

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

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHN H. CHAFEE

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring a distinguished public servant and a revered Member of the United States Senate, Senator John Chafee, who died Sunday evening at Bethesda Naval Hospital.

While John Chafee was elected to the Senate in 1976, his public service began years before when he interrupted his education at Yale University to enlist in the Marine Corps during World War II, serving in the original invasion forces at Guadalcanal. He later returned to complete his education, receiving a bachelors degree from Yale in 1947 and, in 1950, a law degree from Harvard.

In 1951, John Chafee was called again to serve his country, returning to active duty to command a rifle company in Korea. Later, John Chafee served six years in the Rhode Island House of Representatives, where he was elected Minority Leader. He served as Governor of Rhode Island for three terms and in 1969 was appointed Secretary of the Navy.

As a Senator, John Chafee continued his proud legacy of leadership and accomplishment. I worked with Senator Chafee perhaps most closely in the U.S. Senate in his capacity as Chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee where he labored tirelessly on behalf of many critical environmental initiatives, including efforts to strengthen the Clean Air Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Senator Chafee has been recognized for his important contributions in the area of environmental protection throughout his service in the U.S. Senate and has received nearly every major environmental award. He was also a senior member of the Senate Finance Committee where he worked hard to expand health care coverage for women and children and to improve community services for persons with disabilities.

John Chafee was a well-respected member of this body who engendered the affection of every member with whom he served. He had a unique ability to achieve consensus under very difficult circumstances. His unfailing courtesy and civility provided a positive and unifying force in the Congress which will be sorely missed by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The Senate was a better place because of John Chafee and his devoted public service. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to him and to extend my deepest and heartfelt sympathies to his family.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today in mourning the loss of our colleague, John Chafee. John was a good and honorable man who served his state and his country

with distinction. A devoted public servant and member of this body for 23 years, Senator Chafee's influence extended beyond the aisles and transcended partisan rhetoric. His accomplishments as a lawmaker and his unquestionable influence among his peers stand as a testament to his ability.

Senator Chafee will long be admired and remembered for his devotion to this country both as a soldier and public servant. His distinguished service in the military, including serving in the Marines at Guadalcanal and commanding a rifle company in Korea, were indicative of the man who would never shy away from duty or responsibility.

His record as a legislator, governor, and senator in Rhode Island indicate the amount of trust the people of Rhode Island put in John.

Although political views may vary from person to person, it is easy to put these differences aside and to recognize men of strong character and integrity. These are qualities which were abundant in John, and his steadying influence in the United States Senate will be truly missed.

My thoughts and prayers extend to his family and all those whose lives Senator Chafee touched.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of our friend and colleague, Senator John Chafee.

Senator Chafee was the living embodiment of Senate decorum. He always honored this body through his thoughts, deeds and actions. His ideas and messages were delivered thoughtfully and respectfully. He truly followed his heart and soul while representing the people of Rhode Island and this great nation.

His honorable service in both World War II and the Korean Conflict, as well as his distinguished tenure as Secretary of the Navy, reflect his profound respect for America's armed forces and his deep love of country.

I am especially appreciative for all he did to advance causes near and dear to the state of Florida. He took time to visit the Florida Everglades, and his work on this important issue will ensure the preservation of this unique natural system, and will always be a part of his lasting legacy.

Senator Chafee devoted his life to public service. He will be remembered as a thoughtful and patriotic American who cared passionately about those he served, the issues he fought for, and the institution of the United States Senate. He was not only a fellow Republican, but a colleague who was respected on both sides of the aisle. He will be sorely missed in the U.S. Senate.

My heartfelt sympathies go to his wife Ginny, to their five children and 12 grandchildren, and to his staff here in Washington and throughout Rhode Island.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I extend my sympathies to the family of John Chafee.

It has been my privilege to serve with John Chafee for but 3 of the years of his long and distinguished career in the Senate. But I will miss him. I do miss him.

I want to say publicly how much I appreciate the many times he came up to me and told me how much he appreciated me and how glad he was that I was here.

I thank him publicly for the many times he came to me and talked about environmental issues and told me he had a good environmental bill that he wanted me to be on. Many times, I was on them with him.

I appreciated his looking out for me in that regard, and in so many other ways. It was a great pleasure and a high privilege to serve with him in the Senate.

I wish his wife and his family my very best and pray God's comfort be with them in this time of their bereavement.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 434, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:  
A bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the Senate's consideration of the trade bill, all first-degree amendments must be relevant to the trade bill or the filed amendment No. 2325, and any second-degree amendment be relevant to the first-degree it proposes to amend.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I object.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I object.

Mr. LOTT. I truly regret the objection to a reasonable consideration of this very important pending trade bill. This is obviously a vital piece of trade legislation. As I indicated last week on the floor, this is something in which the President has been very interested. He discussed it with me personally last week on, I think, Tuesday and twice since we have discussed it in telephone conversations. I am not doing it just because the President asked for it. I am doing it because I think it is the right thing to do.

I think it would be good for our country, help to create jobs. This is very carefully crafted legislation that the chairman of the committee and ranking member have worked on. I think it would be just vitally important to our friends in Central America and the Caribbean, as well as a major step symbolically and other ways to have African free trade.

I want to get this bill done. There are legitimate objections to it. The Senator from South Carolina is going to

use every rule in the book that he has access to, and there are lots of them. He has staff members who will make sure he knows them all. I understand that. But I am sure everybody can understand I have to take advantage of the rules available to me also because I do not want this to become a debate about farm policy, sanctions policy—one Senator just suggested we should offer fast track on this bill. I agree; I think fast track should be done. That is another very important trade policy. But it will completely bog down this bill.

I think we need to be serious about this bill. I plan now to fill up the tree and file cloture. The cloture vote will be Friday. We will see if the Senate wants this trade bill or not. If we do not get cloture, then it is clear what is going on and we will just have to move on to something else.

My consent would simply keep the Senate on the subject of the African trade and trade benefits for the Caribbean Basin countries. Obviously, with objection from the Democrats, they do not want this subject matter to be the pending issue. I think it is unfortunate, but I understand.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2325

(Purpose: To provide a substitute amendment)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator ROTH and others, I call up amendment No. 2325 and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment and begin reading the text.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], for Mr. ROTH, for himself, and Mr. MOYNIHAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2325.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2332 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2325

(Purpose: To provide a substitute amendment.)

Mr. LOTT. I send a first-degree amendment to the substitute to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment and begin reading the text.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 2332 to amendment No. 2325.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2333 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2332

(Purpose: To provide a substitute amendment.)

Mr. LOTT. I send a second-degree amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment and begin reading the text.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 2333 to amendment No. 2332.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

## MOTION TO COMMIT WITH INSTRUCTIONS

Mr. LOTT. I now move to commit the bill with instructions and send the motion to the desk.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2334

(Purpose: To provide a substitute amendment)

Mr. LOTT. I send an amendment to the desk to the motion to commit with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report and begin reading the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 2334 to the motion to commit with instructions.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2335 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2334

(Purpose: To provide a substitute amendment)

Mr. LOTT. I send a second-degree amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 2335 to amendment No. 2334.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. I now send a cloture motion to the desk to the pending amendment No. 2325.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the substitute amendment to Calendar No. 215, H.R. 434, an act to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

Trent Lott, Bill Roth, Mike DeWine, Rod Grams, Mitch McConnell, Judd Gregg, Larry E. Craig, Chuck Hagel, Chuck Grassley, Pete Domenici, Don Nickles, Connie Mack, Paul Coverdell, Phil Gramm, R.F. Bennett, and Richard G. Lugar.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I think it is unfortunate we have to take this step. I have discussed it with the Democratic leader. Let me emphasize he did not agree with this at all, but we did discuss our situation and our mutual concerns and our mutual desires to try to find a way to move this trade legislation forward. Filling up the tree is not a new practice. It is one I haven't used, I don't think, this year—maybe once. It is a practice that has been used in the past by majority leaders when it is necessary to try to get to a conclusion.

I do not know exactly when our adjournment for the year will come, but it is obvious we do not have a lot of time left. We do have some other issues we would like to have a chance to consider. Again, that is on both sides of the aisle.

The cloture motion vote will occur on Friday, October 29. I will notify all Members of the exact time, after consultation with the Democratic leader.

In the meantime, I ask consent the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. LOTT. I say to the Senate, I would be willing to withdraw the last amendment pending. I will be glad to come back in an hour and withdraw that, allowing Members' amendments to be offered if they were relevant to the trade bill, and this would allow us to make some progress on the bill. I would offer that idea to the minority leader when he returns, and I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota

if he would like to ask any questions or make a comment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I heard the majority leader mention he did not want to see amendments that he did not think were directly related, such as agriculture. As the majority leader knows, for the last 5 weeks I have asked him when I would have the opportunity. The majority leader said he thinks this is the first time he has filled up the tree, or second time. I think there may be other times, but I would have to check. I do not remember an opportunity in the last 4 or 5 weeks, or longer than that, to have an amendment out here that I think will speak to the pain of farmers.

When might I have an opportunity to introduce this amendment that I think would make a difference for family farmers in Minnesota who are being driven off the land? If the majority leader is filling up the tree and therefore I cannot do this, can he tell me when I might have an opportunity? Will he make a commitment there will be a piece of legislation out here that I can amend?

Mr. LOTT. I am not sure when that might occur. I told the Democratic leader just a few minutes ago, if it were just an amendment by Senator WELLSTONE on agriculture, I would be prepared to have that discussion, that debate, and a vote. But that is not the end of the string. We have a lot of innovative thinkers here on both sides of the aisle who are now working feverishly with their very competent staffs to develop other amendments.

If it were just an amendment by the Senator from Minnesota, I think probably that could be done. I think if we would open the door, there would be no end to it.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the majority leader be willing to entertain a free-standing bill I might introduce and have debate on? We have to do something, I say to the majority leader, about what is going on in farm country.

Mr. LOTT. First of all, I will be willing to discuss that with the Senator. I would have to also discuss it with the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and its members. I could not just unilaterally reach an agreement. But, again, I personally would not have a problem with that.

I do not know what his amendment would be, but I am sure I would vote against it. But we could have a discussion. I would need to check with both sides and I will talk with the Senator to see if it is possible, to see if we can do that in some freestanding way.

Having said that, I want to be sure the record has been made at this point. Last Friday, the President of the United States signed the Agriculture appropriations bill—I believe last Friday. It provides funds for agricultural needs all across this great land, in my State and that of the Senators from Minnesota and New York. We have lots of agriculture in New York. I don't

know if you are aware of that, but I have been very impressed when I have been up there, some of the areas outside of Long Island. I found there is a lot of agriculture up there and all across this country.

We did get the Agriculture bill. In that bill was a very significant amount of funds for disaster-related problems. Some of them have been caused because of the depressed prices, some because of drought, some because of floods—all the different problems we have. Others say it was not enough; it should have been more. Some others would say it was not targeted in the right way. We can debate that endlessly, I believe.

But the President, upon review—and I believe he took the full 10 days—decided the right thing to do was go ahead and get this bill signed and get that disaster money to the farmers, the men and women who live on the farms in this country, as quickly as possible. It is not as if this is an issue we have not addressed and we will not address next year.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I appreciate the leader's graciousness. I will not take up any more time with questions to him.

Having just heard the majority leader's report about disaster relief, he may want to reconsider his view about whether or not he would vote for or against an amendment or piece of legislation I would introduce because I say to the majority leader in the form of a question: I am quite sure that, as the majority leader travels around the country in rural America, he understands that the financial assistance package did not deal with the price crisis. People are going to be driven off the land and we have to change the policy.

I appreciate what he said. I guess it is less a form of a question, but perhaps I will get his support because I am sure the majority leader wants to see the Senate take some action that will make a positive difference for family farmers.

Mr. LOTT. Let me say in answer to the Senator's comments, I have learned from past experience that you should never say exactly what you are going to do until you have seen the details of an amendment or a bill because it could be different or it could be something that, in the end, you find would be acceptable. I have a suspicion I might not use that approach, but I had to reserve final judgment until I saw its content. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the managers' amendment to H.R. 434. That substitute includes the Senate Finance Committee-reported bills on Africa, an expansion of the Caribbean Basin Initiative, an ex-

tension of the Generalized System of Preferences, and the reauthorization of our trade adjustment assistance programs.

It is critically important that we move this legislation. Let me say a few words, in particular, about the Africa trade portion of the bill.

The last decade has been a period of great change in Africa. Some of these changes have been quite heartening to those of us who have been watching the countries in that continent for many years. The failed economic policies of socialism and central planning have begun to give way to market reforms, bringing economic growth and an improvement of living standards with it. There have been positive changes on the political front as well. The tragedy of apartheid has, thankfully, come to an end in South Africa. At the same time, democracy has begun to flower in South Africa and in a number of other sub-Saharan countries.

The picture, however, is not all positive. As we know all too well, the countries in Africa continue to suffer through more than their share of difficulties. War, disease and hunger are still very significant parts of the story of that region. Africa is a continent that is on the brink of a new and more positive future, but still has a number of significant hurdles that it must overcome.

For the Senate, the question is what we can do—what this great country can do—to help the African nations obtain the peace and prosperity that they have been working so hard to achieve. In other words, what can we do to help them complete the work that they have already begun.

The manager's amendment is clearly not a panacea; the challenges that the Africans face are too great for any single piece of legislation or any single act to cure. This legislation is, however, an important start towards building an economic partnership between the United States and the countries of sub-Saharan Africa. This partnership, in my view, is a significant first step towards giving the African nations the opportunities they need to continue the progress that many of them have made over the past decade.

I am proud of the support that this legislation has received among the African-American community and among the Africans themselves. I say this because a few of my colleagues have suggested that the African-American community and the African nations themselves are divided in their support for the African Growth and Opportunity Act. I am standing here to say that nothing could be further from the truth. If there was any doubt, it should have been put to rest with the Roll Call ad which ran last week. The ad, appropriately, stated the following:

To the United States Senate, Setting the Record Straight. We endorse legislation that provides social and economic opportunity in Africa and we, the undersigned, are working together to achieve this goal. Can we count on you?

The signatories to this Roll Call ad are a very distinguished collection of religious, civic, political and business organizations and individual leaders. I will name just a few: the NAACP, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the National Council of Churches, AfriCare, the Council of National Black Churches, which represents 65,000 churches and 20,000,000 members, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

The list of individuals signing this ad includes such notables as Bishops Donald Ming and Garnett Henning of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, Mrs. Coretta Scott King, Mr. Martin Luther King III, Ambassador Andrew Young, former mayor David Dinkins, the Honorable Kweisi Mfume, and Mr. Robert Johnson, the head of Black Entertainment Television. I want to note that Mr. Johnson testified eloquently about the need to create new economic opportunities in Africa when he appeared before the Finance Committee last year. He, like the others listed in this ad, have spoken powerfully on the pressing importance of this legislation.

