

Mr. DORGAN. I understand the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, are going to seek recognition. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized in morning business for 15 minutes following their presentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Kentucky.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCONNELL and Mrs. FEINSTEIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1409 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. DORGAN. Of course, I will be happy to yield.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator DASCHLE, there will be no more votes tonight. The majority leader indicated in the morning he is going to move forward on some legislation. It is not for sure what it is. We are hopeful we will move to an appropriations bill. Senator DASCHLE has an important meeting tonight to see if that can be done. Senator DASCHLE asked I advise everyone there is a possibility of votes in the morning. Everyone should be prepared in that regard. There will be no more votes tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

SENATE BUSINESS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, with respect to the announcement by my colleague from Nevada, I am a bit confused what is happening in the Senate. We have the month of September to finish our appropriations bills. We have had no conferences on any appropriations bill at this point. We have 13 of them to do. We have a very short period of time in which to finish the work of the appropriations committees in the House and the Senate.

It is inexplicable to me that we are at this moment at 5 o'clock in the afternoon unable to go to another appropriations bill. They are ready to come to the floor. We are being blocked. There are objections to the motion to proceed to an appropriations bill. It makes no sense to me. This Senate must do its work and pass the appropriations bills. It will have to be sooner or later. It is much better if it is sooner. This is the work of the American people passing appropriations bills that contain the money for essentially the operation of Government. We have so much work to do and so little time in which to get it done.

The appropriations bills and the question of whether this fiscal policy adds up is very important for everyone. This town and, in ways, the country are asking a lot of questions these days about a softening economy, a surplus that used to exist that has now largely vanished, and a fiscal policy that was

put in place when it was expected there would be nothing but surpluses as far as the eye could see that now does not add up at all.

I want to show a quote on a chart from Mr. Mitch Daniels, the head of the Office of Management and Budget in a statement he made on Sunday on "Meet the Press" because it is central to this question about fiscal policy. What are the resources? How many resources do we have? How do we use those resources? Mr. Daniels says we have the second largest surplus in the history of the country. We are "awash in cash," he says. But, of course, what he is talking about is the Social Security trust fund and the money in the trust fund.

There used to be \$125 billion expected above that, which indeed is a surplus, but that is now gone. That has evaporated. What is left belongs to the Social Security trust fund. When he says we are "awash in cash," he is talking about Social Security trust fund monies. Mr. Russert, the moderator of "Meet the Press," said:

The surplus is money that you got through payroll taxes, which are designated towards Social Security. And to tap into that is a violation of what George Bush pledged during the campaign.

To which Mr. Daniels replied:

Well, it's not designated for Social Security, Tim.

It is not designated for Social Security. That is from the head of the Office of Management and Budget from this administration who says that the trust funds are not in the trust fund. The taxes that come out of all the workers' paychecks in this country, called Social Security taxes, that are put into a dedicated trust fund, we are told now by the head of the Office of Management and Budget that this money is not designated for Social Security.

He could not be more wrong or more unsuited for that job if he really believes that. It is possible this is a mistake. It is not a mistake in transcription. That is what he said, but it is possible he misspoke. If he did, let's hear that. If he did not misspeak, if this is what he believes, he is sadly mistaken.

This is a big, big issue. This is a \$162 billion issue in this year alone. It is a half-a-trillion-dollar issue in the next 5 years. It is essential to the construct of a fiscal policy that works to understand that this money does not belong to them; it does not belong to the Government; it belongs to the American workers. They paid it. It is their taxes, and they were told it was going to go into a trust fund.

The message ought to be: Keep your hands off those trust funds.

All of us face difficulty as a result of a softening economy. I am not here pointing fingers at who is to blame and who is not to blame. The fact is, we have had an economy that always has had a business cycle: an expansion side and a contraction side. Nobody has ever changed that.

We suffered a contraction. We went through a period when everybody thought the stock market would always go up and never go down. That is not the case. We went through a period when everybody thought there was one way the economy moves: upward, steadily, relentlessly.

Now they are experiencing what we learned in economics. I actually taught economics for a while, and I have overcome that, as I often say. We taught the business cycle. The business cycle is inevitable. There is an expansion and a contraction. It all has to do with people's confidence in the future. Sometimes there is more confidence and sometimes less confidence.

The point is, we all now inherit this economy that has softened. It is incumbent on us all to get together and work together; that the President and the Congress understand the plan that existed before, anticipating surpluses forever, is a plan that now does not add up. It is desperately short of the resources to do that which the President wants to do. It would make good sense, in my judgment, for the President to join us in an economic summit of sorts to work through a new plan that represents an understanding that there is a new reality to this economy and the numbers in the current plan do not add up.

