



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

## SENATE—Wednesday, May 10, 2000

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable WAYNE ALLARD, a Senator from the State of Colorado.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, nothing is impossible for You. You have all power. Nothing happens without Your knowledge and without Your permission. You will what is best for us as individuals and as a nation. You desire to bless us with the wisdom and discernment we need to solve problems. And yet we have learned that You wait for us to ask for Your help. By Your providence You have placed the Senators in positions of great authority, not just because of their human adequacy but because they are willing to be available to You, attentive to You, and accountable to You. They know that if they trust You, You will be on time and in time to help them in crucial discussions and decisions. Give them the courage to put the needs of the Nation first, above political advantage.

You have promised that those who pray with complete trust in You will receive the answers to their prayers.

In the name of Him who is the Way, Truth, and Life, Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable CONRAD BURNS, a Senator from the State of Montana, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, May 10, 2000.

To The Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable WAYNE ALLARD, a Senator from the State of Colorado, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLARD thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate majority leader is recognized.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will immediately proceed to a vote on the motion to proceed to the African trade and CBI enhancement conference report. If the motion to proceed is adopted, cloture will be filed, and debate will begin on the conference report immediately. Many Senators have expressed interest in making statements on this important legislation, and therefore the debate is expected to consume most of today's session.

By previous consent, the vote on cloture on the conference report will occur at 10:30 a.m. on Thursday morning. Following disposition of the African-Caribbean Basin legislation, the Senate will begin consideration of appropriations bills as they become available for action.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

### H.R. 434—CONFERENCE REPORT

I extend my congratulations to the Finance Committee for their efforts in the conference on this bill. Chairman ROTH was very much involved in the development of a very good conference report. I recognize the Senator from New York and his very effective staff for their involvement.

We have not had a major piece of trade legislation pass the Congress in 5

years. I think this is a tremendous accomplishment. I think it is going to be good for the American people, for American jobs, for consumers, for sub-Saharan Africa, for the Caribbean and Central American countries, and good for the industries that are connected in this trade area.

So I congratulate all those who were involved in this conference. I am very pleased to see we will take it up and I certainly plan to vote for it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator ROTH, who will be returning next week, I would like to express the gratitude of the Finance Committee and of our staff. We would not be here without you, who convened the meetings over 5 long months ago that brought us to this point. And with a measure of temerity, may I say this is the first trade measure on our floor in 6 years.

I thank you again.

### TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000—CONFERENCE REPORT

#### MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion to proceed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 434.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A motion to proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 434 to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

The Senate proceeded to consider the motion.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 434.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL),

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a member of the Senate on the floor.

the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced, yeas 90, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 96 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Abraham	Enzi	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bayh	Gorton	Mikulski
Bennett	Graham	Moynihan
Biden	Gramm	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grams	Murray
Bond	Grassley	Nickles
Boxer	Gregg	Reid
Breaux	Harkin	Robb
Brownback	Hatch	Roberts
Bryan	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Burns	Hutchison	Santorum
Campbell	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Chafee, L.	Inouye	Schumer
Cleland	Jeffords	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerry	Specter
Craig	Kohl	Stevens
Crapo	Kyl	Thomas
Daschle	Landrieu	Thompson
DeWine	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dodd	Leahy	Voinovich
Domenici	Levin	Warner
Durbin	Lieberman	Wellstone
Edwards	Lincoln	Wyden

NAYS—6

Bunning	Dorgan	Reed
Byrd	Hollings	Smith (NH)

NOT VOTING—4

Hagel	Roth
Helms	Thurmond

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the consent agreement, I now send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 434, The African Growth and Opportunity Act:

Trent Lott, Jon Kyl, Pat Roberts, Craig Thomas, Bill Frist, Paul Coverdell, James Inhofe, Orrin Hatch, Don Nickles, Larry Craig, Slade Gorton, Mitch McConnell, Peter Fitzgerald, Chuck Grassley, Phil Gramm, and Mike Crapo.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the cloture vote will occur on Thursday at 10:30 a.m. Debate on this important

trade legislation is expected to consume the remainder of the day.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I believe there are several Members who wish to speak as in morning business, and Senator GRASSLEY and I will be more than happy to accommodate them at this point.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we have agreed to give Senator COLLINS 5 minutes and Senator FEINGOLD 5 minutes at this point. I ask unanimous consent that they be recognized.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Iowa and my colleague from New York for their graciousness.

