PRESIDENT'S EXPORT COUNCIL

Room 628 Dirksen Senate Office Building Washington, DC

Thursday, June 7, 2007

The meeting was convened, pursuant to notice, at 3:09 p.m., MR. J.W. MARRIOTT, JR., Chairman, presiding.

PRIVATE SECTOR

MR. J.W. MARRIOTT, JR.
Chairman and CEO
Marriott International, Inc.
Chairman, President's Export Council

MS. BETTY MANETTA President and Chief Executive Officer Argent Industries

MR. JAMES MORGAN Chairman Applied Metals MR. ARNOLD DONALD Retired Chairman and Chief Executive Officer Merisant Company

MS. CECILIA OCHOA LEVINE President MFI International Manufacturing, LLC

MS. SHARON ALLEN Chairman Deloitte & Touche

MR. JOHN S. CHEN Chairman and CEO Sybase, Inc.

MR. JAMES F. DICKE, II Chairman and CEO Crown Equipment Corporation

MR. PRAKASH PURAM President and CEO iXmatch Inc.

MR. TIMOTHY P. SMUCKER Chairman and CEO The J.M. Smucker Company

MR. SEAN HEALEY President and CEO Affiliated Managers Group, Inc.

MR. LEE STYSLINGER, III President and CEO Altec, Inc.

MR. JUAN CARLOS ITURREGUI President Foundation for Inter American Development

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

THE HONORABLE SHERROD BROWN A United States Senator from the State of Michigan

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

THE HONORABLE CARLOS M. GUTIERREZ Secretary of Commerce

THE HONORABLE HENRY M. PAULSON, JR. Secretary of Treasury

THE HONORABLE ELAINE CHAO Secretary of Labor

THE HONORABLE AL HUBBARD
Assistant to the President for Economic
Policy and Director of the
National Economic Council

THE HONORABLE KARAN K. BHATIA Deputy U.S. Trade Representative

THE HONORABLE JAMES LAMBRIGHT Chairman and President Export-Import Bank of the United States

THE HONORABLE FRANKLIN L. LAVIN Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade

THE HONORABLE STEVEN PRESTON Small Business Administration

I N D E X

	<u>PAGE</u>
AGENDA ITEM	
MEETING CALLED TO ORDER Mr. J.W. Marriott, Jr., Chairman	6
REMARKS The Honorable Carlos M. Gutierrez, Secretary of Commerce	8
REMARKS ON TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY AND FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS The Honorable Karan K. Bhatia,	
Deputy U.S. Trade Representative	17
REMARKS The Honorable Elaine L. Chao, Secretary of Labor	26
REMARKS ON U.SINDIA TRADE The Honorable Franklin L. Lavin, Under Secretary of Commerce for	
International Trade	29
DISCUSSION ON TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY	36
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADE PROMOTION AND NEGOTIATIONS REPORT Mr. Prakash Puram, Member of the Subcommittee	
Presentation of Proposed Letter on <u>U.SIndia Trade</u>	47
DISCUSSION ON U.SINDIA TRADE LETTER	52
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY AND COMPETITIVENESS REPORT	
Ms. Betty Manetta, Subcommittee Chairman .	54
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SERVICES REPORT Ms. Sharon Allen, Member of the Subcommittee Presentation of Proposed Letter on	
<u>Capital Markets</u>	55
DISCUSSION ON CAPITAL MARKETS LETTER	59

REMARKS ON U.SCHINA RELATIONS AND THE STRATEGIC ECONOMIC DIALOGUE	
The Honorable Henry M. Paulson, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury	66
DISCUSSION ON CHINA	70
A D.TOTIRM	77

1

PROCEEDINGS

2

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER By Mr. J.W. Marriott, Jr., Chairman

3

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Good afternoon,

5

everybody. Welcome to the summer meeting of the

6

President's Export Council. I am Bill Marriott, and I

7

would like to officially call the meeting to order.

8

Today we continue the discussion on a number of issues

9

we've talked about during the past year.

10

and want to mention the two issues we've discussed

11

recently: trade promotion authority and immigration are

Mr. Secretary, we're pleased to have you here

1213

something we're all talking about today, and we're

14

looking forward to hearing from you on these issues.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Additionally, in January we discussed the pending letter on the U.S.-India trade, and today the Subcommittee on Trade Promotion and Negotiations will present such a letter. I'm pleased that Ambassador Karan Bhatia, Deputy U.S. Trade Representative, and Under Secretary Frank Lavin have joined us to discuss trade with India, as well as to add to the discussion on trade promotion authority.

Finally, the Council continues to be interested in China. Secretary Paulson will be joining us later to discuss the U.S.-China Strategic Economic

Dialogue which took place last month.

As always, we are joined by Secretary of Commerce Charles Gutierrez. It's a real honor to welcome you, Mr. Secretary, and I'll turn it over to you.

REMARKS

By Honorable Carlos M. Gutierrez, Secretary of Commerce SECRETARY GUTIERREZ: Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your leadership, and everyone else on the President's Export Council. I appreciate your advice, your guidance, the amount of time and the commitment that you have to this body and to this goal. So, thank you again for your service.

I would like to recognize my colleague,

Secretary Chao, and welcome her. I also would like to

welcome new members to the Council: Senators Sherrod

Brown, who's with us today. Welcome, Senator.

SENATOR BROWN: Nice to be here. Thank you.

SECRETARY GUTIERREZ: Senators Byron Dorgan
and Debbie Stabenow will not be here, but they have
joined, and will join the Council meetings in the
future.

And then we'll have other members who will be announced at some other point. I'm not sure that Robin Hayes or Jay Inslee will be here with us today, or David Wu, but we'll see if they join us. But, anyway, we have some new members. Again, welcome.

Before getting started with just some comments I have, I thought I'd start out with some results and

some numbers. This is an Export Council, so it's good to talk about exports and how they're doing.

We're going to announce April trade numbers, I believe, on Friday, so we'll have some fresh numbers to talk about. What I have here is just the first quarter of 2007 versus the first quarter of 2006: exports up 9.8 percent. It's a strong number, especially on top of what was a over 12 percent growth in 2006. So we're starting the year off with strong growth over the same period of last year.

Interestingly, imports were up the first quarter of this year versus first quarter of last year 4.2 percent, so our export growth rate doubled the rate of growth of our imports, which is a great trend.

The focus is on exports. What we said, is our strategy is about increasing exports, continuing to open up markets, and focus on that line as opposed to strategically focusing on restricting imports. That's been sort of the way we've thought about this. So exports: 9.8, 4.2, and that's March. We'll have new numbers on Friday, and I look forward to discussing those.

I've got three topics that I wanted to talk about. I know Karan Bhatia is going to talk about TPA and some of the pending free trade agreements that we

have, so I'll let Karan cover that.

