

a presentation by a Member of Congress at one of our briefings on Social Security. Did I recall hearing that there is a privatization scheme in Britain where 40 percent of the dollars that are allocated for savings in this privatized account go to transaction costs?

Mr. LEVIN. I think that was the number I heard. My memory is very similar to that. It is an astounding number that the people who recommend privatization don't even factor.

There are a lot of other things they don't factor, by the way; some of them are even more focused. They don't replace the money. They don't say how they will replace the money which would be lost to the Social Security system by people not contributing to it and supporting folks who are retired or near retirement. They never talk about that huge hole in the general fund that would be created. They don't talk about the uncertainty of private accounts as much as they should, the fact that the market over time may go up depending on what time period you look at, but not for everybody.

Even within that long window, there will be some losers. Maybe most people will win, but what about the losers? They don't talk about that as much as they should. The thing they never talk about are these administrative costs, these transaction costs which, as the Senator has pointed out, are apparently a very significant percentage of the money.

Mr. CORZINE. If the Senator from Michigan will give me the grace of making sure my arithmetic is right, if you add a 25-percent cut for people who are now working plus 40 percent in administrative costs, that 65 percent out of the total amount of benefits from Social Security seems to be a big chunk out of how one would have their retirement financed. Certainly it would go a long way to eroding the base of benefits that people have come to expect from Social Security.

Mr. LEVIN. It would, indeed. It makes that enticement of private accounts, when you analyze it, a lot more superficial. The reality is a lot more negative than that superficial glow of riches.

Mr. DAYTON. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LEVIN. Sure.

Mr. DAYTON. Contrary to what most people in this country probably believe, the Social Security Administration is extremely efficient, and, in fact, less than 1 percent of Social Security goes for administrative costs. The Senator cited some of the figures from the OWL report, which is an excellent document, about the disparities between men and women. I have seen the statistic that one-quarter of the retirees in America today don't receive any pension fund whatsoever.

My experience in Minnesota would be that probably 80 or 90 percent of those are women, particularly older women

who are widowed and often, with the older pensions, lose any benefit payments whatsoever once their husband dies. I wonder if the Senator from Michigan has had that same experience. Would the Senator say in Michigan that number applies?

Mr. LEVIN. It is a very large percentage. I don't have it directly in my mind, but it is a large percentage of people, particularly women, who rely exclusively on Social Security. We encourage people, of course, to have private savings, and some people have pensions. That three-legged stool Senator BINGAMAN talked about of Social Security and private pensions and private savings is a one-leg stool for a large percentage of our seniors and a larger percentage of women.

Mr. DAYTON. The Senator is absolutely right. That is exactly the dilemma, the predicament in which so many elderly women find themselves. There is only one leg to that stool. As the Senator from New Jersey pointed out, with the average Social Security payment for women being only \$750 a month, that is not much money on which to live. I think that creates part of the lure of the personal privatization which the Republican Commission has now come forward with, which, obviously, someone receiving that little amount of money would be tempted, enticed by something else. As the Senator pointed out very well, there is no reward without risk.

I wonder if the Senator—certainly the Senator from New Jersey who spent a career in financial pursuits—is aware of anywhere where there is that potential for reward in the private sector without commensurate risk.

Mr. LEVIN. There will be winners and losers. It turns Social Security into a social insecurity system.

Mr. DAYTON. I compliment the Senator from New Jersey in bringing this important report to the Senate. He is to be commended. It is a very important topic, as we look ahead to the future of Social Security.

Mr. LEVIN. One last word: I have met with the women who are active in the OWL commission. They are very keenly aware of the problems with the President's Commission and the uncertainties it would create for women in particular who are seniors. And I think the opposition to the President's Commission's findings is very strong and is growing.

Mr. CORZINE. Will the Senator from Michigan yield for a moment to say, I am very appreciative of the discussion you have had, the contributions the Senator from Minnesota made with regard to raising this issue so we can have a debate about it. This debate ought to be had before the election, not after the election. People ought to have to make a statement about how they feel about these recommendations since it has such an impact on Americans' lives, particularly women in America. That is what the OWL report was about. I very much appreciate the

contributions my colleagues have made to this discussion.

Mr. LEVIN. One additional word: I hope we will actually not only consider the recommendations of the President's Commission but actually vote on them. We ought to put them to rest. There is a lot of concern in the country about those recommendations, that they would totally make the Social Security system much less secure. I think we ought to try to address the concerns by voting on those recommendations. I believe they will be voted down, as they should be, so that the people out there who are not only retired but in their forties and fifties, who rely on Social Security, want it to be there, don't want the uncertainty that will be created by the contributions being reduced—which is what would happen without any idea of where the replacement funds would come from—I think it would be healthy for the country not just to debate it but, if possible, before the election to vote up or down on those recommendations. I hope and believe that all of them will be rejected.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time for morning business is closed.

#### ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE EXPANSION ACT—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 3009, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3009) to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Baucus/Grassley amendment No. 3401, in the nature of a substitute.

Baucus amendment No. 3405 (to amendment No. 3401), to clarify the principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to foreign investment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3405

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 10 minutes debate in relation to the pending Baucus amendment. Who yields time?

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, is there a time allotted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 10 minutes debate in relation to the pending Baucus amendment.

Mr. BAUCUS. It is my understanding that the Senator from Massachusetts will have 5 minutes and the other 5 minutes will be allotted to Senator GRASSLEY and myself. I will take 2½ minutes of that.

I rise once again to urge my colleagues to support the amendment that I laid down yesterday on behalf of myself and Senators GRASSLEY and WYDEN.

The amendment is a short but very important clarification to the trade bill's negotiating objective on investment. When we negotiate investment agreements, our primary objective is to ensure that U.S. investors abroad have rights and protections comparable to the rights and protections they enjoy in the United States. In fulfilling that objective, we generally undertake reciprocal obligations with respect to foreign investors.

Our amendment makes absolutely clear that the rights we extend to foreign investors must not exceed the rights we afford our own citizens.

I expect that this is not the end of our debate on investor-State dispute settlement. As the debate goes forward, it is important to understand that we are trying to achieve a balance. In taking steps to protect U.S. investors abroad, we must not sacrifice the sovereignty of Federal, State, and local governments here at home. Striking the right balance is precisely what we have done in the trade bill. When it was brought to our attention that we might improve that balance, we did so in the amendment laid down yesterday.

In the days ahead, it is important that we not upend the balance. We have carefully crafted a foundation for future investment agreements. I strongly urge my colleagues to support that foundation and to support the Baucus-Grassley-Wyden amendment.

I reserve the remainder of my 2½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I appreciate enormously the efforts of the chairman and ranking member to move what is always a very difficult issue through the Senate. They have done a good job of trying to resolve a great many issues. I don't oppose this amendment of theirs, but, in fact, I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

I emphasize to my colleagues that this amendment does not fix the chapter 11 problem that still exists with respect to the sovereignty of American businesses and the rights of Americans and of our communities to be able to be protected. I am very grateful for the chairman's willingness to try to respond, but substantial disagreements still exist with respect to how we best protect American businesses and our communities, according to our rights.

As our colleagues know, it is clear that the NAFTA investor-State dispute resolution process, which is known as chapter 11, is going to be the model on which future agreements are predicated. And chapter 11, in its current form, is a flawed model. It is not a failed model; it is simply flawed. We have the ability to be able to fix it.

Last night, Senator BAUCUS referenced letters written by several organizations that urged correction of the no-lesser-rights language, which is precisely what will happen in this particular amendment. I appreciate his re-

sponse, but let me point out that in those letters he referenced, there are a whole set of other issues that are unaddressed in this amendment. Specifically, from the National League of Cities, they say: We are concerned that future trade negotiations, particularly for a hemispheric free trade area of the Americas, could include provisions that expand the definition of a regulatory taking. As evidenced by disputes under chapter 11 of NAFTA, vague expropriation language has allowed new avenues of recourse for foreign investors to challenge current State and local ordinances.

So we are allowing a foreign investor to come in and actually undo the intent of our local and State communities to enforce certain kinds of health or other kinds of restraints.

From the National Association of Towns and Townships:

In particular, we are troubled that a claim by a foreign company that a local government's regulation or zoning laws constitutes a taking against the company will make it impossible for the locality to enforce that law or regulation.

From the National Conference of State Legislators:

The bill does not adequately and explicitly guarantee that trade agreements negotiated under this authority will respect State sovereignty, nor incorporate well defined and constitutional Fifth Amendment takings principles.

Regrettably, the Baucus-Grassley amendment does not, despite what they claim in the no-greater-rights-than language, address the shortcomings of the chapter 11 model. Adopting their language without other needed changes is still going to allow future chapter 11-like tribunals to rule against legitimate U.S. public health and safety laws using a standard of expropriation that goes well beyond the clear standard that the Supreme Court has established in all of its expropriation cases.

The amendment before us does not give assurances that the due process claims of the Constitution will be respected, nor does it provide safe harbor for legitimate U.S. public health and safety laws.