Let me read a quote in the ad from just one of these individuals. That individual is the very distinguished Rev. Leon Sullivan of the nearby city of Philadelphia. Rev. Sullivan is quoted in the ad as saying that:

The African Growth and Opportunity Act will open new markets for American products and will create additional jobs for Americans and Africans. For every \$1 billion in exports to Africa, 14,000 jobs are created or sustained in the United States. Those are powerful and important words.

Let us not forget that this legislation is also good for Africa. That is why every single one of the 47 African nations covered under this the legislation have publicly stated their support. Let me repeat that, because it is important. Every single one of the countries covered under this legislation supports this legislation. I think it is fair to say that these countries have the judgment to decide what is in their interest. In this instance, they have spoken loudly and clearly. The African Growth and Opportunity Act is good for Africa.

I am proud to say that President Clinton is also a strong supporter of this legislation. He recently said, and it is quoted in the Roll Call ad, that:

Our administration strongly supports the African Growth and Opportunity Act which I said in my State of the Union Address we will work to pass in this session of Congress.

That, Mr. President, is exactly why we are here. We are here to work on a bipartisan basis to work for passage of an important piece of legislation that is good for the American people and good for Africa.

I was honored to have representatives of many of the groups and individuals I mentioned join me in a press conference this past week to express their support for this legislation. What these individuals and groups understand—and stated at the press con-

ference—is that Africa has for too long been neglected in our trade policy. They also understand that the African Growth and Opportunity Act is the right legislation to begin the strengthening of our economic relationship with that continent.

Let me emphasize that these individuals and groups support the African Growth and Opportunity Act and not the HOPE bill. They support this bill because it is good legislation. It is the right thing to do. It is good for the American people, and it is good for the people of Africa.

There is, of course, much more that is part of the manager's amendment. The enhancement of the CBI program is long overdue. It is also a vital step to strengthening the economic compact begun with that region by President Reagan with the original CBI initiative. The reauthorizations of the Generalized System of Preferences and Trade Adjustment Assistance programs are also of critical importance. These measures are essential for ensuring that the benefits of the global economy are felt as broadly as possible and to ensure that workers and firms displaced by trade receive the assistance and training that they need.

The effort to move the bill enjoys broad bipartisan support. But, it is long overdue. The House of Representatives passed the Africa legislation by an overwhelming vote of 234-163 in July of this year. It is now time for the Senate to Act.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 434, as amended. The time to act is now.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

MR. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate our revered chairman for his achievement in a partisan setting. I think it is generally agreed that this Congress has not been one governed from the center. Here we have major legislation brought to the floor by near unanimous vote of the Committee on Finance and with extraordinary support across the country.

I wish to make two points, the first to the question of Trade Adjustment Assistance. It goes back 37 years as an integral measure in our trade policy. As Dean Acheson might say, I was present at the creation. I was an Assistant Secretary of Labor, one of three delegates who negotiated the Long-Term Cotton Textile Agreement which was necessary to win the votes in the Senate for authorizing what became the Kennedy Round. When we came back with that agreement, the issue arose, if we were to open up trade, there would inevitably be persons displaced—just as jobs were created, jobs would be lost. There is nothing complex in the calculation nor very complex in identifying just whom you are talking about.

We started Trade Adjustment Assistance. It has worked. We included a comparable provision in the NAFTA implementing legislation. In Fiscal

Year 1998, we had 150,000 workers eligible to receive Trade Adjustment Assistance; last year, we had 200,000 eligible workers. Those are rounded numbers.

This is an active program. There are families who are displaced in the world economy, and they are living off this transitional benefit—200,000 eligible workers. That is not a small number. The authorization for this program, that has been integral to our trade policy for 37 years, expired on June 30. The appropriation expires on Friday; on Saturday, it is no more. And when it can come back, how it comes back—have we seen many things started of late in this Congress or the previous ones? No.

Now, those are lives of American workers we are talking about, just as President Kennedy talked about them. John Pastore of Rhode Island was very vigorous on this matter, and many Members of the Senate who are marked in history by their capacity to see the large national interest.

One other matter: The chairman noted the meeting which the Committee on Finance had with the group of presidents, vice presidents, and foreign ministers from Central America, ranging from Trinidad and Tobago all the way up to Honduras. It took place just off the Senate floor in the LBJ Room. It was a special occasion.

They came here as representatives of elected governments asking to trade. They weren't asking for foreign aid. They weren't asking for military assistance. They were simply asking to become part of the trading system of the western hemisphere in that Monroe Doctrine context about which the chairman spoke.

It already seems to have happened long ago. In the 1980s, we spent \$8 billion sending arms to Central America, with precious little to show for it. A good enough outcome in the end, but the weaponry was everywhere, on all sides—a fantastic miscalculation, in my view, in my view at the time.

I will give my colleagues a moment's recollection. It was 1983. I was in El Salvador in the capital of San Salvador having breakfast with the president and provost of the University of Central America, a Jesuit institution. At that time, the United States was going through enormous efforts to prevent the Sandinistas in Nicaragua from smuggling arms to their rebel counterparts in El Salvador.

I asked the President and the provost, with whom I had a relationship through a professor at the University of Chicago, "Father, are the Sandinistas sending weapons to El Salvador?" He said, "No." I said, "No? Well, surely they had been." He said, "Yes." I asked, "And they don't any longer?" He said, "No. You do."

Every day, the skies over Salvador were filled with American planes bringing in weaponry, which was promptly divided—half for the government, a quarter for the rebels, and a quarter for

the international arms market. And what a better thing now to be talking about trade. And we have stability. If we want to ensure it, there has to be an economic basis. This legislation does so and, again, and finally, there are 200,000 American families entitled to trade adjustment assistance, which expires on Friday after a 37-year run as part of the American safety net as a condition of expanding trade. Let's not let them down. We can do this if only we will do it together, as we did in the Finance Committee. I only hope the same can be repeated on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I see my friend from South Carolina who is seeking recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New York. I have been trying to get the floor. I tried earlier today to be recognized to speak on this bill. It was the objection I had made, of course, to the motion to proceed, due to the strong feelings I had with respect to trade. Incidentally, on yesterday, I could not be present. Amongst others, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota more or less carried the day. I am obligated to him. Senator WELLSTONE did an outstanding job. He asked that, if I could ever get the floor—and I tried twice this morning and could not get the floor—to please ask unanimous consent that he be recognized when I had completed my remarks. I have talked to fellow Senators and there is objection to that. I wanted to let him know that I remembered the promise made. I am not making the request because I know it will be objected to.

That brings us right to the unsenatorial, more or less, procedures into which we have bogged down by. In a line, the distinguished majority leader says what we ought to have had was fast track and, within a breath, he gives us fast track. We have fast track on this bill. You cannot put up an amendment. He "filled up the tree," and he says, "oh, but I am so considerate that I will be glad to help you out if I can give you permission to give you relevant amendments." Of course, he decides what is relevant.

What about relevance with respect to the Finance Committee? What they are calling a trade bill is actually a foreign aid bill, because you have the Secretary of State calling around on the bill, not the Secretary of Labor for jobs—I don't think she had the gall to do it. But the Secretary of State, with pride, is calling the various Senators because this is a foreign aid bill. It is a one-way street. It is unilateral. It does not have the labor side agreements. It does not have the environmental side agreements that were included in NAFTA. It does not include the reciprocity that we got from the Mexicans when we passed NAFTA. I have prepared amendments that would be rel-

evant, but you can't tell around here. I don't think that I should have to stand as a Senator and beg another Senator permission to put up an amendment. That is the most arrogance I have ever seen since I have been here, some 33 years. It has gotten really raw in this particular body, when you try to debate the most important subject that you can possibly imagine, which is hollowing out not only our industrial strength, but the middle class of our society and the strength of our democracy, and you have to beg to put up an amendment in order to satisfy what the majority leader says what is relevant.

Could it be the minimum wage amendment that the Senator from Massachusetts has been trying to get up since the beginning of the year? Well, it is not for Africa, not for the Caribbean Basin Initiative, but more for the workers of America. I say why not? Don't we have trade adjustment assistance in the bill? If that is relevant so is minimum wage. Doesn't minimum wage have relevance to the welfare, the pay, the being of American workers?

The question in my mind is what rules are we under? I presided for 6 years under Heinz's precedent. I presided for 4 years under Jefferson's rule. When I got to the Senate, we threw away the rule book because it is whatever the majority leader says. That is the rule. That is what happens up here—we all understand that—in order to facilitate legislation. But when it gets to this point of arrogance it is totally counterproductive. Here you have been trying to get up the bill all year long, and then you put it up in the last few days and say we are all trying to get out of town, let's not have any debate, let's take it or leave it as the Finance Committee has it, and thereupon, let's have cloture, let's have fast track.

Well, with respect to the minimum wage amendment, I would gladly put it up. I understood today—and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts can speak for himself—but I talked to him the day before yesterday and advised him that if he didn't, I would, because I think it is just as important as trade adjustment assistance.

I see that the distinguished Senator from Texas is on the floor. I understood he said this would create 400,000 jobs. That's very peculiar because I understood the distinguished Senator from New York indicating that we are going to have to put 200,000 on trade adjustment assistance—in other words, we are going to put them out of a job, we are going to give them welfare. What a wonderful thing it is; we started it some 37 years ago. Has this body got any idea what is going on? Are we really creating jobs, or are we decimating the jobs? One brags that we put them on; the other brags that we put them out. And there we are, with respect to relevant amendments.

Mr. President, there is another relevant amendment. This is the Time

magazine for this week. It is an article called, "The Fruit of Its Labor." I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the RECORD in its entirety.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Time Magazine, October 1999]

#### THE FRUIT OF ITS LABOR

(By Adam Zagorin)

WASHINGTON.—If you are an underwear mogul, you surely cannot lack confidence. So it is with Bill Farley. The handsome physical-fitness buff has under his belt brands like BVD, Munsingwear and his flagship, Fruit of the Loom. He rubs shoulders with the rich and powerful, and recently co-chaired a lunch that raised more than \$500,000 for George W. Bush. Muscles rippling, Farley, 57, has also shown up wearing a tank top in Fruit of the Loom advertising. He once even put himself forward as a candidate for President of the United States.

These days, however, Farley's political focus is squarely on Congress, where Fruit's adventures in lobbying offer a choice example of how the game is played. Fruit of the Loom is a tattered company, suffering from bad performance and poor management and lobbying heavily for a bill that would ripen its bottom line.

How likely is it that the company's case will be heard on the Hill? Well, last year alone Fruit handed out more than \$435,000 in soft-money donations, a figure that puts contributions by the firm (1998 sales: \$2.2 billion) ahead of those of such giants as Coca-Cola, Exxon and Bank of America. Most of Fruit's plums go to Republicans, including \$265,000 to the National Republican Senatorial Committee, run by Kentucky Senator Mitch McConnell, the principal opponent of campaign finance reform.

This week, with Congress having for now killed campaign finance reform, McConnell and other Republicans will get on with other business, such as an amendment to an African trade bill that would allow apparel produced in the Caribbean Basin to enter the U.S. duty free, provided it is assembled from U.S. fabric.

Fruit's lobbyists—along with those from competitors like the Sara Lee Corp., which makes Hanes underwear, and retailers like the Limited and the Gap—are pushing hard for passage. Fruit officials claim the measure, which Bill Clinton supports, will create jobs, and deny that the company's donations can buy influence. Says Ron Sorini, a Fruit lobbyist: "There's absolutely no correlation between our soft-money donations and those who decide to vote in favor of this bill."

Whether there is or not, Farley's much coveted tariff break comes at a cost. Eliminating duties on apparel from the Caribbean will run U.S. taxpayers at least \$1 billion in lost revenue over five years—a figure that, by congressional rules, must be made up with cuts in other programs.

Fruit confirms that the bill is expected to deliver a quick \$25 million to \$50 million to the bottom line, adding to savings achieved after moving some 17,000 of its U.S.-based jobs, mostly to the low-wage Caribbean Basin, and reincorporating in the tax haven Cayman Islands. The jobs cuts were spread across the South, especially Kentucky, where earlier in this decade Fruit was one of the largest employers. "They are trying to win in Washington what they've been unable to achieve in the marketplace," says Charles Lewis, executive director of the Center for Public Integrity, a watchdog group. "They're now trying to secure advantages from Congress at a time when they're in dire financial straits."

Dire is right. After a major inventory snafu, Fruit's financial elastic stretched again last month, when it had to make a \$45 million interest payment on accumulated debt of \$1.3 billion. Its stock, traded at \$48 a few years ago, now sells for less than \$4. The board, its confidence in Farley shaken, managed to shunt him into the role of nonexecutive chairman in August, and the company is searching for a new CEO. Farley retains a role in large measure because he still controls 28.5% of Fruit's voting shares. He has also arranged for the company to guarantee loans to himself worth \$65 million.

Fruit of the Loom's favorite trade bill has led to a rare split between Kentucky's two conservative Republican Senators. While McConnell is expected to support the tariff cut, his colleague Jim Bunning has no intention of backing the measure. Asks Bunning: "How many more jobs do we have to lose until we wake up and smell the Caribbean coffee?"

Yet for Bill Farley, the aroma is nothing if not enticing. By one count, he's tried to get versions of the bill through Congress six times in recent years. Perhaps seven's the charm.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I don't know whether the distinguished majority leader would agree that this is a special interest bill, but the public domain thinks it is a special interest bill. The leading news magazine in the world thinks it is a special interest bill. Therefore, campaign finance reform would be relevant.

Why do I say that?

"The Fruit of Its Labor."

It is on page 50.

"How a company that exports jobs pushes for a Capitol Hill handout."

"The politics of underwear."

I quote:

If you are an underwear mogul, you surely cannot lack confidence. So it is with Bill Farley. The handsome physical-fitness buff has under his belt brands like BVD, Munsingwear and his flagship, Fruit of the Loom. He rubs shoulders with the rich and powerful, and recently co-chaired a lunch that raised more than \$500,000 for George W. Bush. Muscles rippling, Farley, 57, has also shown up wearing a tank top in Fruit of the Loom advertising. He once even put himself forward as a candidate for President of the United States.

Maybe that is where Trump got the idea. I always wondered where that rasical could think he could be President.

But, in any event, reading on:

These days, however, Farley's political focus is squarely on Congress, where Fruit's adventures in lobbying offer a choice example of how the game is played. Fruit of the Loom is a tattered company, suffering from bad performance and poor management and lobbying heavily for a bill that would ripen its bottom line.

How likely is it that the company's case will be heard on the Hill? Well, last year alone Fruit handed out more than \$435,000 in soft-money donations, a figure that puts contributions by the firm (1998 sales: \$2.2 billion) ahead of those of such giants as Coca-Cola, Exxon and Bank of America. Most of Fruit's plums go to Republicans, including \$265,000 to the National Republican Senatorial Committee, run by Kentucky Senator Mitch McConnell, the principal opponent of campaign finance reform.

This week, with Congress having for now killed campaign finance reform, McConnell and other Republicans will get on with other

business, such as an amendment to an African trade bill that would allow apparel produced in the Caribbean Basin to enter the U.S. duty free, provided it is assembled from U.S. fabric.