I thought I'd just bring you up to date on immigration, which is a topic that is actually being debated right now as we speak on the floor. I think it impacts all of us: it impacts exporters, it impacts the economy. I won't get into the details of the bill, and I know you'll thank me for that. (Laughter)

But just to say that there are three goals that we will achieve with this legislation, three very important goals, and three goals that we have to get at now. We can't assume that we can get at this problem in the future because it's getting worse every day, and we have a very dysfunctional system and a very broken system.

The first goal is national security. We will be more secure with comprehensive immigration reform. We will know who is crossing our border, we will know who is being hired. You will be able to know if you're hiring someone who's here legally. We'll be able to know who's in the country, who's working in the country, who's here, who shouldn't be here.

So from a national security standpoint, a very important step forward. From an economic standpoint, we cannot continue to grow without immigration, and that is one of the realizations that, the quicker we

come to as a country, the better off we'll be.

We've talked before about how just about every developed economy in the world has a demographic challenge, and will have demographic challenges in the future. How they address it will make a big difference as to how they perform.

We're talking about Germany, France, Spain,
Italy, Japan, Australia, Canada, the U.K., Russia.
Unless they embrace immigration, they're going to have a tough time growing their workforce, and if they can't grow their workforce they can't grow their economy.

So if we do this right, this can be a tremendous competitive advantage for our country. We should be able to do it right, given that we've been doing it for 230 years. You think about countries like France, Germany and Japan, and they haven't had as much experience as we have. So, it should be a tremendous advantage for us, and that's one of the many reasons why I'm so committed and so passionate about immigration reform.

The third goal, of course, is social stability. We have a system that doesn't work, is very dysfunctional. We've got people crossing the border in the dark of night in the desert, risking their lives.

We have 12 million people living in the shadows. We

have children being born in the U.S. to illegal parents, which makes the child a U.S. citizen.

As we continue to enforce the law, there will be raids on companies. We've had examples where by the kids come home from school and their parents happen to have been deported. That's not the kind of society we want, it's not what we want to be. So, there's a lot at stake here, and I appreciate your support.

I wanted to talk about the countervailing duty. You probably heard that for the first time ever we applied an anti-subsidy duty on China, and it's the first time we've ever done it to a non-market economy.

The theory has been that a non-market economy--think about the Soviet Union and countries in the Soviet bloc--that would receive subsidies, but they really wouldn't change their behavior because of the subsidies. They wouldn't change their price because they're not competing in the sense that we're competing.

We think that China has graduated to the point whereby, when they do get a subsidy they do change their behavior, so in the event of getting a subsidy from the government, we think that that does impact their pricing strategy. So because of that, we decided to go ahead and apply that. You can imagine, it's been

a bit of a controversial decision.

We believe it's the right way to go, and we will continue to do it to the extent that we've got the information, that we've got the petitions, and that we believe that China is applying unfair subsidies.

In this case, it was for coated sheet paper. The subsides that we've calculated so far--and these are preliminary--range from about 10.9 to 20.3. Again, the rationale here is that we believe that China, as a non-market economy--even though they are a non-market economy--that they do change their behavior when they receive government subsidies. That's the whole rationale.

We're going to continuously look at this and we're going to continue to enforce U.S. trade laws with respect to China and any other country. We are also conducting CVD investigations covering imports of paper from Indonesia and South Korea. This is all going through a process. We will also apply an antidumping duty to China for this coated paper.

The challenge here—and I'm sure that they'll be watching this very closely—is that we not double count dumping and subsidies. We're working through the numbers to ensure that we don't do that. But again, we believe that we are right to proceed in this fashion.

The third point is, on Monday we start our Americas Competitiveness Forum in Atlanta, Georgia. This is the first time that this is being done. There was actually an agreement that was reached between President Bush and leaders of the hemisphere at the last meeting of the Americas in Argentina.

We are expecting about 500 to 600 participants coming from 30 countries in the western hemisphere, so this is a widely attended event. We're going to have public sector officials, private sector officials. We've got the gamut, everyone from Brazil, to Nicaragua, to Colombia, to Mexico, to Ecuador. It's going to be a very broad group.

The whole idea is that many of these countries are competing with Asia. They're not really competing with the U.S., and in many ways we complement each other and we have supply chains that can be complementary.

So we're going to be talking about best practices, how companies in the region have been successful, how they have done it, and talk about ways to be able to improve the competitiveness of the hemisphere. So it's going to be a great meeting. I'm sure you've all received invitations, but we'd love to have you there.

It's going to be a great audience and a great discussion, and hopefully we'll walk out of there with a sense that, truly, we need to, as a region, get more competitive and work together to achieve that competitiveness. That will be good for every single country in the hemisphere, obviously including the U.S.

So, again, thank you for being here. Thank you for your leadership. Thank you for your continued service.

I'm going to pass it on to Karan Bhatia, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Secretary Chao?

SECRETARY CHAO: I think it makes more sense for Ambassador Bhatia to speak first, and I will speak after him.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Let me introduce him.

Almost every meeting we have, we've talked about China. But now we are talking about India as well. Two of the key players in this engagement are the U.S. Trade Representative and the Department of Commerce, and they're both here to report on their efforts with India.

I'd like to introduce Ambassador Karan Bhatia, the Deputy U.S. Trade Representative to discuss trade promotion authority and the pending free trade

agreements, as well as the Trade Representative's efforts concerning India.

Briefly, as USTR, Ambassador Bhatia's portfolio includes overseeing U.S. trade relations with South and East Asia and Africa. His responsibilities also include supervising USTR's functional offices, handling environmental, labor, and pharmaceutical issues.

Karan, we're delighted to have you here.

REMARKS ON TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

AND FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

By Hon. Karan K. Bhatia,

Deputy U.S. Trade Representative

AMBASSADOR BHATIA: Great. Thank you very much, Bill.

Mr. Secretary, Madam Secretary, thank you for all of the many contributions that you make to the trade agenda, as well as so many other things.

Let me thank the members of the PEC for being here, and express Ambassador Schwab's regrets at not being able to join you in person. I know she was at the last PEC meeting and would very much like to be here.

She is actually, at this moment, in Russia accompanying the President at the G-8 meeting and endeavoring mightily to push for a successful Doha Round outcome, and I know sends her best regards and her welcome to the new members of the PEC. Senator Brown, thank you for joining as well.

Let me just try and cover a fair amount of material in a relatively short period of time, touch on a few things: first of all, again, the core elements of the trade agenda, as we see it going forward; a very brief synopsis of what we think the recent results of

the trade agenda have been; and then a few moments about the importance of TPA and the FTAs; and then finally, just briefly, touch on India, knowing that Secretary Lavin will also touch on the India issues.

I think Ambassador Schwab, when she was last here, emphasized three key elements of the trade agenda going forward. First of all, multilateral liberalization, the strengthening of the WTO system, and in particular, core to that effort, a successful Doha Round. We remain very much engaged in that effort.