I ask unanimous consent that we be permitted to proceed for not to exceed 15 minutes, and that would be divided such that I would have 7 minutes and the Senator from Wisconsin would be permitted to proceed for not to exceed 8 minutes.

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

The Senator from Maine is recognized.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS and Mr. FEINGOLD pertaining to the introduction of S. 2528 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I was going to speak for about 15 minutes, but if my colleague had expected to speak as one of the managers, I don't want to precede him.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to speak for a few minutes opening up debate on the African trade bill. Senator MOYNIHAN will want to make opening comments. After we have completed our remarks, I will not object.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to follow Senator GRASSLEY and Senator MOYNIHAN for a period of up to 15 minutes on the bill.

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

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as a person who supports the African trade bill, I rise in support of this conference committee report on the Trade and Development Act of 2000. This legislation contains the conference agreement on the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act, and even some miscellaneous trade measures that were passed as part of the Senate's consideration of this legislation in November last year.

Passage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act conference agreement by the Senate will send to the President the first significant trade legislation to pass both Houses of Congress since 1988, other than legislation implementing trade agreements under very special fast-track procedures.

If I could characterize this conference agreement with one word, it would be the word "opportunity." That word is in the title of the African portion of this bill.

First, this conference agreement provides people in sub-Saharan Africa with the opportunity and promise for a better life. In many cases, these countries are not able to sustain their own people. They lack even the simplest, most basic infrastructure. This prevents the people of Africa from meeting necessary agriculture, education, transportation, and health care needs.

By giving these countries new tools to develop a textile and apparel industry, they will have new opportunities to participate in the global trade flows and the increased prosperity that have largely bypassed the majority of Africa's people.

I stress this bill provides opportunity. Once again, this bill is about opportunity. It is not about a guarantee, and it is not about a panacea, but an opportunity that has, up until now, been missing for the people of sub-Saharan Africa.

This legislation will give these countries the opportunity to build the essential capital that struggling economies need to increase their investment in their own people to help themselves. What we will create with this bill is opportunity for these struggling economies, and do it in a way that will not in any way jeopardize U.S. employment.

Some 30 sub-Saharan countries of Africa have begun dynamic economic reform programs that help make it much easier to pass this bill because we know they are taking the first steps to help themselves. They are liberalizing exchange rates; they are privatizing state-owned enterprises; they are reducing harmful barriers to trade and investment; they are also ending costly trade-distorting subsidies.

All of these things, for those who believe enhanced freedom of international trade is the right direction in which to go, always need a little bit of help from the indigenous economies of the respective countries. We believe the 30 countries of sub-Saharan Africa are doing all the right things. This legislation will create greater opportunities for new partnerships with these African nations based on economic directions they have already begun to take.

The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act is designed to compliment the economic reform policies that African nations have already decided to pursue by offering increased access to U.S. markets for non-import-sensitive goods and textiles while creating enhanced opportunities to deepen our bilateral trade relations.

Speaking of opportunity, we will open up for American goods and services a market for 700 million potential new consumers, more than in Japan

and all the ASEAN nations combined, if we approve this conference agreement.

Both the United States and African nations recognize this legislation for the win-win opportunity it is. The United States benefits and Africa benefits from this legislation. The African Growth and Opportunity Act has been endorsed by every African ambassador in Washington. We don't see unanimous agreement on many things in these cities these days. However, we do here. All of the 48 nations of sub-Saharan Africa are united in support of this legislation.

