

I have a very short statement I would like to make.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am pleased the Indian Prime Minister spoke today before a joint session. His remarks were thoughtful. He spoke of the great promise and values our two nations share—first of all, democracy.

I also welcome to the Senate today several Indian Americans from Nevada, including my friend, Dr. Chanderaaj, and several of my friends from the Sikh community in northern Nevada. I have gotten to know them. They did a number of events for me this past year. They are very interested in government. I am so impressed with them and their community, located mainly in Carson City, NV. They traveled throughout the night so they could be here today for this historic event.

The contributions of the Indian American community to Nevada and to this country are significant. They have made such a positive impact in communities across the Nation.

What we have going on in southern Nevada is exemplary. We have an Asian-American community there. There is no distinction between Pakistanis and Indians. They meet together; they join together. Unless you are familiar with the two communities, you could not tell them apart. They work together. Our largest and most famous Indian restaurant in Las Vegas is run by a Pakistani.

So, Mr. President, I am very happy they have made such a positive impact in Nevada and communities all across this great Nation. That is why I am so pleased the Prime Minister could be here today: to join our two great democracies, to recognize the common bonds between us, and to celebrate the promising future that lies before us.

I would be remiss if I did not recognize one of the leaders of the Indian community, someone who has been involved in government and politics. He helps Republicans; he helps Democrats. He is very interested in government. He is a physician by the name of Prabhu, who is a friend to so many of us. I acknowledge him today as being someone who has done so much to bring the communities together.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

IMPORT RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN THE BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the

Senate will proceed to the consideration of S.J. Res. 18, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 18) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the joint resolution will be read a third time and placed back on the calendar.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 52, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 52) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour 20 minutes for debate on the joint resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time run equally against all participants.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, a little more than 2 years ago, thugs working for the military strongmen of Burma attacked Aung San Suu Kyi and members of the opposition party that she leads, the National League for Democracy. The Government put Suu Kyi into what they call "protective custody." She remains under house arrest to this day.

In response to this heinous attack, America banned imports from Burma. We in Congress believed something had to be done. In 2002, those imports were valued at \$350 million, mostly in garments.

In the autumn of 2003, Burmese Prime Minister Nyunt, who had opposed the attack on the opposition party, called for a seven-point road map to Democracy.

But the road map led to nowhere. And a rigged national convention broke down when opposition representatives rightly decided to boycott it.

The strongmen of Burma then removed Prime Minister Nyunt from his post. They placed him under house arrest, for supposed corruption. And they replaced him with a hard-line general, whom many believe to have planned the attack.

Where does this leave Burma? In short, the ruling generals have consolidated their grip on power. And govern-

ment security forces continue to inflict innumerable human rights violations on the Burmese people.

This is a tragic situation. The long-suffering people of Burma deserve to be rid of the criminals who purport to represent them.

But what is the best way to do that?

When the Senate first considered banning Burmese imports, Senator GRASSLEY and I worked hard to ensure two key conditions.

First, we made sure that Congress would retain its constitutionally vested power to impose and evaluate trade sanctions. We should never write the President a blank check.

Second, we made sure that the law would direct the administration to work with other nations, to make these sanctions work. Unilateral sanctions seldom work. Unilateral sanctions typically harm innocent citizens far more than the odious rulers against whom they are aimed.

Sadly, events on the ground in Burma suggest that these unilateral sanctions have proved no exception to the rule. The sanctions have harmed innocent citizens. And the odious rulers remain in place.

The U.S. ban on Burmese imports caused a number of Burmese garment factories to close. Tens of thousands of garment workers, overwhelmingly women, lost their jobs. And more Burmese women, with nowhere else to go, turned to prostitution.

Today, the Burmese garment industry has to some extent rebounded, sustained by new orders from Canada, Europe and Latin America.

U.S. sanctions against Burma might have been more effective if other countries would join us in isolating the Burmese regime. But that has not happened.

To the contrary, China has embraced the Burmese government. China has invested in Burma's energy sector. And China has extended generous aid packages to Burma, including a \$356 million aid package that more than makes up for Burma's loss of America's import market.

Thailand and India share a long border with Burma. But Thailand and India have their own ideas about how to deal with Burma's military rulers. And those ideas do not include joining U.S. sanctions.

And ASEAN member countries continue to welcome Burma to their economic summits.

This is not a record of success.

Nevertheless, I will vote to renew the sanctions on Burma for another year. But I do so with an eye toward next year, when the sanctions automatically expire.

I know that most of my colleagues will vote reflexively to renew these import sanctions. Boycotting Burmese imports allows us to express our collective disapproval of the awful regime running Burma. But I hope that my colleagues will take a moment to consider whether a boycott is the best thing for the Burmese people.

Next year, if my colleagues seek to extend the Burmese import sanctions, Congress will have to enact new legislation to do so. At that time, I hope that we can have a more extensive debate on how best we can help the cause of freedom, and how best we can help the Burmese people.

Mr. President, I note the presence of the Senator from California on the floor, a leader on this issue.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and the distinguished ranking member of the Finance Committee. I caught the tail end of his remarks, and what I heard I agree with.

I rise today with my colleague from Kentucky, Senator MCCONNELL, in support of the resolution renewing import sanctions against Burma. The House overwhelmingly passed this resolution in a 423-to-2 vote. I believe it is time for the Senate to follow suit.

