

Treaty, the Reagan administration sought to reinterpret the provisions of the ABM Treaty—to reinterpret those provisions because the Reagan administration did not want to live up to the ABM Treaty. They wanted to get away from that ABM Treaty. There were some people in that administration who sought to reinterpret the ABM Treaty. But as we prepared for the subsequent approval by this U.S. Senate of the ratification of the INF Treaty, the distinguished Senator from Delaware was adamant in insisting that there be an amendment written to provide that there be no reinterpretation of any treaty by a subsequent administration; that the treaty had to be interpreted based on the four corners of the treaty plus interpretation of the treaty as explained by witnesses of the administration in power at the time the treaty was ratified. Any new understanding would have to be agreed upon by the executive branch and the legislative branch.

The distinguished Senator from Delaware rendered a great service in that instance, as did the then-Senator from Georgia, Mr. Nunn, who was chairman of the Armed Services Committee; the then-Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Boren, who was chairman of the Intelligence Committee; and the then-chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Pell.

Mr. BIDEN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Those three Senators and I insisted on having it in writing from the Soviets. And Secretary of State Shultz went to—I guess it was Paris—went to Europe, at least, and worked with Mr. Shevardnadze, I believe, and came back with a document in writing saying that all parties agreed that that would be the interpretation, that there would not be any subsequent reinterpretation by any administration, any subsequent President. Because if that were the case, how could we ever depend upon any treaty as having credibility, if a subsequent administration could reinterpret it according to its own wishes?

How would a subsequent administration interpret an “understanding” that was entered into by a handshake? All the more reasons for wanting to see it in writing and having it debated by the elected representatives of the people.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. BIDEN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, to reaffirm what the Senator says, I do not think anyone should read in this that the Senator from West Virginia and I aren't happy that the President wants to bring down the number of nuclear weapons.

Mr. BYRD. No.

Mr. BIDEN. We are very supportive of that. We want to make sure when it is done, it is done.

Mr. BYRD. It is done.

Mr. BIDEN. And we know it is done.

I thank the Senator and I thank the Chair, and I particularly thank Senator BAUCUS for his kindness in allowing us to proceed.

Mr. BYRD. I join in the thanks.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from West Virginia as well as the Senator from Delaware. They as well as many others over the years have provided terrific service to our country, keeping their eye on this ball with respect to the former Soviet Union, current Russia, and the key question of nuclear proliferation. I thank them very much. On behalf of the American people, I thank them, too.

The Senator has done a terrific job.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, let me say I am deeply appreciative, and I thank the very able Senator from Montana for his observations.

WTO MINISTERIAL MEETING

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the just-concluded World Trade Organization Ministerial in Doha, Qatar.

The administration has announced that WTO members reached an agreement to launch new negotiations on a number of international trade topics. Our trade negotiators hailed this as a major victory.

I recognize the considerable efforts of our trade negotiators in this process. That said, I am unsettled by the results of this session in several areas.

The agreement reached today in Doha makes it even more clear why Congress must have deeper involvement in our international trade policy.

Without a doubt, there are positive items in the documents to launch the negotiation. I am pleased that the United States was able to negotiate forward-looking language on agriculture. There are some good things there—for example, goals of improving market access and reducing market distortions, particularly export subsidies.

But these are vague commitments, and Europe and some of its allies have already demonstrated their strident opposition to meaningful progress in this area. The devil is in the details—and the details have yet to be worked out.

On the other side of the ledger, I am extremely troubled by the decision to re-open the agreements reached just a few years ago on antidumping and anti-subsidy measures. Both Houses of Congress have made it clear that they oppose negotiations to further weaken U.S. trade laws.

Let's be absolutely clear on this point. Our trading partners have only one goal here: to weaken our trade laws. That is something the administration should not tolerate—and that Congress will not tolerate.

