

especially at a time when it is being subjected to such a critical test as that which Iraq presents.

In a more practical vein, Mr. President, I submit that the old adage "pay now or pay later" applies perfectly in this situation. If Saddam Hussein is permitted to go about his effort to build weapons of mass destruction and to avoid the accountability of the United Nations, we will surely reap a confrontation of greater consequence in the future. The Security Council and the United States obviously have to think seriously and soberly about the plausible scenarios that could play out if he were permitted to continue his weapons development work after shutting out U.N. inspectors.

There can be little or no question that Saddam has no compunctions about using the most reprehensible weapons—on civilians as readily as on military forces. He has used poison gas against Iranian troops and civilians in the Iran-Iraq border conflict. He has launched Scud missiles against Israel and against coalition troops based in Saudi Arabia during the gulf war.

It is not possible to overstate the ominous implications for the Middle East if Saddam were to develop and successfully militarize and deploy potent biological weapons. We can all imagine the consequences. Extremely small quantities of several known biological weapons have the capability to exterminate the entire population of cities the size of Tel Aviv or Jerusalem. These could be delivered by ballistic missile, but they also could be delivered by much more pedestrian means; aerosol applicators on commercial trucks easily could suffice. If Saddam were to develop and then deploy usable atomic weapons, the same holds true.

Were he to do either, much less both, the entire balance of power in the Middle East changes fundamentally, raising geometrically the already sky-high risk of conflagration in the region. His ability to bluff and bully would soar. The willingness of those nations which participated in the gulf war coalition to confront him again if he takes a course of expansionism or adventurism may be greatly diminished if they believe that their own citizens would be threatened directly by such weapons of mass destruction.

The posture of Saudi Arabia, in particular, could be dramatically altered in such a situation. Saudi Arabia, of course, was absolutely indispensable as a staging and basing area for Desert Storm which dislodged Saddam's troops from Kuwait, and it remains one of the two or three most important locations of U.S. bases in the Middle East.

Were its willingness to serve in these respects to diminish or vanish because of the ability of Saddam to brandish these weapons, then the ability of the United Nations or remnants of the gulf war coalition, or even the United States acting alone, to confront and halt Iraqi aggression would be gravely damaged.

Were Israel to find itself under constant threat of potent biological or nuclear attack, the current low threshold for armed conflict in the Middle East that easily could escalate into a world-threatening inferno would become even more of a hair trigger.

Indeed, one can easily anticipate that Israel would find even the prospect of such a situation entirely untenable and unacceptable and would take preemptive military action. Such action would, at the very least, totally derail the Middle East peace process which is already at risk. It could draw new geopolitical lines in the sand, with the possibility of Arab nations which have been willing to oppose Saddam's extreme actions either moving into a pan-Arab column supporting him against Israel and its allies or, at least, becoming neutral.

Either course would significantly alter the region's balance of power and make the preservation and advancement of U.S. national security objectives in the region unattainable—and would tremendously increase the risk that our Nation, our young people, ultimately would be sucked into yet another military conflict, this time without the warning time and the staging area that enabled Desert Storm to have such little cost in U.S. and other allied troop casualties.

Finally, we must consider the ultimate nightmare. Surely, if Saddam's efforts are permitted to continue unabated, we will eventually face more aggression by Saddam, quite conceivably including an attack on Israel, or on other nations in the region as he seeks predominance within the Arab community. If he has such weapons, his attack is likely to employ weapons of unspeakable and indiscriminate destructiveness and torturous effects on civilians and military alike. What that would unleash is simply too horrendous to contemplate, but the United States inevitably would be drawn into that conflict.

Mr. President, I could explore other possible ominous consequences of letting Saddam Hussein proceed unchecked. The possible scenarios I have referenced really are only the most obvious possibilities. What is vital is that Americans understand, and that the Security Council understand, that there is no good outcome possible if he is permitted to do anything other than acquiesce to continuation of U.N. inspections.