I will propose an amendment, and we will debate this amendment over the course of the next couple of days. I urge my colleagues to adopt a policy that will fully protect the constitutional rights of American businesses and the constitutional right of our States, the expropriation laws and standards of the Supreme Court. I urge them to vote for this amendment recognizing this does not complete the task.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the amendment that is before us was introduced by Senator BAUCUS and myself and is designed to make it crystal clear that in pursuing these objectives, foreign investors are not to be granted any greater rights in the United States than our own U.S. investors have

rights within the United States. This provision builds upon the already strong improvements to the investment objectives within this bill. These provisions strike a very careful balance between the needs to protect U.S. citizens from arbitrary takings of their property overseas and the need to ensure that the investor-State dispute settlement process is not abused.

Critics of the investment provisions insist that the investor-State dispute settlement process has somehow run amok. Not true. The fact is that no U.S. environmental, health, or safety regulations have ever been overturned by the international investment arbitration. Only 13 investor-State claims have been filed under NAFTA chapter 11 in the entire 8 years of its existence. Meanwhile, U.S. investors continue to face discriminatory and arbitrary government action in most of the developing world. We need to maintain U.S. investors' ability to get redress in impartial tribunals while ensuring that the investor-State dispute settlement process continues to protect our own investors overseas. This simply is what the Baucus-Grassley amendment does.

I urge support for this amendment and support for the Baucus-Grassley compromise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 109 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Akaka	Brownback	Cochran
Allard	Bunning	Collins
Allen	Burns	Conrad
Baucus	Byrd	Corzine
Bayh	Campbell	Craig
Bennett	Cantwell	Crapo
Biden	Carnahan	Daschle
Bingaman	Carper	Dayton
Bond	Chafee	DeWine
Boxer	Cleland	Dodd
Breaux	Clinton	Domenici

Dorgan	Johnson	Roberts
Durbin	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Edwards	Kerry	Santorum
Ensign	Kohl	Sarbanes
Enzi	Kyl	Schumer
Feingold	Landrieu	Sessions
Feinstein	Leahy	Shelby
Fitzgerald	Levin	Smith (NH)
Frist	Lieberman	Smith (OR)
Graham	Lincoln	Snowe
Gramm	Lott	Specter
Grassley	Lugar	Stabenow
Gregg	McCain	Stevens
Hagel	McConnell	Thomas
Harkin	Mikulski	Thompson
Hatch	Murkowski	Thurmond
Hollings	Murray	Torricelli
Hutchinson	Nelson (FL)	Voinovich
Hutchison	Nelson (NE)	Warner
Inhofe	Nickles	Wellstone
Inouye	Reed	Wyden
Jeffords	Reid	

## NOT VOTING—2

Helms	Miller
-------	--------

The amendment (No. 3405) was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3408

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. DAYTON. I call up amendment No. 3408.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAYTON], for himself and Mr. CRAIG, proposes an amendment numbered 3408 to amendment No. 3401.

Mr. DAYTON. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To limit the application of trade authorities procedures)

At the end of section 2103(b), add the following:

(4) LIMITATIONS ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (trade authorities procedures) shall not apply to any provision in an implementing bill being considered by the Senate that modifies or amends, or requires a modification of, or an amendment to, any law of the United States that provides safeguards from unfair foreign trade practices to United States businesses or workers, including—

(i) imposition of countervailing and antidumping duties (title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; 19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.);

(ii) protection from unfair methods of competition and unfair acts in the importation of articles (section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930; 19 U.S.C. 1337);

(iii) relief from injury caused by import competition (title II of the Trade Act of 1974; 19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.);

(iv) relief from unfair trade practices (title III of the Trade Act of 1974; 19 U.S.C. 2411 et seq.); or

(v) national security import restrictions (section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; 19 U.S.C. 1862).

## (B) POINT OF ORDER IN SENATE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering an implementing bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator against any part of the implementing bill that contains material in violation of subparagraph (A), and the point of order is sustained by the Presiding Officer, the part of the implementing bill against which the point of order is sustained shall be stricken from the bill.

## (ii) WAIVERS AND APPEALS.—

(I) WAIVERS.—Before the Presiding Officer rules on a point of order described in clause (i), any Senator may move to waive the point of order and the motion to waive shall not be subject to amendment. A point of order described in clause (i) is waived only by the affirmative vote of a majority of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(II) APPEALS.—After the Presiding Officer rules on a point of order under this subparagraph, any Senator may appeal the ruling of the Presiding Officer on the point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions on which the Presiding Officer ruled. A ruling of the Presiding Officer on a point of order described in clause (i) is sustained unless a majority of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, vote not to sustain the ruling.

(III) DEBATE.—Debate on a motion to waive under subclause (I) or on an appeal of the ruling of the Presiding Officer under subclause (II) shall be limited to 1 hour. The time shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader, or their designees.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3409 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3408

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk as a second-degree amendment, for Senator BAUCUS and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 3409 to amendment No. 3408.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To make preserving the ability of the United States to enforce rigorously its trade laws a principal trade negotiating objective, and for other purposes)

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment, insert the following:

(4) ADDITIONAL PRINCIPAL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 2102(b) of this Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(15) TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade remedy laws are—

“(A) to preserve the ability of the United States to enforce rigorously its trade laws, including the antidumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard laws, and avoid agreements that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international disciplines on unfair trade, especially dumping and subsidies, or that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international safeguard provisions, in order

to ensure that United States workers, agricultural producers, and firms can compete fully on fair terms and enjoy the benefits of reciprocal trade concessions; and

“(B) to address and remedy market distortions that lead to dumping and subsidization, including overcapacity, cartelization, and market-access barriers.”.

## (B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Section 2102(c) of this Act is amended—

(I) by striking paragraph (9);

(II) by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (12) as paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively; and

(III) in the matter following paragraph (11) (as so redesignated), by striking “(11)” and inserting “(10)”.

(ii) Subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of section 2104(d)(3) of this Act are each amended by striking “2102(c)(9)” and inserting “2102(b)(15)”.

(iii) Section 2105(a)(2)(B)(ii)(VI) of this Act is amended by striking “2102(c)(9)” and inserting “2102(b)(15)”.

(C) PRESIDENTIAL REPORT TO COVER ADDITIONAL TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—Section 2104(d)(3) (A) and (B)(i) of this Act are each amended by inserting after “title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930” the following: “, section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, title III of the Trade Act of 1974, section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.”.

(D) EXPANSION OF CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT GROUP.—

(i) MEMBERSHIP FROM THE HOUSE.—Section 2107(a)(2) of this Act is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) Up to 3 additional Members of the House of Representatives (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party) as the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Ways and Means may select.”.

(ii) MEMBERSHIP FROM THE SENATE.—Section 2107(a)(2) of this Act is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) Up to 3 additional Members of the Senate (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party) as the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Finance may select.”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have sent a second-degree amendment to the desk in place of the Dayton amendment. I am going to debate that in just a little while, but I want everybody to know the situation.

Also, Senator BAUCUS and I are going to visit with various people to see if there is a smooth way of handling both the substitute as well as the original amendment. We may not be successful, but that is our desire. We are going to be talking while this debate is ongoing, and I will be back to give the specifics of my amendment in just a short period of time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, the amendment Senator CRAIG and I have introduced is one that I think has great importance to this legislation. It is one I am very proud to sponsor with the senior Senator from Idaho, someone with whom I have had the good fortune to work on this and other matters relating to trade as they affect our two States.

I also am very pleased that this amendment is cosponsored by 26 of our colleagues, 13 Republicans and 13 Democrats. They reflect a broad spectrum of views on many issues, yet they agree on the need for this amendment. Is it because all of us are against trade, as our detractors have charged?

The answer is an emphatic "no." We support this amendment because we recognize that there is more than one side to the U.S. trade equation. There are a great many citizens in our States who have benefited from the liberalization of international trade during the last 20 years. However, there are also a great many Americans who have been harmed by the results of recent trade agreements.

The proponents of more free trade acknowledge only the winners. Their reports cite only the businesses, the jobs, and the revenues from increased exports. Those benefits are substantial; however, they form only one side of the trade ledger. On the other side are thousands of bankrupt businesses and farms in the United States, many thousands of lost American jobs, and the massive shifting of U.S. production to other countries.

This Dayton-Craig amendment is on behalf of Americans who have been, are being, or will be harmed by continuing trade liberalization. They are hard-working citizens who nevertheless will lose their livelihoods, which in turn will cause lost homes, lost health insurance, lost pensions, lost retirement security, lost hope, and even lost lives. They are not isolated occurrences. They are growing in number across America.

They are victims of trade policies and trade practices which are out of balance. In the year 2000, the United States total trade deficit for goods and services was \$376 billion. In goods alone, the deficit was \$452 billion. In 1990, the total U.S. trade deficit was \$81 billion. In 1980, it was only \$19 billion. Our country's trade deficit, that imbalance between the value of our exports and the value of our imports, was 4½ times greater in 2000 than in 1990, and 20 times greater in 2000 than in 1980.

