

May 25 at 9:30 a.m. to conduct an oversight hearing.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on Thursday, May 25, 2000, at 10:00 a.m., in SD226.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on Thursday, May 25, 2000, at 2:00 p.m., in SD226.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND RECREATION

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 25 at 2:30 p.m. to conduct an oversight hearing.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 25, 2000, to conduct a hearing.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, PROLIFERATION, AND FEDERAL SERVICE.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 25, 2000, at 10:00 a.m. for a hearing.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Health, be authorized to meet for a hearing during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 25, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Major Scott Kindsvater from Dodge City, KS, a major in the United States Air Force, an F-15 pilot, and a congressional fellow, be granted the privilege of the floor during the foreign policy dialog.

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

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent my legislative fellow, Chris Grant, be given access to the floor.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Tom Lederer, a congressional fellow serving in Senator CONRAD's office, be granted floor privileges during the consideration of the crop insurance conference report.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, on behalf of our majority leader, Senator LOTT, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Seeing my colleague from Georgia on the floor, if he would like to proceed. I am going to be about 10 minutes.

Mr. COVERDELL. The Senator was recognized. It is appropriate he has his 10 minutes.

FREE TRADE IN THE AMERICAS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, as you know, our colleagues in the House passed, by a vote of 237-197, legislation to establish permanent normalized trade relations with China. The vote yesterday condensed months of intense debate over economics, foreign policy, and national security concerns with regard to that relationship with China.

This is significant legislation, and I look forward to a thorough Senate debate on this matter. I will have more to say about this very important issue during that debate. There are very significant economic and trade concerns, but there are also some very significant national security issues that must be discussed.

Over the last several months, the current administration has invested considerable time, energy, and resources to achieving House approval of what is essentially a bilateral agreement with China. While this issue is a very important one, I also believe we need to place it in its proper context and consider whether our overall trade policies have been successful.

I am concerned that over the last 4 years, the administration's pursuit of a bilateral trade agreement with China has come at the expense of missed bilateral and even multilateral trade agreements and economic opportunities right here within our own hemisphere.

Regardless of what the potential economic benefits that PNTR with China could offer, the bottom line is that stability and economic opportunity within our own hemisphere always must be a top priority. To that extent, we, as a nation, stand to lose or gain, depending on the economic health and security of our own neighbors. What that means is

that ultimately a strong and free and prosperous hemisphere means a strong and free and prosperous United States.

The reality is that in 1997, we had an opportunity to move forward to give the President greater authority to negotiate new trade agreements with countries in our own hemisphere. Sadly, that did not happen. Now it will be up to our next President to pursue new markets in this hemisphere. If we as a country do not lead, other nations and their businesses will take our place. No country is waiting for us to act first.

In the end, the longer we wait to pursue more trade opportunities in our own hemisphere, the more we stand to lose.

Take, for example, my home State of Ohio. The future of Ohio's economy is linked to our ability to send our products abroad. Given the chance, Ohio's businessmen and women and Ohio's farmers can and do compete effectively on the world stage. For example, in most years, one-third to one-half of Ohio's major cash crops—corn, wheat, and soybeans—are found in markets and meals outside our country. In 1998, the city of Cincinnati increased its exports by slightly more than \$1 billion. It was the fourth-biggest such increase in the country. Columbus, OH, boosted its exports by \$92.5 million, ranking 36th in the country and second in the State in terms of percentage growth. Open trade opportunities have allowed Ohio's and the Nation's economy to continue thriving.

This argument has been used to support granting permanent normal trade relations with China. Much of the public debate has focused on the potential of more than 1 billion Chinese consumers. Yet, we are ignoring another very sizable market—the market within our own hemisphere. Right here in our hemisphere, with a combined gross domestic product (GDP) of more than \$10 trillion—a hemisphere encompassing 800 million people—trade with our hemispheric neighbors represents vast opportunities. These are opportunities that we must not ignore.

