

not to exceed 5 minutes, and that I be recognized to transact legislative business.

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

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

CHINA'S ACCESSION TO THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in my capacity as chairman of the International Trade Subcommittee and getting ready for the Seattle Round, as well as considering China's accession to the World Trade Organization, I want to speak on Congress' power and our responsibility on the whole issue of international trade.

It is very clear in the Constitution that the Congress of the United States has the power, as one of the specifically delineated powers of Congress in the first article, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. So the United States has just concluded a bilateral market access agreement with China. It should pave the way for China's accession to the World Trade Organization.

From what I have heard about this agreement—and, of course, we only have summaries at this point—it is an exceptionally good one for the United States and especially for American agriculture. I said, when the agreement fell through on April 8, I was fearful that a lot of ground would be lost. I don't think, from what I know, there has been any ground lost with the renegotiation. Charlene Barshefsky, our U.S. Trade Representative, conducted herself in a highly professional way and negotiated what appears to be an excellent agreement, and she did it under very difficult circumstances.

Now that the negotiations are finished, the job of the Senate and the House of Representatives becomes even more important. Our constitutional responsibility requires that the Senate and the House carefully review the agreement in its entirety, and the extent to which there are changes in law, they obviously have to pass the Congress, as any law would, and be signed by the President.

It is a responsibility every Senator takes very seriously because it is assigned to us by the Constitution. And because the Congress has a unique and close relationship with the American people, we must also keep faith with the people who sent us here to fulfill our constitutional responsibilities.

That is why it is critical we know everything that was negotiated.

I want to put emphasis upon that statement.

That is why it is important that the Congress of the United States know everything that was negotiated—every thing, every issue, every detail, and every interpretation—so there can be no surprises, no private exchanges of letters, no private understandings about the key meanings of key phrases in the agreement, and no reservations

whatsoever that are kept just between negotiators.

In other words, if Congress is going to legislate these agreements and secure these agreements, Congress has a responsibility not only to make sure everything is on the table but to make sure the administration puts everything on the table.

Let me be clear about this. There is an absolute requirement of disclosure. Congress must see everything that is negotiated. And it has not always been this way, or I wouldn't be to the floor asking my colleagues to consider this, and with an admonition to the administration to make sure everything is given to Congress. When congressional approval is required, only what we see and vote on should become the law. Nothing should become the law of the land that is secretly negotiated and that isn't submitted to Congress for our approval.

Because there have been problems in this area in the past, Senator CONRAD of North Dakota and I have introduced legislation. This legislation is contained in the African trade bill. That trade bill was recently approved by the Senate. I will work very hard to see that this provision is part of the final bill approved by conference committee before the African trade bill is sent to the President.

Why are we where we are today with what Senator CONRAD and I have tried to accomplish, and did accomplish, as far as the Senate is concerned? Unfortunately, past administrations have not complied with their basic principles of complete disclosure and complete openness in their submittal of agreements to the Congress. A prior administration—it happened to be a Republican administration—violated the spirit, if not the letter, of this absolute good faith requirement of complete disclosure. This incident occurred in 1988. I want to give background on it because it was in regard to the Canadian Free Trade Agreement which became part of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

At that time, there was disagreement about the meaning of a term relating to Canada's price support system for wheat.

If anybody has heard the articulate speaking of the Senator from North Dakota on this issue—Senator CONRAD has talked about this many times, about wheat unfairly coming into the northern United States in violation of the free trade agreement but somehow being legal because of these side agreements that Congress didn't know about in the past.

There was a disagreement about the meaning of a term relating to Canada's price support system for wheat. The issue dealt with whether the Canadians were manipulating their price support system by unfairly defining a very key term in their favor, thus allowing them to sell wheat below cost in the United States market in violation of the clear meaning of a provision of the Cana-

dian-United States free trade agreement.

The United States insisted that Canada was, indeed, selling wheat below cost in violation of the agreement. Canada denied the violation. The dispute was even taken to a binational panel for resolution.