The conference agreement is also a win-win opportunity for the countries of the Caribbean Basin region and for the United States. This conference report grants duty-free, quota-free benefits to apparel made in the Caribbean Basin Initiative countries from U.S. yarn and U.S. fabric. The Caribbean Basin nations will now have an opportunity to compete with Mexico and other developing countries in Asia in a way that will permit them to more fully participate in the global economy.

Additionally, the conference report provides benefits for apparel made with regional fabric under clearly specified conditions to be fair to the United States. This will encourage additional U.S. export of cotton and yarn and U.S. investment in the region while also helping to create desperately needed jobs for the Caribbean workers. In fact, I cannot think of a time when this legislation was needed more. We have to act now to help rebuild the shattered Caribbean economies and the ruined lives of those whose nations were devastated by Hurricanes Georges and Mitch. This all happened in 1998, but the recovery is not what it should be.

It is hard for us to imagine the destruction these storms inflicted. We were not there. We saw them on television, but, as so many things seen on television, they soon get out of mind. The devastation is still there, although there has been some cleaning up, some enhancement of the economy. But this will help, not by giving them our money, as we have done under the humanitarian programs we have, but helping them to help themselves through enhanced trade opportunities.

In the worst-hit Caribbean countries, virtually all sectors of the economy were affected. Houses by the hundreds were washed away. Roads and bridges disappeared under tons of water. Hotels were wrecked. Beach erosion demolished tourism. Both the administration and the Congress deserve credit for joint efforts to enact an assistance package of close to \$1 billion to aid in the reconstruction of the most basic elements of infrastructure—roads, bridges, and sewer systems—for what they did 2 years ago. But even this investment falls far short of what is

needed to rehabilitate the economies of these countries.

The Caribbean nations hit by these disasters have seen the basic pillars of their economies—agriculture and tourism—almost completely ruined. I have spoken to many of the ambassadors from the Caribbean nations about this. I just had a meeting this morning with the President of Costa Rica, thanking us for our work on this particular bill, telling us about how their economies are starting to turn around. In my view, based on these discussions, comprehensive reconstruction will not be possible without an effective trade and investment component. The ambassadors tell me—and the regional leaders and the U.S. officials all agree—it will take years for the hardest hit countries to recover. These countries are more than just our friends; they are our neighbors. They are right there in our backyard. We must put in place a program to help them rebuild and to sustain growth during the long road back to economic prosperity. We can do this without threatening jobs in our own country.

The Caribbean Basin is one of the few regions of the world where the United States consistently—I want to emphasize consistently—maintains a trade surplus. In fact, close to 70 cents of every dollar spent in the region is returned in the form of increased exports from the United States. In 1999, the U.S. exports to Caribbean Basin countries exceeded \$19 billion, making this group the sixth largest export market of U.S. goods in that year, 1999.

We will see other long-term benefits to the United States if we approve this conference agreement and help our Caribbean neighbors to help themselves. We will contribute to the U.S. national security, in addition to our economy, by helping democratic countries in our own backyard maintain political and economic stability.

In closing, I want to say a word, then, in addition to all the big components of this bill, a word about the significance of our work. This is very general, but this work is an example of U.S. leadership in trade policy. But that U.S. leadership in trade policy has suffered serious setbacks in the last few years. One obvious setback has been the repeated failure of the Congress to renew the President's fast-track trade negotiating authority. Another setback has been the failure of the negotiations on the multilateral agreement on investment in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. And the most serious blow to U.S. leadership in global trade policy was the failure last December of the Seattle ministerial conference meeting of the World Trade Organization.

The entire world is watching, wondering whether the lack of leadership on the part of the United States for the

last 7 or 8 years, or maybe the last 5 or 6 years, is a pattern we are going to continue to follow because it is such a different pattern from what the United States has done as a world leader in breaking down barriers to international trade since 1947.