Right now, Europe, Asia, and Canada are securing their economic fortunes throughout Latin America and Central America. Take the example of Brazil—the world's eighth largest economy. In 1997, the European Union—the EU—exported to Brazil more than they did to any other country, and between 1990 and 1998, their exports grew 255 percent. Also, although United States exports to Argentina are double that of Asia's, our growth rate is less than half of Asia's incredible 1664 percent increase from 1990 to 1998.

As my colleagues can see, other nations are riding the tides of change—of free-market economics and openness—and integrating into the world economy. The region's "Mercosur" or common market—which includes Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, and associate member Chile—is the world's

largest growing trading bloc, experiencing trade growth of 400 percent between 1990 and 1998. In 1990, they bought less than \$7 billion worth of U.S. products. In 1997, their U.S. purchases had grown to \$23 billion.

The Europeans aren't asleep at the wheel either. As of now, the European Union is the largest trading partner with the Mercosur countries. Trade between the EU and the Mercosur countries totaled \$42.7 billion in 1996 compared to \$31 billion for the United States. Additionally, between 1990 and 1998, the EU's market share of all Mercosur imports increased from 23 percent to 27 percent. It is becoming increasingly obvious that the European Union is not going to sit idly by and let the United States gain any market share in our own hemisphere, our own region. In fact, the EU recently has intensified negotiations with the Mercosur toward consolidating the two regional blocs. Moves like this represent more than just a loss of export opportunities for our Nation—they represent a lack of leadership to aggressively pursue new markets in our own hemisphere.

This is the hemisphere we live in. Those should be our markets. To lose them through neglect would be a truly shameful outcome for our country.

There is enough of a consciousness in Latin America of the benefits of economic liberalization that we will see more and more trade barriers go down—to somebody's benefit. The question that remains is: Will we in the United States be in on that market, or not?

I am optimistic, though, that our Nation can capture a larger share of markets in our hemisphere now that the Senate passed and the President signed into law the Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act. This act will bring tremendous benefits to the United States and to the Caribbean Basin. It will enhance our economic security, both by opening new markets for American products and by strengthening the economies of our closest neighbors. And, it would create new hope for those left jobless by Hurricanes Mitch and Georges.

The CBI law will extend duty-free treatment to apparel assembled in the Caribbean Basin—or assembled and cut in the region—using U.S. fabric made from U.S. yarn. This will help strengthen existing U.S.-CBI partnerships in the apparel industry, because the duty-free treatment will help U.S. apparel manufacturers maintain their competitiveness with the Asian market.

CBI is a good law. It is a good law that was long, long overdue. In the context of our overall trade policy, it represents a modest step forward. To do more toward further expanding market opportunities abroad will require strong leadership both in the Congress and from the President.

Despite the success of CBI, plenty of unfinished business remains with re-

gard to our hemispheric trading partners and our hemispheric trading policies, as well as our overall trading strategy. It will be incumbent upon our next President and this Congress to deal with this unfinished business of our country. I am hopeful that several important initiatives will, in fact, be pursued. That is why I believe the next administration and the next Congress needs to approve fast track trading authority.

It is not a stretch to say that America's continued leadership in the global economy is fundamentally dependent on our ability to secure new markets abroad. By giving the President greater flexibility to negotiate trade agreements, and by giving the President the ability to set the pace and the timing of many of our most important trade negotiations, Congress would be giving the President the authority to negotiate trade deals very quickly, but also the ability to assert and protect the continued international economic supremacy of the United States. And that—that is key to our economic future.

Finally, ultimately, our Nation's ability to aggressively promote free and fair trade and enter into trade agreements with countries within our hemisphere is critical. The more we pursue economic initiatives with our neighbors, the more we, as a nation, stand to gain and in ways that go beyond economic growth. In a region that is largely Democratic, a hemispheric commitment to free and fair trade will strengthen Democratic principles and the rule of law. Such pursuits are good for the Caribbean Basin; they are good for Central America; they are good for Latin America; and they are good for agriculture and business right here at home in the United States. Overall, it just makes good sense.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, after long and difficult deliberation, I have decided to vote for permanent normal trade relations with China. The House of Representatives has now passed the bill and I expect the Senate to take it up next month, after the Memorial Day recess.

