

in policy in 1934 with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This legislation authorized the President to negotiate trade liberalizing agreements on a bilateral basis with our trading partners.

But the damage was done. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was too little, too late.

Although 31 bilateral agreements were signed, the outbreak of the Second World War completely shattered any hope of a more cooperative international trading environment. I don't think it is a coincidence that another World War closely followed the Depression. If political tensions were not inflamed by severe economic pressures, and made worse by unnecessary and destructive trade disputes, perhaps the history of the first half of the 20th century would have been different.

Free trade alone may not keep the peace. But it makes it a lot harder to go to war.

At the end of World War II, the United States led the effort to once again construct a world trading system based on the Most-Favored-Nation principle of nondiscrimination. We succeeded with the launch of the GATT, in 1947.

Now, once again, we have a world trade system that increases our collective wealth through nondiscriminatory free trade. We also have a world trade system that helps keep the peace. The fact that the cold war never ignited to a hot conflict is due in large part to the success of the GATT in forging closer economic ties at a time when world political tensions were escalating over other issues.

Mr. President, we finally got it just about right. But we still don't have a world trade system that includes the world's most populous nation, and one of its most dynamic economies. China's absence from the global trade forum matters because we still have not managed to rid the world of political tensions and destabilizing trade disputes.

We could still easily lose it all, just as Europe did in 1885, and as we did in 1930. Increasingly, many of these disputes and tensions will involve, or at least affect, both China and the United States. There are a few Members here who may remember the pressures on the world trading system we had in the early 1970s. Back then, we had a major world recession and two major oil price shocks.

These pressures led to the so-called "New Protectionism," when countries increasingly resorted to non-tariff barriers to trade, such as quotas, voluntary export restraint agreements, industrial and agricultural subsidies, and orderly restraint agreements. The heightened tensions brought about by the "New Protectionism" were potentially very destabilizing.

It was only with the conclusion of the Uruguay round of global trade negotiations in 1993 that we finally reversed the dangerous course of this "New Protectionism," and got free trade back on track. Our experience in

the 1970s, when we could have easily lost most of our progress in opening new global markets, demonstrates why it's so important to expand and strengthen the world trade system as much as we can.

China was not a GATT member in the 1970s. The disciplines were much weaker. Important sectors like agriculture weren't covered. Dispute resolution was largely unenforceable.

Today, that is all changed. Disciplines are stronger. Disputes can be settled and effectively enforced. For the first time, we now have rules that cover agriculture. And now China is ready to end a fifty-year period of going its own way on trade policy.

Mr. President, rules and disciplines are meaningless unless they are widely accepted and broadly applied. We cannot have an effective, open world trade system that excludes China. It's as simple as that.

There is one more reason why China's entry into the WTO is in our vital national interest. For the first time in history, China would be bound by enforceable international trade rules. I would like to briefly explain why this development is so important.

Because of the economic reforms of the 1990s, China's leaders have sparked an economic renewal that has led to growth rates of 7–10 percent every year of the last decade, easily dwarfing the growth rates of our own super-heated economy. As a consequence of its new prosperity, China is buying a great deal of everything, especially agricultural products.

But because about one-third of China's economic activity is generated and controlled by state-owned enterprises, if often manipulates its markets in a way that harms its trading partners. Take just one example well known to the soybean farmers in my own state of Iowa. In 1992, China's soybean oil consumption shot up from about 750,000 metric tons to about 1.7 million metric tons. Keeping pace with this increased new demand, soybean oil imports also more than doubled.

In order to keep up with surging domestic demand, China imported more soybeans and soybean meal, much of it from the United States, and much of that amount from Iowa. When China's soybean imports hit their peak in 1997, soybean meal in the United States was trading at an average base of about \$240.00 per ton. This means our farmers were getting between \$7.00 and \$8.50 per bushel for their soybeans. Everyone was better off. China's consumers got what they wanted. America's soybean growers prospered. This is the way trade is supposed to work.

But suddenly, China's state-run trading companies arbitrarily shut off imports of soybeans. Soybean meal that was selling in 1997 for \$240.00 per ton in the United States plummeted to \$125.00 per ton by January 1999. Soybeans selling for \$8.00 per bushel in 1997 fell to \$4.00 per bushel by July 1999. You can imagine what happened on the farm.

