

giving it to people who are working when we are giving it to people who are not working?

Currently only about one out of every four people who qualify for trade adjustment assistance take the benefit. Most of them don't take it because it is more generous than unemployment, but it is generally not as good as getting another job. I would say if you lost your job to trade, trade promotes jobs generally, your chances of getting another job in the economy are probably better.

But in any case, I think the question we have to ask ourselves is the following: If one-fourth of the people who are eligible take the benefits now, don't you think the number will go up when the Government is going to pay 73 percent of their health care costs?

My guess is we might even see as much as a quadrupling of the people who take trade adjustment assistance. We get numbers tossed around about how many billions of dollars this new benefit will cost. But nobody knows because we don't know how we are going to change behavior with it. And how many people who now go out and get a new job would not go out and get a new job if they have 73 percent of their health care costs being paid for while they are unemployed?

These are questions to which we have no answers. I remind my colleagues, last week we discovered that a budget that had a huge surplus last year was \$130 billion in deficit this year, with us spending every penny of the Social Security surplus. Our colleagues often like to talk about it. They want to protect the Social Security surplus. Yet we are talking about imposing a rider on this trade bill that is going to cost billions of dollars, and every penny of it is going to come right out of the Social Security surplus. Much of it is going to be borrowed.

My view is that we should not pass this bill with this provision on it. It is subject to a point of order, or at least I believe it will be if we ever see the bill. It seems to me it is perfectly consistent—in fact, I think it is the definition of consistency—if we believe we need trade promotion authority and we ought to have a freestanding vote on it, and then if the Senate wants to bring up trade adjustment assistance, it ought to do that. But the idea of tying the two together—they didn't come out of the Finance Committee together—is fundamentally wrong.

There are a whole lot of other problems. For some reason, our Democrat colleagues have concluded that while we are going to pay 71 percent of the health care bills for the people who are drawing this trade adjustment assistance, we are not going to let them choose their health insurance.

Freedom is dangerous. If we start letting them choose their health insurance, God knows what they are going to want to be able to choose next.

So, extraordinarily, there is a provision in this bill that says you have to

buy exactly the same insurance you had when you had a job and your company was a big part of buying the health insurance. How many people who are unemployed—say you lost your job with General Motors where they are notorious for having benefits such as first-dollar coverage—how many people want to be forced to buy that same benefit when they are unemployed?

Doesn't it seem logical to you that if you are unemployed, you might take a higher deductible so the money you got from the Government would buy you a larger share of your cost, so that the 29 percent you would have had to pay could go to help send your children to college or buy a training program? Why do we have to make people buy the Cadillac health insurance policy when they are unemployed, when they might choose to buy the Chevrolet policy?

I have a very hard time understanding those who would impose this on us saying, no, you cannot let these people choose. My position is, if you are going to provide this benefit, which, A, I don't believe we can afford and, B, I don't know how you justify giving to some people and not others, why not let them pick and choose the health care coverage that is best for them? Why not allow them to buy a Chevrolet policy when they were getting a Cadillac policy—when the company was paying for almost all of it—when it is partly their money? I don't understand why we have to do that.

So I wanted to come over today to simply make a these points: One, I am for trade promotion authority. Two, I think we ought to pass it as a clean bill. Three, I assume there will be a point of order against trade adjustment assistance, and it would be my intention to make the point of order against that provision. There is not a point of order against trade promotion authority. So I am hopeful we can come to some accommodation.

Finally, the one thing you learn when you are a member of a legislative body, such as the Senate, is that seldom do you get things the way you want them, that almost always there is some kind of compromise. I think we should pass trade promotion authority freestanding. But if we do end up with a compromise on trade adjustment assistance, I think we are a long way from being there. I think it needs to be very narrowly defined to be benefits for people who really lose their job due strictly to trade. I think you have to make this benefit affordable, remembering you are going to be taxing working people, who don't get health insurance, to buy Cadillac coverage for people who are unemployed. How can anybody believe that is rational?

How would you justify at a town meeting if some guy stood up and said: I don't get it. I work at the local company that sells tires, and I change tires, and I don't get health insurance through my job. But you are taxing me

to buy first-dollar-coverage health insurance for somebody who is unemployed. Why do you treat unemployed people better than you treat employed people? I don't get it. I am not going to have to answer that question because I am going to say it is stupid, typical of Government, and I am not for it. Of course, normally, somebody back in the corner says: Yeah, but you were there when it happened. It always bugs me when that happens. But it hasn't happened yet, and I am going to do my best to see that it doesn't happen. I wanted to cover all these issues.

I hope we can get on with trade promotion authority. I hope we can work something out. I know the President wants this. There have been more than 130 trade agreements reached worldwide, to date, of which we are not a part. When our trading partner, Mexico, has entered into nine free trade agreements covering 26 countries and the U.S. has entered into three trade agreements, NAFTA, Israel and Jordan, covering four countries, and when we have not entered into these trade agreements because we don't have trade promotion authority, something is wrong. This is the greatest trading country in the history of the world. I hope we can get on and pass the bill in a rational way.

I yield the floor and 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. NELSON of Florida. 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. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business on the matter of this trade bill that is before us.

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

FREE TRADE

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, as we move more to a global economy, I would note that the United States, over the course of time, has been a driver of economic prosperity because of the ingenuity of our people, because of the technological prowess we have, and because of the edge we have over many other countries in our competitiveness with regard to computers.

I think back to when we were in the great space race, after the Soviets had surprised us by launching the first satellite Sputnik—we finally got Explorer up—and that shook the Nation to its core. Then suddenly, the Soviets surprised us again by getting into orbit with a human, Yuri Gagarin, before we could ever get off the pad with Alan Shepard trying to go into suborbit because we did not have a rocket that was strong enough to get that Mercury capsule up into orbit.

