could propose a very narrowly worded label for a device and that the FDA would be barred from asking for information on other obvious uses.

This is simply not the case. The FDA retains its current authority to not approve a device if based on a fair evaluation of all material facts, the labeling is false or misleading. Clearly, if a bad actor device manufacturer attempted to get a misleading label past the FDA, the Agency would have full authority to disapprove the product.

I was pleased to join Senator JEFFORDS as the first Democratic cosponsor of this bill. I would thank him again for the hard work and long hours that he and his staff, as well, as Senator KENNEDY, Senator MIKULSKI, Senator WELLSTONE, Senator COATS, Senator GREGG, and others, have contributed.

I look forward to further debate on and to joining my colleague next week in enacting this legislation.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present and ask unanimous consent that it be evenly divided between the minority and majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JEFFORDS. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. JEFFORDS. The minority representative and myself are sitting here. There is some time left. However, we also want to move the calendar forward as best we can. I just want to alert all Members, minority and majority, if we do not receive a communication from a Member or staff within 10 minutes, it is our intention to yield back the remainder of our time in order that we may move the process of the Senate forward. I just let everyone know that. We will be sitting here, awaiting the news.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JEFFORDS. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, speaking on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote with respect to FDA occur at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, September 16, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII be waived, and the time between 9:30 and 10 a.m. be equally divided for debate, prior to the vote.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Therefore, under rule XXII, all first-degree amendments must be filed at the desk by 1 p.m. on Monday, September 15. I ask unanimous consent that all second-degree amendments may be filed up to the time of the vote on Tuesday.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, at this time, and I have the permission of the minority, I will yield back the remainder of our time, both minority and majority time; and I so do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 5 minutes as if in morning business.

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

IN MEMORY OF MOTHER TERESA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, Mother Teresa, truly a saint, died last week at age 87. I think we have all talked about her and the fact she dedicated her life to helping the poor and the sick, the dying around the world, particularly in India. But I remember so well a morning on February 3, 1994. It was a National Prayer Breakfast. We had invited Mother Teresa to come and be our speaker. She did not reject. She just said, well, if the Lord is willing, I will be there. And we said, do you think he will be willing? And she wasn't too sure.

Nonetheless, she did show up and we had an audience of 3,000 people in the hotel, including the President and his wife, and the Vice President and Mrs. Gore, and congressional leaders, people from all over the Hill and from all over America. Every State was represented, almost every country was represented, and, of course, in addition to that there was a television audience of millions.

Mother Teresa gave really an extraordinary speech. It was referred to by columnist Cal Thomas as ''the most startling and bold proclamation of truth to power I have heard in my more than 30 professional years in Washington.''

I think a lot of us know Peggy Noonan. She was the speech writer for Ronald Reagan. She called it ''a breathtaking act of courage.''

In describing it she said Mother Teresa was introduced and spoke of God and love and families. She said, ''We must love one another and care for one another.'' And she described it that there were ''great purrs of agreement'' from the audience. And I remember that so well because I was one who was purring.

But the speech became more pointed at that moment.

Mother Teresa—and I am quoting now, Mr. President—said:

> I feel that the greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion, because it is a war against the child, a direct killing of the innocent child, murder by the mother herself. And if we accept that a mother can kill her own child, how can we tell people not to kill one another?

She said:

> By abortion, the mother does not learn to love but kills even her own child to solve her problems. And, by abortion, the father is told that he does not have to take any responsibility at all for the child he has brought into the world. That father is likely to put other women into the same trouble. So abortion just leads to more abortion.

Then she said:

> Any country that accepts abortion is not teaching its people to love, but to use any violence to get what they want. This is why the greatest destroyer of love and peace is abortion.

Mrs. Noonan described the scene:

> For about 1.3 seconds there was complete silence, then applause built up and swept across the room. But not everyone: the President and the First Lady, the Vice President and Mrs. Gore looked like seated statues at Madame Tussaud's, glistening in the lights and moving not a muscle.

I remember when Mother Teresa then looked over at President and Mrs. Clinton and she said:

> Please don't kill the child. I want the child. Please give me the child. I am willing to accept any child who would be aborted and to give that child a married couple who will love the child and be loved by the child.
>
> From here, a sign of care for the weakest of weak—the unborn child—must go out to the world. If you become a burning light of justice and peace in the world, then really you will be truest to what the founders of this country stood for.