With the loss of that income, combined with other factors, farmers were unable to pay their bills. Many lost their farms. Many are still struggling to recover.

Mr. President, what happened in China shows what occurs when protectionism, trade barriers, tariffs, and government-run controls take the place of free markets. Trade is distorted. Consumers abroad have less choice. American farm families suffer. It also demonstrated how important China's entry into the WTO is for America's farmers.

With a new bilateral market access agreement in place, and with meaningful protocol agreements that should soon be in place, China won't be able to use state trading enterprises to arbitrarily restrict and manipulate agricultural trade—and trade in other products—once it enters the WTO.

Let me say one final word. When we trade with other countries, we export more than farm equipment, soybeans, or computer chips. We export part of our society. Part of our American values and ideals. This is good for the WTO. It is good for China. It is good for the United States. And I believe it will help keep the peace.

Mr. President, we seldom get a real change in Congress to make this a better and safer world, but this is one of those rare moments. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting China's admission to the WTO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### DISMANTLING THE COLUMBIA-SNAKE HYDROELECTRIC SYSTEM

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, last Friday, Oregon governor John Kitzhaber announced his support for a radical Clinton-Gore administration proposal to begin dismantling the Columbia-Snake hydroelectric system by removing four hydroelectric dams in southeastern Washington. That same day, in Seattle, campaigning for president, Bill Bradley also announced his support for this proposal.

Is support for destroying the Columbia hydro system now a litmus test for the Democratic Party and its candidates for public office? I hope not, because the importance of salmon recovery and the value of our Northwest hydro system is too important to every family and community in our region.

The Clinton-Gore administration—most prominently through Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt—has aggressively advocated dismantling dams. Specifically, the administration has devoted significant agency resources to study removal of the four Snake River dams in Washington. Even the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has publicly endorsed dam-breaching. Several other agencies list it as a serious "option" to recovery Pacific Northwest salmon.

I will state here again—as I have many times already—no proposal to remove Snake or Columbia River dams will pass in Congress while I am Senator. I know that my colleagues, Senator GORDON SMITH of Oregon, Senator MIKE CRAPO and Senator LARRY CRAIG, as well as Governor Dirk Kempthorne of Idaho share my view.

In addition, last year, Republican members in the House for Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Alaska—led by my friend Congressman Doc Hastings—co-sponsored a House resolution expressing opposition to the removal of dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers. Scores of Washington State Senators and state legislators appeared at a rally last year in support of the dams. And unlike the Democratic presidential candidates, my friend governor George W. Bush has stated that he would not approve of such a proposal.

I particularly commend Governor Gary Locke for stating his opposition to this unwise position. Governor Locke has been especially courageous and thoughtful in representing the best interest of his constituents in spite of the criticism of many of his own supporters. Removing dams from the Columbia hydro system is bad policy. It is bad for people. It costs too much. And the value to salmon is highly questionable. What is certain is that dam removal will make the Northwest a dirtier place to live as it will put tens of thousands of added trucks on the road and as clean hydro power is replaced with coal or gas burning energy.

The case against breaching the Snake River dams is bolstered by evidence found in the Corps of Engineers own feasibility study. The Corps found that with existing dam conditions, the average survival rate through all four dams and reservoirs on the Snake River for juvenile salmon is already over 80 percent, and for adult salmon is 88–94 percent. In addition, in the dozens of appendices, summaries, charts, glossy brochures, and documents, there is little, if any, concrete, verifiable biological or scientific data in the Corps' study that shows that the removing even one inch of these dams would restore salmon runs.

At the same time, much of the Corps' own evidence in the feasibility study verifies that the economic and social effects caused by dam breaching would be devastating to the region. The Corps' cost estimates, which are unrealistically low, assume that the economic impact measured in lowered farmland values, pump modification costs, and irrigation wells would exceed \$230 million.