Fruit's lobbyists—along with those from competitors like the Sara Lee Corp., which makes Hanes underwear, and retailers like the Limited and the Gap—are pushing hard for passage. Fruit officials claim the measure, which Bill Clinton supports, will create jobs, and deny that the company's donations can buy influence. Says Ron Sorini, a Fruit lobbyist: "There's absolutely no correlation between our soft-money donations and those who decide to vote in favor of this bill."

Whether there is or not, Farley's much coveted tariff break comes at a cost. Eliminating duties on apparel from the Caribbean will run U.S. taxpayers at least \$1 billion in lost revenue over five years—a figure that, by congressional rules, must be made up with cuts in our programs.

Fruit confirms that the bill is expected to deliver a quick \$25 million to \$50 million to the bottom line, adding to savings achieved after moving some 17,000 of its U.S.-based jobs, mostly to the low-wage Caribbean Basin, and reincorporating in the tax haven Cayman Islands. The jobs cuts were spread across the South, especially Kentucky, where earlier in this decade Fruit was one of the largest employers. "They are trying to win in Washington what they've been unable to achieve in the marketplace," says Charles Lewis, executive director of the Center for Public Integrity, a watchdog group. "They're now trying to secure advantages from Congress at a time when they're in dire financial straits."

Dire is right. After a major inventory snafu, Fruit's financial elastic stretched again last month, when it had to make a \$45 million interest payment on accumulated debt of \$1.3 billion. Its stock, traded at \$48 a few years ago, now sells for less than \$4. The board, its confidence in Farley shaken, managed to shunt him into the role of nonexecutive chairman in August, and the company is searching for a new CEO. Farley retains a role in large measure because he still controls 28.5% of Fruit's voting shares. He has also arranged for the company to guarantee loans to himself worth \$65 million.

Fruit of the Loom's favorite trade bill has led to a rare split between Kentucky's two conservative Republican Senators. While McConnell is expected to support the tariff cut, his colleague Jim Bunning has no intention of backing the measure. Asks Bunning: "How many more jobs do we have to lose until we wake up and smell the Caribbean coffee?"

Yet for Bill Farley, the aroma is nothing if not enticing. By one count, he's tried to get versions of the bill through Congress six times in recent years. Perhaps seven's the charm.

Mr. President, I ask the same question as the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. BUNNING. How many more jobs do we have to lose until we wake up and smell the Caribbean coffee? Is there any question in anybody's mind? As we used to say in the law, any reasonable and prudent man—and now woman—can see that this is not a special interest bill. And with campaign finance reform, which is mentioned in this article and which is mentioned in this particular bill, it would be relevant—not under the majority leader's rule of relevancy.

Ask the majority leader when he comes to the floor. I can offer the cam-

paign finance reform, or I can offer the minimum wage. Then we will all agree to move right along and vote on the amendment. I will agree to a time agreement. We are not holding anybody up. We can vote both of those amendments this afternoon. We don't have to worry about cloture on Friday. We are ready to roll. We, like the majority leader, want to get out of town. We have a lot of work to do. Don't put on this act about how reasonable and thoughtful and so pressured we are in trying to reconcile all of the particular problems there are in the closing days. Don't give me any of that. Let's get to the reality.

We have a special interest bill; we have a bill affecting workers. I want to put up another bill affecting the workers that have been up all year long and all last year—minimum wage. The majority leader won't come out and say it is relevant. When he comes out and says it is relevant, I will put up the amendment; we can vote in 10 minutes' time. When he says a special interest bill, Shays-Meehan is relevant; we can vote in 10 minutes. The House has voted on it overwhelmingly.

We couldn't get a vote on account of the so-called rules of the majority leader with respect to when we can call something and when we can't call anything around here. They won't give us a freestanding Shays-Meehan without the cloture and everything else.

I have been interested in campaign finance reform since I voted for the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974. We had that bill up, and we had a good bipartisan cross-section vote for the measure saying one cannot buy the office. We have come full circle. What we are saying in Washington today is, the trouble is, there isn't enough money to buy the office. Do you know what? We have amendments. Mr. President, \$1,000 isn't enough; we ought to be able to buy it quicker with \$3,000 and \$5,000, \$10,000. We have moved in the opposite direction from the original intent of cleaning up politics in this land of ours by stating categorically one could not buy the office.

I can still see the Senator from Louisiana, Russell Long. He said, every man a king—everybody, regardless of economic circumstance or background, could aspire for the Presidency of this land of ours. Listen to Elizabeth Dole. One can be a former Secretary of Commerce, one can be a Secretary of Transportation and Secretary of Labor, one can have been head of the American Red Cross, every kind of track record, but unless the candidate has the money, the candidate doesn't stand a chance—money is what talks.

We are saying it is a real problem. On the one hand, we have too many limits, we ought to have more money in this; or, on the other hand, let taxpayers, let the public, pay for our politics; let's have public campaign finance. We have had about three votes on it.

I remember when I first introduced it, it was a joint resolution. There was



one line, and it is in now, but I can't get it up. I have been waiting for a good joint resolution to come over, Senator. If it comes over, I will offer it. They told me I couldn't offer it to campaign finance reform because mine was a joint resolution and it was a simple bill, with three readings to be signed. A joint resolution, of course, and amending the Constitution, is not to be signed by the President.

That being the case, I put in this particular one-line amendment that the Congress of the United States is hereby empowered to regulate or control spending in Federal elections. I had a dozen good Republican colleagues—my senior colleague and others—joined as cosponsors way back; this has to be almost 20 years ago. We can't get that, except for the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SPECTER. So the Hollings-Specter amendment was so salutary that the States said, wait a minute, add that the States are hereby empowered to control or regulate spending in Federal elections.

So we added that. We have gotten a majority vote, but we never have gotten the two-thirds necessary. It would pass. I am not worried about it at any next election. It would easily come about.

We relied upon looking at the last five of the six amendments. They passed in an average of 17 months.

Does the distinguished Senator have a question? I am just feeling good about this particular measure.

Mr. REID. If the Senator will yield, I do have a question. I personally am in agreement with the different issues the Senator has raised—campaign finance reform, minimum wage, being able to amend bills. I agree with the Senator in that regard.

However, the Senator from Texas and I have a matter on the floor. I ask the Senator about how much longer he will speak. I know the Senator has a lot of capacity, but if he could give an idea so we could either interrupt at this time or come back at whatever time the Senator indicates.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I suggest the Senator come back because I am just beginning to cover the subjects. We have a luncheon in the next 15 minutes, and I will complete my thoughts.

Mr. REID. The Senator will finish in the next half hour?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes.

Mr. REID. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

What happens if we can get up campaign finance and get an up-or-down vote on Shays-Meehan? I have my doubts about its constitutionality. I have voted several times for McCain-Feingold. I voted against the most revised or limited McCain-Feingold for the simple reason it was similar to half a haircut; it was worse than none at all. It said the parties couldn't take soft money but everyone else could take soft money.

Immediately, my adversary, Tom Donohue at the Chamber of Commerce,

said we had not participated financially sufficiently in campaigns. So I am getting up a kitty of \$5 million. The Chamber of Commerce will get up a kitty of \$5 million and pick some 8 or 10 senatorial races and give them at least \$100,000.

Mind you me, the Chamber of Commerce no longer represents Main Street America, no longer represents the middle-size or small business; rather the international, the transnational, the gone overseas crowd, such as the Farley group that has already transferred 17,000 jobs offshore. It is headquarters to the Cayman Islands. I don't know whether those are foreign contributions. I had better look into that. It strikes me they are talking about the Chinese. I am wondering whether the Chinese have any worse position than the Cayman Islanders to make contributions. I think we ought to call Janet Reno and say here is an example of foreign contributions by the Cayman Island Farley to the campaigns—\$500,000 for George. Poor George W. will never get through the year. They will find these things I am talking about. Poor fellow, he hasn't gotten into the Washington go-round. This crowd will chew anyone up.

See how the logic applies. We are all talking about the Attorney General not doing enough on some antiquated contribution; that happened way back. I am talking about what is being made now in this week's Time magazine, the Cayman Island contributions to poor George W. in Texas, and he probably doesn't even know it—when one runs a mammoth national campaign. We will have to look into that.

We have a special interest bill. We need a vote on Shays-Meehan to find out whether it is constitutional or to make sure, along with it, to constitutionalize Shays-Meehan by coming right along and taking the Hollings-Specter amendment to constitutionalize it.

As I was about to say before examined by my distinguished friend from Nevada, we have found that of the last eight amendments to the Constitution, seven have passed in 17 months' time.

There is no debate, and they all relate to elections. There is no greater cancer on the body politic than the campaign finance practices in this land.

Everybody talks about the amount of money. I would say a word about the amount of time. As a full-time Senator, I am supposed to be giving full time to the problems of the people of South Carolina. But I found myself last year giving full time to my particular problem of staying in office, by going all over the country, trying to collect funds from anybody and everybody who thought I could be a pretty good Senator.

This was the seventh time I have been elected to the Senate. I am still the junior Senator. I am working hard on my way up.

Be that as it may, when I first got elected back 33 years ago, it was a lit-

tle budget, somewhere, I think, around \$400,000 or \$500,000. I had to collect \$5.5 million last year.

In a small State where they are all Republicans, such as Delaware and South Carolina, we have that Dupont crowd. We have them. They are the best of the best. But all my State has gone Republican as did the South: two Republican Senators in Texas, two in Alabama, two in Mississippi, and two in Tennessee. October of last year I was the last remaining statewide Democrat in office except for my friend the comptroller, Earl Morris. He and I were the last two: city councils, mayor, the Governor, the legislature—all Republican. With this recording of every contribution in and every contribution out, there were a lot of Republican friends who wanted to participate. But we put that burden on them. They would have to, literally, explain why they gave that fellow HOLLINGS \$100 or \$1,000, whatever the contribution was.

Rather than become involved—if we want to know what cuts off people have from involvement in the process in America today, it is just this particular requirement. I voted for that requirement. I think it ought to be made public. But it can get bad, and it does, and has gotten bad in my State.

We can correct this. We can constitutionalize whatever is the intent of Congress. You do not have to get that distorted opinion of Buckley v. Valeo for the simple reason that they said money amounted to speech. Those with money had all the speech they wanted, but those who did not have money could get lockjaw. They could just shut up and sit down. "You are not in the swim, Liddy Dole; you are not in the race at all. You can forget about it." The party has already arranged and crowned George W. in Texas, and he has \$50 million to \$60 million. He doesn't need the public money, and everybody thinks that is great.

I think that is not great at all. I think when it has gotten to be that bad, when you have enough money, like Perot, to start a party, and you have enough money to control the party as is being done now on the Republican side, we have to clean this thing up and get back to not being able to buy the office. So I would have campaign finance reform as a very strong amendment and make sure there is no question.

Time magazine thinks it is relevant, but the Senator from Mississippi does not think it is relevant. If he can come out and if he will make the proposal that he does think it is relevant, we can agree on a time agreement on Shays-Meehan, 5 minutes to a side, and vote. Do not come weeping and wailing that, Oh, we have so many things to get done, we have the appropriations' bills, we have this bill, we have that bill, and everything like that. This is not a time-consumption strategy on the part of the Senator from South Carolina. This is to bring to the fore that which has been prevented from

even being debated in this body. The most deliberative body in the history of the world can no longer, under the process, deliberate. You have to walk up to the table and find out how to vote.

I was here with Senator Mansfield. Senator Mansfield would think that demeaning, to put there how a Senator is supposed to vote. Senator Dirksen would absolutely oppose nonsense of that kind. But that is how we all are going. You have to do it this way and get on message. You cannot debate what the public wants debated. You can only debate what the polls show to be debated.

Everybody is running all over the world talking about education because it shows up in the polls. But we only control 7 cents of every education dollar; the 93 cents, that is the State and local responsibility. Bless them, I am a leader on that subject. You name another Senator in this body who has put up a 3 percent sales tax and passed it for public education. You name another one who has come in with a system of technical training that would even equal—much less be better than—ours.

I have worked in the vineyards over the years for education so I do not demean the need for improving the quality of education, namely, doubling the pay of teachers. So you get what you pay for. If we start attracting the best and the brightest, they do not need retraining; they need money. They need to be paid. The average pay, I think, in South Carolina, is around \$27,000 or \$28,000. Maybe it has gone up to \$31,000. Don't hold me to the exact figure. But I know that is relevant. That doesn't pay for the children to go to college. I go to the graduations and they come across the stage. "Senator, I would like to have taught, but I am not able to get into teaching because I cannot save enough money to get my children through school and college. So what do I do? I get into international studies, business course and otherwise."

Mr. President, we have the Kathie Lee sweatshop bill here before us, where 17,000, according to Time Magazine, have gone from Kentucky in the last few years. I have the exact figures. I had a talk the weekend before last to the northern textile industry. The Senator from Delaware had all of his textile people there, Drew Potter and otherwise. I was glad to talk to the northern textile industry people.

I want to make a record of this particular situation because this is how bad it can get, how politics can really take over. I have been the principal sponsor of five textile bills that have passed this Senate, four of them have passed the Senate and the House of Representatives and gone to the President of the United States. One was vetoed by President Carter, two by President Reagan, and one by President Bush. I remember when President Bush implied, in his commitment to the talk in Greenville, that he was for textiles.

When asked how come he vetoed it, he said, "C'est la vie." He not only wants to import the textiles, he wants to import the language. That is how far off we have gotten.

I could not get invited. I tried last year. Here is a fellow who has grown up and held just about every office at the local level: Lieutenant Governor and Governor and Senator elected seven times. But I tried. They have a little lunch or evening meal, I think it is, at the Piedmont Club, these new young executives. I said: You know, I ought to make an appearance there because they have a new group and everything else. I could not get invited. They never could find a time.

I had some old-time leaders say: We will arrange it for you. I could get invited, thanks to Karl Spilhaus and the leadership of the northern textile industry. At least I can get invited now to the northern textile industry, but I could not get invited to my own backyard.

Here, as the cosponsor and voter for the right to work bill, I am out here trying to protect organized labor because—where are they? I heard that Ms. Evelyn Dubrow is finally back in town. She is the best of the best. She just won the Presidential Medal last month. I congratulate her. She has been outstanding over the years. Maybe if I explain this bill long enough, we might be able to pick up some votes.

I see others waiting. I said I would take at least 15 minutes. My good friend from Minnesota, who really held the fort down yesterday, has been trying to get recognized to say a few words. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I see the Senator from Ohio is here. I ask unanimous consent that I follow the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for his courtesy. I say to him and the Senator from California, I plan on speaking probably 12 minutes.

Yesterday, I filed an amendment to H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, which amendment would improve our Nation's ability to retaliate against illegal trade practices by foreign governments. Despite efforts to reduce European trade barriers against American agriculture, despite repeated rulings by international trade bodies that European trade barriers are illegal, there still remains a "fortress Europe" mentality against free and fair trade.