A March 18, 2002, *Business Week* article began:

How much longer can the United States rack up giant current account trade deficits?

The article cited a Goldman Sachs Global Economic's Research report, which called the current trend "unsustainable."

Another recent report stated:

America's ballooning trade deficit may be the worst economic problem we face—and no one wants to talk about it.

What is driving these soaring trade deficits? It isn't that U.S. exports are not expanding. In many sectors they are growing at a very strong rate, and the last administration worked hard to open foreign markets to U.S. goods and services, as did its predecessors. It's the explosion in imports which is far exceeding export gains.

From 1990 to 2000, total U.S. exports in goods and services almost doubled to

just over \$1 trillion. However, during that decade, total U.S. imports more than doubled—in fact, increased by 133 percent, to almost \$1½ trillion. The increase in imports was \$295 billion more than the growth in exports.

If you look at key sectors in our economy, you see this pattern. Exports expand. Imports explode. Trade deficits multiply. This serious imbalance has cost the jobs, farms, businesses, and livelihoods of too many Americans.

Even in agriculture, the growth in imports has exceeded the growth in exports. Farmers and national commodity organizations, including many coming right out of Minnesota, have been among the biggest supporters of trade liberalization in their hopes that increased exports would lead to higher prices and decent profits in the marketplace. From 1990 to 2000, total U.S. agriculture exports did grow by \$10.5 billion, a 26-percent increase. However, agriculture imports increased by over \$16 billion during that time. Today, the U.S. balance of trade in all agriculture commodities is still positive; however, that margin is shrinking.

Two major causes of our huge trade deficits have been Mexico and Canada. They are the big NAFTA winners. Look at what has happened to U.S. trade with our neighbors since NAFTA took effect on January 1, 1994.

In 1993, the last year before NAFTA, all United States exports to Mexico totaled \$41.6 billion. Imports from Mexico totaled \$39.9 billion, leaving the United States with a \$1.7 billion trade surplus with Mexico.

During the next 7 years, United States exports into Mexico grew to \$111 billion, a 167-percent increase in 7 years. However, Mexican imports into the United States exploded to \$136 billion, a 240-percent increase, and the United States balance of trade with Mexico went from its 1993 surplus to a \$25 billion deficit in the year 2000.

Our trade with Canada followed a similar pattern. United States exports into Canada increased by \$69 billion from 1993 to 2000. However, our imports from Canada grew by \$120 billion, almost double the growth in exports. In 2000, our trade deficit with Canada was \$52 billion.

Looking at one key sector, automobiles, the total automobile imports from Mexico into the United States more than tripled from 1993 to 2000, to almost 1 million per year. Cars imported from Canada into the United States increased by 56 percent during that time to 2.2 million automobiles. Those 3 million autos used to be—or could have been—manufactured in the United States by American auto workers.

Agriculture is another big loser under NAFTA, as too many Minnesota farmers have painfully realized. Canadian wheat, Mexican sugar, milk protein concentrate, stuffed molasses via Canada, and other trade imbalances have caused domestic commodity prices to plummet. The average price

of a bushel of corn in the United States in the year 2000, was \$1.85, well below the price of \$3.11 for a bushel of corn in 1980, 20 years previously. For a bushel of wheat, the price in 2000 was \$2.65 per bushel; in 1980 it was \$3.91. For soybeans, a bushel in 2000 averaged \$4.75; in 1980, that price was \$7.57. Milk averaged \$12.40 per cwt. in 2000, compared to \$13.05 per cwt. in 1980. Turkeys brought 40.7 cents per pound in 2000; 41.3 cents per pound in 1980.

All of those prices are in current dollars. After adjusting for inflation, their drops are even more severe. Last year, the U.S. farm price index, the value of all U.S. agriculture products divided by the cost of producing them, dropped to its lowest level since the Great Depression. That index has fallen by 20 percent during the last 10 years. So much for the benefits of NAFTA and international trade liberalization on American agriculture.

Similarly, in the nonfarm private sector, the average hourly wage paid U.S. workers in real dollars was less in the year 2000 than in 1990. It was less in 2000 than it was in 1980, and less than it was in 1970. Only by more spouses working more hours have average American families stayed even or moved slightly ahead in the U.S. economy during the last 10, 20, and 30 years.

Thus, U.S. trade policies and practices, in balance, are doing many Americans more harm than good. And the harm is increasing more than the good.

The response of free trade proponents to this predicament is more free trade. More opening our doors to the largest marketplace in the world, the U.S. economy, which still produces 23 percent of the world's GWP, accounts for 12 percent of world exports, and 18 percent of world imports.

Who, then, does benefit from this U.S. trade policy? Primarily, it has been, and continues to be, the enormous cost advantages afforded U.S. corporations who shift production out of the United States into low-wage low-cost countries. Deregulation of the world's product and financial markets has enriched a world class of investors, entrepreneurs, and professionals. At the very top, the accumulation of wealth has been extraordinary.

In 1996, the United Nations reported that the assets of the world's 350 billionaires—that is, 350 individuals in this world who are billionaires—exceeded the combined incomes of 45 percent of the world's population, almost 3 billion people.

Let me say that again. The assets of the wealthiest 350 people in the world exceeded the total assets of over 3 billion of our world's citizens. But the larger promise made by the proponents of this unregulated world marketplace—particularly to the people of the United States—was that living standards for the rest of Americans would also rise. That promise has not been realized. As trade and financial markets have been flung open, incomes have

risen not faster, but more slowly. Income equality among nations has not improved, and within nations, including the United States, income inequality has worsened.

But this seems not to matter to the promoters of this rapid deregulation of the global economy, the so-called neo-liberals, and their solution to whatever problems afflict us is, of course, more trade liberalization. Ironically, many of them spent the last 30 years associating the word "liberal" with social failure. In this instance, they may prove themselves correct.

Nevertheless, it is the considered judgment of this administration and of the House of Representatives, albeit by a single vote, to continue in that direction. I expect this body will join with them by passing this trade promotion authority legislation.

Thus, the Dayton-Craig amendment represents one of the last opportunities for Congress to assert its priority for the economic well-being of the American people over the capital-serving efficiencies of liberalized world markets. This amendment preserves Congress' ability to look out for the best interests of all Americans, especially the people who are on the losing side of the trade equation. And if we don't look out for them, it is a near certainty that no one else will.

The Dayton-Craig amendment applies only to so-called trade remedy laws. They were enacted and put into law by previous Congresses and Presidents to protect American business owners, workers, and farmers from illegal or unfair trade practices, and to assist those Americans whose lives and livelihoods were irrevocably damaged by them. These trade remedy laws include safeguards in section 201, which provide for temporary duties, quotas, or other restrictions on imports that are traded fairly but which threaten serious injury to a domestic industry. They include anti-dumping remedies for the destructive effects of imports sold on the U.S. market at unfairly low prices, and countervailing duty relief from the negative impact of imports receiving foreign government subsidies. They also include section 301 of the Trade Act which authorizes the United States Trade Representative to investigate trade agreement violations and illegal foreign trade barriers which are harmful to U.S. businesses and exports, and to remedy those violations.

All of these remedies are already subject to the rules established under the World Trade Organization and under the North American Free Trade Agreement. The United States and other WTO members must adhere to the Uruguay Round Stipulations on subsidies and countervailing measures. This is hugely important. This is the first time the United States has ever agreed to subordinate its sovereignty to an international organization. The folks who decried the Trilateral Commission and so-called one-world government, those who condemn the coordination of

U.S. military forces with NATO, and those who oppose any U.S. adherence to international agreements, are strangely silent about U.S. subjugation to the economic dictates of the World Trade Organization. Heretofore, the WTO, has operated largely as the creation of the United States that it is. However, now that it is fully established and empowered with the unanimous consent of the participating countries and whose rules can only be altered by the same, any sovereign powers negotiated away in future trade agreements that are agreed to by this body will not be redeemable, which is all the more reason why Congress should be vigilant over them.

The Dayton-Craig amendment says that Congress, along with the President, enacted these trade remedy laws, and only the President and Congress may eliminate them. They cannot be negotiated away by an unelected trade negotiator, albeit one selected by the President, who has a much narrower perspective than Congress, who has the specific objective to secure further trade agreements, and who may not share this body's perspective and concerns. Since a letter from 62 Senators opposing the inclusion of trade remedy laws in future trade negotiations was ignored, there is no reason to expect otherwise when those negotiations finally occur.

So, when a new trade agreement comes to Congress, to the Senate, with the trade remedy laws of the United States altered, with their protections weakened, and with Congress' prior enactment of them overridden, then, if this trade promotion authority law is in effect—as it is written now without the Craig-Dayton amendment—we will be faced with a take it or leave it proposition. We will have no discretion or latitude. It will be all or nothing.

