

Olympians and they can look down and know they are for the USA. What about jerseys for trade negotiators so that occasionally when they are in meetings, behind those locked doors, they can look down and say: Oh, yes, that's right, now I remember for whom I am negotiating.

Most of our trade policy has been negotiated as foreign policy. Most of it has been eggheaded foreign policy now almost a quarter of a century. For the first quarter century after the Second World War, it was all foreign policy. We just granted trade concessions everywhere, and it did not matter because we were bigger, tougher, and we could compete with anybody around the world with one hand tied behind our back. So our trade policy was almost exclusively foreign policy. Then we had competitors who developed into shrewd, tough, international competitors in the global economy, and we are still running around giving away concessions, tying our hands behind our back, negotiating agreements we will not enforce, and shame on us for doing that.

This country needs an economy with a manufacturing base. We cannot remain a world-class economy unless we have a manufacturing base. We need good jobs that pay well, that sustain a strong manufacturing base in our country.

There are those in this town who divide the trade debate into two thoughtless categories: You are either a smart, incisive person who can see over the horizon and understand that global trade is benefitting our country, or if you say anything at all on the other side of the issue, you are some xenophobic stooge who does not get it, has never gotten it, and wants to build walls around America to keep foreign products out. Of course, that is a thoughtless way to describe relative positions on trade. There is a much better way to describe this country's trade interests, in my judgment, and that is to say this country ought to be willing, ready, and able to compete anywhere in the world with any product as long as the competition is fair.

The doctrine of comparative advantage is a fair doctrine, in my judgment. If someone can make a product better than we can, then by all means let's find a way to acquire that product from a country that has a natural advantage. But the impediments to fair trade have very little to do with comparative advantage; they have to do with political advantage. They have to do with countries that decided they do not want minimum wages; that think it is fine to have 16-year-old kids working 16 hours a day being paid 16 cents an hour; they think that is fine.

This country fought 75 years to say it is not fine, and the American marketplace ought not be open to any and all schemes of production around the globe, regardless of how inhumane and unjust they might be. It is not acceptable to us as consumers and ought not

be acceptable to us as public officials who have an obligation to stand up for American producers, for fair trade.

Mr. President, that is a long meandering road to describe the decision next Wednesday that this administration has to make on the subject of steel. My hope is that the administration will make the right decision. I have not seen an administration in some 20 years that has a record in international trade that I think benefits this country and its producers in a way that is fair.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 94

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I notice my colleague from Wyoming is in the Chamber. I did give notice that I was going to propound a unanimous consent request, and if he is in the Chamber for the purpose of representing the minority, I will propound that unanimous request at this point in time.

I spoke yesterday about the subject of the wind energy production tax credit, which expired at the end of last year. The expiration occurred because it became embroiled in the back and forth over the economic recovery package and the stimulus plan. The fact is, the Congress ended its year and its work without having extended the tax extenders—there are some half dozen of them—one of which is the tax credit for wind energy.

In my judgment, it is just fundamentally wrong for us not to take the action we need to take right now to extend that production tax credit for wind energy.

I had a conference in Grand Forks, ND, last week when the Senate was not in session. The conference was on wind energy. Over 700 people showed up. There is great interest in this from all over the country. North Dakota is No. 1 in wind energy potential. The new technology wind turbines are remarkable. To be able to take energy from the wind, put it in a transmission line and move it around the country is remarkable.

There are plans on the books right now. A CEO from one of the largest companies came to see me 3 weeks ago. He said: I have plans for 150 megawatts, 150 one-megawatt towers. It is going to cost \$130 million to \$150 million. The plans are done. He said: They are ready; I have the money. That is already developed. But it had to be put on the shelf until Congress extends the production tax credit.

We do not seem to think it is urgent. I believe it is urgent.

My colleague, Senator REID, asked he be remembered on this issue because he supports this. He has companies in Nevada with plans on the shelf. They are ready to go, but they are held up. The same is true in many other States in the country.

For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consider-

ation of S. 94, a bill to extend tax credits for wind energy; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I understood there would be an objection. I want to demonstrate again—and I hope I can do this in the coming days—there are many Republicans and Democrats serving in the Senate who know we ought to pass this bill, who want to get this done. We need to find a way to make this happen. This is urgent. Yet we are sort of at a parade rest on a range of areas.

We can talk about who is at fault. I do not intend to do that. I am much more interested in trying to get this started than I am in trying to figure out why it stalled. Let's see if we can work together to accomplish this goal. We know it needs doing. We are going to turn to the energy bill next. We know having this production tax credit extended is important. It ought to be done now, not later.

Mr. President, I understand my colleague from Wyoming was required to object to this. I will not go beyond that except to say I hope he joins me and others as we find a way to extend these tax credits and that we do so soon.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I, too, am supportive of wind energy and the alternatives, of course, but we have been waiting—talk about waiting, we have been waiting for months to get to an energy bill, which has been objected to and held up by the folks on the other side of the aisle. We are finally going to get to it, and certainly this issue ought to be part of an overall energy policy, not a stand-alone bill.

