget Act. They use that jargon and those titles, and the silly press picks up the language and headlines it.

So what do we do? We find out, Heavens above, that we are like Tennessee Ernie Ford, "another day older and deeper in debt." And now, instead of 356, if we only paid out \$16 billion on a pay-as-you-go basis, since President Lyndon Johnson's day, we would have \$340 billion to spend. For what? For agriculture. For what? For the research at the National Institutes of Health. For what? For Kosovo expenses. For what? For all the housing the Secretary of Housing has promulgated, and everything else like that.

We could go down and provide for all the programs you could possibly think of. You can double WIC, Head Start, any education programs, just double the education budget. And we can still have what? A tax cut. And still have what? Pay down the debt. With \$340 billion—we are spending \$340 billion. We are forced to spend it. It is a tax—a tax. What you are doing is raising taxes. You don't want to say it, but you have to pay it, you have to borrow it every day, a billion dollars a day. It is a tax on the American people. With a sales tax, I can get a school; with a gas tax, I can get a highway; with this tax, I get nothing. I served on the Grace Commission on waste, fraud, and abuse. This is the biggest waste ever created in the history of any government. They don't want to talk about that. They want to talk about the sub-Sahara.

We are building libraries down in Little Rock now. We are headed for the last roundup. So if we can show that we did something in Africa, and we did something in the CBI, oh isn't it wonderful? The President wants the minimum wage. Leaders want the minimum wage. I have 27 cosponsors who want the minimum wage. It is relevant. Trade adjustment assistance is relevant to the workforce of America and minimum wage is just as relevant to the workforce of America.

If the majority leader would come out here and say, all right, I will let you have the agricultural amendment, or rather we should say we will have this agricultural amendment, and the distinguished Senator from Missouri, if he just calls up our minimum wage, and we will agree to 5 minutes to a side, and 10 minutes, and vote. They don't want to vote. They want the political cover of parliamentary maneuver, acting as if it is serious here, and we could work this out, and this is a big responsibility on my leader, but we have to listen to both sides, and we have to be able to move legislation.

We are not going to move any minimum wage. We are not going to move any campaign finance reform. Even though they are relevant?

Time magazine came out day before yesterday and said it is relevant. They wrote a whole article. I refer again to pages 50 and 51. Everybody can read it.

Campaign finance reform is relevant. There isn't any question on this particular bill. The magazines are writing it, but the Senators can't see it. The Parliamentarians can't understand it. They couldn't call that relevant because why? Because the majority leader says you don't call that relevant. You don't call that agricultural amendment of the Senator from Minnesota relevant, but call mine: Look I have come all the way back to the floor and withdrawn my part of the tree, and put up immediately my friend's amendment on agriculture, and yes, it's relevant. We are going to be represented in agriculture. I can tell you now, but

they are going to have some bureaucracy. And that could be a good speaking point when I run for reelection myself. I hate to have to explain why I have to oppose this to my farmer friends because that is going to cause the farm problem in America, as if we didn't have a special Trade Representative with the title of ambassador.

I thank the distinguished chairman of our Finance Committee for finally removing that sandwich bowl. I didn't get over there and see it in the debate. But I see they have, these folks who are interested in textile jobs: the Bank of America, Bechtel, City Group, Daimler-Chrysler, Enro, Exxon, Fleur, and Gap that we have on the list of the Time magazine which is going overseas. They have gone over. Sara Lee and Fruit of the Loom. Actually Fruit of the Loom is already organized in the Cayman Islands as a foreign corporation. McDonalds just sells hamburgers. They wouldn't care if you came naked to buy a hamburger. Modern Africa Fund Managers, Philip Morris, Amoco, Bally's Lakeshore Resort—come on—Mobile, Occidental, Texaco. Where is anybody? The African Growth and Opportunity Act is not clear.

I could keep on talking down and down the list.