Ambassador Schwab has been working very closely with many trading partners, but in particular with the so-called G-4 countries, the EU, India and Brazil, to seek convergence around a high-level, ambitious, market-opening, multilateral trade liberalizing round.

Suffice it to say that there has been a tremendous amount of effort, I think, not only on the part of the United States, but on the part of many of our trading partners to obtain a breakthrough that would make a successful Doha, come this year, realizable. I don't think we are there yet.

Ambassador Schwab has, in meetings scheduled for this week and upcoming later this month, deployed

the full resources of the U.S. Trade Representative's office, as well as receiving great support for many other parts of the U.S. Government and other departments in seeking to create a convergence around core sectors.

In particular, there's a very strong focus, continues to be a very strong focus, on agricultural trade liberalization, recognizing that it is the door through which we must pass to obtain liberalization in a lot of the other key sectors. But Doha remains a very strong priority for both the U.S. Trade Representative's office and for the administration at large in the trade area.

Secondly, let me mention the free trade agreements and other bilateral and regional trade liberalizing efforts. The record here that I think the administration has to offer over the past six years is, we're proud to say, a strong one. We have implemented trade agreements with 11 new partners since 2001, with six more FTA partners pending either implementation or congressional approval.

The results of these agreements have been outstanding. U.S. exports to Chile are up 150 percent; to Singapore, up 49 percent; to Australia, 25 percent. That is, of course, just to name a few.

Overall, U.S. exports to FTA partners are growing twice as fast, on average, as are our exports to the rest of the world. And while FTA countries make up only 7 percent of non-U.S. global GDP, they purchase approximately 42 percent of our exports. With our new FTA partners since 2001, it bears noting that we ran a \$13 billion trade surplus in 2006.

The point being, our FTAs, I think, have been demonstrated to sort of not only the lower tariff, but also non-tariff barriers in ways that meaningfully level the playing field and allow our companies, our workers to access fast-growing markets around the world. It has been a success and it's a success that we need to continue. I'll touch, in a moment, on a necessary prerequisite for that, and that would be an extension of Trade Promotion Authority.

But let me touch, briefly, also on the third prong of our trade agenda, and that would be enforcement. Secretary Gutierrez has touched on the use of domestic trade remedies. Let me talk about something more in USTR's bailiwick, and that's the use of WTO or international dispute settlement to address failures on the part of our trading partners to live up to their international commitments.

There are also bilateral enforcement

mechanisms that are used as well. But this remains a very, very high priority of the administration to ensure that our trading partners live up to their commitments.

To that end, let me just simply note five cases that we've filed in the last eight months or so: four against China having to do with, first of all, tax and tariff barriers applicable to auto parts which we feel unfairly discriminate against U.S. exports; secondly, subsidies, illegal, WTO-prohibited subsidies that are employed that provide benefit or incentives to Chinese companies or to foreign companies in China to export as opposed to opening their market on a more level basis.

Third, intellectual property rights. We have, notwithstanding assiduous efforts by many parts of the U.S. Government to work with China to address IPR enforcement, we continue to be troubled by developments there, and ultimately in the last several months filed a WTO complaint on that front.

Lastly, market access issues with respect to a number of copyright-intensive industries, basically our concern that China has not fully honored its obligations to open its market in that area.

Just last week, we filed a case against India.

We sought the formation of a WTO panel against India with respect to its practices on taxes applicable to alcohol and wines and spirits.

So, we remain very focused on using the full array of enforcement mechanisms to make sure that obligations that our foreign trading partners have to us and to our businesses are, in fact, honored and enforced.

Finally, let me just turn to this issue of trade promotion authority and the pending agenda before Congress. As you all may know, Trade Promotion Authority expires at the end of June of this year. This is formerly known as fast track authority, the key authority that permits the U.S. Trade Representative's office, supported by many other parts of the U.S. Government and working closely with our Congress, to negotiate effectively with our trading partners.

We believe an extension of TPA is going to be critically important to a successful conclusion of the multilateral round. But beyond that, it is critically important to allow us to negotiate effectively with our trading partners on a bilateral and regional basis as well.

When you only look at what's going on in Asia today, as an example, where one sees a plethora of

bilateral trade agreements springing up between China and regional partners, between Japan and regional partners, that effectively places our companies at a disadvantage because they do afford trade preferences to companies within those trading relationships.

And for us not to be able to go out and negotiate on behalf of America's companies, on behalf of America's workers, not to be able to negotiate agreements that allow us to lower their tariffs, I think, would be to all of our detriment, and certainly would place us in a very difficult position going forward. So, we would urge that we continue to work with the PEC, and obviously with the Congress, to see an extension of TPA going forward.

The four free trade agreements that I referenced before with Panama, Peru, Colombia and South Korea will be before Congress. Two of those agreements have already been signed; Panama and Korea will need to be signed by the end of this month.

We feel very encouraged by recent developments in terms of securing a new bipartisan consensus for trade with agreement on a template for labor and the environment that we are working with our trading partners on, and we'll work with them on in the period leading up to submission to Congress.

So we considered passage of these FTAs to be critically important, not only from an economic perspective, but also in terms of the strategic and geopolitical importance that these relationships represent. Again, that's an area we look forward to working with the PEC on.

Finally, India has been an important area of focus for the Trade Representative's office, working in close partnership with other agencies. I see Deputy Under Secretary Terpstra from USDA who's been a key player in this, and obviously the Commerce Department, and we work very, very closely on this.

I'll let Secretary Lavin talk at great length, obviously, about this, but suffice it to say that India is one of our most exciting trading partners today. We see fantastic growth in the market.

Two years ago, or a year and a half ago, thenTrade Representative Portman talked about the goal of
doubling bilateral trade within three years with India.
I think we're on path to accomplish that.

In part, that's due to the tremendous opportunities that have been bred by India opening unilaterally, and in part it's been due to a lot of hard work on the part of government agencies trying to break down barriers. We're looking to continue to do

that, and have been doing it through a series of government-to-government dialogues. We appreciate the PEC's efforts in terms of the letter that you have crafted here, which we are strongly supportive of.

With that, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Thank you, Karan.

I'd like to take the opportunity now to hear from Secretary Chao. We're thrilled to have you here. Thank you.

<u>REMARKS</u>

By Hon. Elaine L. Chao, Secretary of Labor

SECRETARY CHAO: First of all, welcome. Also,

I want to thank Senator Sherrod Brown for being here as
well. I know it's your first meeting, Senator.

Welcome.

I wanted to bring to your attention a government program that you'll be hearing a lot of in the coming months, because it will be coming up for reauthorization in September of 2007.

It's a program that's called Trade Adjustment Assistance, or TAA. This program is run by the Department of Labor and it basically helps individuals who have become unemployed as a result of competition from foreign trade, either from, 1) a shift in production to a country with which the U.S. has a free trade agreement with, or 2) an increase in imports of like or similar articles.