I suppose you could go back to the 1930s, when we learned the lesson of the Smoot-Hawley legislation that brought about the world depression, and the world depression brought about World War II. We very quickly learned that high tariffs are not good for the world economy. It was not good for the American economy because we suffered as much or more than they did elsewhere in the world in that Great Depression as a result of Smoot-Hawley. Under Cordell Hull's leadership as Secretary of State, working for President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, we started reciprocal trade agreements at that particular time. They were the forerunner of gradually reducing some of these very high barriers to trade we had at that time around the world, mostly high tariffs—bringing them down on a reciprocal basis. But all of that eventually resulted in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade process that we led the world in establishing in 1949.

There have been eight rounds of GATT. Those eight rounds have been very successful in breaking down barriers to trade, so successful that President Clinton can tell the American people with all honesty, on a factual basis, that one-third of the jobs created during his Presidency are a result of international trade.

So if anybody thinks we are here promoting an African trade bill and Caribbean Basin Initiative bill to somehow benefit the economies of Africa and the Caribbean nations without any concern about the workers of America, the working men and women of America, the taxpaying people of our country, and are they going to have enough jobs, we have history, since 1947, to demonstrate the value of international trade to the economy of the United States and the economic benefit of the United States.

Too often, in international trade, we look to the economic issues only. But I believe commerce does more to promote international peace and humanitarian progress than anything we as political leaders or diplomats can do—as important as political leadership is in the world, and as important as diplomats are. But there are just not enough political leaders or diplomats in the world—if you take all the countries combined—to guarantee any peace. But as you break down barriers among the diverse people of our world—that is, one on one, whether it is business or nonbusiness relationships—that has more to do with the promotion of international peace, prosperity, democratic principles, and free market principles than anything.

So I see this legislation as part of a small process of promoting those issues as well as our concern about Africa, among others.

So the entire world I think is watching what we do today because it is some show of America wanting to retain that leadership in the reduction of trade barriers and enhancing peace and prosperity of which we have been a part since 1947.

It is vitally important to not only approve this conference agreement but to do it in a resounding way. If we do that, we can send a message to the rest of the world that American leadership in trade policy is alive and well. For many in the international community, that leadership, as I said before, is in serious doubt.

It is especially important to approve this conference agreement after the profoundly disappointing failure of the Seattle WTO negotiations. We are only now beginning to pick up the pieces with the start of new agriculture and service trade negotiations in Geneva.

I have been watching these negotiations very closely. They are both difficult and delicate. We are trying to rebuild confidence, both in the World Trade Organization and in U.S. leadership. After Seattle, this is necessary and vitally important. It is not an exaggeration to say that failure to approve this conference agreement, or even a tepid approval, would send a shockwave through these negotiations. It would undermine our negotiators, jeopardize any progress we might make in Geneva, and do great harm to our long-term international trade interests.

By the same token, a strong Senate endorsement of this conference report would say to the entire world that the Senate is engaged, committed, and we want to reestablish the historic leadership role that has characterized U.S. trade policy for the last 50 years.

Finally, I salute the hard work of the majority leader, Senator LOTT, as well as that of my distinguished colleagues, Senator ROTH and Senator MOYNIHAN. Without their vision, their efforts, and their perseverance, we would not be here today.

I urge my colleagues to join me in a resounding show of support for American leadership in world trade negotiations by supporting the Trade and Development Act of 2000.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise in complete accord with the resounding statement of the Senator from Iowa. I know he would agree with me when I say we are both here speaking in the intellectual grasp of our chairman, Senator ROTH, who will return to the Senate next week after necessary surgery and who is so much responsible for our being here today.

The Senator from Iowa said the world is watching. The world is watching and has been watching with dismay for 6 years as we seem to have backed away from that tradition which Cordell Hull took up at the depths of the recession, which I will get to, and we have carried on, on a bipartisan basis, right into the nineties and then we seem to have stopped.

