I believe even the proponents of this bill will admit that the short-term effect of the legislation will be an acceleration of job loss in the apparel sector. And while this bill includes a reauthorization of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, which I strongly support, nothing in this bill will create a single job for these displaced workers to have.

While Massachusetts continues to be a leader in exports, many small companies and workers are suffering as a result of the trade deficits caused by the economic crises in Asia and South America. In response to the needs of companies hurt by imports, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program in general, and the New England Trade Adjustment Assistance Center in particular, exist as valuable resources. They offer vital assistance to firms and workers suffering from competition by imports. The Trade Adjustment Assistance Program is an effective initiative that has been shown to provide a return on investment of up to 348 percent.

The American people, I believe, will hold this Congress responsible for refusing to address so many issues which are critical to our families and our communities. The majority has once again turned a deaf ear to the pleas of the American people for action, and I regret this latest missed opportunity.

DRYLAND DEGRADATION AND ITS IMPACT ON TRADE RELATIONS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, as the Senate considers the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an important article from the President of the Corporate Council on Africa, Dr. Mima S. Nedelcovych, concerning Africa's problem of severe dryland degradation (known as ''desertification'') as it affects our trade relations.

The Corporate Council on Africa, CCA, includes 180 members with substantial business interests in Africa, including such industry giants as General Electric, Ford Motor Company, IBM, Citibank, ConAgra, Cargill, AGCO, 3M, Pfizer, Land O'Lakes, Chevron, Texaco, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Eli Lilly, Raytheon and Rhone-Poulenc USA. Recently Dr. Nedelcovych, who also serves as Vice President for International Business Development for F.C. Schaffer & Associates, published a short article entitled ''Africa's Creeping Desert, A Problem for the U.S. Too,'' in the CCA's Perspectives on Africa (Fall 1999).

In it, Dr. Nedelcovych outlines clearly the extent to which the degradation of Africa's agricultural land is undermining one of the continent's most crucial natural resources, impeding economic growth, and slowing the hoped-for shift from aid to trade. Cocoa, coffee, cotton, cola nuts and spices grown in Africa end up in a myriad of everyday processed products on American store shelves, but land on which they are produced is increasingly threatened by a combination of bad management practices, drought and poverty.

As a boost to U.S. trade relations with Africa, Dr. Nedelcovych makes a strong case for full U.S. participation in the 1994 United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, not just because it seeks to help Africa's agricultural sector grow and achieve food self-sufficiency, but because it will also open greater opportunities for U.S. sales to Africa, including seeds, agricultural machinery, irrigation equipment as well as a wide range of automobiles, pharmaceuticals, electronic equipment and other goods to more prosperous African consumers.

Dr. Nedelcovych ends with an urgent plea for the Senate to ratify this important agreement without delay. With a world population now over 6 billion and fertile farmland shrinking at an alarming rate worldwide, I heartily support Senate action on the Convention to Combat Desertification.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Nedelcovych's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[Published by The Corporate Council on Africa, Fall 1999]

PERSPECTIVES ON AFRICA

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF DIALOGUE AND OPINION

AFRICA'S CREEPING DESERT—A PROBLEM FOR THE U.S. TOO

(By Dr. Mima S. Nedelcovych, President, Corporate Council on Africa)

We Americans are well known for our ingenuity and problem-solving abilities. All too often, however, we also are noted for our inability to see crises in advance and deal with problems when they are still easily manageable.

One such issue is the world's desertification problem. In Africa, more than two-thirds of the land is dry land, and approximately 70 percent of the population lives on that land. They also grow crops such as cocoa, coffee, cotton, cola nuts and spices on that land. Moreover, rare and endngered animals—a key to tourism in African countries—currently struggle to survive on that land. Without effective land management policies in developing nations, the need for foreign aid will rise at a time when available funds are shrinking.

The United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification has been designed to deal with this problem in a cost-effective way. The Convention does not call for the creation of a major new center of bureaucracy at the UN, nor does it create a mandated contribution by the United States. The onus is placed on developing nations needing assistance to devise a comprehensive national plan to effectively deal with desertification. However, if the United States Senate doesn't ratify this convention, the U.S. will be on the outside of this process, which will directly endanger U.S. interests.

