

China pause the next time another Tiananmen Square breaks out. Ultimately, this way engenders freedom and human rights better than either of those other two methods. After all, isn't that what this is all about?

One final note: I hope that the Chinese Government does not think that the tabling of the Thompson amendment is the end of the proliferation debate in the Senate. China must stop engaging in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The Clinton administration has failed miserably to curb such proliferation. That is why there has been support to legislate antiproliferation policy in the absence of an executive proliferation policy.

Mr. President, China must stop making weapons of mass destruction available to rogue nations around the world. We need to open up trade with China to increase our exports and to increase the exposure of the Chinese people to economic and political liberalization. But trade must not come at the expense of national security. Ignoring China's proliferation activities while we increase our trade ties with China would be a grave mistake. We must be vigilant and enforce current U.S. law as it pertains to proliferation. The Clinton administration's failure to do so has jeopardized national security. Congress must not permit future administrations to make the same mistake.

Mr. President, 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. GRAHAM. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during today's session the following Senators be recognized in morning business for the times specified: Senator GRAHAM of Florida and Senator EDWARDS of North Carolina for up to 10 minutes each, and Senator DORGAN of North Dakota for up to 20 minutes.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will now proceed to use the 10 minutes which I have been allocated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAHAM are located in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT AMENDMENTS—Motion to Proceed

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, there have been numerous efforts over the past several months to find a way to come to agreement on how to proceed to the so-called H-1B bill, which is a bill to provide for additional high-tech workers to come into this country. Since we have already reached the limit, I believe, for this year, there is a need for additional workers in this area. We have negotiated back and forth. At one point we were talking about 10 amendments on each side. Then we got down to seven, six, and yet Senator DASCHLE and I were working to see if we could clear five amendments.

Then you get into all kinds of discussions. Are these just relevant amendments or can it be five agreed-to amendments? How do we deal with Senators who would want to add clearly unrelated amendments that could take down the whole issue?

Without questioning the motives of anybody, I think Senator DASCHLE and I have been serious in trying to work something out. We have tried repeatedly, but there have been objections for one reason or another on both sides. I do not think we can pursue that any further, although one of the major problems, I had a Senator tell me yesterday maybe he would feel he would not object by Tuesday. But if we wait until Tuesday, then we have lost more days. So if we should be able to come to agreement that would be good. We could vitiate cloture and go to it. If we cannot, we need to go ahead and get to this issue.

Hopefully we can get cloture, and when we do, relevant amendments would still be in order, and we still would have to go through a conference. Obviously, there would be input from both sides of the aisle, both sides of the Capitol, and from the administration on the final contours on this bill. But we are down to the point now where there are a number of important bills remaining on the calendar, and if we don't find a way to address them one of two things will happen: They either won't be considered in a conference at the end of the session, or they will be considered in such a way that they will be added to some other bill, unrelated, some appropriations conference report, or something else.

At times that is the best way to proceed, and we should keep that option open. But I would prefer to have the Senate act its will on a bill of this type and relevant amendments be offered and debated and voted on. So that is what I want to try to set up here.

I have notified the Democratic leader—he has a representative here—that

this is what we are going to do now, that we would move to a cloture motion and then we will get to vote on it next week.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 2045, the H-1B legislation, and send the cloture motion to the desk.

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 motion to proceed to calendar No. 490, S. 2045, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to H-1B Non-Immigrant Aliens:

Trent Lott, Chuck Hagel, Spencer Abraham, Phil Gramm, Jim Bunning, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Sam Brownback, Rod Grams, Jesse Helms, John Ashcroft, Gordon Smith of Oregon, Pat Roberts, Slade Gorton, Connie Mack, John Warner and Robert Bennett.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this cloture vote will occur, unless there is some intervening agreement, on Tuesday. I ask unanimous consent the cloture vote occur immediately following the passage of H.R. 4444, and the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I want to make a comment to the majority leader.

This H-1B visa bill is important to all of us. It is important to those on the Democratic side of the aisle as well. We recognize that our economy is experiencing substantial and sustained growth, unparalleled growth, and to keep that on track we have to ensure our high-tech industry has the employees it needs.

I was at a company in California some while ago and the president of the company said we have 2,000 open positions for engineers right now that we can't fill. There is not any way for us to fill them—2,000 jobs, engineers we need and we can't get. So we understand this issue. We want it to be resolved.

I must say, the Democratic leader is not here today. On his behalf, I would mention to you that with regard to the discussions that you and he have had about the potential for five amendments on a side—he was fairly optimistic about being able to clear that. We think that can be resolved. We hope it can be resolved on next Tuesday. It is our understanding the Republican leader was amenable in those discussions to an agreement that would allow

five amendments on each side related to H-1B or to technology-related job training, education, and access.

It is also our understanding the Republican leader was amenable to our Democratic leader, or his designee, offering a Latino fairness amendment and a Liberian adjustment amendment.