Let's create a plan together that makes sense for the American people, one that invests in the American people's future and one that tries to provide the stimulus and incentive to help promote confidence and start this economy, once again, on an upward trend. That is what we have a responsibility to do.

Fingers that are pointed mean very little at this point. We are all in this ship of state together. It is not as if there is an engine room with dials, knobs, gauges, and levers so that if we can just get Alan Greenspan, or someone in charge of fiscal policies, to move these gauges and levers just right so the ship of state will move. That is not the way the economic engine behaves.

This ship of state moves forward and the economy grows when people have confidence in the future. The American people, the bond markets, and stock markets do not have confidence in a fiscal plan they know does not add up. That is why it is important for the President to recognize that reality and work with us to construct a new plan.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to speak about a different subject, international trade. I will do it briefly because I understand my colleague, Senator BYRD, wishes to address the Senate. I certainly do not want to disadvantage him. If my colleague, Senator BYRD, will indulge me for a few more minutes, I want to make a comment about international trade.

Mr. BYRD. Please.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my colleague, as always, is gracious, and I deeply appreciate that.

Congress Daily today says:

Vote on trade negotiating authority suffers another delay.

This is a story about the House of Representatives deciding to delay a vote on what we normally call fast track. They have delayed it because the Speaker of the House says they need time to get all their "ducks in a row."

I simply point out to those who are working to get their "ducks in a row" in the House of Representatives to pass fast track trade authority, that when it comes to the Senate, there are not going to be ducks in a row to pass fast track trade authority for our President.

I would not support it for President Clinton and I will not support it for this President, and I want to explain why. I believe a band of Senators who feel as passionately as I do about our trade policy believe it is not only undemocratic to cede to someone else the ability to go to negotiated trade agreements with the promise that no Senator has the opportunity to offer a change to that agreement when it comes to the floor of the Senate. But I also want to explain why I think those who have negotiated our trade agreements are not entitled to be given a blank check for trade negotiation authority by this Congress.

Let me give a couple of examples to describe why. Here is what has happened to our merchandise trade deficit. It has ballooned from \$132 billion in 1993 to \$449 billion last year. It is exploding. We are exporting manufacturing jobs at a rapid pace, and this is a trade debt that we must repay in the future with a lower standard of living in the United States. This is serious. It is trouble and we must get it under control.

We have had a trade deficit with Mexico. Let us look at what has happened with Mexico. In 1993, we passed the North American Free Trade Agreement. Before the agreement, we had small deficits with Mexico, \$5 billion, and then \$2 billion or \$3 billion. Then, a few years before the agreement, we had a surplus with Mexico.

What has happened since NAFTA was passed? We are drowning in red ink with the country of Mexico.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Yes, of course, I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD. What are those figures representing our drowning?

Mr. DORGAN. Their the current accounts deficit. With Mexico alone, it is over \$30 billion a year. In fact, our aggregate merchandise trade deficit is over a billion and a quarter a day, every single day. It is many trade partners including Japan, China, Canada, Mexico and Europe. It's a huge growing dangerous debt.

How does all of this happen? Let me give a few examples. Vehicles in Korea.

In 2000, Korea shipped 570,000 vehicles to the United States of America. How many vehicles did we produce and ship to Korea? Only 1,700.

Is it because we do not make automobiles? No, that is not the reason. It is because if Ford makes a car and ships it to Korea, by the time it gets through all of their taxes, tariffs and other obstructions, it costs thousands more than it ought to cost. Therefore the Koreans do not buy it.

First of all, one has trouble getting it, but if they get it in the country they do not buy it because it is thousands more than it should be. So the result is our automobile trade with Korea is extremely unbalanced. They send us 570,000 vehicles a year and we send them 1,700. That is vehicles to Korea.

How about T-bone steak to Tokyo, beef to Japan? Do my colleagues know that every single pound of American beef we send to Japan has a 38.5 percent tariff on it, every single pound? To buy a T-bone steak in Tokyo is very expensive. Do you know why? Because they restrict the amount of beef coming in. We reached a beef agreement with Japan and our negotiators celebrated it. Twelve years later we still have a 38.5 percent tariff on every single pound of beef going to Japan. T-bones to Tokyo, that is unfair trade; cars from Korea. How about high-fructose corn syrup to Mexico? Here they levy the equivalent of a 43 percent to 73 percent tariff on corn syrup, despite being in violation of NAFTA. Or how about durum wheat to this country from Canada? Fundamentally unfair trade. There are millions of bushels coming across in 18-wheel trucks. The Canadians have a monopoly that would be illegal in this country called the Canadian Wheat Board. They ship wheat to this country at secret prices. When we say to them, "open up your records," they simply thumb their nose at us and say, "We do not intend to shed one bit of light on this. We do not intend to share any data with you at all." That is the way trade is.