The U.S. private sector has five concerns with how the problem of desertification is handled. First, no issue is more important than that of land use. The national plans called for in the Convention will govern all land use—not just agricultural land. Oil drilling, mining and manufacturing operations, all will be affected by this convention. If the United States fails to ratify this Convention, we will have no voice in the development and implementation of national land use plans.

Second, the United States sells hundreds of millions of dollars in irrigation and related equipment to Africa each year, as well as seeds and agricultural equipment. Companies and experts in nations that ratify the Convention will be placed on a roster of service providers. While America currently has a competitive advantage, that advantage will soon disappear if U.S. firms and experts are not on the convention-generated list. Our firms will then face the prospect of losing contracts to countries such as Spain, Portugal, Italy and Greece, who will provide technology based on what we have developed earlier.

Third, U.S. firms purchase millions of dollars of agricultural goods each year from developing nations. Products such as coffee, cocoa, cotton, cola nuts and spices are grown on dry or sub-humid lands facing the impact of desertification. Many consumers products we now use would cost more if the problem of desertification is not dealt with successfully. A morning cup of coffee surely would be more expensive—so would the chocolates given on Valentine's Day. The prices for items ranging from cooking oils or soft drinks also would rise.

Fourth, it is much cheaper to work with African nations to implement effective land management plans than to send millions to implement disjointed anti-desertification efforts and hundreds of millions more to provide humanitarian assistance to combat the effects of droughts and other natural catastrophes caused by desertification after they occur. Individual taxpayers and corporations certainly would appreciate a more cost-effective approach to this problem.

Finally, developing nations—particularly African nations—see this Convention as their major international initiative. The Convention was developed with the assistance of the United States Government. To date, all but Australia and the United States have ratified this Convention. U.S. failure to ratify this Convention will leave the United States Government, U.S. corporations and American experts out of the anti-desertification process. Moreover, it will poison our relations with African and other developing nations who believe non-ratification is a lack of support of their efforts to both deal with their problem and join global markets.

It is critical that the U.S. business community let the U.S. Senate know the importance we place on the ratification of the Convention to Combat Desertification. Potentially billions of dollars—and more importantly, millions of lives—depend on what the Senate does about this issue in the next few weeks.

PROPOSED DELAY IN FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to express my serious concern that House and Senate negotiators have agreed to delay for one year almost all of the proposed increase in the National Institutes of Health (NIH) budget for FY 2000. I strongly disagree with this approach to balancing the budget. Fully funding biomedical research at the NIH should be one of our

highest priorities, and I intend to oppose proposals that would delay funding for the NIH or fail to provide sufficient funding to ensure continued advancement in the field of biomedical research.

The proposed delay in NIH's authority to use $7.5 billion of its FY 2000 funding will mean that no new grants could be made until the end of the fiscal year. Thus, a one-year freeze will be put on all new biomedical research. Moreover, some on-going grants will have to be short-funded. For those suffering from life-threatening diseases, a one-year delay could be devastating. We cannot imperil continued progress in an area as important as biomedical research.

As our Nation searches for ways to improve health care for all its citizens, the need to ensure stability and vitality in biomedical research programs is increasingly imperative. Biomedical research has fundamentally changed our approach to treating disease and illness and has revolutionized the practice of medicine. Through the NIH, the Federal government has been the single largest contributor to the recent advances made in biomedical research, and NIH research has played a major role in the key medical breakthroughs of our time.

Biomedical research at the NIH has also contributed significantly to the growth of this Nation's biotechnology, medical device, and pharmaceutical industries. Many of the new drugs and medical devices currently in use were developed based on biomedical research supported by the NIH. NIH research has paved the way for the development of pharmaceutical, biotechnology, and medical device industries that have created millions of high wage jobs.

The promise of continued breakthroughs in the eradication of disease and the overall improvement in public health are contingent upon our commitment to supporting our scientists and researchers with adequate tools and resources. However, today, only one of three approved research proposals can be funded.

We must maintain our commitment to achieving full funding for biomedical research by FY 2002. Last year, we provided NIH with a downpayment on the resources it will need to take full advantage of the overwhelming opportunities for scientific advancement currently available in the field of biomedical research. This year, again we started on the right track by including another fifteen percent increase in the NIH budget. However, the proposed one percent overall budget cut will have a dramatic impact on the grant-making capacity of the NIH. As a result of this cut, 500 to 550 fewer grants will be awarded by the NIH next year.

