

These are the kinds of conflicts I think we have to deal with, and we should. We have to do something about it. Amendments will be offered. There is an amendment I was involved in, where a sugar anticircumvention provision was put in. What that deals with is, in the past, we have had a situation from Canada in which sugar was mixed up in molasses, brought over the border where sugar is not allowed but molasses is, the sugar is then taken out, and the molasses is sent back. We have been able to put a stop to that, but this is a permanent anticircumvention provision, which all it does is go around the law. So I hope that is not struck.

There are a number of other things, of course, that could well be included.

This is basically an issue that is very important to the United States. It is very important to the administration to be able to do their job. I do not think there is any question about that. I come from a State that is involved in agriculture. Agriculture is very much a part of trade. About 1 out of every 3 acres, almost 40 percent of the production, goes into foreign markets. We produce much more than we consume. So one of our real issues is to be able to develop some fair overseas foreign markets for agricultural products. That really has not happened as it should. As well as we get along, for instance, with Japan, we still have very high tariffs on U.S. beef. Japan could be a great market for us.

In balance, it is like most everything else we have to face up to, which is that not everyone agrees. We will hear someone say we ought to do it the right way. I do not know of anyone who wants to do it the wrong way, but there are differences of views as to what is the right way. That is the reason we come together and vote. It is perfectly legitimate to have different points of view, but it is not legitimate to not deal with the issues that are before us.

We spent a very long time on energy. I am very pleased we have a bill, but we now have to do something in the conference committee. Certainly, in terms of our situation, in terms of defense, in terms of terrorism, in terms of our economy, these are issues that have real impact. We can deal with lots of little things. We could list a number of major issues that have a great deal to do with the way we want to see our country in the future, and what we see down the line and that is really what we ought to be doing, is sort of setting some goals as to where we want to be in terms of freedom, in terms of economy, in terms of safety. Having set those goals, it is then reasonable to deal with the issues that are in the interim and determine whether those issues will lead us to the goals we have established.

Unfortunately, too often I think we sort of deal with the issue that is at hand without much thought to where it is going to be over time. It is also true that we represent 50 States, and each of us is a little different. Some this

morning were talking about health care. I am chairman of the caucus on rural health care. Wyoming is a rural State, so when one talks about health care, it is different in Meeteetse, WY, than it is in Pittsburgh, PA. There has to be a system to recognize those differences.

The same is true with trade. It is different in different parts of the country. Overall, it is to our advantage, and I hope we move forward.

In conclusion, we need to get on with some other things, like the budget, like appropriations, some of the things that have to be done in order to keep our Government rolling. I am sure we can do that. I urge we move forward and complete our work as soon as we can.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I ask to speak as in morning business.

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

The Senator from New York is recognized.

THE FUTURE OF TEACHING HOSPITALS

Mrs. CLINTON. I will speak on a very important issue that affects every single American. It affects people all over the world. That is, the future and viability of our teaching hospitals. We know we have the crown jewels of the global health care system in the teaching hospitals who train our doctors and nurses and provide research that gives breakthrough therapies and drugs that saves and lengthens lives. We know our teaching hospitals are often the treatment of last resort for the sickest of the sick and the poorest of the poor.

Yet if we do not act by October of this year, our teaching hospitals nationwide will lose \$700 million next year alone. I believe that would be a disastrous outcome. It certainly would undermine the ability of our teaching hospitals to continue to provide the funds in our health care system that all of our other hospitals, all of our entire health care infrastructure, rely upon.

New York, because we have a plethora of first-class, world-renowned teaching hospitals, would lose about \$230 million of that \$700 million, with over half of that falling directly on our leading-edge teaching hospitals. In 1 year alone, New York teaching hospitals will lose \$120 million in Medicare payments because of the effects of the balanced budget amendment, which have slashed hospital reimbursements by \$100 billion more than the CBO originally estimated. That is a huge

amount of money. It is often the difference between a hospital being able to continue to provide first-class service, training, and charity care, and having to shut departments, lay off people, and turn their backs, literally, on those who need the help. Congress has already softened and delayed some of those reimbursement cuts, including postponing the reductions in the so-called indirect medical education payments, sometimes referred to as IME.

This October, the delay expires and Medicare will revert to the very harsh reimbursement levels that we all recognize cut much more deeply than anyone predicted. The cut would amount to an automatic 15-percent decrease in IME funding across the board, across all States. I oppose an automatic 15-percent decrease in home health payments, and I oppose such a decrease in medical education payments. That is why today a number of my colleagues and I are joining together to introduce a bill to call on the elimination of those cuts before they eliminate our academic medical centers.

New York has a number of fine teaching hospitals. Everyone will recognize the names. It also has 60 rural hospitals, which is more than some rural States have altogether. I am always a little bit surprised when my colleagues and others do not understand that New York, with 19 million-plus people, is not only the island of Manhattan or the five boroughs of New York City or the beaches of Long Island or the suburbs that I live in to the north. It is rolling countryside. It is dairy farms with 80, 100, 120 cows. It is apple growers with the orchards along the Great Lakes that form our northern and western borders. That is why I support a balanced package that will try to help both our teaching hospitals and our rural hospitals.

I draw our attention to a provision in this legislation that deals directly with our great centers of biomedical innovation. If we go forward with the cuts as planned, I believe we set back the cause of clinical trials, of lab research that is going on right now that might hold out a cure for one of us or a loved one. Make no mistake, these cuts will not only close departments, lead to layoffs and furloughs of highly trained doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel, I believe it will also harm patients. If we do not act on the indirect medical education amounts we need to continue to function, the scheduled cuts will affect the quality of health care all over the country.