So I say to those in the House who are getting their ducks in a row to pass fast track trade authority, "Well, go ahead and get your ducks in a row. But you should understand that ducks are not going to be in a row when that gets to the U.S. Senate."

I did not believe President Clinton ought to have this authority, and he did not get it. I do not believe this President ought to have this authority, and, in my judgment, he is not going to get it.

The first step, and I have said this to the Commerce Secretary: "Do you want to talk about fast track? I will tell you what you ought to fast track. Why don't you put on the fast track a few trade solutions." I say to the trade negotiator and others, "Get some good negotiators. Fit them with jerseys, just like we do with the Olympics. Make sure the jerseys have a big "USA" on the front so that occasionally our ne-

gotiators can look down at their chests and see who they are representing and for whom they are negotiating." Send them over to the negotiating table and say, "Stand up for this country's interests."

Do not build walls and keep things out of here. But our negotiators need to say, "We expect fair trade." We expect them to stand up for this country's interests. Stand up for the American worker. Stand up for American business. Stand up for American products. We are sick and tired of unfair trade bargains that put us in a sea of red ink and put our employees and businesses at a disadvantage.

That is true with Japan. It is true with China. I have not spoken about China. I should, but out of respect for my colleague who is waiting to speak, I will do that at a later time.

Japan, China, Korea, Canada, Mexico, Europe. This country is drowning in a sea of red ink, in international trade deficits, and it ought to stop. I will not be a part of a Senate that is going to try to give fast track authority to a President.

There will be a group of Senators who believe, as I do, that it is worth the passion, energy, and time to see that the priority in this country, and the priority in trade policy, is not to grant fast track authority to the Administration so they can go off and negotiate new trade agreements. Rather, we need to get some people who know how to negotiate solutions to the problems in the old trade agreements.

Let us fix the problems they have already created instead of running off and trying to create new trade agreements. This is especially true when we have this trade deficit that is becoming an albatross around the neck of our children. A trade deficit that will and must be repaid. One that must be repaid with a lower standard of living in this country. That is why it is important now to solve this problem. It will not be solved by more trade if it is unfair.

I am for expanded trade. I am for more trade. I am for all the things that people want to do to engage around the world in commerce, but I demand on behalf of this country, and on behalf of American workers and businesses, that trade agreements be fair to America for a change.

Trade agreements with Japan, China, and others have been negotiated in an incompetent way. You can put a blindfold on. It does not matter whether it is Republicans or Democrats in office.

Will Rogers once said the United States of America has never lost a war and never won a conference. He certainly must have been thinking about our trade negotiators. We can do a whole lot better than that.

My point very simply is, on fast track, get your ducks in the row in the House, but understand when it gets to the Senate it is not going any further. There are plenty of us who are going to see that fast track is not passed in the U.S. Senate.

Yes, we are for trade, but we are for fair trade. It is time to insist on fair trade and get rid of these ballooning trade deficits.

Let me thank my colleague, Senator BYRD, from West Virginia. He is, as is always the case, most gracious to allow me to continue beyond the time allotted.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. DORGAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD. Sign me up. Sign me up as one of those who will stand with the Senator to defeat fast track. We have seen too many American jobs take a fast track out of this country. We have seen what happened to pottery in my State. We have seen what happened to glass, what happened to leather goods, what has happened to textiles, what is happening to steel, what is happening to chemicals.

I will be with my colleague. I am opposed to fast track. I am for free trade but fair trade.

Next year will be my 50th year in Congress, and I see one administration after another, Republican and Democrat, go down this same fast track, and I am tired of it. I have been against it. I do not stand here today and propose we ought to deliberate on putting a duty on every toothbrush or every fiddle or fiddle string or every paint brush that comes into this country, but there are a few major questions that we should be allowed to debate and offer amendments on when that measure comes before the Senate. What's wrong with that? I wouldn't mind, half a dozen, six, three, but why should we go along with our eyes closed and continue to join in this fast track of American jobs and American industries across the seas?