This most recent proposal to require that the NIH delay spending approximately $2 billion of its FY 2000 funding until FY 2001, essentially revokes the entire increase for next year and goes back on our promise to substantially increase NIH funding by 2002. This additional funding cut will disrupt and delay research fundamental to saving lives and improving public health. It will also critically undermine our progress toward securing a strong and stable funding stream needed to ensure continued advances in biomedical research.

The proposed delay in NIH funding for FY 2000 is unconscionable. I will oppose it, and I urge the President to veto any conference report that includes this proposal.

AGJOBS ACT OF 1999

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I'm pleased to have joined Senators GORDON SMITH, BOB GRAHAM, MAX CLELAND, and several other colleagues this week in introducing S. 1814. This bill is a new, improved version of the Agricultural Job Opportunity, Benefits, and Security Act—or, as we call it, the ''AgJOBS'' bill.

We are facing a growing crisis—for both farm workers and growers.

We want and need a stable, predictable, legal work force in American agriculture.

Willing American workers deserve a system that puts them first in line for available jobs with fair, market wages. We want all workers to receive decent treatment and equal protection under the law.

Consumers deserve a safe, stable, domestic food supply.

American citizens and taxpayers deserve secure borders and a government that works.

Yet Americans are being threatened on all these counts, because of a growing labor shortage in agriculture, while the only program currently in place to respond, the H–2A Guest Worker Program, is profoundly broken.

Last year, the Senate adopted meaningful H–2A reform, on a bipartisan vote of 68–31. Unfortunately, that bipartisan floor amendment did not survive the last round of negotiations over the omnibus appropriations bill last year.

This year, the problem is only growing worse. Therefore, we are introducing a new, improved bill. The name of the bill says it all—''AgJOBS''.

Mr. President, our farm workers need this reform bill.

There is no debate about whether many—or most—farm wokers are aliens.

They are. And they will be, for the foreseeable future. The question is whether they will be here legally or illegally.

Immigrants not legally authorized to work in this country know they must work in hiding.

They cannot even claim basic legal rights and protections. They are vulnerable to predation and exploitation. They sometimes have been stuffed inhumanly into dangerously enclosed truck trailers and car trunks, in order to be transported, hidden from the view of the law.

In fact, they have been known to pay ''coyotes''—labor smugglers—$1,000 and more to be smuggled into this country.

In contrast, legal workers have legal protections.

They can assert wage, safety, and other legal protections. They can bargain openly and join unions. H–2A workers, in fact, are even guaranteed housing and transportation.

Clearly, the status quo is broken.

Domestic American workers simply are not being found to fill agricultural jobs.

Our own General Accounting Office has estimated that 600,000 farm workers—37 percent of the total 1.6 million agricultural work force—are not legally authorized to work in this country.

That estimate is low; it's based on self-disclosure by illegal workers to government interviewers.

Some actually have suggested that there is no labor shortage, because there are plenty of illegal workers. This is not an acceptable answer.

Congress has shown its commitment over the past few years to improve the security of our borders, both in the 1996 immigration law and in subsequent appropriations.

Between computerized checking by the Social Security Administration and audits and raids by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, more and more employers are discovering they have undocumented employees; and more and more workers here illegally are being discovered and evicted from their jobs.

Outside of H–2A, employers have no reliable assurance that their employees are legal.

It's worse than a Catch-22—the law actually punishes the employer who could be called ''too diligent'' in inquiring into the identification documents of prospective workers.

The H–2A status quo is slow, bureaucratic, and inflexible. It does nothing to recognize the uncertainties farmers face, from changes in the weather to global market demands.

The H–2A status quo is complicated and legalistic. DOL's compliance manual alone is 325 pages.

The current H–2A process is so hard to use, it will place only 34,000 legal guest workers this year—2 percent of the total agricultural work force.

Finally, the grower can't even count on his or her government to do its job.

The GAO has found that, in more than 40 percent of the cases in which employers filed H–2A applications at least 60 days before the date of need, the DOL missed statutory deadlines in processing them.

The solution we need is the AgJOBS Act of 1999.

Our new, improved AgJOBS bill includes three main parts:

First, it would create a national AgJOBS registry.

This new program would match willing workers anywhere in the U.S. with available farm work. Workers would be