Mr. President, we must revere Mother Teresa for what she was, the saint that she was, and we must remember her. But I think most of all we must listen to her. I repeat: ''Any country that accepts abortion is not teaching its people to love but to use any violence to get what they want. This is why the greatest destroyer of love and peace is abortion.''

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. 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. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

FAST-TRACK TRADE AUTHORITY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the President has sent to the Congress a determination that he would like Congress to provide what is called fast-track trade authority with which he could negotiate additional and new

trade agreements with other countries. It is my hope that in the coming weeks, this request will result in a significant, new and interesting debate about this country's trade policies.

I know as I begin this discussion that we will almost retreat immediately into two camps. The one camp is ''We're for free trade, we're for, therefore, what is called fast-track trade authority.'' The other side is somehow a bunch of know-nothing protectionists, a bunch of xenophobes who just don't understand the world, and all they want to do is create walls around our country.

That is the thoughtless way that most trade debate has been conducted in this town and in Congress. I hope, however, that this time, when we discuss fast-track trade authority, we will have an opportunity to evaluate trade policy.

The issue for me is not fast track. That is a procedural issue. Yes; I will want to evaluate the underlying law from 1974 on fast track, and I am going to do that to see whether that fast-track approach might be changed. However, I am much more interested in the question of what will be the results? What kind of trade agreements and what kinds of trade policies are they seeking under fast track?

We had fast track most recently for something called NAFTA, a set of trade agreements with the United States, Mexico, and Canada. Just prior to fast track, we had a $2 billion trade surplus with Mexico. Now we have a $16 billion trade deficit with Mexico. Can anyone believe that should be described as a success? I think not. Just prior to this trade agreement, we had an $11 billion trade deficit with Canada. Now we have a $23 billion trade deficit with Canada. Can that be described as a success? I think not.

Our trade problems go and on. There is China, Japan, and more. We will have a trade deficit with China of well over $40 billion a year. Our trade deficit with Japan has hovered between $50 and $60 billion a year as far as the eye can see.

No one wants to talk about the central question we ought to debate with respect to trade, and that is, what about enforcing the trade agreements that already exist?

I want to give my colleagues an example of one of the things that bothers me so much about where we go in this trade discussion. Right at this moment we have an ongoing discussion with Japan on the issue of the United States aviation industry's access to the Japanese markets. In trade with Japan, in the arena of airline passenger service, we have a net surplus with Japan of a couple billion dollars. We have better carriers in terms of being able to compete. They are better able to compete with the Japanese, and we actually do quite well. We have a surplus in that area.

If we had completely open skies and unlimited competition and unfettered competition with the Japanese with respect to airlines, we would have an even larger surplus with Japan. But we have trade agreements with Japan that we made previously with respect to passenger aviation and with respect to hauling freight on airlines, and so on.

What has happened is the Japanese have not abided by the previous agreements. We have had a freight agreement with them that they simply have ignored, and have not abided by. Now we are back into negotiation with the Japanese, and the Japanese have done a couple of things. For one, they said, ''We don't like the fact that you have a surplus with us on hauling airline passengers.''

Think of the arrogance of that. Here is a country that has a $50 billion trade surplus with us—and has had such a surplus every year, year after year after year—complaining about one little sector where we have a surplus with them, and then they want to get us into a negotiation. Instead of going to open skies where you have free and open competition, they want to get this administration—and I think this administration is headed in that direction—to reach an agreement that is not in our interest.

That is an example of what is wrong with trade policy. We ought to say to the Japanese that on aviation and other issues that we believe that our trade policy ought to result for this country, for the United States, increased economic opportunity and increased trade and, yes, balanced trade. This country cannot and should not countenance long-term trade deficits with countries like Japan of $50 and $60 billion a year.

We ought to say to China, for example, that you have a $40 billion trade surplus with us. We have become a cash cow for your hard currency needs in China, and we will no longer stand for it. If you want to send us all the goods from China into the United States, then we say to you, you have a responsibility and an obligation to buy more from us.

Why is all this important? Because it represents economic vitality and jobs. It is interesting. I hear people talk about trade and they say, ''Gee, we've done so well in trade. We've doubled our exports to this country or that country.'' That is the first thing they will point out in a press release.

