

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.

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

MR. LOTT. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Tennessee for my objection. I was engaged in a discussion and did not hear what he was asking for. I understand it had been worked out and was ready to go. We were not clear on exactly what was happening.

The Senator from Tennessee wishes to reclaim the floor, and I yield.

MR. THOMPSON. I didn't hear the majority leader.

MR. LOTT. I was explaining why I objected.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

MR. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I ask for the bill's second reading.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

MR. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will remain at the desk.

MR. THOMPSON. I yield the floor.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALL-ENDAR—H.R. 1291, H.R. 3591, H.R. 4051, AND H.R. 4251

MR. LOTT. Mr. President, I understand there are four bills at the desk due for their second reading.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1291) to prohibit the imposition of access charges on Internet service providers, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 3591) to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in recognition of their service to the Nation.

A bill (H.R. 4051) to establish a grant program that provides incentives for States to enact mandatory minimum sentences for certain firearm offenses, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 4251) to amend the North Korea Threat Reduction Act of 1999 to enhance Congressional oversight of nuclear transfers to North Korea, and for other purposes.

MR. LOTT. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings on these bills at this time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be placed on the calendar.

PROVIDING FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS

MR. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the adjournment resolution just received from the House, that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 336) was agreed to, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 336

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House ad-

journs on the legislative day of Thursday, May 25, 2000, or Friday, May 26, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 6, 2000, for morning-hour debate, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, May 25, 2000, Friday, May 26, 2000, Saturday, May 27, 2000, or Sunday, May 28, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, June 5, 2000, or Tuesday, June 6, 2000, as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or at such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS

MR. LOTT. Mr. President, we had talked over the period of, I guess, 2 or 3 weeks about trying to come to an agreement so we could go back to the very important bill, S. 2, the Education Opportunities Act of 2000. We still have pending on that bill, I believe, two amendments for debate, and I don't know if we have the time agreement for a final vote. We do not, but we have Senators JEFFORDS, STEVENS, DOMENICI, and others—and maybe Senator KENNEDY is on that amendment—plus a second Kennedy amendment. What we have been trying to do is agree to another grouping of amendments after that but preferably to go ahead and get agreement on a list of very important amendments on both sides of the aisle that are related to elementary and secondary education and have votes on those amendments and then come to a conclusion.

I wanted to see if we could make any progress in that regard and, hopefully, we can get agreement on this. If not, we will keep working to see if we can find a way to reach an agreement.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 2, the Educational Opportunities Act of 2000, the Stevens amendment No. 3139 remain the pending amendment, and that the education-related amendments which follow be the only first-degree amendments in order to be offered; that they be subject to relevant second-degree amendments; that debate on all amendments, whether first or second degree, be limited to 1 hour equally divided; and following the conclusion of debate on or in relation to the first-degree amendments listed, the bill be read the third time, and the Senate proceed to a vote on final passage.

I also ask consent that when the Senate receives the House companion measure, it proceed immediately to its consideration; that all after the enacting clause be stricken, the text of the Senate bill be inserted, the bill advanced to third reading and passed; that the Senate then insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, all without any intervening action or debate, and that S. 2 be indefinitely postponed.

The remaining first-degree amendments in order to be offered to S. 2—and I note again these will be 1 hour each equally divided—are:

An amendment by Senator JEFFORDS relating to high schools; an amendment by Senator STEVENS involving physical education programs; an amendment by Senator BINGAMAN regarding accountability; an amendment by Senator SANTORUM which calls for full funding for IDEA; the Kennedy amendment regarding teacher quality; a Hutchison amendment regarding single-sex schools; an amendment by Senator DODD involving 21st century schools; an amendment by Senator GREGG involving 21st century schools; an amendment by Senators HARKIN and BINGAMAN concerning school construction grant programs; an amendment by Senator VOINOVICH regarding IDEA funding options; an amendment by Senator WELLSTONE regarding fairness and accuracy in testing; an amendment by Senator GRAMS involving alternative testing; an amendment by Senator REED involving parental involvement; an amendment by Senator KYL which would deal with parental opt-out for bilingual education; an amendment by Senator MIKULSKI involving community technology centers; an amendment by Senator ASHCROFT involving IDEA discipline—an amendment, I might add, he has been trying to get in the order for several weeks now, and we have not been able to get it agreed to in the order, and I must say that at one point he could have insisted on it but was agreeable to setting it aside with the understanding he would get a shot at it later on—a relevant amendment by Senator LOTT; a relevant amendment by Senator DASCHLE; a relevant managers' amendment by Senator JEFFORDS; and a relevant managers' amendment by Senator KENNEDY.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

MR. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

MR. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me simply respond to the distinguished majority leader.

As he knows, in past debates on ESEA, there have been an average of 22 Republican amendments that have been considered, an average. In some cases, that number has exceeded 30 amendments. The average number of