The amendment I have filed is designed to strengthen the one and only allowable weapon in our arsenal against WTO noncompliance, the only weapon we have when a country is found to be in violation of the WTO and repeatedly refuses to comply. The only

weapon we have, the only method of forcing compliance, is tariff retaliation.

The amendment I filed enjoys widespread bipartisan support. In fact, the bill I filed is similar to the amendment and now has 24 sponsors. It is bipartisan.

This amendment has strong backing by our very diverse agricultural community, and this is certainly no surprise. Ask any corn grower or cattle producer or pork producer. They know and understand their well-being depends on expanding our export markets. We have the greatest agriculture in the world. We do it more efficiently and cheaper and better than anyone in the world today. All our farmers say is: Give us a chance to sell; give us a chance to compete. That is what this amendment is about.

It is my hope the Senate, by adopting this amendment, will take a stand for our farmers and ranchers and send a strong signal to the European Union that their gross violations of international trade law simply must stop.

Specifically, the European Union, despite years of efforts to find a fair solution, continues to defy the World Trade Organization's rulings against its ban on U.S. beef imports and its banana import rules. Both cases are important not just for the specific producers and the distributors impacted by these two cases, but it is important for every American business, particularly small businesses, seeking a fair shot at the European market.

To appreciate the magnitude of Europe's current actions against American agriculture, it is important to put it in the context of recent history. Both these specific trade cases took several years to work through the WTO and were undertaken at great expense to the U.S. Government, and the producers in the businesses are at the heart of this dispute.

Here are the essential facts. This is the story.

The E.U. first imposed their ban on U.S. beef with growth hormones in 1985 and officially banned all U.S. beef in 1989. When the United States sought rulings on this ban, either through the WTO or the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade process, the result was the same: The E.U.'s ban was found to be without merit and in violation of international trade rules. That was the ruling repeatedly, time after time. First through the GATT process and then through the WTO, the results were the same.

In other words, the WTO, and before that the GATT, found against the European Union for violating trade laws. However, in spite of these repeated rulings, the E.U. has refused to comply, and to this very day, to this hour, to this minute, they continue to refuse to comply. In spite of these rulings, the E.U. has refused to change its practices. In spite of these rulings, they continue to thumb their nose at the WTO decision.



The real question is whether or not the WTO rulings are enforceable, do they mean anything, and every nation that is a member of the WTO has a vested interest in making sure the rulings are enforceable, they do mean something, and they do matter. That is what this amendment is about.

In the face of noncompliance by the E.U., the United States only has one remedy, and that remedy is tariff retaliation. We have no other way to go. This is prescribed, it is allowed, and it is provided for in the WTO rules. This is the only recourse a country has when another country refuses to comply.

Under current WTO rules, the United States can retaliate against a beef ban by imposing tariffs on European imports at a total amount equal to the amount of financial pain being inflicted on our U.S. beef industry. The WTO determined in this particular case that the E.U. beef ban was inflicting \$116.8 million per year in economic damages to U.S. farmers.

Although the WTO's \$116 million figure is significant, our cattle industry strongly believes this is a very conservative estimate. They believe the actual impact is closer to \$1 billion annually.

Let me talk for a few moments about the other case, the banana case. With bananas, the E.U. imposed import quotas and licenses in the early 1990s. While the United States produces bananas in Hawaii, we also have a significant stake in the distribution and sale of bananas domestically and internationally.

Seven times, the WTO ruled that the European Union's attempts to obstruct U.S. banana distribution violated WTO rules—seven different rulings. The WTO determined that the banana policy of the E.U. is resulting in \$191.4 million worth of economic damage annually to U.S. interests. Again, the impacted U.S. companies believe the actual damage is more than \$1 billion annually. Again, the United States, with regard to bananas, as was the case with beef, has the authority to impose retaliatory tariffs against E.U. products.

Let me recap where we are in the story. With both bananas and beef, the European Union repeatedly has been in violation of the WTO rulings. The European Union has refused, in spite of these rulings, to change its policies.

The WTO procedures provide a waiting period of 15 months for a nation that is found to be in violation of rules to comply. In other words, nothing happens—even as the ruling comes out, nothing happens for 15 months. What happened here in 15 months was nothing, absolutely nothing. The European Union, again, continued for that 15-month period of time not to comply. On the beef and banana cases, we waited these 15 months, and the European Union still didn't comply. So at that point, the United States simply had no choice but to impose tariffs in retaliation—tariffs that are fully allowed under the WTO.

The purpose for allowing the United States to impose tariffs is, of course, to compel compliance with the WTO rulings. It has been 6 months since tariffs on European imports were imposed in response to the banana case, and it has been 3 months since tariffs were imposed in response to the beef ban. So we had the 15-month waiting period. We had some other time that elapsed, and then we had the 6 months and the 3 months in the banana and beef cases. After all this, are the Europeans making any effort to comply with either ruling? We know the answer. The answer is, no, on both counts. They still are not in compliance, and they still give absolutely no indication that they are going to come into compliance.

This is not just about beef. It is very important. It is not just about bananas. It is about whether the WTO is going to mean anything. And it is whether or not the rulings of the WTO are going to mean anything. I think we have to look at the big picture and put this in perspective.

While the European Union, the E.U., continues its fortress mentality and thumbs its nose at the WTO rulings, other WTO member nations finding themselves on the wrong side of a WTO ruling have acted responsibly.

Members of the Senate may ask: Well, what has happened in other cases when other countries have been found to be in noncompliance, to have violated the WTO, and the ruling has come down, and they lost their case and they have lost their appeal? What have they done? The answer is, they have done what you would expect them to do. They have complied.

The United States has lost four separate WTO cases. In each case, after losing, we complied. Canada has lost and they complied. Korea lost and Korea complied. Japan lost and Japan complied. Everybody but the E.U.—all of these countries that lost their cases came into compliance. In fact, every nation found in violation of a WTO ruling has come into compliance—every nation—except for the nations of the European Union.

Retaliation is the only authorized tool to bring a country into compliance with WTO rulings. That is the point of this amendment, to make this authorized retaliation more effective and to get the job done.

What is a nation to do if its current list of imports subject to retaliatory tariffs is not working to move the offender such as the E.U. into compliance? The solution, I believe, is to seek other products to target and at tariff levels that will impose the kind of pain that will cause the European Union to see compliance as the remedy. This is a process known as "carouseling." That is what this amendment is about.

In both the case with bananas and the case with beef, we came forward with a list of products that we were retaliating against and the duties were imposed. Nothing has happened. What our amendment provides—and I will

discuss this in greater detail later when I formally offer this amendment—is that if the first list of items on which we are imposing tariffs to retaliate against the E.U., quite candidly, does not inflict enough pain to get their attention, then we need to carousel or change the list.

The amendment provides that at least one of the items must be changed. It provides that many can be changed, but at least one has to be changed. The whole idea is, if this is the only way we can get their attention, the only remedy we have, the only tool we have, the only stick we have is this type of retaliation, we must make sure it is effective and we must make sure the correct products are being chosen on which to inflict the pain to get the attention of the E.U. That is what this amendment is all about. It is a rather modest amendment, but it is an amendment that we believe will significantly make a difference.

To date, the administration has refused to carousel products in either case. They do have, currently, the authority to do it, although they are not compelled to do it. As long as the E.U. remains unwilling to comply with WTO rulings, it becomes more imperative that the tool of retaliation be used effectively. Our amendment would do that by requiring the United States to change retaliation lists periodically to inflict pressure, pain, on the noncomplying party to comply—in this case, the E.U.

The ramifications of the E.U.'s noncompliance with the entire WTO dispute settlement process is staggering. If the E.U. is successful, if they get away with this, then we can expect them to continue this tactic on other products and other commodities, and the entire WTO process will mean nothing, at least as far as the E.U. is concerned.

The issue today is beef and bananas, but tomorrow it could be grains, apples, peaches, potatoes, perhaps even computers. Who knows? A lot is at stake. We must ensure our retaliation does, in fact, result in compliance. We must ensure that it works.

This amendment would require the carouseling—or the rotating—of products on a list of goods subject to retaliation when a foreign country or countries have failed to comply with a previous WTO ruling. This amendment would help ensure the integrity of the WTO dispute settlement process because it would provide the U.S. Trade Representative with a powerful mechanism to place considerable pressure on noncomplying countries to actually comply.

In conclusion, it is my hope that in the near future, my fellow cosponsors and I will have an opportunity to have a more detailed discussion of this amendment and the issues involved and that the Senate will overwhelmingly approve our amendment.

It is time, frankly, to break down the barriers of fortress Europe in the name of fairness for American farmers.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. And I do thank my colleague from Minnesota for his courtesy.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first of all, let me repeat, in about 2 minutes, what I suggested today about the legislation before us, the several trade bills.

I think while those who argue, with the WTO meeting that is coming up in Seattle, that we might be able to have some enforceable labor provisions and environmental provisions, and, for that matter, think about a fair shake for farmers in this trade regime, now bring to the floor of the Senate some trade agreements where there is no enforceable labor standards whatsoever, no enforceable environmental standards—zero—the message of this legislation to working people in this country is: If you should want to organize and bargain collectively to make a decent wage, those companies are gone. And the message to people in other countries, the Caribbean and African countries, is: The only way you get investors to your country is if you are willing to work for less than 30 cents an hour, or whatever.

This is hardly legislation that leads to the uplifting of living standards of working families in our country, much less poor and working people in other countries.

I am opposed to these trade bills and have had a chance yesterday to lay out my case. And Senator HOLLINGS has spoken today. Others may have spoken, as well.

But what I want to do right now is speak to another issue which I think is almost more important than the legislation before us.

We now have legislation out here, and the "tree" has been filled with amendments, so there is no opportunity whatsoever for those of us who have been saying for a while that we wanted to have an opportunity to offer some amendments, some legislation that we think will make a difference for the people we represent, there is no opportunity for us to be able to do so. That is what is at issue.

If the majority leader, to whom I spoke about this earlier, was serious about trying to get this legislation passed, getting the necessary votes for cloture, then certainly we wouldn't have a piece of legislation on the floor with the tree filled with no opportunity for Senators to offer amendments. The majority leader wants to argue they have to be relevant amendments. Who gets to define relevant? One wonders whether or not, if we had amendments to have enforceable labor standards, that would be viewed as relevant.

For me, it has been, now, about 6 weeks. This is why I deferred to the Senator from Ohio. First of all, he was on the floor first and I didn't want to

precede his speaking. Secondly, I want to take a little bit of time. I think probably I will wait for a more timely time to take more time because one way or the other I am going to force a vote on some agricultural initiatives. The Chair and others can vote for or against it, but I have, for the last 6, 7 weeks, asked the majority leader, when will I have an opportunity to offer legislation I think will fix not all that is wrong but at least could make a positive difference? Other Senators can disagree. But we take responsibility for what we do, and we vote one way or the other. We debate one way or the other, and then we are held accountable.

The exchange I had with the majority leader today about this has been going on for quite some time. The majority leader said he was pretty sure if I introduced an amendment, he probably would be opposed to it. That is fine. I think the more important point, which is what I tried to explain—I don't choose to debate the majority leader; he is not here—is that nobody in the Senate, Democrat or Republican, should be under the illusion, because we passed a financial assistance package, emergency package, that we have, in fact, dealt with the price crisis. I don't know of any producers who feel good about this bailout legislation every year. People are sick of it. They want us to get to the root of the problem.

They don't think the farm policy is working. I don't think it is working. I don't even choose to point the finger. I thought Freedom to Farm was "freedom to fail." I never liked it. I thought it was a big mistake. I thought it was great for the packers and the grain companies. I didn't think it was good for family farmers. Others take a different position.

It seems to me the point is, looking forward not backward, whether or not we are willing to talk about some modification, some adjustment, some changes. If Senators don't think taking the cap off the loan rate makes sense, then what else? If Senators don't think a moratorium on these mergers and acquisitions, which is what I will talk about today—that is the amendment I wanted to introduce to this legislation, which the majority leader shut me out from doing right now—makes sense, then perhaps Senators will have other proposals.

In farm country in Minnesota—maybe it isn't that way in Montana—almost everybody I know thinks there is a correlation between monopoly power, the power of a few companies that muscled their way to the dinner table and have control, and their low prices. The farm retail spread grows wider and wider, a lot of our producers face extinction, and the packers are in hog heaven. IBP makes record profits, and pork producers are going under.

I thought I could introduce this amendment today, which I will explain.

Mr. President, I came to the floor probably for the sixth or seventh time

today to ask the majority leader when I would have an opportunity to submit an amendment to introduce legislation that I believe will speak at least in part to the economic convulsion that is taking place in agriculture. We have too many family farms that are going under the auctioneer's hammer. There are too many of our producers who are being driven off the land.

If I had to pick one "issue" that means the most to me right now just in terms of the emotion of it, it would be what is happening to our producers. What is happening to our producers is they are being driven off the land. This is not only where they work. It is where they live. I think it is all quite unnecessary. I think if we were willing to change some of the policies, this wouldn't be happening.

I am determined one way or another to force the Senate to vote up or down on several initiatives that I believe would make a difference. If there are other Senators who have a better idea than having a moratorium on these mergers and acquisitions that are leading to more monopoly power by these conglomerates and driving farmers off the land, or have a better idea of taking the cap off the loan rate, or creating a farmer loan reserve, or extending the payment period on the loan rate so that farmers have some leverage vis-a-vis these huge conglomerates, then come out on the floor of the Senate with your ideas. If there are Senators who believe we should leave in the next week or two without taking any action whatsoever to deal with the price crisis, to deal with what is really going on in agriculture, then come on out and make the argument.

I appreciate the exchange with the majority leader. But, to tell you the truth, I think what is going on in the countryside doesn't have much to do with whether or not the majority leader says something that is fairly clever, or I say something that is fairly clever, or we have a kind of back and forth discussion. That is fine. Each of us is saying what we believe. Each of us is representing what we think is right.

The only thing I know is that October 25, 1999, at the Bird Island Elevator in Renville County, wheat was \$2.89 a bushel; corn was \$1.43 a bushel; soybeans were \$4.04 a bushel; and this is way below the cost of production. These farmers can work 19 hours a day, be the best managers in the world, and they are still going to go under.

If U.S. Senators want to come out on the floor and amend the "freedom to fail" bill, feel free to do so. But let's have the debate. More importantly, let's all come out here with some legislation, some change in policy, that will make a difference so we don't lose a whole generation of family farmers.

In Minnesota, farm income has decreased 43 percent since 1966, and more than 25 percent of the remaining farmers may not be able to cover expenses, or won't be able to cover expenses in 1999.

That is why I take it so personally when I am essentially told again: We are going to shut you out. We are going to bring this legislation to the floor. We are going to fill up the tree, and we are going to make sure, Senator WELLSTONE, that you can't come out here with an amendment, or with legislation that you think would help farmers in your State.