I don't know who is going to protect the jobs and the manufacturing capacity of the United States of America. I don't believe in obstructionism. I believe in moving forward. I don't believe there is, other than budget, a more important issue than the matter of manufacturing capacity here in the United States of America, on which I have gone down before and will go again. But there is no doubt we will have the opportunity to point out how we are losing out. We don't have anything to export. We have hollowed out the industrial might of the United States.

The reason they don't listen, I take it now, is they have a candidate for the President who is mixing that in with Hitler and World War II and everything else and all kinds of nonsense. So we lose credibility. Anybody can talk free trade, free trade, dignified, credible, respected, and anybody who talks about protection of the industrial strength of America is some kind of kook. I think they said, "Unite, we nutcakes." Michael Kelly in his column this morning: "Unite, we nutcakes."

So here comes another nutcake who is trying to protect American jobs, and is looked upon now by the leadership as getting in the way. Why don't I be more reasonable, and everything else of that kind? Why don't they be more reasonable?

Why don't they allow me to put up Shays-Meehan, which passed overwhelmingly, and for which we have a tremendous need? Why don't they let me put up the minimum wage, which is relevant to the trade adjustment assistance and welfare of the workers? They need it in America.

Why don't we agree to a time? We are not delaying—5 minutes to a side. We

can vote this evening on both of those bills, and they can go to all of their appropriations bills that they want so we can get away from this so-called fill up the tree and fast track on this trade bill. They have fast track. They know it. Don't come out and complain and say: We would like to have gotten fast track. Parliamentarily, they have instituted fast track. That is the position they put the Senator from South Carolina in, and those in international trade.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed as if in morning business for up to 12 minutes.

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

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Tony Martinez, a legislative assistant in my office, be allowed floor privileges during the pendency of this introduction.

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

(The remarks of Mr. BINGAMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1806 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

(The remarks of Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. CRAIG pertaining to the introduction of S. 1814 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I was taking the opportunity to address some of the arguments that have been raised during the debate on this bill these past several days. Some of my colleagues have questioned why we are taking this bill up now. Let me help them by putting this in context.

Section 134 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, which passed the Congress in 1994, directed the President to develop a comprehensive trade and development policy for the countries of Africa. That provision originated with Senator DASCHLE, now the distinguished minority leader.

In the Statement of Administrative Action that accompanied the Act, the President made clear that the first measures he intended to consider in complying with that congressional mandate, were measures to:

Remove impediments to U.S. trade with and investment in Africa, including enhancements in the GSP program for least-developed countries.

Section 134 of the URAA recognized that, as a continent, Africa had been left behind in trade terms. New approaches were needed to integrate Africa fully into the world economy, to allow Africa to take full advantage of the world trading system, and to ensure that Africans themselves had the

opportunity to guide their own economic destiny.

Now, 5 years after the Congress originally endorsed the idea, this legislation responds directly to that mandate. The legislation offers a down payment on a new and more constructive relationship with the African continent—one as partners with similar interests in expanding economic opportunity and raising living standards in all our countries.

The President has for the past 2 years indicated in his State of the Union Address his intent to press ahead with this legislation. He identified this legislation as one of his top trade and foreign policy initiatives. In his trip to Africa this past year, he committed to move the bill as part of a new initiative for Africa.

That led to the consideration of this legislation in the 105th Congress. The House passed its counterpart legislation in the spring of this past year, the Finance Committee reported out a bill in all respects the same as that we now have before us, but time ran out before the Senate could act on the bill.

This year the House once again acted, this time in June. By that point, the Finance Committee had already reported out the legislation now on the Senate floor. The Africa bill is timely—indeed, it is past time we acted on this important measure.

The same holds true for the CBI. A proposal for establishing parity between the preferences granted Mexico under the NAFTA and those granted the Caribbean and Central America has been before Congress in one form or another almost since the NAFTA was implemented in late 1993.

In the 105th Congress, there was considerable effort invested by both the Ways and Means and Finance Committees in moving counterpart bills. That work was renewed in the 106th Congress with hearings and markups before both committees.

The CBI title enjoys the same bipartisan support as does the Africa title. Indeed, the President's CBI bill, introduced in this session at his request, is virtually identical to the bill reported from the Finance Committee bill in both the 105th and 106th Congresses.

