



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1999

No. 150

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, November 1, 1999, at 12:30 p.m.

Senate

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1999

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

O God, we need You. The Senate schedule is full of debate, deliberations, and decisions. There are votes to cast, and inevitably the Senators and their staffs will deal with winning and losing. Lord of the loose ends, grant us Your strength. May we do all we can for everyone we can. Help us to keep our relationships in good working order, oiled with the lubricants of mutual esteem and trust. Particularly we ask You to bless the working relationship between the parties. Thank You for enabling negotiation without negativism, compromise without contradiction of truth. Keep the Senators calm as they trust You and relaxed as You replenish their reserves. You have promised never to leave nor forsake us. We are grateful for the assurance of Your presence, dependable at all times, available whatever our needs, bracing when we need correction, and inspiring when we need courage. So Lord, lead on as we press on. In Your all powerful name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MIKE DEWINE, a Senator from the State of Ohio, led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will begin 30 minutes of debate on H.R. 434, the African-CBI trade bill. By previous consent, the Senate will proceed to a cloture vote on the Roth substitute amendment at 10 a.m.

ORDER TO FILE SECOND-DEGREE AMENDMENTS

Under the provisions of rule XXII, I now ask unanimous consent that Senators have until 10 a.m. today in order to file second-degree amendments to the substitute.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, following the vote, the Senate will continue consideration of the African trade bill or any other legislative or executive business. The Senate may also begin consideration of the conference report to accompany the D.C./Labor-HHS bill during today's session.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Also under the previous order, the Senate

will now resume consideration of H.R. 434, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

Pending:

Lott (for Roth/Moynihan) amendment No. 2325, in the nature of a substitute.

Lott amendment No. 2332 (to amendment No. 2325), of a perfecting nature.

Lott amendment No. 2333 (to amendment No. 2332), of a perfecting nature.

Lott motion to commit with instructions (to amendment No. 2333), of a perfecting nature.

Lott amendment No. 2334 (to the instructions of the motion to commit), of a perfecting nature.

Lott (for Ashcroft) amendment No. 2340 (to amendment No. 2334), to establish a Chief Agricultural Negotiator in the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 30 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I might ask my colleague to yield 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair and I thank my colleague from South Carolina. I thank him for all his fine work in this Chamber.

Mr. President, I want to divide my remarks in 5 minutes and deliver them in two parts. In the first part, I will talk about the African-Caribbean trade bill. I want to repeat two points I made

- This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

during the course of this debate. There are some very good Senators who in very good conscience can have different viewpoints on this legislation.

For my own part, the first point I will make is that I actually do not believe this is about whether or not we as a nation are in an international economy; we are. And I don't think it is about whether or not we are actively involved in trade; we are. It is more about the terms of the trade. I do believe it is a flaw, a fundamental flaw, of this legislation that, again, we have trade legislation that does not have any enforceable labor protections or enforceable environmental protections. At the very minimum, it would seem to me we have to get serious about having clear language in these agreements which gives people the right in countries with which we are trading to be able to organize and bargain collectively for themselves and their families. The same thing can be said for the environment, the same thing can be said for child labor, and the same thing can be said for human rights as a part of these labor agreements.

I think basically what this African and Caribbean trade agreement says is two things. It says to workers, to wage earners in our country: If you should decide you want to organize to be able to bargain collectively and get a better wage and better working conditions for yourself so you can do better for your family, then just understand that these companies, these businesses, will just go to other parts of the world where they don't have to deal with you at all. They don't have to deal with the right of the workers to be able to organize. What it says to poor people and what it says to working people in African countries and Caribbean countries is, the way you get the investment is to be willing to work for jobs that pay less than 30 cents an hour, or whatever the case might be, because that is the only way it is going to happen because there are in these agreements no protections, no enforceable labor code—child labor, right to organize, right to bargain collectively—no enforceable environmental code. That is the first point.

The second point I will make about this legislation is that I think it is a terrible message to send as we move to the WTO gathering in Seattle. I am in profound disagreement with the administration on this. They think we should pass this and that would be important. To me, I hear the administration, Democrats—I am a Democrat—saying to labor, and saying to environmentalists, and saying to nongovernmental organizations, and saying to a whole lot of other people: Listen, we have a real chance at this WTO gathering of moving toward enforceable labor codes, enforceable environmental protection. Well, if you can't do it in a bilateral agreement, how in the world are you going to do it in a multilateral agreement, multinational agreement? It is not going to happen. So I oppose this legislation on substantive grounds.

I hope my colleagues, especially Democrats, will vote against cloture because we have again been shut out of the opportunity to introduce amendments that really go to the heart of whether we can represent people in our States.

I have talked about the right to fight for family farmers for 8 weeks. The majority leader said the other day he filled up the tree one time. I said I thought the record would show more than that. I think in the last year it has been 9 or 10 times we have been shut out of the opportunity to even have an up-or-down vote. What is relevant to me is the pain and agony of the family farmers and all the producers who are being driven off the land, and to not have the opportunity to consider amendments, to have a debate and up-or-down votes, and to fight for people back in my state to try to make a difference for family farmers. And other Senators feel the same way.

I also said I do not think the debate about campaign finance reform is over. To me, the energy is at the State level. To me, the energy is toward clean money and clean elections, and I want an opportunity to offer an amendment that would give States the authority to have a clean-money, clean-election initiative that would apply not only to State races but to House and Senate races as well.

This debate is not over. Just because there are Senators here who block reform, we will not go away. I want to offer an amendment which gives States the ability to pass sweeping campaign finance reform and that would apply to our elections as well. I think that is where the energy is going to be.

If we are not going to do it here, if the powerful financial interests are going to block reform, let the States do it. I have an amendment on that. I want to be able to bring up the amendment for debate. That is what the Senate is all about. We are not the House of Representatives. Therefore, I hope Senators will vote against cloture around this fundamental principle that the Senate should be the Senate and we debate and fight for the people in our States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act and Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act and urge my colleagues to reject the cloture motion to end debate on this ill-advised legislation.

Today's proposal offers a unilateral opening of the U.S. market in exchange for no market access commitments from the countries affected. Unlike NAFTA, no negotiations are required for these benefits contained within the legislation to take effect. It is no wonder that the governments of the impacted countries argue in favor of this legislation.

This legislation contains limited protections for Caribbean and African

workers and offer no protections for the environments in either region. It is essentially an invitation for companies to leave the United States and exploit African and Caribbean workers and the environment.

Moreover, today's proposal disrupts a carefully balanced transition in textile and apparel manufacturing industries from a quota system to a less regulated market.

Five years ago, in adopting NAFTA and the WTO we established a textile and apparel policy that was designed to be implemented over a 10-year period. We are now halfway through that implementation.

Manufacturers, workers, and families made investments and planned their future based on that scheme. It is grossly unfair to all involved to alter that plan in the middle of its implementation.

Specifically, the Africa portion of the legislation alters the generalized system of preferences program by permitting increased access to imports from Africa into areas that have traditionally been limited because they are import sensitive.

Let me restate that.

This package essentially lifts the protections for the most import sensitive products. In short, that means that U.S. workers will lose jobs as a result of this legislation.