It is not only New York that benefits from New York's teaching hospitals; our hospitals are filled with people from all over our Nation who are sent there because they cannot get what they need at home. We are proud of that. We have people from all over the world who come to New York's teaching hospitals. We train 20 percent of all physicians practicing in the United

States today. We provide both the medical education, the internship, the residency, the continuing education, that 20 percent of America's doctors take advantage of.

I was surprised to learn that 14 percent of all of Arizona's doctors and 25 percent of Florida doctors were trained in New York. Moreover, the therapies developed and perfected in our academic medical centers offer hope to patients everywhere. Chances are, no matter where you live, you have been touched by the work that has occurred in a New York teaching hospital. We have been instrumental in developing treatments for heart disease, for HIV/AIDS, for developing the therapies on cardiac catheterization, the first to innovate new forms of laser surgery, and the new minimally invasive surgical methods.

Many in this body support NIH funding. We want to double the amount of funding NIH has, but that funding is useless if the research grants cannot go to the top researchers to do the work we hope will come from additional NIH funding.

The U.S. health care system delivers some of the highest quality care to be found anywhere. The reason that happens is because we have a partnership. We have our local community hospitals in small towns and rural areas. We have our larger hospitals in bigger cities in every State in the country. Then we have the so-called teaching hospitals that provide what is called tertiary care. When you are really sick, when you need extra special help, that is when everybody at home has said: There is nothing more we can do for you, go to Sloan-Kettering, go to New York Presbyterian, go to Mount Sinai. There is someone there who can give you the help you need. We are very proud to provide that service to our country.

I hope we will be successful in the legislation we plan to introduce today to protect our academic medical centers. I am calling on our colleagues in both Houses to ensure the provision to eliminate these IME cuts in any Medicare package we enact this year. I hope what seems like an arcane, somewhat abstract issue, is understood as being the extremely important, critical concern that it is.

If one looks at the number of physicians trained, the cures and therapies that have been invented, the last resort care that saves lives that others had given up on, there is no doubt that our teaching hospitals are absolutely essential to the quality of health care in America. We need to do everything we can to make sure they stay healthy and provide the kind of care we have come to take for granted.

Mrs. CLINTON. 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. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, this has been cleared with the Republican leader. I ask unanimous consent morning business be extended until the hour of 1 o'clock today with Senators permitted to speak therein for a period not to exceed 10 minutes.

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 legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 30 minutes in morning business.

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

FAST-TRACK

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I rise to offer some comments on the proposed trade legislation before us, and in particular on the so-called Trade Promotion Authority provisions in that package, also known as fast-track.

As a number of my colleagues have noted, the issue of whether or not to enact fast-track procedures is not a question of whether one favors or opposes free or fair trade, but rather what role Congress plays in trade agreements.

The fast-track proposal we are considering, and its predecessors, are quite recent inventions.

Prior to the Tokyo round of the GATT, there was no fast-track mechanism.

In fact, of the hundreds and hundreds of trade agreements our Nation has negotiated and entered into, only five have used the fast-track procedures.

This by itself should dispose of the argument that fast-track is necessary for us to negotiate trade agreements at all.

Really, what we are saying here is that fast-track has been the exception, not the rule, with regard to trade negotiations.

The previous Administration negotiated and implemented over 200 trade agreements without fast-track.

What were some of those agreements?

Madam President, I don't think I really need to tell you, but they included:

The Market Access Agreement with Argentina for Textiles and Clothing, the Market Access Agreement with Australia for Textiles and Clothing, the Agreement on Bilateral Trade Relations with Belarus, the Market Access Agreement with Brazil for Textiles and Clothing, an Agreement concerning Intellectual Property Rights with Bulgaria, an Agreement Between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Cambodia on Trade Relations and Intellectual Property Rights Protection, the Agreement on Salmon and Herring with Canada, the Agreement on Ultra-high Temperature Milk with Canada, the Agreement on Trade in Softwood Lumber with Canada, the Agreement on Intellectual Property Rights Protection with Ecuador, a Memorandum of Understanding on Trade in Bananas with Costa Rica, several agreements with the European Union, an Agreement on Intellectual Property Rights Protection with India, several dozen agreements with Japan, several dozen agreements with Korea, and many, many more agreements with dozens of other countries.

Just last year, this body passed legislation implementing the U.S.—Jordan Free Trade Agreement, also negotiated and implemented without fast-track procedures.

We passed not only bilateral agreements, but multilateral agreements such as:

the Information Technology Agreement, which involved over 40 countries, the Financial Services Agreement, and, the Basic Telecommunications Agreement.

President Clinton did not need fast track to negotiate those agreements, and President Bush does not need it to negotiate additional agreements.

While the ability to negotiate and enter into international agreements are inherently part of the President's constitutional powers, the Constitution grants exclusive authority to Congress "to regulate Commerce with foreign nations."

Congress has sole constitutional authority over setting tariff levels and making or changing Federal law.

Those who support fast-track constantly make the argument that if you want free trade, you have to enact fast-track.

They equate fast-track with free trade. The reason is obvious. The arguments for free trade are powerful. Indeed, I agree with those arguments.

We as a nation are better off in a world with freer trade than we are without it.

But the underlying premise, that we need fast-track to achieve free and fair trade, is absolutely false.

I have referred to the hundreds of trade agreements negotiated without fast-track procedures.

That is evidence enough.

But let me also argue that not only is fast-track not necessary for free trade, it may actually undermine it.

One of the greatest defects of the NAFTA and GATT agreements was the