

time high of about 37 percent of total market share. As a result of that, we now see in this country about 29,000 men and women who are unemployed as a direct result of a major dumping effort—let me repeat, as a direct result of a major dumping effort—on the part of the Canadian forest products industry into our market.

In my State of Idaho, just in the last few days, we have had announcements of another 200 men and women laid off simply because the price of lumber, as a result of this huge volume of subsidized lumber pouring in from Canada, is so low that mills cannot operate.

Ceda-Pine Veneer north of Sandpoint, ID; Crown Pacific in Bonners Ferry, ID; and two Louisiana Pacific plants in Chilco and Sandpoint have just announced layoffs or have shut down, and the story goes on and on, as is true across Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and the Southeast, as a result of what has happened with Canadian lumber imports.

This administration, to their credit a good many months ago became aggressively engaged with the forest products industry in negotiating with Canada in an effort to resolve this issue.

When I say that, it is about the only good thing I am going to say, because as we entered into those negotiations the forest products industry was told by our United States Trade Representative nearly 10 months ago that within 6 months, if the Canadians did not negotiate in good faith successfully, this administration would take action, and that action would be a temporary duty imposed until such time as a countervailing duty suit would be charged or the Canadians would come to the table with some form of a legitimate agreement to negotiate the differences between the two countries.

That did not occur from the Canadians, and, as a result, finally this administration did say, "We will have to bring a countervailing duty suit, and move toward a temporary duty."

In late November of this year, the Canadians finally did bring some proposed agreements for us—the industry and our United States Trade Representative—to look at to see whether they would meet the criteria that we were trying to advance, which was a level playing field, recognizing the legitimate share of the market that the Canadians could have without destroying our industry.

From that point, myself, Senator BAUCUS, and a good many others have asked the United States Trade Representative to become much more aggressive in insisting that this problem be solved now. It was in December, just before we recessed for Christmas, that Mickey Kantor did come to the Hill and sat down with myself, Senator BAUCUS, five or six other Senators from timber-producing States, and a good many Representatives from the House to talk about where we were in this negotiation.

At that time, Mickey Kantor said to us, and it was conveyed to the Canadi-

ans, that if no agreements were reached through the current negotiation, that on January 31, 1996, he would impose a temporary duty against the Canadians, and we would then move to do a variety of other things, including reform NAFTA's chapter 19, to consider what is called suspension of liquidation on Canadian imports into this country, and do a variety of other things that would bring about some permanency and stability to this problem.

Madam President, today is January 31. Canadians are now still negotiating with our trade ambassador, and I do not want to say nothing will be resolved, but I do want to say to our trade ambassador: If nothing is resolved by the end of the day, it is absolutely imperative for this country's credibility and for this administration's credibility with Canada and with the industries and the work forces involved that we move. And that tomorrow I would expect to hear from our United States Trade Representative an announcement of an imposed temporary duty against the subsidized lumber coming out of Canada while these other measures are forthcoming; that the United States lumber industry would probably move to file a countervailing duty case, and that case would go forward, but would literally take months and potentially a year.

But what is important here and what this administration must face is that it is now time to make a decision, and they must make that decision. If they fail to, if they bend in any form to the Canadians, they will send the kind of message that I believe has been sent for the last 6 months: We just keep on talking.

As we keep on talking, mills are closing down in my State. As I mentioned, 29,000 jobs in this country are now in suspension, and men and women are not working as a direct result of this phenomenal flood of Canadian lumber coming into the market.

It is important that this administration recognizes the high level of importance of the decision that they are about to make today, which is if the Canadians still are only talking—and, oh, are they good at talking—that the talking is over; that it is time for the temporary duty to level this playing field to send a very clear message to the Canadians that we mean business; that while they have a right based on need and supply, on the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement, and on the North American Free-Trade Agreement to have access to our market, they absolutely do not have the right to intentionally dump, and we know that is what they are doing at this time. They have reached out to grab a very large share of the U.S. market, as much as 10 percent more than they have ever held.

Stocks of Canadian lumber are sitting in lumberyards across this country, and they are even financing it to sit there and saying, "You keep it until you sell it and then you pay us."

I call that an aggressive antitrade effort. It is a dumping process and the Canadians know it. It is time they stop it, and the only way they will is when we speak directly and act decisively to solve this problem.

Back in the early eighties, they played this game on us, and it was at that time in the Reagan administration that a duty was imposed and thousands of people went back to work in my State almost overnight as the markets rapidly improved. Of course, that also happened in other timber-producing States across the Nation.

(Mr. ASHCROFT assumed the chair.)

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the same thing can happen in the next month if this administration will act. If it does not act, I say to our trade ambassador today, "What are you going to say to the nearly 30,000 men and women that are without a job today in the timber industry simply because of the aggressive dumping action on the part of the Canadians?" "What are you going to say, Mr. Ambassador, and, more important, what are you going to say, Mr. President, about the fairness and equity you talk about, about the jobs you talk about creating, while you, by your failure to act, may well be destroying jobs?"

In the end, when you destroy the jobs, you destroy the mills and the infrastructure that has been an extremely important part of the forest products industry of our country. As those people stand in unemployment lines, many of the mills are near bankruptcy today because most of them have operated in the red for well over a year now. It is time that stopped and that we bring fairness back to the marketplace. That can be done by a single act by a trade ambassador and a President. They know they can do it. We asked them to do it, and we hope it will be done tomorrow if the Canadians fail to come to an agreement today.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] is recognized.

#### TRIBUTE TO RALPH YARBOROUGH

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to one of my predecessors, Ralph W. Yarborough of Austin, who died last weekend.