Getting our ducks in a row, we have become sitting ducks. These are the ducks that our forefathers gave us to put in a row. Section 8, article I, the U.S. Constitution:

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States * * *

It doesn't say anything about getting our ducks in a row. It doesn't say anything about fast track. It doesn't say anything about binding and gagging ourselves when it comes to trade legislation. It says the Congress shall have power to regulate commerce.

Let's exercise that power. Let's exercise our rights as Members of the Senate, elected by a free people. Count me, register me, make me a first lieutenant in the ranks. I am ready. I volunteer.

I thank the Senator for his contributions. I thank him very much for his leadership on this issue.

Is the Senate in a period for morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Are there any limitations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Each Senator is restricted to 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 45 minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I thank the Chair.

U.S. IMMIGRATION POLICY

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, the inscription on the base of the Statue of Liberty that has welcomed immigrants for generations can be found in the poem, "The New Colossus," by Emma Lazarus:

Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame,
With conquering limbs astride from land to land;

Here at our sea-washed, sunset gates shall stand

A mighty woman with a torch, whose flame
Is the imprisoned lightning, and her name
Mother of Exiles. From her beacon-hand
Glows world-wide welcome; her mild eyes
command

The air-bridged harbor that twin cities
frame.

"Keep ancient lands, your storied pomp!"
cries she

With silent lips. "Give me your tired, your
poor,

Your huddled masses yearning to breathe
free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to
me,

I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"

The United States has a proud history of welcoming immigrants fleeing religious persecution, political oppression, and economic hardship. My own forebear on my father's side came to these shores in 1657, settled on the banks of the Rappahannock River where all—with the exception of possibly one in this Chamber—are children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and great-great-grandchildren of immigrants. The magnanimous promise of a better life that is inscribed in the base of the Statue of Liberty has deep roots in both the American mind and American law. George Washington captured that promise in his dictum two centuries ago that the United States should be "a country which may afford an asylum, if we are wise enough to pursue the paths which lead to virtue and happiness, to the oppressed and needy of the Earth."

I understand the American dream that has lured immigrants here for more than 200 years. I have a son-in-law who is an immigrant from Iran. He is a physicist. I have a grandson who is married to an immigrant from Korea. My own State of West Virginia has benefitted from the many contributions made by our foreign-born citizens. West Virginia's coal miner population in the early part of the 20th Century reads like a United Nations roster: British—English, Welch, Scottish—Irish, Italian, Hungarian, Lithuanian, Swedish, Austrian, Russian, Greek, Syrian, Romanian, German, Polish, Slavic, and on and on.

In recent months, this administration has been working with its Mexican counterparts to craft a new immigra-

tion policy that would, among other things, legalize three to four million undocumented Mexican immigrants now working in the United States.

According to the latest numbers from the U.S. Census Bureau, immigrants now comprise about 11 percent of the total U.S. population. That is about 30 million immigrants living in the United States—13 million to 14 million of whom arrived just in the last 10 years.

These numbers are quite extraordinary because they suggest that at least 1.3 million immigrants are settling in the United States each year. That is more than arrived during the last great wave of immigration between 1900 and 1910, when about 850,000 people entered the country each year.

In addition to their arrival in the United States, during the 1990's, immigrant women gave birth to an estimated 6.9 million children. If we add together the number of births to immigrants and the number of new arrivals, immigration during the 1990's led to the addition of 20 million—or two-thirds of the nearly 30 million people who populated the United States over the last 10 years.

If current trends continue, according to the Census Bureau's middle-range projections, the U.S. population will grow from 280 million to 404 million people by 2050, with immigration accounting for about 63 percent of that growth. That means the number of new immigrants entering this country over the next 50 years, about 78 million immigrants, will be roughly equal to 43 times the current population of West Virginia.

As I have said, many of these immigrants will contribute to the economic, cultural, and political development of the United States. But, let us not forget, let us not be unmindful of the fact that there will also be real costs associated with this population increase. Many of these new citizens will come in search of access to quality health care services. Yet too many of our Nation's 5,000 emergency rooms are already operating at critical capacity.

Go over to Fairfax Hospital. I just had my wife of 64 years over to that hospital twice within the last 6 weeks. And I took her both times—once through a call to 911. You will be amazed at what you see. The hospitals are overcrowded.

According to the LA Times, at many of the nation's hospitals, "ambulances are being turned away and patients are stacked in the hallways." If we are to accept these new citizens, it is clear that we will have to spend billions of taxpayer dollars to expand our health care infrastructure.

This Nation also has the responsibility to provide a quality public education to its citizens. Yet, the Department of Education recently reported that the number of children in public schools has grown by nearly 8 million in the last two decades. This growth has strained the resources of many