Almost a month ago, Nobel Peace Prize winner and leader of Burma's democracy movement Aung San Suu Kyi celebrated her 60th birthday under house arrest. She has spent the better part of the past 15 years imprisoned under house arrest.

The brutal military regime, the State Peace and Development Council, has gone to extraordinary lengths to prevent Suu Kyi and her National League for Democracy from assuming their rightful place as leaders of the Burmese state.

It is worth repeating that the NLD decisively won their parliamentary elections in 1990, results that were soon nullified by the military junta.

Two years ago, Congress passed the original sanctions legislation, the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, following a brutal attack by progovernment thugs on a motorcade carrying Suu Kyi and several of her NLD colleagues. That bill imposed a complete ban on all imports from Burma for 1 year and allowed those sanctions to be renewed 1 year at a time for up to 3 years.

Last year, in response to the failure of the SPDC to make "substantial and measurable progress" toward a true national dialog on national reconciliation and recognition of the results of the 1990 elections, Congress passed and President Bush signed into law a renewal of the import sanctions for another year.

One year later, it is clear the military junta has taken no steps toward restoring democracy, releasing Suu Kyi and all political prisoners, and respecting human rights and the rule of law and, therefore, we believe we have no choice but to renew the sanctions again for another year.

Some may argue that since we are no closer to a free and democratic Burma since Congress passed the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act 2 years ago, we should let the import ban expire and attempt to "engage" Rangoon.

I disagree. I urge my colleagues to stay the course for this additional year. I ask them to remember that the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003—a 1-year ban on Burmese imports—allowed those sanctions to be renewed twice for 1 year at a time if Burma failed to make "substantial and measurable" progress toward restoring democracy.

We have almost completed 2 years of the import ban and, if we pass this joint resolution, we will renew the sanctions for a third year.

If Congress does not renew the import ban when the military junta has so clearly failed to meet the conditions set out in the original legislation for having the sanctions lifted, we will reward the SPDC for its inaction and for their continued suppression of the entire Burmese people and we will send a clear message to Aung San Suu Kyi and the National League for Democracy that the United States does not stand with them.

Brutal regimes around the world would know that if you simply wait for the United States to give in, they will do so. The damage to our reputation as leader for freedom and human rights will be devastated and will take years to repair. We simply cannot afford to make that mistake.

Let me be clear, I don't support sanctions as a panacea for every foreign policy dispute we have with another country.

Each case needs to be judged on its own merits and needs to have substantive debate. Congress needs the opportunity to revisit sanctions on other countries in a timely fashion. Indeed, next year, when the import ban contained in our original bill of 2003 expires, we will have the opportunity to judge any progress made by Rangoon over the next year towards restoring democracy and possibly debate new sanctions legislation, or let the legislation expire.

We know in some cases sanctions can be effective. I think South Africa is the one case where that has proved to be the case. While Burma's military regime has totally failed to respect democracy, human rights, and the rule of law, world opinion is coming together to put additional pressure on Rangoon.

In fact, members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, called ASEAN, from Malaysia to Singapore and Indonesia, have expressed concerns about Burma assuming chairmanship of the organization next year and have pushed Burma to make progress on democratic reform.

I, frankly, believe ASEAN's prestige and effectiveness would be substantially undermined and reduced if Burma assumed a leadership position in ASEAN. More fundamentally, it would signal that ASEAN has been totally ineffective in moving this military junta toward elections in Burma, or any reconciliation, for that matter, with the duly elected government led by Aung San Suu Kyi.

The way Senator Bill Cohen and I began this many years ago was to give a period of 6 months for ASEAN to exert its influence on Burma, and then we gave the Secretary of State—who was then Madeleine Albright—the ability to trigger these sanctions. In fact, ASEAN was unable to achieve any change in Burmese military behavior. So Secretary Albright, at the time, triggered the sanctions.

In a recent op-ed in *The Nation*, Datuk Zaid Ibrahim, president of the ASEAN Caucus on Burma, called on the members of ASEAN to defer Burma's chairmanship for 1 year and condition its assuming the chairmanship at a later date on progress toward democracy and national reconciliation.

This is important. I hope the ASEAN nations defer the chairmanship. I hope they insist on progress. I hope they say the time has come to release Aung San Suu Kyi and to effect a democratic reconciliation to this impasse.

Mr. Ibrahim added:

A mere facade of political reform will not lead to stability and progress in Burma and will not alleviate the impact throughout the region. ASEAN stands ready to assist Burma, but ASEAN's good will must be met with the Burmese government's political will.

I strongly agree. I hope this will be ASEAN's posture. I hope it will be strong, formidable and, to the extent it can, unrelenting.

Of course, I would like to see ASEAN take additional measures to put pressure on Burma, particularly since the spread of narcotics, HIV/AIDS, and refugees across the region can all be traced back to Rangoon.

Denied the most basic of human rights by the repressive regime—including education and health care—the Burmese people endure forced labor, rape, and conscription. Those who dare speak out against the SPDC and its abuses are harassed, imprisoned, or killed. Few realize there are between 600,000 and 1 million internally displaced persons in Burma today, with up to 1,300 political prisoners.

