

absolutely huge, as has the percentage increase for education.

In fact, what the President did was consolidate that money into basically a more focused stream so that it goes back to the States in a more effective way. I have charts to reflect this, but I am not sure they are here. Hopefully, they will be arriving soon.

In any event, if you look at what we did, what the President did, you see he put the money into title I. Yes, some of these other programs—they held up five or six different programs—have been zero-funded. They should have been, because they were a little bits of money tossed around for the purposes of some Member of this legislative body getting out a press release.

What the President said was: Let's not do that. Let's put this money into one focused stream and have those dollars flow directly back to the communities. The practical effect of that is that the title I dollars over the last 2 years, the President's increase in title I spending, the money going to low-income kids, has seen a \$2.5 billion increase. If you take all the money that went into title I, all the increases during the administration of President Clinton, which was 8 years, not 2 years, his increases only amounted to \$2 billion in that account.

So in 2 years the President has exceeded by 20 percent the amount of money that went in as increases over 8 years into the Clinton accounts. This concept that the President has not funded education is absolutely fallacious.

You could hold up another chart on this relative to special education which would show the exact same thing. In fact, it would show that President Bush has made a stronger commitment to special education than President Clinton ever did during his entire term in office. President Bush in the last 2 years, in both of those years, has increased special education by \$1 billion each year. President Clinton, of his entire 8 years, in only 1 year, the last year when he was basically forced into it, did he increase special education by \$1 billion. In every other year, for the 7 prior years, his increase in the special education amount was actually negligible.

As we know, special education has a huge impact on the local tax base. The failure of the Federal Government to pay its fair share of special education has been one of the real problems local communities have had.

President Bush has made, from the start, a major commitment to funding special education, increasing that funding by over \$2 billion, \$1 billion in each year of the last 2 years and, as a result, has lived up to a commitment he made during the campaign which was that he was going to move towards full funding of special education. This concept that the President is not funding education really doesn't hold water.

Then there was some discussion of postsecondary activity and this con-

solidation issue, this "bloody shirt" that the other side continues to draw across the floor. Let's talk about a little bit of history. This concept was reported as a concept, as a trial balloon in the New York Times. That is where the issue comes from.

Somebody in OMB, which is not the education policy arm of the administration, threw out the idea: We have to pay for the Pell grant shortfall which is \$1.3 billion. One way to do that would be to disallow consolidation of student loans. That is one of the many ways we could do it.

It was reported in the New York Times as a concept. It was a trial balloon. The education arm of the administration, which is the Education Department, immediately rejected it. The OMB was told to forget it. In fact, the OMB called around the Hill to the staff of the appropriate committees and members of the appropriate committees and said they would not pursue it. Yet for 3 weeks now we have heard it as if it were a policy. How outrageous. I refer to the approach the other side is taking as the thought police, where, if you have an idea, you just beat it into the ground, like those mullahs who run around with sticks and beat people if they have ideas. This idea doesn't even exist as a policy. Yet we continue to hear about it.

What does exist as a policy, however, is what this administration has done in the area of postsecondary education, which is huge in the way of funding. The largest increase in Pell grants in the history of this country has occurred under this administration. More students, 500,000 more students, will get Pell grants this year than got them in the last year of the Clinton administration. This administration has committed huge dollars into this program. The rate of interest which a student will pay on their student loans will drop to below 2 percent by the beginning of next year—below 2 percent—as a result of this administration supporting language which allowed those loans to be reorganized in a way that students could get a less than 2-percent rate of interest on their student loans—incredibly low-cost money to help kids go to school, huge benefits to students trying to go to graduate school. And equally important, the tax bill which passed this Congress and which a number of Members on the other side did vote for but nobody who just spoke voted for, the tax bill which passed this Congress gave a massive increase, something in the vicinity, I think, of \$30 billion of incentive money to help parents fund their children's education in the expansion of the Coverdell accounts, the expansion of the deductibility of interest for student loans, and a variety of other initiatives—teacher tax credits for people who stay to go on to teach, a supplemental payment there—all sorts of initiatives which dramatically increased the funding available to assist parents who are trying to put their children through school.

So to come to the floor of the Senate, as some of the Members have from the other side for literally 3 or 4 weeks now, to berate the administration for the consolidation proposal, which was never a proposal, which was simply a trial balloon, and to berate the administration for not funding education is, in my opinion, tilting at windmills by the other side and trying to set up straw men because the issues hold no water on the basis of fact.

Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Ohio letting me go forward, and I appreciate the courtesy of the Chair.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, over the last couple of weeks during the debate on this trade bill we have heard arguments for and against trade promotion authority, the Andean Trade Preference Act, and trade adjustment assistance. Many of the arguments have focused, and I think rightfully so, on the impact of those issues on American jobs and on the American economy. American workers and the American economy benefit from free and open trade. Granting the President trade promotion authority will greatly help to facilitate open trade. It will help our economy and it will help jobs.

Today, I would like to focus on another benefit of the passage of this legislation. I would like to talk about the benefit to our foreign policy, to our national security. A top priority in our foreign policy must be to promote freedom, peace, and stability in the world and particularly in this hemisphere, the Western Hemisphere.

Last year, a Dallas Morning News editorial put it very well. Here is what they said:

In the post September 11 world, free trade is not just good economic policy. It is also good foreign and security policy.

We, as a nation, stand to lose or gain depending on the economic health and security of our neighbors. A strong, a free, and prosperous Western Hemisphere means a strong, free, and prosperous United States. That prosperity depends in large part on free and fair trade. In 1987, President Ronald Reagan told Soviet Premier Gorbachev to tear down the Berlin Wall. It was a symbol of repression, keeping freedom and prosperity out of Eastern Europe. Today, we need to destroy another wall, a wall that prohibits the free and fair trade that Ronald Reagan envisioned for not just the people of Eastern Europe but for all of the world.

I am talking, of course, about the tariffs, quotas, the lack of trade agreements that are really bricks in the walls that surround all countries. We must work to eliminate those barriers while also negotiating free trade agreements so our Nation has reciprocal access to these foreign markets. Such efforts are key foreign policy steps that

can effectively counter poverty, disease, and tyranny.

From an economic point of view, business in the developing world struggles to survive for a multitude of reasons. During my 15 years in the House and Senate, I have traveled across many poverty-stricken and disease-ridden parts of the world. My wife Fran and I have seen the destitution, devastation, and desperation in which millions and millions of men, women, and children live. I believe we have both the ability and the obligation to help these suffering people.

In addition to foreign aid, to foreign assistance, increasing our trade relationship with these countries will help promote economic freedom and growth.

I cannot tell you how many foreign leaders I have met—I know my other colleagues have also met—who say do not be concerned about foreign assistance to us. What we really need is access to your markets. What we really need is the opportunity to sell the goods that we can produce to the American people. Tear down the artificial barriers. That is the best assistance that you can give us.

So in addition to helping us, it helps them and ultimately helps our vision of the world, which is a world filled with countries that are Democratic and that have developing middle classes.

Statistics show that when developing countries engage in international trade and investment, they develop and grow faster than closed economies. Trade agreements open up markets. It cuts poverty and advances the cause of economic and political liberty. The sad fact is the United States has underutilized trade to the detriment of our Nation and our trading partners, particularly in our own hemisphere. Right now, the United States is only party to 3 of the more than 130 bilateral and free trade agreements in this area—that is right, only 3. The European Union, on the other hand, has had free trade agreements with 27 nations. Mexico, our Nation's and my home State of Ohio's second leading trading partner, has secured 25 such agreements just since 1994.

Providing our President trade promotion authority is a chance for us to, once again, show our leadership in this area.

Many foreign leaders have expressed this frustration, that the agreements they sign with the United States, frankly, could get bogged down in Congress. So without trade promotion authority, it is difficult, if not impossible, for our President to conclude the agreements that we so desperately need. That is why this bill must pass and we must send it on to the President.

Few foreign leaders candidly will be inclined to invest their time or effort in working out agreements that may be radically altered by Congress. At best, the administration's ability to negotiate bilateral free trade accords

will be seriously hampered. We need to remember that trade promotion authority is not a new concept. Our Presidents were granted this authority almost continuously from 1974 to 1994 when the authority lapsed and was not renewed. We also should remember that under the provisions of TPA, the President is required to consult with congressional committees and to notify Congress at major stages during trade negotiations. And we also should remember that Congress retains the ultimate authority, of course, to approve or disapprove the final trade agreement.

By granting trade promotion authority, we are not abdicating control of our Nation's trade policy. On the contrary, we in Congress are helping our Congress to lead. Many of my colleagues have spoken very eloquently about why the President needs trade promotion authority. And they have provided statistics showing how increased trade will help open markets and provide job opportunities right here in the United States in every sector of our economy. They have argued further that the President needs TPA in order to strike the best deals for American workers, for families, for farmers, and for business men and women.

They have shown that trade promotion authority represents the vital partnership between Congress and the executive branch.