This amendment will permit—not require, but permit—Congress to separate those provisions in a proposed new trade agreement which alter existing trade remedy laws, allow the rest of the agreement to proceed along fast track, and then consider those trade remedy changes under regular Senate rules and procedures. Then, Congress can decide, as only Congress should decide, whether they must be given up for some larger gain. Then, we, or our successors, will be able to look our constituents in their eyes and tell them that we have acted in their collective best interests.

Trade negotiators look at those trade remedy laws and they see words, or bargaining chips, or perhaps even nuisances to get rid of. We see people, our constituents, who elected us and who depend upon us to look out for their interests. So when words which protect them are going to be removed, those decisions should be reviewed by their elected Representatives.

Last week, the trade ambassador said that you cannot be for this amendment and be for trade. There is great irony in an unelected official in the execu-

tive branch, which has no constitutional authority over trade, telling 535 elected Members of Congress, to whom the Constitution assigns the full responsibility for foreign trade, essentially to butt out of his domain. He was quoted as saying:

This goes to the heart, of whether the Congress is going to try to negotiate with 435 Members of the House and 100 Senators, whether they want to go over to Brussels and all sit around together, or whether they are going to have the Executive Branch negotiate.

My reply, Mr. Ambassador, is: You negotiate and then Congress will exercise its responsibilities under the United States Constitution. If our trading partners question those procedures, show them a copy of our Constitution. We bring government officials from all over the world here to learn about our system of government. This is another teaching opportunity. Under our Constitution, we do not permit one person—no matter who he or she is—to bargain away our laws. No one—not even the President of the United States—has that authority. And no one who understands our Constitution should seek that authority.

While our country's future trade policies are debatable, the right of Congress to participate actively in setting those policies is not. For anyone to try to usurp that authority is seriously misguided. If it succeeds, Congress has failed, failed its responsibility, failed the Constitution, and failed the people of America.

By adopting this amendment, the Senate upholds that right and that responsibility.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, as a co-sponsor of the Dayton-Craig amendment, I wish to speak for a few moments about the constructs of the amendment itself and applaud my colleague and partner in this amendment, the Senator from Minnesota, for a very thorough and well-thought-out explanation as to the reason for this amendment.

I need not repeat the statistics. I need not repeat the facts that have been so eloquently spoken about a problem that exists in our country today that begs for a remedy and, at the same time, demands that we move forward in the area of expanding trade amongst our trading partners around the world.

The elements of fairness, the elements of transparency, the elements of the right hand knowing what the left hand is doing are absolutely critical in any trade relationship.

By the character of a developing economy, by the uniqueness of a resource-directed economy, by the uniqueness of a populated economy, all of our countries around the world have differences. And those differences have values. And those countries that sense those values work to protect them or

in some way assure that they will not be traded down or effectively destroyed by the very governments that are destined to protect them.

As a result of that, from the very beginning, and from the beginning of the debate over trade, very substantively coming with the Kennedy Round of trade years ago, when we first established the fast-track concept, we knew our trade negotiators, once they were at the table of international negotiations, would have to have flexibility to propose and bring back to the Congress a whole package. But that whole package had to be representative of the laws of the country of which they were diplomats.

We have struggled with that over the years. Congress has consistently passed fast tracks, and we have worked to move progressively and to liberalize our trade laws. We, the United States, have been the world's promoters of trade. It is quite simple why we would want to be that.

In my State of Idaho, nearly a third of every acre planted of agricultural produce has to sell in world markets to maintain some degree of value in a domestic market.

My State was built on potatoes, potato chips. Now it is being built on computer chips. And those products have to sell in world markets. Clearly, the DRAMs that are produced by Micron, a large portion of those move into international markets to be applied to new technologies being developed in those markets that then again sell in the world market.

Clearly, in my State, trade has expanded dramatically in the last several decades. But while the hi-tech economy has grown very well with a substantial amount of profitability, the agricultural economy has floundered. And while trade has been extremely beneficial in some areas, I would have to argue, as the Senator from Minnesota has, that in other areas it appears to have been less than fair and, in many instances, not fair at all.

There is a bit of a classic struggle going on between the United States and Canada in our forest products industries, forest products industries that are in part supply, publicly owned in the sense that the timber comes from public lands. Whether it is the Federal lands of the U.S. Forest Service in the lower 48 and Alaska or whether it is crowned and provincial timber in Canada, the reality of placing values on those rough products as they move to the market is substantially different.

Over the years we have fought mightily to create balance. But as a result of some of what we believed to be unfair practices between Canada and the United States, we have seen the rights of our policies go out and our men and women walk away with empty lunch pails while Canadians were aggressively logging and dumping in our markets. Just this year our President had to use trade remedy laws to stop the

very process I have just defined. He stood up and he spoke out and he placed a tariff against Canadian lumber until such time as they can come back to the table and balance out with us a relationship and an agreement that does not put our men and women out of work and still allows them to work and still allows the beneficial reality of Canadian and U.S. sticks, 2 by 4s, being at the local lumberyard to build the homes of Americans.

That is called balanced trade. That is called fair trade. The 201 process that brought about the investigation by our government, which was open and transparent, and that led our President to move is known as a trade remedy law passed by the U.S. Congress, passed by a majority vote out of this body—in other words, reflective of the constitutional responsibility of every Senator and every U.S. Member of Congress representing their States but, most importantly, taking an oath right there in that well to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

The argument is simple and the argument has been made already today by the administration in a letter to all of our colleagues that fast track is simply a process and we make all of these proposals and we make all of these changes and all of them come back for a vote in this Chamber and they are correct—one vote, up or down.

The problem occurs with the anticipation of the positives that will happen in an overall trade package once negotiated because they are never quite negotiated in a vacuum. The process goes on for years and years, as you have round after round and finally they conclude; there is a lot of attention and the world finally says, Oh, here it is, here is a trade package, a product of WTO, a product of aggressive negotiations, probably a product of the new round launched last year in Doha. The anticipation is so great and the public pressure is so great that when it gets to the well of the Senate and we see that substantive law has been changed and we would like to fix it, we cannot. We can vote against it, but the pressure by business, by industry, by the economy in general is you must pass this trade package. And we do. And we have consistently.

As a result, some of us have had to vote no. I voted no against NAFTA. Why? Because of some environmental provisions in it and because of loopholes that I felt were in it, that an 18-wheeler truckload with Canadian grain could get through and into our markets were a reality, and they were and I voted against it, and time has proven that to be the case.

But it has also proven one other thing—that Canadians are very good at enforcing laws at the border and we are very bad. But that was then. This is now. This administration is acting differently, and it is acting responsibly, and it led with the steel decision and it has now followed with the softwood lumber decision, and it is saying that

it will effectively use a very transparent process to review the fairness or the lack of fairness in trade relationships and where it finds dumping it will move. And it has. I credit them for that.

But what I am also saying, what the Senator from Minnesota is saying is that within the process itself, we can avoid some of the problems that have now been recorded over the last several decades if we would be allowed, on laws that we are proposing to be changed that might reduce the ability of the executive branch of our Government to enforce trade remedy laws, to say that they would apply to a point of order and a simple majority vote, the same vote it takes to pass the trade package that would be in the Chamber that they would be a part of. So I would say to any negotiator, if you are negotiating a package that cannot get 51 votes in this Chamber, and you are proposing changes in substantive law that might be required to get 51 votes, wherein lies the problem, especially if we are defending what I believe to be the very thing that the Senator from Minnesota has talked about—our constitutional responsibility and the sovereignty in doing that.

Every administration and this administration protects with a vengeance its executive prerogatives, its executive authority, and we have seen this administration step up to that on at least two occasions in the last couple of years. That is what we are doing today—stepping up to what is, in fact, a legislative prerogative of the Constitution and why we think it is right that it be allowed to be a part of this package requiring a simple majority vote.

What am I saying? The Dayton-Craig amendment is simply a point of order that would be part of it. That is, if a package comes to the floor and there are changes in trade remedy law—and in the current package that we are alleging we will know if they are there without even having to look because 90 days prior, under the law proposed, the negotiators would have to announce proposals of changes in the law. That is part of what came out of the House. That is part of what the Finance Committee, Chairman BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY agreed on. And that is appropriate. It is appropriate that the legislative bodies of this constitutional Republic understand that changes in the laws that they have written are being proposed. What we are saying today is that there ought to be the next step and that next step is quite simple—to allow a simple majority vote of the constitutional officers of this body—us, U.S. Senators—to say whether those changes are right.

Now, here is the next step, though: but to do so without dragging the whole trade package down. Not all trade packages are changes in our laws. They are expansions of authority. They are access to other markets. They are adjustments in other laws—ours and



theirs, our trading partners. And so we are saying you do not bring down the whole package; there is good in trade and we know that. But what we are saying is that there is an authority and a responsibility that we should not abrogate or that we should not cast in such a way as to never be able to get there because the value of the whole appears to be so much greater and so important at that moment in time than the long-term constitutional responsibility of these Senators.

So the Senators from Minnesota and Idaho, pass go, because the whole is so much more important than the parts. We are here today to tell you that the parts are darned important. They are constitutionally important.

And now let me try to set another stage for you about the pressures involved.