In the argument before the binational panel for dispute resolution, the Canadian side at that time produced a letter from a few years back from the United States Trade Representative to the Canadians supporting the Canadian interpretation of the provision and very devastating to the case brought by the United States.

The question now is whether the U.S. Trade Representative's letter, or his interpretation of this controversial and important provision, was properly reported to the Congress before we considered that agreement, voted on it, and it became the law of the land. Some might argue that it was disclosed. Others say it was not.

In my view, because the issue of Canada's price support system for wheat was such a politically sensitive issue in the context of the NAFTA agreement, there should not have been any room for doubt what the administration's interpretation was. The disclosure of the administration's interpretation of this key language should have been fully and completely disclosed—not just in the fine print or in response to questions raised by a Senator at a hearing.

When important issues of foreign commerce are at stake and Congress is exercising its constitutional power of regulating foreign commerce, we in the Congress should not have to guess what the answer is or even have to figure out how to ask the right questions in the hearing at the right time and in the right way to get an honest answer, to have open disclosure of what our agreements are and what the results of the negotiation are.

This incident on the wheat and the Canadian Free Trade Agreement had unfortunate and profound consequences. It led some in Congress to believe they could not trust our negotiators. Some of us believed we weren't dealt with fairly. The American wheat farmer has been harmed as a result of it.

Now, I want to say I have the highest regard for our negotiators, especially for Ambassador Barshefsky. She has done a remarkable job. She has my complete trust. So this is not about Ambassador Barshefsky. It is not about any one of our negotiators. Nor is this a partisan concern. The incident that sparked my concern occurred during a Republican administration. I am concerned about one simple thing. The principle of openness and full disclosure to Congress.

This simple, basic principle applies not just to the agreement with China. In about ten days, the United States will help launch a new round of global trade negotiations in Seattle. This new round of trade liberalization talks will

cover agriculture, services, and other key trade issues. Many of these issues are sensitive, and even controversial.

We must be confident that we will see everything that is negotiated in the new round before it can become law. The legislation Senator CONRAD and I wrote that is part of the Africa trade bill requires full disclosure to Congress of all agreements or understandings with a foreign government relating to agricultural trade negotiations—what we refer to here as agricultural trade negotiations, objectives, and consultation.

Anyway, our provision says that any such agreement or understanding that is not disclosed to Congress before legislation implementing a trade agreement is introduced in the Congress shall not become law. In other words, if Congress doesn't know about the agreement, it should not become law. That is very simple. It is very clear. It is a restatement of the principle of full disclosure. It is consistent with Congress' constitutional responsibility for foreign commerce, but I understand the administration opposes this common-sense provision. They want it removed from the bill.

Mr. President, it says in the Conrad-Grassley bill, no secret side deals. The Congress agreed that there should be fully submitted to Congress all of the provisions of any negotiations that must be approved by Congress. I don't know why the administration wants this language removed from the trade bill, but this is what they have sent to the conferees in the Congress of the United States. They list this section that says no secret side deals. They are suggesting we strike this subsection.

We cannot let this happen. I will do everything I can to make sure this physical disclosure provision becomes the law of the land when the House and Senate conferees finally consider the African trade bill. I believe our Government should live by the same standards we expect from farmers in my hometown of New Hartford, IA, or any businessman in Des Moines, IA. Tell us exactly what you mean. Show us everything in the agreement. Act in good faith.

I ask my colleagues to support this provision and vote for it when it comes back from the conference committee so we have physical disclosure of everything so Congress isn't asked to vote on something that is secret, that we don't know anything about. If we do that, we are violating our constitutional responsibility to the people of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement the Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

GOOD NEWS FOR RURAL NEW YORK

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today I am happy to say there is good news in the omnibus budget bill for rural New

Yorkers in two ways. The Satellite Home Viewer Act will finally allow rural residents in rural areas to receive local television programming, and the dairy language in the omnibus final package allows both option 1-A and the New England Dairy Compact to continue. Let me touch on both of these. It is clearly two dollops of good news for rural New Yorkers.