The protections that this legislation will erase have long been recognized in U.S. trade policy. Proponents of this bill will argue that the ITC has conducted a study that suggests that U.S. job loss will be less than 1,000 jobs. I do not believe the study and will offer an amendment to this legislation that would suspend benefits when textile and apparel job loss exceed 1,000 workers.

Moreover, this legislation contains few assurances that the products coming from Africa be made in Africa. In fact, for most products, a minimum of 20 percent of the work can be done in Africa and the benefits of the legislation will still apply to the product.

Traditionally, I have expressed concern on a variety of trade initiatives and most particularly with regard to those impacting the textile and apparel complex.

South Carolina has 93,000 workers in our textile and apparel industries including 73,000 in the textile industries and 20,500 in the apparel industries.

The proposal before the Senate today would essentially condemn the 20,500 employees in the apparel industry (and the 666,000 apparel workers nationally) to unemployment by permitting the duty-free entry, quota free entry of apparel products from Africa and the Caribbean that are made from American fabric—the so-called 807-a, 809 exception.

Many will claim that such a provision aids the U.S. textile industry and for a brief time it may. Unfortunately, it decimates the U.S. apparel sector. If the apparel sector is undermined, eventually the textile industry will erode as

well, because manufacturers will always move to be near their customers.

Moreover, it is unlikely that the strict provisions that exist in the legislation will remain, once the conference committee completes a reconciliation of this bill with the much more expansive proposal from the House of Representatives.

In addition, the principles underlying this legislation assumes that the current tariff situation remains unchanged as result of the new WTO Seattle Round negotiations. Such an outcome is unlikely.

This legislation merely continues the ongoing assault by the current administration on America's strong manufacturing base. It will further weaken an already besieged U.S. textile and apparel industry and cost the jobs of countless American workers.

This administration has become enchanted by the false promise of "free trade," to the detriment of numerous U.S. industries. While expanding global commerce and benefiting less developed nations are admirable goals, we cannot afford to pursue them if it means dangerously weakening our industrial complex and putting American laborers out of work.

I have often spoken on behalf of the beleaguered textile and apparel industry, one that is critical to maintaining a strong U.S. manufacturing base. Currently the United States imports \$21 million worth of apparel and fabric for every \$6 million that it exports. This margin will likely increase substantially with the implementation of S. 1387.

American textile companies cannot compete with the increasing amount of cheap imports that are flooding our markets. Just in the past 17 months, 50 plants have been forced to close their doors, displacing 30,000 workers. And as disturbing as they are, these are just the most recent figures. I use them to underscore the seriousness of a much larger, longer-term problem.

In large part it is our previous free trade agreements that are to blame for the losses in textile jobs. During the 36 months prior to implementation of the NAFTA agreement, just 2,000 jobs were lost in the American textile sector. The ensuing 56 months saw job losses rise to 305,000. To put these numbers in perspective, that is over 300,000 families who have lost their major source of income in just the past year and a half.

The deterioration of the textile and apparel job market is not only harmful to South Carolina, but is devastating for many parts of the United States. In my State, the past 10 years has seen the number of jobs in the apparel sectors drop from 45,000 to 20,500, a decrease of more than 50 percent. Similarly, Pennsylvania's textile and apparel jobs have dipped from 80,000 jobs to 34,800 since 1989.

Some might argue that in place of these jobs, many comparable new jobs have been created through the growth of the retail industry. This fact appears

to be true on the surface, but closer examination shows it to be deceiving. Textile jobs pay 63 percent more than retail jobs. While the average mill worker receives wages of \$440.59 a week, retail positions pay only \$270.90.

Furthermore, as an indication of the value of textile sector jobs, one can look at the increase in wages earned by mill workers over the past ten years. The \$440.59 figure is up from \$308.15 in 1989.

In effect, well-paying jobs are being replaced with significantly lower paying jobs. This is a serious problem, particularly when many of these workers provide the only source of income for their families.

Considering the difficulties of the domestic textile market, the last thing America needs is to increase the amount of cheap imports coming into our country. Yet this is exactly what S. 1387 does. It provides the perfect loophole for Asian countries to circumvent U.S. import restrictions.

With the implementation of the Africa trade bill and the Caribbean Basin initiative, Asian companies will be able to easily conduct illegal textile transshipments from both African and Caribbean nations. Once they build manufacturing plants on the Caribbean islands, their products will be automatically accepted into the U.S. with low duties and no quotas. The restrictions contained in the Africa trade legislation will be subverted in a similar manner. Illegal transshipments already hurt American textile companies, and making them easier will just exacerbate the problem.

This decimation of one of America's most important manufacturing sectors is unacceptable. I agree, as most of us do, that increased economic development in Africa and the Caribbean Basin is an important international objective, and is ultimately in America's best interest. Further, it is important that we assist these regions in implementing effective policies for this development. However, to do so at the expense of the textile and apparel industries and the American workers in those industries is irresponsible and foolhardy.

The opportunity we are offering to the countries covered by this legislation is enormous. We are allowing them open access to our markets, giving them the opportunity to export their products to the United States at will. Meanwhile, more American workers will lose their jobs because foreign laborers are willing to work for much lower wages. Effectively, we are opening our doors to cheap imports and unemployment, all in the name of helping these poor nations to establish a firmer economic footing.

In return for this favor we ask for nothing. We are agreeing to give away our employment and our money, and yet we want nothing in exchange. This is bad economics and poor policy-making.

It seems clear to me that we should ask for something in return. We should

ask that, at the very least, these nations treat their citizens decently and with respect. The human rights records of the countries included in this trade bill range from marginal to abominable. It should not be too much to expect for their governments to take steps to improve the living conditions of their people.

Women suffer unequal and often violent treatment in many of the African countries and Caribbean nations. It is common in these societies to accept physical violence as a means of resolving domestic disputes. The result of this toleration is that women are routinely battered, raped, and assaulted. For example, human rights workers estimate that 20 percent of the female population in Nigeria has been subjected to physical abuse in the home. Furthermore, many African tribes force their female members to undergo rituals of severe violence, which are often life-threatening. In some countries, such as Sierra Leone, such brutal acts have been practiced on almost 100 percent of females.

Obviously, these women are considered inferior citizens. That inequality is clear in the labor laws of many of these countries. If they are allowed to work at all, women make far lower wages than their male counterparts. In Kenya, women's average monthly wages were a striking 37 percent below those of men in 1998.

Many of the children of these nations suffer similarly dismal fates. Street children, often orphaned by the loss of their parents to the AIDS virus, are sold into prostitution or, in some cases, into slavery. In El Salvador, as many as 270,000 children fit into this category. More "fortunate" minors are put to work as street vendors or domestic servants to help support their families financially. Most of these countries maintain the pretense of compulsory education and child labor laws, but few conscientiously enforce them.

The plight of unskilled laborers in Africa and the Caribbean is also problematic. Only a handful of the countries covered by S. 1387 have established minimum wages that are sufficient to allow workers to support their families. To state one example, unskilled and agricultural laborers in Burundi are forced to survive on an astonishingly low 35 cents per day! Not surprisingly, this amount has been deemed inadequate for a worker and his family to maintain a decent standard of living.

