

Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to surveillance and information concerning the relationship between cervical cancer and the human papillomavirus (HPV), and for other purposes.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. Under the rule, the bill will be read the second time the following day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 11, 2000

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, May 11. I further ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act. I further ask unanimous consent that the scheduled cloture vote occur at 10 a.m. on Thursday, with the time until 10 a.m. equally divided in the usual form.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, tomorrow from 9:30 a.m. until 10 a.m., the Senate will debate the conference report to accompany the African trade/Caribbean trade initiative. At 10 a.m., the Senate will proceed to a cloture vote on that legislation. If cloture is invoked, it is hoped a short time agreement can be made so a final passage vote can take place at a reasonable time. On Thursday, the Senate is also expected to begin consideration of the military construction appropriations bill. Therefore, additional votes will occur during tomorrow's session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator DASCHLE and Senator EDWARDS.

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

(The remarks of Mr. DASCHLE pertaining to the introduction of S. 2541 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

AFRICAN-CARIBBEAN TRADE

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose the conference report

on the Trade and Development Act of 2000, the so-called African-Caribbean trade bill.

When we debated this bill last October, I expressed my concerns about it, and what has happened is the fruition of what I was concerned about at that time. A bill that was bad when it left the Senate last October has become worse. This bill creates enormous risks for American textile businesses and American textile workers, with very little in the way of offsetting benefits.

Let me speak for a couple of minutes about what I think is wrong with this bill and what kind of risk I think it creates for American workers. When we negotiate trade agreements, in my judgment, there are certain fundamental principles that should always be adhered to: First, they must be negotiated and multilateral; that is, both sides give up something; second, that they create a fair and enforceable system so the trade agreements don't become an empty shell but in fact there is a real and meaningful mechanism for enforcing the trade agreements; third, they must have adequate labor and environmental protections; and, fourth, they must have real, tangible, and provable benefits for U.S. businesses and U.S. workers.

These bills do not meet those basic principles that ought to be complied with on every single trade agreement.

Senator FEINGOLD spoke very eloquently about the lack of adequate labor and environmental protections in these bills.

There are two other principles that have been violated in these bills. First is the requirement that they be multilateral and negotiated, the simple proposition being that if the American people and we as a country are going to lower our barriers, we ought to get something in return. That "something" is that the other countries that are subject to these trade agreements lower their barriers. That simply has not happened here.

What is happening is we are lowering our trade barriers while these other Caribbean and African nations are keeping their trade barriers completely in place. Their tariffs remain just as they were. There is no set of circumstances under which that kind of arrangement is equitable for American business or equitable for American workers.

Second, there has to be a real and meaningful mechanism for enforcing these provisions. One of the things that happened to this bill when it left the Senate is there was a complex set of enforcement mechanisms and provisions put in place. When the bill left the Senate, we had what was called yarn and fabric forward provisions, which basically said, as a matter of equity, we would allow the trade barriers to be lowered for those African and Caribbean nations that used yarn and fabric from the United States so that our workers and our businesses benefited.

Well, when the bill got to conference with the House bill, those provisions were changed. Now there are many African nations that are not required to use American yarn or American fabric. Secondly, they are allowed to use regional yarn and fabric; that is, yarn and fabric from that area.

So those are two significant changes in the bill since it left the floor of the Senate which have real and meaningful impact on American business and American workers.

Probably the more dangerous situation, though, is that created by the potential for transshipment. We talked about this on the floor of the Senate when this bill was debated the first time, and my colleagues are aware of this problem.

Transshipment, basically, is a situation where a country, such as China, which I think has the greatest potential for taking advantage of transshipment, ships their fabric and their goods through Africa only for the purpose of having a button sewn on or some other minor change in the product, and then the product is shipped to the United States.

The antitransshipment provisions of this bill are simply not adequate for a variety of reasons. One of the two most important is that the enforcement mechanism relies upon African countries for enforcement. The reality is—and all of us know it—that these African nations are not going to be able to enforce the provisions about transshipment. And we are going to have—at least there is real potential for—a massive transshipment by China and Chinese textile businesses through Africa to the United States. Transshipment has a real and devastating effect on American workers and American businesses, and we have seen some of those effects over the last 8 to 10 years.

I have some specific examples of this. In North Carolina, my home State, during 1999, these were the jobs that were lost as a result of cheap textile goods coming into the United States:

At Pluma, Inc., a plant located in Eden, NC, a small community, 500 jobs were lost when the plant was closed. Jasper closed a plant in Whiteville, NC, in September and 191 jobs were lost. Whiteville Apparel in Whiteville, NC, closed a plant in August and 396 jobs were lost. Stonecutter Mills in Rutherford and Polk in western North Carolina closed a plant in June—800 jobs lost. Dyersburg in Hamilton, NC, closed a plant in May—422 jobs lost. Levi Strauss closed a plant in Murphy—382 jobs lost.

Remember that we are only talking about 1999 at this point.

Burlington Industries, in January, closed plants in Cramerton, Forest City, Mooresville, Raeford, Oxford, and Statesville—2,600 jobs lost as a result; all of those occurring in 1999.

In 1999 alone, the South lost 55,000 textile and apparel jobs.

This is not an abstract position for the families and employees whose lives