This is the first trade bill to come to the Senate floor in 6 years. More, we have defeated measures. We have denied the President the trade negotiating authority for trade agreements. It took the administration too long to ask for it. It responded to the same domestic pressures we saw in Seattle and we saw in front of the World Bank, baffling in some instances, but powerful.

Now we return to our tradition. The Senator from Iowa spoke of sending a resounding message. Can there be a more resounding message than our vote this morning of 90-6 to proceed to the consideration of this measure, following, perhaps, an equally, more astounding and equally resounding measure, a vote in the House of 309-110 to send us this conference report?

Senators will recall that the House had sent over to us the African Growth and Opportunity Act. This was a measure to give some measure of trade stimulation to sub-Saharan African countries in the area of apparel exports. The distinguished chairman, our revered Senator ROTH, saw to it, in a near to unanimous Finance Committee, that the Caribbean Basin Initiative, an initiative begun by President Reagan, that this, too, was included in the bill—it is a combined measure—with a number of other provisions of interest to the Senators.

The importance of the CBI, as we say for purposes of simplification, in this regard is very simple. Having created the North American free trade area, we created an incentive to develop trade ties with Mexico—in essence, Mexican production would enter the United States on a completely free basis, whereas its neighbors in Central America and nearby Caribbean islands were suddenly disadvantaged. We will call it an unanticipated consequence. It had to be dealt with. We do not completely deal with it here, but we acknowledge that it is an urgent matter, and we begin it.

Nearly all the Senate provisions—the bill passed the Senate 76-19—were retained, thanks to extraordinary exertions by our respective staffs who we will thank fulsomely in time.

We must particularly acknowledge that this 5 months of negotiation, and often going into 5 in the morning, would never have come to any conclusion absent the active participation of our majority leader who convened the meetings in his own office and listened to a lot of incomprehensible discord over tariffs.

I speak as a veteran, if I may, and ask the indulgence of the younger and more vital persons. I was one of the three persons who negotiated the Long-Term Cotton Textile Agreement of 1962 for President Kennedy, that having become a condition of passing the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 by the textile industry and the garment industry, which we successfully did, but it was not an easy effort with the French at the height of Gaullist recidivism. That 5-year Cotton Textile Agreement, which we negotiated nearly 40 years ago, is now in its eighth reincarnation and will continue well into the now new century. Still, we got it. And we got as well the series of trade rounds in the GATT about which Senator GRASSLEY has spoken. Finally, the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, which authorized our participation in the World Trade Organization, was enacted in 1994.

I make the point that in establishing the WTO, we were only getting back to where we were in the immediate aftermath of World War II when, at Bretton Woods in New Hampshire, the British-American-Chinese-French negotiators thought of how to establish a world which would not have the profound instability of the 1930s, and they envisioned three institutions: One, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which we call the World Bank, headquartered here; the International Monetary Fund, to deal with monetary fluctuations, which we established here; and an international trade organization, which was to be headquartered in Havana—I acknowledge that that died in the Senate Finance Committee.

So we established, on an ad hoc basis, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Eric Wyndham White, a British Treasury official, with three or four assistants, managed these negotiations in Geneva which would take place periodically. In time, we got back to the World Trade Organization.

This moved so well. But suddenly we find ourselves anxious about proceeding in a policy direction that has been so profoundly successful for two-thirds of a century—66 years, since Congress enacted the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program.

We recognize the extraordinary results of the Smoot-Hawley tariff. It is a point not often noted that there has not been a tariff bill on the Senate floor since 1930. We tried that and it did not work. I think it is fair to say that the dynamics of horse-trading—I will do this for your product; you do this for mine—are not suited to a world in which trade is so important today.

Indeed, also the 19th century tariff legislation was hugely acrimonious and at times divisive. I think the division between North and South had something to do with the tariffs imposed in the early part of the 19th century.

As the Senator from Iowa has said, if you would make a short list of five events that led to the Second World War, and the horror associated with that war, the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930 would be one of them.

