import a lot of it this year—about 11 million tons, the Department of Agriculture expects.

Where are they buying their wheat? From us because they are flooding our markets with their goods and running up this trade surplus? Oh, no, not mostly from the United States. They are off price shopping for wheat in Canada and Argentina.

I want to show a graph that demonstrates the absurdity of what is going on. This line represents our trade deficit with China. You can see what has happened there—straight up. Straight up. And this line demonstrates the United States share of Chinese wheat purchases. You can see what has happened there—down.

As our trade deficit with China goes up because they flood our market with Chinese goods, they are off shopping elsewhere for wheat in Canada and Argentina.

I come from a very small town. In my town, there is an obligation. If someone comes and buys from your business, and then you need something that they have, you have an obligation to go buy from them. That is the way it works.

But that is not the way it works in international trade, unfortunately. It is a case of Uncle Sucker saying, ''Our market is wide open. Do what you want. You have no reciprocal obligation to our producers who want to sell in your market. You can go buy the things you need elsewhere and you can still access the American market.'' Something is fundamentally haywire in this trade strategy. It is hurting this country badly and it must stop.

I have written to Agriculture Secretary-designate Glickman and Trade Ambassador Kantor today, saying when these negotiators are in Beijing they ought to tell the Chinese they have reciprocal obligations in our marketplace. They need wheat? Then they buy wheat from us. If they need what we produce in dozens of areas, they buy from us. They have an obligation. Either we, with our trading partners, are going to work toward balanced trade relationships or we are not. If they are not willing then we ought to change the trade strategy we employ with those trading partners—and we ought to do it soon.

MEXICO'S MONETARY CRISIS

Let me make two other points. One, about the issue of the bailout for Mexico. I have not spoken publicly about it, but I have grave reservations about it. And I want to tell you why. Not that I am unconcerned about Mexico. It is our neighbor. It faces a financial crisis and we must respond in some manner.

But it in some ways relates to what I just spoke about in our trade relationship with China, Japan, and others. That is, trade and business relationships among nations should be reciprocal: There should be a sharing of economic responsibilities among nations who trade and do business with each other. I am wondering if that kind of shared responsbility is happening among nations who do business with Mexico.

What is the current account balance deficit in Mexico? Mexico has had to float bonds in order to underwrite a current account deficit. What does the current account balance deficit in Mexico result from? Largely from a trade deficit. Who is the trade deficit with? Us? Oh, no. No, very little of it is with the United States. Mostly with others.

I do not have all the information because I cannot get it. I have asked for it repeatedly from those in our Government who should provide it, and I am going to get it today, I guess, after some delay. But at least the sketchy information I do have suggests that a fair portion of Mexico's trade deficit comes from Japan and a fair portion of Mexico's trade deficit comes from Europe.

One would ask the question, then, if they issue public debt in Mexico to finance a current account balance, and that current account balance results from trade deficits, and if the trade deficits are deficits with Japan and Europe, should then the American taxpayer be the guarantor of a bailout of Mexico's trade relationship with Japan and Europe? Or is the new global order one in which there is a responsibility for other countries trading with Mexico, including Japan, including the Europeans, and others who have a trade relationship with Mexico, to own up to their responsibility?

Why is it only America's responsibility to come forward and protect Mexico in a monetary crisis? In my judgment this is a time to say to the countries that run a trade surplus with Mexico, or who have otherwise caused an outflow of money from Mexico, to step forward and say they will bear their share of responsibility.That is an issue which I think is very important.

I am greatly troubled by the call for a unilateral bailout of Mexico by the United States. I do not have all the information yet, but I intend to get it very soon. When I do, my hope is that we will be able to discuss this in the context of the obligations of others around the world. What are the obligations of the Japanese and the Europeans, and why are they not meeting them?

TOURS OF THE U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, a lot of ideas are floating around the Hill, some reform, some new, some nutty, and, in a new article I have here, an idea offered by someone from the Heritage Foundation. The foundation is the think tank which helped write the Contract With America. This fellow from the Heritage Foundation came to the Hill to testify and said he thinks we ought to charge the American people for touring the Capitol Building. He said they wear down the steps, they brush up against the walls, and apparently he thinks that we should charge the American people for touring the Capitol.

I would say that those who belong to a think tank who think this way should eliminate the word ''think'' and call it just a ''tank.'' Does anybody really believe it is too old fashioned to think that those who own a building ought not to have to pay an admission fee to tour it or enter it?

There are going to be a lot of things around here under the guise of new ideas or reform. A lot of them are going to be about half goofy, including this one.

I know people do not like to talk honestly about spending and taxing, so they come up with all kinds of other devices to avoid it. I guess to avoid talking about the need for revenue, they say let us talk about admission fees for the American people to the U.S. Capitol.

To those who come from think tanks who think this way, I say think again. Not many people who serve in the U.S. Congress would believe it appropriate to charge the American people an admission fee to enter and tour a building the American people themselves own.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] is recognized for up to 5 minutes.

THE EARTHQUAKE IN JAPAN

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I would like to take just a moment to express my deep concern and condolences to Japan and the Japanese people over the tragic loss of life and property from Tuesday's devastating earthquake.

The death toll is estimated to exceed 3,100 with another 15,000 suffering injury, and over 600 people still unaccounted for. The earthquake has left over 200,000 Japanese people homeless.

I know my colleagues in the Senate and the House, as well as the American people, share a profound sense of sympathy for those who have lost loved ones or have been devastated by this disaster.

