

them an appropriate reward in their efforts. I am trying to help these men resolve their dispute with Major League baseball so that they can receive a small but important token for their contributions to sports history.

Also throughout the era of segregation, when public facilities were segregated by law, the African-American community of Miami was forbidden to use all of the area's beaches but one, Virginia Key Beach, in Biscayne Bay known as "the Negro beach."

Known in those days as the "Colored Only Beach," Virginia Key Beach was an important place in the lives of African-American families—a place for them to gather and enjoy the pleasures of relaxation beside the ocean. The memories of this place are sweet, even mixed and intertwined with the bitterness and memories of segregation.

Together with my friend and colleague, Congresswoman CARRIE MEEK of Miami, we have sponsored legislation that will help preserve this historic place. Our bill would require the Secretary of the Interior to study and report to Congress on the feasibility of incorporating Virginia Key Beach into the National Park System.

By enacting this legislation, we can preserve its 77 acres of beach and wildlife, while honoring its past and present importance to the people of Florida.

These are examples of some of the small ways in which we can honor the lives and memories of our Nation's African-Americans.

My own State, Florida, has an especially proud history in this regard, as well as a willingness to correct past mistakes.

In 1994, for example, the Florida Legislature passed, and the late Gov. Lawton Chiles signed, the Rosewood claims bill, which provided \$2.1 million to survivors and the families of victims of the 1923 Rosewood Massacre.

Last year, the legislature enacted sweeping reforms to give every person an equal opportunity to have his or her vote counted.

You don't want any State to ever have to go through what we went through in Florida in the last Presidential election because there were votes that were not counted. So the Florida Legislature, in 2001, in trying to correct the voting rights abuses, passed legislation to help modernize the system in a Presidential election.

Unfortunately, a \$50-billion State budget proposed by the Florida House last week left out the second of two installments of \$12 million to help counties replace antiquated, punch-card voting machines.

African-Americans were disproportionately affected by flaws in the election system. And Florida lawmakers have made a commitment not only to that community but also to all the people of Florida to fix the system.

Without this funding, they will have broken their promise.

It would be appropriate at this time of recognizing the achievements of Af-

rican-Americans for the State House to do its duty and to keep its word so that every vote gets counted.

Today—and every day—let us celebrate African-American achievement both by remembering our past and by recommitting ourselves to the current fight for social, political, and economic equality for everyone.

I thank the Chair for the time to address the Senate.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 3 o'clock today.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for the edification of Members, Senator DODD has been working. I talked to him not long ago. He indicated progress was being made. Even though it appears we are not doing anything, there is a lot of committee work going on around the Hill. With this most important election reform legislation, there is a last-ditch attempt by Senator DODD to see if it can be rescued.

As a number of Members indicated this morning, it would be a real shame if this were held up by virtue of a filibuster, especially when we know that matters go to conference, and with the present makeup we have in Washington, with a Republican President and a Republican House, certainly they should be willing to take their chances with a Democratic Senate.

I hope progress is made and we can resolve the Schumer-Wyden matter. But if we can't, I hope Members look forward to invoking cloture on this most important legislation tomorrow when the vote is scheduled.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I seek recognition and ask unanimous consent that upon the completion of my comments, the Senator from North Dakota, who is sitting in the chair at the moment, be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PLEA TO THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I want to follow my remarks of a

few minutes ago about Black History Month with an underlining of my concern of what is happening in the Florida Legislature as we speak, which is meeting in the capital city of Tallahassee.

It is almost ironic that at the very time the Senate is considering an election reform bill, of which for that legislation we are having discussions, negotiations, and awaiting agreements to finally come forth so we do not have to come to the Chamber to break a filibuster to pass it—and it is legislation that is going to get wide support once we get to final passage—but it is almost ironic what has happened in the Florida Legislature since we started this legislation 2½ weeks ago when I spoke in this Chamber in favor of the legislation. At that time, I took to the floor complimenting the Florida Legislature.

In the State of Florida, we went through a grueling experience in the Presidential election of 2000. We saw so many ballots that were not counted. We saw clear voter intent that was not followed. There was confusion over the ballots. There was confusion in the construction of the ballot, how it fit together. There was the famous butterfly ballot. We saw how even when voter intent was so clear for example, a first-time voter, who was not familiar with the ballot, would go down the Presidential names and select one name and mark that on a punchcard ballot, and then at the bottom of the Presidential names there was a line, and it said: "Write-in," and they would write in the same Presidential candidate—the voter intent was clear, but that ballot was not counted.

So after that awful experience, before which I had never known anything about error rates in ballot counting—and thank the Good Lord I never had a close election, and little did I ever know there could be the confusion and so many people, in effect, disenfranchised in an election—when we started our election reform bill in this Chamber a couple weeks ago, I took to the floor and complimented the Florida Legislature because it changed all of the punchcard ballots and it appropriated, out of a \$50 billion annual budget, \$24 million so that the counties could buy new voting equipment and they would never have to go through the confusion of that punchcard voting system again. They would have an optical scan system with a much lower error rate.

That was my compliment to the Florida Legislature. They did right. That was a year ago. But just last week, the Florida House of Representatives did not appropriate, in its appropriations bill, the second \$12 million installment to modernize the election system. What in the world are we thinking in the year 2002, when it is almost taken for granted that it is a bedrock principle that registered voters should have the right to vote and to have their vote counted?

So as we continue to discuss and debate—and ultimately we will pass—this election reform bill at the Federal level, let me make a plea to the Florida Legislature: You were so gallant, as leaders in the Nation, after the debacle and the disenfranchisement of the 2000 election, to first step forward with an election reform bill and providing the appropriations to fund that election reform.