Our trade remedy process, countervailing duty, antidumping, 201 is transparent. It is a public process. If you, Mr. President, are a manufacturer in your State and you feel you are being dramatically harmed by a product coming in under a trade agreement, you have a course of action. Now, it takes a couple of years. It is open, it is public, and it will cost you money because you will have to get the attorneys and you will have to make the argument. If it is dramatic dumping and dramatic competition, you might be out of business before you get a remedy, but the remedy is still there and it is still open and it is still public. What we have tried to do and what our negotiators have tried to do since the Kennedy round forward is to convince other countries of the world to make their processes more transparent.

Now, over time, there has been a shift. The shift has been away from their duties and away from their penalties toward antidumping provisions, not unlike ours. They are not transparent. Sometimes they are cast or administered in the dark of night. And so what our trading partners are telling our trade negotiators, or at least our trade negotiators believe, is that we have to get rid of what we have to cause them to get rid of what they are getting or they have got as it relates to trade remedy laws. In other words, we walk the plank first and maybe they will follow. In the meantime, what happens to the manufacturers and the workers? What happens to the economies of Idaho and Minnesota? Do they have to shift to the new paradigm? Do the old economies have to go away even though under a different day and a different scenario they were viable and productive? Well, I guess I am frustrated by it all.

Let me talk about what happened in November of 2001 at Doha, Qatar, when our trade negotiators were involved in a round that we worked very hard to get, that was a product of the fallout of the very tragic round that occurred in Seattle, which basically fell apart as a result of national and international dissidents and disruption. In Doha this

past November, our administration agreed to reopen negotiations on agreements of implementation of article 5 of the GATT—that is called on antidumping and countervailing duties—and on subsidies and countervailing pressures. The World Trade Organization had already ruled a number of times against our domestic trade remedy laws under these agreements and stated: the stated purpose of almost every other WTO member in securing these new negotiations is to further weaken U.S. trade law; in other words, further weaken the ability of the U.S. Government to protect its work force and its producers and its industries from what might be dumping, what might be clearly antitrade or unfair trade.

The Japanese Government was elated by that action. They said: We are satisfied. This constitutes a major victory for their efforts to gut our trade laws. Those are the words of the Japanese economy, trade and industry minister. He said: "We are 120 percent satisfied that that's where the Bush administration wants to go."

The USTR sacrificed our antidumping and countervailing duty laws in order to get a new round of talks at the table—not yet; they simply put them on the table.

Now, here is where I think the Senator from Minnesota and I agree and we also agree with our Trade Ambassador. There is nothing wrong with putting those issues on the table. When you are sitting at a negotiating table, everything ought to be negotiable, if the goal is to move from here to here and the benefits that will accrue as a result of that proposal are positive for our economies. So, our Trade Ambassador, put it on the table.

But in putting it on the table, it is important that you recognize who made those laws and how we ultimately ought to address them. And what we are saying is, put them on the table; talk about them. See if there is a better way to get where we need to go in 2002 than there was in 1960. The world has changed dramatically. We understand that. We are willing to listen to it. Put it on the table. The laws we passed in 1960 may not apply today.

But in putting it on the table, we are simply saying: And you bring back proposed changes in current law, not new law, in current trade remedy laws that are subject to a point of order. Why? Because this sovereign body created those laws. And the executive branch of government does not have a right to change them. And they don't. They only propose changes, but they do so in an environment that almost always assures that never will that vote occur.

It is a rather simple approach. We are being told by the administration and by some in it that this destroys TPA. It has been editorialized that this is a bitter pill. Then the other day it was called a torpedo. Today, in what is a well-meaning but not totally accurate letter from the administration, they strongly opposed it.

Let me go through the letter in the context of what I have just talked about, about the flexibility of negotiations. Before I do that, let me drop back a moment to something I think is important, and it is a frustration that our negotiators deal with when they are in the business of negotiating.

I had the opportunity a couple of years ago to be part of an observer team at The Hague at a climate change conference. The head of the U.S. team of the Clinton administration that was there said at the beginning of that conference: We will not propose laws that will damage the economy of the United States. And he said: No agreement is better than a bad agreement. The conference began and the pressure built.

During that time I had the opportunity to have a dialog with some of our counterparts from different Parliaments around the world. For the first time, I began to understand that they don't understand us. They didn't realize that a treaty negotiated by an administration and signed off on by an administration was not law until the Senate ratified it. Why? Well, if you are a member of a parliamentary body and you are elected and then you, if you are in the majority party, elect the Prime Minister out of that, that Prime Minister and the parliamentary body are, in essence, one. If that Prime Minister signs off on a treaty, it is law, unless the country doesn't like it. Then you hold a special election and get rid of the Prime Minister and the party. You get a new party and a new Prime Minister. That is how it works for a lot of countries in the world.

It does not work that way here. Our Founding Fathers created a division of labor in our Constitution. I think it was quite a clear division. When I began to say: The Kyoto treaty is not law in our country, it is a proposed treaty the Senate of the United States has refused to consider, therefore, it is not law, therefore, our negotiators don't have to negotiate to it or for it, the European parliamentarians, didn't understand that, or at least they chose not to understand it.

Of course, I was there as part of an observer team. I spent a lot of time encouraging the team not to make bad law, not to craft an agreement with which we couldn't live. Ultimately, they could not agree with the parliamentarians of Europe, and they came home.

That is the reality of where we are at the moment. That is why it is important to understand the frustrations our trade ambassador has when he goes to the table and they say: Why can't you just negotiate something? That has been arguable, why we have wanted TPA or fast track over the years. It is why we originally gave it.

But from the 1960s to 2002, the world and the economies of the world and the economies of this country and the economies of Idaho and the economies of Minnesota have changed dramatically in part because of trade, both positive and negative.

I believe it is right and proper that we debate this issue today, that we don't sweep it under the rug, that we ask our colleagues to choose whether we ought to have a point of order and whether we ought to have a simple majority vote on the need to change the trade remedy laws of our country as proposed by the trade agreement that is on the floor at the time or if we should retain the existing law.

In the letter sent this morning by the administration, they say that "first and foremost, the amendment derails TPA without justification." I disagree with that. The Senator from Minnesota said it so well: An appointed bureaucrat is not an elected Senator. The oath of office we take to adhere to the Constitution is so clear and so simple and so important. We ought to be extremely cautious about delegating that constitutional responsibility to an unelected official.

The trade ambassador would say: You don't do that. You ultimately get to vote on it. I think I have talked about the vote, the circumstances of the vote, the climate in which the vote is cast. That is why we are here today suggesting we make some subtle changes in the law.

"We have been committed not just to preserving U.S. trade laws but, more importantly, to using them." This is the administration talking in the letter. You are right; they have. And yet we are saying: we want to preserve them if it fits for you to use. They are saying, no, no; they can be negotiable or at least we want the right to negotiate.

We are not denying that right. I have said it once. The Senator from Minnesota has said it. We are not denying the right of negotiation at all. If we are bright and clear and articulate in what we do, we will not sour the debate or the environment in which those negotiations occur because if I were a negotiator, I would say: You bet, we will talk about it. We will put it on the table. It will require a simple majority to pass. But then the whole agreement will.

In all fairness to the administration, they recognize in the letter 41 Senators are a minority blocking this process. We offered to the administration yesterday that we would make some modification. They did not see fit to accept that. We went ahead. The Senator from Minnesota, when he offered the amendment this morning, modified it so it is not a two-thirds. It is a simple majority on the point of order, exactly the same vote it takes to pass the whole package. I believe that is a reasonable and right approach and a fair approach toward dealing with this issue.

A minority ought not be allowed to block trade law or any law for that matter. We rule by a majority procedurally. We deal with supermajorities on occasion, and we have done it here on occasion, and with cloture and other issues to protect trade laws.

Mr. DAYTON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRAIG. I am happy to respond.

Mr. DAYTON. The Senator will recall—I would like the RECORD to show I ask the Senator, I received a call from a colleague on a matter this morning and indicated a desire to change, modify this amendment and make it more acceptable to the administration. I would like to ask if that was the Senator's intent, to make this one that would be more acceptable to the administration?

Let me say also parenthetically that, as a member of the other political party, I do not intend this amendment in any respect to be something that is referenced to this particular administration. I respect the role the administration has taken, that the trade ambassador has taken with regard to the steel products, as the Senator indicated. I thought it was a very strong position the President took with regard to the lumber coming from Canada; that, as the Senator said, this administration is far more aggressive than its predecessor in that regard, and also with regard to Canadian wheat. My concern in offering this was not with regard to any particular administration. My interest was in protecting this Congress for many administrations to come on this matter.

I ask the Senator, is this attempt on our part one that came out of the Senator's negotiations and discussions with the administration?

Mr. CRAIG. It is that. I thought that was a right and reasonable approach. We should not ask for a supermajority on issues that can be passed or should be passed by a majority of the body.

The Senator from Minnesota listened to those arguments, accepted those arguments today. I was pleased that his amendment could be modified for that purpose.