The people of Burma also face a severe epidemic of HIV infection. Measures of the HIV burden are always difficult to assess, but estimates suggest that Burma is believed to have one of the largest HIV rates in Asia, with up to 1 percent of its population infected. That amounts to a half million people. After initial and outgoing outbreaks among injecting drug users, HIV rates have rapidly risen among heterosexual men, blood donors, and are now rapidly rising among women and infants.

I believe the United States can gain additional international support for change in Burma by continuing to take a leadership role on sanctions against this military regime. Now is not the time to turn our backs on the very brave Aung San Suu Kyi and the people of Burma who voted for democracy in 1990. Let's finish what we started with the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003. I urge my colleagues to

support a free and democratic Burma and support the joint resolution renewing import sanctions for another year. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, how much time remains in control of the Democratic Senators on this resolution?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 39½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes of that time be reserved for Senator KENNEDY and that I may use such of the remaining Democratic time as I consume for a statement as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOYAGES OF TRADE AND DISCOVERY

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, 600 years ago this month, a great fleet of more than 300 ships lifted anchor at Nanjing, China, on the first of 7 voyages of trade and discovery. The Chinese fleet counted the largest wooden ships ever built, some with nine masts, massive keels of teak, and decks 400 feet long—you can imagine, longer than a football field.

The Ming Emperor gave his nearly 7-foot tall admiral orders to sail on July 11, 1405, nearly a century before Christopher Columbus and Vasco da Gama left Europe. And all of those European explorers' ships could have fit on a single deck of one of the Chinese treasure ships. The 36-foot rudder of one of the ships stood almost as tall as Columbus' flagship, the *Nina*, was long.

The Ming fleet carried a crew of nearly 28,000, with a medical officer for every 150 souls on board. The fleets carried more than a million tons of silk, porcelain, copper coins, and spices to trade for the riches of the world, on to what the Chinese called the Western Ocean—what we call the Indian Ocean. They reached Sumatra, Ceylon, and India. They went to the Arabian peninsula and Africa's Swahili coast. They made a side trip to Mecca.

At each port, ships with colorful prows delivered platoons of Chinese merchants, ready to do business. In Siam—now Thailand—they acquired sandalwood, peacocks, and cardamom. In Indonesia, they acquired tin. In Oman, they traded porcelain for frankincense, myrrh, and aloe. The Sultan of Aden gave them zebras, lions, and ostriches. In east Africa, they acquired a giraffe.

In 1451, one of the fleet's interpreters would write a memorial of the voyages, exclaiming:

How could there be such diversity in the world?

In Sri Lanka, the admiral engraved a granite slab in Chinese, Tamil, and Persian, seeking blessing from Buddha, Siva, and Allah alike.

In the south Chinese harbor of Changle, the admiral inscribed on a pillar:

[We] have recorded the years and months of the voyages . . . in order to leave [the memory] forever.

He listed his destinations, "altogether more than 30 countries large and small."

He wrote of his efforts:

. . . to manifest the transforming power of virtue and to treat distant people with kindness.

He wrote:

We have traversed more than 100,000 li—

That is 40,000 miles—

of immense water spaces and have beheld in the oceans huge waves like mountains rising sky-high, and we have set eyes on . . . regions far away hidden in a blue transparency of light vapors. . . .

Today, approximately 600 years later, Chinese officials will proudly recall the voyages of the Ming fleet. They will observe that Ming China amassed one of the most powerful naval forces ever assembled, and they will pointedly note that China used the fleet not for conquest but for business and exploration, trade and diplomacy.

Three weeks ago, on June 24, 2005, a fleet of Chinese-made cars began rolling onto a ship in Guangzhou, China, bound for Europe. The fleet counted cars made at a gleaming new Honda factory on the outskirts of the sprawling city of 12 million souls near Hong Kong.

As reporter Keith Bradsher of the New York Times described:

At the new Honda factory . . . white robots poke and crane their long, vulture-like heads into gray, half-completed car bodies to perform 2,100 of the 3,000 welds needed to assemble each car. Workers in white uniforms and gray caps complete the rest of the welds, working as quickly as workers in American factories—but earning roughly \$1.50 an hour in wages and benefits, compared to the \$55 an hour for General Motors and Ford factories in the United States.

In America, General Motors and Ford struggle to pay high health care costs for autoworkers with an average age of nearly 50. In China, most of Honda's autoworkers are in their twenties. They do not go to the doctor much, and when they do, Chinese doctors charge less than \$5 for an office visit and a few stitches.

China's manufacturing companies are rapidly building wealth, and they have begun to trade that wealth for the riches of the world, across the Pacific Ocean.

At airports throughout the world, airplanes with colorful tail wings deliver platoons of Chinese merchants, ready to do business. In May, the Chinese company Lenovo acquired the personal computer division of IBM. In June, a Chinese company bid \$2.25 billion for the Iowa-based appliance company Maytag. Also in June, China National Offshore Oil Corporation bid \$18.5 billion for Los Angeles-based Unocal, whose "76" marketing symbol is one of the most recognized and enduring corporate symbols in America. And all this buying pales next to the acquisition by China's central bank of \$230 billion of American Government debt.

China is pursuing trade agreements with India, Australia, New Zealand,

and Thailand. China is reaching out to the 10 countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, known as ASEAN.

The Chinese are visiting the rest of Asia in greater numbers than before. They bring with them money and optimism about the "new China." The new China has gleaming skyscrapers, modern, productive industries, and a rapidly developing infrastructure.

