

during challenging times. When Michelle heard about all the cattle losses Western ranchers were suffering, she contacted Lisa who works as an Ag Extension agent for Madison and Jefferson Counties. Together, the two women formulated a plan. And, that plan was to convince ranchers who survived the storms to help the less fortunate replenish their herds. The dream has become reality.

Today, the "One Good Cow" project is working to collect and transport 80,000 healthy, pregnant cows to folks who lost significant portions of their herds last winter. And the good news is that their fellow ranchers from across the Nation are donating these cattle. This teamwork has resulted in success for all. It has even gained national media attention and will be featured on national TV network news later this week.

The "One Good Cow" program is a prime example of how ranchers from all over the United States can work together in times of adversity. That shouldn't surprise anyone. Ranchers have always relied on each other as they face the worst that Mother Nature has to offer.

But the real credit goes to Michelle and Lisa. Mr. President, it is impossible to count the number of lives that will be touched by their idea. I would just like to add my voice to all the others and say "Thank you, so much, Michelle and Lisa."

I encourage all of my colleagues to become familiar with the "One Good Cow" Program and give it their full support. Our ranchers are depending on it.●

PROTECTION OF U.S. BORDERS

● Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, when we convene for the second session of the 105th Congress, I will introduce legislation which will authorize the U.S. Customs Service to acquire the necessary personnel and technology to execute their duties at our international borders with Mexico and Canada. Specifically, my proposal is designed to reduce delays at border crossings to not more than 20 minutes, while maintaining—in fact, strengthening—our commitment to interdict illegal narcotics and other contraband.

In working with local officials, businesses, the Border Trade Alliance, and several of my colleagues, it has become evident that the best way to accomplish these objectives is to increase Customs staffing and provide the technological resources that can give them the best chance at accomplishing their mission. Customs staffing needs to be increased significantly to facilitate the flow of substantially increased traffic on both the Southwestern and Northern borders. The practical effect of these personnel increases will be to open all the existing primary inspection lanes where congestion is a problem during peak hours and enhance investigative resources on the Southwest border.

I am very concerned about the impact on Texas and the Nation of narcotics trafficking and have worked closely with Federal and State law enforcement officials to identify and secure the necessary resources to battle the onslaught of illegal drugs. At the same time, however, our current enforcement strategy—which is burdened by insufficient staffing and a virtual absence of vital interdiction technology—is effectively closing the door to legitimate trade.

Long traffic lines at our international crossings serve no useful purpose and are counterproductive to improving our trade relationship with Mexico. At a time when NAFTA and the expanding world marketplace are making it possible for us to create more commerce, freedom, and opportunity for people on both sides of the border, it is important that we eliminate the border crossing delays that are stifling these goals.

My bill will be designed to shorten those lines and promote legitimate commerce, while providing the Customs Service with the means necessary to eliminate the drug trafficking operations that are now rampant along the 1,200-mile border that my State shares with Mexico. I will be speaking further to my colleagues about this initiative and urge their support for the bill.●

FAST-TRACK LEGISLATION

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I want to offer some thoughts on the proposed fast-track legislation.

A number of other Members have made some excellent points on this subject, in large part reflecting my own views.

This is especially true of the comments made by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and I want to commend him for his constancy on this critical issue of preserving the constitutional role of Congress in matters of trade.

He has rightly framed this issue, not as a question of favoring or opposing free or fair trade, but as a question of what role Congress plays in trade agreements.

Mr. President, the fast-track proposal we are considering, and its predecessors, are quite recent inventions.

Prior to the Tokyo round of the GATT, there was no fast-track mechanism.

In fact, of the hundreds and hundreds of trade agreements our Nation has negotiated and entered into, only five have used the fast-track procedures.

Mr. President, this should dispose of the argument that fast track is necessary for us to negotiate trade agreements.

Fast track has been the exception, not the rule, with regard to trade negotiations.

I understand this Administration has negotiated and implemented over 200 trade agreements without fast track.

What were some of those agreements?

Well, Mr. President, they included: the market access agreement with Argentina for textiles and clothing; the market access agreement with Australia for textiles and clothing; the agreement on bilateral trade relations with Belarus; the market access agreement with Brazil for textiles and clothing; an agreement concerning intellectual property rights with Bulgaria; an agreement between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Cambodia on trade relations and intellectual property rights protection; the agreement on salmon and herring with Canada; the agreement on ultra-high temperature milk with Canada; the agreement on trade in softwood lumber with Canada; the agreement on intellectual property rights protection with Ecuador; a memorandum of understanding on trade in bananas with Costa Rica; several agreements with the European Union; an agreement on intellectual property rights protection with India; several dozen agreements with Japan; several dozen agreements with Korea; and many, many more agreements with dozens of other countries.