Tariffs were increased to unprecedented levels in the United States—by 60 percent. Incidentally, they are still the legal, official tariffs. It is only through trade agreements that we have negotiated reciprocal reductions.

As predicted, imports dropped by two-thirds, in value terms. And all the simple-minded persons who said, if we do not let any foreign products come in, then our producers will prosper, what they did not know is that exports would drop by two-thirds, and the depression settled in.

The stock market crash of 1929 would have worked itself out. It was a matter of a crisis on paper. Factories did not close. Factories began to close when there was no market for their products, much of which had been going overseas.

The result was ruinous overseas. The British abandoned free trade, which had made them the principal economic power of the 19th century. They had to fight it a very long time, and much later than we think, when they abolished the so-called corn laws, which kept the price of wheat high enough to maintain the economic viability of the large land area of the state and not let that Iowa wheat get into Liverpool. The minute they did, they became an industrial power, and their farms did not disappear either.

As a matter of fact, Britain is self-sufficient in agriculture today. But it was free trade that gave them the advantage in the world. And they kept it right up until the Smoot-Hawley tariff, after which they adopted commonwealth preferences.

The Japanese began the Greater East Asian Co-Prosperty Sphere. And, sir, in 1933, with unemployment at 33 percent, Adolph Hitler was elected Chancellor of Germany. That is what you get when you do things like this.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934—Cordell Hull's innovation of President Roosevelt's initiative—got us back on track. For more than half a century, from one administration to another, without exception, there we have stayed. It had looked like we were going to stray. But here we are, moving again in the context—I daresay, the shadow—of the decision on China coming within the next 2 or 3 weeks.

With the African trade bill—the African Growth and Opportunity Act—for the first time, the United States is, with this legislation, putting in place a trade policy with respect to sub-Saharan Africa, a policy that is long overdue.

The economic challenges facing that region may be even greater than they were at the height of the cold war.

There has been a decline of institutions on a massive scale.

Consider the differing paths of South Korea and Ghana. In 1958, the year after Ghana achieved independence, its per capita gross national product was \$203; South Korea's was lower. South Korea per capita GNP at that time was \$171.

Forty years later, in 1998, South Korea's per capita income has soared to \$10,550—even after the financial crisis of Asia a few years back—while Ghana's has stood at a modest, an impoverished, \$390.

According to the most recent World Bank data, the average per capita GNP for sub-Saharan Africa was \$513 in 1998, or \$316 if South Africa is excluded. These countries simply do not pose competitive threats to us. They are, if anything, a source of concern for economic aid, peacekeeping forces, and the like.

The legislation we have before us, which we will pass overwhelmingly after we hear some arguments that are all too familiar, is intended to assist sub-Saharan Africa to develop one of the basic building block industries of economic development, which is textile and apparel production.

It offers duty-free, quota-free treatment to certain categories of apparel—principally those that are made with American fabric that is itself made, indeed, with American yarn.

There is some allowance for so-called regional fabric; that is, fabric made in sub-Saharan Africa. But the benefits are subject to a very tight cap, beginning at 1.5 percent of total U.S. imports and growing over the life of the bill to only 3.5 percent of total imports.

For a transition period of 4 years, the less developed of the sub-Saharan African countries may use third country fabric as they ramp up their own production capacity.

But we should put this in some perspective. In 1999, domestic production of apparel and certain fabricated textile products such as home furnishings—but not fabrics and yarns—in the United States topped \$81 billion.

That same year, U.S. imports of apparel from sub-Saharan Africa were valued at \$584 million—that is to say, 0.7 percent of domestic production and just 1.1 percent of total apparel imports.

Should imports from sub-Saharan Africa grow to 3.5 percent of the total U.S. imports—the maximum quantity allowed for regional fabric under the bill—they will barely register in a market this size.

The African trade legislation in this package will not reverse years of neglect and decline, but it may provide a decent start.