These problems demonstrate why Congress must take a hard look at trade negotiations. The Constitution assigns responsibility for international trade to the Congress. Yet the administration is now acting without a mandate from Congress.

Congress must have a more prominent role in trade negotiations. As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I plan oversight hearings on these negotiations.

The problems I have outlined also make clear why any new grant of fast track negotiating authority must address the concerns of Congress on issues like preservation of U.S. trade laws. It must also ensure that Congress has an active role in trade negotiations.

I yield the floor. 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.

THE STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, while we are waiting for some intervening Senate business, I wish to make a couple of comments about international trade. I am inspired to do that by my colleague from Montana.

Before I do that, let me compliment my colleague, Senator BAUCUS, on the work he has done on the stimulus package. I told him yesterday in a private conversation how impressed I was with what he brought to the floor dealing with taxation and other issues to try to provide some lift and recovery to this country's economy. I think it was the right bill. It was the right thing. I commend him for his leadership, and I appreciate his leadership on that.

I was sorely disappointed that there was a point of order raised against that which prevailed last evening because I think Senator BAUCUS, along with Senator DASCHLE and others of us who were pushing very hard to get this done, had put together a piece of legislation that really would provide some boost to the American economy.

We are not in a position where we can just decide to stand around and wait and see what happens. I mentioned earlier that we had a trade history during President Hoover's period where this country seemed to be sinking into a deep abyss. And the attitude was: Well, there is not much we can do about that; we will sit around here and wait and see what happens. That is not what should have been done then, and it is not what we can do now.

What we did was positive; that is, try to put together a legislative program

that does the best we can to say to the American people that we are trying to give lift and boost to this economy in a way that provides jobs.

I say to my colleague from Montana that I thought he did a great job, and I appreciate his work.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me talk just for a moment about international trade because there has been a trade conference in Doha, Qatar. I expect the people who run the WTO chose that place largely because they did not want to have a trade conference where there were a lot of hotel rooms. Experiences in trade conferences in recent years have not been good. Thousands and thousands of people from around the world have come to demonstrate and express concerns about one thing or another. So they decided to have a ministerial conference in Doha. My understanding is there are so few hotel rooms in Doha that they had to bring in cruise ships in order to provide lodging for visitors to Doha.

Because of other business this week, I didn't pay a lot of attention to what they did at Doha.

I do know that all these trade folks converged and they had a long visit. I watched part of a similar visit in Montreal some years ago. I watched part of the visit they had in Seattle. So I know they all get together. They have the same backgrounds, and they talk the same language. They actually have shorthand for all the trade lingo that they develop. Apparently now, from the experience of recent days in Doha, they have decided they have reached some agreements on a new round, and so forth.

So I want to point out just a couple of concerns I have about where we are with international trade.

I have a chart that shows a series of balloons that represent the very serious trade problem confronting us in this country. It is a trade deficit that is ballooning, year after year after year. It is the largest trade deficit in human history.

We spend a lot of time worrying about the fiscal policy budget deficit that about 9 years ago was almost \$300 billion a year. There was hand wringing and teeth gnashing and people wiping their brow, and they would come to the floor of the Senate, saying they wanted to change the Constitution, they wanted to do this and that. Why? Because we had this growing budget deficit, this tumor that was growing in the fiscal policy of this country. It was going to hurt this country.

It is interesting that there is a deafening silence in this country about the trade deficit. It, too, is growing, much more rapidly, in many ways, than the fiscal policy deficit did. It is much higher at this point than our budget

deficit was at its height. One can make the case, as an economist, that the budget deficit is something we owe to ourselves. This deficit we owe to others. This deficit will ultimately be repaid by a lower standard of living in the United States.

My point is, this deficit is growing and growing and growing. After round after round of trade negotiations, we are in worse and worse shape. The question is, why?

It is interesting, if you ask economists, they all give you different answers: It is because the dollar is too strong; the dollar is too weak; it is because our budget deficit is too high, not high enough; productivity isn't high enough. It depends on the economist that you ask.