As the world's only current superpower, we have the enormous responsibility not to exhibit arrogance, not to take any unwitting or unnecessary risks, and not to employ armed force casually. But at the same time it is our responsibility not to shy away from those confrontations that really matter in the long run. And this matters in the long run.

While our actions should be thoughtfully and carefully determined and structured, while we should always seek to use peaceful and diplomatic

means to resolve serious problems before resorting to force, and while we should always seek to take significant international actions on a multilateral rather than a unilateral basis whenever that is possible, if in the final analysis we face what we truly believe to be a grave threat to the well-being of our Nation or the entire world and it cannot be removed peacefully, we must have the courage to do what we believe is right and wise.

I believe this is such a situation, Mr. President. It is a time for resolve. Tomorrow we must make that clear to the Security Council and to the world.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. TORRICELLI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to morning business and address the Senate for 15 minutes.

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

#### FAST TRACK

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, this Congress is engaged in a great debate about giving the President of the United States virtually unrestricted authority to engage and negotiate with other nations in what has been termed fast-track authority.

Capital markets and international political leaders are waiting to see whether or not this Congress will grant that authority to the President of the United States.

To some, the debate has already been defined as either one of believing in free trade or returning to protectionism. I believe that that is a disservice to this Congress and indeed to the debate itself because the issue is extraordinarily more complex.

The United States needs no lectures about the advantages or the pursuit of free trade nor, indeed, does this Congress. In Bretton Woods, the Kennedy Round, the Uruguay Round, the United States has both led and constructed the current system both in monetary and trade relations.

This country understands that free, unfettered trade, the opening of international markets, is the very foundation of both our own and international prosperity. This generation's standard of living has been based on the lessons of each of these agreements.

As a result, the United States has become the largest importing nation in the world. Indeed, although the United States has an economy that is smaller than the combined economies of the European community, we import more than twice the industrialized product from the developing world.

This trade has been not without benefit to even those industries which seemingly have suffered the most. Although there have been serious dislocations in key industrial industries, like autos and steel and new products like

semiconductors and computers, the current competitiveness and efficiency of even these industries have benefited by international trade and competition.

Indeed, it is because of this enhanced efficiency in competition that I supported fast-track authority in 1988, supported the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement and most recently the GATT agreement.

I take the Senate floor today because I have reached my own conclusion that when asked to vote in this body, I will not support fast-track authority as currently requested by the President of the United States this year. I do so despite a long history of supporting similar authority and as one who believes strongly in free trade as enhancing American competitiveness and it being essential to America's quality of life, because I believe the United States has reached an important crossroads in our trade strategy.

Like many Americans, I am simply not convinced that the U.S. Government has a strategy to maximize benefits in current trade agreements. I do not fear the competition of foreign trade. I simply fear that our negotiators are not prepared to protect and defend our national interests with a coherent strategy.

I base my conclusion on four principal problems.

First, over 4 decades, by necessity, through the cold war and in times of threats to our national security, it became necessary for the United States on occasion to compromise in our trade strategy in order to engage in the protection of other important national interests.

By necessity, whether it was to secure Philippine military bases or the cooperation of Korean or Turkish or a host of other allies, the United States would set apart our trade objectives in order to secure national security concerns.

Even now while American intellectual property rights are being compromised in China, we are being told that this is necessary for the political engagement of the People's Republic of China.

Mr. President, my first objection to fast-track authority to the President is these agreements on trade must stand for economic purposes of their own weight. The American people and this Congress must be convinced the country is pursuing a coherent trade strategy without compromise for other purposes.

Second, it is critical that this Congress be convinced that our trade negotiators are using the leverage of those seeking access to our market to its maximum advantage. In negotiating NAFTA, the United States afforded Mexico the most important advantage that any nation economically could ever seek. That is, to gain access to the American market for their products. But we did so without using all of the leverage available to the United

States. So Mexico, a country that is a principal conduit for narcotics into the United States, a source of massive illegal immigration to the United States, a nation which does not allow access to American products or investment without reservation, was afforded the opportunities of NAFTA without, by necessity, conceding cooperation on all these fronts. So in my mind, Mr. President, the second reason for a reservation in proceeding with fast-track authority is that the United States is not using its principal leverage in negotiating with other nations.

