

Ten years ago, March 29, 1990, the Federal debt stood at \$3,052,317,000,000 (Three trillion, fifty-two billion, three hundred seventeen million).

Fifteen years ago, March 29, 1985, the Federal debt stood at \$1,710,731,000,000 (One trillion, seven hundred ten billion, seven hundred thirty-one million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,022,720,648,545.39 (Four trillion, twenty-two billion, seven hundred twenty million, six hundred forty-eight thousand, five hundred forty-five dollars and thirty-nine cents) during the past 15 years.

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS FOR CHINA

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the Senate to a timely Opinion-Editorial, written by former Ambassador Leonard Woodcock, that appeared in the March 9, 2000 Los Angeles Times. Long a champion of workers' welfare and workers' rights, Ambassador Woodcock was also the first United States Ambassador to the People's Republic of China.

Ambassador Woodcock lays out, in a clear and well-reasoned manner, powerful arguments showing how the United States will benefit from establishing permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) with China, and why it is in our interest to see China in the World Trade Organization (WTO). Equally important, the author forces those who profess a concern for Chinese workers' rights to take a realistic look at how our decision concerning China PNTR will help or harm workers in China.

I comment Ambassador Woodcock's thought-provoking commentary to all my colleagues in the Congress and, even more, to all persons interested in understanding the basics of the U.S.-China PNTR debate. I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Woodcock's Opinion-Editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVOLUTION DOESN'T OCCUR OVERNIGHT

WTO agreement: Organized labor should support it. It's in both U.S. and Chinese interests.

(By Leonard Woodcock)

The recent U.S.-China World Trade Organization bilateral accession agreement appears to be good for workers in both countries. I was privileged, as U.S. ambassador to China, to sign the 1979 trade agreement that provided for most-favored-nation trade status to China and have, as a private citizen, been involved with this issue for many years.

American labor has a tremendous interest in China's trading on fair terms with the U.S. The agreement we signed with China this past November marks the largest single step ever taken toward achieving that goal. The agreement expands American jobs. And while China already enjoys WTO-based ac-

cess to our economy, this agreement will open China's economy to unprecedented levels of American exports, many of which are high-quality goods produced by high-paying jobs.

There is reason to fear unfair trade practices. Yet this agreement actually provides better protections than our existing laws allow. It stipulates 12 years of protections against market surges and provides unusually strong anti-dumping laws—which aim to counter unfairly priced imports—for 15 years.

I have, therefore, been startled by organized labor's vociferous negative reaction to this agreement. The reality is that the U.S. as a whole benefits mightily from this historic accord. The AFL-CIO argues that nothing in this agreement demands that free trade unions be formed in China. Yet the WTO does not require this of any of its 136 member countries, and the WTO is the wrong instrument to use to achieve unionization.

We should, instead, be asking a more important question. Are Chinese workers better off with or without this agreement? The answer is that this agreement, in a variety of ways, will be enormously beneficial to Chinese workers.

On a subtle level, the changes the agreement requires of China's economic system will work in favor of investment by Western firms and take away some of the key advantages Asian firms now enjoy in China. Every survey has demonstrated that working conditions and environmental standards in plants run by West European and North American firms are usually better than those in Asian and in indigenous Chinese firms.

The greater foreign presence also will expose Chinese workers to more ideas about organization and rights. That is perhaps one reason why almost every Chinese political dissident who has spoken on this issue has called the United States-China WTO agreement good news for freedom in China.

The trade deficit with China is a troublesome one to the labor movement. We need to put it in perspective in two ways. First, if we were to block access of goods from China to the United States, this would not increase American jobs. That is because the Chinese exports—mostly toys, tools, apparel, cheap electronics, etc.—would be produced in other low-wage countries, not in the United States. Yet if China stopped buying from us, we would lose about 400,000 jobs, mostly high-wage.

Second, a large portion of exports from "China" are goods produced in the main in Hong Kong, Taiwan and Southeast Asia. The major components are then shipped to China for final assembly and packaging, but the entire cost of the item (often only 15% of which was contributed in China) is attributed to China's export ledger. Exports to the United States from Hong Kong and Taiwan have declined over the past decade almost as fast as imports from China have increased. Yet the companies making the profits are in Hong Kong and Taiwan, and they will simply shift their operations to Vietnam or elsewhere if we close down exports from China.