I hope my colleagues will vote against cloture, whether or not they are for this trade legislation, just because of the way business is being conducted in the Senate. The way business should be conducted in the Senate is that when we have a piece of legislation, Senators must be able to come out with amendments they believe are an important part of their work to represent people in their State. If other Senators don't agree, they can come out and disagree. If other Senators want to come out and say you have no business bringing legislation to the floor of the Senate that deals with agriculture because we are on a trade bill, then I would ask you: When have I had the opportunity over the last several months or for the last year? The majority leader alluded to some of my colleagues who think that because we passed the financial assistance package we have dealt with the problem. Spend one second in Minnesota, come on out to northwest Minnesota, or west central Minnesota, or southwest Minnesota, or southeast Minnesota, and meet with some of our producers. Look in their faces and see grown men and women break down and cry. Why don't you come out to do that? Since, again, we are not going to take any action—this legislation is now filled up with amendments—people in greater Minnesota don't know and have any idea what "fill up a tree" means. It means, once again, we can't come out here and fight for the people in our State.

DEAR FARM AID: My husband and two of our sons live on the farm in Missouri. My husband has loved the farm ever since he was a little boy. It would just kill him if he loses it. And in fact it might just kill him. I am so very concerned. We have been farming several years, and we have gone in and out of bankruptcy. That is why we cannot get financing to save our farm.

I will make a long story short. I am not used to this. We have no place to go. Our farm may be sold at the end of September on the courthouse steps. Many lives will be affected. I am really worried about what will happen if we can't hold onto our farm. We have worked our entire lives and made many improvements to the farm. I do not know how you can help. You cannot give farmers a price for what they sell, but anything you can do would be appreciated. The banks are demanding \$200,000 from us. Time is very critical. If you can save our family farm, we will be forever grateful. You may even save one's life.

Actually, we can do something about the price. When we talk about taking the cap off the loan rate, we are saying to farmers, get more leverage in the marketplace to get a better price. When we talk about farmer on reserve, we are talking about farmers being

able to withhold their grain until they get a decent price. When we are talking about the need to take antitrust action and a moratorium on the acquisitions and mergers, we are simply saying to our livestock producers when there is less concentration of power, there is a much better chance of getting a decent price.

When a farmer is at an auction and there are three buyers for what is being sold, one does not get a very good price.

DEAR FARM AID: We are at our wit's end. This farm has been in our family since 1908. We are one of the only original homestead families still surviving. We fought off foreclosure three times since the 1980s. We have four children and we don't live a fancy lifestyle. We built a new home 6 years ago. Or rather we tried to build a home 6 years ago. We still hope to have siding on the house one day. We got running water 3 years ago, and fortunately we have electricity. We were able to purchase a window for the house in 1997, and some day the house will have flooring and sheet rock. This is our only luxury. We don't have any retirement, life insurance or health insurance.

I repeat: We don't have any retirement, life insurance or health insurance.

Our farm has been listed for sale 5 times but so have all our neighbors' farms. There is not employment in this area and the nearest city is 78 miles from us [Montana farm.] Yet we do not want to leave. We owe the bank \$39,000 currently and we know they will not release any income for our land payment that is due this January. Therefore, we face foreclosure in 2000. We don't know which way to jump. Should we declare bankruptcy? We cannot afford a lawyer. We don't even have money for groceries. We are not ignorant and we are not bad farmers. We cannot compete against the large companies. Last year we couldn't even sell our grain and it had to go under the CCC loan. We delivered the grain for loan repayment but it didn't bring enough to cover the CCC loan and we owe an additional \$1,765 on that, as well. What can we do? Should we concede defeat and lose our legacy? Our son would have been the 6th generation to work this land. Where will he go? We can no longer qualify for conventional loans. What's next? What do we do? We are so scared. In 1 year we can lose what has taken 92 years to build. We have tightened our belts as far as we can. We live on less than \$3,000 a year.

Senators, are you listening to that?

Please tell us what we should do. We live on less than \$3,000 a year. Please tell us what we should do.

What we should do, come early February when we come back in session, before spring planting season, is have 10,000 farmers and rural people coming to the Capitol and rocking the Capitol. That is what we need to do. We need to have farmers, rural people, the religious community, labor and supporters coming right here—people are not going to come by jet because they don't have the money—buses of people coming from the Midwest, the South, and other agricultural States, joined by allies, have face-to-face meetings in every Senator's office, every Representative's office, be he or she a Democrat or a Republican. That is what we are going to need to do.

It is clear to me with a week to go we are not going to take this action. I can't even get an up-or-down vote on one amendment. I can't even get an up-or-down vote. I can't even get a debate. On this piece of legislation, the tree is filled. No amendments can be introduced.

But today won't be the day because the Senate right now is waiting until the cloture vote on Friday. The first opportunity I get to get the floor when we do need to do a lot of business, I will be out here talking for hours about agriculture—for hours.

A Kansas farmer's daughter:

My father is a farmer and the bank is foreclosing on his farm. Due to circumstances beyond his control he has been unable to make his mortgage payments. He was able to forestall the sale scheduled for June 9, 1999. I don't know how much longer he can put them off. He has been farming since he got out of the army in 1945. He is 77 years old and he is still trying to make a living. He has no life insurance and I am fearful that his health will not hold out. Is there any help for him? What can be done to help him maintain his farm?

All appeals have fallen on deaf ears.

Including the deaf ears of the Senate.

At this moment, I hold the majority party accountable for not enabling us to come to the floor with amendments to try to change the situation for the better.

All appeals have fallen on deaf ears. This farm has been in our family since the 1800s. We don't want to lose it. But it seems one way or the other my father's life will be taken. Either the stress and his health will kill him, or losing the farm will kill him. Please help.

I am going to repeat that so often on the floor of the Senate. We debate statistics. It is all abstractions. It is all party strategy. Several hours ago when I came out ready to go with this good bill to impose a moratorium on large agribusiness mergers and establish a commission to review large agricultural mergers and the concentration of market power with Senator DORGAN, the majority leader came out and through several motions filled up the tree.

That is what we are talking about—filling up the tree. Don't let Senators have any amendments. Then I heard the majority leader say: We certainly don't want to have something dealing with agriculture.

It seems one way or the other my father's life will be taken. Either the stress and his health will kill him or losing the farm will kill him. Please help.

I guess this woman in Kansas isn't going to get any help today from the Senate. Won't get any help tomorrow. Since the majority leader has filled up the tree, there is not opportunity for any amendments at all, no opportunity to bring legislation to the floor to try to make a difference. No opportunity.

Please help.

I am going to read this again quickly because several other colleagues have come to the floor. This woman is talking about her dad. He is a World War II

vet. He is 77 years old. He is trying to make it on the farm. She says:

What can be done to help him maintain his farm?

With these record low prices and record low income.

All appeals have fallen on deaf ears. This farm has been in our family since the 1800s. We don't want to lose it but it seems one way or the other my father's life will be taken. Either the stress and his health will kill him or losing the farm will kill him. Please help.

There is no help from the Senate today because the majority leader has filled up the tree and I don't have the right to come to the floor with an amendment to try to help this woman, this farmer or other farmers in our country. When are we going to do something about agriculture? Are we sleepwalking through history? I see my colleague, Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa. He knows what is going on in the countryside. I know he knows. But I just believe the Senate does not. We are going to go with the current policy? Do Senators not believe that we need to make perhaps some modification, maybe some adjustments when farmers are getting prices way below the cost of production? When the men and women who produce the food and fiber for our country cannot even make a decent living, do we think we should not be doing anything about this?

Iowa farmer:

I am a hog farmer and as you know times are tough. I want to make some changes in my farm business that would necessitate an off farm job. I do not have much choice. I have to get an off farm job, or I will have no farm. I'm 54 years old, I'm healthy, and I have a BA in history. When I go to the employment agencies, I feel like the counselors do not know how to help me. The only jobs out in my area are low paying factory or sales jobs. Do you have any suggestions? I feel that time is running out.

I hear that so often. I hear that so often from farmers. They say, "I feel like time is running out."

That is the way I feel, as a Senator from the State of Minnesota. I feel that time is running out. I feel that time is not neutral. I feel if we stand still and we do not pass any legislation that will make a difference and we do not change this failed farm policy, a whole generation of producers are going to be wiped out in my State of Minnesota. The majority leader fills up the tree, denying me and denying other Senators an opportunity to come out here with legislation we think would help people in our States.

By the way, I am pleased to debate this with any Senator, the majority leader and others.

An Illinois farmer wife:

DEAR FARM AID: My mother and father-in-law saved and borrowed enough money in 1945 to buy an 80-acre farm in Illinois. They farmed with horses, milked cows, raised hogs in the Timber Creek Bed and raised 12 children. My husband now has had the farm turned over to him since his parents have passed away and his sister was killed in a car accident 2 years ago. My husband is, has always been, a very hard worker.

Boy, I tell you, this sounds like my mother, Mensha Daneshevsky. If she really liked somebody, this was her ultimate compliment. She would say, "He's a hard worker" or "She's a hard worker." My mother is no longer alive. I tell you, family farmers in Minnesota and around the country are hard workers.

We both work at jobs full-time, our other jobs outside the farm. We were both raised on a farm and we both love to farm. We cash rent three other farms close by to get along, but we are still having an awful time. The prices are so low that we just cannot seem to make ends meet.

That is the point. I cannot believe it when Senators come out here on the floor, or at least one Senator today, and talk about this emergency financial crisis bill we passed, this disaster relief bill we passed, as if this is a response. It does not have anything to do with low prices.

All that money we have been spending, more than we ever spent before in the "freedom to fail" bill, is only enabling people to live to farm another day. There will be no "other day" for these farmers until we deal with the price crisis. I am told by this majority party that I cannot bring an amendment to the floor to try to enable this family to make a living?

Prices are so low that we cannot seem to make ends meet. If it wasn't for our jobs in town we would have lost everything my husband's parents worked so hard for. We are doing all we can, but we just cannot get out of debt. In fact, we are going deeper and deeper into debt every year. My husband and I have shed many tears and had many sleepless nights trying to figure out just what to do to save our family farm. We do not want to lose it. Do you have any help for us or anything else that we can do? We lost over \$20,000 this year. It breaks my heart to see my husband work so hard and get so tired of working two jobs and still not making it. Please help us. If we could just get a break, even on this year, things would be easier. Thank you for listening and I hope you will be able to help my husband save his deeply loved family farm.

I have hours of stories, especially from Minnesota farmers. I am going to pick the right time on the floor of the Senate to go through all of that, especially when the Senate most needs to do business.

But this is what I hear over and over and over again. "Thank you for listening and I hope you will be able to help my husband and save our farm."

The answer is: I can't. I can't. I can't help save family farmers in my State or in other States because the Senate, and in particular—I don't usually come out on the floor and do this, but I am doing it today—the majority party which filled up this legislation with amendments has turned its back on agriculture. I heard today we do not want to deal with agriculture.

When are we going to deal with agriculture? Exactly how much longer do you think these people have? How many farmers do we want to see driven off the land? How much more pain do we want to see? How many more fami-

lies do we want to see shattered before we do something?

This is about the angriest I have ever been since I have been on the floor of the Senate because I was ready to do this amendment. I say this to my colleague from Iowa, who is a good friend, he has nothing to do with anything I am talking about. But I was ready to have a debate. I was ready to bring out this amendment. I was going to say I think we ought to have a moratorium on these acquisitions and mergers because they are taking place at such a breathtaking pace, and I think what is happening is we are moving to monopoly and our family farmers cannot get a break. Let's have a study of this and let's put a moratorium on it for 18 months.

I tried. I have an amendment that is I don't know how many pages. It is well thought out. My colleague from Iowa could agree or disagree. We even had some discussion. He raised some questions I thought were important questions. But as long as we have legislation out here with the tree filled and no opportunity to do the amendment, there is just no opportunity to do it.

I would not be out here today saying this, but this is the sixth or seventh time. For the last several months, I have been saying: When do we have the opportunity to have this debate? It is hard to go home and meet with people and know people are hoping for some change and know this disaster package we passed does not do anything but enable people to survive. But then what about next year and next year? People want to know: Do I have a future? Do my children have a future? What is going to be done?

Basically, what we get out here today on the floor of the Senate is a parliamentary maneuver which basically denies any Senator from coming out here with amendments.

Therefore, I do not know what is going to happen, but I certainly hope my colleagues will vote against cloture. Then, of course, it becomes a game again. Then the President, who wants this legislation, will not get the legislation. Then some people can say that is good; we don't care one way or the other anyway. Or people can point the finger and some people can say: Those who voted against cloture, they are the ones who killed it, and many of them were Democrats.

It goes on and on and on, this grand political strategy.

Look, I don't support this legislation. I was out on the floor the other day stating my reasons why. But, frankly, I think there is a larger question. That has to do with whether or not we are going to have debate on issues that are important to the lives of people in our country and whether we are going to have the opportunity to represent and fight for people in our States. Today certainly is not such a day.

I have at least a 2-hour historical analysis, but not today—I got the attention of my friend from Iowa—at

least a 2-hour historical analysis of concentration in the food industry. I will go back to the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and some of the work of Estes Kefauver. I will talk about the Farmers Alliance, the populist movement, the gilded age, Teddy Roosevelt, and what we should be doing. As a matter of fact, tomorrow I have the opportunity to testify about Viacom buying up CBS. It is pretty incredible. There we have concentration in the media, telecommunications, which deals with the flow of information in a representative democracy. I think food is a pretty precious commodity.

I will summarize what this amendment would have done, if adopted.

This amendment represents comprehensive legislation. I would have offered this with Senator DORGAN—he would be out here, Senator HARKIN would be out here, and other Senators would be out here—to deal with the problem of market concentration in agriculture. Anybody who does not think we do not have a problem of market concentration in agriculture just does not know what is going on in the countryside. If anything, we are looking to put free enterprise back into the food industry.

Given this concentration, given the mergers, given the anticompetitive practices, and given the failure of our antitrust authorities to remedy the situation, we need to do something.

A moratorium on these large agribusiness mergers is something the Congress can do right now. This would apply to mergers and acquisitions among firms that do at least \$10 million of business annually. It would apply to mergers and acquisitions that, under current law, must already be filed with the Justice Department and FTC; namely, the mergers and acquisitions in which one party has net revenue or assets over \$100 million and the second party more than \$10 million. The moratorium would last 18 months or until the Congress enacted comprehensive legislation to address the problem of concentration in agriculture, whichever occurred first. We also would set up an agriculture antitrust review commission to study the nature and consequences of concentration in the agricultural sector.

We have a long history in our country, a glorious history, of ordinary people who have been willing to take on concentrations of wealth, of economic power, and of political power that are unhealthy for democracy. They were some of our greatest leaders: Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson; think about the New Deal, the Progressive era, Teddy Roosevelt, and the People's Party of the late 1800s.

The populist platform of 1892 at the nominating convention in Omaha declared:

The fruits of the toil of millions are boldly stolen to build up colossal fortunes for a few unprecedented in the history of mankind.

