

with the work of the people when they refuse to allow reasonable debate on the subject. There are ways to do it: Fill up the amendment tree, that stops it; invoke cloture, that stops it; or put in quorum calls, or have majority votes on things that stop the process.

The question is simply, Do we want to extend Social Security solvency? I think that answer has to be yes. Do we want to extend the Medicare solvency? I think that answer has to be yes.

Let the American people decide. When do they decide? They decide in November 2000 whether or not they prefer one method or the other. We ought to be plain spoken about what it is we are trying to do and not shut off the debate and not say that the Democrats could have offered amendments. They couldn't have, not at that time. They could have in due time—after everything was signed, sealed, and delivered. It is a backhanded way of operating.

I hope we will move on to the debate of the lockbox legislation. Let the public hear it. Take the time necessary to have a full airing. Let either side amend it and get on with serving the people's needs.

How much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has control of 3 minutes 20 seconds; the Republicans have 2 minutes 54 seconds.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield the floor.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute 30 seconds.

We are here today to try to put in motion a process that will save the Social Security trust fund surpluses for Social Security. The Republicans have been trying to simply get a vote on our proposal for over 70 days.

The entire parliamentary effort that has been described has been aimed at simply getting us a chance to have a vote on what was our original amendment to a different bill. The notion that getting cloture on that amendment would somehow stifle opportunities for others to bring amendments is not the way this system works. I think everybody should understand that. Our goal is to get a vote on the amendment we wanted. That is perfectly consistent with what people on all sides always try to do. It was a simple effort.

Let's not get caught up in the parliamentary discussions. The bottom line is we are still trying to create a lockbox for the American people who send payroll taxes to Washington so they can be assured those dollars go to Social Security. That is what we are fighting for. This debate is no more complicated than that.

We have heard claims people want a weaker lockbox, a harder lockbox. Let's go forward with it. Let's pass this motion. Let's vote for cloture today. Give Members a chance to have a vote on our plan. If others want to offer their plans, there will be opportunities for that.

I don't think there should be any absence of clarity as to what we have

been trying to achieve for 73 days, and that is simply to get a vote on a lockbox, which was brought as an amendment by the Republicans. We will still get that vote; we will keep fighting until we do.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield back the remaining time.

Mr. ABRAHAM. How much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republicans have 1 minute 16 seconds.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I yield that time to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this is not an issue of what kind of economic game plan we have had for the last 5 or 6 years. We all understand that hard-working Americans are making this economy hum. Investors who have become more enlightened and entrepreneurs who are taking more risks have caused a great American recovery, sustained in a manner we have never expected.

The issue is, when we collect more taxes, and we exceed expectations—in fact, not just by a few hundred million, but actually approaching \$1 trillion—should we wait for the Government to spend it or should we give some of it back to the American taxpayer?

Actually, the Social Security trust fund can be saved. Medicare with prescription drugs can be reformed and fixed so we have prescription drugs, and there is still a large amount of money left over. What should we do with it? Invent some way to set it aside? If we do that, it will be spent. Let's give some of it back to the American people. That is why the lockbox is important. It says what is left over does not belong to Social Security; it belongs to the American people. Use it prudently, Congress, and give back some of it.

It appears there is a war with that side of the aisle against giving anything back to the American people from these kinds of surpluses. I believe we will win that war. We relish it. We are ready to go. That will be the issue the next couple of months.

I yield the floor.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 89, S. 557, a bill to provide guidance for the designation of emergencies as a part of the budget process:

Trent Lott, Spencer Abraham, Jim Inhofe, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Pete Domenici, Paul Coverdell, Wayne Allard, Jesse Helms, Larry E. Craig, Mike Crapo, Chuck Hagel, Mike DeWine, Michael H. Enzi, Judd Gregg, Tim Hutchinson, and Craig Thomas.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the quorum call is waived.

#### VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 557, a bill to provide guidance for the designation of emergencies as part of the budget process, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rules. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced— yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 193 Leg.]