These are all important points, and they are all valid. They all illustrate how free and fair trade agreements, accomplished through the exercise of trade promotion authority, are important for the United States. They are correct. But as we have seen, free trade also benefits developing countries, and this is important to the United States.

For example, for most of the 20th century, Mexico had closed itself off from international trade and capital flows by setting up currency controls and trade barriers. Only with the Latin American debt crisis of the 1980s did Mexico slowly begin to open its economy to global trade and investment. Then with NAFTA the payoffs to Mexico's economy and workers were certainly very real.

Between 1993 and 1999, Mexico climbed from 26th place to 8th place among the world's largest exporters, and in recent years Mexico's exports fueled growth rates of 4 percent. Free trade also has enhanced Mexico's overall stability, and the involvement of U.S. businesses has positively influenced both labor conditions and environmental quality in Mexico. Due to increased competition, domestic firms in Mexico increasingly are forced to compete with foreign-owned businesses and joint ventures by offering better working conditions and higher pay. The situation in Mexico is not perfect and the results so far are uneven, but overall there has been improvement.

Meanwhile, U.S. production methods and technology are demonstrating to

Mexican business that it is possible to be both profitable and environmentally responsible. The Mexican Government has actually strengthened its environmental regulations and enforcement procedures since NAFTA has been in place, and this, of course, benefits the United States, particularly the area along our southern border.

Ultimately, the example of Mexico demonstrates that free trade is not only in Mexico's best interest, but it is also in our best interest as well.

If we in the United States care about the illegal drugs that are coming into our country across our southern border, if we care about immigration problems, if we care about other issues of political and economic stability, then we want our neighbors to be peaceful democratic nations. It is in our national interest.

It is in our national interest to see a Mexico, to see a Central America, to see the rest of this hemisphere be democratic, to see people have opportunities, to have a chance for the future. It is important for someone who has a family in Central America or Mexico to think they have the opportunity to feed that family and not have to make the very difficult, tough, and illegal decision to come to the United States and cross our border. It is in our interest for Mexico to develop, and one of the best ways is through fair trade.

What is true of Mexico is also true with the rest of the hemisphere. That is why it is important this legislation pass.

Some of the strongest evidence of the benefits of free trade is over the past couple of decades developing countries have been opening their markets voluntarily. Even some of the most traditionally closed economies are abandoning protectionism in favor of freer trade. The World Trade Organization's own history illustrates this trend.

Established in 1948, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the precursor to the WTO, had only 23 contracting parties, most of which were industrialized countries. Today more than three-quarters of the WTO's 144 members are developing nations. Of the 49 countries designated as least developed by the United Nations, 30 have become members of the WTO, 9 are eagerly awaiting coming in, and 2 are WTO observers.

The world of trade, economics, and international development is, of course, extremely complex, and it is hard to narrow things down to a direct cause-and-effect relationship, but, for most people, the benefits of free trade can be boiled down to one key point: Trade does spur economic growth and growth raises living standards.

There is an undeniable relationship between growth rates and economic freedom, including the freedom to conduct international transactions, and research supports this. One study found that developing countries with open economies grew by an average of 4.5 percent per year in the 1970s and 1980s,

while those with closed economies grew by only .7, less than 1 percent.

Other studies have concluded that nations with relatively open trade regimes grew roughly twice as fast as those with relatively closed regimes. According to a recent report of Africa, East Asia, South Asia, and Latin America, were each to increase their share of world exports by just 1 percent, the resulting gains in income would lift 128 million people out of poverty. The \$70 billion that Africa alone would generate is approximately five times the amount it gets through aid and debt relief. If developing countries as a whole increase their share of world exports by just 5 percent, this would generate \$350 billion, seven times as much as they receive in aid.

It is important that we now, more than ever, provide the President trade promotion authority.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business.

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, one of the issues that continues to haunt Americans is the whole question of the cost of prescription drugs. I have been troubled, as I have traveled across my State of Illinois, at the number of people I have met who are facing serious hardship trying to pay for their drugs.

There was a hearing in the city of Chicago where a lady came forward to tell a sad story of how once she had received her prescription drugs from her doctor, she realized the cost of the drugs were so much that on her fixed income under Social Security she could not take it. This lady was facing a particular hardship because she had received an organ transplant. If she failed to take the antirejection drugs, she stood the chance of dying or having even a worse medical condition.

Mr. President, do you know how she answered that particular dilemma? She moved into the basement of her children's home. She is living in the basement of her children's home so she does not have to pay for rent or utilities so she can have enough money to pay for the drugs to keep that new organ in her body that keeps her alive.