Ralph Yarborough was reared in Chandler, TX, attended West Point and what we know as Sam Houston State University. He worked as a teacher, a trade emissary, a National Guardsman, a lawyer, an Assistant Attorney General, a judge, an Army officer in World War II, a writer, and a U.S. Senator. In the Army, he served on the staff of Gen. George Patton. He was among only three southern Senators to support the 1965 Voting Rights Act and was a key supporter of the National Cancer Act.

Senator Yarborough and I share a common background. We have deep

east Texas roots. We attended the University of Texas law school. We both held this seat in the U.S. Senate, which both of us reached through a special election in the spring after the resignation of a Senator in January. Like me, he reached this Chamber less than 2 years before the term was up, and probably felt, as I did, envy for Members of the other body, who have a full 2 years between campaigns.

Mr. President, on behalf of all the citizens of Texas, I offer to Mrs. Yarborough, his widow, the rest of the Yarborough family, and his many friends, our deepest condolences. May he rest in peace.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. 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 Wyoming is recognized.

#### CONSISTENCY IN LEADERSHIP

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, from time to time, in the mail we get a letter, an observation, or a communication from a constituent that we think is particularly on target. I would like to share that a little bit this morning. It has to do with consistency in leadership and with where we are going in this country. The President has talked in the last couple of days about the consistency of his administration. Of course, I think there is great question about that. If we are to move forward to make the changes that most of us want to make, that I think most Americans want to make, we have to have some consistency in policy.

The President came to Washington based on a campaign of change, based on a promise of change, based on a promise of a new Democrat. He said more recently that the era of big government is over. The fact is that there has not been much consistency. The fact is that there was a great deal of talk about reforming of welfare which is certainly high on the agenda of most people. Most people want to continue to be able to help people who need help, but in a program that helps people back into a position to help themselves. Yet this Senate passed a bill on welfare, I think 85 positive votes, that was vetoed by the President who says he wanted to change welfare as we know it.

The balanced budget—I suspect the prime issue of this entire congressional session—it took four budgets to come up with a balanced budget, despite the President saying he was for a balanced budget when he ran, and would do it in 5 years. It took four budgets to do it in 7 years, and then, frankly, not a real budget.

Most everyone who studies the issue knows that if you are going to change the financial direction that this country has taken, if you want to be responsible for finances, that there has to be a significant change in the budget, that you cannot tinker around the edges.

The President and his staff, and Mr. Panetta, whom I worked with in the House, and I always thought was responsible—almost as if you push a button, we protect Medicaid, protect the environment, have an investment in education. The fact is that over a period of several years you cannot do that; there is no money to do that unless you do something about entitlements. That is a fact.

So to say we are going to balance the budget and we are going to protect Medicare, Medicaid, the environment, invest in education, it is impossible to do, unless, of course, you raise taxes considerably.

Mr. President, these are the things raised about consistency. I want to read the letter from Linda Russell of Rawlins, WY.

President BILL CLINTON,  
White House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I sent you a wire to just get the budget balanced and quit "posturing" and playing politics.

You wrote a very nice letter back—but I am very concerned that you don't understand what the people of this USA want and need. You say we must "maintain our values—protecting Medicare, Medicaid, and the environment". Certainly no one would disagree that these are excellent GOALS—but they are NOT our base VALUES. Our base values would be fiscal responsibility, keeping a military strength sufficient to protect us, and staying out of the faces of people who are perfectly capable of handling the GOALS you mention far better than the Washington DC political establishment.

I attended the White House Conference on Small Business and heard you address the group on how you felt regulations should be reduced and the budget balanced and the tax burden lessened. WHAT HAPPENED TO YOUR SUPPORT OF THOSE IDEAS since that meeting??

May I respectfully suggest that you let the power revert to the people by going with the block grants so that we can take care of our neighbors with our tax money and not waste 90% of it paying a huge bureaucracy in "DC" to tell us how to do it. TRUST US—we are neither stupid nor insensitive. If you have any wish at all to be reelected, it would be well to give us the respect we are due—and stop taking more and more money via taxes to support some liberal agenda.

Mr. President—listen again to your own inaugural address to the nation, which I thought very impressive—and WALK YOUR TALK??

Sincerely,

LINDA RUSSELL,  
Rawlins, WY.

Mr. President, I think her expression "and walk your talk" is an expression from someone who represents a good deal of the thought in my State in Wyoming. I think many of us believe that this is the direction we should take, make the changes that we came here to make—less government, less cost, less regulation, move the responsibilities to communities, to States, and frankly to individuals.

I had the opportunity last evening to meet with a group of students from Washington and Lee High School in Arlington, VA, who were inducted into the Honor Society. We talked to some of them about the concepts of freedom and about the responsibility in leadership that goes with freedom. I was really pleased at the receptiveness they had to the notion that if you are going to be free and responsible and have a Government where we participate and we govern ourselves, then you have to be responsible and take some leadership positions to do that.

Mr. President, that is sort of what it is all about and what this letter is about.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's response to Linda Russell's wire be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, December 6, 1995.

Ms. LINDA RUSSELL,  
Rawlins, WY.

DEAR LINDA: Thank you for sharing your views. It's important for me to know how you feel about the challenges facing our nation.

I believe that we must balance the budget, but we must do it in a way that is good for our economy and that maintains our values—protecting Medicare, Medicaid, and the environment, and continuing our investment in education. And we have to do it without raising taxes on working families.

In the weeks ahead we will continue our bipartisan efforts to find common ground on balancing the budget, and I hope you will stay involved.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. THOMAS. 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. AKAKA. 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. AKAKA. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I will take the floor in morning business to speak about a concern that has been global.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

#### FRANCE'S CESSATION OF NUCLEAR TESTING IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, it is with a great sense of relief and hope that I rise today to comment on the announcement by French President Jacques Chirac that France has concluded its nuclear weapons testing program for good and will close its nuclear testing center in French Polynesia.