And not only bilateral agreements, Mr. President, but also multilateral agreements such as the complex Multilateral Agreement on Investment, the Information Technology Agreement, and the Telecomm Agreement—these last two having been both negotiated and implemented without fast-track procedures.

Indeed, Mr. President, the phrase "fast-track negotiating authority" is a misnomer.

The President already has the authority to negotiate and implement trade agreements.

That broad authority was most recently extended indefinitely to the President as part of the 1994 GATT Uruguay round implementing legislation.

That authority, called "Proclamation Authority," has its roots in the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934, which allowed a President to "enter into foreign trade agreements * * * and to proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions * * * as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement."

Mr. President, while the ability to negotiate and enter into international agreements are inherently part of the President's constitutional powers, the Constitution grants exclusive authority to Congress "to regulate Commerce with foreign nations."

Congress has sole constitutional authority over setting tariff levels and making or changing federal law.

With the 1934 act, though, Congress delegated some of its authority to the President when the number and frequency of trade negotiations began increasing.

It is under this "Proclamation Authority" that President Clinton has negotiated and entered into over 200 trade agreements.

And he is free to continue that work.

He did not need fast track to negotiate those agreements, and he does not need it to negotiate additional agreements.

At a recent meeting on this very issue, one of the participants suggested that everyone ought to pay a one dollar fine every time they used the phrase "fast-track negotiating authority," because it was so fundamentally misleading.

Mr. President, the Senate might consider adopting such a rule, and if we did adopt a \$1 fine for using the phrase "fast-track negotiating authority," we might balance the budget ahead of schedule, maybe even begin to pay down the debt.

Until we do adopt such a rule, Mr. President, we will just have to be alert to the misuse of that phrase, and correct those who employ it.

Mr. President, those who support fast track constantly make the argument that if you want free trade, you have to enact fast track.

They equate fast track with free trade.

The reason is obvious.

The arguments for free trade are powerful.

Indeed, I agree with those arguments.

We as a nation are better off in a world with freer trade than we are without it.

But the underlying premise, that we need fast track to achieve free and fair trade, is absolutely false.

Mr. President, I have referred to the hundreds of trade agreements negotiated by this Administration without fast-track procedures.

That is evidence enough.

But let me also argue that not only is fast track not necessary for free trade, it may actually undermine it.

Mr. President, one of the greatest defects of the recently enacted NAFTA and GATT agreements was the perception that those agreements picked winners and losers.

I believe strongly that those perceptions are based on reality, that some industries were huge winners in those agreements, while other industries were effectively written off.

Mr. President, Wisconsin had more than its share of those industries that were written off, and at the top of that list, at the very top was the dairy farmer.

There is no doubt in my mind that other industries were given a higher priority than our dairy farmers, and the results of those agreements underscore that feeling.

Under the GATT, the European Union is allowed to export 20 times the amount of dairy products under subsidy that the United States is allowed to export.

Mr. President, not only did we formally provide the EU this significant advantage in that agreement with respect to dairy, apparently the EU is not even complying with those incredibly generous limitations.

The lower priority industries do not end with dairy, and while our more populous cities—Milwaukee, Madison, Green Bay—experienced serious job the fallout from the winners and losers approach extended to many smaller communities.

Even if we only use the extremely conservative statistics collected by the Department of Labor—statistics which many argue grossly understate actual job loss—smaller communities all over Wisconsin have been the victim of this winners and losers approach to trade agreements.

These include places such as: DeForest, with 40 lost jobs; Elkhorn, with 50 lost jobs; Hawkins, with 443 lost jobs; Mauston, with 48 lost jobs; Merrill, with 84 lost jobs; Montello, with 25 lost jobs; Peshtigo, with 69 lost jobs; and Platteville, with 576 lost jobs.

Mr. President, to trade negotiators whose focus was on advancing the prospects of those industries they predetermined to be winners, the losses experienced elsewhere apparently were unfortunate but acceptable.

For the communities I mentioned, Mr. President, those losses were real—real workers with real families to support.

Mr. President, the fast-track procedures under which GATT and NAFTA were negotiated and implemented invites this kind of polarization at the negotiating table.