The program costs approximately \$1 billion a year. This is on top of the \$9.5 billion that the Department of Labor alone spends annually on workforce training. The Department has proposed a number of changes to this Trade Adjustment Assistance program to increase its relevance and effectiveness. And again, you might be hearing more about it, so I just wanted to

bring it to your attention.

As the program is currently designed, training options are limited and may not be what workers want. It's kind of like an HMO option. Access to these training options is rather bureaucratic, and as currently designed, TAA is an all-or-nothing program. It requires a worker to give up all benefits if he or she returns to work, even if it's at a lower paying job, or even if it's a job that doesn't provide health care. The program really creates a disincentive for a worker to accept new employment.

So the Department will be working along with the rest of the administration and the Congress to introduce some reform efforts, and we hope that these reform efforts will incorporate transitional benefits, it will create better access to education and training through portable accounts, provide access to training prior to layoff. As of now, we spend a great deal of money on training, but a great deal of these financial resources are not available to workers until they're laid off.

Nowadays, we hear from large companies two or three years in advance of their layoff plans, so we want to be able to use these funds to help transition workers before they are laid off to help them access

training to get new jobs in high-growth industries

Lastly, the administration's proposal will also attempt to reduce program duplication. So again, as we talk about all of these issues, you might be hearing more about TAA reform also, and I just wanted to make you aware of it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. Okay.

I'd like, now, to call on our executive director, Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, Frank Lavin, to discuss Department of Commerce efforts about India.

REMARKS ON U.S.-INDIA TRADE

By Hon. Franklin L. Lavin,

Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade

SECRETARY LAVIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, Madam Secretary, Senator, Ambassador Bhatia, members of the PEC, I am glad to join with you today to review India, which has been a central theme of our discussion today and I commend Prakash and his subcommittee for their leadership in structuring a letter that is going to be presented today.

But I want to try to put in context from our Department perspective some of the issues as we see them, and some of the projects we have under way to try to grapple with the opportunities and the challenges in India.

As a first principle, I think it is worth noting, although our mission is on the commercial side of the relationship, that we are at a moment in which the overall political relationship is moving ahead very nicely. There's warmth on both sides, and I think we saw a culmination last year with President Bush's visit to Delhi and the initiative.

On the economics side, you've got two sheets of paper coming around. One talks about the bilateral relationship and one puts it in a broader context. I

think that gives you a sense of sort of the good news, if you will, and the challenges.

If you look at the sheet of paper that has the pure bilateral activity—I'll hold it up just to make sure you get a look at that—you can see the numbers are pretty impressive: 26 percent growth last year, 36 percent growth this year in terms of exports. So, a very nice rise in activity. We give you a sectoral breakout below that. So, that's a nice snapshot of the good news.

When you look at the other sheet of paper, you can see there are still substantial challenges ahead of us, that in terms of opportunity and how India stacks up against other major trading partners, there is enormous room for growth.

In our view, there are two central reasons for the fact that we're in the position we are right now: one is policy reasons, the other is promotional. By policy, I mean on the Indian side we see a number of barriers to commercial activity: caps on investment, financial services, intellectual property rights reasons, very high tariffs, regulatory barriers, a range of trade issues on the Indian side. Although, we have to say that these issues have been slowly addressed over the last 15 years, so the climate is

improving but barriers remain.

On the promotional side, we think there are also a lot of challenges. We try to emphasize what the United States can do in that regard. On a policy basis, our main policy tool for engagement is the commercial dialogue, a Commerce Department-led mechanism which allows us to connect with the Indian government on these particular set of issues.

So we have sectoral discussions, we bring in business leadership, we've engaged the Indian government, I think, pretty systematically. USTR has initiatives as well, and I commend them for the Trade Policy Forum, which I also think has been very effective.

We did see, just to give two examples, one sector and one more macro, in the last six months a relaxation on trade barriers, for example, for large-scale motorcycles, so that Harley-Davidsons can now be sold in India.

More broadly, we've seen a relaxation in tariffs, from 12.5 to 10 percent, which is one of the reasons why we're seeing this very nice double-digit growth in exports.

So there has been a shift in the policy environment. We think our policy engagement is

working. We also have a number of promotional activities under way as well.

I'll mention just four sectoral initiatives.

We have a major civilian nuclear power initiative under way where we're bringing our engineering, scientific, and commercial leadership in that sector to India to meet with our counterparts and the regulatory authorities in India pending full approval of the political process between our two countries.

We also have a military aircraft initiative under way. For the first time, U.S. manufacturers are competing for the large-scale MRCA (Multi-Roll Combat Aircraft) competition in India, which will be over a \$10 billion package.

Third, we have an alternative energy initiative under way. In India, alternative energy isn't simply an environmental initiative or a financial initiative, it's also recognizing the fact that there are millions of Indians who are not on any power grid, poor people in rural areas. So what we might consider alternative energy is simply energy access for millions.

Our fourth sectoral initiative in India is the educational sector, where we are running a television show in India to encourage Indian students to think

about attending U.S. colleges and universities. We're profiling Indian students here. As you might know, India represents the single largest source of foreign students in the United States. We believe this is an important export, as well as an important cultural/public diplomacy connectivity.

So we have four sectoral initiatives under way and we've had large-scale trade missions in India as well. Just as a reference point, when we announced a large-scale trade mission last year to India it was a pleasant surprise when that mission turned out to be the largest trade mission in the history of the U.S. Government, with something like 260 participants.

Well, we are trying to repeat a large-scale mission again this year. I think that reflects not just good work on the Indian side and our side, but it really reflects there's a hunger in the American business community for that connectivity in India.

So we have a number of promotional activities under way. We have a policy dialogue under way which we think is helpful, and we also, as Al Hubbard mentioned earlier, have the CEO Forum, which is a very useful mechanism that allows business leadership on both sides to explore some of these impediments to economic growth as well. I think if we keep on this

track, we are likely to see these numbers continue.

The question I put forward to our Indian colleagues -- in conclusion, I'll just put this on the table. We see a lot of good news in India. We see the whole society, the whole economy moving the right way.

But the question is, is this simply the Indian moment or does India have the political capacity to sustain these reforms over an extended period of time? They have some of the same political constraints and considerations that we've got. They've got to face the voters. They have a substantial agricultural base which isn't always supportive of some of these reforms.

So it requires leadership. It requires leadership in Washington to keep reform on track, it requires leadership in Delhi to keep it on track and to make sure that this good news we're seeing in India is able to sustain for a number of years and pull millions of Indians out of poverty and into middle class status.

That's just a general overview. I don't know if we have time later to go to questions, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Thank you, Frank. We want to thank you for your service. We understand you're going to be retiring in July and going back to the private sector. We appreciate the good work you've done, particularly here on the PEC, and your other

great responsibilities. So, let's have a round of applaud for Frank.