The People's Party founder, Tom Watson, thundered:

The People's Party is the protest of the plundered against the plunderers.

The late 1800s and the early 1900s is the way it seems to me in this country now. I keep referring to my colleague from Iowa because he is a friend. I do not know what his experience is, but when I speak, for example, to pork producers—there may be several hundred there—it seems as if I am in the late 1800s when the deck was stacked against producers. It really does. They work hard. There are just a few packers who pretty much control everything. The producers do not understand why they cannot even make a living and IBP is making millions.

Come on, what is going on? Where is the competition? Let's give our producers a fair shot, a fair shake. That is all they are asking. I have not met anyone in the countryside—and this transcends all party differences—who does not believe there is some correlation between the concentration of power and the low prices they receive.

Everybody thinks this is a problem, and we are sitting on our thumbs. I am told today by the majority leader, in filling up the tree: We don't want these amendments such as agriculture; that is unrelated; that is not relevant.

An amendment on agriculture is relevant to me. It is relevant to Minnesota. It is relevant to family farmers in the Midwest. It is relevant to rural America. If I cannot meet the majority leader's definition of relevant, then I will just have to come to the floor whenever I can and take as many hours as I can to talk about what is relevant.

There is nothing more relevant to me right now than the pain and agony of family farmers in my State of Minnesota, and there is nothing more urgent, from my point of view, than for me to try, even if I lose—I may very well. Cargill, IBP, ConAgra, and Monsanto have a fair amount of clout, but I think it is worth trying to take them on. I really do. At least I am going to try to fight for it, and at least I am going to try to continue to force this question in the Senate. If I cannot get an up-or-down vote and keep getting blocked, then I will just have to figure out ways to block the Senate as we try to do our business because to me this is the relevant question.

What is relevant to me is that on the present course, we lose a generation of producers. We can change the course. We can change some of our policy. We can make some modifications. We can make some adjustments. We can get the price up. We can give our producers some protection against these monopolies. We can do something that will make much more sense on trade policy, and we can make a difference.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on the Africa trade bill, which is now before the Senate, we are in a parliamentary position in which all the amendments offered have been offered by the

Republican side. Such a position had to be taken by the majority leader because of failures to get time agreements and commitments from the other side, meaning the Democrat side, on a limitation on amendments and time agreements on those amendments so we could bring this bill to a vote.

I hope our Democrat friends will heed the necessity of this legislation from President Clinton's State of the Union Address that this was one of the most important goals of his administration. Since the Republican majority in the Congress is often criticized by the President for not working closely with the President—and I think those charges by the President of the United States are overblown most times, but those charges are still made. So in the present environment in which one of the President's prime pieces of legislation is before the Senate, with a determination by our majority leader to help get this part of the President's program into law, I would think the Democrat minority would be embarrassed that they are taking actions that make it difficult to get one of the President's programs through this Congress for the President's signature.

I hope, as one Senator—not speaking for the majority leader, just speaking for myself—they will reach agreement on these very important amendments so we can bring this bill to finality and get it sent to the President, not because it is one of the President's major goals, not that it shows the President's charges against the Republican majority are many times unfounded, not for any of those reasons, as legitimate as that might be, but because the substance of this legislation is very important for the economy of the United States and the economy of the countries that it applies to—because free trade strengthens economies, free and fair trade creates jobs, not only in the United States, but also economies that practice free trade anywhere around the world are stronger economies because of it. That is the goal we seek in this legislation.

We have heard we have a lot to fear from free trade. In the last few months, we have heard from many quarters that free trade is harmful because it destroys jobs. We have heard free trade is not fair trade because it causes investments to shift overseas. We have heard that the Africa trade bill will do both of these things, as well as cause illegal transshipment that we cannot do anything about.

When you look at the facts, none of these three arguments that are used against this piece of legislation has any merit. First, let's look at the claim that free trade destroys jobs. The 50-year history of the multilateral trade negotiations, first under the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade, and now under the World Trade Organization, called WTO for short, shows the enormous positive effect on the world economy of liberalizing trade by reducing tariffs and getting rid of nontariff trade barriers.

We have had eight series, or rounds as they are called, of multilateral trade negotiations since GATT first started in 1947. We are about to launch a new round, the ninth one, at the WTO Ministerial Conference in Seattle in about 5 weeks.

During the first round, the Geneva Round it was called, in 1947, we negotiated 45,000 tariff concessions affecting one-fifth of world trade.

In the sixth round, which was called the Kennedy Round, we slashed custom duties on average of 35 percent.

During the last round, the Uruguay Round, starting in the middle 1980s, ending in 1993, we reduced or eliminated many nontariff trade barriers.

The results of this trade liberalization have been nothing short of astounding—creating jobs, expanding the world economic pie, creating better economies in various countries around the world, enhancing political opportunities and, most importantly, political stability. The expansion of free trade that has followed this 50-year period of trade liberalization has spurred one of the greatest bursts of wealth creation the world has ever seen.

In 1947, when we started postwar trade liberalization, the total value of world exports was about \$50 billion. Today, the total value of world exports is \$7 trillion, more than 3½ times the total budget of the United States.

Free trade has enriched every American family. According to the President's own 1998 economic report, the added economic benefit to each American through expanded trade is \$1,000 per year or \$4,000 per year for a family of four, as we measure families in America. This is equivalent to an annual \$4,000 per family tax cut. Where can one get a \$4,000 tax cut these days? Even the tax cuts now being debated in the Congress do not come anywhere close to this amount of money to enhance family income and disposable income.

The facts that show the benefits of free trade seem to be so compelling that in explaining them, I don't know where to begin.

Let me mention a recent example that comes from NAFTA. According to a September 1998 report published by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, approximately 191,000 jobs were certified, between January 1, 1949, and August 12, 1998, as potentially suffering NAFTA-related loss—affecting 191,000 workers. That is on the negative side. We have always said that free trade will cause some job dislocation. That is why we have programs such as trade adjustment assistance—to ease the transition that is sometimes necessary when we have open markets.

On the positive side, there has been much more gain. Let's go back to that Congressional Research Service study I cited. The number, 191,000 workers affected negatively by NAFTA over 4 years, represents less than the number of jobs created in any single month in

1997. In contrast, then, on the positive side, more than 1 million new jobs were created from new exports to Mexico and Canada after NAFTA was enacted into law—more than 1 million new jobs.

Next let's look at the claim that is made by opponents of this legislation or free trade generally that it causes investment to shift overseas. That claim, too, has little or no merit. Section 512 of the NAFTA Implementation Act required the President to provide a comprehensive assessment of the operation and effects of NAFTA to Congress. The President's report shows that the amount of new United States investment in Mexico is very low. Again, the specific facts are compelling. In 1997, direct United States investment in Mexico was \$5.9 billion compared to United States domestic investment in plant and equipment of \$864.9 billion. In other words, United States investment in Mexico was less than 1 percent of all United States domestic investment in plant and equipment in 1997. So much for that giant sucking sound we were supposed to have heard continuously from south of our border.

Free trade has been so good for our economy. If all these predictions about economic disaster haven't come true when we have liberalized trade in the past, it is clear we shouldn't fear tearing down barriers around the world, as we have for the last 50 years with the good results we have for the 50 years, without the expectation that those beneficial impacts would continue. We should, then, embrace such an opportunity.

Let me get specifically to the Africa trade bill. The fear that the Africa trade bill will cause a huge influx of illegal textile transshipments from Asia, as has been stated on the floor of the Senate, just is not true. I cite the International Trade Commission study, our own Government. It looked at the transshipment issue. Here is what our International Trade Commission found:

Assuming we will get illegal transshipments in a worst case scenario, the ITC study shows that U.S. apparel shipments would drop by one-tenth of 1 percent and result in the loss of less than 700 jobs. Again, to put this number in perspective, the U.S. economy has created about 200,000 jobs each month this year.

Remember, the ITC study guessimate of 700 jobs is based on a worst case scenario. It is highly unlikely, then, that sub-Saharan Africa will see this level of export growth in the near term. They don't have the infrastructure. They don't have the trained workforce. They don't have good transportation. And the Africa bill has strong anti-transshipment provisions.

One might say, then, why the big deal about the Africa trade bill? Because trade is better than foreign aid and because, when you want to build up the economies of the developing nations, you start someplace. This is how

we can best help them to help themselves.

Participating countries will have to commit to full cooperation with the United States to address and take any necessary action to prevent transshipment. The spirit of this legislation is that there not be transshipment. In addition, the U.S. Customs Service has effective procedures to thwart illegal transshipments, as Customs jump teams have proven to be successful in doing in both Hong Kong and Macao. And there are many other provisions aimed at preventing transshipments. So free trade works. Free trade creates jobs and prosperity in the United States, adding \$4,000 every year in economic benefits to each American family at home. Free trade keeps the peace by building interdependence among nations, and by bringing political stability to nations that heretofore have relied upon dictators and relied upon a government-controlled economy. Finally, free trade will help Africa break the shackles of poverty by bringing economic freedom to the most economically unfree and also the poorest regions in the world. So I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment, No. 2335, be temporarily laid aside in order for Senator REID of Nevada to offer an amendment. I further ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of that amendment, amendment No. 2335 become the pending business.

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2336

(Purpose: To amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 with respect to export controls on high performance computers)

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2336.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

#### SEC. . ADJUSTMENT OF COMPOSITE THEORETICAL PERFORMANCE LEVELS OF HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTERS.

Section 1211(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (50 U.S.C. App. 2404 note) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking "180" and inserting "30"; and

(2) by adding at the end, the following new sentence: "The 30-day reporting requirement shall apply to any changes to the composite theoretical performance level for purposes of subsection (a) proposed by the President on or after June 1, 1999."



Mr. REID. Mr. President, I was born and raised on the southern tip of the State of Nevada, in a little mining town called Searchlight. When I grew up, there wasn't a single telephone anyplace in the town. No one had a telephone. In the home I was raised in, there was no hot water. We had no indoor toilets; they were outdoor toilets. It was primitive—well, I would not say primitive, but we weren't very modern there. That is the way it was with a lot of people in rural Nevada at that time.

Today, it is hard for me to comprehend what has taken place in the advancement of science. I can go home at night and see if I have received any e-mail on my computer. It is easy to do. I open my computer and it says, "You've got mail." I open that up and find out who has contacted me by e-mail, and it is like magic. I press a button and I can reply to that person as quickly as I can type that message out. That message is sent quicker, of course, than the speed of light. It is gone. It is amazing. I can check to find out the weather on my computer. I can communicate and buy a CD, or anything else I want, on my computer. I can't imagine how that can happen, but it happens.

I rise today in total awe of what is happening in science and technology in America. The amendment I have offered is an amendment that is critical to maintaining our Nation's lead in the high-tech sector. Specifically, this amendment is crucial to the computer industry, the industry that allows me to communicate, for example, with all five of my children. It is easy to do. It is easier to do than seeing if they are home by virtue of a telephone. It is easier to do because it is very convenient. They can send me a message when I want a message sent. I can send them a message when I have the time. I can have a good time with my children over the Internet. I sent one of my boys, who is the athlete of the family, an e-mail last weekend saying that I think the Redskins are going to do well if they get a new coach. He was an athlete at the University of Virginia. It is the first time I can remember that the University of Virginia soccer team has not been ranked in the top 10; they are in the top 20. I suggested to my son that it might not be a bad idea to get a new coach for the soccer team at Virginia.

This is done so quickly. He will communicate back to me when he has the time. I am in total awe of what is going on in the high-tech sector.

This amendment relates to an issue I have been interested in for quite a long time and, in particular, have done a lot of work on this session with some of my colleagues. What I am concerned about is bipartisanship. For once in this legislative session, we are doing something that is bipartisan. I have to say it appears the underlying bill is generally bipartisan, even though some disagree with it.

I want to talk about the U.S. computer industry. According to an article

in *Computers Today*, one of the many computer trade journals, dated July of last year, American computer technology has led the world since the first commercial electronic computer was employed at the University of Pennsylvania in 1946. The advancements that have been made are unbelievable. I can remember, before I came back to Washington, going to the Clark County Courthouse and being shown around by the person who was in charge of the computers for the county. It was a whole floor of that large building. Of course, it had to be really cold because computers needed constant cool temperatures. Well, today, what was done on the whole floor of that Clark County Courthouse can be done on a computer the size of a briefcase.

The industry is constantly changing with new companies and new products emerging every day. A statistic I find fascinating is that more than 75 percent of the revenues of computer companies comes from products that didn't exist 2 years ago. That statistic shows they will continue to grow and change rapidly.

Through research and development that is largely due to another issue I have strongly favored, the research and development tax credit—and I think it should be permanent—the computer industry has been able to remain competitive for these many years. The challenge we now face is a challenge that, frankly, we haven't lived up to in the past as a Congress, and that is to allow our export control policies to change with the times and not to overly restrict our Nation's computer companies.

In the free enterprise system, entrepreneurs have never been so in charge of what is going on than in the computer industry. They have led this Nation forward economically. We have to give them the freedom that they can continue, in this free enterprise system, to sell the product. We need to stop trying to control technology by politics. We have to start controlling technology by allowing the businesses to go forward. The technology we are regulating, computers with performance levels of 2,000 to 7,000 millions of theoretical operations per second, or MTOPS, is readily available from many foreign companies. Companies from countries such as China and other tier III countries are moving into this field rapidly.

Not too long ago, I secured funding through Congress for a supercomputer at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas. We were so proud of that computer. It required its own room. It is now about as powerful as my laptop computer. The supercomputer is no longer the same supercomputer it was then, in 1988 or 1989, when it came to UNLV. That is exactly, though, the kind of computers we are still regulating politically.

Computers that are now considered supercomputers operate more than 1 million MTOPS, or about 500 times the

current level of regulation. Last month, Apple began producing a computer that exceeds the current threshold and, as a result, Apple is unable to sell its new G4 computer systems in over 50 countries.

The bottom line is that by placing artificially low limits on the level of technology that can be exported, we may be denying market realities and could very quickly cripple America's global competitiveness for this vital industry. If Congress doesn't act quickly, we will substantially disadvantage American companies in an extremely competitive global market.

On July 23, 1999, at my urging, and the urging of some of my colleagues, the President proposed changes to the U.S. export controls on high-performance computers. Since that announcement, the President's proposal has been floating around Congress for a mandated review period of 180 days, or 6 months. When the President made his proposal, the new levels would have been sufficient; however, we are still regulating under the old levels, and therefore hindering companies such as Apple from competing in tier III countries with other foreign companies.

The amendment I am offering simply reduces the congressional review period from 180 days to 30 days to complement the administration's easing export restrictions by amending the National Defense Authorization Act of 1998.

I would like to share an example of how outdated today's restrictions are. I was at a meeting recently where Michael Dell, President of Dell Computers, stood up and pulled from his hip holster a little pager. Under current export controls, this little pager, normally smaller than a computer mouse, can't be exported to tier III countries because it is considered a supercomputer. That is wrong.

I am going to withdraw my amendment. I am going to do it because I have had conversations with the chairman of the Banking Committee. I fortuitously was able to have lunch with the ranking member of the Banking Committee, and I met also with Senator ENZI, who has worked very hard on this issue, and also Senator JOHNSON, who has worked very hard on this issue. They indicated they are very impressed with the need to change this time period. They want to do it under the Export Administration Act. I, frankly, have been convinced by them that their intentions are well considered. They have thought this out over a long period of time. I want to work with them and the majority leader and the minority leader to do whatever we can to, this year, move the Export Administration Act. It is vitally important that we do that.

We need to allow the entrepreneurs in America who have made this economy the vibrant, untiring economy that it is the freedom to sell their products because if we don't allow them to have that freedom to sell their

products, other foreign companies, some of which will be actually Americans moving over and setting up foreign companies, will be selling products that we should be selling with American-manufactured goods.

I am going to withdraw my amendment with the notice that I am going to work very hard with my friend, the chairman of the Banking Committee and the members of the Banking Committee to do whatever we can to move this very important piece of legislation. It is more than just my amendment. What the Banking Committee wants to move is more important than my amendment. I am concerned about the material that I have in this amendment. I think this is very important.

I look forward to working with the chairman of the Banking Committee and the other members of the Banking Committee to see what we can do to move the Export Administration Act in this Congress. With all the turmoil we have had in recent months with the partisanship, I believe we need to move this legislation in a bipartisan fashion. It can be done. We need to show the business community of America that we can move forward.

It is vitally important to everyone. The people who buy these products don't look to see who manufactures them, whether they are Democrats or Republicans. The people who work putting these computers together, no one knows whether they are Democrats or Republicans. But everyone knows when we have a good economy that we, the Congress, should get some consideration in a positive fashion for that. If something goes wrong, we deserve the blame. I think with things going so well we have to do everything we can to make sure the economy continues to move forward.

I am going to do what I can to help this piece of legislation that we hope will come up as early as this week or next week and have it passed in this Congress and not next Congress. I mean this year of this Congress and not some subsequent year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank our colleague from Nevada for his amendment and for withdrawing it, and for joining our effort to try to pass the Export Administration Act.

As some of our colleagues will be aware, there have been 11 failed attempts to pass a new Export Administration Act since the last one expired.

We now find ourselves in a position where despite the Cox report, despite concerns that have been raised about lost American technology, and despite the growing obsolescence of the residual permanent law the administration is forced to operate under, we have not reauthorized the Export Administration Act. I think it is a terrible indictment of the Congress that we have not done that.

That is the bad news.

The good news is that under Chairman ENZI we have put together an ex-

cellent bill. Chairman ENZI has done something I am not aware of any Member of the Senate ever doing. He has gone over and sat through meetings of the current bodies of the executive branch that make decisions related to export licensing. So he has, through practical experience, come to understand the process. He has provided leadership whereby we have put together a bill. He has provided leadership where we literally sat down with everybody who has any interest in this bill. We have had numerous meetings. We have let people submit concerns in writing. I believe we are on the verge of having a bill that is uniformly supported.

What our bill tries to do is simple to say and very difficult to achieve. We have a conflicting interest. We want to sell things on the world market which embody new technology because those are items that we have a comparative advantage in producing, and they are items that are high-wage items in the production process.

Finally, they represent commodities that will dominate the future of the world economy. So we want to be the leader in selling these types of goods.

On the other hand, we have legitimate concerns about technologies. If they are in the hands of people who may be potential terrorist nations or potential enemies of the United States, they could end up hurting our national security.

We have taken those two conflicting concerns, and we have put together a bill. The two major features of it are the following:

One, we define a brand new concept called mass marketing. It is a very simple and powerful concept. It says if an item is for sale at Radio Shack, if you can buy it over the web site of Dell Computers, if it is generally being marketed in the United States and around the world—though you might wish that it is possible that all of this could happen without it falling into the hands of a potential adversary—the bottom line is there is no practical way at that point that you can keep anybody from getting the technology.

So we take mass marketed items out of the process and, hopefully, reduce the number of different items that are under licensing in any given year from about 10,000 to 1,000 so that we could put the focus of attention where it belongs.

Second, under current law, if companies are accused and found guilty of wrongdoing in China, despite numerous accusations, all of which carry some penalties, the maximum fine under current law would be \$132,000, which for corporate America is a relatively insignificant amount of money. Under our bill, we have a \$10 million fine per violation. We also have for a conscious, knowing violation where individuals are involved, prison sentences of up to 10 years, and in aggravated cases, life in prison.

So there is a dramatic strengthening of current law.

I agree with our colleague from Nevada. This needs to be adopted this year. I believe we have eliminated opposition to it.

It simply is now our task to provide leadership where we can bring the bill to the floor later this week, or early next week, and get an agreement that this is not going to become a vehicle for a bunch of unrelated amendments.

Having said that, let me stop before I sit down. I want to say a couple of words about the African trade bill.

First of all, I congratulate the chairman of the Finance Committee for his leadership on this bill. I endorse the African trade bill. Our President went to Africa, did an extensive tour, and talked about what we could do to try to break the bonds of poverty—this crushing, grinding poverty—that people in sub-Saharan Africa face. I think the President rightly understood, if we take all the important aid provided by all the countries in the world and combine them, we have about \$40 billion a year. There are 700 million people in sub-Saharan Africa, so if they get all the foreign aid provided by all the countries in the world, we will have relatively little impact on them, and there is relatively little evidence that foreign aid has produced economic development in areas where no economic development ever existed before.

As a result, the President proposed bringing in the most powerful tool for economic development ever to evolve in the history of mankind; that tool is trade. The President proposed we open up a fiber trade agreement in textiles with sub-Saharan Africa. I remind my colleagues, under existing agreements internationally, by the year 2005, under the Multifiber Agreement, we will no longer have quotas on tariffs anywhere in the world. We are not talking about a permanent advantage for sub-Saharan Africa; we are talking about giving them a little bit of a head start.

Let me briefly define the problem. The average per capita GDP of countries in sub-Saharan Africa is \$490 a year; 40 percent of the people in sub-Saharan Africa earn less than \$1 a day. The current estimates are, we import about .86 percent of textiles and apparel imported into America from sub-Saharan Africa. The International Trade Commission has estimated that if they devoted their productive capacity to textiles, under this agreement, still within 10 years we couldn't expect more than 2 percent of our textile imports to come from sub-Saharan Africa. We are talking about expanded trade, and we are talking about trade with countries that have no significant capacity to impact American imports of textiles.

I believe this bill is needed. I think it is a step in the right direction. I remind my colleagues, for any country in sub-Saharan Africa to take part in this program, they have to do the following three things: they have to make progress toward a market-based economy, they have to institute a democratic society, and they have to open

their trading system. These are all actions that will mean stronger economic growth in Africa, that will mean greater human happiness in Africa, and that will ultimately mean a greater demand for American goods and services.

I believe this is an important bill. I believe it should be adopted. I am hopeful we will adopt it today. I intend to vote for cloture and for final passage.

There is one provision in this bill in the Senate that is not in the House bill. That is a provision that requires, for textiles and apparel to be imported from Africa, they have to be made out of American fabric and yarn. That same agreement is in the Caribbean Basin Initiative, which I support. But the problem with Africa is that given the transportation costs, and given that their ability to market products is basically based on using longer strand cotton and basically producing different types of textiles that would be relatively new to the American market, I believe the provision in the Senate bill for all practical purposes kills the African trade bill.

I am not going to offer an amendment to strike this provision because it is not in the House bill. I hope it will be dropped in conference. We are talking about a relatively small effort to benefit 700 million human beings. The worst thing that could come out of it is that we would have greater diversity in the textile goods that would be for sale in American stores and they would be at lower prices. I can't see anything but good that can come out of this. Anywhere in the world, when we can encourage people to move toward a market-based economy, toward a democratic society, and toward open trade, we are doing things that benefit them and benefit the world.

These are important bills before the Senate. I am for them. Trade is vitally important. It is an amazing thing to me that, due to ignorance and prejudice, we continue to restrict the importation of goods and services into America. Why we should give government the ability to impose a tax on working Americans and deny them the ability to purchase, with the fruit of their own labor, better and cheaper goods if they are produced abroad, I don't know. That the greatest trading nation in the world would continue textile laws that cost every working American family of four \$700 a year is an absolute outrage. Something needs to be done about it. This is not going to solve that problem, but it is the right thing to do. I hope it will become the law of the land this year. I am hopeful it will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I, too, thank the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, for helping to raise the consciousness of the Senate and the consciousness of the Nation to the increases in productivity that we have gotten through technology and the rate at which it is moving. I thank him

for his recognition that we have a bill that will not only solve some of the problems of technology but go hand in hand with our need for national security.

This is a bill that has been before the Banking Committee and, before that, before the International Trade and Finance Committee, of which Senator JOHNSON is the ranking member on that subcommittee. He and I had an opportunity this year to spend a lot of time pursuing a bill to increase our world trade while preserving national security, making sure they run down parallel tracks instead of crossing tracks where the locomotive might wind up in a train wreck.

I thank the chairman of the Banking Committee, the senior Senator from Texas, for working with me to focus the committee on the need to reauthorize the Export Administration Act. I appreciate the assistance that has given in helping to put together a balanced product that we reported out of the Banking Committee.

I am remiss if I do not mention Senators SARBANES and JOHNSON again. They deserve our thanks for the constructive and thoughtful input they put into the bill to make it truly bipartisan.

I thank every single member of the Banking Committee. We worked together for a period of 9 months to be sure all of the concerns of national security and commerce were covered in this bill on which we are working. The members not only devoted a lot of time to it; they assigned staff to it. We had one of my offices—I don't have very many offices—dedicated to this bill. At any hour of day, and often night, one could walk into that office and there would be a group of people meeting to make sure their concerns and their solutions were being represented. We had some great discourse that led to a solution that I think can pass both the House and the Senate. We worked with the members of the Defense Committee, Intelligence Committee, Commerce Committee, and the Governmental Affairs Committee, and I think the bill is better because of everyone's involvement in it.

The first 9 months I was on the job as chairman of the subcommittee I spent dedicated to this bill. At first, I did not envision I would have to put in quite as much work on the issue as I did. I now realize there was a lot to learn about export controls.

It has been mentioned there were attempts to reauthorize the Act, which expired in 1994. Since 1994, this country has been operating under Executive orders on something so entirely crucial to the United States. But during that period of time, we have tried to reauthorize it. During that time, 11 separate measures have failed; in fact, they failed to even make it out of committee.

But one of the nice things about the Senate is that there is a lot of documentation, even on things that fail. We

have gone back and looked at that documentation. We have talked to the people who were involved in the issues each of those 11 times. We were able to find out what the pitfalls were before and have worked to come up with a solution.

As mentioned, I visited the Bureau of Export Administration and I observed some of their activities and processes. I sat in on committee meetings.

During the time we were working on this, the Cox and Dicks report also came out, and so did the Deutch Commission report that talked about problems that have been identified with foreign countries getting secrets from this country. These commissions and committees looked into ways to solve that.

As soon as their reports were filed with the Intelligence Committee, before any public documentation came out on it, I went over to the Intelligence Committee and I read those reports to see if the efforts we were making had any parallel with the suggestions that were coming out from these people who were looking at some very detailed and often secret situations. I am pleased to say, out of the recommendations of Congressman Cox and Congressman Dicks there were 17 different areas of legislative possibility. We covered 15 of those in the act and part of the other two.

The subcommittee and full committee held a total of 6 hearings that consisted of 25 witnesses who helped us identify critical areas relating to export controls as well. We also met with various high-tech and industry groups. We met with several Members of Congress. I have mentioned the Departments we met with, and a lot of the other executive agencies it seems have some involvement in exports and securities or both, and we met with them as well.

We also had an opportunity to meet with many people in the business community. It has been my goal to have an open-door policy for everyone, and we will continue that policy through the time the bill finally gets passage. Throughout the hearings held this year on the Export Administration Act, there were many calls to reauthorize the expired act. Only a few people have questioned the need for us to reauthorize that act. They asked what problems have been identified with the current system.

There are several reasons for reauthorizing the Export Administration Act. The first is the U.S. Government's inability to convince other countries, even our strongest allies, to improve their export control regimes. Only if the EAA is reauthorized can the United States exercise a legitimate leadership role to strengthen the multilateral export controls that seek to curb dangerous dual-use items. We cannot do it by ourselves; we have to have help from other countries. Our ability to convince other countries to impose similar controls on their exports is compromised by the fact that Congress has allowed the EAA to expire.

In our June 24 hearing, Richard Cupitt, who is the associate director of the Center for International Trade and Security, agreed with this assessment by saying:

The inability of the U.S. Government to craft a firm legislative foundation for its own controls on the export of dual-use goods, technologies, and services over the last decade... has compromised U.S. leadership initiatives.

Another reason for the reauthorization is the lack of penalties for violations of export controls under the implementing Executive order—very strict. If the outdated EAA of 1979 had stiffer penalties than the Executive order's maximum penalty of \$10,000, we would be in better shape. A reauthorization will also give enforcement officers the authority to use the tools they need to be effective.

I now have a person on my staff, who has been loaned to us, who has been working on the export enforcement, so we can make sure enforcement will be adequate. She has run some numbers for us on some of the indictments that have been handed down on things that happened during this period between 1994 and now. You have heard some of those numbers—16 indictments, potential fine of \$132,000 on a contract that was \$5.4 million. A microdot in the budget—less than the advertising budget spent. Fines need to be increased.

Additionally, it is important we deal with the issue of export controls in a comprehensive reauthorization instead of allowing some issues to be addressed by a patchwork of inadequate measures. I suspect over the next few days and over the next few months, if we do not get this passed, you will see parts of the bill that solve a particular problem put on as an amendment to something else to take care of an immediate critical need. There are a lot of them involved in the bill.

There is a very delicate balance that is maintained through this bill. All of it needs to go through together. If one person gets everything he or she wants, there is no reason to participate in the rest of the bill. All of them have worked together to make sure their interests were covered as well as being able to live with the other interests involved here.

We have received great cooperation from the administration because they understand the need to reauthorize the Act. Under Secretary Reinsch has even said:

The EAA is held together right now by duct tape and bailing wire.

It is also questionable whether export controls are permitted under the International Economic Emergency Powers Act.

The bill before us today represents a compilation of thoughtful comments gathered from industry, the administration, Members of Congress, on and off of the committee. However, it is not a hodgepodge of conflicting ideas and competing interests. The bill is interwoven with several basic themes

throughout: Transparency, accountability, deterrence, multilateral cooperation, and enforcement. It strikes a balance by recognizing the need for export controls on very sensitive items for national security purposes while relaxing those controls on items that have foreign availability or mass market status and thus are difficult to control effectively. It allows enforcement to concentrate on what can be effectively enforced. It gives each of the departments and agencies an equal stake and a fair shake. The compromise for the interagency dispute resolution process represents a fair procedure that defaults to decision. Yet it provides any department's representative the opportunity to appeal a decision without going through the bureaucratic hassle of convincing his or her boss of the need to appeal a decision in a relatively limited amount of time.