Please do not falter now, Florida Legislature. Please, appropriate the second half of that appropriation that was promised a year ago so Florida will not have any serious questions about every Floridian's vote being counted.

I thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to speak.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Yes. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNFAIR TRADE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, Senator DASCHLE, the majority leader, was in the Chamber today talking about a decision that will be made in the coming days by the Bush administration on the subject of trade disputes that exist with respect to the American steel industry.

What is all this about? It is that the steel industry, as with many other American industries, has been under assault. It has been under assault by unfair trade coming from abroad, products being dumped in our country into our marketplace below their acquisition cost, undercutting our domestic producers. This is unfair trade. It is trade that violates our trade laws. In fact, an International Trade Commission investigation has recently determined that the flood of foreign steel has significantly hurt the U.S. steel industry.

The question the President will decide next week is: What will be the remedy? What will be done about it? If our steel industry is being threatened and assaulted by unfair trade and it is closing plants, going into bankruptcy, laying off workers, what is the remedy? That is the question this administration will answer next Wednesday.

My hope is they will answer this question in an aggressive way. My hope is they will say, we intend to stand up for American steel. My hope is they will say, we intend to stand up for all American producers when confronted with unfair trade. How do you stand up for producers when confronted with un-

fair trade? You take action against those perpetrating that unfair trade against our producers.

We have something like 10,000 steelworkers in Washington, DC, today who are here demonstrating the point that they are losing their jobs and their companies are going bankrupt. This is about them and their families and their future. They are saying: Give us some fairness in international trade. Stand up for our interests.

It is not steelworkers saying, we want our country to be protectionist. It is not them saying, we want to build a wall around our country and prevent imports from coming in. It is a group of workers who have come to Washington to say: When we are confronted with unfair trade, we expect our Government to be in our corner. We expect our Government to stand with us.

It is interesting that the steel dispute is very much like a dispute we have with Canada on the issue of wheat. The North Dakota wheat producers, with a 301 case, brought a trade case against Canada. That case, after investigation, was recently resolved by the United States Trade Representative saying, yes, the Canadian Wheat Board is a state-sponsored monopoly that engages in unfair trade practices that harm United States wheat growers.

If we have decided Canada is guilty of unfair trade with respect to wheat, what have we done about it? USTR's answer was: We are not going to have any remedies. If we provide relief at this moment, it will violate NAFTA and it will violate our World Trade Organization commitments. Therefore, even though we have decided Canada is guilty of unfair trade practices that injure American farmers, we essentially will do nothing at the moment; we will instead take this to the WTO.

That means that our great grandchildren, if we are lucky, may see action by the WTO. Although they probably won't see it because the WTO considers and takes action behind closed doors. And anyway, it is likely not to take much action at all; if it does, it will be years in the future.

I have talked about the steel dispute and the wheat dispute. In both cases, our producers have been told that those who are competing against us, foreign producers, are doing so unfairly, injuring our workers and our farmers. Yet it is very hard to get relief, to get this country to stand up for its producers.

There are some real storm clouds on the horizon. Our trade deficit keeps rising year after year. The more trade agreements we have, the higher the trade deficit.

This chart shows what has happened. We have the GATT Tokyo Round, and then we have the Uruguay Round, the WTO agreement, and then the NAFTA. We can see what has happened to the trade deficit—up, up, up, over a long period of time.

The U.S. Constitution has something to say about international trade. Arti-

cle I, section 8, says: The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

That means the authority vested by the U.S. Constitution on matters affecting international trade rests here—not at the White House, but in the Congress, and only here. Yet to listen to Republican and Democratic administrations over the last 30 or 40 years, you realize that, by and large, they think they are the ones in control of trade. Administrations empower negotiators to go out and work out trade agreements that they bring back to the Congress under a provision called fast track. Fast track allows administrations to tie the hands of Members of Congress behind their backs and say: Here is the trade agreement we negotiated—mostly in secret—and you have no right to offer any amendment to change any of it at any time. That is fast track.

Fast track is fundamentally undemocratic. I voted against it in the past. I would not support giving it to President Clinton; I will not support giving it to President Bush. Go negotiate treaties, if you wish—but good ones. If you do, the Congress will approve them. If you don't, they deserve to be changed or killed.

Let me talk for a bit about some of these treaties. We've had fast track in the past; fast track was something given to previous Presidents, including President Reagan and the first President Bush. We negotiated an agreement with Canada, and the agreement with Canada went through the House Ways and Means Committee. I was serving in the House at the time. The vote for the United States-Canada trade agreement was 34 to 1. I cast the lone vote against it. There were 34 for it, 1 against.

I believed I was right at the time, and events certainly demonstrated that was the case. We took a small deficit with Canada and doubled it very quickly. They dumped grain into this country, injuring our farmers, and we have had trouble ever since. Do you know why we could not do anything about the provisions in that agreement that traded away the interests of family farmers? Because you can't offer amendments to trade agreements with fast track. So the administration said: Here it is. We negotiated it and, by the way, we had secret side agreements we will not tell you about. You accept it, yes or no. If you don't like it, there can be no amendments because fast track ties your hands behind your back. That is what happened with that trade agreement.

Not long after that, I drove up to Canada with a man named Earl in a 12-year-old, orange, 2-ton truck. The truck was carrying 150 bushels of U.S. durum wheat. All the way to the Canadian border, we saw Canadian 18-wheelers coming into this country, hauling Canadian wheat into this country.