

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