Americans are broadly concerned about the rights and quality of life of Chinese citizens. My perspective on this serious issue is influenced by my experience in the U.S. In my lifetime, women were not allowed the vote, and labor was not allowed to organize. And, in my lifetime, although the law did not permit lynching, it was protected and carried out by legal officeholders. As time passed, we made progress, and I doubt if lec-

tures or threats from foreigners would have moved things faster.

Democracy, including rights for workers, is an evolutionary process. Isolation and containment will not promote improved rights for a people. Rather, working together and from within a society will, over time, promote improved conditions. The United States-China WTO agreement will speed up the evolutionary process in China. American labor should support it because it is in our interest, and it is the interests of Chinese workers too.

RYAN WHITE COMPREHENSIVE AIDS RESOURCES EMERGENCY ACT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to briefly discuss a reauthorization bill introduced yesterday by Senators JEFFORDS and KENNEDY, the Ryan White CARE Act Amendments of 2000, S. 2311. This legislation is very important in that it will help to continue to improve the quality and availability of care for low-income, uninsured, and under insured individuals and families affected by AIDS and HIV disease. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this initiative.

Ryan White died on April 8, 1990 at age 18. He was a prime example of someone whose own community rejected him when he was only 13 years old because of his health status. As a result of his courageous battle to attend public school in Indiana, we all learned and understood more about AIDS. Ryan White played a major role in changing people's views concerning the disease and AIDS patients. Through his actions, he conveyed the importance of education and awareness to combat the spread of this deadly disease. Even after his death, the story of his courageous battle with AIDS continues to impact the common man. His legacy lives on through the Ryan White CARE Act.

This reauthorization provides us the opportunity to improve this bipartisan legislation to adequately care for those persons affected with AIDS and HIV. As noted by Ryan's mother, Jeanne, "We have come a long way since Ryan's death, but we still have so far to go." Although the number of AIDS cases continues to decline each year, the number of HIV-positive individuals continues to grow at an alarming rate. This legislation would expand the duties of the Planning Council, provide for a Quality Management Program, establish requirements for health care referral relationships, fund early intervention services, and improve resources for infants, children, and women. Until a cure is found, the Ryan White CARE Act will continue to be the "payer of last resort" for thousands of individuals who otherwise cannot afford health care or basic subsistence needs. In my home State of Rhode Island, \$3,463,706 of Ryan White CARE funding was provided during fiscal year

1999 to ensure access to life-sustaining drugs and other critical health and social services for those individuals affected with AIDS and HIV.

Because AIDS and HIV is a national problem, it deserves national attention. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee to make further enhancements and improvements to the bill. Specifically, I understand my colleague, Senator BINGAMAN, has been working on a provision that would allow more states to have access to dental care grant funding under Part F of the act. I believe this is a very important issue for individuals with HIV and AIDS and hope this provision will be incorporated into the overall bill.

ANTI-DEMOCRATIC ACTIONS IN BELARUS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak today about the dramatically deteriorating situation in Belarus. As of Sunday, March 26, more than 100 opposition activists remained in custody after a rally on Saturday that turned from a peaceful event into a demonstration that saw police clubbing protesters with nightsticks, hitting journalists covering the event and sending armored cars into Central Minsk. More than 500 people were detained, most of whom were not formally charged until Monday. This is only one of the examples of how, in Belarus, the Lukashenka regime continues to try to suppress the will of the people.

In November, Senator CAMPBELL and I introduced a resolution condemning the Lukashenka regime and its actions towards the country. The sad reality is that Belarus is being left behind while the rest of Europe is building a foundation of democratic governance, respect for human rights, and the rule of law.

Since 1996, President Lukashenka has been responsible for numerous unconstitutional steps. He unilaterally extended his term until 2001 after he promised to hold democratic elections in 1999. He replaced the 13th Supreme Soviet with a rubberstamp parliament and he rewrote the country's constitution.

Belarus has turned into a country where those who choose to participate in civil society by speaking truth to power must do so at great risk to their freedom, and even their lives, under Lukashenka's rule. Two prominent opposition figures—General Yuri Zakharenko and Viktor Gonchar—as well as another associate, Anatoly Krasovsky, have disappeared. Many of the people arrested on March 25 as well as other peaceful protesters were members of the opposition.

