What I am trying to say is it becomes, I think, a Catch-22. If we as Senators are going to say, ipso facto, we give approval to any number of different trade agreements up through the year 2001, the provisions of which we do not even know about yet, then quite clearly what we are saying is we will not be able to come out here with amendments to protect consumers and working families, in which case I think we are going to get the same response from the administration, which is we will not make these agreements part of a trade agreement, basic protection on fair labor standards, on consumer protection, on environmental protection.

I think that is the tragic mistake we will be making if we approve fast track.

My second reason for opposing the motion to proceed is that I am not at all confident—in fact, unfortunately, I am quite certain—that as opposed to improving the standard of living and the quality of life for a majority of Americans, these trade agreements will have precisely the opposite effect.

Let me also say that I am equally concerned about trade agreements that will lead to an improvement of the quality of life and living standards of people in other countries. I am all for trade agreements that lead to an improvement of the standard of living of people in our country and people in other countries. I am not in favor of a trade agreement that ends up not being global village but global pillage, where what you have instead is a systematic violation of the rights of children, of basic human rights, of basic fair labor standards and of basic environmental standards leading to profits for the few large multinational corporations and misery for way too many people throughout the world.

Mr. President, we have had extensive debate on NAFTA, which was approved, and also extensive debate on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which ultimately led to the creation of the World Trade Organization, the WTO. I voted against implementing these trade agreements because I was concerned that these trade agreements would not take our country in the right direction. Now, as I think about it, I am afraid that the empirical evidence supports this view as well.

Let me say again, I didn't oppose NAFTA or WTO because I am a protectionist. I am an internationalist. I don't have any interest in building walls on the borders of our country to keep out goods and services. Nor do I fear fair competition from workers and companies operating in other countries. I am not afraid of our neighbors. I don't fear other countries nor their people. I am in favor of open trade, and I believe the President should negotiate trade agreements which lead, generally, to more open markets here and abroad.

Indeed, I am aware of the benefits of trade for the economy of Minnesota, and I am told about that constantly. We have an extremely internationally minded community of corporations, larger companies, small businesses, working people and farmers in our State. And we have done relatively well in this international economy. I am very proud of Minnesota's performance in this international economy.

We have lost some jobs to trade, as have most States, but we have also benefited from trade. We benefit both from the exports and the imports: The exports create the jobs, as we all know, but the imports are not necessarily a bad thing. They provide the competition for consumers and they can push our own domestic companies to do better, to be more productive and to be more efficient. Open trade can contribute significantly to the expansion of wealth and opportunity, and it can reward innovation and productivity. It can deliver higher quality goods and services at better prices.

So, what I am saying is not that we should not be involved in international trade, not that our country doesn't have a major role—we have a major role and play a major role in the international economy. But what I am saying is that the Congress should exercise its proper role in regulating trade, which is what trade agreements do, so that the rules of this international trade reflect American values. That is how America can lead in the world and it is how America should lead in the world.

What American values are we talking about when it comes to trade? What are the American values when it comes to trade? We believe in open markets at home and abroad. But we also think there is a role for Government to play, especially when it comes to the protection of fundamental labor rights for working women and men, when it comes to the protection of children in the labor force, when it comes to environmental standards, when it comes to food and other consumer protections. These are important values in our country. When it comes to fundamental standards dealing with human rights and when it comes to democracy, these are important American values. The question is, how can we pursue these values when we are negotiating trade agreements?

The Clinton administration believes that the commercial issues are primarily in the body of the trade agreements, which are enforceable with trade sanctions, and that the environmental and the labor rights issues and the human rights issues are secondary. A majority of the Senate appears to agree. I do not, and I don't believe most Americans agree with the President and the majority of the Senate on this question. I believe, and I think most Americans believe, that fundamental standard-of-living and quality-of-life issues are exactly what trade policy should be all about. That is why strong and enforceable labor rights, environmental and consumer protections belong directly in the agreements themselves. And if trade agreements do not help to uphold democracy and respect for human rights, then they are deficient. That is my position and, as we enter the 21st century, these should be the pillars of American leadership in the world.

At the same time we are told that America must lead on the issue of trade, we are also told that if we don't negotiate trade agreements, even ones that do not live up to our own principles, then other countries will do so with each other in our absence; we will be left out. That is what we are told. What a contradiction. We must lead but we must do so by weakening our values, by leaving enforcement of labor rights out of agreements we negotiate, by leaving protection of the environment out of agreements we negotiate, by surrendering our principal linkage of human rights concerns to trade policy.

Are we saying that when it comes down to it, that money is basically all that matters? Is that how America should lead the world? Not in my view. Our trade policy should seek to create fair trading arrangements which lift up the standards of people in all nations. It should foster competition based on productivity, quality, and rising living standards—not competition based on exploitation and a race to the bottom.

As one Minnesotan, Larry Weiss, wrote in our State's largest newspaper earlier this week, ''What we want is a global village, not global pillage.'' Protection of basic labor and environmental and food safety standards are just as important and just as valid as any other commercial or economic objective sought by the U.S. negotiators in trade agreements. We need to be encouraging good corporate citizenship, not the flight of capital and the dissemination of good-paying jobs from the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend his remarks for a moment?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, since I have to interrupt my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for additional comments immediately after the vote.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JAMES S. GWIN, OF OHIO, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the Senate will now proceed to executive session and the clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James S. Gwin, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 10 minutes equally divided on the nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am delighted that the majority leader has taken up the nomination of Judge James S. Gwin to be a U.S. district court judge for the northern district of Ohio.