Replacing lost hydropower with other energy forms would increase electricity costs to local ratepayers by as much as \$291 million per year. And increased highway and rail traffic costs would cost industries an additional \$24 million per year, and \$100 to \$200 million a year to replace barging with trucking and rail. On top of that, the government, through your taxpayer

dollars, would have to find an estimated \$1 billion just to accomplish the job of removing the dams.

Throughout the study, the Corps acknowledges that breaching the dams would have an adverse effect on the environment, resident fish and wildlife, clean air, higher water temperatures, specifically through 50 to 75 million cubic yards of eroding sediment, increased dust and emissions from replacing hydroelectric power with natural gas, and increased annual pollution and safety concerns from highway and rail traffic.

What the Corps didn't say in the study is that today, the Columbia and Snake Rivers provide a transportation corridor that moves more than \$13 billion in cargo comprised of exports and imports to and from 43 states. This system in 1997 alone handled 43 percent of all U.S. wheat exports and 11 percent of U.S. corn exports. That's a significant amount of food for the world that would have to be transported in other ways.

All of this comes at a time when the Bonneville Power Administration is reporting impending energy shortages for the Pacific Northwest and the Secretary of the Energy is traveling to the Middle East to try for cheaper oil to counteract increasing gasoline and oil prices.

Also lost on this administration and other dam removal advocates is the fact that salmon populations are declining everywhere including in watersheds where there are no dams. The National Academy of Sciences studied Northwest salmon issues and found that in river basins like the Chehalis basin and the Willapa basin where there are no dams, the decline of salmon populations, per capita, is identical to that of the Columbia River. Native salmon runs on the East Coast are in more serious decline than many in the Pacific Northwest and yet almost none of those salmon runs are from rivers containing hydroelectric dams. But are we still to believe that destroying the Columbia hydro system is necessary to save salmon?

And let's be clear about one more thing. Today, the dam removal advocates focus only on four dams that generate power for BPA on the Snake River. But let nobody be fooled. They and their political allies among the national environmental groups mean to destroy more of the Columbia hydro system than just these four dams.

If removing these four dams on the Snake River—dams containing fish passage facilities—is necessary to comply with the Endangered Species Act and other laws, then surely, Grand Coulee Dam without fish passage facilities blocking hundreds of miles of pristine salmon habitat must come down. Perhaps the Oregon Governor can explain why Oregon's Hells Canyon dam on the Snake River and with no fish passage capacity can survive under his criteria.

This debate is about preserving or dismantling the Columbia River hydro

system. I will fight to preserve this system and fight to restore salmon runs within the context of this system.

I thank the Chair. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. 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. DODD. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DODD pertaining to the submission of S. Con. Res. 82 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

#### THE REMARKS OF KING JUAN CARLOS AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have the pleasure to be the chairman of the U.S.-Spain Council, which is a council formed in 1996 between the American and Spanish governments and made up of members of the private and public sectors. This council meets once a year to discuss issues of common interest, and also to work on what we call a triangulation, utilizing the tremendous knowledge, awareness, and influence of Spain in the Americas to enter into cooperative efforts with the United States to improve economic conditions and strengthen democratic institutions in the Western Hemisphere.

This past couple of days we have had the pleasure of hosting King Juan Carlos of Spain and his wife, Queen Sofia. This morning, I had the privilege of being in attendance at the Library of Congress to hear an address in the Great Hall by King Juan Carlos. This was a remarkable address that I thought my colleagues might enjoy reading.

I was tremendously pleased that we were joined at a reception prior to the King's address by our majority leader, Senator LOTT, who made excellent remarks welcoming the King to the Library of Congress, and by Senator DASCHLE, who commented on the unique cooperative relationships that the two countries have enjoyed. Senator TED STEVENS, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who, of course, is also the head of the commission that deals with the Library of Congress, also shared some of his thoughts. In addition, a number of our colleagues were present to speak with King Juan Carlos, including the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator WARNER, Senator BAYH, and Senator BOB GRAHAM, who, in fact, was my predecessor as the U.S. Chairman of the U.S.-Spain Council. It was a very worthwhile gathering.

I feel fortunate to have attended this morning's address. In his address, King Juan Carlos spoke about the defining moments and opportunities in a nation's history. His Majesty, himself,