In the administration's letter there is another argument. They say:

Secondly, the amendment would jeopardize our current trade negotiations, especially the new global trade liberalization mandate launched in Doha last November.

My reaction to that is, it does not.

They go on to say:

This is not a hypothetical observation. The failure to launch a global trade negotiation at Seattle in 1999 was due in significant part to a refusal even to discuss trade laws.

Well, that was then. This is now. I have just said—the Senator from Minnesota has just said—discuss trade laws. Put them on the table. Look at the fact that they might need adjustment or change, that laws we have written in the 1960s might need some change.

All we are saying is, when the package comes back, it will require, if a point of order is brought against a change that you have already reported to us, Mr. Ambassador, a 50-percent plus one of those present and voting.

The conversation in Doha or the next round ought to go like this: While the Congress of the United States is giving us new expanded trade authority and negotiation authority, it also recog-

nized the strong desire on the part of the citizens of our country to protect some process of trade remedy and trade remedy laws that are currently on the books of the United States. So any changes that we would make in them or propose to be made—and we are certainly willing to discuss those and talk about them, as we also want to talk about you, Spain, or you, France, or you, Germany, or somewhere else's trade laws—will be subject to the same vote as required for passage of the trade package.

Instead of going with alarm, the ambassador ought to go with a very clear, matter-of-fact statement, and then roll up his sleeves and get at the business of negotiating in a way that I hope will help American agriculture and a lot of our industries.

Trade remedy laws are not off limits. Those are the words used in the administration's letter today: Not off limits at all; available for full discussion, full debate, negotiation and change subject to a majority vote of the Senate. I think that is right, that is proper, and that is what we ought to be about.

Their fourth argument was the WTO negotiations launched in Doha will not impair our ability to enforce U.S. trade laws. I think our explanation stands. If the ambassador brings back a package and in it there is substantive law change proposed and the dynamics of the package are such that the world and the economy of this country is saying pass it, pass it, pass it, there will be no opportunity because the law would not require, unless this amendment is adopted, us to make those adjustments if collectively the Congress of the United States felt the negotiators had gone beyond what we believe to be right and proper protection under those laws.

(Mrs. CARNAHAN assumed the chair.)

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator from Idaho yield for a question?

Mr. CRAIG. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I would like to propound a question to my colleague. I believe this is one of the most important amendments we will be dealing with on the trade promotion authority legislation. I am pleased to be a cosponsor, and I will be pleased to speak in support of it at some point.

I ask the Senator from Idaho, is it the case that much of the angst that exists with respect to recent trade agreements—U.S.-Canada, NAFTA, and others—is that when we see areas of clear trade problems, clear manipulation of the markets, clear abuse of trading practices, we cannot ever get much of a remedy?

We have all these trade agreements, but we cannot get a remedy; we cannot get a problem solved. Why? At least one of the reasons, in my judgment—and I inquire of the Senator from Idaho if he feels the same way—is that we have weakened all these remedies to the point that no one wants to use



them because they believe they are ineffective.

For example, section 22 is pretty much gone. In many ways, section 301 is made much weaker by subsequent negotiations. The result is, it does not matter whether it is wheat from Canada or high-fructose corn syrup from Mexico or a dozen items I could mention. We just cannot get anybody to tackle a remedy to say: Yes, this is unfair, and we will stand up on behalf of our producers and deal with it. That is why this amendment makes so much sense.

If the Trade Representative negotiates a new trade agreement and that agreement further weakens remedies that now exist, my understanding is the amendment allows that to come back to the Congress for an up-or-down vote. I think that is one of the most important provisions that we could adopt to this underlying bill.

I ask the Senator from Idaho, is it the case that the biggest problem these days has been we cannot get a remedy for anything in international trade?

Mr. CRAIG. The Senator from North Dakota has explained it very well, and that is the essence of this amendment. Again, a simple majority vote of this body will do so. Let me complete my comments. I have spoken long enough. There are others who wish to speak on this issue.

I close by speaking to the second-degree amendment the Senator from Iowa has just proposed, and I hope at some time we appropriately will move to table that second-degree amendment. Let me tell my colleagues why.

There is nothing in that amendment with which I disagree as part of process and procedure. You bet we should have talked about proposed substitutes and changes removed from, I call it the catchall title to the advanced title, to a higher priority as it relates to the direction we give our negotiators and ambassadors, the principles of negotiation and the objective of those principles.

The second-degree amendment, though, takes away the point of order. It says, here is how you negotiate, but it does not deny the right of the Senate to speak. I hope at the appropriate time, early afternoon, we will offer a motion to table that amendment. I do believe we need a good straight up-or-down vote on the Dayton-Craig amendment. It is an important amendment.

I yield the floor. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, at this time I am not going to address either my amendment or the amendment by the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Idaho. I do wish to speak generically about the issue before us, to which the amendment of the Senators from Minnesota and Idaho are very central, and to remind my colleagues what trade promotion authority is all about.

First, as all my colleagues know, nothing can be done under the Con-

stitution about trade unless the Congress of the United States does it, because one of our explicit powers in the Constitution is to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. It is our authority, and Congress rightfully and according to our oath of office ought to protect our constitutional responsibilities, and we ought to perform our constitutional responsibilities.

For the first 150-year history of our country, when all Congress had to do in regard to trade was put on tariffs, up or down, and other business of that nature, it was very appropriate for Congress to initiate and finalize action as far as the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce was concerned.

Since the 1930s, we have been involved in cooperative efforts with other countries to reduce tariff and nontariff trade barriers because it was seen then and today as mutually beneficial to all nations to do so. We have been involved in international agreements and international fora to accomplish those goals.

One can imagine how impossible it would be then in an international forum to have 535 Members of Congress, in a meeting of 142 countries, negotiating trade agreements, with the Congress of the United States speaking for the United States. It is almost impossible for Congress to reach an agreement among its Members without, in the process, trying to negotiate with 142 other countries. So for the last 25 years, or some people would say in different ways since 1935, we have given the President permission to negotiate agreements with other countries.

In a sense, the United States, through this legislation and previous legislation, has set up a contract with the President of the United States saying we would like to have him negotiate for the Congress of the United States, where the constitutional power lies, some agreements under strict authority that we would give the President, and with Congress having final authority to adopt what was negotiated if we agreed to it.

We are talking about giving the President the power to negotiate for us because it is an impossibility for the Congress to enter such a forum.

The basic question to our colleagues as they consider Dayton-Craig and other amendments is: Do they want the President of the United States to have this authority? This is not blanket authority given to the President of the United States. It is very confined to subject matter. It is very confined to the President reporting to the Congress of the United States on a regular basis what has been done and to get our feedback so that the President carries out the intent of Congress in the negotiations.

Finally, the President of the United States has to come to an agreement with 142 countries. Remember, that is not done by a majority vote of those 142 countries. That is done by consensus. So if the President of the

United States feels the interests of the United States are not adequately protected, all the President has to do is walk away, and there is no new WTO agreement.

Eventually, if the President decides U.S. interests are being protected and he agrees to it and the other 142 countries agree to it, then it comes to us to make a decision whether or not the interests of the United States are adequately protected as the President negotiated with us, and it takes a majority vote in the House and Senate for that to become law of the land.

The basic question before the Senate in the Dayton-Craig amendment is whether or not they want the President of the United States to be credible at the bargaining table. The issue is whether or not the President will be credible if, when he reaches an agreement, there is opportunity in the Senate to have separate votes on separate parts of the agreement so some can be dropped and others might be adopted.

Do my colleagues think the other 142 countries of the WTO are going to negotiate with our country on that basis?

Do you think there will be a final agreement? No. The Dayton-Craig amendment undoes the pattern of this contract between the President of the United States and the Congress over the last 25 years.

So we all have to ask ourselves: Has the United States prospered by our international agreements over the last quarter of a century by the process that is once again before us to set up a contract with the President of the United States to negotiate? I have come to the conclusion this process has been good, but I am a Republican. Maybe Democrats would question my judgment of whether or not this is a good process.

So I have said before in this debate, and I want to say again, listen to what President Clinton said as he correctly bragged about the agreements he finalized—that started in previous administrations—during his first year in office. The North American Free Trade Agreement and the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trades were finalized during his first months in office.

He says as a result of those agreements, and I suppose he would say, too, predecessors to those agreements, that the United States has benefited very well by it. And he used, as I heard him say so many times, that there were, I think the figure was, 22 million jobs created during his administration, and one-third of those jobs were related to trade.

If President Clinton says that, if President Bush believes this is a good process to continue, and you have one Democratic President and one Republican President who think proceeding down the road that we have gone for the last 25 years is the right road to go, I think it would carry some weight with people on both sides of the aisle and it would be a no-brainer that this

process ought to be continued. Our colleagues are suggesting that would put a kink in this machine, and that might not be the thing to do. I raise those questions with my colleagues.