Since 1989, Judge Gwin has served as a judge for the Court of Common Pleas in Stark County, OH. Three times during his judgeship, Judge Gwin has been elected administrative judge by his peers, and in 1995, he was elected presiding judge. In addition to his legal service, Judge Gwin has volunteered for several organizations, including the North Central Ohio Juvenile Diabetes Foundation and the Central Stark County Mental Health Center. His nomination enjoys the strong bipartisan support of Senator GLENN and Senator DEWINE.

Despite his exemplary record, one or more of my colleagues on the majority has again demanded a rollcall vote on a judicial nomination. That is, of course, the right of any Senator and I do not object. Indeed, I welcome the vote. I expect this rollcall vote to be much like the last eight in which a unanimous Senate approves a well-qualified judicial nomination. I congratulate Judge Gwin and his family on this achievement and look forward to his service on the U.S. district court.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the time will be charged equally. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. 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. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James S. Gwin, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 293 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Abraham	Burns	Dodd
Akaka	Byrd	Domenici
Allard	Campbell	Dorgan
Ashcroft	Chafee	Durbin
Baucus	Cleland	Enzi
Bennett	Coats	Faircloth
Biden	Cochran	Feingold
Bingaman	Collins	Feinstein
Bond	Conrad	Ford
Boxer	Coverdell	Frist
Breaux	Craig	Glenn
Brownback	D'Amato	Gorton
Bryan	Daschle	Graham
Bumpers	DeWine	Gramm
Grams	Landrieu	Rockefeller
Grassley	Lautenberg	Roth
Gregg	Leahy	Santorum
Hagel	Levin	Sarbanes
Harkin	Lieberman	Sessions
Hatch	Lott	Shelby
Helms	Lugar	Smith (NH)
Hollings	Mack	Smith (OR)
Hutchinson	McCain	Snowe
Hutchison	McConnell	Specter
Inhofe	Mikulski	Stevens
Inouye	Moseley-Braun	Thomas
Jeffords	Moynihan	Thompson
Johnson	Murkowski	Thurmond
Kempthorne	Murray	Torricelli
Kennedy	Nickles	Warner
Kerrey	Reed	Wellstone
Kerry	Reid	Wyden
Kohl	Robb	
Kyl	Roberts	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT OF 1997—MOTION TO PROCEED

The Senate continued with the consideration of the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under unanimous consent, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, it is the role of national governments to establish the rules within which companies and countries trade. That is what trade agreements do. They set strict rules. If, for example, a country does not enforce respect for patents, trade sanctions can be invoked.

Mr. President, you can bet that U.S. companies get right in the face of our negotiators to make sure that the rules in these agreements which protect their interests are ironclad and will be strictly enforced. That is what companies do. You can be absolutely sure that U.S. companies would laugh in the face of negotiators if they were told that their concerns were legitimate but could be pursued just as seriously in less enforceable side agreements.

My point, Mr. President, is that it is fine to represent the interests of the companies. We should do so. But we are also elected to represent other people in our country, not just large multinational corporations. We are elected to represent the majority of people.

I say, Mr. President, that we should take a very strong interest not only in representing the majority of people in our country but also in representing a lot of people, ordinary citizens, wage earners, ordinary people in the countries we trade with. Because if they do not make enough money to demand the products that we produce, then we are not going to do well.

Mr. President, I think this fast-track agreement, which extends on to NAFTA and GATT, is deeply skewed toward large corporate interests. That has been our recent experience with trade agreements. And I want to talk a little bit about what has happened with NAFTA.

NAFTA has been in operation for 3 years. And we heard a lot about what NAFTA was going to do for all of us. We have an opportunity now to look at the results with NAFTA. They include loss of jobs, suppression of wages, and the weakening of food, safety, and pollution laws.

Mr. President, if we repeat these mistakes, we are only going to condemn ourselves to replicate some of NAFTA's worst measurable consequences. Let me draw for colleagues from a respected Economic Policy Institute report. This report was issued in September of this year and titled ''NAFTA and the States: Job Destruction is Widespread.'' EI's study concluded that ''an exploding deficit in net exports with Mexico and Canada has eliminated 394,835 U.S. jobs since NAFTA took effect in 1994.'' The report argues that this job loss contributed significantly to a 4-percent decline in real median wages in the United States since 1993. Minnesota, according to this report, lost about 6,500 jobs due to the NAFTA-related trade deficit between 1993 and 1996, contributing to about a 3.8 percent drop in real median wages.

Mr. President, last month the Institute for Policy Studies and United for a Fair Economy published a study which tracked the performance and actions of a number of companies which belong to a major corporate coalition which is advocating passage of fast track. The study found that the 40 companies which are members of the America Leads on Trade coalition, from whom all of our offices have received pro-fast-track materials regularly, cut jobs in 89 U.S. plants under NAFTA. The study also documents that almost 13,000 workers who were laid off by members of this coalition, America Leads on Trade, qualified for NAFTA retraining assistance. And while jobs were being cut by these firms, these firms' profits soared and the salaries of their CEO's were significantly higher than those of executives in other leading firms.

Mr. President, again, looking at the record with NAFTA, according to Public Citizen in a report released in September of this year, U.S. food imports have skyrocketed while U.S. inspections of imported food have declined significantly. The report charges that ''imports of Mexican crops documented by the U.S. Government to be at high risk of pesticide contamination have dramatically increased under NAFTA, while inspection has decreased.''

Mr. President, our experience with NAFTA can't be dismissed. Jobs and wages in the United States have gone down. We have this paradox over the last 20 years of workers' productivity going up but real wages going down. Wages have gone down in Mexico, too,