China has launched a major charm offensive across Asia to promote itself as a desirable place to visit, to invest, and to live. Through ventures such as China Radio International, worldwide television broadcasts, and Chinese language and cultural centers across Asia, China advertises itself as an attractive destination. Increasingly, Asians are forgoing trips to Los Angeles, traveling to Beijing instead. For many young Asians, the gleaming lights of Shanghai illuminate the new Manhattan.

Already 90 million people in China's coastal cities have access to the Internet, and the Chinese own more cell phones than any other people in the world. There are more cell phones in China than there are people in the United States.

China has the world's largest population, the fastest growing economy, the second largest foreign currency reserves, and the third largest trade. China creates one-fifth of world trade growth.

In 2004, America exported 2½ times more to China than it did in 1999, 5 years earlier. My State of Montana exported 11½ times more. But America's merchandise trade deficit with China has more than doubled in the same time. China accounted for a quarter of America's \$652 billion trade deficit last year.

As Tom Friedman writes in his book, "The World is Flat," which I recommend for everyone:

[W]hat is really scary is that China is not attracting so much global investment by simply racing everyone to the bottom. . . . China's long-term strategy is to outrace America and the EU countries to the top, and the Chinese are off to a good start.

China is amassing one of the most powerful economies ever assembled. So America must ask: Will the result be as benign as the voyages of the Ming treasure fleet 600 years ago?

Asia accounts for one-third of the world economy. It is the world's most economically dynamic region. And America needs to pay attention. This administration has launched 20 free-trade agreements, but only one has been in Asia—with Thailand.

Instead of embracing ASEAN, this administration has largely ignored it. The Government has ceded the initiative in Southeast Asia to China. That is how ASEAN views the recent decisions of Secretary of State Rice to skip an important ASEAN gathering later this month. U.S. Secretaries of State have traditionally attended that conference. And this administration has failed to use the Asia Pacific Economic

Cooperation, otherwise known as APEC, as a platform for trade integration. Rather, this administration has turned the organization into little more than a venue to discuss security options.

Since 2000, this administration has negotiated bilateral and regional trade agreements at a furious pace, but most of the agreements the Government has been negotiating offer little real value to America's commercial interests. Why? Because the Government is choosing trading partners more for foreign policy reasons than it is for commercial reasons.

The U.S. Trade representative has finite resources. To be effective, to deliver the greatest benefits to Americans, our Government must direct their efforts where they are most likely to have the greatest effects.

In 1962, Congress created the Special Trade Representative—the predecessor of the U.S. Trade Representative—to remove trade policy from the State Department precisely so that commercial interests rather than foreign policy interests would drive American trade policy. I don't think that has happened. I believe trade shots are called by the White House.

We must focus trade policy efforts where they promise the greatest return for our ranchers, businesses, and our workers. First and foremost, we need to devote more effort to the ongoing Doha round of WTO negotiations. From all appearances, the negotiations are dragging. The pace of progress will have to improve considerably to meet the goal of an agreement by the end of 2006, and that will require a substantial commitment of U.S. leadership and resources.

We need to look more to Asia for bilateral agreements as well. For example, South Korea is our seventh largest trading partner, with a two-way trade totaling \$70 billion. Korea has promised real reforms in its agricultural markets. It has liberalized investment restrictions and lowered merchandise tariffs. I have met with Korean trade officials on several occasions, and they are serious about reforms.

Regional trade agreements in Asia, perhaps under the auspices of APEC, also hold promise. APEC's 21-member economies account for a third of the world's population and about three-fifths of world production. American exporters will get a major boost from a regional free-trade agreement on this scale.

We also need to seek out further sectoral agreements such as the WTO's hugely successful Information Technology Agreement negotiated largely by America, Japan, and Singapore.

We should launch an initiative in the advanced medical equipment sector. Asia has a rapidly aging population, particularly in Japan, Korea, and China. This demographic shift translates into growing demand for advanced medical equipment. America already exports half a billion dollars a

year in medical devices to China and Hong Kong, and these exports are expanding 12 percent a year.

We need to do a better job of enforcing our existing trade agreements.

In China, piracy—the theft of American copyrights and patents—is at epidemic levels. In the past 2 years, companies from General Motors to Sony to Cisco have complained that Chinese have stolen their intellectual property. More than 90 percent of software in China is stolen. American innovators are losing billions of dollars a year.

Combating piracy would help the American economy far more than further agreements with countries whose entire economies are but a fraction the size of our losses to piracy alone. I need only mention CAFTA. CAFTA is a blip compared to other commercial interests we should be pursuing.

China also maintains a troubling currency peg. But retaliatory tariffs are not the answer. Tariffs would violate our WTO commitments. Tariffs would inflame already difficult trade relations with China, invite Chinese retaliation in other areas, and make Chinese imports nearly a third more expensive. Tariffs would hurt American consumers who would pay more for many of the goods that they buy. And tariffs would hurt U.S. companies who rely on Chinese inputs to develop their own products.

Having said that, China's currency peg is a problem. It distorts world markets and hurts both America and China itself. China needs to revise its currency policy.

