and our inventories went down. As a matter of fact, the Administration admits that it was ''caught napping'' after OPEC decided to decrease production in March of 1999—and while they napped through a long winter's sleep, prices for crude climbed as temperatures plummeted.

The effect on gasoline, diesel and home heating oil was predictable, and in fact was predicted. Last October—a half a year ago—the Department of Energy, in its 1999–2000 Winter Fuels Outlook, projected a 44 percent increase in home heating oil bills. In a severe winter, the agency estimated, an additional 28 percent increase in costs could be felt for residential customers.

In other words, the Department of Energy itself predicted an increase of over 70 percent, but did nothing. In actuality, home heating oil costs jumped from a fairly consistent national of 86 cents per gallon in the winter of 1998–99 to as high as $2.08 per gallon in Maine early last month—an increase of well over 100 percent. And, in that same time frame, conventional gasoline prices have risen 70 percent or higher.

So now the Administration tells us that gasoline prices will most likely go down by this summer because of the small production increases agreed to by OPEC. Well, even with an increase in OPEC quotas, there will still be a shortfall in meeting worldwide demand for crude oil. Approximately 76.3 million barrels per day are needed to meet demand, but the anticipated new OPEC production is estimated to be only 75.3 million barrels per day. So you'll have to excuse me if I'm a little hesitant accepting estimates from an Administration that seems to make predictions by gazing into a crystal ball. I want to at least make sure that Americans have in their pockets what they would have otherwise paid in fuel taxes if the Administration underestimates prices once again and gasoline hits $2.00 a gallon.

Beyond the pump, consumers are getting hit with extra costs directly attributable to high fuel costs. If you've paid to send an overnight package lately, you probably noted that you were charged a fuel fee, because their cost of diesel fuel has increased by about 60 percent over the past year. And with a 150 percent increase in jet fuel, that airline ticket you buy today will probably include something you've never seen before—a fuel charge of $20.00. How long will it be before costs of other products will also be passed on the consumer?

And, consider the impacts to the nations' farmers. The New York Times reported just this past Wednesday that a farmer paying 40 cents a gallon more this year to fuel his diesel tractors and combines is adding as much as $240 a day to his harvesting costs. In my home state of Maine, we are at the peak season for moving last year's potato crop out of storage and to the large Eastern markets. But the industry can't get truckers to come into the State to move the potatoes because they are discouraged by the particularly high price of diesel in Maine.

The only help the potato industry has had recently in getting their product to market has certainly not been due to the energy policy of this Administration, but to local truckers who have turned to hauling potatoes because the recent wet weather has kept them away from taking timber out of the Maine woods.

Soon, we will enter the summer months, when tourism is particularly important to the economy of New England and to Maine in particular. With gas prices climbing even higher, we need relief now, and that's what this bill provides.

Mr. President, the choices are clear—do nothing for the taxpayers who are being gouged by failed energy policies, or do something by supporting legislation that acts as a circuit breaker that gives citizens a break at the gas pump, protects the Trust Funds that build our highways and airports, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to the Gas Tax Repeal Act, S. 2285:

Trent Lott, Frank H. Murkowski, Paul Coverdell, Conrad Burns, Larry E. Craig, Mike Crapo, Judd Gregg, Orrin Hatch, Rod Grams, Susan Collins, Robert F. Bennett, Chuck Grassley, Mike Inhofe, Don Nickles, Sam Brownback, and Richard G. Lugar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to the Gas Tax Repeal Act, S. 2285, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 86, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 51 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Abraham	Allard	Bayh
Akaka	Ashcroft	Bennett
Biden	Gramm	McConnell
Bingaman	Grams	Mikulski
Breaux	Grassley	Moynihan
Brownback	Gregg	Murkowski
Bryan	Hagel	Murray
Bunning	Hatch	Nickles
Burns	Helms	Reed
Campbell	Hollings	Reid
Chafee, L.	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Cleland	Hutchison	Roth
Cochran	Inouye	Santorum
Collins	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Conrad	Johnson	Schumer
Coverdell	Kennedy	Sessions
Craig	Kerrey	Shelby
Crapo	Kerry	Smith (NH)
Daschle	Kohl	Smith (OR)
DeWine	Kyl	Snowe
Dodd	Landrieu	Specter
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Stevens
Durbin	Leahy	Thompson
Edwards	Levin	Thurmond
Feingold	Lieberman	Torricelli
Fitzgerald	Lott	Voinovich
Frist	Lugar	Wellstone
Gorton	Mack	Wyden
Graham	McCain	

