

and tactfully glance away from his abuse of his people. We Americans should settle for nothing less than democracy.

An impossible, naive dream? I think not. The Iraqi people, despite the lobotomy Saddam has tried to give them, are a well-educated, skilled people. They know the horrors of dictatorship better than anyone else on Earth. When Iraqis tell me their heartfelt commitment to a democratic future for their country, I believe them.

How do we turn this yearning for democracy into the reality of a free Iraq? Let me lay out a road map. First, we should maintain sanctions on Iraq and return to the inspection system which existed until October 29, when Saddam excluded American inspectors from the teams. If we have to use military force to get Iraqi compliance, fine. We should strive to have our coalition partners join us in this use because the power of the world community to bring an outlaw to heel is at issue here. If Iraq can thumb its nose at the Security Council today, some other rogue state will do the same tomorrow, and the system we and our allies have carefully built over 52 years will collapse. But even if some of our coalition partners don't join us, we should act militarily if Iraq won't back down.

Second, we must convince our core European and Asian allies that democracy, not just the compliance of a dictator, is the right long-term goal for Iraq. We must show our allies the far greater benefits and reduced risks that will accrue to them as well as to us from a democratic Iraq. We must sign up our allies for the long term.

Third, we must make the people of Iraq our allies, too. We must go beyond merely stating our support for democracy and instead put concrete encouragements on the table, solid indicators of Western commitment to Iraqi democracy. We should announce we will forgive Iraqi debt if a democratic regime takes power there and we should encourage our allies to do the same. We should state clearly the loan and foreign assistance preferences which a democratic Iraq would receive from United States and multinational institutions. We should discuss our preparations to supply immediate food and medical assistance to Iraq at the moment of Saddam's replacement by a regime which states its intention to hold free elections. And we should make sure, by means of Voice of America and commercial media, that every Iraqi knows about these encouragements to be democratic. Even before change comes, these steps will restore hope in Iraqi hearts.

Fourth, we should openly and consistently state our goal of a free, democratic Iraq. To accept less and to say less is simply unworthy of our heritage. Let democracy, respect for human rights, and a free economy be our consistent mantra for Iraq, as it ought to be for every country, and some day, not far off, when Saddam's prisons

and graveyards and secret weapons sites are opened and the Iraqi people can tell the story of their suffering, we will be proud that we set a lofty goal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the role.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the role.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1269

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now resume the fast-track bill for consideration of the Dorgan amendment, that no amendments be in order to the Dorgan amendment, and, immediately following the reporting of the bill, the Senate resume the Dorgan amendment.

I further ask unanimous consent that, following disposition of or consent to dispose of the Dorgan amendment, Senator REED be recognized to offer an amendment regarding environmental standards, and only relevant amendments be in order to the amendment, and, following disposition of or consent to dispose of the amendment, the Senate resume morning business, and no call for the regular order serve to bring back the fast-track legislation.

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

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT OF 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1269) to establish objectives for negotiating and procedures for implementing certain trade agreements.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Dorgan Amendment No. 1594, to establish an emergency commission to end the trade deficit.

Inhofe amendment No. 1602, to establish a research and monitoring program for the national ambient air quality standards for ozone and particulate matter and to reinstate the original standards under the Clean Air Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 1594

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the amendment pending on fast-track legislation, is the amendment I offered 2 days ago. It is an amendment called the End the Trade Deficit Act. It is S. 465, a piece of legislation that I previously introduced in the Senate that I now offer as an amendment.

Let me describe why I bring this amendment to the floor of the Senate, especially when we are dealing with the fast-track legislation.

Mr. President, this Congress has spent a great deal of time dealing with the fiscal policy budget deficit, and with some success. I might add that actions by the Congress and a healthy growing economy have substantially reduced the budget deficit. But there has been very little discussion about the other deficit. And that is the trade deficit.

This country's trade deficit is the largest in history, and growing. For those who don't know much about the trade deficit, let me explain. Understandably you do not hear much about it. All we do is crow about our exports. We talk about how much we exported. Nobody talks about how much we have imported. It is like a business talking only about their receipts and refusing to talk about their expenditures.

Here is the merchandise trade deficit. It is 21 years old. For 36 of the last 38 years we have had an overall trade deficit. For the last 21 years in a row we have had this merchandise trade deficit. This trade deficit represented here in red is getting worse—not better. The last 3 years in a row have seen record merchandise trade deficits. And this year it is expected to reach a record merchandise trade deficit.

Some say the trade deficits are really quite good for this country. They must be ecstatic because these trade deficits are expected, according to some economic forecasters, to go from \$191 billion in the last fiscal year to \$356 billion by the year 2005. Some will make the case, I am sure, that it depends on the kind of trade deficits you have; what the trade circumstances are; what the economic circumstances are of the various regions of the world. I understand all of that.

But I say this: A trade deficit that is persistent and growing a trade deficit that represents a chronic 21-year uninterrupted set of trade deficits is not good for this country.

I propose a piece of legislation, now offered as an amendment, to establish a commission the members of which would hold hearings and make recommendations to Congress on how this country can eliminate the trade deficit by the year 2007.

We are having a discussion about fast track. It is a strategy that describes a procedure here in the Congress with respect to how we handle trade agreements. Most of us understand how trade agreements are negotiated. They are negotiated by trade negotiators sent overseas somewhere, in most cases. They close the door, have sessions, and come up with an agreement. They bring it back to the Congress, and they say, "Here is the agreement. Take it or leave it; up or down; no amendment."

But I want to also underscore why I feel so strongly about this issue, even as I discuss this amendment. I want to once again describe for my colleagues the dilemma we face with, for example, one free-trade agreement. This is the one with Canada. It is undoubtedly