So the headline is ''U.S. Doubles Export of Goods to Country X.'' What they didn't say was that imports from that country increased 10 times during the same time period, which means that our trade deficit with that country skyrocketed.

So the whole story, the rest of the story, would describe failure, but the press release describes success—''We've doubled our exports.''

In sectors where you have tradable goods, we actually have had a net job loss in this country as a result of all the trade agreements. The job gains which are often trumpeted as being the result of exports actually come from areas in the nontradable sectors of our economy, particularly in services.

The point I am making about all of this is we are going to have a debate about fast-track trade authority. I want the debate to be about trade policy. Is our trade policy working for this country or isn't it?

I happen to believe in expanded trade. I believe in free trade to the extent that it is fair. I also believe in trade agreements to the extent that we negotiate trade agreements that are in this country's interest. But, for a change, I would like the negotiators who negotiate trade agreements to start wearing the jersey of our side. It is our team that we are worried about.

Is that economic nationalism? Well, I don't know about all those terms they throw about. Do I care about the long-term economic opportunities in this country? Yes. Do I want economic growth here? Yes. Do I want jobs in this country? Yes.

So when a country like China says to the United States, ''We want to ship you all of these goods and run a very large surplus with you or have you run a large deficit with us,'' and then China says, ''By the way, we want to buy some airplanes,'' and they say, ''We don't want to buy airplanes made in America, we want you to have your American company produce these airplanes in China,'' we ought to say that's not the way a trade relationship works.

A bilateral trade relationship works in a way that says, ''When you have goods our consumers need, we will buy them from you and you have access to our marketplace, but when you need what we produce, when you need what our workers and our companies produce, we expect you to buy them from us.'' That is the way a trade relationship works in a manner that is mutually beneficial to both parties.

Our country has been satisfied to have a trade policy that has produced trade deficits, net trade deficits for 36 out of the last 38 years. You show me one CEO of one American company who has had 167 successive quarters of losses, quarter after quarter after quarter forever, who isn't going to stop and say, ''Gee, I think there's something wrong here. Something is out of whack.'' That is exactly what is wrong with our trade policy. Yet, Republicans and Democrats will tell us on the floor of this Senate that our trade policy is working very well. What a terrific policy, they tell us.

I want for us to have greater access to foreign markets. For example: If China wants to send us goods that exceed the amount of goods they will accept from us by $40 billion a year, I want us to say to China, ''You have an obligation to buy much, much, much more from the United States of America to have a balanced trade relationship.'' I want us to say the same thing to Japan, the same thing to Mexico, the same thing to Canada and others

with whom we have large, abiding trade deficits. We need to say that because those deficits weaken this country. Those deficits detract from our economic growth and fundamentally weaken the American economy.

There are those who, I guess, believe that whatever the interests of the largest corporations in the world are, that they are also in the common interests of the United States. Things have changed. We do, indeed, have a global economy, but the largest corporations in the world now are not national citizens. They don't get up in the morning and say, ''Well, you know, I'm an artificial person, I'm a corporation, what in law is described as an artificial person; I can sue and be sued, contract and be contracted with; I'm an artificial person and, therefore, I have allegiance to this country.'' That's not what they do.

We are not talking about American corporations anymore. We are talking about international corporations that do global business that are interested in profits for their shareholders.

How do you maximize profits for your shareholders? You access the cheapest kind of production that you can access in the world, produce there at a dime-an-hour, a-quarter-an-hour, or a half-a-dollar-an-hour wages and then ship the products to Pittsburgh, Toledo, Los Angeles, or Fargo and sell it on a shelf in a store in one of those cities. Produce where it is cheap and then access the American marketplace.

The problem with that strategy is that while it presents increased profits for international corporations it tends to undermine the American economy. I am not saying the global economy and the growth of the global economy is wholly bad; it is not. It provides new opportunities and new choices for the consumers, and in some cases lower-priced goods for the consumers. The question we have to ask ourselves is: what is fair trade and what advances this country's economic interests?

If deciding that you can produce something that you used to produce in Akron, OH, in a factory in Sri Lanka or Indonesia or Bangladesh and you can get 14-year-olds, pay them 24 cents an hour, working 13 hours a day—if you decide that is in your company's interest—is that in this country's interest? I don't think so.

Is it in this country's interest to see that kind of manufacturing job flight from this country to a low-wage country so that the same product can be produced to be shipped back into this country, and the only thing that's changed is the corporation has more profit and the United States has fewer jobs? Is that in this country's interest? I don't think so.