California is the leading state in world trade. Its location on the Pacific Rim makes our relationship with Asia extremely important.

During my congressional career, I have supported some of the trade relations proposals we have considered and opposed others. I believe that each trade proposal should be considered on its own, and I do not have an ideological bent on the issue of trade.

The decision on this bill—to grant permanent normal trade relations status to China—has been one of the hardest I have ever had to make, because the arguments on both sides have merit. I would like to review in this statement the excellent points made by both sides in the debate.

First, with respect to human rights, those opposed to PNTR cite China's

continuing terrible human rights record. They argue that by not having annual review of China's trade status, we will lose our strongest leverage to force China to change its behavior. It is also argued that by granting China permanent normal trade relations, we are rewarding and legitimizing the leaders who have such a bad human rights record. Finally, the argument that increased contact with China will improve human rights conditions is undermined by the facts. According to the 1999 State Department Human Rights Report, the Chinese government's human rights record has deteriorated over the past several years, despite increased contacts between China and the United States.

But there are human rights advocates who support PNTR for China. They believe that isolating China will be bad for human rights, because the leaders will then be under no outside pressure to change their behavior. They also argue that, over time, people to people contacts through the media, internet and travel will expose the Chinese people to international standards and values and will continue to gradually loosen rigid, authoritarian structures. This is why such esteemed human rights leaders as the Dalai Lama and Wang Dan, on of the Tiananmen Square leaders, support PNTR for China.

The human rights concerns are why inclusion of the Levin amendment in the House bill is so important to me. This regime to monitor human rights and worker rights in China will put these issues in sharp focus and will significantly increase our knowledge about whether the Chinese people are making progress in these areas. I commend Congressman LEVIN for his leadership in attaching this important safeguard to the legislation.

Second, with respect to the impact of PNTR on American jobs, there are arguments on both sides. Opponents say that bringing China into the World Trade Organization and granting it permanent normal trade status will result in the loss of more than 800,000 jobs in the United States. They believe it will allow multinational corporations to move many operations into China, where worker wages and benefits are much lower, wages being as low as 13 cents an hour.

The principal argument in favor of PNTR is that we must pass it in order to get the benefits of the trade agreement negotiated by the Clinton administration last year, which requires China to lower trade barriers and open up the Chinese market to all kinds of American products and services, including many from my State of California. Supporters estimate that implementation of this agreement will increase exports of U.S. goods to China by more than \$13 billion per year by 2005. Supporters also argue that granting PNTR to China will give the U.S. the ability to force Chinese compliance with all terms of the trade agreement,

including with WTO-authorized sanctions if necessary. If PNTR is not granted, the U.S. could not avail itself of WTO enforcement procedures.

So it is clear that there are strong arguments on both sides of the human rights and workforce/labor issues.

But the reason I have decided to vote in favor of permanent normal trade relations status for China is because, first and foremost, I believe that it is my responsibility as a United States Senator to put the national security of the United States above all other considerations. And on the national security question, in my opinion, there is only one rational view.

I believe that through engagement with China we have the best opportunity to avoid a cold war type atmosphere, which hung like a cloud over this nation—indeed, the world—for 45 years after World War II.

A vote against PNTR would suggest that the U.S. views China as an adversary and would make it much more difficult to engage China to work with us constructively in key strategic areas. Of particular concern to me is China's role in efforts to bring peace and stability to the Korean Peninsula. China encouraged North Korea's compliance with the U.S.-DPRK (North Korea) framework which halted the North's nuclear weapons program, and China will undoubtedly have to be part of any solution that integrates North Korea into the international community.

China also plays a key role in the international community's response to the continuing conflict between India and Pakistan. China has in fact condemned both nations for conducting nuclear tests, and has urged them both to conduct no more tests, to avoid deploying or testing missiles, and to work to resolve their differences over Kashmir through dialogue, rather than military action.