The Finance Committee bill enjoys the backing of the leadership and members on both sides of the aisle. It is, in fact, a testament to the bipartisan support for this legislation and the considerable push by the White House that we have been given time to debate this bill now.

It is time to reject the isolationist label, the instinct to ignore the broader world around us, and the tendency for focus exclusively inward. It is time to affirm the constructive role that the United States can play in the wider world and fulfill the leadership the world expects from the United States. It is time to act.

It is time to act because it is time we made good on the unfulfilled promises made to both Africa and the Caribbean.

An October, 1998, report of the International Trade Commission makes clear, Africa faces daunting economic challenges. The ITC report highlights the economic and structural problems Africa faces in attracting productive investment.

For all that, the ITC report also reflects the positive changes under way in Africa. The region's GDP rose by 4.8 percent from 1995 to 1997. Since 1990, the region has reached a number of agreements eliminating trade and investment barriers and harmonizing economic policies.

Most of the governments of the region have "introduced economic reforms to control budget deficits, and inflation, and to stabilize currencies." They have liberalized "regulations on trade and investment," reduced tariffs and other import charges and abolished most price controls.

In addition, many of the governments have begun significant programs of privatization. In fact, the governments of sub-Saharan Africa raised "an estimated \$5.8 billion from privatization, primarily through divestitures of utilities and telecommunication firms."

What this legislation tries to do is meet those governments half way. It is an effort to open our markets to their products as a way of reinforcing their own efforts to encourage productive investment and economic growth.

The legislation is designed to reinforce a growing, the growing interest in Africa among U.S. businesses. Direct investment by U.S. firms more than quadrupled in 1997 alone to \$3.8 billion, according to the ITC. We want to encourage that positive trend.

Some may argue that, because this is a grant of unilateral preferences, it is one-sided—that there will be no benefits to the United States. What that ignores is the track record of the last several decades.

Where U.S. investment goes, U.S. trade follows. Significantly, while U.S. investment was increasing in 1996 and 1997 in sub-Saharan Africa, our exports to the region experienced a corresponding growth in capital goods, particularly exports of machinery for use in agriculture and infrastructure projects.

Africa represents an important opportunity to our farmers as well. While agricultural exports fell in dollar terms, largely because of the lower prices available on world markets for all commodities, Africa represents an important potential market for U.S. food exports as the continent increasingly looks offshore to meet its needs.

The real issue is whether or not the region will have the wherewithal to buy what it needs to offset the steady decline in per capita caloric intake that has accelerated in the last 2 to 3 years. The legislation before us would help address that problem. By opening our markets to their products, sub-Saharan African countries can earn the foreign exchange needed to purchase

food on world markets, including from U.S. exporters.

Will that be enough? Will this legislation alone be the answer to Africa's problems? Plainly not. As Senator GRASSLEY indicated in his eloquent statement opening the debate on this bill last Thursday, this legislation is no panacea. It is instead a small, but significant step toward a new economic relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

Should this legislation be supplemented by other initiatives? It should and it must if it is going to work. But, the fact that it is not the whole answer to Africa's problems or does not reflect all that the United States might do to help Africans secure their own economic destiny is no argument against action. It is time to move ahead and engage constructively with our African partners in the transition they themselves have begun.

The same holds true for the Caribbean and Central America. Through the original CBI program, the United States and U.S. private businesses have played a significant role in the economic progress the region has made over the past 15 years.

This past year, however, natural disasters eliminated much of the progress made in the Caribbean and Central America in recent years. The devastation began with the eruption of a long-dormant volcano that nearly depopulated the island of Montserrat and nearly erased its economy in the summer of 1998.

In September of that year, Hurricane Georges severely damaged both the Dominican Republic and Haiti. An even more devastating hurricane—Hurricane Mitch—struck Central America in late October and early November late in the hurricane season.