I was on a television program 2 days ago. When I asked this question the moderator said the conditions under which goods are produced in other countries is none of our business. If another country wants to hire kids and pay them dimes an hour, if another country wants to produce by dumping chemicals into the water and pollution into the air, if another country wants to produce having no restrictions on those companies and allows them to pollute the air and water, hire kids, pay a dime an hour, if that's what they want to do, is that none of our business? And if the production from that factory—hiring kids and polluting the air and polluting the water—if that production comes into this country and goes on the grocery store shelves, is that all the better for the American consumer because it is going to be cheaper?

I think that is a catastrophe to have that kind of attitude. This country spent 60 years debating the question of what is a fair wage? This country spent decades debating whether we ask polluters to stop polluting, and whether we demand that polluters stop polluting in order to clean our air and water. This country spent a long while debating the question of child labor and whether we should allow factories to employ 10-year-olds and 12-year-olds.

This country has debated all those issues. Yet, in the so-called global economy, fashioned in the interest of those who want to accelerate profits from it, there are those who would tell us that they can just pole vault over all of those issues. They don't have to worry about minimum wages. They do not have to worry about pollution control. They do not have to worry about any of that because they can move their factories elsewhere and ship their products back into the United States. That is not fair trade. That is not something that advances the economic interests of our country and ought not be allowed.

What we do is we pass trade agreement after trade agreement, and we don't enforce any of them. When someone hears me speak they say, ''Gee, this is just another protectionist that wants to put walls around this country.'' I do not; not at all. I am very interested in saying to other countries, first of all, you have an obligation. There is an admission price to the American marketplace. The admission price is that you must abide by certain standards with respect to clean air and clean water, and you can't hire kids, and you can't pay a nickel an hour. Yes, that is the admission price to compete in our domestic market.

And, yes, there is a requirement with other countries with whom we have a trade relationship. That requirement is if they want to access the American marketplace and dump tens of millions of dollars of products into that marketplace, then they have a responsibility to America. That responsibility is that their marketplace must be open to us. If our workers and our producers want to go to Japan and go to China to sell our goods in their marketplace, they must have their marketplace open for that. And to the extent you don't, it is unfair trade.

To the extent any country is involved in unfair trade, this country ought to have the will and the nerve to say that we're not going to put up with it.

Mr. President, one final point. This advent of a global economy post-Second World War has been an interesting kind of development. The first 25 years after the Second World War we could compete with anybody in the world with one hand tied behind our back. It did not matter much. Our trade policy was almost all foreign policy. Whatever we did or had with another country had to do with foreign policy. For the first 25 years we could do that easily. We did that and our incomes kept rising in this country.

The second 25 years we have had to deal with competitors who are shrewd, tough economic competitors. We now must insist on trade relationships and trade agreements that are fair to this country's interests. The conditions of trade must be conditions with rules that are fair to our workers and producers. The absence of that means that this country is the economic loser. This ought not be what we aspire to achieve in trade agreements.

Mr. President, I have more to say, regrettably, for my colleagues who do not like this message. I will say it often in the coming weeks as we discuss the trade issue. For now I will yield the floor. I see the minority leader has come to the floor. I know he is going to talk about another topic of great interest. I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. I will use my leader time to talk on another matter, and I appreciate very much the Senator from North Dakota yielding the floor to allow me to do so.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we just announced the signing of a letter dated September 9 by every one of our Democratic colleagues in support of some bipartisan legislation that I hope will enjoy even broader bipartisan support in the not-too-distant future.

The letter is addressed to the majority leader. Because it is brief, and I think the letter is very to the point, perhaps it would be appropriate for me simply to read it.

On July 9, we sent you a letter requesting a date certain on which comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation would be considered on the floor.

Today, we do more than simply renew this request. The purpose of this letter is to communicate to you in the clearest terms possible our specific legislative intentions in this regard.

Senate Democrats are prepared to cast 45 affirmative votes for the substitute language to S. 25, as announced by Senators McCain and Feingold on May 22, 1997. This support, coupled with the votes of the three current Republican cosponsors of this legislation, constitutes 48 votes for final passage, merely two votes shy of a majority.

While each of us might prefer to craft a bill to our individual liking, we recognize that