I also raise the questions with my colleagues of whether or not the present trade remedies are working, which I heard a few minutes ago. Well, what do they think the steel agreement is all about? The President is looking out for our basic industry, to give it some help through transition. The President looked at that and decided that other countries dumping steel in the United States was not right, and our economy was being hurt by it. He stepped in, in a very strong way, to protect our interests.

I think of the 201 process where the previous President stepped in, in the case of lamb coming into the United States from New Zealand and Australia. I suppose there are a lot of others I ought to refer to, but our Presidents, Republican and Democrat, have been willing to use the tools that are on the table. Other nations are beginning to learn from the United States and are willing to take action to protect their industries in a way that is going to eventually hurt us.

We have been the pioneers of trade remedy legislation for a long period of time, and other nations have somewhat resented our using it, and they are beginning to learn from us and use it. Now they are doing it in a way that is not as transparent as the United States. They do it probably in a way that is less concerned about their using it on the world economy than what our Presidents have done in regard to our action and the world economy.

Now, are we going to say we should not be looking out for our interests on trade remedy legislation? I think what they are saying is we ought to let the rest of the world adopt these measures, even if they hurt the United States. Some examples: South Africa imposing dumping duties on United States poultry, closing an important \$14 million market; Mexico imposing dumping duties on United States high-fructose corn syrup, decreasing our exports by half, \$30 million; Mexico imposing dumping duties on certain United States swine, formerly a \$450 million market; Mexico imposing dumping duties on certain cuts of beef affecting companies' abilities to service and grow this \$512 million market. Just this year, Canada imposed dumping duties on United States tomatoes, \$115 million. In 1999, Canada imposed dumping duties on exports of United States corn, a \$36 million market resulting in little United States corn exported to Canada for 4 months until a provisional duty was removed.

These are examples of the rest of the world learning from the United States. Consequently, don't we in the United States think it would be better if our country or our President were at the table negotiating to see that these things did not happen? I think those are the issues before us.

I probably have implied very much that Dayton-Craig is a bad approach. My point is to simply say I hope my 99 other colleagues will look at the practice of the last 25 years, which has been a credible approach for the United States to be at the negotiating table, and say: Do you really want to change that? Do you want to change the credibility of the President of the United States at the negotiating table?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, of course the Senator from Iowa is correct; the Constitution does provide in article I, section 8, that the Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations—not the President, not the trade ambassador, but the Congress. That is in the Constitution of this country.

The Congress has, over some period of time, decided it would like to put handcuffs on itself so these handcuffs would prevent it from being involved in any trade negotiation or trade agreement that came back to the Congress. If it did not like a provision, if it thought a provision was not in accordance with this country's interests, the Congress will have said, by fast track or trade promotion authority, no, we are not allowed to offer amendments to that trade agreement. Congress has done that on previous occasions. I do not support that. I do not believe it is appropriate.

What the Senators from Minnesota and Idaho are saying with respect to fast track, or trade promotion authority, which will tie the Congress's hands, at least in regard to the issue of providing trade remedies for trade abuses that exist, that our businesses and our employees in this country have to try to deal with, at least with respect to those trade remedies, Congress ought to have a say in that if someone negotiates a trade agreement that weakens those trade remedies.

We have had plenty of examples: Section 22 was largely negotiated away; section 301 has been diminished in importance. So we have had examples where the trade remedies are not available.

My colleague from Iowa cited some of the trade abuses that I could cite. On high-fructose corn syrup to Mexico he says: Yes, that is a problem. Do not blame us. Let us not blame America for trade abuses that are imposed by other countries.

Unfair wheat subsidies or unfair wheat trade flooding into this country from Canada, that is a problem. That is not our fault; that is Canada's fault. The high-fructose corn syrup, that is Mexico's fault.

I could go on to give a dozen such examples, but let's not blame our country for trade abuses that are committed by other countries. Let's make sure businesses in our country and their workers know that when another country does that, when it tries to rig

the marketplace with a trade practice that is abusive, then we have a remedy against it.

Ralph Waldo Emerson said that common sense is genius dressed in work clothes. When we deal with trade issues, I find very little genius these days, especially in Washington, DC. Almost all of the debate that ought to be thoughtful turns thoughtless in an instant. This morning's Washington Post editorial is an example of that, suggesting this amendment is going to torpedo this trade promotion authority legislation. It will do nothing of the sort. It strengthens it.

Let me give some examples of what is going on in trade. Canada pushes an avalanche of grain into our country, unfairly subsidized, unfairly traded in our country by a Canadian wheat board that is a sanctioned monopoly in Canada which would be illegal in this country. So our farmers are confronted with this massive amount of unfair trade, and it takes money right out of the pockets of our family farmers, and nothing can be done about it. It has been going on for 10 years. It was given the green light, incidentally, in the United States-Canada Free Trade Agreement, which I voted against; nonetheless, this has been going on relentlessly, and nobody does anything about it.

We had an investigation by the ITC, and they said: Yes, Canada is guilty of unfair trade. There was a 301 action filed by wheat growers in my State, and the trade ambassador said: No, despite the fact that there is a conclusion that Canada is guilty of unfair trade, we will not impose fair trade quotas that United States law would allow because it might be inconsistent with NAFTA and the WTO. But Ambassador Zoellick says to farmers: Don't lose hope. Under U.S. laws you can always consider filing antidumping or countervailing duty cases.

Let me show my colleagues a Congress Daily Report, November 26, 2001—November 9 through 14: The WTO ministerial at Doha, Qatar, Trade Representative Zoellick agreed that U.S. antidumping laws could be discussed as the new round gets underway.

In other words, in the next round the antidumping laws will be up for discussion because many countries don't want us to have antidumping laws. They want to dump their products into the American marketplace, and if our producers are concerned about that—saying we cannot compete, we will have to close our plant, we can't compete against products coming from China or Japan or Europe or Canada or Mexico or Korea, we can't possibly compete against them because they are dumping at below the cost of acquisition, what are we going to do—we are going to put this on the table to talk about. Maybe we can get rid of countervailing duty or antidumping laws. Maybe the next negotiation in a room, behind a closed door, in which we are not present, the American people are

not present, trade negotiators from all around the world will decide that the United States will agree to get rid of its antidumping laws. Maybe that is what will happen.

If that happens, I sure want the Congress to be able to vote on that separately on behalf of farmers, factory workers, steelworkers. I want Congress to have a shot at saying yes or no, and my vote is going to be a resounding no.

One final point, if I might. I have just had a bellyful of people saying it is wrong to worry about protecting America's interests. The word "protect" has become a vulgarism in trade speech, and I find that Byzantine.

Who in this Chamber does not want to stand up and protect our country's interests? Who do you not want to protect? Do you not want to protect a steel industry that is under siege from unfairly subsidized shipments into this country? Do you not want to protect farmers and factory workers? Who is it you do not want to protect? Isn't it our job to decide that we will protect our industries to the extent of demanding fair trade?

I don't mean, by "protection," saying we are going to put walls around our country. I don't mean that at all. I don't believe we should do that. I believe we ought to be required and able to compete at any time, at any place in the world. That competition does not mean, however, that our companies and our workers ought to compete with 12-year-olds who work 12 hours a day and are paid 12 cents an hour in some plant 8,000 miles away, and some company takes the product of that plant and moves it to a store shelf in Pittsburgh or Fargo or Los Angeles or Pocatello. It is not fair trade and it is not what our businesses and workers ought to have to put up with.

When we talk about protecting our country's economic interests, it is not about diminishing trade or putting walls around our country. It is about saying we have a right in this country to protect the economic interests of businesses and workers who want to play by the rules when they confront others in this world who decide they will not play by the rules.

One final point. I have made this point over and over because it is so dramatic. I want to mention automobile trade with Korea to demonstrate what is happening on a range of things throughout the world in a way that hurts our workers and hurts our companies. Last year, Korea sent us 630,000 cars, Daewoos, Hyundais, and others. Madam President, 630,000 Korean cars came into the U.S. marketplace. Good for them.

Last year, we were only able to sell 2,800 cars in Korea. Let me say that again: 630,000 Korean cars coming to the United States, and we were only able to get 2,800 U.S. cars sold in Korea. Do you know why? Because the Korean Government doesn't want American cars sold in Korea. It is very simple. And that is not fair. We ought

to say to Korea and other countries, if your market is open to American products, then our market is open to you. But if we make the American marketplace open to your products, then you had better open your marketplace or you find a way to sell your cars in Kishasa, Zaire, next year and see how you like that marketplace.

I want to speak a little later, but let me say Senator DAYTON and Senator CRAIG have propounded an amendment that is very important. All it says is we need to preserve the opportunity to vote if someone behind a closed door in some room half a world away is going to negotiate away the remedies for unfair trade, our remedies to get after and take after the unfair trade that exists.

That is not antitrade; that is protrade. That is not undercutting the bill that is on the floor of the Senate; that in fact will strengthen and improve it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the Senator from South Carolina has asked to speak.