On the satellite bill, I have had constituent after constituent in areas such as Allegany County and Chenango County and Steuben County and Ulster County, throughout New York State in rural areas, tell me all of a sudden they were unable to receive over the air signals to receive local satellite programming. Imagine being cut off. Imagine for years depending on the weather reports before you took your kids to school or because you are a farmer and then not being able to get them. Imagine having your local news shows cut off. Imagine not being able to see things your family was accustomed to seeing, all because of a court action.

Today, that bill, that court action, is being overruled in the omnibus act. I am delighted to say half a million New York residents will now be able to get their local signal from their satellite which they were not able to do before—half a million people, all back the way they should be.

I hope we will continue the progress of the Satellite Home Viewer Act. The Federal provision was taken out. I understand the Senate Banking Committee plans to hold hearings next year to ensure that multiservice providers are encouraged to extend competition. I want to work with my colleagues to make sure my constituents in upstate rural New York, central New York, the west and southern tier, and in the north country have the same viewing options as those in downstate.

The other bit of good news, of course, is the dairy language in the final bill. First, I know some of my colleagues from Wisconsin and Minnesota have labored long and hard on behalf of their constituents in this regard. I salute their hard work, their tenacity, and their diligence. I heard the Senator from Minnesota say the average dairy farm in his State has 60 cows. It is no different in New York. We don't have large farms, by and large. We shouldn't be pitting one against the other. Without 1-A and without the dairy compact we would have had desperate times in rural New York for our dairy farmers. We are the third largest dairy State. Dairy is a vital industry in much of New York.

If option 1-B were allowed to be implemented, New York would experience the single largest loss of any State, \$30.5 million a year. Compacts, of course, are necessary. The 1-A option passed both Houses. This is not something being done in the dark of night and not being debated. Both Houses, after full debate, passed both compacts.

I say with all due respect to my colleagues from Minnesota and Wisconsin,

it is they who seek to thwart the will of the majority of the House and the Senate when they try at the last minute to stop an omnibus bill from going through. We need this compact.

In New York and New England, the price of milk has not risen by more than 4 cents over the national average in every given year. I say to my downstate constituents, to keep an industry vital to all New Yorkers going, is it worth it to pay that 4 cents? Almost everyone says yes. With senior citizen centers, WIC, and other types of good programs being exempt, this is a worthy piece of legislation. I think it is a good day for the dairy farmers of New York.

It is not all we wanted; I admit that. We want New York to be added to the Northeast Dairy Compact, and we will fight like the devil to make that happen in future years. Without 1-A and the existing dairy compact, which still benefits New York dairy farms in the north country and places such as Washington and Warren Counties and in central New York, those areas without the New England Dairy Compact, we would have suffered dramatically. Adding insult to injury, not having option 1-A would have been devastating.

In the last decade, New York State has lost one-third of its dairy farms, 13,000 to 8,600. The dairy compact and option 1-A will help my State and region retain this vital and cherished industry. I believe that can be done not at the expense of our counterparts in the Midwest.

In conclusion, it is a good day for rural New Yorkers in this omnibus bill. No. 1, the Satellite Home Viewer Act will allow half a million New York families to receive local signal once again; and, an extension of the dairy compact, as well as extension of option 1-A, will allow our dairy farmers who have been struggling over the last decade to have a better chance to survive, to grow, and to prosper in one of the industries most vital to all of New York State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, the Senator from Maine is recognized.

SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Ms. COLLINS. For the information of all of our colleagues, I inform Senators that we are still working out some last-minute issues that will then allow the Senate to move a number of important bills that have been cleared on both sides. While we are waiting for these last-minute glitches to be resolved, I want to take this opportunity to respond to some of the comments made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle this morning.

I am disappointed in some of the process, and I do not support all of the provisions of the omnibus appropriations bill which we will consider later this day, but I very much disagree with the assertions made by some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle