

Do no harm. These are hardly provisions which benefit the beans and bacon crowd.

No, no, this is strictly a caviar and champagne revolution! No ordinary commoners need apply.

And it gets worse when one focuses on the fact that what I have just listed represents only the tip of the iceberg. It is only the small amount of information on special tax breaks which I so far have been able to glean regarding the blue-ribbon character of this very select revolution.

So, the rich and the powerful and the oh so very comfortable will continue to sip their white wine and murmur ever so joyously about their exclusive little "gimme gravy" revolution. But, while this private tea party is going on in some circles, health care for the elderly has been slashed in order to foot the catering bill.

So, mark this down as a time when the so-called "world's greatest deliberative body," deliberated very little and produced nothing even close to "great." We tinkered around the edges with amendments, when all the while most of us had no real idea of what was buried in the underlying bill and were provided with little time or opportunity to inform ourselves or to inform the American people about these far-reaching changes.

This reconciliation process has been twisted out of all recognizable shape. It has become the antithesis of solid thorough legislating, and it makes a mockery of minority rights and the tradition of extended debate here in the Senate.

This Senator is fond of saying, "Est deo gratia pro Senatus!" "Thank God for the U.S. Senate." But, with regard to this sorry spectacle, I will have to alter my usual exclamation and say, "Thank God for the Presidential veto," not the line-item veto, but the veto which the President is given in the Constitution of the United States—the real contract with America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, was leaders' time reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Leaders' time has been reserved.

FAST-TRACK AUTHORITY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, Congress is now trying to put in place a plan that will reduce the tax burden on the American people, produce growth, create jobs, and put us on a responsible path to a balanced budget.

In the midst of this monumental undertaking, President Clinton would

like to get Congress to give him new fast-track trade negotiating authority. He wants to negotiate more trade agreements with more countries. In fact, he has already started negotiations for new trade agreements even without fast-track authority.

Mr. President, I believe it would be a mistake to extend new fast-track authority at this time.

There are a number of good reasons, but in my view first and most important is President Clinton's complete failure to explain to the American people why we need yet another trade agreement at this time. I believe the President's effort to get new fast-track authority has most Americans shaking their heads, wondering "Why does the President seem to want to rush into more free-trade agreements with as many countries, regions, or trading blocks as he can?"

Mr. President, the fact is we recently concluded two major trade agreements, GATT and NAFTA. I believe it only makes good common sense to step back a little and assess the results.

The ink is hardly dry on the largest trade agreement in history, the Uruguay round of the GATT, which came into force on January 1 of this year.

We do not really know what the impact of that agreement will be. We had many predictions last year, favorable and unfavorable, about the potential impact. But the agreement is unprecedented in its coverage, creating new rules for textiles, agriculture, services. It makes massive tariff cuts and lowers barriers worldwide. It establishes an entirely new and untested dispute settlement regime.

We need time to assess the impact of what amounts to the largest restructuring of our trading relationships ever.

No private entity, no corporation, no small business going through a fundamental restructuring would consider a new merger or acquisition in the middle of that process. Indeed it would be irresponsible. It could endanger the enterprise. So too for the United States as we implement the recent major restructuring of our trade relationships.

Instead of new trade agreements, let us proceed with a proposal I made last year to ensure that our sovereignty is not compromised by the new world trade organization. Although I believe the United States stands to gain overall from the GATT Agreement, many Americans remain unconvinced that the WTO will benefit them in the long run. Indeed, there is one important way the WTO could be harmful, and that is if the new dispute settlement system runs out of control. We must never submit to decisions by an unelected WTO bureaucracy if it oversteps its mandate and pursues its own agenda. My legislation, which I had hoped to have passed by now, and I hope we can pass in the near future, would set up a Dispute Settlement Review Commission that would allow us to withdraw from the WTO if our rights

are being trampled by bureaucrats in Geneva.

This is the kind of legislation we need right now. We need this legislation because it will help to protect American workers and American jobs. We need to have this protection in place as soon as possible before the first WTO decisions start to come. In fact the administration supports my legislation. And yet the administration has been silent on this issue. We have had no cooperation in trying to pass and enact into law a bill that everyone agrees is good for America, good for working Americans, and good for the multilateral trading system. It provides insurance against harm, it is an insurance policy for our sovereignty. What could be more important? Certainly not more trade agreements, because we are choking on new agreements right now.

It was just 21 months ago that we entered into another major trade agreement, the North American Free-Trade Agreement. The record for NAFTA is a work in progress. The verdict is not yet in. This is so for a number of reasons. The peso crisis is the most significant, but there has also been significant disappointment with the operation of that agreement, and with the level of cooperation we have experienced since it went into effect. The operation of the NAFTA dispute settlement mechanism for unfair trade cases has also raised serious concerns in Congress and in the private sector.

So we need time to assess the real results of NAFTA as well. I do not know how President Clinton explains to the American people that the provisions of NAFTA, good and bad, should be extended to other countries when we do not yet have a clear picture of how NAFTA has benefited working Americans. We need to know how this agreement has helped the American family.

Mr. President, I believe we need to step back from this unprecedented whirlwind of new trade agreements. We need a cooling-off period, a time to digest the results. We need to focus on our domestic house, on the actions we can take here at home that will improve our global competitiveness.

But for some reason, the administration seems to be in a great hurry to pile on not just one, but many more trade agreements as soon as possible from Latin America to Asia to Europe. President Clinton seems to be saying "Don't worry about it—I'll cut a new trade deal now and we'll figure out later if it was good for the American people."

I have no quarrel with any country that, as part of a program of overall economic reform, pursues a trade agreement with the United States. I admire and applaud countries that eliminate barriers to trade, that reform their economies, that improve the standard of living for their people, that attempt to open up to world trade, to reverse years and decades of ill-conceived, statist policies. Getting the

dead hand of government off the backs of the private sector results in explosive economic growth. The evidence of this is irrefutable as countries around the world throw off the shackles of protectionism, high tariffs, and trade barriers, to the great benefit and enrichment of their people.

The United States is the most desirable market in the world. I understand why countries seek to gain ever better access to our market through trade agreements.

And no one has been a bigger supporter over the years of breaking down trade barriers worldwide than I have.

But Mr. President, a responsible, sober trade policy for America is not measured by the number of trade agreements we conclude with the rest of the world.

A responsible, sober trade policy for America is measured by the benefit to the American people, to the American worker, and the American family.

Mr. President, another concern that I have, and that Republicans generally have, with fast-track relates to our experience during approval of the two previous trade agreements.

This administration has promised that it will add extraneous issues, such as labor and environment and maybe other issues, to any trade agreement it negotiates. I believe that linking trade to the agendas of worker rights and environmentalist activists would be a serious mistake and in the end would harm working Americans.

Mr. President, I supported the NAFTA and GATT agreements because I support increased trade and opening foreign markets to U.S. goods and services.

However, I did not support the way in which this administration used, and some would say abused, the fast-track procedures for those trade bills.

The fast-track rules were the result of an agreement between the Congress and the President. The President agreed to consult with the Congress regularly and in depth on the details of trade agreements under negotiation. In return, Congress agreed to give up the right to amend legislation implementing a trade agreement after its submission to the Congress, and further agreed to consider the implementing legislation in a limited time concluding with an up-or-down vote, without amendment.

The fast-track rules were crafted to provide a sensible way for negotiating the elimination of trade barriers with other countries. The purpose of requiring considerable consultation between the President and the Congress was to arrive at a consensus on the content of an acceptable agreement. If you did that, you did not need a lot of amendments. That was the original intent.

The fast-track rules were never meant to operate as a vehicle for matters that lay well outside any consensus.

Fast-track was never meant to be a vehicle for matters on which there was fundamental disagreement.

The fast-track procedures were used effectively for a long time. Through four administrations trade agreements were negotiated and submitted to Congress under fast-track rules, and the process worked pretty well.

But when the Clinton administration arrived, this changed.

Despite warnings from Republicans, then in the minority, the administration insisted on labor and environment side agreements accompanying the NAFTA. We opposed these side deals for a simple reason: linking trade to other issues like these winds up hurting us more than others.

Now the President has stated that if Congress gives him fast-track authority, he is committed to extending these labor and environment provisions to other countries in any trade agreement he concludes with them.

Mr. President, this is unacceptable. We cannot and must not burden our trade relationships with the agendas of any number of special-interest groups. The President seems to want to use fast-track once again to advance interests other than trade. We must not permit that to happen.

During the GATT debate, we had a similar experience. Despite numerous warnings from Republicans, the President submitted an implementing bill that was full of provisions that had nothing to do with trade. One in particular was an incredible multimillion-dollar handout for a few telecommunications companies. It had no reason to be in that bill. It was strictly special interests, and some would say really special interests because of their links to certain people in the administration.

These additional provisions could not be removed, because of the fast-track rules. Members of Congress in both Houses were powerless to act against this abuse of the fast-track procedures.

Mr. President, most of us remember these events very clearly. We explicitly warned the administration at the time that stretching the fast-track rules to the breaking point would jeopardize re-authorizing fast-track in the future.

Well, Mr. President, as they say, the future is now. I do not believe Congress should extend new fast-track authority until we have had an adequate cooling-off period following the 2 recent major trade agreements and until there is no possibility that the fast-track procedures can be abused. I also believe this is the view of the majority of the American people, and I happen to believe it is the majority of those of us in the Senate on each side of the aisle.

The American economy is the most innovative, most technologically advanced and most productive economy in the world. I want to keep it that way. I want to make sure American goods, commodities, and services get a fair opportunity in the world marketplace. I want to tear down unfair trade barriers and make it clear to our trading partners that unfair trade practices that harm American companies and

jeopardize American jobs will not be tolerated.

Mr. President, we do have an obligation to set a higher standard for the world in the matter of trade relations and economic policy. And in discharging that obligation, we must never give in to the temptation to sacrifice real gains for mere appearances.

We do have an obligation to demonstrate to our trading partners our seriousness of purpose in bringing about a more open world trading system.

But this is not achieved through a haphazard rush to sign more trade deals with more countries as quickly as possible. Trade agreements are not trophies. A policy that treats them as trophies is wrong and is not in the best interests of America or of working Americans.

ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN UNTIL 5 P.M. TODAY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committees have until the hour of 5 p.m. today to file any legislative or executive matters, and further, that the RECORD remain open until 5 p.m. today for the introduction of bills and statements.

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

MAKING MAJORITY APPOINTMENTS TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 192, submitted today by this Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 192) making majority appointments to the Joint Committee on the Library and the Joint Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

So the resolution (S. Res. 192) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 192

Resolved,

The following are named majority party members on the part of the Senate to the Joint Committee on the Library: Mr. Hatfield (chairman), Mr. Stevens, and Mr. Warner.

The following are named majority party members on the part of the Senate to the Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Warner (vice chairman), Mr. Hatfield, and Mr. Cochran.