Clearly, the citizens of African and Caribbean countries are being subjected to numerous and often brutal human rights abuses. It is absurd that we are proposing to help these nations economically while turning a blind eye to the violence and inequality that goes on within their borders. If Congress and the administration insist on expanding "free trade" and granting open access to our markets to developing states, let us at least make such

action contingent upon the equitable and decent treatment of their people. We have a powerful tool at our disposal, and we would be foolish not to use it.

This legislation defies common sense. By passing it, we would further erode our manufacturing base and sacrifice important jobs, while receiving nothing in return. To you who represent farmers, I ask that you join me today in opposing this legislation, just as I and the textile workers have stood with you during the current crisis. To those who represent steel, I remind you that we supported you during your crisis as well. Please stand with me in voting against this proposal.

Mr. President, to sum up:

The bill decimates the apparel sector. It permits duty-free, quota-free imports from the CBI/Africa when made from United States fabric.

It targets import-sensitive sectors by altering the rules for the imports of products from Africa.

It provides limited protections for African workers and limited protections for Caribbean workers.

Unilateral action requiring that countries benefiting take no real action to obtain the benefits.

It provides no protection for the environment. Unlike the NAFTA side agreement, there are no side agreements to protect labor.

It undermines the textile and apparel policy adopted as part of GATT.

This Congress has no continuity of mind and attention. We passed a 10-year phaseout in the GATT agreement on textile quotas. Now, 5 years into the agreement, we want to cut it out. Investments made on the national policy of a 10-year phaseout are cut short. How do we pay for the machinery?

Since we have a limited time, I will bring the issue into focus. This could be called the Fruit of the Loom job flight bill or the campaign finance bill because this proves the efficacy of soft money.

I have an article from today, Friday, October 29, from the Washington Post, entitled "Will Capitol Crusade Bear Fruit? Ailing Underwear Maker Gives Freely as Senate Mulls Tariff Cut."

Fruit of the Loom Inc. is feeling deep pain these days. The company whose name has long been synonymous with underwear has lost money in the last three quarters. Its stock has dropped from \$40 in 1997 to below \$3 yesterday.

So a bill that would eliminate tariffs that it and other companies pay to bring in certain garments from their factories in the Caribbean looks awfully attractive.

That is what we will be voting on.

On Capitol Hill, the company that industry people simply call Fruit has emerged as a prime promoter of the Senate bill, which is part of the United States' Caribbean Basin Initiative. The company also has become a big contributor to Republican causes.

Contribution records show that Fruit gave \$350,000 in "soft money" to GOP groups, \$265,000 of it to the National Republican Senatorial Committee, in the 1997-98 election cycle. That placed the company in the same league as the National Rifle Association and

much bigger companies, such as drugmaker Novartis Corp. and Atlantic Richfield Co.

Fruit also gave almost \$90,000 in "soft money" to the Democratic cause, all of it to the Democratic Senate Campaign Committee.

Contributions have continued in 1999. Records show an additional \$73,000, all of it to Republicans.

At the same time, Fruit's chairman, William Farley, has been an active donor to key Republicans, giving \$2,000 in May to the group Trent Lott for Mississippi, which supports the Senate majority leader, and \$2,000 to the Keep Our Majority Political Action Committee, which supports GOP candidates.

Mr. President, we are not dealing with jobs and dealing with trade. We are dealing with campaign finance.

I continue:

"It's a company in bad shape giving money fairly lavishly to the [political] process, with incredible things to gain," said Charles Lewis, executive director of the Center for Public Integrity.

Fruit doesn't deny the bill would help it—a spokesman said it expects to gain \$25 million to \$50 million a year if the Senate bill is enacted—but argues it will also help American industry and jobs.

"We don't look on this bill as corporate welfare," said Ronald J. Sorini, Fruit senior vice president for government affairs.

Sorini said that his company and the industry are "getting hammered" by imports from Asia and that the Senate version of the bill, which limits import benefits to clothes made abroad from U.S.-produced textiles, would help the company compete by helping team its U.S. textile workers with its low-cost garment stitchers overseas. The House bill does not require use of American cloth.

Mr. President, as an aside, the ATM disapproves this particular bill because it marries the House bill with the Senate bill and does not require the Senate language.

Reading on:

He denied the contributions are targeted at the Caribbean bill, saying Fruit has more issues than that to worry about in Congress. "We support those who generally support our industry," he said.

The Clinton administration also backs the Senate bill, as does the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, which represents companies that make cloth.

The Senate bill, along with one to offer similar tariff benefits to Africa, was caught up in maneuvering last night, with a vote to limit debate set for today. The measure is opposed by a coalition of labor groups and companies that still make garments in the United States. They contend it will further erode U.S. garment jobs and unfairly reward companies like Fruit that have sent garment jobs overseas.

Fruit's U.S. employment has fallen from 33,000 to 17,000 people, the company says. About 3,500 Fruit employees are based in Kentucky, and the bill has caused a split between the state's two senators, Mitch McConnell and Jim Bunning, both Republicans.

McConnell favors it. "It's not unusual for a senator to support the interests of a major employer in his or her state," said Kyle Simmons, his chief of staff.

McConnell heads the Republican committee that has been the beneficiary of Fruit's soft-money contributions. Simmons said the money has no connection to McConnell's position, adding that he has always been a "free-trader."

Bunning has spoken out against the bill, on the grounds that too many jobs are going abroad.

All in all, the bill would cost the Treasury about \$1 billion in lost tariff revenue over five years.

Mr. President, if there is any pride in being a Senator, they would withdraw this bill.

I yield the floor and I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I rise one last time to implore my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the motion to invoke cloture. Frankly, it would be unconscionable to block progress on a bill that enjoys the support of at least 80 Senators from both sides of the aisle. It would be unconscionable to block progress on what the President has described as one of the most significant initiatives of his presidency. It would be unconscionable to block progress on a bill that enjoys the support of the vast majority of political, civic and religious leaders in this country and the support of each of the nations that would benefit from its passage.

But, most importantly, it would be unconscionable to block progress on a bill that would create 121,000 jobs in the American textile industry over the next 5 years. I have emphasized again and again in this debate that this is not a bill that is good just for our neighbors in the Caribbean and Central America or our partners in Africa. This is a bill that is good for our workers here at home!

Let me remind my colleagues that it is no benefit to workers in the textile industry if you raise the minimum wage when they don't have a job. It is of no use to American textile workers if you debate mergers and acquisitions in the agribusiness sector if we do not open markets for their products. It is of no use to the American textile workers if we debate, yet again, reform of campaign finance laws when they headed for the unemployment line.

I was not elected by my constituents in Delaware to look out for the short-term political advantage. I was not elected by my constituents in Delaware to win debating points and I have never sought the floor for that purpose.

I have drafted a bill here that is a benefit to workers and industry here in the United States, as well as neighbors in the Caribbean, Central America, and Africa. It is a "win-win" situation economically for American workers and our friends abroad.

The bill is also a victory for an outward looking foreign policy. It is a statement about American leadership in an age that cries out for us to lead in positive ways that ensure peace and stability around the world.

Let me remind my colleagues that no state in Africa or the Caribbean or Central America is politically stable if people cannot feed themselves!