While issues with China dominate the headlines, there are other enforcement priorities, including in our own hemisphere. In Brazil for example, the government recently forced an American pharmaceutical company to reduce its price for one of its medicines. It did so by threatening to break its promise to protect the American company's patent, and to let a state-owned company make generic copies of the medicine, an outrage.

This is blackmail, pure and simple. And it is illegal. This sort of coercion has no place in our trade relations. It hurts our companies and our workers. And it dampens the incentive to create new and innovative pharmaceuticals.

Our problems with Brazil go beyond just pharmaceuticals. Until recently, Brazil banned the sale of genetically engineered seeds for use in agriculture. These are the kind of high-tech seeds American companies like Monsanto and Pioneer Hi-Bred develop and sell all over the world—but not in Brazil. How odd then, that roughly 30 percent of Brazil's soybeans are grown with genetically engineered seeds. The figure is nearly 90 percent in Brazil's southernmost state of Rio Grande do Sul.

How can this be? Theft. These seeds were smuggled in from neighboring countries where they are allowed, and planted illegally. They were not purchased. They were stolen.

And just like piracy in China, piracy in Brazil costs American industries

dearly. Last year, American companies lost \$930 million in Brazil because of piracy of audiovisual goods. Some estimate that three-quarters of these audiocassettes sold in Brazil are pirated.

Of course we cannot launch a full-fledged WTO dispute to address each and every foreign trade barrier. And the U.S. Trade Representative often rightly attempts to resolve many of these issues through negotiation and other means.

But there can be little doubt that trade enforcement has received a lower priority of late. In the 6 years from 1995 through 2000, the United States filed 67 WTO dispute settlement cases. In the 5 years since, we have filed only 12. That is about an 80 percent decrease.

Too often, our tools to address trade barriers are lying unused, on the shelf. That burdens Americans with economic losses. But what is more, when Americans see that others are cheating, their enthusiasm for trade cools. And we all suffer as a result.

Americans also cool to trade when they see nothing being done to help those who lose from trade. Lowering tariffs and barriers increases competition and benefits many more than it hurts, but it inevitably hurts some.

For more than 40 years, the Government has been helping to retrain workers affected by trade to give them the skills that they need to find new jobs. These programs were expanded in 2002 under the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reform Act, a bipartisan effort and one of my proudest achievements as chairman of the Finance Committee at that time. The reforms expanded eligibility to new categories of workers, created a new health coverage tax credit, and helped older workers with a new wage insurance benefit. Last year, these programs helped nearly 150,000 workers.

TAA is an integral part of a successful trade policy. A few weeks ago, I discussed this very issue with Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan during a Finance Committee hearing. Chairman Greenspan stated, as he has before, that our trade policy should "assist those who are on the wrong side of the adjustment" caused by trade.

Lately, the Government has not supported TAA. This year, the administration's budget zeroed out funding for the TAA for Firms Program, which pretty much everyone agrees has been useful and cost effective. Last month, the Senate Finance Committee passed an amendment offered by my colleague from Oregon, Senator WYDEN, to extend TAA benefits to workers in the service industry. The administration stripped the language out of the CAFTA implementing bill that it submitted to the Congress.

Liberalizing trade requires a grand bargain with workers. Workers agree to be exposed to increased international competition. It is helpful. But society agrees to erect a strong social safety net to help workers adjust.

When workers' old skills become obsolete, society helps them learn new skills to compete. If we undercut this bargain, we do so at the peril of further trade liberalization and our international competitiveness.

We must press forward with trade liberalization. For, 600 years later, international trade remains as vital to the world economy today as it was to Ming China.

Trade allows Americans to specialize in what we do best. That allows us to improve our international competitiveness and maximize our standard of living.

What Americans do best today is manufacture capital-intensive goods: airplanes, automobiles, and construction equipment.

Americans invent whole new fields, like biotech and nanotechnology, that lead to new products to make our lives better. University of Michigan scientists recently used nanotechnology to deliver a powerful drug inside cancerous tumor cells, increasing the drug's cancer-killing activity and reducing its toxic side effects.

Americans pioneer new services to make our lives better, like Internet banking. We export our services all over the world. Hollywood movies and American television programs are translated into countless languages and watched around the world. American universities educate students from virtually every country on Earth. American insurance companies insure assets in jungles, deserts, and savannas.

And American ranchers and farmers feed and clothe people around the globe.

Freer trade helps us find and open new markets for what Americans do best. New markets provide new opportunities for American workers and their companies. New markets mean greater demand for what Americans produce. And new markets mean more jobs and more investment opportunities to meet the demand.

As we meet the demand of foreign consumers through trade, American products become global products. American brands become global brands. Coke is Coke, the world over.

I might digress and say 40 years ago I hitchhiked around the world with a knapsack on my back in northern Ghana. I went to a little hut. I got off from the back of a truck. I was riding with the cattle in the back of the truck. My driver stopped to pray. He pointed his little prayer mat toward Mecca. In that little hut there was a little refrigerator, no electricity, and there was Coca-Cola. It was a world brand back then. Just think of all the world brands we could have today. On today's voyages, one can find the familiar yellow arches of McDonald's in Cyprus, Slovenia, and Oman.

The American standard becomes the global standard and the international sign of excellence. Excellence means that half of the world's 20 largest com-

panies are American companies—companies like Citigroup, IBM, and General Electric.