Under the previous order, we are to go out in 1 minute. I ask unanimous consent the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. HOLLINGS, be recognized for up to 15 minutes, and this will be for debate only. At that time, we would go out for the party caucuses.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I thank the distinguished leader and the two distinguished sponsors of this particular amendment, the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Idaho. There is nothing better than a clear-cut, clean-cut little amendment, this particular provision. It simply says: Wait a minute, we don't want just an up-or-down vote on an overall patchwork of all kinds of trade measures, and all kinds of articles, and everything else of that kind.

Somebody might not like what they got on prunes. Somebody might not like what they have on textiles and everything else.

We are not disturbing whatever the negotiations are of our special Trade Representative, or the President. They tried to label it as either you are for the President or against the President. That is baloney.

What it says is: Wait a minute, before you have to vote up or down to just bring a whole trade bill down, let's make certain the basic laws are right. Here is how it reads:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law [it] . . . shall not apply to any provisions in an implementing bill being considered by the Senate that modifies or amends, or requires a modification of, or an amendment to, any law of the United States that provides safeguards from unfair foreign trade practices to United States businesses or workers, including—imposition of countervailing and antidumping duties . . . national security import restrictions—

It goes down and lists those things that they are trying to safeguard from unfair trade practices.

Even then, only on a point of order will the majority vote up or down. So you do not have to argue the entire trade measure that they have spent months and months, sometimes years and years on. You can just bring it to a majority vote.

If I were the President or anybody else were the President, they would say please put that in there. We are not trying to superimpose this kind of authority over the Congress. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution says that the Congress has that responsibility. It is not the responsibility of the Special Trade Representative, not the Supreme Court, not the President—we have the responsibility. What I am trying to do is protect that responsibility. The administration should want me protecting the Constitution.

What really is happening is that people do not understand the fix. Let me explain what I call the fix.

If you go back to the early '90s to the enactment of NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, the trade treaty with Mexico, it was a very interesting thing.

The New York Times published an article, after the vote was cast, about the 26 freebies that President Clinton did, to put on the fix in order to pass that particular measure. He gave two golf rounds, one in California, and another one somewhere in Arkansas for votes; he gave two C-17s to another Congressman; he gave a cultural center to Congressman Pickle, down in Texas, for a vote.

At least those freebies, in order to fix the vote, got some people some jobs. Look the golf matches at least got somebody a job to cut the grass.

Let's clear the air and understand what is going on right now. Under Mr. Bush's plan, we would not be allowed to debate and consider these trade measures—except in a limited way. The Senators from Minnesota and Idaho, said: Heavens above, let us have at least the national security laws, countervailing duties, and antidumping laws—where a point of order will give you an up-or-down vote and you do not have to vote up or down the entire trade measure.

There is a very interesting article here—the unmitigated gall of the proponents of fast track.

Let me read it:

The Bush Administration indicated that the President might veto trade legislation if the Senate adds a provision that would allow Congress to amend foreign trade agreements the President negotiates. This week, the Senate is considering granting Bush fast track trade powers. Under fast track, Congress could approve or reject trade pacts but could not amend them. However, Senators Mark Dayton, Democrat of Minnesota, and Larry Craig, Republican of Idaho, are pushing an amendment that would allow Congress to change trade pacts. They say Congress must have the power to make changes

to protect U.S. workers. Commerce Department officials said that would defeat the purpose of fast track and they would recommend that Bush veto the legislation.

In short, yes, the President does not have the authority under the Constitution. The Congress, under article I, section 8, has the authority and the responsibility. The President, and his little minion, Robert Zoellick, the Trade Representative—he runs around and smiles and grins in all of these places, and he can amend anything. He can amend the laws. But, oh, they bring and amend the laws with respect to our national security, with respect to countervailing duties and antidumping provisions. He can amend it. But the Congress can't even consider it on an up-or-down vote.

Can you imagine the polls in such a situation as this. That Grassley amendment ought to be tabled immediately and we should not wait for 2:15. There isn't any question in my mind that this thing has gotten totally out of hand. The trade laws are not successes. The distinguished Senator from Iowa points out that everything has been coming up roses. But the fact is, we have been going out of business. Because of NAFTA we lost 53,900 textile jobs alone in the little State of South Carolina, 700,000 around the country—not just 20,000 steelworkers. So we lost all of those jobs. And we are going out of business. And the Congress of the United States tells them: Retrain, re-educate, high-tech, global competition. The President says you don't understand it.

We understand it. We retrain. I told the story—I will repeat it right quickly—of the Oneida mill in Andrews that made the little T-shirts. At the time of the closing, they had 487 workers there. The average age was 47. The next morning they did it the President's way. They retrained the employees. They are re-skilled. They are now 487 skilled computer operators.

Are you going to hire a 47-year-old computer operator or a 21-year-old computer operator? You are not taking on the retirement costs, you are not taking on the health costs of the 47-year-old. So it is a real problem.

Here we have the responsibility, and this crowd will not even let us do our job. The arrogance of this K Street crowd who writes these trade measures is unbelievable. And the President of the United States went over on the House side, and by one vote he promised—what?—he would do a fundraiser. So he has been down to Greenville to show up at a fundraiser.

It is money that talks, that controls here. You do not argue the trade measure, whether it is in the best interests of our country or not. This thing has gotten totally out of hand. And to come here and say whether this President likes it or that President likes it, well, this Senator does not like it at all.

We have many other measures, too. I noticed that Nick Calio, and his minion

at the White House, said we have to get on, we can get rid of this bill this week and we can get it to conference, and everything else like that. We have barely been able to get on this particular amendment to discuss it. And then they say, well, we will put in a little maneuver here. And we will fix that vote. And we will not even have it, even when they have changed it from a 60-vote point of order down to just a majority vote up or down. They will not even let you have a majority up-or-down vote on the security of the United States under the responsibilities of the Senate.

They say that past Presidents like it. Past Presidents don't go back down to Arkansas—they move to New York. They don't sell this trade bill as being good for farmers in Arkansas, I can tell you that. They won't run for election down there. And they won't do it in my State of South Carolina, either.

It is a hearty development to find the distinguished Senator from Idaho, and the Senator from North Dakota—they know that agricultural business extremely well. They are now joining in because they are losing all the agriculture. The 3½ million farmers that we have in America cannot outproduce 700 million farmers in China. That is why we have a deficit in the balance of trade with respect to corn.

They tell me that now China is shipping to Japan and Korea some of their wheat so they can continue to appear as if they are taking our wheat. But we are going out of business there. And we will not have the wonderful export of America's most productive production; namely, America's agriculture.

So I hope we will slow down, stop, look, and listen, and understand that all we are trying to do is our job. And our job is to regulate foreign commerce. Please let us have a vote up or down. Do not come in and say, you cannot even have an up-or-down vote on the antidumping substantive law, that you can repeal it. Because once they repeal it in Doha, or any other foreign land, we're in trouble. When the trade reps meet to discuss agreements they don't go to places like Seattle any more, where people can go to and demonstrate and tell about our trade experiences here in the United States. No, they pick a place that no one ever heard of. You can't find it on the map.

The next meeting will be down in the Antarctic. I have been down there. It is hard to get there. That is where they will have the next trade negotiation, where nobody can be heard. And they will get the fix, and then they will come back and do exactly what is happening on this bill.

There is a fix. In this particular case it is not golf games and not C-17s, it is not cultural centers like it was on NAFTA, but it is welfare. It does not employ anybody. It says: Well, we give you a little welfare to keep your mouth shut, so you can go back home and run for reelection. It is not about trade, not about jobs.

We have the job of creating jobs. They are exporting them faster than we can possibly manage it. And now they are not only exporting their manufacturing, they are exporting the executive office to Bermuda.

So here, in a time of war, when you should hear the word "sacrifice," they put the President on TV, who says: Don't worry. Take a trip. Go to Disney World. Take your family. And what we ought to do is cut some more taxes to run the debt up.

You are going to hear about that because by this time next month we will be in desperate circumstances. We have to increase the debt limit, but they will not say they will increase the debt limit. They will try to say it is the war, as to why we need to borrow money. Oh, no, it is not the war. It is the trillions of dollars they have lost. And now they want to lose another \$4 trillion.

Larry Lindsey—he doesn't like me referring to him—but he is the one who opposed what we had going with President Clinton and Secretary Summers to stop all of these offshore locations from avoiding taxes. They even had a bill, reported out of the committee over on the House side, that did that.

You would think, by gosh, we would be raising taxes to pay for the war, certainly not escaping our civic duty in a time of war. But that is the hands that we are dealt. The wonderful Business Roundtable, the Conference Board, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—oh, they will all tell you what is good for the country. What they are saying is wrecking the economy. They don't want to pay for anything. All they want to do is just help everybody buy the different elections.

I see my time is up. I hope that at 2:15, when they move to table, Madam President, that the people will sober up and come to the floor and give us a chance on that vote to table the Grassley amendment so we can do our job. We don't say one way or the other; we just say, give us an up-or-down vote to consider the security, consider the antidumping provisions, as the Dayton-Craig amendment calls for.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:46 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BREAU).

#### ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE EXPANSION ACT—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 3408

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.