In recent weeks, I have heard an unending cavalcade of criticism about the Senate's vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Isolationists!

That's what the opponents of this bill called those of us who thought more about our national security than we thought of our political expediency.

Where are those voices now? Where is the one or two voices that would argue now for an outward looking foreign policy agenda? Where are those one or two votes in favor of engagement with the world, rather than a sterile debate about senatorial privileges?

This is not a debate about the minority party's rights. This is a tyranny of the small minority on each side of the aisle that wants to kill this bill. We must see our way clear to a vote against partisanship. We must rise above the parochial and focus on our national interest and the world around us.

Let me remind my colleagues that this bill enjoys the support of one of the strongest bipartisan majorities I have seen in the Senate. The cloture vote on the motion to proceed was 90-8.

This is a measure that the distinguished minority leader himself initiated in 1994. This is a measure that the distinguished majority leader has fought for and made room for at a time on the legislative calendar when the hours are precious. This is a measure that the President has indicated in his State of the Union Address is at the top of his agenda.

This bill has the support of the strongest coalition of political, civic, and religious leaders of any measure I have seen in years.

That said, I want to give credit where credit is due. Those who want to kill this bill—those who have appeared so frequently on the floor of the Senate this week to talk about anything but this bill—have done a masterful job.

Does it strike anyone as an odd coincidence that Time magazine runs an article during the week of this debate that suggests that this bill, which would do so much for both Africa and the Caribbean and for workers in the United States, is the work of a single company? Does it strike anyone as an odd coincidence that someone named John Burgess in the Washington Post, who erroneously reported last week that Nelson Mandela opposed this legislation, regurgitates that Time magazine article in this morning's edition of the Post?

Those articles ignore the bipartisan push that has brought this bill to the floor of the Senate. A bipartisan push in the House of Representatives led by the chairman and ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee. And, the strong bipartisan push in the Senate as well.

My friends, each day this week, the Ambassadors of the 47 African countries that would benefit from this bill have watched this debate from the Senate gallery. Each day this week, members of the American public have looked on as we discussed our privileges, rather than their business. They have read the misreporting of the bill

in the popular press. They have seen the pleas of the President to vindicate his foreign policy initiatives in Africa and the Caribbean go unheeded as the discussion of process, rather than substance, has dragged on.

The real question before us is whether we can look up into the Senate gallery and look those people in the eye if we fail to move this bill. There will be a time to debate an increase in the minimum wage. There will be a time to debate consolidation in the food processing industry.

There will be—and there has been—ample time devoted to the issue of campaign finance reform. A vote for cloture does not preclude that debate.

What would it do? It would leave us with a solid bill that is good for Africa and the Caribbean and good for the United States. It would also leave us with another two days to debate the merits of this bill and offer any germane amendments that would improve the legislation before us.

What is wrong with that? What is wrong with sticking to the subject at hand and getting our job done?

I implore my colleagues to vote for cloture on this bill. I implore my colleagues to vote in favor of an open engagement with the world around us, rather than a fearful isolationism that hides behind protective walls. I implore my colleagues to support this initiative with a vote in favor of the motion before us.

Make your stand here. Vote for the motion.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). Who yields time? The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, much of the controversy surrounding U.S. trade policy arises from differences in opinion about the economic benefits achieved from trade agreements. Trade agreements, in principle, have winners and losers. In recent years, regrettably, U.S. trade agreements seem to be pitting U.S. conglomerates and foreign policy interests against the traditional American workers. By traditional worker, I mean craftsmen, artisans, and laborers who, in this information age, still actually make things. Man cannot live on information alone—we still need clothes, shoes, dishes to eat from, watches, and tangible items. I believe the underlying issue for the traditional American worker is the question of who benefits from our trade negotiations. I believe that the traditional American worker perceives that a selected few U.S. industries keep winning, while other domestic industries keep losing, and that the promised trickle down of benefits from the winners to the losers never happens.

Certainly, this is the case with the trade legislation now before the Senate. The same industries keep losing. Under the African and Caribbean provisions in the bill, the losers will likely be textile and apparel, footwear, glass, electronics, handbags, along with

canned tuna and petroleum. In this decade alone, the Senate approved two major trade bills, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and in each of these bills the losers were many of the same players. The deemed "losers" were workers in traditional industries such as textile and apparel production, footwear, glass, electronics, watches, and handbags.

I believe that many in the textile and apparel industry understand only too well about the stigma of losing so often in trade agreements. I am bothered by the "loser" sign that has been placed on the traditional U.S. workers, and the lack of concern about workers who lose their jobs as a result of a trade agreement. I believe that the so-called "losers" in U.S. trade policy ought not to be thoughtlessly discarded.

In the U.S. trade policy process, we have become heartless, insensitive, merciless, and numb to the potential pain that these trade agreements can inflict on Americans—on mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, and children. The so-called Trade Adjustment Assistance program falls woefully short in providing meaningful benefits to the workers who lose their jobs as a result of trade agreements, and I hope that members are not fooling themselves about the true hardships that are ahead for many workers as a result of the trade legislation that we are considering today. Yes, today the economy is booming, in most parts of the United States. I hope this state of well-being lasts forever. However, we know it will not.

Many of my colleagues eagerly point toward the benefits in the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program. TAA is touted as the sure thing to make a winner out of the loser from a trade agreement. Under TAA, in return for their years of contributions to the local and national tax bases, workers who can prove that their company went under as a result of foreign trade might get a federal extension of unemployment checks, which is approximately \$250 a week in West Virginia, and two years of "approved" retraining. Possibly, if no "approved" jobs are available in the area, these workers might also be eligible for a one-way ticket to another region or state, with a whopping \$800 from the federal government to start them off in their new lives. With good reason, most workers do not want TAA. They want to earn full wages, with benefits, and two years of unemployment does not cut it.

Advocates of the trade bill proclaim that we have to think about the future U.S. relations with Africa and the Caribbean basin, and that we have to accept the fact that many traditional industries are a thing of the past in the United States. There are numbers of members who dismiss the textile and apparel industries, as sure to go the way of covered wagons or the steam locomotive. Advocates want to make the

case that you are either for the trade bill before us, or against U.S. relations with Africa and the Caribbean. I support meaningful economic development in Africa and the Caribbean, but I also care about what happens to the traditional worker here in the United States that might lose his or her job as a result of this bill, and I simply have not received any reasonable assurance that these workers will receive the support they deserve.

From my years in the Senate, I have a very strong viewpoint on accepting winners and losers as deemed by the Administration—any administration—or by the committee of jurisdiction. I can tell you that there are many, many industries that would be at risk, if certain special tax or procurement provisions failed to exist. In my view, the main reason that textile and apparel workers are so-called “losers” is because decade after decade we have chipped the tariffs away, allowing our trading partners to enter the U.S. market under very advantageous conditions. This strategy was called free trade, but, in reality, I believe that it was mostly a heyday for our trading partners who had no labor or environmental standards. Regardless, decade after decade, this country has relentlessly chipped away at the textile and apparel manufacturing base, mostly on the grounds that this is a natural procession of development, like the demise of the covered wagon and steam locomotive. My staff informs me that advocates of the African and Caribbean trade provisions actually use the metaphor of the covered wagon and steam locomotive as evidence that this is just the way the world works. I guess someone forgot to educate this group that, unlike covered wagons and steam locomotives, Americans will likely continue to wear and use textile and apparel products!