Just a final word on the enhanced Caribbean Basin Initiative, the Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act. As I mentioned, it was begun in 1983 under

President Reagan, and which the Senate Finance Committee added to this bill, and the House accepted it. The House was very open in this matter. I remarked earlier how the North American free trade area has eroded the market positions of Central America and the Caribbean islands.

Senator ROTH and I met last fall, in September of 1999, with the Presidents and Vice Presidents and Foreign Ministers of a number of the Caribbean and Central American states—the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Trinidad and Tobago, and Costa Rica. They made a simple request. They said: Look, we are here before you as democratically elected or appointed members of stable democratic governments. We are not here asking for aid. But the unanticipated effects of NAFTA have put us at a great disadvantage. All we want to do is trade with you. And that is what our provisions would allow. This is trade both ways, and again, in American textiles.

The provisions in the bill will help our producers structure their production in this hemisphere so that they will be in a position to compete with Asian producers when—as I mentioned earlier, after more than 40 years—textile and apparel quotas will be eliminated by January of 2005, as agreed in the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing.

If we don't have a trade infrastructure going with Central America and the Caribbean, we will all be overwhelmed by Asian production; and we can do it simply by passing this legislation—or we think we can do it, and we have not been wrong in our understanding of these matters.

I have a brief note about the problem of fine wool fabrics. After months of negotiation, and with great good faith on the part of all interested Senators and industry representatives, we have finally reached agreement on a measure that will begin to address this problem—again, the unanticipated consequence of free trade with Canada and the fact that we have exorbitant tariffs still in place.

Senators DURBIN, SCHUMER, GRAMM, HAGEL, MIKULSKI, SPECTER, NICKLES, FITZGERALD, SANTORUM, and THOMPSON joined me in sponsoring a very modest measure, and we are very happy with the outcome of the effort to provide some relief for our suitmakers.

The conference agreement begins to address this problem. It will also begin a data collection process that will give us a better database on this industry in the near future. It is not a perfect solution, and it does not permanently fix the problem, but it is a start. So I strongly support the conference agreement. I signed the papers. We had a long 5-month negotiation. These are exhausting efforts. They tend to exhaust our staffs more than we because we go home at midnight and they stay until daybreak. But we have done it.

Just to repeat what my friend from Iowa has said, this is important—if modest—legislation. A good debate, a strong vote on this conference report will surely set a positive tone for permanent normal trade relations with China. That debate will engage us in the very near future. We have a wonderful beginning. This morning, we voted 90-6 to take up this conference agreement, and I hope that reverberates into the other Chamber. I can speak for the Finance Committee. The China permanent normal trade relations—just normal trade relations—will pass the Senate Finance Committee and will pass the Senate floor, but we need to send a signal to the other Chamber that we are ready. We hope they are willing. Sixty-six years of American trade policy is in the balance. So let's begin this debate and conclude it on the same resounding support that we commenced this morning.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California follow me. She has a very lengthy statement.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may take 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

#### CAPITOL HILL POLICE FACE A FORCE REDUCTION

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, the Hill just came out today, and the headline is "Capitol Police face loss of 400 in 2001 budget cut."

The U.S. Capitol Police force would be reduced by more than 400 officers under a bill approved Tuesday by the House Appropriations Committee.

And then later on there is a quote from John Lucas, chairman of the U.S. Capitol Police Labor Committee. He says:

This budget cut comes on the heels of promises to improve Capitol security for members, staff, visitors and the officers who protect this wonderful institution.

"Where is the passion of yesterday's promises? What happened to the commitments to the officers who protect you and to their survivors?" he continued, in an attempt to invoke the concern expressed by Congress shortly after the 1998 shootings.

That was, of course, Officer Chestnut and Agent Gibson. Today, at 3:30, there will be an appointment of a new police chief. What a way for the new police chief to be sworn in.