(Applause)

SECRETARY LAVIN: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is bittersweet to move on. We all move on in life. It doesn't mean we move on from our friendships and our relationships. I will tell you, one of the joys of my job is the chance to work with American businesses, small businesses and quite established firms.

But it is really exhilarating to talk with people who are inventing, who are creating, who are doing, who are trying to tackle problems, who are creating jobs and opportunity. It is an honor, I think, for those of us at the Department of Commerce to be able to get out there and support commerce. So, thank you for the opportunity to serve over these last few years.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Thank you very much.

DISCUSSION ON TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: We talked a little bit earlier about trade promotion authority, which is expiring at the end of June. The Council has sent a letter to the President requesting that the White House and Congress work together to extend TPA.

I'd like to open up the floor for a minute or two for some comments on TPA by any of you who would like to make some.

Tim?

MR. SMUCKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Also, I'd just like to say it's great to have a fellow Ohioan, Senator Brown, here.

As a producer of food products, in our export business we export to about 40 countries around the world. I'd just like to enter my support for the trade promotion authority and how important that is.

Also, in addition, I represent the Grocery
Manufacturers of America, as well as the Food Products
Association, where I serve on their boards. For both
of those, I would like to support the need for trade
promotion authority.

U.S. food and agriculture consumer product sectors are dependent upon export for continued growth and profitability. Trade barriers, both tariff and

non-tariff, lock our products out of many foreign markets. Free trade agreements, aided by TPA, will increase our ability to export and, importantly, benefit U.S. consumers through lower prices and greater choices.

Trade promotion authority will greatly support the President in his efforts to open markets and promote U.S. agricultural, food, and consumer products overseas, so I would urge Congress to grant the President's request and provide him with this critical negotiating tool.

Additionally, as has been stated already, the Doha negotiations present the best opportunity for U.S. business workers and consumers, and it's critical that the TPA be reauthorized to achieve the greatest benefit from these negotiations. U.S. leadership is critical to the success of the Doha Round, and the reauthorization will send, we think, the clearest message to the world.

I'll just add one little vignette. I was in Seoul, Korea just a couple of weeks ago. I checked into the hotel, and as I was checking in the lady saw my name. She said, "Gee, I want to tell you, Mr. Smucker, I grew up with Smuckers jams." It just shows that, around the world, clearly, it does make a

difference for free trade. 1 2 Thank you. CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Thank you very much. 3 Are there other comments or questions about 4 5 TPA? SENATOR BROWN: Mr. Chairman? 6 7 CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Senator? Yes, sir. SENATOR BROWN: Thank you. Thank you very 8 9 This is my first meeting, and I thank you very much for including me. James Dicke from Ohio, nice to 10 11 see you. And my old friend, Tim Smucker. I've been 12 through his plant a couple of times. It's the best 13 plant tour in the entire State. It smells the best. (Laughter) And after the event, they let you eat 14 15 strawberry preserves. It's pretty cool. Come to New Bremen. 16 MR. DICKE: SENATOR BROWN: Not that going through Crown 17 18 Equipment isn't a thrill either. (Laughter) MR. DICKE: It doesn't smell as good. 19 20 (Laughter) 21 SENATOR BROWN: Just a few comments about TPA, 22 and some of your comments, Ambassador Bhatia, and yours, Mr. Secretary, on trade generally. I think that 23 24 I understand the perspective that all of you have. I

25

think that it's a different day on trade in a lot of

ways in this country. If you look at the elections last fall, voters said something, I think, very strongly about wanting a different direction in trade. We all support increasing exports.

In my first term in the Congress 14 years ago,
I helped to get the U.S. Export Assistance Center in
Cleveland through the Department of Commerce and SBA
and all, and that has mattered for exports from our
State.

But I think when you look at every trade agreement we pass and you look at what's happened with the trade deficit -- in 1992 when I first was elected to the House we had a multilateral trade deficit of \$38 billion. Last year, depending on whether you count services or not, it was either \$700 some or \$800 some billion.

Our bilateral trade deficit with China went from low double digits to close to 20 times that over that same decade and a half. I think, while it's a good sign, the administration and the Democratic leadership in the House have come together, at least in a macro way, on environment and labor standards.

I think there are a lot of people that are still skeptical because we haven't seen the details, and we've also heard from Ambassador Schwab that we may

not have to open up Peru and Panama, we'll just do a side agreement.

The last time we did "just a side agreement" was NAFTA on labor and the environment, and I think we all agree, whether you like NAFTA or not, that the side agreements didn't really amount to very much.

The second note of skepticism, I think, that many members of both parties in the House and Senate have -- and understand, these trade agreements get harder and harder to pass every year because of opposition from both parties, and it's not just labor, it's religious groups, it's environmentalists, it's a lot of middle class families that have great anxiety about what happens with trade.

But we've seen, there was some sense of betrayal after the Jordan agreement, which I voted for, and many of us did, that had reasonably strong labor and environmental standards, and then there was a letter from Ambassador Schwab's predecessor two people back that we weren't going to enforce those labor standards in Jordan, and Jordan has become, by any measurement, a country of sweat shops as an export platform. That's troubling to a lot of us in Congress, and I think it's troubling in both parties.

So I think we need real assurance, whether

it's TPA, whether it's Panama, Peru, and later Colombia and South Korea, that labor standards and environmental standards are in the core agreement.

Those are our American values, good, strong environmental policy. We have differences at the margin, but most people in this country, there's a real consensus about general environmental policy and there's a consensus about labor standards, that unions be allowed to form, that people are paid a decent wage, that workers' standards, safety standards are generally at least moderate, if not stronger. Mr. Secretary, nice to see you.

And so I think that we need a pretty skeptical Congress, and frankly a way more skeptical public than the Congress, because the Congress got here way later than the public, on trade agreements and really want some assurance that labor standards are in the core agreement and assurance that the Bush administration or succeeding administrations will really enforce these standards. That's really my only comment, whether it's TPA, whether it's Peru and Panama, whether it's down the road on Colombia and South Korea.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SECRETARY GUTIERREZ: Thank you. I want to just build on that, if I may. I think we all agree

that labor standards and the environment are American values. I would just add to that that commerce, business, opening markets, and engaging is also a great American value.

I think our challenge is going to be dealing with the trade deficit, while keeping in mind that ultimately what really counts is unemployment, GDP growth, and inflation, and that we could make a serious dent on the trade deficit very quickly and do a lot of damage to our economy. I don't think anybody wants that.

So that ultimately will be the challenge. I would just caution, in a very objective way and all in the spirit of teamwork, that we cannot just lower the trade deficit in isolation and not expect that not to filter over and have an impact on employment, GDP, or inflation. That will be ultimately our challenge—not any party's challenge, but our challenge as Americans—to pull it off.