I wonder if members supporting this legislation recall that during debate on GATT only five years ago, we implemented drastic cuts in the textile and apparel tariff rates. We told the textile and apparel industry that they would have to swallow the cuts, but that we would phase the tariff reductions in over ten years to help them make business decisions and adjust to the new rules. Let me repeat that: five years ago this body implemented deep tariff cuts on textile and apparel with the understanding that the cuts would be phased in over ten years. Well, it is 1999, and here we are again, chipping relentlessly away at the nominal base that the textile and apparel industry has left. Does the word of this body have no meaning?

Under the African and Caribbean trade provisions, there are U.S. industry “winners,” mostly retailers, most notably apparel retail companies, and the bill would help U.S. fabric manufacturers and growers. To those winners, I say “good for you.” I know the value of a dollar. I spend my money carefully. I like the benefit of con-

sumer savings from our free-market economy. I have never been against trade agreements on fair trade.

I am here to tell you, however, that the consideration of trade agreements should be completed in a serious, deliberative, and scrutinizing manner, as trade agreements have broad impacts, and negative consequences. There has been only one relevant hearing held on this legislation, and that hearing pertained solely to the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act. There were no hearings on the Caribbean Basin Initiative, the Generalized System of Preferences, or on Trade Adjustment Assistance during this Congress.

While the proponents argue in behalf of the potential long-term benefits that the bill might provide to the United States, the fact remains that this bill lacks real reciprocal benefits for the United States. This bill is generally a foreign aid package financed on the backs of a few industries, such as the textile and apparel industry. Is that fair?

It is time for the Senate to be sensitive to the costs of trade agreements. We are preparing to approve a bill that imposes enormous costs on direct segments of our economy. TAA is a start, but it is not the whole answer. I urge my colleagues to put a human face on workers in industries such as textile and apparel, footware, glass, electronics, watches, and handbags. I can put a human face on these workers, and I put a value on their hopes and dreams, and on their future prosperity.

I am a product of the coal fields of West Virginia. I have seen what it is to work hard, physically hard, to sweat, and to toil. American workers, traditional workers, are the soul of America. They are the essence of our values. They bleed and hurt as U.S. trade policy tightens around their necks. With proper review, hearings, and consideration, I am convinced that we could find a better way to achieve U.S. foreign policy goals for the fine people of Africa and the Caribbean nations. I support a long and prosperous relationship with our friends in the sub-Saharan African and the Caribbean Basin nations.

We need to restore the average American worker’s faith in our trade policy. We need to move forward on a trade process that provides fair and equitable treatment to all Americans. We need to recognize that all American workers should be able to depend upon our understanding and regard for their position upon enactment of trade law. This bill is not what we are looking for. It does not do these things. For these reasons, I cannot support this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman talked of a short-term political advantage. I have debated this issue for 33 years in the Senate. When I started, I was not successful. We had 90 percent of the pro-

duction of textiles. We are down to one-third or less of the critical mass. If we preempt the 10-year phaseout of the Multifiber Arrangement, I can tell you right now, the industry is gone. The jobs are gone.

He talks about the tyranny of the minority. He has not seen me. If I could be a tyrant, I would be. The White House and an overwhelming majority of Republicans and Democrats are all in favor of soft money.

The morning headline: “Will Capitol Crusade Bear Fruit?” “Ailing Underwear Maker Gives Freely as Senate Mulls Tariff Cut.”

It is not the jobs. The jobs have left Kentucky. Senator BUNNING has to protect the jobs so that no more of them leave. 7,000 have already left Louisiana. The gentleman, Mr. William Farley, has moved his headquarters to the Cayman Islands; so we can call this the Fruit of the Loom job flight bill.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to explain my opposition to the African Growth and Opportunity Act. My decision was difficult because I wholeheartedly support provisions of the bill that would reauthorize of two important trade-related programs—the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). These programs provide vital benefits to the state of Maine and the nation. Although on balance, I believe that H.R. 434 unfairly damages Maine’s economy, I take solace in the fact that the TAA and GSP programs are one step closer to being reauthorized. I would like to focus for a moment on these two programs.

The TAA aids workers and firms in global economic readjustments. By providing funds to retrain workers, TAA’s program offers both opportunity and a lifeline to workers displaced by market changes caused by imports. It helps firms threatened by increased imports through grants to explore new technology, manufacturing methods, and marketing techniques. I have seen the effectiveness and efficiency of the TAA program firsthand in my state of Maine and strongly support both its goal and methods.

Mr. President, I would like to recount just one TAA success story of the many in Maine and the nation. Four years ago, when a shoe factory in Old Town, Maine closed, one of the employees laid off was a woman in her fifties. She had worked in shoe factories all of her working life. With no high school degree, unemployed, and no skills other than making shoes in an economy with few shoe-making jobs, this woman was in dire straits until she qualified for TAA assistance. Fortunately, she seized the retraining opportunity to earn her GED and then trained as a nursing assistant. She recently proudly stopped by the local retraining office to let them know of her new job as a nursing assistant. She now works in home health care, making more money and enjoying greater flexibility than when she worked in a shoe

factory. In a true tribute to the effectiveness of the TAA program, she told the retraining officials, "I wish I had been laid off sooner." This story exemplified why the TAA program must be expeditiously reauthorized.

Similarly, the GSP program deserves swift reauthorization. It establishes a mechanism for extending duty-free treatment of certain products imported from designated developing countries. The GSP program allows for participation by only those countries that adequately protect intellectual and property rights, observe international standards of labor rights, employ certain economic policies, and satisfy other important criteria. Moreover, the GSP program is limited to products that are non-import sensitive, meaning American jobs are not threatened.

In fact, the GSP program helps create jobs in America. The Foreside Company based on Gorham, Maine, depends on the GSP program to be able to import product necessary to create jobs in Maine. The Foreside Company, with over 150 employees, is one of the fastest growing companies in Maine. The energetic entrepreneur who runs this company tells me that if GSP is not renewed, it would harm this Maine business to the point that it would jeopardize dozens of jobs.

I am disappointed that legislation reauthorizing the TAA and GSP programs were incorporated in H.R. 434, and not passed as independent bills. Unfortunately, H.R. 434 includes measures that I cannot support. The African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Caribbean Basin Initiative are both deeply flawed proposals that would hurt Maine workers and companies.

I want the record to clearly show, however, that in spite of my votes against H.R. 434, I remain strongly supportive of both the Generalized System of Preferences Extension Act and the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act and strongly advocate for reauthorization of both programs.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, on few occasions is this body faced with a bill that is supported by such a vast, diverse, and a broad based list of industries and organizations, such as the NAACP, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Corporate Council on Africa, and the National Retail Federation. The African Growth and Opportunity Act provides a real chance for the U.S. to engage in new trading partnerships with the sub-Saharan Africa, but also provides a mechanism to assist those countries to bolster their own economies.

This bill is important not only because of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, but for the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI), the Generalized System of Preferences Program (GSP), and the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) programs contained therein. It is essential that the Senate reauthorize the GSP and TAA and discontinue the practice of simply extending these programs year by year. This all encom-

passes trade package, the result of three years of negotiation, deserves passage.