Honduras and Nicaragua were particularly hard hit, but the hurricane also did considerable damage to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Belize. Hurricane Mitch left 11,000 dead and an even greater number homeless. Much of the resulting damage was long-term—massive property damage and soil erosion, the devastation of crop lands and manufacturing sites, putting thousands out of work. The region will take years to recover.

Those devastating circumstances have given renewed impetus to an idea that surfaced almost immediately after the implementation of the NAFTA—the expansion of tariff preferences under the CBI to match those offered under the NAFTA to Mexico.

Will it work? I am confident it will because the legislation is modeled on existing production-sharing arrangements in textiles and apparel and other industries that already account for nearly half of all imports from the CBI beneficiary countries.

In other words, the program has a proven track record. Indeed, bilateral trade in textiles and apparel under existing production-sharing partnerships between U.S. and Caribbean or Central

American firms already accounts for 36 percent of current two-way trade between the United States and the CBI region.

For all those reasons, the legislation merits our support.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I am aware there are other Senators who wish to speak. I will only take a moment to thank our chairman, our revered chairman, for his comments, with which I wholly agree, with which the Finance Committee entirely agrees. This bill comes to you, as he has said, from a near unanimous committee. Ninety Senators voted, just yesterday, to move forward.

I would just say, sir, I wish we could have all been present this afternoon when the Congressional Gold Medal was presented to President Ford and Mrs. Ford in the Rotunda. The President gave a wonderful speech, describing the Congress he came into, just as the Cold War commenced; the extraordinary efforts that the 80th Congress made to pass the Marshall Plan, for which they were not entirely rewarded by President Truman, who kept talking about the "do-nothing" 80th Congress. But there you are. Then came President Eisenhower and the movement to establish NATO and to fund NATO, in which Speaker Rayburn, Majority Leader Johnson, and great Republicans joined in that matter.

Of his life in politics, in government, he said: I came in and I remained a moderate on social issues, a fiscal conservative on fiscal issues, and a convinced internationalist.

That is the America that fought in the dark, that long struggle about which John F. Kennedy talked. And we prevailed.

The totalitarian 20th century is behind us. Freedoms open up. Are we now to close down at just the moment when everything we have stood for as a nation, from the time of Cordell Hull and the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934—every measure we are talking about in this bill, no, it is not the final end-all effort; it is a part of a continuing effort that goes back to Trade Adjustment Assistance. It was established in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. I was involved in writing that legislation. It said, if you have trade, there will be winners, there will be losers. We will look after the people who are temporarily, as it turns out, disrupted, as economic patterns, trade patterns change.

In 48 hours, or 52 hours, the appropriation for the program, supported by every President since President Kennedy, expires. The authorization in fact ended on June 30. Can we let that happen? Can we believe that we would do this? Surely not.

But unless we are urgently attentive to the matters before us, and work out what are technical differences, it will go down; and we will be remembered

for ending an era of enormous expansion and example to the rest of the world, which the Western World is just beginning to follow on. It is hard to believe.

But listen to what the chairman said and hope in the next 24 hours we can do this, because we can. And, sir, we must.

Under the rules, President Ford, I believe, has free access to the floor. I wish he would come on here and talk to each of us one on one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. First of all, let me thank the distinguished ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator MOYNIHAN, for his eloquent remarks. All I can say is, we must not let that happen. And with the kind of bipartisan spirit we had in the Finance Committee, it will not happen.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I would like to be recognized to conduct morning business.

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

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to Rebecca Morley of my staff.

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

Mr. REED. I thank the Chair.

#### NATIONAL CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING PREVENTION WEEK

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to speak with respect to National Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Week. Because of the efforts of my colleagues, Senator COLLINS, Senator TORRICElli, and myself, this Senate passed a bipartisan resolution a last week to commemorate, during the week of October 24 to 30, National Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Week.

I think it is appropriate to recognize this problem that is taking place throughout this country and also recognize what we are trying to do to alleviate this great problem.

As a preliminary point, let me commend my colleague, Senator COLLINS, for her great efforts in this regard. She has been a true leader in this issue. She has been someone who has fought the good fight with respect to this problem. She has participated legislatively.