I spoke to our Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Ziglar, about this. Senator BENNETT, Senator FEINSTEIN, with key positions, care deeply about this issue. I find this to be, in the years I have been in the

Senate, one of the most unconscionable decisions that has ever been made.

I just for the life of me don't get it, albeit I have my own emotion on this question, and I have spoken on the floor many times.

In July, almost 2 years ago, we lost two police officers. We said we were going to do everything we could to make sure it would never happen again, albeit it could never be 100-percent certain. One of the things we certainly were going to make sure of was that there were two officers at every one of these posts, because if one deranged person shows up—especially if 20 or 30 people are coming through the door. Senator GRASSLEY is my neighbor over at the Hart Building. This happens at the Hart Building sometimes in the middle of the day. This is just simply unacceptable.

I am telling you that there is an unbelievable amount of bitterness right now in the police force over what is happening with this vote. They have been making the requests. They have been begging. They have been pleading. I think very soon we will start to at least get to the point where we have two police officers at these posts because people are coming in and then one deranged person might show up sometime. That is all you need. Then, God knows what will happen.

In order to get there, there are one or two things that have to happen: More money has to go into overtime; the slack could be taken up that way; or more officers have to be hired.

Now we have a headline that they are going to cut 400.

This could be one of these sorts of inside games where the House says to the Senate: Look, we need to do this to show—whatever. I don't know what they are trying to show, frankly. Then you will put it back in. You save us on the Senate side.

I will tell you something. Maybe it is my background in community organizing, but my hope is that they get to decide for themselves. This is a union. My hope is that the Capitol Hill Police Union will hold a press conference. I hope they are there in numbers. I hope they make it crystal clear to people who voted for these cuts that they are not going to let you play around with their lives: We are not going to let you profess such concern for us and our families and then put us in a position where we not only cannot protect the public but we cannot really protect ourselves, which is absolutely outrageous.

I do no damage to the truth when I say this on the floor of the Senate. As a matter of fact, I initially made the mistake, I say to the Senator from California, of listing some of the door posts. I was then told by the police to not do that because they worry that you then create a security risk. So I don't do that anymore. But I can tell

you that I observe it all the time. This House vote is just so damaging to people's morale. It is not right. It is going to create a dangerous situation. It is already not a good situation. But we are going to see a lot of people leave this police force. We are. They are going to join D.C. police, or go wherever; they are going to leave.

Hopefully, in the Senate we can be there and inject some sanity into this appropriations process.

But I will tell you one thing. I think this union and these police officers should take on this vote. They have been patient. They have been patient.

I think this is just absolutely unconscionable.

Two years ago, we went through hell. There was such emotion. We made this commitment. What a short memory. What a short memory.

#### TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I now turn my attention to this bill. I thank both the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from New York, two exceptional Senators.

I am going to divide my remarks into two parts. We have some other Senators, Senators FEINGOLD and FEINSTEIN, who are going to talk at great length about what happened in the conference committee. I am going to speak to that briefly. I shall not take a lot of time. But I say to both Senators that I will be pleased to come back later on this afternoon, if you need me, because I think we need to put a focus on what happened.

I am in some disagreement with both my colleagues for, I hope, substantive reasons, which I will go into in a moment on the overall bill. It is not because of either one of the Senators on the floor managing this bill. But we had an amendment—Feinstein-Feingold, Feingold-Feinstein; I don't know the order. It doesn't matter; they are together—regarding the HIV/AIDS drugs in Africa. We will go into the specifics of the purpose of this amendment in a moment. But the purpose was to figure out a way that these countries could afford the combination of drugs that could help treat this illness so people wouldn't die.

I strongly support the amendment my colleagues introduced. The amendment was accepted by the bill's managers, Senators ROTH and MOYNIHAN. It was simple. It basically prohibited the U.S. Government—history is not very inspiring, frankly—or any agent of the U.S. Government from pressuring African countries to revoke or change laws aimed at increasing access to HIV/AIDS drugs so long as the laws in question passed by these countries adhered to existing international law and international standards.