Having both studied and taught economics in college, I understand that the field of economics is certainly not a science. I consider it psychology pumped up with just a little bit of helium. All you have to do is ask, and you get an answer. It does not mean it is an informed answer. There are 100 different answers as to why our deficit is out of control. Ask any economist. They don't have the foggiest idea. We had a \$449 billion merchandise trade deficit last year in this country.

Now let me describe some of the details of trade. It is interesting that everybody talking about trade, especially those at the ministerial conferences, want to talk about the big picture: global trade. They never want to the talk about specifics. So here is a specific.

We trade with Korea, which is a good friend of ours. This chart shows that last year Korea sent 570,000 automobiles to the United States to be sold in the United States. Do you know how many automobiles the United States sent to be sold in Korea? Was it 570,000? No, not quite. The answer: 1,700. So 570,000 cars coming our way and then we were able to export 1,700 cars to Korea. Get a Ford Mustang convertible here in the United States, send it to Korea, and it costs twice as much for a Korean consumer. Why? Because Korea does not want our cars. They do not want our cars coming in and competing. They have all kinds of mechanisms and devices to discourage our ability to move a car to Korea. The result is, 570,000 Korean cars in the United States; 1,700 United States cars to Korea. Fair trade? I don't think so.

Is that something we ought to correct? In my judgment, it is because these numbers translate to jobs. A working family, a man or a woman getting a job on an assembly line in a manufacturing plant, a job that pays well, a job with security, a job with benefits, these are good jobs. This means we export these jobs to other countries that produce products and send them to us and then keep their market closed to our products, which

means fewer manufacturing jobs in the United States.

I have another chart I did not bring to the Chamber. It shows T-bone steaks in Tokyo. Do you know that 12 years after the last beef agreement we reached with Japan, the conclusion of which resulted in feasting and rejoicing by everyone engaged in the trade negotiations—you would have thought they just won the gold medal in the Olympics. The headlines trumpeted the beef agreement with Japan. What a wonderful agreement. Twelve years later, by the way, every pound of American beef sent to Japan has a 38.5-percent tariff attached to it—every single pound. Is that fair trade with Japan? No. Fair trade would be more T-bone steaks to Tokyo, in my judgment. But we have a 38.5-percent tariff on every single pound.

Going back to Korea: What about potato flakes to Korea? Up in my part of the country, in the Red River Valley, where the Presiding Officer also represents some potato growers, those potatoes are cut into flakes. Those potato flakes are sent around the world, and they are put into chips in fast food. Potato flakes are used for fast food. Well, that is probably a pejorative. I shouldn't say "fast food." I should say "snacks." Potato flakes are used for snacks.

If you raise a potato in the Red River Valley and then turn it into potato flakes and send it to Korea, guess what happens to it? Korea slaps a 300-percent tariff on potato flakes.

Are potato flakes going to threaten the Korean food market? I do not think so. Is it fair to an American potato farmer to confront a 300-percent tariff? Where I live, it is not fair.

I could spend a lot of time talking about these things.

China: We have a huge trade deficit with China. We also have a huge trade deficit with Japan. We have a big deficit with Europe. We have a huge deficit with Canada and Mexico. But China, we sent 12 American movies into China in the last year. Why? That is all China would let into their country, 12 movies. Fair trade? I don't think so.

Or how about this? In the last trade agreement we negotiated with China, we sent our negotiators to China. Now, presumably, these are the best negotiators we have. We sent them to China. I do not know how we sent them there, probably not on a slow boat, as the saying goes; probably in an airplane.

They got to China and negotiated a bilateral agreement with China, which was the precursor to allowing China to join the WTO. They brought back the bilateral agreement, which we did not vote on because we do not have a vote on a bilateral trade agreement with China. Guess what we discovered?

Let me give you an example. Automobiles: After a long phase-in, we have