

offering producers a tax exemption for the cost of doing so. So going in and trying to reopen a well that has been capped, which is very expensive, could be done with a tax exemption for the expenses of doing it, and that would ensure greater oil availability and increase Federal and State tax revenues. Everyone would win—more jobs, more tax revenue for our States, and, most importantly, more domestic oil.

Actual results have shown that this can work. In my home State of Texas, a program similar to this has met with huge success. Over 6,000 wells have been returned to production, with State tax abatements injecting \$1.6 billion into the Texas economy in a year. Think what we could do nationwide.

A recent study by the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission examined State incentive programs and found that the average program attracts \$1.1 billion in investment over its lifetime, with over \$50 million in net tax collections typically associated with each incentive. That incentive will create 6,000 jobs and \$16 billion in impact for the States.

There is more to do. We should look for ways to reduce the cost of excessive regulation on our domestic producers. This was what the fight we had last year over MMS royalty valuation was about. Some said it was a giveaway to big oil. It wasn't. It was about keeping costs low so we don't push more producers out of business. Maybe those paying record prices for home heating oil and gas today have a different perspective on that issue now. The MMS is going to release its new oil royalty valuations tomorrow, and I challenge everyone to see if they raise the price of drilling for oil on public lands. If they do, the President is just saying, yes, we are going to continue that policy to try to keep domestic production down so we can be held by the throat by OPEC countries.

The overlapping regulations that govern exploration and production and refinement add \$4 to \$5 a barrel to the cost of oil. Compare that with the overall cost of production in Saudi Arabia, including capital and labor, of \$2 to \$3 a barrel. Is it any wonder that oil companies are drilling in Saudi Arabia instead of in our country, providing jobs for our citizens?

Our fight last year on MMS was over the opposition to adding yet another complicated scheme of rules and further raising the cost of production. When gas prices were low, few Senators were listening. In fact, the major television networks weren't listening either. They were pretty brutal during that debate. Today we are seeing the results of that brutality.

We don't have to be at the whim of market forces. We don't have to be out of control of our own domestic oil production. What we need is to be part of the price setting, not the price taking. We must increase our domestic oil supply.

This is something we can all rally around. I will work with the North-

eastern Senators to get quick fixes to their problems. I will work with all of the Senators whose constituents are going to be affected by high gasoline prices. But let us not do a quick fix without also having a longer term fix that would keep our jobs in America, that would keep our oil prices stable, that would keep the revenue coming into our States for schools and highways at a time when prices go below break even. We can have a win for everyone, if we can pass legislation that will provide help for everybody and provide a stable oil supply for our country. We have the opportunity to create a domestic policy for oil and gas in this country that makes sense and will benefit all of our constituents. Let us take that chance.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1712

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill, S. 1712, be placed back on the calendar as it existed yesterday before the unanimous consent agreement calling up S. 1712.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that the unanimous consent request that has been suggested be amended to read as follows: Consent that the pending bill, S. 1712, be placed back on the calendar in its present status and that the bill become the pending business again at the discretion of the majority leader with the concurrence of the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMPSON. May I inquire of my colleague exactly what he just suggested, that it be placed on the calendar now and that it be brought back up as pending business at the discretion of the majority leader?

Mr. REID. The two leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will sort this out. We have a unanimous consent request on the floor now put forward by the Senator from Texas. We have to deal with that first before we can even go to another phase. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me for a moment withdraw the unanimous consent request and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill, S. 1712, be placed back on the calendar in its present status, and that the bill become the pending business again at the discretion of the majority leader with the concurrence of the Democrat leader and the chairman of the Banking Committee.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I, first of all, state how appreciative I am of the work done by Senator JOHNSON and Senator GRAMM, the chairman of the Banking Committee. I feel badly that we are not going to be able to go forward on this legislation.

We are going to agree to the unanimous consent request, but not because this bill shouldn't be considered. We should be legislating on it today. It is important legislation. It is being held up on the other side of the aisle. This is legislation that the high-tech industry feels confident should be passed.

I simply say that the cold war is over, but the high-tech war is just beginning. We need to be the winners of that war.

The minority is reluctantly agreeing to this unanimous consent request. We hope the rest of the day and tomorrow can be used in a constructive fashion. We hope the chairman of the Banking Committee can use his experience—he certainly has experience; he proved that when he was in the House of Representatives, and here—to be able to get the warring parties together and move this legislation forward.

We have no objection.

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

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me give a word of explanation. First of all, let me make it clear that it is my intention as a person who has concurrence in this decision not to bring the bill back up through this procedure, nor will I support it being done unless there is an agreement among the parties. Obviously, I would have a right to file cloture on the motion to proceed at some point.

Let me explain what has happened. We have for the last 3 weeks been trying to work out concerns about a very tough, very important, and very complicated bill. America has two competing interests. On the one hand, we want to produce and export items that embody high technology because that is the fastest growing industry in the world. We are the world leader in the high-tech industry, and it creates the best paying jobs in America.

We have that as one objective. On the other hand, we want to prevent technology that has defense and security implications from falling into the hands of those who might use that technology against the United States of America and our interests. Between these two interests, there is competition and friction. These are very complicated and very tough issues.

In the last 3 weeks, roughly half a dozen Members of the Senate have been

working to bring to the floor and pass a bill that passed the Banking Committee 20-0 and that would do something we have not done since 1990: to set in place a new permanent law to protect America's access to the high-tech world market and at the same time protect our national security.