SENATOR BROWN: And I agree with that. I think all of us on both sides of the trade debate want trade, and want plenty of it. I fully concur about GDP growth. But as Secretary Paulson said, soon after assuming his position with the administration, said to our Banking Committee that GDP growth is not the only

number that counts, it is also what is happening to middle class families, what is happening to wages throughout the economy, not just profits, not just GDP growth. That's a pretty infractible problem that we're all wrestling with, to lift standards up for so many more in this country than we've seen in the last few months and years.

Thank you.

SECRETARY GUTIERREZ: Yes. But at some point we should go through numbers, because I think the numbers tell a story.

MS. MANETTA: Chairman Marriott?

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Yes?

MS. MANETTA: This is Betty Manetta. I just want to also echo a little bit what Mr. Smucker said, but from an Hispanic, women, minority, and SMOBs, it's important, the TPA, because we have to level this playing field. The subsidization is a major problem, not only controlling the means of production overseas, but now you control the whole supply chain, even into our country. So it becomes problematic for us to compete not only globally, but also locally.

So, you know, I think that while we continue to talk about how it impacts major corporations, it also impacts small businesses. I think that we need to

be cognizant of that if we're going to grow the economy the way we want to. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT:

Thank you, Betty.

particular job.

Any other comments on TPA? Yes, Cecilia?

MS. LEVINE: As a benefactor of a great

treaty, NAFTA, at this time it provides about a

1,250,000 jobs in Mexico. That really helps with the

immigration issues we have right now from Mexico. For

every job in the maquiladora industry or the

production-sharing industry, it is known that there are

three indirect jobs provided as a result of that

It also includes three to five jobs in the
United States as a result of those jobs in Mexico. So,
there are trade agreements that really impact our
Nation and neighboring nations, and immigration issues.
So, I am all for fair trade agreements that also
protect us from labor issues or any other unfair trade
issues.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Any other comments on TPA? Yes?

MR. PURAM: Mr. Chairman, the three points I

want to make are: TPA is going to be the tool going

forward for the United States to show leadership around

the world in economic areas, social areas, and even political areas. That is what the world is all about in the next 20, 30 years, probably into the future.

In regards to the trade deficit and the deterioration of the numbers, the key question to ask is, what would the trade deficit have been without TPA? That's a very stark point of analysis. I think the numbers bear that out very significantly.

The last issue we grapple with is our jobs and our situation domestically. Despite the IT sector moving to India and southward and various other areas, gravitating to China, our unemployment is, I think, at a record low of 4.2 percent compared to any other time in our history. So the numbers are very, very strong in support of the benefits of TPA.

Since 1978, I think every Democratic and Republican president has had TPA from a bipartisan standpoint. This is one area where we've come together, and I think we should strongly support the President's renewal for TPA.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Thank you very much.

Any other comments? Questions?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Okay. The Council has prepared a series of recommendations on the U.S.-India

trade. Before we open the floor for discussion, I'd like to call upon Prakash Puram, a member of our Subcommittee on Trade Promotion Negotiation, to present the Council's letter.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADE PROMOTION AND NEGOTIATIONS REPORT

By Prakash Puram, Member of the Subcommittee

Presentation of Proposed Letter on U.S.-India Trade

MR. PURAM: Chairman Marriott, Secretary

Gutierrez, distinguished guests, and members of the

President's Export Council, I thank you for the

opportunity to present the Trade Promotion and

Negotiations Subcommittee's letter on the U.S. economic relationship with India.

With a GDP of \$786 billion in 2005 and a growth rate in excess of 8 percent, the Indian market offers a tremendous opportunity for U.S. exporters and investors alike. With India's growing economy, U.S. exports to India increased by 26 percent in 2006 to \$10 billion.

With \$8.5 billion invested as FDI (foreign direct investment) the United States is currently the second largest foreign investor in India. The total volume of trade between India and the U.S. exceeded \$30 billion in 2006.

I am pleased to read to you a quote by U.S. Ambassador David Mulford, with which the President's Export Council fully agrees: "The United States and India are building the foundations of an historic partnership, and I'm convinced that no other

relationship will be more important in shaping the world in the 21st century. Our relationship with India is based on shared interests and shared values and touches a wide variety of areas.

India is rising even faster than many expected. Economic growth remains consistently strong. New U.S. investment is coursing in, and our growing trade partnership is expanding at a rate that should double our overall bilateral trade in the next three years."

Despite the growth in our commercial relationship, there are significant problems that discourage closer ties and preclude more rapid economic development in India. The proposed letter of recommendation to the President outlines some of the PEC's concerns over the slow pace of India's economic reforms.

In particular, the letter highlights issues such as India's higher tariffs than surrounding areas in neighboring countries or in the world in general, regulatory hurdles and weak intellectual property protections that hinder trade flows, and India's restrictions on foreign direct investment and the country's inadequate infrastructure development are also serious impediments to the competitiveness of

India's economy.

The PEC offers suggestions on reforms that would serve to hasten India's integration into the global economy and provide benefits to both Indian and U.S. exporters, as well as investors.

For example, the PEC recommends a two-step approach to the reduction of India's protective tariffs: first, ones that cause most harm to the consumers are very politically sensitive, and then to tackle the ones that are more politically sensitive and less harmful over a six- to nine-year period.

The PEC calls for the establishment of a sound intellectual property protection regime in India to safeguard the growth of the country's emerging pharmaceutical, banking, and information technology sectors.

It urges the removal of controls on foreign investment in certain sectors. The PEC also encourages the development of a bilateral infrastructure investment program to identify key priorities in the construction of roads, airports, port facilities, clean water supply, and power supplies.

These are all areas in which the U.S. private sector companies can bring to bear their expertise and financial resources to help deliver a higher standard

of living faster than would be otherwise possible.

Building on initiatives such as the U.S.-India Trade

Policy Forum, the CEO Forum, and the U.S.-India

Commercial Dialogue, the PEC requests the

administration focus particular attention on the U.S.
India economic relationship and promote reforms that

would remove barriers to bilateral trade and

investment.

The President's Export Council also notes that India should be encouraged to take a productive and responsible role in the WTO Doha Round negotiations.

On behalf of the subcommittee, I thank you for your attention and the focus of time and resources on India, and I submit the subcommittee's letter for discussion and adoption.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Thank you, Prakash.

I'd like to note that copies of the letter for consideration are in your binder today. They're posted online and are available outside of the room for the public.

I'd also like to note that we have, from Sherrod Brown, received a letter which we will be submitting for the record.

[The letter appears in the appendix.]

								51	
1		CHAIRMAN	MARRIOTT:	Thank	you	for	your	letter.	
2	It's nice	e to have	you here.						
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									

DISCUSSION ON U.S.-INDIA TRADE LETTER

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: I will now open the floor for comments and questions on the India letter. Are there any comments or questions? Yes, Sharon?