What is also essential about this trade bill, is the manner in which the United States can give a hand-up to the Caribbean Basin and sub-Saharan Africa. After the death and destruction caused by Hurricane Mitch, the Caribbean nations have been struggling to regain the economic hold necessary not only to sustain their inhabitants, but to continue to prosper in the world economy. Instead of providing blanket financial assistance, the Caribbean Basin Initiative provides a mechanism and an avenue for these nations to begin rebuilding their economies. The tariff preferences provided in this bill, on products not previously covered by the 1990 CBI, will allow this region to expand economically, and integrate them into the international trading system.

In addition, these Caribbean nations have asked and desire similar treatment to those afforded Mexico in the North American Free Trade Agreement. These nations aspire to have the ability to broker trade deals with the United States in order to ensure their economic longevity in the region.

Trade with Africa is just as significant. According to the Department of Commerce, U.S. exports to sub-Saharan Africa in 1998 was approximately \$6.7 billion, or 1% of total U.S. exports. Conversely, the U.S. imported approximately \$13.1 billion from sub-Saharan Africa. The African Growth and Opportunity Act establishes the protocol and trade mechanisms necessary to engage in future endeavors with these countries. The bill provides for benefits under the GSP for sub-Saharan Africa as well as benefits for the textile and apparel industries. As my colleagues know, these benefits were constructed not to inhibit, but to enhance these industries in the United States. All garments and apparel manufactured in Sub-Saharan Africa must consist of U.S. thread, yarn, and other components.

For my own State of Washington, passage of this bill means additional export markets for our highly sought after wheat, world-renowned aircraft, and the various other commodities and goods and services that has made Washington the most highly trade dependent state in the nation. For example, the leading exports to sub-Saharan Africa include aircraft, wheat, and aircraft parts. Incidentally, 68% of the aircraft utilized in sub-Saharan Africa is produced by the Boeing Company. Boeing estimates that these nations will eventually require at least 270 new aircraft valued at approximately \$20 billion. Naturally, the 330 in the current fleet will require new parts and services. I cannot over emphasize the importance of these numbers alone, not only to Washington state, but to all the Boeing employees nationwide.

But free trade does not exist for the soul purpose of exports. Through the mechanisms and tariff reductions pro-

vided in the CBI, Northwest companies such as Nordstrom and Eddie Bauer have an opportunity to expand and import new materials and apparel.

Mr. President, again I reiterate the importance not only of the content of this trade bill, but of the far-reaching support for its passage. Senators ROTH and MOYNIHAN have repeatedly reminded our colleagues of the many, many organizations and entities that support this bill. Religious leaders coupled with business, and agriculture working with the apparel industry—these partnerships emphasize the importance of expanding and enhancing free trade to sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean. I urge my colleagues to support passage of this omnibus trade bill.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as we consider the African Growth and Opportunity Act, I rise to speak about the status of the United States textile and apparel industry. During my time in the Senate, there has been an ever increasing effort to give away our textile and apparel industry. This is done in the name of free trade, under the guise of promoting market-based economies and democratic governments in developing countries. In spite of all this, the textile and apparel industry still ranks second among United States manufacturing industries. Notwithstanding downsizing, automation, and unfair import competition, this industry provides jobs for over one million two hundred thousand American workers, and contributes nearly sixty billion dollars per year to the Nation's Gross Domestic product.

Back in 1983 we passed the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act. This was an attempt to provide free market economic and democratic political incentives to twenty-four Caribbean Basin countries. In 1994, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) went into effect, lowering our quotas and tariffs for imports of textiles and apparel from Canada and Mexico. The following year, the United States made further concessions upon joining the World Trade Organization. Now the Senate is considering legislation, which, in my view, will further impair the textile and apparel industry.

What has been the result of these trade agreements on the textile and apparel industry in the United States? During the five-year period from 1994 to 1998, the trade imbalance (imports over exports) for textiles increased an annual average rate of 17.5 percent. For apparel, the trade deficit increased at an annual average rate of 9.8 percent. During this time period, textile and apparel imports from Mexico rose by 288 percent. Apparel imports from the Northern Marianas jumped by 300 percent. Additionally, the United States has endured a flood of textile and apparel imports from Asia.

This flood of imports has had a significant impact on employment. Since 1981, just prior to the initial Caribbean

Basin trade legislation, 874,400 American textile and apparel jobs have been lost. In the five years since NAFTA, which supporters argued would create more jobs in the United States, the domestic textile and apparel industry has lost 437,000 jobs. While some of these jobs have been lost as a result of restructuring and automation, major reductions in employment levels are due to the elimination of our quotas and tariffs.

The textile and apparel industry is very important to my State of South Carolina. Unfortunately, the loss of textile and apparel jobs in South Carolina has been particularly devastating. Since 1987, textile employment has decreased from a high of 108,000 to 73,000 this year. This is a loss of almost 35,000 jobs, a reduction of nearly one-third of all textile jobs in South Carolina.

During this same period, my State has also endured the elimination of over 50 percent of all its apparel jobs. Apparel employment is down from a high of 46,000 jobs in 1987 to 20,000 jobs today. This means almost 26,000 apparel jobs have disappeared in South Carolina.

The employment impact has been felt in other States as well. More recently, from 1993 to 1998, North Carolina lost over 70,000 textile and apparel jobs; Tennessee nearly 35,000; Georgia almost 29,000; Virginia and Alabama 18,000 each; Mississippi over 17,000; and in Texas about 15,000 jobs have been lost. In Oklahoma, the entire textile and apparel industry has been lost—8,300 jobs no longer exist.

What is the outlook for future employment in the textile and apparel sector? There is great uncertainty, and a wide range of estimates. What is known, Mr. President, is that by the year 2005, the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing will expire, and all quota restrictions will lapse. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated the impact of this development to be at least 200,000 jobs. The American Textiles Manufacturers Institute predicts employment losses as high as 650,000. Mr. President, it does not make sense to give away American jobs. The policy of the Federal Government should be to preserve and promote job growth for Americans, not make them unemployed. I do not think that we went through the process of reforming welfare just to add to the ranks of the unemployed.

The loss of textile and apparel jobs is more than just numbers, Mr. President. It affects the living conditions, health, and welfare of individuals, families and the communities in which they live. In many rural counties in South Carolina, where the textile plant or sewing factory is (or was) the only source of employment, unemployment rates range from 8 to 16 percent. Textile and apparel industries have been the economic backbone of many of these rural Southern counties. These communities have limited job opportunities. Furthermore, for a variety of reasons, the

residents of these communities cannot just pick up and leave, nor is retraining a viable option in many cases.

Earlier during the floor debate on this bill, a report by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) was referenced during a discussion of labor productivity in the textile industry. The CRS Report notes that there has been productivity in the industry because of capital investment in labor-saving machinery. The report states, "Rapid employment losses combined with stable output necessarily implies gains in labor productivity." Furthermore, it concludes that "Many textiles factories have become almost completely machine-driven, leaving little room for further labor-savings, and the apparel industry seems ill-suited to such mechanization." So I wanted to clarify the record on productivity in the industry. It has come at the expense of employment.