We thought yesterday that we had reached an agreement in principle that would allow us to bring the bill to the floor. The problem with reaching agreements in principle is that, as one of my famous constituents once said, the devil is in the details. We found ourselves today thinking we had such an agreement but having great difficulty getting the language to comport to what each individual felt the principle to be. Under those circumstances, I thought good faith required that the bill be pulled down. So we pulled the bill down, and it will not come up under this consent agreement unless an agreement is worked out among the parties that were engaged in this negotiation.

I think we all agree that no one acted in bad faith, but what happened was, on a very complicated and very important matter, agreeing in principle is not agreeing to the details.

We are hopeful that in the next few days we might still work out these details. If we do, then we will go to this unanimous consent agreement and bring the bill back up. If we don't work out those differences, we will not.

Before I yield the floor, because I know the distinguished Senator of the Foreign Relations Committee wants to take the floor, I will make a general point.

We started dealing in export control in 1917 with the Trading With the Enemy Act. We then had the Neutrality Act in 1935, and, with the beginning of the cold war, the Export Control Act became law in 1949. We were in a life and death struggle with the Soviet Union. There was an "evil empire." There was a cold war. We won the cold war, and export control on a multilateral basis played a key role in that victory.

In those days, two things existed which no longer exist. One was that the United States had a virtual monopoly in high technology. Indeed, we were the world's undisputed leader in technology. Virtually, every area in the world had been decimated by World War II, and we stood supreme. So technology was an American monopoly.

Second, in 1949, most of the new technology was driven by defense research. Our legitimate concern, life and death struggle concern, was that this defense research embodied in American industry would end up leaking abroad where it could threaten American national security.

By 1990, our consensus had started to fade on the Export Administration Act, and while for two brief periods—from March 1993 through June 1994, and from July 1994 to August 1994—we had temporary solutions, since 1990 we have

had no permanent law to protect American national security.

Today, the world is very different. We have won the cold war. Today, technology is driven by private industry. Today, it is not defense labs that are generating the new technology that drives American business, it is American industry.

We had set out in our export law the number of MTOPS, millions of theoretical operations per second, that a restricted computer could employ, thinking we were protecting what we then called supercomputers. Now, any schoolchild with a computer has the technical capacity, or can get it, and exceed that limit. The number of MTOPS is doubling every 6 months.

So we were faced with a decisive question: Can we pass a law and control this technology? We could pass a law and stop it in the United States, but it would occur elsewhere in the world.

What we ultimately have to decide is: Is our security tied to our being the leader in technology, or is it tied to our ability to hold on to the technology we have and not share it with anybody?

I believe in the end that American security is tied to our leadership in technology. I believe that we have put together a good bill. There is a debate about the details, and there are legitimate differences. As Thomas Jefferson once said: Good men with the same facts are prone to disagree. I have seen nothing in my political career or personal life to convince me that Jefferson was wrong about much of anything, but he was certainly not wrong about this.

We have put together a bill that we believe meets national security concerns. But trying to deal with concerns about Presidential powers and waivers is extremely complicated. Yesterday we reached an agreement in principle. There was the nucleus of the agreement, but getting to the details this morning proved more difficult than we anticipated. To be absolutely certain that everyone's rights are preserved, and to be certain we are dealing in good faith, I concluded—and all of the members of the negotiation agreed—that the bill should be pulled down. As a result, I pulled it down.

I am hopeful that perhaps as early as tomorrow these differences can be worked out. I don't know whether they can or they can't. I believe America would be richer, freer, happier, and more secure if they could. If they are not worked out, it won't be because I didn't make the effort. I want it to be worked out. I hope it can be. Whether it can be or it can't be, I want to be certain that we are dealing in good faith and that we are dealing with each other on that basis.

I think we have preserved that here today. I appreciate my colleagues' help. Someone could have done mischief by objecting; my preference was to go back to the status quo, but we

couldn't do that. We have achieved the same result with this agreement, and I thank my colleagues for agreeing to it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

THE RADICAL AGENDA OF CEDAW

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, earlier this morning I was thinking about 20 years ago when a delightful young lady Senator from Kansas served in this body, Nancy Kassebaum. She was a lady in every respect, and I miss her to this good day.

I was thinking about Nancy because today is International Women's Day. The radical feminists are at it again. They have chosen once again to press their case for Senate ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, and that has the acronym of CEDAW.

Let's examine this treaty which women organizations—including some of the more liberal women in Congress—are so eager to have approved by the Congress and reported out, first of all, by the Foreign Affairs Committee, on which I am chairman. They put out a press release yesterday that they were going to picket me. I guess they were going to scream and holler at me as they tried to do not long ago, which suits me all right because I have been screamed and hollered at before by the same crowd.

"This urgently needed" treaty, as they describe it, has been collecting dust in the Senate archives for 20 years. It was submitted by President Carter to the Senate in 1980. In these years since President Carter sent it to the Senate, the Democratic Party controlled the Senate for 10 of those years and the Democrats never brought it up for a vote.

Indeed, in the first 2 years of the Clinton administration, when the Democrats controlled not only the Senate but the White House, the Democrats never saw fit to bring this radical treaty up for a vote. They were silent in seven languages about it.

Now, suddenly, 20 years later, they demand to be given urgent priority in the recommendation of this treaty, and that it be considered first by the Foreign Relations Committee and then by the Senate.

I say dream on because it is not going to happen. Why has CEDAW, the Convention of Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, never been ratified? Because it is a bad treaty; it is a terrible treaty negotiated by radical feminists with the intent of enshrining their radical antifamily agenda into international law. I will have no part of that.

Let me give a few examples of the world in which the authors and proponents of this treaty would have all live. Under this treaty, a "committee on the elimination of discrimination against women is established with the