Importing products from our trading partners challenges domestic companies to compete. Competition keeps American companies nimble. American companies are constantly coming up with new products and better ways to make them.

Just look at the number of U.S. patents filed by Americans versus the rest of the world. Americans filed nearly 90,000 patents in 2003. That is 50,000 more than the next most innovative country, Japan. In innovation, we are still number one.

The biggest payoff from international trade goes to the American consumer. As more and more companies trade and produce what they are best at producing, prices in supermarkets and department stores plummet. Cheaper products mean that we can afford more of what we need, and our standard of living improves.

The now-ubiquitous cell phone provides a great example. Ten years ago, it was an unaffordable luxury for most Americans. Using one in public aroused curiosity, but trade forced prices to drop. Now many Americans see cell phones as a necessity.

Leaders have not always appreciated the benefits of trade. After the stock market crash in 1929, America enacted the Tariff Act of 1930. That act imposed the now-infamous Smoot-Hawley tariffs that deepened the Great Depression.

During the Presidential campaign of 1932, President Hoover warned that repealing the Smoot-Hawley tariffs would devastate the U.S. economy, why? Because Americans could not compete successfully with workers in poorer countries with lower wages and lower costs of production. It was Franklin Roosevelt who argued that worldwide reduction of trade barriers would benefit both America and its trading partners.

Roosevelt's victory, along with his signing of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, ushered in the modern era of American trade policy.

During World War II, Secretary of State Cordell Hull argued that economic protectionism had fed the animosities that led to the war. He advocated freer trade in the postwar era as a bulwark for peace and prosperity.

This vision led to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, otherwise known as GATT, negotiated during the Truman administration. This forerunner to today's World Trade Organization brought down the disastrously high Smoot-Hawley tariffs and freed \$10 billion of trade from duties.

Democrats can be proud of our role in expanding free trade. Democratic administrations completed and implemented the last three rounds of GATT negotiations. In 1967, the Johnson administration completed the Kennedy Round. In 1979, the Carter administration completed the Tokyo Round. In

1994, the Clinton administration completed the Uruguay Round.

The Clinton administration completed the North American Free Trade Agreement, negotiated the historic bilateral trade agreement with Vietnam, and granted permanent normal trade relations to China, ultimately paving the way for China's membership in the WTO.

The success of trade liberalization has been spectacular, touching the lives and well-being of all Americans. Freer trade has lowered our tariffs from about 40 percent in 1946 to about 4 percent today, and made our trading partners do the same. Freer trade has increased our national income by nearly \$1 trillion a year. Freer trade has increased the average American household's income by nearly \$10,000 a year. Freer trade with China alone saves American households \$600 each year.

Today, 12 million Americans, 1 of every 10 workers, depend on exports for their jobs. International trade now accounts for a quarter of our gross domestic product, up from just 10 percent in the 1950s.

Trade opens our lives to new opportunities and choices. Trade gives us new foods to eat, new movies to watch, and new products to buy.

Strengthening trade ties also contributes to peaceful relations with our trading partners. Our quality of life improves as the world grows ever smaller, shrinking with the better communications and transportation links that develop with increased commerce.

Back in China, Guangzhou Airport has a terminal designed by an American company, boarding gates supplied by a Danish company, and an air traffic control tower engineered by a company from Singapore.

America's Dell Computers is giving the Chinese competitor Lenovo a run for its money in China. Dell now has become China's third-largest seller of PCs, and Dell now produces 3 million PCs in China, as many as Lenovo.

America should welcome China's greater integration into the world market. It may mean that we will have to work a little harder, study a little bit harder, and think a little bit quicker to keep ahead. But those are talents at which Americans excel.

In the middle of the 15th century, China made an abrupt change in foreign policy. Remember just earlier all those ships around the world? China turned inward and abandoned outward-looking trade. Imperial edicts banned overseas travel. To reduce commerce with foreign nations, the new Chinese dynasty burned a swath of land 30 miles deep for 700 miles of its southern coast. Any merchant caught engaging in foreign trade was tried as a pirate and executed.

With the Emperor's death in 1435, the government put a stop to the voyages of the Treasure fleet. Chinese court officials destroyed the plans for the Treasure ships, the accounts of their

voyages, and almost every map and document of the previous period. Sadly, China's golden Ming age came to an end, China's economy fell backward, and the treasure ships became shrouded in the mists of history.

We cannot yet know whether the voyages of today's fleets of Chinese ships will lead to another golden age for China like that of the Ming Dynasty. But we also cannot expect that China will somehow once again abruptly reverse course and turn inward. That will not happen.

Try as regimes after the Ming dynasty did, they could not erase the history of the Ming treasure fleets, whose voyages will leave a memory forever.

Let us respond to today's Chinese fleets with the best spirit of the Ming admiral, and the best spirit of America.

Let us work to advance freer trade, so that for America and for China, we can, in the words of the Ming admiral, "manifest the transforming power of virtue."

Let us work to advance freer trade, to make a better world both for ourselves, and for "regions far away hidden in a blue transparency of light vapors."

And let us work to advance freer trade, because both in terms of new innovations and new trading partners, America's greatest voyages of discovery still lie ahead of her.

Mr. President, under the previous order, do we have up to 10 minutes reserved for the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). The Senator is correct. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. I see my friend and colleague from Arizona on the floor. I understand by previous agreement we are voting at 12:20, so I am glad to divide the time that is remaining.