And it is this kind of economic disparity produced by these trade agreements—the picking of winners and losers—that undermines broad public support for pursuing free trade agreements.

Mr. President, free trade ought to benefit all sectors of the economy.

Without fast-track procedures, our negotiators will know their work product will undergo rigorous congressional scrutiny.

And they will know that it will be much more difficult to enact a trade agreement that disproportionately benefits some while disadvantaging others.

Mr. President, it is this kind of trade agreement—one which benefits the entire economy—that will enhance the cause of free trade.

Mr. President, fast track also encourages another disturbing trend in trade agreements, namely advancing the short-term interests of multinational corporations over those of the average worker and consumer.

The increasing globalization of the economy confronts us every day.

Few can doubt the enormous power multinational corporations wield in trade agreements, from the negotiating table itself to the closed-door bargaining that will go on before the implementing legislation is sent to Congress.

Fast track procedures make it all the easier for those interests to advance an agreement that may include provisions which conflict with the interests of our Nation.

With opposition to the entire agreement the only alternative left to Con-

gress, and with the considerable weight of the multinational corporate interests behind any proposal, it is likely that Congress will swallow even a deeply flawed agreement.

Mr. President, what does that do for the public support necessary for free trade?

It severely undermines it, Mr. President, and puts future trade agreements that can enhance our economy at risk.

Fast-track also undermines the cause of free trade in another important way, Mr. President.

The proposal we are considering partitions off a number of issues that are vital to achieving a sustainable trade agreement, including currency stability, human rights, and worker and environmental protections.

None of these issues is brought under fast-track procedures.

Mr. President, we have only to look to recent Mexican history, their political turmoil and fiscal roller coaster culminating in the peso crisis, to understand the importance of these other issues to the long-term success of any trade agreement.

Even NAFTA's most ardent supporters will concede these events severely undermined any benefits to our economy that were hoped for under that agreement.

Mr. President, one might have thought those events would have been a lesson on which we could draw.

Instead, the fast-track proposal actually backslides in this area.

And for what reason, Mr. President?

What possible reason can there be to specifically exclude these areas from fast-track procedures?

Some might suggest the reason is that while our national long-term interests could be well served by including these issues in a trade agreement to ensure a rising quality of living with our trading partners, such issues might conflict with the short-term goals of some multinational interests that look only at next year's bottom line.

Others might argue the reason stems from the desire of some interests to pursue a race to the bottom in worker and environmental protection, and in basic human rights.

Such interests can use the leverage of international trade to change those fundamental standards they have been unable to change directly.

Mr. President, there is certainly no argument that specifically excluding these issues from fast-track procedures will enhance our ability to negotiate.

Human rights, working conditions, environmental protections—these are all great strengths of this Nation.

Preventing our trade negotiators from drawing on these great national strengths limits our flexibility at the table.

There is no reason to tie our negotiators hands in these areas.

In this important regard, the fast-track proposal we are considering is a barrier to a sustainable free trade agreement.

Mr. President, let me turn to another provision in the current fast-track proposal.

It may surprise some to know that while specific issues closely related to the long-term success and sustainability of any trade agreement are excluded, the provisions which offset the costs of any trade agreement—provisions which have absolutely no connection to the trade agreement or the willingness of our partners to negotiate with us—those funding provisions are covered by fast-track procedures.

What does this mean, Mr. President?

It means that Congress cannot amend, it cannot even strike, provisions which are attached to implementing legislation to offset the costs of the trade agreement.

It means that the most unjustified funding mechanism attached to trade implementing legislation under fast track will remain unscathed.

Mr. President, let me stress these funding provisions are not part of the trade agreement itself.

Our trading partners do not get a say in how we offset the cost of a trade agreement.

One might ask, if our trading partners have no say in the offset provisions, why are those provisions included under fast-track procedures.

An excellent question, Mr. President.

Many of us will recall the GATT implementing measure which included some controversial funding provisions, including a change in the actuarial standards of the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corp. and what many viewed as a sweetheart deal for certain media giants that gave them preferential treatment with respect to FCC licenses.

Neither of those offsets had anything to do with the underlying trade agreement.

Both certainly deserved more scrutiny than they received under the constraints of fast-track procedures.

Whatever justification there may be for providing special procedures for trade agreements, procedures which supporters argue are necessary to attract our trading partners to the table, there is no such justification for shielding the funding provisions from thorough congressional scrutiny and review.

Mr. President, we are talking about possible tax increases here.

Though not required, as I understand it, among the offsets that comply with our budget rules are tax increases.