I was very pleased and honored a few weeks ago to have her join me in Providence, RI, for a hearing on this issue. I look forward to joining her in a few weeks in Maine so we can examine the experience in her home State.

I also want to commend my colleague, Senator TORRICElli, who also is very active as a leader in this effort. Indeed, Senator TORRICElli and I have introduced legislation, the Children's Lead SAFE Act of 1999, which is critically important to the future of our children in the United States.

This importance has been underscored and highlighted by two recent reports—one earlier this year in January of 1999 by the General Accounting Office, and another report that has been released recently under the auspices of the Alliance To End Childhood Lead Poisoning and the National Center for Lead-Safe Housing.

Both of these reports underscore the need for additional efforts to eliminate childhood exposure to lead and also to provide additional support for screening and treatment of children who are exposed to environmental lead.

Regrettably, there are too many children in this country who are exposed to lead, typically through old lead paint that may be in their home. It is particularly critical and crucial to children who are at a very young age, under the age of 6, because their body is much more likely to absorb this environmental hazard, and also because those are exactly the times in which brain nervous systems are developing, where cognitive skills are being developed. We know lead is the most pernicious enemy of cognitive development in children.

In the United States, too many children are poisoned through this constant exposure to low-levels of lead in their atmosphere. This exposure leads to reduced IQ, problems with attention span, hyperactivity, impaired growth, reading and learning disabilities, hearing loss, and a range of other effects.

Lead poisoning is entirely avoidable, if we have the knowledge and the resources and the effort to prevent young children from being exposed to lead.

In January of this year, as I indicated, the General Accounting Office highlighted the problems in the Federal health care system with respect to lead screening and followup services for children.

We have policies that require all Medicaid children to be screened for lead. Sadly, we have not achieved that level of 100 percent screening. We want to reach that goal. Then after screening all of the children in the United States who may be vulnerable to lead poisoning, we want to ensure these children have access to followup care. Identifying poisoned children is only the first step and is only effective when coupled with proper follow-up care.

Most recently, we received information about that follow-up care from a report, the title of which is: "Another Link in the Chain: State Policies and

Practices for Case Management and Environmental Investigation for Lead-Poisoned Children." As I indicated, this report was sponsored by the Alliance To End Childhood Lead Poisoning and the National Center for Lead-Safe Housing.

This report presents a State-by-State analysis of data which suggests, first, there have been some innovative steps taken by the States, but unfortunately there are disappointing gaps in the screening and treatment of children who are exposed to lead throughout the United States.

There is also a great range among the States in their response to this problem of childhood lead poisoning. In my own State of Rhode Island, we have taken some very aggressive steps. Last week, we dedicated a lead center in Providence, RI, which provides comprehensive services for lead-poisoned children, including parent education, medical followup for children who have been exposed, and transitional housing. Many times the source of the pollution is in the home of these children, and because of their low income, there is no place for them to go unless there is this transitional housing. This is an innovative step forward. I am very pleased and proud to say it has taken place in my home State.

If you look across the Nation, you find much less progress. Nearly half of the States have no standards for case management and, thus, the quality of care lead poisoned children receive is often not consistent with public health recommendations. There is no real way to ensure these children are getting the type of care they need because there are no case management policies. Only 35 States have implemented policies that address when an environmental investigation should be performed to determine the source of a child's lead poisoning. There are many States where there is no way to determine where the source of the pollution is coming from that is harming the child.

In addition, the report points out that despite the availability of Medicaid reimbursement for environmental investigation and case management, more than half the States have not taken advantage of this Medicaid reimbursement. In addition, despite the emphasis we have in Medicaid on screening children, only one-third of the States could report on how many of their lead poisoned children were enrolled in Medicaid, suggesting that screening data are not being coordinated, and there really is not comprehensive, coherent screening policy in all too many States.

Senator TORRICElli and I have proposed legislation that would address these deficiencies. The legislation will improve the management information systems so States know how many children are screened and how many children have been exposed. We also encourage them to integrate all the different agencies and institutions and programs that serve children so we can