Transparency, accountability: The reporting requirements in the EAA of 1999 instill accountability and transparency in the export control process and multilateral negotiations. The criteria for foreign policy control provisions foster an accountable system, very similar to that in the EAA of 1979.

The bill encourages the administration to strengthen multilateral export control regimes since multilateral controls are more effective. It also maintains the sanctions provisions for those who violate multilateral export control regimes and contribute to the proliferation of missile, chemical, or biological weapons.

The bill remains tough on terrorism, requiring licenses for the export of certain items to countries designated as supporting international terrorism. Additionally, it includes penalties that deter violations of export control law and the authorities to effectively enforce the provisions set forth in the bill.

It has been mentioned this is supported in a bipartisan way. This bill came out of the full Banking Committee unanimously. Our country needs this bill, and the people on that committee recognize the need. The more they were involved in it, the more they recognized the need.

I want to mention the patience the House folks have had during this process. The problem has been more deeply studied in the House, perhaps, than on the Senate side. The suggestions for what needed to be done came from the House side, but they have been waiting, watching, discussing, following, and commenting on the process we have had on this side. They have spent a lot of time with Senator JOHNSON and me, to see if the solutions we came up with met the suggestions they have given. They have waited, but they are ready to go.

This bill cannot be done piecemeal. It needs to be done immediately for the security of our country and for the furtherance of our commerce. I ask for your support.

Again, I thank the Senator from Nevada for raising the consciousness on

this level and giving us an opportunity to comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAU. I thank the Chair for recognizing me.

Mr. President, I want to comment on the legislation pending before the Senate which is the Caribbean Basin Initiative trade bill along with the African trade bill.

I remind my colleagues, it came out of the Senate Finance Committee with a unanimous vote. In essence, we did it on a voice vote. At a time when this Congress and perhaps this Senate is becoming better known for what we have not done, we are presented with an opportunity to do something extremely significant in the area of trade for a large part of the world with which the United States deals.

When we write about what we did or did not do in this first session of this Congress, it will be clearly pointed out that we did not do Social Security reform, as the Presiding Officer well knows, because of his involvement in an effort to reform that system.

We did not do Medicare reform, as the speaker certainly knows, following the efforts of the National Commission on Medicare.

We did not do campaign finance reform, and we all remember those arguments.

We have not done Patients' Bill of Rights legislation because of the differences of opinion and the politics involved in that legislation.

I do not know of any environmental legislation that has worked its way through this body with a resounding vote of support, nor do I remember particularly any major education efforts that have been successfully navigated through this body this year.

I have a great fear this body is becoming more known for what we have not done rather than what we have done. I wonder what the American people think of the distinguished Members of this body with whom I have the privilege of serving and why we cannot get together and work out our differences in the interest of the American public. Why do we spend so much of our time debating whose fault it is that nothing is getting done as opposed to working together? We can always have the debate over who did it. At least under those circumstances we would be arguing about success: Look what we did; no, look what we did, rather than arguing about failure and whose fault it is that nothing was done.

We have one last opportunity of great significance in this Congress to pass legislation that is bipartisan in its origination, that is strongly supported by the administration, which, when it came before the Senate Finance Committee after the hearings and after the debate, we reported out by a voice vote.

The question then becomes: What is the problem now? Some will argue it is the Republicans' fault because they

have filled up the tree. That ought to go over well in my State of Louisiana when I tell people we did not pass this bill because the Republicans filled up the tree. They are going to say: What in the world are you talking about?

I daresay some are going to say: We did not complete action on this bill because we were not able to offer amendments to it in the nature of other important efforts, such as minimum wage or agricultural provisions, or other trade legislation that some want to offer. Because they cannot offer it now, we are not going to continue our progress on this legislation.

I daresay, the American people would say: What in the world are you talking about?

Here is a trade bill that affects U.S. jobs, U.S. industry; it helps people who have been loyal to the United States in other parts of the world. It clearly helps Central American nations which not too many years ago were Marxist countries, Communist dictatorships that have gradually been brought into the family of nations with the assistance of the United States, and we want to continue having their support on things that are important for the people of this country.

This legislation is a way of doing that—by working out bilateral trade agreements with these countries to the south of us that will help them economically. When we help them economically, they help us. When countries in Central America can do a little bit better economically, they buy more of what we produce.

From my own State of Louisiana, they could buy more rice, more soybeans, more manufactured goods. They would ship it through the Port of New Orleans, the Port of Baton Rouge, and the Port of Lake Charles because they have more money and better jobs. They are helped and we are helped. It is a win-win situation.

The question is: Why don't we do it? What is the problem? The problem is politics. The problem is political posturing about whose fault it is that it is not getting done. Most of the debate is going to be why we did not do it and blame each other for failure. Then, again, the American people are going to say: What in the world are they talking about?

My State is particularly affected by this. I have heard arguments that it is bad for American jobs. My State has lost thousands of jobs in the stitch-and-sew industry. It used to be in Louisiana that thousands of minimum wage employees, many of them minorities, were working in the stitch-and-sew industry for many of these large companies that manufacture items we are talking about today. Many of them were arbitrarily dismissed, arbitrarily fired. Many of them lost their jobs right before Christmas a couple of years ago when most of the companies moved out of my State and went to Central American and Latin American countries and located down there. That

has already happened. It did not happen because of this bill. This bill was not being considered then. It happened because of the existing state of the world.

I have worked with our people. We have helped them find other jobs. Fortunately, because of the economic conditions of our State and the economic conditions of the United States, the vast majority of these people who lost jobs in the so-called stitch-and-sew industry have found jobs in more sophisticated, if I can use that term, industries in the United States that represent the future of the United States in terms of jobs in the high-tech industries as opposed to something like stitch and sew.

What we have been able to do is use some of the training programs and retrain these people to get them into other manufacturing segments, to get them into high technology, to get them into computers, to get them jobs where they now find they are much better off than they were sitting behind a sewing machine stitching and sewing underwear.

I argue the future of U.S. employees is not in the stitch-and-sew industry. If we have to somehow preserve jobs in the stitch-and-sew business, we are not being very bullish on America. I argue that is not the future of this country. The future of this country is highly trained men and women who can do the jobs for the 21st century, and that is not in the stitch-and-sew industry.

It is interesting. I love my dear friend and colleague from South Carolina who was reading this article in Time about how these companies have, in fact, moved out of the United States. He is absolutely right. One of the things I noticed when I was looking at the article the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina was pointing out is the article had a picture of the State of Kentucky, and the caption under the article is: "Fruit of the Loom eliminated more than 7,000 jobs in the past 6 years. Here would-be workers attend a job fair held by new arrival Amazon.com."

That is particularly important because it says that while stitch-and-sew jobs are moving out of this country, high-tech jobs, better jobs, better paying jobs, more sophisticated jobs, jobs that require more training and a better educated workforce are moving in.

The people who were leaving the Fruit of the Loom jobs were moving, on the other hand, into jobs that Amazon.com was providing in that area using those workers and retraining them for the 21st century.

That, I argue, is the future of the United States. The future workers of this country are not going to sit behind a sewing machine. If that is the future of this country, I daresay it is not a very bright future. The future is highly trained jobs in highly technical industries which pay well and have a future.

We are not going to be able to compete with the poorest of the poor in

terms of who can pay the lowest wages. We should be concentrating on educating our workers for the 21st century and then, at the same time, trying to do what we can in the textile industry.

The reason I believe it is so very important and necessary to pass this bill is because we say in this trade bill, particularly in the textile industry: Look, we are not going to have the stitch-and-sew jobs, but, by God, we are the best manufacturer of textiles and cloth and fabric.

We have the best technical ability to weave and dye the fabric. And this bill, for the first time, says: Look, if we are going to give these countries some advantages, at least we want it to be a two-way street, to at least say, if you are going to be able to do these products in your country, with lower paying jobs, at least use fabric that is manufactured and woven and dyed and assembled in this country. We will send it to you. We will manufacture the fabric, you will use those fabrics to manufacture garments, and then you have the ability to export those products back to this country.

Mexico can do it now. China will be able to do it. Unless we have something like this, we are not going to get any part of the business.

This legislation, when it talks about the products that are covered, clearly says: Apparel articles assembled in the Caribbean basin and sub-Saharan Africa from fabrics wholly formed and cut in the United States from yarns wholly formed in the United States.

What that says to the cotton farmers in my State of Louisiana and throughout the South is that we are going to use their cotton. Without this legislation, we are not going to be using their cotton. The fabric will come from overseas, as well as the finished product. At least this legislation says we will use their cotton.

This legislation also says it has to be assembled in this country. It has to be woven in this country. If it is going to have a color to it, it is going to have to be dyed in this country. So we are getting something out of this that we do not have now, that in the absence of this legislation we will not have. Therefore, I think it is very clear this is something that is important to do. The House thought it was.

You talk about how bad the House is divided. The House passed this 234-163. Now it is before this body. For those who argue they don't like the process, I don't like the process, either. I would probably like to offer a Medicare reform bill to this legislation. People are looking for a wagon to jump on to get something passed they would like to have passed. I understand that. The problem is that you are affecting the merits of good legislation that was bipartisan when it left the Senate Finance Committee, that passed by voice vote in the Senate Finance Committee, and that merits our support.

So my point is that other countries are going to benefit, but we are going

to benefit. If we do not have this legislation, other countries will be able to have access to our market with no requirements on using U.S. fabric at all. I think we owe it to the workers of this country who are still engaged in some aspect of this industry to come up with a fair product and fair package like this is.

I intend to support this legislation. I think it is the right thing to do. I hope my colleagues will join me in that effort.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

#### IMPACT AID PAYMENTS FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am going to speak a few minutes about an issue that is very important to me; that is, the condition of school buildings with the federal impact aid, particularly on the school buildings on Indian reservations which are in very dire condition. I hope there is something we can do about it.

As you know, there have been many bills introduced in this Congress to try to help school districts and make sure school districts have enough funds for school construction and renovation, modernization, and so forth. But as you also know, when schools try to raise money, basically they do so by bonding, which is paid for by local property taxes. That is essentially the way schools in our country are financed; it is a time-honored approach to school construction.

The problem is, in this heated debate, one group of children is continually left out in the cold; that is, students who live on federally owned land, usually on an Indian reservation or a military installation.

In my State of Montana, there are about 12,000 children who fall into this category; that is, children who live on a military installation or on an Indian reservation, where there is either none or there is very little private property to support school funding, particularly school construction. These schools are located in areas where much of the local property just cannot be taxed. Why is that? Because it is Federal property.

In many cases, the local schools have to educate the children of the families who live on the property, and these are so-called Federal students who could come from military families, from civilian families, or could come from Native American families. Some schools are off reservations, but a lot of the kids live on reservations, and vice versa. This causes a tremendous problem in financing school construction.

I believe we have a responsibility. After all, the Federal Government has

a trustee responsibility with respect to Indian reservations. More than that, more fundamentally, we have a moral obligation to be sure all children in our country have not only equal access to education but generally have the same accessibility to good schools and relatively up-to-date schools. We are not asking for the Taj Mahal but just basic solid construction.

Congress has recognized its responsibility in many respects for these schools through payments authorized under title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That is the impact aid provision. These districts are supposed to receive impact aid to compensate school districts for the burden of educating children whose parents do not have to pay local property taxes due to Federal activities; namely, because they live on an installation or an Indian reservation.

The bulk of the impact aid payments do help with salaries and utilities and other day-to-day costs of running the schools, but this is the catch: When it comes to replacement or renovation of buildings, these schools still have an additional problem; that is, impact aid cannot begin to pay both the salaries and utility bills and the day-to-day costs, and also pay for the modernization of schools because they just cannot issue the construction bonds to pay for them.

There have been several bills introduced in this body dealing with school construction, but none of them deal with this problem; that is, the problem of impact aid on reservations and installations.

I am asking for something that is pretty simple. I am asking for a slight increase, from the present \$7 million that goes to impact aid school construction to \$50 million. That is all. That is not very much money. Mr. President, \$7 million is currently spent on impact aid school construction, and I am asking that it be raised to \$50 million. Very simple.

I can give lots of stories, lots of examples, of just the dire conditions these school districts face. For example, I talked to the superintendent of the Harlem school district. Harlem is in north central Montana. He says his district is so crowded that his students are now using a closet. Guess what was in that closet. In that closet was a snowblower that they hauled out whenever there was a bad snowstorm.

So that closet is now a classroom. The snowblower is out in the hall. The students are in the closet. I think this is not right. It is no place to put kids. There is no place to put kids in the closet of a school and put the equipment out in the hallway. In addition, if they try to bring in a portable classroom, then there would be no playground. That is just not right.

A few days ago, I received a letter from the principal of the elementary school in Box Elder, MT. His student population is growing very rapidly because there is new housing on the near-

by Rocky Boy Indian Reservation. In fact, virtually all of the 300 or so students in his school are Federal students.

He has classrooms in portable buildings and in basement rooms with no windows and only one exit door. He tells me he would be afraid to send his own small children to that school, but he has to. This is a disgrace.

Last year, the Box Elder school received—get this—\$13,000 in Federal impact aid construction funding; \$13,000, that is all.

That is about the average for schools in this situation. I might say, \$13,000 is a pittance. That is not even enough for half of a paint job in the school, let alone for reasonable reconstruction or renovation.

I have some photos I would like to display. These photos are representative of not only my State but could represent almost any State in the Nation that has Federal impact aid. This is a picture of an out-of-code electric installation at Babb Elementary School in Browning. There are no fire sprinklers in the basement where the insulation is located. Over in the left corner, we see a socket and wiring dangling. It is uncovered. It is obviously a fire hazard. This is all they can do.

Now I have another photograph of a doorway at Babb. This is a doorway in the school. This photo doesn't begin to represent how bad the situation is. Sometimes pictures overstate something. In this case, the photograph understates.

The next photo is that of a lunchroom. This is down in the basement of the school. Again, it doesn't look all that bad; but I have been there; it is worse. Then there is a photo taken in the local high school in the same community. There is a leaky ceiling. Things are starting to fall apart. Again, this school can't find the money to pay for it.

Imagine for a moment that we in the Senate met in a facility that looked like this or our offices were in rooms such as this or we had electrical equipment so obviously out of code. We would change it. We would do something very quickly because we wouldn't stand for it.

What kind of message does this send to children throughout our country—the message that we don't have enough respect for them, enough respect for their parents, enough respect for education to do something about this. We have a huge Federal surplus and the biggest, most wealthy country in the world. Yet we turn our back on a lot of kids in our country. Obviously, it is to their peril but even more to the peril of our country.

The bill I will introduce will raise the authorization from \$7 million to \$50 million—not very much but a first step that is needed. We also make a change in the eligibility rules. Right now schools with populations made up of 70, 80, or even 100 percent Federal students cannot ask for impact aid construction