Mr. MCCONNELL. If the Senator from Massachusetts will yield for a moment, I believe I have the last amount of time before the vote. I ask the Chair, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has 18½ minutes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I will not likely use the entire 18½ minutes. The vote is scheduled to begin at the end of the time, or do we have a time specific for the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the end of the time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Fine. I will proceed then for my 10 because I understand there will be adequate time for the others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent my statement appear at an appropriate part of the debate on this issue.

(The remarks of Mr. KENNEDY are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on the matter before the Senate today, the Burma sanctions, I want to point out that this legislation addresses one of

the worst human rights tragedies in the world, the atrocious acts of the Burmese junta. They suppress dissent. They jail opponents. They deny the basic rights of free speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of assembly, and they have had Aung San Suu Kyi under house arrest for many years. So the action we take today is appropriate.

I am proud Massachusetts has led the way to encourage sanctions against this abusive government. In 1996, the Massachusetts legislature adopted a law barring State agencies from doing business with Burma. It was the first step toward national action.

I hope our Senate colleagues will support this measure here today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank Senators MCCONNELL and FEINSTEIN for their leadership in renewing the sanctions contained in the 2003 Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act. I am proud to co-sponsor this legislation.

As we renew the sanctions, I note with sadness that the situation inside Burma grows ever dimmer. The military junta in that country controls the population through a campaign of violence and terror, and the lack of freedom and justice there is simply appalling. The Burmese regime has murdered political opponents, used child soldiers, and forced labor, and employed rape as a weapon of war. Political activists remain in prison, including elected members of Parliament, and last month the courageous woman Aung San Suu Kyi celebrated her 60th birthday in captivity. Her resolve in the face of tyranny inspires me and I believe every individual who holds democracy dear. Because she stands for freedom, this heroic woman has endured attacks, arrest, captivity, and untold sufferings at the hands of the regime. Burma's rulers fear Aung San Suu Kyi because of what she represents: peace, freedom, and justice for all Burmese people. The thugs who run the country have tried to stifle her voice, but they will never extinguish her moral courage. Her leadership and example shine brightly for the millions of Burmese who hunger for freedom and those of us outside Burma who seek justice for its people.

I know my friend from Kentucky has been very involved in this issue. I ask unanimous consent the Senator from Kentucky and I engage in a brief colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized along with the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I again thank my friend and colleague from Kentucky for his commitment to democracy and freedom in Burma in general and his continuing advocacy on behalf of this Nobel Prize winner and truly great citizen of the world.

One of the issues I would like to discuss with the Senator from Kentucky is the fact that a few years ago, Burma

was allowed into ASEAN on the premise that there would be some kind of progress made and by being part of this organization they would seek some kind of legitimacy.

Now, apparently, next year ASEAN is scheduled to meet in Burma. I wondered about the Senator's thoughts about that. Maybe we should give that some more attention as the time approaches.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend from Arizona for bringing it up.

Let me point out to my colleagues that the Senator from Arizona has actually had an opportunity to meet Aung San Suu Kyi. I heard him say before what an inspirational experience that was. I wish I had the opportunity to actually meet her at some point. As the Senator from Arizona pointed out, she basically has been under house arrest for some 15 years.

This outrageous regime in Burma is scheduled, as the Senator from Arizona pointed out, to host in Rangoon the ASEAN meeting in 2006. It will be an interesting test of whether the policies of the governments in ASEAN, which basically add up to constructive engagement, will be honored even through that, and everybody will go traipsing to a meeting in Rangoon.

I had an opportunity to have a few words with the Prime Minister of India. They, like ourselves, abhor the regime there and revere Suu Kyi but nevertheless pursue this policy of constructive engagement. Maybe the scheduled meeting in Rangoon will be a way to bring this whole issue to a head and move the governments in the area in the direction of some kind of policy other than constructive engagement. Obviously, this policy is not going to work. I share the Senator's view.

It is unacceptable for ASEAN to meet in Rangoon while this regime is in power and Suu Kyi is in jail.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my friend for his continued sponsorship for and renewal of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act. I believe it has had an effect inside Burma. I do believe the people who are in prisons and mistreated, as well as San Suu Kyi herself, are aware of our efforts on their behalf.

I thank my friend from Kentucky for his continued efforts on behalf of these people. I believe we should continue to ask that one day they will achieve their freedom—not if, but when. I think the Senator's efforts and our passage of this legislation will help get them there. I look forward to exploring other options and ways we can put continued pressure on this bunch of thugs to at least allow this brave woman a chance to live some semblance of a normal life. She certainly deserves it.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I make a further observation to my good friend from Arizona. The Prime Minister of India mentioned a meeting that Than Shwe, the head thug of the thug regime that controls Burma, apparently came to in New Delhi sometime within the last

year. One of the arguments he made with reference to reform was that Burma was so ethnically diverse that it simply could not handle democracy. I am sure my friend from Arizona shares my view of the irony of that. What could be a more ethnically diverse country than India?

No one knows this, but India is the second-largest Muslim country in the world, whose President is a Muslim and has had a total democracy by Western standards these many years, going back to independence. India has done a superb job of absorbing all of these different minorities, many of whom do not speak the same language, into a genuine democracy for over 50 years.