Third, Mr. President, in my mind, is the legitimate concern about the pace of international economic integration. Mr. President, during this debate, both in this body and in the other, no one will be quoted more often than Adam Smith. Indeed, to my mind, there is no man who has been read less and quoted more often than Adam Smith in his "Wealth of Nations." For my third reason in objecting to fast-track authority, I return to his treatise of more than two centuries ago when he said, ". . . freedom of trade should be restored only by slow gradations, and with a good deal of reserve and circumspection. Were those high duties and prohibitions taken away all at once . . . the disorder which this would occasion might no doubt be very considerable."

Mr. President, free trade is a national objective, but like other human virtues, it may never be fully realized. It is forever pursued, but it requires so many changes in culture and values and so many complications that it must remain a goal, understanding it may never be realized. Every Member of this institution recognizes that fast-track authority and opening the American market involves a host, indeed hundreds, of different industries that compromise many communities and their economic strength. It is understood and recognized that, like manufacturing, certain high-labor-intensive industries have no long-term future in the American economy.

As Adam Smith warned two centuries ago, that does not mean that with haste or even immediacy they must be subjected to their demise. There are industries in this country that employ thousands, if not millions, of people who live on the economic margins of our society who have no other economic choice. The 50- or 60-year-old textile worker who may have lived in this country for generations, or be new to our land, who may speak English or may not, who may be educated or may have the bare minimum of education, will not in a single generation or with the stroke of a pen be transformed from a textile worker to a computer technician.

American trade policy with a goal of free trade must be realistic and fair to all elements of this society and must take into account the very disorder of which Adam Smith warned only that we be accommodating.

Mr. President, finally, a fourth and final reason that I believe this Senate should withhold fast-track authority on this occasion. It is based on a series of judgments that this Congress reached a long time ago. It has become, I believe, standard in this country, almost without reservation, to believe that it is appropriate, from bans on child labor to a reasonable minimum wage, to the human rights organized labor unions, to just and fair environmental standards. But our country now, in the decision to engage itself in free and open global trade, needs to reach a judgment. How is it we keep these basic commitments without engaging in an extraordinary and even hypocritical contradiction? At this moment in time, the Nation wants both to maintain these high moral standards, some of which have transcended generations, but at the same time to take advantage of the inexpensive products, the economic opportunities of importations where workers have no right to organize, nonexistent or unenforced minimum wage and, in many cases, almost no protections against child labor, and a minimum of environmental standards.

The difference, Mr. President, is whether or not the United States will, in some cases, engage in exploitation, not whether or not the United States will engage in free trade. I believe, therefore, Mr. President, that on this occasion, with a commitment to free trade and an understanding of the need and necessity for the United States to engage in free, fair, and open competition, this Congress should not grant unrestricted authority to the President of the United States to engage in trade negotiations, without reserving for ourselves the right to ensure that there is a trade strategy that encompasses the goal of reaching trade balance, dealing with structural imbalances that, by necessity, are arising from countries that continue to protect their own markets. And we deal with these inherent contradictions of how we maintain both a standard of living for those in our country who cannot quickly adjust to the competition, the contradictions of maintaining environmental labor standards, while allowing access to our market to those who do not.

This will require a trade strategy by the Executive that, to my judgment, has not yet been defined and may not yet exist. I do hope, however, Mr. President, that this is understood for what it is—not a retreat, not protectionism, just forcing this country, at long last, to begin to define a real and lasting trade strategy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT  
AGREEMENT—H.R. 2607

Mr. LOTT. After consultation with many, many Senators and especially the Democratic leader, I now ask that