MS. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to, first of all, commend the subcommittee for their work on this letter. If I may, I'd like to add some additional perspective around the regulatory obstacles that are providing an example of their impact, even in the accountancy world.

As Indian enterprises continue to invest in the U.S., and as U.S. companies continue to invest in India, there is a requirement for good accounting and professional services to be provided in relation to those activities.

While there is not technically regulatory requirements that limit the activities of the internationally affiliated firms, there really are processes that limit the activities of international services firms in India by limiting the number of partners in an organization, as an example, by limiting the use of the international names of the services firms, by limiting even the number of people that can be recruited or trained in an organization.

So as you look at that, what essentially

happens is you are very much restricting the activities of the international services firms in India by the processes that are in place that are essentially allowing for only one, two, or three partners in each firm, and therefore limiting the activities that are related to the services provided.

And while I don't intend to be parochial, necessarily, about that by just giving that example, I think and expect that probably there are other industries that are similarly impacted by these types of limitations in services. So, I would just urge us to keep these in our minds as we continue to negotiate the activities with the Indian government.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Thank you very much.

Are there other comments?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Are there any objections to this letter?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: If not, we will assume it is approved and we will pass it on to the Secretary to pass on to the President.

I'd like to ask Betty Manetta, chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology and Competitiveness, to give her report on the progress of the <u>Tort Reform</u> letter.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY AND COMPETITIVENESS REPORT 1 By Ms. Betty Manetta, Subcommittee Chairman 3 MS. MANETTA: Chairman Marriott, I think our letter was postponed for this meeting. 4 5 CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: It has been. You're working on it? 6 7 MS. MANETTA: Yes, sir, we are. CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Good for you. Thank you. 8 MS. MANETTA: Next meeting we'll have it. 9 10 Hopefully we'll have it all approved. 11 CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: That's great. 12 MS. MANETTA: So, thank you so much. 13 CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Okay. 14 The Council has prepared a recommendation on 15 Capital Markets, and I'd like to ask Sharon Allen, member of the Subcommittee on Services, to give a 16 17 report. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SERVICES REPORT

By Ms. Sharon Allen, Member of the Subcommittee

Presentation of Proposed Letter on <u>Capital Markets</u>

MS. ALLEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If you weren't working on it you are now, right?

MS. MANETTA: Yes.

(Laughter)

MS. ALLEN: The Subcommittee on Services is pleased to present a letter on maintaining global preeminence of the U.S. capital markets. This is a particularly timely issue and we are honored to have Secretary Paulson, maybe, with us.

We look forward to hearing his perspective on this because he has, in fact, brought groups together to take a look at capital markets' competitiveness with conferences that focus on that, and in fact is just making some recent announcements on some other activities with regards to that idea.

So the U.S. capital markets have long held a preeminent position globally, and the benefits to our economy cannot be overstated. Robust capital markets provide the needed resources for growing companies, millions of high-quality jobs, and the opportunities for millions of investors to share in wealth creation.

The fact that is sometimes overlooked is that healthy competitive capital markets here and the variety of transaction and cutting-edge services that they provide are critical to our service export performance.

So while certain financial centers around the world are inevitably evolving and they're maturing, and therefore they're naturally becoming more competitive and they're gaining some competitive advantage, we also believe there are some actions that can be taken, and should be taken, to ensure our ongoing leadership position.

There have been a number of organizations, committees, and reports dedicated to this issue, including the Committee on Capital Markets Regulation, the Commission on the Regulation of U.S. Capital Markets in the 21st Century, and the report on Sustaining New York's and U.S. Financial Services Leadership, among others.

The President's Export Council believes that the recommendations put forth by these bodies deserve serious consideration by the administration and the regulatory agencies responsible for ensuring the integrity of our capital markets.

Specifically, we believe areas of

consideration should include: maintaining an open investment climate; establishing principles of effective regulation; including a careful cost benefit analysis of proposed rules and regulations; moving expeditiously towards convergence around high-quality international standards of regulation, although I will tell you we should not underestimate the difficulty of this task—that should be included, by the way, with the accounting and auditing industry. I don't want to leave those out, of course—reforming approaches to regulatory enforcement, securities litigation, and auditor liability; coordinating regulatory approaches among Federal agencies, as well as between Federal and State regulation.

Finally, with regards to Sarbanes-Oxley, in our opinion the Act has contributed significantly to capital markets confidence, but we believe that reexamining aspects of the Act to improve their cost-effectiveness and redress unintended efforts on our capital markets competitiveness is appropriate.

We do believe the regulatory process currently under way to scale certain provisions of the Act will allow, if we let them be implemented, for good changes to be made, and we hope that those will be considered before any legislative actions are considered.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other issue which impacts the competitiveness of our capital markets which we think should be acknowledged and, while it is not technically a part of this letter, it has previously been addressed by this Council.

I'm referring to our policies regarding the employment of foreign nationals with critical professional skills. This is an important issue that's getting a lot of coverage today as it relates to our capital markets.

Current U.S. policies are denying U.S. firms the opportunity to compete for world-class talent are forcing highly-skilled workers and students to look for jobs and educations in other parts of the world.

Human capital is our most precious commodity of the capital markets, and our ability to attract and retain talent globally, combined with the structural recommendations which are put forth in our letter today, we believe can help maintain the strength, the integrity, and preeminent position of the capital markets while expanding our export position in financial and related services.

We thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to present this letter from the committee.

DISCUSSION ON CAPITAL MARKETS LETTER 1 2 CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Thank you very much. Any comments or questions? 3 4 (No response) 5 CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Any objections? (No response) 6 7 CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: If no objections are found 8 we will assume there is a consensus, and I will propose 9 the letter be passed on to the Secretary and to the President. 10 11 I want to take a moment just to thank all the 12 subcommittee chairs and the staff representatives for 13 their very hard work on these various letters in getting them ready for the President. We are waiting 14 15 now for Secretary Paulson to return. He's finishing up a call. 16 While we are here, are there any other items 17 that any of you would like to discuss at the meeting 18 today? 19 20 SECRETARY GUTIERREZ: I just have a question. Out of curiosity, do you have any type of offices in 21 India? 22

in India. We have two types of operations there.

have a significant offshoring operation which are

Mr. Secretary, we do have offices

MS. ALLEN:

23

24

25

really U.S. employees working in India. We also have an Indian firm which is active in serving the Indian market, and it is really that Indian firm that is challenged by the regulatory requirements of the size and scale of the firms that can be operating.

So our firm is actually technically made up of several firms because of the size restrictions. It is, of course, a real challenge, even in being able to train people to leverage up the opportunity to serve the clients.

SECRETARY GUTIERREZ: One of the areas we saw in India the last time we were there, and I recall from my days in India it was still a challenge back then, is the retail sector. I think they're making a step forward in terms of opening up retailing, not all the way, but opening up somewhat, which I think could do wonders for the agricultural sector, being able to get their product through a supply chain that's more efficient. I think that will be a major breakthrough for the Indian economy, and we'll see how it works.