There is unanimous support for the steps the United States has taken to assist the people of the Kobe area, and our thoughts and prayers are with our friends across the Pacific who have acted so bravely in the face of this tragedy.

Mr. President, I have a second statement which I shall read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] is recognized.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. ROTH pertaining to the introduction of S. 244 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 243 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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. NUNN. 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 Senator from Georgia is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. NUNN pertaining to the introduction of S. 244 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. NUNN. I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

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. BREAUX. 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. BREAUX. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana, Mr. BREAUX, is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

Mr. BREAUX. I thank the Chair.

NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President and my colleagues, I remember when I was practicing law in Louisiana as a very young lawyer. One of the senior lawyers was explaining to me how we should proceed in a courtroom. His suggestion was,

> If you don't have the facts on your side when you are arguing your case, well, you should talk about the law. But if you do not have the law on your side and you are handling a case in court, you should talk about the facts.

He went on to suggest if you do not have either one on your side, you ought to just stand up and shout and walk around the courtroom and act like you know what you are talking about.

Mr. President, I would suggest that some of the Republican rhetoric that I have heard in talking about national service takes the approach if you do not have the facts on your side, just make them up and say whatever you want about a program in order to try to show that it is not a good program.

I think it is very important that we stick to the facts when we talk about programs and things we do in Government. I think the public gets so much misinformation that it is very important to try to point out when the facts are wrong when we talk about programs.

I start off by making these comments because I was really very surprised by the Senator from Iowa, who was on the floor earlier, his remarks regarding national service that I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I supported the program. It was the type of initiative that the President ran on 2 years ago, the type of program that I think is a good program. When I read the gentleman's statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I was flabbergasted. I said, This cannot be true.

In essence, what the Senator was saying was that the AmeriCorps Program, part of the National Service Program, was costing $70,000 per student—$70,000 per student—in order to help kids go to college. I said that is ridiculous; I am not going to spend $70,000 a year to send kids to college. I found out some serious mistakes, in my opinion, were made about characterizing this program that is costing $70,000 a student in Pennsylvania, in the city of Philadelphia.

What I found out was that the mistake that was made in using these facts was the fact that they did not take into consideration private law firms that were contributing to this individual's salary; they did not take into consideration the Philadelphia Bar Association's contribution in this particular area. When he added up what the private sector was going to do with up to 11 full-time workers, he came up with the figure of $70,000, when in truth the Federal Government's contribution and the cost to the taxpayers was only $4,911. That is a big difference from $70,000.

The AmeriCorps Program, the National Service Program, is really what I think Republicans have always been talking about. Let us get away from giveaway programs. Let Members terminate programs, and just give money away from Washington to get people to do certain things. The essence of what AmeriCorps is all about—and we have had up to 200,000 young men and women in this country volunteer to participate in the AmeriCorps Program. It is a wonderful concept. It builds on the Peace Corps Program.

By the way, Peace Corps Program volunteers get a stipend; they are paid. Just like the Vista Program has young men and women in this program, that participate in the program and do wonderful things, they get a small salary, as well. The concept of AmeriCorps, and why I think Republicans and Democrats alike should be supportive of it, is because it is a partnership between the Government and the citizens of this country.

It talks about community, responsibility, reciprocity; it talks about saying if the Government is going to help me to go to college, I have an obligation to reciprocate and give something back. What they give back in the AmeriCorps Program is doing community work, doing legal work in the communities, working in a law enforcement program, in a drug rehabilitation program, in a nursing program, an environmental cleanup program, as they are doing in my State of Louisiana, as we are doing in Louisiana where we have young AmeriCorps students who are working in the sheriffs department and local law enforcement.

Mr. President, they are giving something back to a Government that has helped them go to college. It is a partnership. It is not a giveaway program. It does not cost $70,000 for one young student to be able to participate in this program. It is asking the local community to say, do you need these types of students working in your local town? Most of them are saying, Yes, we need some help. We need some help in the environment. We need some help in drug enforcement programs and drug rehabilitation programs.

So the AmeriCorps Program is not a giveaway program; it is a program that encourages young people to participate. We have an all-volunteer army. They get paid, too. They get a salary so they can survive and so they can live. I do not think they detract from an all-volunteer military. The basic fact is we should be encouraging young men and women to give something back to a Government that has helped them get an education.

As President Clinton has said so many times in this country today, what you earn is going to be based on what you learn. The facts are dramatic, that a young person, a young male in this country that graduates from a 4-year college earns about 83 percent more in his lifetime than a person who has not been able to go to college; 83 percent more in a lifetime. That is not just pie in the sky. That is real facts.

That is something that we as a nation should be encouraging. And we do not encourage it under national service by a giveaway program; we encourage it to be a partnership by saying to that young man or young woman that if you would like to go to college and you need some help, we will help you pay for your tuition. But it is not free; it is not free. You have an obligation to try to give something back to your Government—not in India, not in Japan, not in Europe, not in a Third-World country, but right here in America. That is why it is called AmeriCorps. It is not a foreign aid program. We are not sending kids to other nations to help them solve their problems. We are saying that if you accept this challenge, we will let you work in your local community, back where people know you, where you may ultimately end up working as a citizen in a partnership with your local citizens in your local community.

That is why when someone says, well, this program costs $70,000 a student, it is absolutely not factual. It does not cost $70,000 for the taxpayers of this