Finally, China is playing an increasingly active and constructive role in Asian security and stability. U.S. isolation of China would seriously undermine our ability to influence China's future orientation, and would set us on a dangerous path of confrontation.

I am under no illusions that granting PNTR to China will make it our new best friend. But failure to do so could well make it an adversary of the sort that we lived with for almost half a century until the fall of the Berlin Wall and the disintegration of the Soviet Union. That is a risk we should not take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

#### THE RUNOFF ELECTION IN PERU

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, it is fortuitous that the Senator from Ohio would make his remarks before mine. I share and agree with most of what he has said with regard to trade.

I rise on a point that could be a troubling cloud that, even if the next President and even if the next Congress were

to take the suggestions of the Senator from Ohio, and if certain events that are unfolding this very minute were to take a wrong turn, could dramatically and negatively affect these trade opportunities.

The Andean region—Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, Panama, and Venezuela—is experiencing difficult times. I rise specifically today about events that are under advisement this minute in Peru.

As those who follow events there know, very aggressive behavior by President Fujimori led to a constitutional override of a two-term limitation on his Presidency, and he is seeking a third term. The elections on April 9 were viewed as flawed by the international community. Severe questions occurred as to whether or not a fair election had occurred. The OAS, the Carter Center, NDI, and other international observers have argued that the runoff election which will occur this Sunday, unless postponed, is in severe doubt and question. The Organization of American States, along with others, has said that the computer system—which is crucial to the vote count and crucial to monitoring the election—is not in a condition for which a fair election can occur and as a result they would not be able to accredit the election. If an election occurs this Sunday, for which all national and international interests have said you cannot appropriately observe the election, you can't tell whether it has been fair or not, if the government proceeds with that, it will be a serious blow to the democratic countries that the Senator from Ohio alluded to and to constitutional law and to the growth of democracy in our hemisphere.

Very recently, Senator LEAHY from Vermont and I authored a joint resolution on this matter which reads: Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled that it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should promptly convey to the President of Peru, if the April 9, 2000, elections are deemed by the international community not to have been free and fair, the United States will review and modify as appropriate its political and economic and military relations with Peru and will work with other democracies in the hemisphere and elsewhere towards restoration of democracy in Peru. This is passed by the House. This is passed by the Senate. This is signed by the President of the United States and, therefore, this is the policy of the United States with regard to these elections.

The situation has not improved. As I said, we have a computer system that is flawed. We have the opposition candidate who has withdrawn from the election. We have the Organization of American States saying we will withdraw all observers. We are hours away from a very serious turnback and reversal in our hemisphere in the coun-

try of Peru. Constitutional law, the hemisphere of new democracies, will have suffered a blow.

Supposedly, in the next 2 or 3 hours, their electoral commission will make a statement as to whether they will listen to the world, listen to the OAS, listen to the United States Congress, the President of the United States, and delay these elections or not.

I rise only for the purpose of saying that it will be an acknowledged blemish on so much progress that had been made in this last decade. It will have dire and long-reaching consequences if the Government of Peru does not hear a world talking to it.

I can only pray that in the next hour or two, the government will recognize that it must have an environment under which elections will be fair and observers will have the ability to adjudicate this was a fair election or this was not. To my colleagues, I say, there are events unfolding in this hemisphere to which we must pay far more attention. As the Senator from Ohio said, the vast majority of our trade now is in this hemisphere. It exceeds Europe and it exceeds the Pacific. It had better be a healthy place because it means a great deal to us and our fellow citizens.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

#### MEASURE READ FOR THE FIRST TIME—S. 2645

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill, the China Non-proliferation Act, which I now send to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator TORRICELLI, as well as the following original cosponsors: Senators COLLINS, DEWINE, INHOFE, KYL, SANTORUM, and SPECTER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for the first time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2645) to provide for the application of certain measures to the People's Republic of China in response to the illegal sale, transfer, or misuse of certain controlled goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMPSON. I now ask for the bill's second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be held at the desk.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.