#### YEAS—99

|           |            |             |
|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Abraham   | Enzi       | Lott        |
| Akaka     | Feingold   | Lugar       |
| Allard    | Feinstein  | Mack        |
| Ashcroft  | Fitzgerald | McCain      |
| Baucus    | Frist      | McConnell   |
| Bayh      | Gorton     | Mikulski    |
| Bennett   | Graham     | Moynihan    |
| Biden     | Gramm      | Murkowski   |
| Bingaman  | Grams      | Murray      |
| Bond      | Grassley   | Nickles     |
| Boxer     | Gregg      | Reed        |
| Breaux    | Hagel      | Reid        |
| Brownback | Harkin     | Robb        |
| Bryan     | Hatch      | Roberts     |
| Bunning   | Helms      | Rockefeller |
| Burns     | Hollings   | Santorum    |
| Byrd      | Hutchinson | Sarbanes    |
| Campbell  | Hutchison  | Schumer     |
| Chafee    | Inhofe     | Sessions    |
| Cleland   | Inouye     | Shelby      |
| Cochran   | Jeffords   | Smith (NH)  |
| Collins   | Johnson    | Smith (OR)  |
| Conrad    | Kennedy    | Snowe       |
| Coverdell | Kerrey     | Specter     |
| Craig     | Kerry      | Stevens     |
| Crapo     | Kohl       | Thomas      |
| Daschle   | Kyl        | Thompson    |
| DeWine    | Landrieu   | Thurmond    |
| Dodd      | Lautenberg | Torricelli  |
| Domenici  | Leahy      | Voinovich   |
| Dorgan    | Levin      | Warner      |
| Durbin    | Lieberman  | Wellstone   |
| Edwards   | Lincoln    | Wyden       |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 99, the nays are 1. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

#### GUIDANCE FOR THE DESIGNATION OF EMERGENCIES AS A PART OF THE BUDGET PROCESS—RESUMED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 557) to provide guidance for the designation of emergencies as a part of the budget process.

Pending:

Lott (for Abraham) amendment No. 254, to preserve and protect the surpluses of the social security trust funds by reaffirming the exclusion of receipts and disbursement from the budget, by setting a limit on the debt held by the public, and by amending the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide a process to reduce the limit on the debt held by the public.

Abraham Amendment No. 255 (to Amendment No. 254), in the nature of a substitute.

Lott motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Governmental Affairs, with instructions and report back forthwith.

Lott amendment No. 296 (to the instructions of the Lott motion to recommit), to provide for Social Security surplus preservation and debt reduction.

Lott amendment No. 297 (to Amendment No. 296), in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the pending amendment No. 297 to Calendar No. 89, S. 557, a bill to provide guidance for the designation of emergencies as a part of the budget process:

Trent Lott, Pete Domenici, Rod Grams, Michael Crapo, Bill Frist, Michael Enzi, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Judd Gregg, Strom Thurmond, Chuck Hagel, Thad Cochran, Rick Santorum, Paul Coverdell, James Inhofe, Bob Smith, Wayne Allard.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LOTT. For the information of all Senators, under the previous order, this cloture vote will occur on Friday, July 16, at 10:30 a.m. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived. And I ask consent the bill be placed back on the calendar.

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

Mr. LOTT. Let me emphasize to all Senators to double-check and recheck their calendars—there will be a vote on Friday morning, the 16th, at 10:30—so that everybody will know they will be expected to be present and voting at that time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Pennsylvania has 30 minutes.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a few seconds for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. SPECTER. I agree to yield for 15 seconds, which the Senator asked for, for a unanimous consent request.

#### TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

##### AMENDMENT NO. 1193

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent to send an amendment to the desk to

the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill and that the amendment be laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NOMINATION OF LAWRENCE SUMMERS AND PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I had asked for a reservation of some 30 minutes to speak on the pending nomination of Mr. Larry Summers for the position of Secretary of the Treasury.