To put it gently, it is ironic that many who would amend our Constitution to require a supermajority vote before any taxes could be increased are now prepared to support a fast-track bill that sweeps away even the most modest review of possible tax increases.

Evidently, as long as it is done in the name of free trade, even the most outrageous inconsistency is permitted.

Mr. President, let me reiterate that many of us who support free and fair trade find nothing inconsistent with

that support and insisting that Congress be a full partner in approving agreements.

Indeed, as Senator BYRD has noted, support for fast-track procedures reveals a lack of confidence in the ability of our negotiators to craft a sound agreement, or a lack of confidence in the ability of Congress to weigh regional and sectoral interests against the national interest, or may simply be a desire by the administration to avoid the hard work necessary to convince Congress to support the agreements it negotiates.

Mr. President, I can think of no better insurance policy for a sound trade agreement than the prospect of a thorough Congressional review, complete with the ability to amend that agreement.

Not only would the threat of possible Congressional modification spur our negotiators to produce the best product possible, that potential for Congressional intervention could serve as an effective club in the hands of our negotiators when bargaining with our trading partners.

Mr. President, with hundreds of trade agreements negotiated and implemented without fast track, the refrain we hear again and again, that we need to enact fast track in order to negotiate trade agreements, is off key.

We do not need fast track to negotiate trade agreements.

As I have argued today, in several important ways, fast-track invites bad trade agreements.

It produces agreements that pick winners and losers instead of advancing all sectors of the economy together.

It produces agreements designed to respond to the short-term interests of multinational corporations instead of fostering long-term sustainable economic growth.

It produces agreements that encourage a race-to-the-bottom in critical areas of human rights, and worker and environmental protection, instead of improving those standards around the World.

It protects the completely unrelated funding provisions in trade implementing legislation, and as such invites enormous abuse.

Mr. President, fast track is bad for free trade.

We don't need it, and we shouldn't enact it.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation, and in doing so, voting for free and fair trade.●

TRIBUTE TO DON NOEL

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President. As 1998 rolls around, so does another election. But this upcoming campaign season will be different from any other that I have ever known. For the first time since I entered public office in 1974, a certain dapper reporter with a flower in his lapel will not be there reporting the facts of the campaign and offering his assessments. Don O. Noel, Jr., who

is one of the most prominent and respected journalists in Connecticut history, has retired after working for 39 years as a political reporter in Hartford.

Don Noel's career as a journalist dates all the way back to 1958, the year that my father was elected to the first of two terms as a U.S. Senator. It is amazing for anyone to have such a long career in any field, particularly in an area as mentally, physically, and emotionally demanding as journalism.

Don Noel started out as a writer for the Hartford Times, where he worked for 17 years. For a change of pace, he ventured into television journalism and spent a decade at WFSB-TV Channel 3. He eventually returned to print journalism in 1984 when he became a political columnist for the Hartford Courant, where he stayed until his retirement.

Don Noel was an old-school reporter in the truest and best sense of the term. He was always courteous and respectful of the people he interviewed and wrote about. At the same time, he refused to skirt around difficult issues and never refrained from asking stinging questions or making pointed comments. He felt that part of his role as a journalist was to comfort the afflicted and afflict the comfortable.

Don Noel was able to succeed for so long because he was a reporter of substance who cared about the truth and cared about his readers. He understood that his role as a journalist was to hold politicians accountable for their actions and to serve as a watchdog on behalf of the general public.

Don Noel did more than simply report the facts, he also interpreted them. As an editorial page writer, he was responsible for offering his opinions on the issues of the day. Not everyone agreed with his ideas, but everyone respected them because they were always thoughtful and well-developed. Most of Mr. Noel's criticisms were aimed at those who tended to be a bit more conservative, but to the end he remained an equal opportunity critic. It didn't matter if you were a Democrat, Republican, or Independent; if you were a public official and Don Noel thought that you were anything less than an upstanding public servant, it's safe to say that your name would be in the paper that week.

One of his colleagues at the Hartford Courant noted that Don Noel was an institution not because of the number of years he put into service, but how well he applied them. I strongly concur with these sentiments and believe that Don Noel was one of the finest people that I have had the pleasure of knowing during my career in politics.

While his retirement is truly a loss for the people of Connecticut, I am glad that he will finally have more time to do the things that he truly enjoys. He has said that he plans to spend a good deal of his new-found free time doing community service work in the neighborhoods of northwest Hartford, where