Belarus' economy is apparently imploding and neighboring countries, Poland, Lithuania, and Latvia, are concerned about regional instability.

Our resolution condemns the arrest of opposition figures and the disappearance of others; calls for a dialogue between Lukashenka and the opposition; calls for the restoration of a democratically-elected government and democratic institutions; calls on the U.S. President to fund travel by Belarusian opposition figures and non-governmental organizations in Belarus; and supports information flows into Belarus.

Belarus is not making progress. We must do what we can to sustain the remarkable progress of the other countries that have transformed themselves into fully democratic market democracies, and encourage the development of a democracy in Belarus.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, on March 25, Belarusian authorities harshly suppressed a pro-democracy demonstration in the capital of Minsk, arresting and detaining hundreds of peaceful protesters, including nearly 30 domestic and foreign journalists. Riot police, deployed with dogs and armored personnel carriers, used excessive force against some peaceful demonstrators.

Among those detained and beaten was democratic opposition leader Anatoly Lebedka, Deputy Chairman of the 13th Supreme Soviet. Many of my Senate colleagues met Mr. Lebedka last September when I introduced him right here on the Senate floor. Mr. Lebedka was just in Washington earlier this month to testify at a Helsinki Commission hearing about the deteriorating situation in Belarus.

Based on information I obtained from the State Department, I am advised that Anatoly Lebedka was arrested by plainclothes police during the demonstration, kept in detention, and reportedly beaten over the course of two days. He spent most of Monday in a police van outside the courthouse awaiting trial, but was released at 5:00 p.m. His trial has been scheduled for April 4.

Mr. President, the harsh overreaction by the authorities to this peaceful demonstration represents a clear violation of the freedom of association, assembly, and information guaranteed both by the Belarusian constitution and OSCE agreements. In addition, the Belarusian authorities detained a U.S. citizen who is an accredited diplomat and a member of the OSCE Advisory and Monitoring Group in Belarus, and who was observing the demonstration in line with his official responsibilities. This action also violates international conventions.

It appears that the green light for the most recent crackdown was given by Belarusian President Lukashenka, who praised the police for their actions. Reports indicate that earlier this month, he cautioned that the riot police will "beat the stuffing out" of any protestor who "gets out of line."

Unfortunately, the suppression by the Belarusian authorities of peaceful

protest, along with the sentencing last week of a prominent member of the opposition, does nothing to encourage a constructive dialogue with the democratic opposition that can lead Belarus out of its continuing constitutional impasse and end its self-imposed international isolation.

Mr. President, I call upon the Government of Belarus to thoroughly investigate reports of police brutality during the course of the demonstration and subsequent detentions and take measures to ensure that citizens are guaranteed their rights to engage in peaceful protests, keeping with that country's OSCE commitments.

I was pleased to join Senator DURBIN as an original cosponsor to Senate Concurrent Resolution 75 which we introduced last November. That resolution summarized many of the political problems facing the democratic opposition in Belarus expressing strong opposition to the continued egregious violations of human rights, the lack of progress toward the establishment of democracy and the rule of law in Belarus, and calls on President Lukashenka to engage in negotiations with the representatives of the opposition and to restore the constitutional rights of the Belarusian people. In light of the recent violent crackdown on pro-democracy demonstrators last weekend, I urge my colleagues to support passage of the Durbin/Campbell resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news report from the Washington Post on this latest crackdown be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 26, 2000]

BELARUS POLICE CRACK DOWN ON PROTEST

MINSK, BELARUS.—Hundreds of police beat back thousands of protesters at an opposition rally, sending armored personnel carriers into central Minsk and detaining 400 people in one of the country's harshest crackdowns on dissent in recent years.

The rally was held to commemorate the founding of the Belarusian Popular Republic on March 25, 1918, when German forces were ousted from Minsk in the waning days of World War I. The independent state was short-lived and within a year, much of Belarus was part of the Soviet Union.

Belarus' hard-line government had said it would allow the rally to be held on the outskirts of Minsk, but several thousand demonstrators went instead to a central square in the capital.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION LAW REPORT

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss an injustice to a group of Central American and Caribbean nationals who for many years have resided in the United States. As I speak, a clock is ticking. A deadline to gain legal status in the United States is one day away. How did we get to this point?