So we went into suborbit with two flights before, then 10 months after, Gagarin. We finally launched John Glenn—a former Member of this body—into orbit aboard an Atlas rocket, and the space race was on. That was when there was that very significant leadership decision made by President Kennedy who said: We are going to the Moon and back in the decade; and America put its efforts behind its will to succeed, and we developed the technology which led us to get there and back safely before the Soviets did.

Finally, the Soviets abandoned their efforts to go to the Moon with a human because they did not have the sophistication we had in our computer technology, sophistication that could help direct a spacecraft on reentry so that its trajectory could be such that human life would not be completely eliminated because of the G forces on a spacecraft on reentry.

I give that as one illustration of America's creativity and inventiveness when we set our minds to it. Thus, in the globalization of our markets on trade, whatever the products may be, America has had an advantage. We use our educationally developed workforce, we develop technology, and that is what we are very good at: exporting around the world. Thus, there is every reason for America to want to be engaged in international trade as long as it is free and fair trade. I am a free trader. That is how I usually will vote. That is how I usually voted as a Member of the House of Representatives over a 12-year period of public service.

We are confronting an aspect of trade that concerns me because it is not free and fair. It is going to affect one of the major economic interests in my State of Florida. Many States have automobile license tags indicating something of particular interest to each State. So it is with the Florida automobile license tag. We have an image of an orange emblazoned on our license tag, which is reflective of the considerable pride we have as well as the economic dominance of our Florida citrus industry.

That industry is threatened. Its very existence is threatened. Frozen concentrated Orange Juice production in Florida, is facing a life or death situation. I hope that as I continue to make speeches about the threat to this industry, that the White House is listening to a State that is very important to this White House. It was Florida, as we all know, that won the Presidency. There is a lot at stake in our State. It has to do with this trade bill.

Free and fair trade could quickly turn into a monopoly of trade for Brazil on frozen orange juice concentrate. It could turn into a monopoly because Brazil produces approximately 50 percent of the world production of frozen orange juice concentrate. Florida produces 40 percent of the world production. That 40 percent supplies the domestic market for orange juice. Indeed, it has been the Florida Citrus

Commission advertising over the last half century that now causes orange juice to be a staple on breakfast tables in America.

We find growers in Brazil forming, in essence, a cartel, which can start dumping extra product on the market, undercutting the price for Florida, and running Florida out of the business if there isn't a tariff protecting our domestic market from the invasion of Brazilian frozen orange juice.

That brings me to the trade bill. The trade bill puts that protective tariff at risk, unless we can attach an amendment to the bill offered by Senator GRAHAM and myself, an amendment that would not apply just to orange juice but to other commodities, as well. The amendment says if there is an order in place by either the International Trade Commission or the Department of Commerce, an order in place indicating that there is anti-competitive behavior, then you cannot reduce the tariff until after that order is taken off.

That is common sense. If there is anticompetitive behavior, in the form of dumping, and therefore trying to run down the price by dumping, that is not free and fair trade. Or if there is another type of order from the Department of Commerce in place, a countervailing duty order that says a foreign government is subsidizing that product of that foreign country in order to give them a competitive advantage, that, in essence, is anticompetitive market behavior. If that kind of order is in place, you cannot reduce the tariff until those two respective organizations—the International Trade Commission and the Department of Commerce—have removed their orders.

It does not have to be orange juice. It could be steel. It could be honey in a State like Montana. It could be salmon production from the Pacific Northwest. It could be any of these products on which there are orders against foreign competitors that have been participating in anticompetitive activities. That is why we have the protection of these orders from either the International Trade Commission or the Department of Commerce. Until those orders are lifted because the anticompetitive behavior of the foreign companies disappears, we cannot reduce the tariff.

It is my hope the good common sense of this type of approach will be recognized by the administration. They think they have the votes to pass the trade promotion authority bill in this body—they may—but I am going to keep raising this issue. Somebody needs to keep raising it. Then, again, maybe they don't have the votes. Or maybe they don't have the votes within the timeframe they think they have.

It is a matter of ultimate fairness of free and fair competition in the global marketplace that we are trying to achieve at the end of the day, which is free and fair trade. Thus, I wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate

and the White House my renewed plea on behalf of Senator GRAHAM and myself, with regard to the interests of the Florida citrus industry, that the administration should be willing to work with Congress to accept this amendment for the protection of free and fair and truly competitive international trade.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. EDWARDS. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for up to 3 minutes as in morning business.

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

THE MEDICAL CONDITION OF SENATOR HELMS

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I want to report to my colleagues. As probably all are aware, our friend and colleague, Senator JESSE HELMS, had heart surgery recently. We have all been monitoring his progress very carefully and closely. I have been speaking with those in his office and his staff who are working so hard and so diligently to keep up Senator HELMS' operation here in the Senate and back in North Carolina while he is recovering from his heart surgery.

The most recent report as of today is that Senator HELMS is progressing. He is progressing in the manner in which his physicians would have expected.

Senator FRIST, along with others, has been watching and monitoring his care and recovery very carefully. I am told by members of Senator HELMS' staff that his progress is exactly as anticipated. They are feeling optimistic. The doctors are feeling optimistic. Hopefully, before too long, we will have Senator HELMS back with us.

We also want Senator HELMS, his wife Dot, whom we all love and adore, and the members of his family, plus the members of his staff who are so devoted to him, to know that all of us, all his friends, all his colleagues, are thinking about him constantly. He is in our prayers daily. We will continue to pray for his rapid recovery.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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 (Ms. STABENOW). Without objection, it is so ordered.