In considering the nomination of Mr. Summers for the position of Secretary of the Treasury, I have reviewed the many facets of the work of that particular office and have focused with particularity, at this time, on the administration's policy on nonenforcement of the antidumping laws. I had met with Mr. Summers on Friday, June 18th, and told him at that time that I was giving consideration to a protest vote against his nomination because of the administration's failure to enforce the antidumping laws after having discussed with him his own views.

Since that time I have decided to direct my efforts, instead, to try to put together a coalition of Members of Congress, both in the House and the Senate, to find a remedy where a private right of action could be used to enforce the antidumping laws.

This is a subject that has been of great concern to me during my entire tenure in the Senate, having introduced a variety of bills—which I shall discuss in due course—going back as early as 1982.

In the course of a number of legislative proposals, I have had cosponsorship from a wide variety of my Senate colleagues, including then-Senator GORE, Senators THURMOND, BYRD, HELMS, COCHRAN, HATCH, INOUE, MURKOWSKI, KENNEDY, LEVIN, SANTORUM, MIKULSKI, and SESSIONS.

The problem of dumping is an extraordinarily acute problem in America today. It has come into very sharp focus with what has been happening in the steel industry, which has been decimated over the past two decades.

Steel, two decades ago—in 1979—had employees numbering approximately 500,000. Today, we have about a third of that number. In the course of the past several months, some 10,000 steelworkers have lost their jobs because of dumping from many foreign importers. But in reviewing the issue of dumping, I have found that it is extraordinarily widespread.

Here is a partial list of the products which are dumped in the United States, in addition to steel: wheat, hogs, lamb, cotton, sugar, orange juice, raspberries, flowers, salmon, mushrooms, paper clips, pencils, garlic, brake rotors, telephone systems, brass, pasta, picture tubes, rubber, industrial belts. And the series goes on and on.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, the antidumping duty orders in effect as of March 1, 1999, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPECTER. This list contains, I am advised, some 280 products which are dumped in the United States where our dumping laws, simply stated, are not enforced.

There is a groundswell in America today protesting the failure to enforce the antidumping laws. Dumping is a situation where, for example, steel coming from Russia will be sold cheaper in the United States than it is being sold in Russia. That is flatly against the laws of the United States. It is flatly against international trade laws. The United States has laws against that kind of dumping. But they are, simply stated, ignored.

The groundswell of opposition to dumping is reflected in the very strong vote in the House of Representatives on the so-called steel quota bill; 289 Members of the House voting in favor of it, 141 in opposition, more than enough votes to override a veto.

When the issue came to the Senate last week, there was considerable speculation as to whether there would be 67 votes to override a veto and whether there would be an excess of 60 votes for cloture. Then, as a result of some very intense, last-minute lobbying by the administration, a great many Senators changed their votes, reversed their announced intentions, and we had 42 votes in favor of the steel quota bill. Even so, it was a large vote in the Senate—considering all the circumstances—because of the very strong public policy against quotas, remembering the problems in the Smoot-Hawley era. I think the effort at the quota bill was really to attract the attention of the administration, to show how serious the problem was.

In my capacity as chairman of the steel caucus, I have convened a number of meetings of our caucus. I have met with Treasury Secretary Rubin and Commerce Secretary Daley and Trade Representative Barshefsky. We have made the case of the need for enforcement of our trade laws. While not exactly a deaf ear, there was certainly little by way of any positive response.

I had an opportunity to talk personally with the President during a long plane ride from Andrews to Tel Aviv last December. The plane ride was more than 10 hours, an opportunity to talk about a great many subjects. I discussed with the President the very serious problems with the steel industry. He was sympathetic but nothing really has come from the administration to deal effectively with the problem of dumping.

The fact of life is, where it comes to considerations of foreign policy or defense policy, American industry is traditionally sacrificed and the antidumping laws are not enforced.

This is an issue which has concerned me, as a Pennsylvania Senator, since 1981 when I took my oath of office. In 1984, there was a favorable ruling by