I want to make a comment on his behalf that support of relief for immigrants who have fled wars in Haiti, El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala, and to other longtime residents who have been in the United States since before 1986 is important to ensure fairness in the immigration system. If we do this, we will immediately increase the size of the legal workforce and also alleviate the shortage of low-skilled workers, and we will keep families together.

We believe our offer is reasonable. We hope we can work out an agreement. I think the discussions we have had about the five amendments on each side is something that should give us some hope that we will be able to resolve this soon and certainly before this Congress adjourns.

It is a very important issue. You want to address it. We want to address it. We believe we should find a way to connect here and reach agreement to do so.

Mr. LOTT. Will the Senator yield on another point? He and I have discussed the fact that we need to make sure that, wherever possible, some of these high-tech jobs be available in areas now that are underserved—rural areas, including my own State and the State of North Dakota and several other States. I think Nebraska would be in that group. You know, you can't direct where those jobs go, but we could encourage some of those programs, some of these people to be taken into areas where there are not now opportunities, that training be available for them. That certainly would be very attractive so we do not have the high-tech industry only concentrated on the west coast and Northern Virginia or in some other areas, but to try to spread it as much as possible. That is an issue I would like us to consider.

With regard to the immigrant problems, I think, as he knows, we have in the past supported some movement in that area. I believe there is some application now to Nicaraguans that are here. Of course that causes some of the problems. Some of their neighbors don't have that same consideration. We should look at this issue. We should do it thoughtfully. But that is one of the problems.

H-1B has been pending a long time. We need to get it done. The argument can be made that these are different issues. For instance, I understand the other issues mentioned would not be relevant postcloture to the bill, but I do think it is going to be an issue that is going to be discussed as we get to

the end of this session to see if there is some way some of those can be addressed. The Senator is talking, in some instances, about a relatively small number of people. One he mentioned was Liberian immigrants, focused primarily on one State. Maybe something can be done on that.

I want us to find a way to get this bill done. It has been dragging for 6 months. We are down to the last 2 weeks of the fiscal year. I am trying to set up a process that guarantees we get to a conclusion while we continue to work with those on both sides who may have objections.

The problem we have is, if you include these three, four, or five, you will have other people who will say: What about this issue, that would cause a filibuster to begin and we would wind up having to pull down the bill. I would rather that not be the end result.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield further under my reservation, as he knows, it is even difficult to agree to five amendments. We are willing to do that. The Democratic leader wants this bill done. I want it done. My colleagues want it done. We risk ending this session not doing something that we know should be done. We need to do this H-1B bill, and we need to increase the number of these visas.

Let me also respond to the point the Senator from Mississippi made a moment ago. The Senator from Mississippi pointed out that if we bring additional people in to fill jobs here, which makes sense—I much prefer they come in and fill jobs in this country rather than have the company move their operations to India or some other country—it makes sense also not to move all of those jobs into the same part of the country. Because information technology now allows us to do this work anyplace in the country, what about targeting some areas of the country where we have had outmigration, where we have lost population? That is what the Senator from Mississippi said. I think it makes eminent good sense. I hope we can work on at least a piece of that.

I will not object. Again I say it is our intention to get this legislation passed. We think the proposal offered in the last couple of days makes sense. We think we can probably clear that in the manner previously discussed between Senator DASCHLE and Senator LOTT.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has up to 20 minutes. The Senator from North Dakota.

BUDGET SURPLUSES AND DEFICITS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I come to the floor of the Senate to discuss the fiscal policy questions that are ricocheting around this Chamber, and the House as well, about what the future will hold with respect to tax cuts, budget surpluses and/or deficits, investments in education, the possibility of reducing Federal indebtedness, and other spending. I want to talk about that because we now have a discussion in this town about the potential for big recurring budget surpluses every single year.

It was not too many years ago in Washington, DC, that we had the leading economists in the country saying the 1990s would be a decade of anemic economic growth. We had very large budget deficits, the country was not doing well, and the economists said for the next decade this economy is going to grow very slowly.

The economists did not know what they were talking about then. That is not unusual. I always thought there should be some sort of standard by which we measure economists and evaluate whether what they say has any validity in terms of what we experience. Of course, we have no such yardsticks, so these economists keep on talking and people keep on listening. That is why I am here today: What do we expect in the future, and what should we do in this country as a reasonable response to those expectations.

I want to for a moment talk about the early 1990s and recall where we were. The unified budget deficit in 1992 was \$290 billion and rising—\$290 billion just for that year and rising. Now we have a surplus in the year 2000. Economists said we would have continual, larger and larger deficits. That was wrong. We now have a surplus.

Economic growth: Then it averaged 2.8 percent. We were apparently at the end of, or beginning to see the end of, a recession. Economic growth averaged 2.8 percent annually for the previous 12 years, and it looked as if we were finally ending a recession. Since 1993, economic growth has averaged 3.9 percent a year.

Jobs: From 1988 to 1992, we had a difficult period, one of the worst in history in terms of the creation of new