That is a tale of desperation which unfortunately highlights the challenge facing Congress as we need to find a way to make prescription drugs not only accessible but affordable.

There are many projected ideas out there and some of them are valuable and worth pursuing and some of them are certainly not. We have to keep in mind it is not just accessibility to the drugs, but it is also the price of the drugs, to say to someone, you have a right to buy the drugs, and we will help

you up to a certain extent, may be of little or no value if the price of the drugs is so high the person cannot afford it. That, unfortunately, is a reality.

Last year the cost of prescription drugs across America went up 16 percent.

Mr. President, try to imagine a program or even something in your home budget that you could deal with honestly with an annual increase in cost of 16 percent. So what we have tried to do on the Democratic side, as we address prescription drugs, is to go to the heart of the issue, to talk about the affordability of drugs, and to make certain the way we pay for these drugs is not at the expense of the people across America who need a helping hand.

Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan has been a leader on this issue. She held a press conference I attended last week and talked about a prescription drug approach which needs to be thoroughly considered. Right now across America pharmaceutical companies are buying ads on television, in magazines, and in newspapers talking about the importance of research for new drugs. Believe me, there is not a person in the Senate who does not agree with that.

We also know that many of these pharmaceutical companies are spending extraordinary amounts of money, in excess of their research budgets, for advertising. We see it every time we turn on the television, every time we open a magazine or a newspaper—full-page ads for new drugs. They show people dancing through a field of wildflowers and not sneezing, saying: Go to the doctor and ask for Claritin, or Clarinex, or Clarinet, or whatever happens to be the latest from Schering-Plough. When it comes to drugs such as Vioxx from Merck and other drugs, constantly we are bombarded with this information.

What Senator STABENOW has found is that pharmaceutical companies across America are spending two to three times as much on advertising as they are on research to find new drugs. Why should they be given a tax deduction for promotion, marketing, and advertising in excess of what they are spending for research? I do not think they should.

Frankly, I think we ought to call their bluff. If they tell us they need money for research, then for goodness' sake, put in it research. Give us the new drugs. Make the profits by giving us these kinds of blockbuster revelations of new drugs that can change our lives. But do not focus the money on advertising, promotion, and marketing when, frankly, all it does is create false need and false demand.

So as we consider the prescription drug challenge that faces us, let's be honest about the program we put together, that it is accessible and affordable, and let us also be honest about the source of the money. On the House side of the Rotunda, the Republicans have proposed a prescription drug bill

which is paid for by taking money from hospitals under Medicare and doctors across America. That is not the appropriate way to deal with it. We have to deal with it in an honest fashion so that the people of America are not shortchanged in terms of their health care.

I yield the floor.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my thanks to Senator BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY for accepting the Kennedy-Feinstein-Feingold amendment to trade promotion authority. Our amendment instructs our trade negotiators to respect the Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health adopted by the World Trade Organization at the Fourth Ministerial Conference at Doha, Qatar.

This amendment is essential for the developing countries of the world as they confront public health crisis, such as the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

The Doha declaration simply recognizes the right of these countries to use practices such as "compulsory licensing" to gain access to affordable pharmaceutical drugs. These practices are fully consistent with international law, specifically the TRIPS agreement which is the presumptive legal standard for intellectual property rights.

Without these practices, the vast majority of HIV/AIDS patients in the developing world would not be able to afford the more expensive drugs from American pharmaceutical companies and, as a result, they would suffer and die.

The statistics compel us to action. HIV/AIDS is now the leading cause of death in sub-Saharan Africa. Worldwide, it is the fourth biggest killer. At the end of 2001, an estimated 40 million people globally were living with HIV/AIDS; there were 5 million new infections and 3 million deaths as a result of the disease. In the last twenty years, we have come a long way, but we are still losing because people are still dying.

Sub-Saharan Africa houses about 10 percent of the world's population but more than 70 percent of the worldwide total of infected people, 95 percent of all HIV/AIDS cases are of those living in developing countries.

An estimated 25.3 million people are living with HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa and 19.3 million Africans have died of AIDS, including 2.3 million last year. This has meant an increase to a cumulative total of 12.1 million AIDS orphans, which is expected to increase to 42 million by the year 2010. An estimated 600,000 African infants become infected with HIV each year through mother-to-child transmission, either at birth or through breast-feeding.

These statistics are what they are in spite of the tools we have to ease the situation.

The Kennedy-Feinstein-Feingold amendment is by no means the perfect