India itself is a repudiation of the argument that the head thug was using against any kind of reform in Burma.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I know my friend from Kentucky and the Senator from California and all Members will renew our assurance to the people of Burma and their brave leader that we will not rest and we will not stop until they achieve freedom and democracy, which is a God-given right.

I thank my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank, again, the Senator from Arizona for his continuous interest and outspoken involvement in this issue over the years. It has been fun to be in collaboration with him.

I will say a few words on Burma before the Senate votes, and at the end of my remarks I will ask for the yeas and nays on the measure to renew sanctions for another year on Burma.

These sanctions are absolutely necessary. If you do not want to take my word for it, here is what a Thai journalist wrote in a recent opinion piece in that country's newspaper called the Nation:

Whatever momentum was gained from the international calls to free Aung San Suu Kyi and to allow for democracy in Burma on the occasion of the opposition leader's recent 60th birthday must be sustained at all costs. The outpouring of support from presidents, prime ministers, intellectuals, Nobel laureates and activists demonstrated one simple truth—the Lady matters. Contrary to conventional wisdom, perpetuated by junta apologists and other vested interests in the past five years, that the long-suffering opposition leader of the National League for Democracy has been the main stumbling block of progress because of her attitude toward political processes and national reconciliation. Suu Kyi is in fact loved and respected by the Burmese and other people around the world.

He had it right. The Lady matters.

Under the paranoid misrule of Burmese hard-liner Than Shwe, the human rights and dignity of the Burmese people continue to be grossly abused. The litany of atrocities—from the use of rape as a weapon of war to the murder, torture and intimidation of political activists—are well-known and well-documented. It seems as though the only ones denying that a problem ex-

ists in Burma are the very miscreants responsible for creating and propagating that problem.

Second, with the SPDC scheduled to assume chairmanship of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, ASEAN, next year, as Senator McCAIN and I were just discussing, the time has come for ASEAN to fish or cut bait.

Again, listen to what others from that region are saying, such as former deputy prime minister of Malaysia Anwar Ibrahim who wrote last month in the Asian Wall Street Journal:

... It is now evident that constructive engagement [by ASEAN with the SPDC] has not only failed to bring about democratization, but was never seriously intended to encourage any move in this direction. Instead, as far as ASEAN is concerned, the policy amounts to a subconscious manifestation of collective guilt.

I offer that the absence of Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice at the recent security meeting in Laos portends America's involvement with ASEAN should the SPDC be at the helm. The difference might be that no American official attends ASEAN events in her stead.

In case ASEAN members have not noticed, President Bush is a stalwart supporter of freedom in Burma.

As is Secretary Rice. As is the U.S. Congress.

My colleagues may recall that 14 Nobel laureates wrote an open letter on the occasion of Suu Kyi's 60th birthday, which applauded "those countries that have imposed sanctions to deny the regime the wealth it craves to sustain itself" and reminded the world that "Burma was admitted to ASEAN to lift its people up, not to drag the organization down." ASEAN members should feel similarly—how could they not?

Finally, the world must press for the immediate and unconditional release of Burmese democracy activists Aung San Suu Kyi and all prisoners of conscience.

Suu Kyi, the National League for Democracy and Burma's ethnic minorities have an indisputable role to play in the peaceful reconciliation of that country's myriad problems. This role cannot, and will not, be fulfilled so long as these courageous individuals remain behind prison walls or in the gun sights of SPDC goons.

Earlier today we had an opportunity to hear India's Prime Minister address a joint meeting of Congress.

In my discussion with Senator McCAIN in the Senate, I just pointed out the Indian Government certainly does not approve of the regime. I questioned the policy of the constructive engagement of India. They are at least thinking about whether that is the appropriate policy in India for the future. It was interesting and noteworthy the Prime Minister of India happened to be here on the very same day we took this measure up.

I particularly thank Senator McCAIN, Senators FEINSTEIN, REID, FRIST, and LEAHY, to name but a few, who have been involved in this issue from the beginning. This is an important statement of principle for America. I urge my colleagues to support this measure overwhelmingly.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKFELLER), are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 191 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Akaka	Dodd	McCain
Alexander	Dole	McConnell
Allard	Domenici	Mikulski
Allen	Dorgan	Murkowski
Baucus	Durbin	Murray
Bayh	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Bennett	Feingold	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Feinstein	Obama
Bingaman	Frist	Pryor
Bond	Graham	Reed
Boxer	Grassley	Reid
Brownback	Gregg	Roberts
Bunning	Hagel	Salazar
Burns	Harkin	Santorum
Burr	Hatch	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hutchison	Schumer
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sessions
Carper	Inouye	Shelby
Chafee	Isakson	Smith
Chambliss	Jeffords	Snowe
Clinton	Johnson	Specter
Coburn	Kennedy	Stabenow
Cochran	Kerry	Stevens
Coleman	Kohl	Sununu
Collins	Kyl	Talent
Conrad	Lautenberg	Thomas
Cornyn	Leahy	Thune
Corzine	Levin	Vitter
Craig	Lieberman	Voinovich
Crapo	Lincoln	Warner
Dayton	Lott	Wyden
DeMint	Lugar	
DeWine	Martinez	

NAYS—1

Enzi

NOT VOTING—2

Landrieu Rockefeller

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 52) was agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:53 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).