NAYS—11

Baucus	Feinstein	Roberts
Bond	Harkin	Thomas
Byrd	Lincoln	Warner
Enzi	Robb	

NOT VOTING—3

Boxer	Domenici	Inhofe

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 86, the nays are 11. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

LARRY HARRISON

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, sadly this week the Senate has lost another member of our family. On Monday, Larry Harrison, a retired Senate staffer, passed away in Washington, DC. Before his retirement in June of 1997, Larry had over 36 years of Federal service.

Most of my colleagues will remember Larry's hard work as a Chamber attendant. His dedication to the upkeep of the Chamber and the surrounding rooms will be remembered. On Tuesday evening, former Senator Bob Dole fondly remembered Larry during the Leader's Lecture Series.

Like many of the support staff who work for this institution, Larry arrived at work long before the Senate convened and frequently left the Chamber long after adjournment.

Many Senators will recall Larry's passion for golf. I certainly do. As a matter of fact, Larry was one of the founders of the ''Cloakroom Open.'' This golf tournament was organized by Larry to enable many of the Senate staff who work around the Senate Chamber an opportunity to play a round of golf together. It was a chance for a little camaraderie without the discussion of party or politics.

Many may know that Larry's step son, Mike Henry, also works for the Senate and has worked for the Senate for a long time. I have had the pleasure of knowing Mike. I think highly of Mike and his family. Mike's wife, Cookie, also works for the House of Representatives. This is a family who has dedicated decades of service to the Congress and to the Senate.

I join with all of my colleagues in expressing sympathy to Larry's family and our hearts and prayers go out to them at this time. I know all Members will join me in saying, ''Thank you, Larry, for your service, and keep hitting 'em straight.''

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the Senate recently lost a very dear friend. Larry Harrison, who worked in the Capitol for over 36 years prior to his retirement in 1997, died early this week. Larry's many years of dedicated and distinguished work made him an institution within this institution. It was tough on all of us when he retired a few years ago, but it is much more difficult to say goodbye to him today.

Larry served this country and the Senate in a variety of ways for nearly four decades. He served in the U.S. Army during World War II, participating in the D-Day invasion at Normandy, and following the war worked for the Architect of the Capitol for five years. Larry returned to the Capitol to work for the Sergeant at Arms in 1967. He stayed there until 1997, outlasting all but five of the Senators who were serving in this chamber when he started.

Larry had an extraordinary work ethic, and he committed himself to his job with tremendous pride, energy, and humor. During his time in the Capitol, Larry was responsible for maintaining the President's Room, the Cloakroom, and the Senate Chamber. Somehow, he even found time to operate a shoe shine station in the Senator's bathroom, and I know I speak for everyone when I say that this place hasn't been the same without Larry's friendly smile and kind voice.

When he retired in 1997, our loss was his family's gain. His wife, Jean, and sons, Michael Henry, Albert Philips and Kevin Harrison got their husband and father back full-time. Sadly, their time with him has now been cut all too short.

Our thoughts and prayers are with Larry Harrison's friends and family, especially his wife, Jean, and their three sons. Larry was a good man, a caring husband, and great father. He will be missed.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, March 29, 2000, the Federal debt stood at $5,733,451,648,545.39 (Five trillion, seven hundred thirty-three billion, four hundred fifty-one million, six hundred forty-eight thousand, five hundred forty-five dollars and thirty-nine cents).

One year ago, March 29, 1999, the Federal debt stood at $5,647,515,000,000 (Five trillion, six hundred forty-seven billion, five hundred fifteen million).

Five years ago, March 29, 1995, the Federal debt stood at $4,851,857,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred fifty-one billion, eight hundred fifty-seven million).

Ten years ago, March 29, 1990, the Federal debt stood at $3,052,317,000,000 (Three trillion, fifty-two billion, three hundred seventeen million).