Let me now turn to a more general issue. We must consider trade legislation in the context of our broader foreign policy objectives. To a great degree, this is made more difficult given this Administration's lack of clear foreign policy objectives. Nevertheless, let me discuss a few items which I believe deserve closer review before final action on this legislation is taken.

First, our foreign policy regarding Latin America and the Caribbean is basically running on empty. The United States is suffering in its own hemisphere strategically, politically, and economically. A good example is our relationship with Haiti. Despite our intervention, Haiti has advanced little toward establishing a minimally effective government. After spending tens of millions of taxpayer dollars, United States and Canadian troops are being pulled out.

Second, this Administration apparently cannot frame a coherent drug policy. Currently, the United States spends \$289 million on security assistance to Colombia, the third-largest recipient of such aid. Aid for Colombia and its Andean neighbors, Bolivia and Peru, was meant to begin eliminating the sources which fuel the Caribbean drug trade. Yet, according to the Drug Enforcement Administration, Colombian traffickers have taken over a major chunk of the United States heroin market from Southeast Asian dealers. This is in addition to their dominance in the cocaine market. It is no secret the drug criminal organizations look for the easiest route of movement—which is through the Caribbean.

The closing of United States military bases in Panama this year has severely reduced America's ability to monitor the byways traffickers use to ferry drugs into the country. The biggest blow came with the closing of Howard Air Force Base, the U.S. center for anti-drug operations. Retired General George Joulwan, former commander of U.S. military forces in Latin America, testified that Howard was the "crown jewel" in our counter-drug operations

because of its strategic location and infrastructure. Since being booted out of Panama, Administration officials have been scrambling for alternative sites to use to monitor and intercept drug traffic through the Caribbean.

I am concerned that as we propose to drastically increase container shipping through the Caribbean, we will be exposing our Nation to the potential for a tremendous increase in illicit drug imports. Other Senators have addressed the issue of how Custom Agents are presently unable to adequately monitor imports. This situation is aggravated by the movement toward paperless entry, where Customs forms are electronically cleared after the foreign goods move through our ports.

Mr. President, the key to resolving many of our hemispheric problems is coordinating our criminal justice efforts, defense requirements, foreign policy, and economic and trade strategy toward Latin American countries. We cannot afford to look at these in isolation of one another.

Finally, let me highlight some of the more dangerous elements of legislation which some in Congress are proposing. While the Senate bill alleviates some of the worst of these issues, I want the record to be clear on why these provisions must never become law. If, by some chance, this bill moves to a conference with the House, there may be an effort to incorporate some of these proposals. This would be a terrible mistake.

There are some in Congress who would favor the quota-free entry into the United States for apparel made in the Caribbean Basin countries from fabric produced anywhere in the world. Such a provision would void the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing.

Another flawed proposal is the scheme to use Tariff Preference Levels, whereby fabric produced anywhere in the world may be used in apparel sewn in the Caribbean Basin countries and imported duty-free and quota-free into the United States. Such preferences are permitted under NAFTA. Canada has used its preferences to export into the United States textile and apparel products made of non-North American yarns and fabrics. This violation of NAFTA has permitted \$300 million from textile mills in Europe and Asia to severely damage U.S. manufacturers of wool suits and wool fabrics as well as other U.S. producers. Likewise, Mexico is now sending textiles and apparel made from cheap Asian yarns and fabrics into the United States. Tariff Preference Levels are bad for the American textile and apparel industry and for its workers. They must not be permitted to be extended further.

Perhaps the worst provisions proposed in the House bill are those related to transshipment. Transshipment is the practice of producing textile and apparel goods in one country, and shipping it to the United States using the

quota and tariff preferences reserved for a third country. The most egregious part of the House bill is that it fails to include provisions for origin verification identical to those in Article 506 of the North American Free Trade Act. This could lead to Africa and the Caribbean Basin being used as an illegal transshipment point by Asian manufacturers. It would encourage the use of non-U.S. produced fiber and fabric in apparel goods entering the United States duty-free.

Finally, the House bill grants overly generous privileges and preferences to African and the Caribbean Basin countries in a unilateral fashion. There is little incentive for these countries to grant reciprocal access for products made in the United States.

I have outlined the current economic standing of the United States textile and apparel industry. There is no question that unfair trade policies have negatively impacted employment levels in this important sector of our economy. There is no reason to believe the trade bills we are debating will lead to a different result. Furthermore, these bills raise serious national defense and foreign policy questions. Finally, many provisions, which unfortunately might be included in the final legislative product, would cause unnecessary harm to the textile and apparel industry in the United States. The textile and apparel firms may survive as they adapt to our legislative actions and changing economic conditions. American textile workers may not be so fortunate. This is my main concern—for those textile and apparel workers who work hard, pay their taxes and raise their families. This is why I have reservations about this bill.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the question before the Senate now—the Africa trade package and enhancement of the (Caribbean Basin Initiative) (CBI)—is a simple question of recognizing and seizing opportunities for America.

As the world continues to open trade and reduce barriers with GATT and various regional groupings and agreements the opportunity to gain competitive advantage over Europe and the industrialized countries of Asia could not be more starkly presented than with this package.

In terms of the Caribbean and Central America that opportunity begins almost right off our Atlantic and Gulf Coasts. The mutual benefit of those relationships is recognized across the board in both the United States and in the region.

The American textiles industry, which has taken such a hit in the past two decades, recognize the potential that CBI has with respect to competing with Europe and Asia in the next 10 years. Many of the companies see the future of the industry in America dependent on gaining that advantage through CBI and other trade agreements. We should recognize and seize that opportunity.

Sub-Saharan Africa presents an entirely different set of opportunities and considerations.

We have also heard a great deal of concern about what this bill will or will not do for Africa.

Much of that concern is because Africa truly sits on the margins of our external trade relationships. It also sits on the margins of our national interests. But it's not just us. Africa sits on the margins of the global economy, where the gap between it and the developed world continues to grow wider at a disturbing rate.

In the minds of many people it is a lost continent, typified by extreme poverty and horrific brutality. The number of countries is confusing, as are the fluid alliances and corrupt bases of power which dictate the continent's life.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on African Affairs, I must admit that it is very difficult to associate the names of Somalia, Rwanda, Congo, Angola, Burundi, Sierra Leone, and even Sudan with opportunity and potential benefits to the United States. But the continent cannot be viewed as a single entity, and, even in the midst of tragedy and suffering, they still have such great untapped potential.

Sub-Saharan Africa has—depending on whom you ask—a collective population approaching 700 million people. They are overwhelmingly poor and quite often isolated. But take even half that number and view them as potential consumers of American goods, and the opportunities for beneficial trade look better.

In July I held roundtable discussion in the Africa Subcommittee with some of the top fund managers, past and current Administration officials, and economists, regarding the barriers to investment in Africa. This group brought together very disparate interests and somewhat differing views of how to address those barriers, but a single, profound view was shared by all: Africa is truly the final frontier for American investment and trade, and that the potential is great enough that it must be given immediate and higher priority by policy makers.