So hopefully next week we will have a chance to get to energy. I do not think there is anything more important before this Congress than to have an energy policy in this country. We have talked about it now for months. I am on the Energy Committee, as well as the Finance Committee. We have talked about energy for a very long time. We did not have a chance to put it together in the committee but, rather, the majority leader took it away from the committee and brought it to the floor.

So now we find ourselves in a very difficult position by putting together a very complex bill, but hopefully starting in the next day or two we will have an opportunity to do that. I hope my friend from North Dakota will have an opportunity to talk about wind energy and the opportunities to do something with it at that time. It seems to me that is the appropriate time to do it.

ELECTION REFORM

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I will now talk a little bit about election reform. Of course, that is the bill that is before us now, but we have not been able to move it forward in the last day and a half or so. Whether we will be able to or not, I do not know. No one disagrees, of course, with seeking to do something to make elections fair; to make the changes, if there need to be changes made, to make elections available to everyone on a free basis, an open basis, and a legal basis.

I am glad the Senate has taken up this bill. I happen to believe the major responsibility for voting, whether it be in Florida or whether it be in Wyoming, lies with the State. Where there are problems with voting, the State election officers, it seems to me, have the primary responsibility to do that.

One of the issues that has come up—not unusually, I suppose; it comes up in many areas such as health care, education—there is a difference between how you do things in New York City and Meeteetsi, WY. That has kind of become an interesting issue with regard to setting up voting standards and the requirements that need to be made for voting precincts. When one has a precinct that has thousands of people in it, that is one thing. Go to Wapiti, WY, with a precinct that may only have 30 to 40 people in it; that is quite different.

When I went home last weekend, we were talking about the proposal initially that there had to be a paved parking lot and access for the disabled. Everyone wants the disabled to be able to vote, and they were saying sometimes we have to look hard to find a place that has a toilet, so we need to do something about that.

I have talked with the chairman, and certainly we could, I think, come to some kind of an agreement. This bill currently requires each polling place to have a machine that is adaptable for ADA. I am a great supporter of ADA, as a matter of fact, and have worked very hard on that, but I think we have to be realistic about how it is dealt with. We have curbside voting, for example. We can do that for people who are disabled. We have these certain kinds of machines in every county seat, but to require that in some 400 rural polling places, as we have in Wyoming, would be extremely difficult. Even though the return sometimes is, "Well, the Government is going to pay for it," regardless of who pays for it, some of it is not good use of taxpayer dollars.

I do not know exactly how it will end up. Perhaps we will not be having a bill if we cannot move it any more than we have. Perhaps we can continue to talk to the chairman, who seems to be receptive, knowing there are differences in how it is dealt with in one place or another.

I do want to say we have talked with the elected officials in Wyoming. As I said, our voting has been very satisfactory. We have a good many registered

voters. We had more voters last time than we had registered before the election who came in and could register on election day. It is really quite simple.

We are concerned, if we were required to have very complicated machines in every polling place, that that would not be appropriate. Instead, if we could offer the flexibility to where they could make proposals as to how to deal with voting for disabled and other voters, those could be viewed, and if they were acceptable, then they could do it the way they wanted to do it in that community.

In any event, I do not know whether we will have an amendment. If that becomes necessary—or perhaps we could have a colloquy with the chairman to deal with this in the conference committee—we can do that.

TRADE AUTHORITY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have to respond just a little bit to my friend from North Dakota who talked about trade. Obviously, trade is very important for all of us. I am a little interested in how he thinks 435 people could negotiate a trade agreement. The idea is that the trade agreement needs to be negotiated and then brought to the Congress for approval. If it is not approved, it is not approved. I cannot imagine us trying to set up a trade bill and 435 folks trying to deal with that.

So I am not in agreement entirely that we ought to take away the trade authority to negotiate and then bring it to the Congress. Presidents have had that, and hopefully they will continue to have that.

The main constituency of the Senator from North Dakota, of course, is agriculture. Forty percent of agricultural products go into foreign trade. Obviously, we all want trade agreements to be fair and advantageous.

I also have to respond a little bit to the molasses issue. We worked on that for several months, and it has been cured, as a matter of fact. The idea that nobody stood up to it is not accurate. The court has ruled, and that is no longer being done. It was being done, and it was wrong, but we brought it up through the court, and it is no longer the case.

So trade is always difficult, and certainly I feel strongly about it from time to time, too. We are in a world where billions of dollars move around the world every day. We are going to have to trade. We are behind other countries in making trade agreements in South America, for example. So hopefully we can find a way to come up with agreements that will allow us to trade with other countries and, at the same time, of course, be as fair as possible.

I 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. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have been meeting with Senator SCHUMER, Senator DODD, and others. There is some hope we can resolve this vexatious issue that has been so troublesome on this legislation. We are in the process of trying to work this out now. Senator DODD has been conferring with members of the minority all day in hopes that something can be resolved.

I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until the hour of 4 p.m. today.

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

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

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 4:30 p.m.

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

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak up to 15 minutes in morning business.

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

DUMPED STEEL

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment on a meeting which has been held with President Bush and Members of Congress from steel States concerning the plight of the steel industry and the decision which the President is scheduled to make on or before March 6, 2002. The President has initiated proceedings under Section 201, which activated an inquiry by the International Trade Commission. The International Trade Commission has made a recommendation that there be remedies to stop subsidized and dumped steel from coming