Fifteen years ago, March 29, 1985, the Federal debt stood at $1,710,731,000,000 (One trillion, seven hundred ten billion, seven hundred thirty-one million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $4 trillion—$4,022,720,648,545.39 (Four trillion, twenty-two billion, seven hundred twenty million, six hundred forty-eight thousand, five hundred forty-five dollars and thirty-nine cents) during the past 15 years.

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS FOR CHINA

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the Senate to a timely Opinion-Editorial, written by former Ambassador Leonard Woodcock, that appeared in the March 9, 2000 Los Angeles Times. Long a champion of workers' welfare and workers' rights, Ambassador Woodcock was also the first United States Ambassador's to the People's Republic of China.

Ambassador Woodcock lays out, in a clear and well-reasoned manner, powerful arguments showing how the United States will benefit from establishing permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) with China, and why it is in our interest to see China in the World Trade Organization (WTO). Equally important, the author forces those who profess a concern for Chinese workers' rights to take a realistic look at how our decision concerning China PNTR will help or harm workers in China.

I comment Ambassador Woodcock's thought-provoking commentary to all my colleagues in the Congress and, even more, to all persons interested in understanding the basics of the U.S.-China PNTR debate. I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Woodcock's Opinion-Editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

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

EVOLUTION DOESN'T OCCUR OVERNIGHT

WTO agreement: Organized labor should support it. It's in both U.S. and Chinese interests.

(By Leonard Woodcock)

The recent U.S.-China World Trade Organization bilateral accession agreement appears to be good for workers in both countries. I was privileged, as U.S. ambassador to China, to sign the 1979 trade agreement that provided for most-favored-nation trade status to China and have, as a private citizen, been involved with this issue for many years.

American labor has a tremendous interest in China's trading on fair terms with the U.S. The agreement we signed with China this past November marks the largest single step ever taken toward achieving that goal. The agreement expands American jobs. And while China already enjoys WTO-based access to our economy, this agreement will open China's economy to unprecedented levels of American exports, many of which are high-quality goods produced by high-paying jobs.

There is reason to fear unfair trade practices. Yet this agreement actually provides better protections than our existing laws allow. It stipulates 12 years of protections against market surges and provides unusually strong anti-dumping laws—which aim to counter unfairly priced imports—for 15 years.

I have, therefore, been startled by organized labor's vociferous negative reaction to this agreement. The reality is that the U.S. as a whole benefits mightily from this historic accord. The AFL–CIO argues that nothing in this agreement demands that free trade unions be formed in China. Yet the WTO does not require this of any of its 136 member countries, and the WTO is the wrong instrument to use to achieve unionization.

We should, instead, be asking a more important question. Are Chinese workers better off with or without this agreement? The answer is that this agreement, in a variety of ways, will be enormously beneficial to Chinese workers.

On a subtle level, the changes the agreement requires of China's economic system will work in favor of investment by Western firms and take away some of the key advantages Asian firms now enjoy in China. Every survey has demonstrated that working conditions and environmental standards in plants run by West European and North American firms are usually better than those in Asian and in indigenous Chinese firms.

The greater foreign presence also will expose Chinese workers to more ideas about organization and rights. That is perhaps one reason why almost every Chinese political dissident who has spoken on this issue has called the United States-China WTO agreement good news for freedom in China.

The trade deficit with China is a troublesome one to the labor movement. We need to put it in perspective in two ways. First, if we were to block access of goods from China to the United States, this would not increase American jobs. That is because the Chinese exports—mostly toys, tools, apparel, cheap electronics, etc.—would be produced in other low-wage countries, not in the United States. Yet if China stopped buying from us, we would lose about 400,000 jobs, mostly high-wage.

Second, a large portion of exports from ''China'' are goods produced in the main in Hong Kong. Taiwan and Southeast Asia. The major components are then shipped to China for final assembly and packaging, but the entire cost of the item (often only 15% of which was contributed in China) is attributed to China's export ledger. Exports to the United States from Hong Kong and Taiwan have declined over the past decade almost as fast as imports from China have increased. Yet the companies making the profits are in Hong Kong and Taiwan, and they will simply shift their operations to Vietnam or elsewhere if we close down exports from China.

Americans are broadly concerned about the rights and quality of life of Chinese citizens. My perspective on this serious issue is influenced by my experience in the U.S. In my lifetime, women were not allowed the vote, and labor was not allowed to organize. And, in my lifetime, although the law did