Although the continent is troubled and presents less immediate returns than our expanded trade relationships with Latin America, Asia, and Europe, the potential benefits to the United States 10 to 20 years from now are so great that we would be remiss if we did not act now. We have before us an opportunity to start diversifying and nurturing that growth outside of the extractive industries, and to profoundly influence the future of Africa.

The Africa trade legislation is not a comprehensive set of tools to address those barriers and gain advantage in that last frontier—it has never been billed as such and Senators should not consider it such when they vote. But it is a good start. And, remarkably, it is a beginning point upon which both Americans and Africans have agreed.

That is a remarkable opportunity in what has otherwise been a troubled and neglected relationship.

But I differ with the ranking member of the Africa Subcommittee and the other well-meaning opponents that this effort is fatally flawed. I differ as well on the idea that we must do all or nothing with respect to our potential trade relationships and policies toward Africa on this piece of legislation. That will be a long and difficult process and one which will require much more than legislation.

The Africa trade bill also has virtues beyond the expansion of trade.

The United States' national interests in Africa are not clearly understood, and, as a consequence, our policy goals are often ill-defined. Even as the Secretary of State completed her trip to the continent last week, we find a lack of a consensus on the security, economic and humanitarian interests we have there.

One point that is clearly understood and agreed upon on both sides of the aisle and throughout policy circles in the United States and the entire developed world, is that our actions must promote greater freedom and opportunity for Africans who suffer under some of the most incompetent, corrupt and sadistic regimes on the face of the earth.

These regimes also affect our lives when organized crime, terrorists, drug traffickers and disease have found fertile ground and purchase on a continent that has been so ravaged.

In the post-cold-war era, the United States' approach to Africa has been driven almost exclusively by foreign assistance packages. During the cold war, the same was true, but we added the dimension of proxy wars against Soviet and Cuban aggression. That approach was reasonable at the time, considering what was at stake for us, but it did not leave a good legacy on the continent.

We now have what is a tremendous opportunity to begin fundamentally changing that legacy and, as I noted in the opening sentences of my remarks, to seize opportunities.

If you consider the effectiveness of aid to Africa in achieving those goals a continent-wide scale, the record is not good. Almost all of Africa has seen a reduction in income and, now, life expectancy, since we began direct assistance programs in the late 1950s to mid 1960s. Regardless of that record, it is clear that monetary assistance alone is not an acceptable foundation for our relations with an entire continent.

This initiative, though, is quite different and it represents much more than simply a "trade not aid" approach. Not only does it potentially benefit us as well, it contains incentives for simple yet critical changes in governance in Africa.

Those incentives and mutual benefits have the added and rather dramatic quality of being backed by (literally) every single potential participant on the continent. Every single one.

That includes former South African President Nelson Mandela, who has been erroneously portrayed as opposing this bill.

I think it is paternalistic to assert that African nations do not understand the effects this bill would have on them. And I do not believe that these nations have unrealistic expectations of its potential benefits.

Africans widely view their interaction with the outside world as one that has been anything from exploitative at worst to unequal at best. From the time of the first penetration of the African interior by slavers and ivory hunters until today, that has been the case—regardless of intent. Even benevolent missions were viewed as unintentional but nonetheless effective entrees for colonial powers' exploitation of the continent.

Interestingly, our own foreign assistance to the continent—which is viewed as a product of goodwill and of shared goals with reformers—does not escape that stigma.

As with any donor/recipient relationship, the recipient will always be viewed as “less equal” than the donor. That fact is unavoidable and, indeed, universal.

Although cash-strapped and desperately needy, Africans rightfully view a purely donor/recipient relationship between us and them as another manifestation of the treatment of Africans as less than equal—again, that is regardless of intent.

This legislation is clearly viewed differently by Africans, and that's why I am puzzled and unimpressed with the accusations by opponents of this effort that it is “exploitative.” That somehow American corporations are simply going to reinvent that age-old relationship of Africa to the world and this will be their vehicle to do so. This effort is about realizing opportunities to build new mutually beneficial ties between the United States and Africa.

That is the Africans' view, at least. And that is why they bristle at the idea that this effort is not in their best interest, that they must be protected from something which they see as beneficial and positive.

In effect, it says to them that they must be protected from beginning to build relationships with America where they can be equals, where they are not simply something to pity and to patronize.

This bill will not change that attitude nor the continent overnight. As I said earlier, it is neither comprehensive trade legislation for Africa, nor is it a comprehensive policy toward Africa. It is a beginning, though. An important beginning. And, despite its potential flaws, it is critically important to pass this bill if we ever want to help bring Africa away from the margins, away from the suffering and human and environmental disasters and into the fold of developed and free nations.

That effort will require American leadership, and that leadership requires

a first step. This effort is just such a first step, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it and to defend it from those who would kill it, obstruct it or otherwise defeat it, either out of protectionist or other outmoded sentiments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The bill 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 substitute amendment to Calendar No. 215, H.R. 434, an act to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

Trent Lott, Bill Roth, Mike DeWine, Rod Grams, Mitch McConnell, Judd Gregg, Larry E. Craig, Chuck Hagel, Chuck Grassley, Pete Domenici, Don Nickles, Connie Mack, Paul Coverdell, Phil Gramm, R.F. Bennett, 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 amendment No. 2325 to H.R. 434, an act to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would vote “yes.”

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 342 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Abraham	Enzi	Kyl
Allard	Fitzgerald	Lott
Ashcroft	Frist	Lugar
Bennett	Gorton	Mack
Bond	Gramm	McConnell
Brownback	Grams	Murkowski
Burns	Grassley	Nickles
Cochran	Gregg	Roberts
Coverdell	Hagel	Roth
Craig	Hutchinson	Santorum
Crapo	Hutchinson	Sessions
DeWine	Inhofe	Shelby
Domenici	Jeffords	Smith (OR)

Specter
Stevens

Thomas
Thompson

Voinovich
Warner

NAYS—46

Akaka	Edwards	Moynihan
Baucus	Feingold	Murray
Bayh	Feinstein	Reed
Biden	Graham	Reid
Bingaman	Harkin	Robb
Breaux	Hollings	Rockefeller
Bryan	Johnson	Sarbanes
Bunning	Kerrey	Schumer
Byrd	Kerry	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Kohl	Snowe
Cleland	Landrieu	Thurmond
Collins	Leahy	Torricelli
Conrad	Levin	Wellstone
Daschle	Lieberman	Wyden
Dodd	Lincoln	
Durbin	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—8

Boxer	Helms	Lautenberg
Dorgan	Inouye	McCain
Hatch	Kennedy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 45, the nays 46. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, may we have order. The chairman is about to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—D.C./LABOR-HHS APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that today at a time determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate begin consideration of the conference report to accompany the D.C./Labor-HHS Appropriations bill and the conference report be considered read. I further ask consent that on Monday, November 1, the Senate resume consideration of the conference report. I finally ask consent that at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, November 2, the Senate proceed to consider the conference report and that there be 30 minutes equally divided between the two leaders, to be followed by a vote on the adoption of the conference report, with no intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, in light of this agreement, there will be no further votes today. The Senate will continue debate on the CBI/African trade bill and may begin consideration of the conference report to accompany the D.C./Labor-HHS bill.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT—continued

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I will make a few comments because I have