AMBASSADOR BHATIA: Also, Ms. Allen, the Indians have expressed substantial interest in exploring potential areas of cooperation in financial services generally. The one area in the trade policy part that we've chosen to begin to focus on is the

legal services area, to begin with, as an example. But fundamentally, it seems to me, there's no reason why it could not as easily extend to accounting services or other areas.

I think it would be useful to explore, and perhaps we can do this offline, to what extent you had interactions with the Indian government to try and see what incremental changes in policy there might be and to what extent we could actually find a partnership with the Indian accounting firms in actually addressing some of these issues jointly.

We found that to be, at least thus far, a productive avenue forward in the legal services area; whether it would also be true in accounting services would remain to be seen. But perhaps we could chat.

MS. ALLEN: I think that would be helpful to chat offline on that.

AMBASSADOR BHATIA: Okay.

MS. ALLEN: In fact, that is part of the way we go about serving our clients in India. But there are additional opportunities, I think, for cooperation that would really extend both the opportunity to serve those companies and still maintain the consistency that they're trying to achieve within the country.

AMBASSADOR BHATIA: Yes. I think what we've

seen in some of these areas is that it is just recently that India has started to appreciate that they really have, potentially, offensive interest in these areas that is greater than a defensive interest, and it might be useful for re-engagement on that.

MS. ALLEN: Exactly.

AMBASSADOR BHATIA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Are there any other issues that any of you would like to bring up at this point?

Any other items of business?

about it, Under Secretary Lavin and Chairman Marriott were kind enough to mention that Frank Lavin will be moving on to the private sector, I wanted to recognize one thing that I think is going to be a big legacy that will be at the Commerce Department for many, many years. He has revolutionized the way we think about, and the way we do, trade missions. He mentioned the trade mission to India very modestly. That's the largest trade mission we've ever done in our history.

In addition to that, it's the recognition that in a trade mission there are some things that are almost commodity-like that are operational, that it doesn't really matter who does them, and there are some things, some areas where the Commerce Department adds

value, our contacts with the embassy, our contacts with locals, and we can separate those two and, by delegating trade missions, we can be doing a lot more trade missions.

So, he's encouraged governors and mayors to do trade missions. I think we're doing more today than ever before, and it's thanks to Frank. I just wanted, given that this is an Export Council, you'd probably appreciate that more than anyone. I just wanted to thank Frank once again for that really powerful legacy that he leaves behind.

(Applause)

SECRETARY LAVIN: Thank you, sir. Just to comment on that, look, we all know from a business perspective there are a lot of things that matter. One element of business metrics that matter is simply volume. You've got to get your numbers up.

I was looking at the numbers. A conventional trade mission led by one person, all done internally by the U.S. Government, is considered successful if it is has between 20 and 30 people. To say, well, that's not bad, maybe that's all you can manage.

But you're not going to change aggregate numbers in any export activity with 20 or 30 people, you've got to get hundreds and hundreds of people and

you've got to do it multiple times a year.

You've really got to have reach into the U.S. economy and to the host country economy if you're going to move those numbers. That means we can't do it internally. We've got to find partners or people with like-minded missions.

There are a lot of businesses, banks, express delivery companies, other terrific U.S. businesses that have similar missions and are happy to partner with us, and we've got to delegate.

When we delegate, we can take these numbers up significantly so we go up not just one order of magnitude, but beyond that, not quite two orders of magnitude. But we're really able to step on the gas pedal and get the flow up on this activity.

We're in an era now where it's reasonably inexpensive for people to travel. The table stakes, the cost of entry is much more modest than it was 10 or 20 years ago. So a small business can think about Canada, or Mexico, or maybe even India, but you don't need to have an office in Canada or operations in Canada, you just need to maybe visit a few times a year and you could sell into Canada.

So we're trying to reach that middle market strata of businesses and bring them along, and say,

think about exporting.

MR. STYSLINGER: I'd just like to briefly underscore the recognition for Under Secretary Lavin. We were one of the companies, Altec, that participated in the India trip. It was an outstanding success. We work in over 100 countries around the world, and I think the foundation for that mission trip was instrumental in this letter on free trade and trade investment and promotion for India.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Thanks, Lee.

I'd like to turn the time over to Secretary

Paulson, a former member of the PEC and now running the

country. (Laughter)

REMARKS ON U.S.-CHINA RELATIONS

AND THE STRATEGIC ECONOMIC DIALOGUE

By Hon. Henry M. Paulson, Jr.,
Secretary of the Treasury

SECRETARY PAULSON: Bill, thank you very much. Carlos. Thank you for inviting me. Again, thank you for all you're doing. You're dealing with very important issues. I know how much Carlos and Bill rely on you for your advice.

I just tried to think what I could do that would be most relevant and interesting to you. I can't be here without thanking you for your letter on <u>Capital Markets Competitiveness</u>. I think you know this is something we're all focused on, getting the balance right here between ensuring the integrity of our capital markets and making sure that the burdens aren't too great and we have the right cost benefit equation.

I think you know this is something we've been very focused on at Treasury. We announced our first series of initiatives that are aimed at accounting and that part of the equation because, as I think you know, the business scandals were largely—the most recent ones—accounting scandals, and there have been a lot of changes in that area, some of which have been good.

But in some ways the relationships between

accountants, boards and management are not what they could be, and there are plenty of things that need to be fixed there. So, there is a series of initiatives there and we will have, in the next several weeks, some more things coming in other areas. But again, thank you for your focus.

I was asked to say a few words about the Strategic Economic Dialogue, where I've worked with Carlos and Frank here, and so they could easily have talked about it as I could. But let me again say that this is something that we all believe is very important. President Bush and President Hu put it in place.

This is an important, multifaceted relationship, our relationship with China. The economic relationship is a key part of that, very important to both of our countries. There's a big focus on managing it for the long term. But you can't do that well, can you, unless you can deal with the problems that come up in the short term and show tangible results along the way.

So, a lot of this is about having a process that works where we're able to speak with one voice to a broad group of people at the top in China and get results, and tangible results, through discussion and

through negotiation.

This is not about any one meeting. We have had our second session here in Washington and we'll have the next one in Beijing in December. But it is a longer term dialogue and we are going to continue to get, I believe, results along the way.

We are focused, to a large extent, on reform, opening up their economy to competition in goods and services, going beyond WTO. WTO compliance is very important. We've got dispute resolution vehicles.

It's important, but I don't find it nearly as interesting as the continued path to reform. I won't go over all of the things that we've worked on because there is a lot of work done in the energy and environmental arena that is very important. We talked a fair bit about services. We had some breakthroughs in civil air, some significant breakthroughs there.

We've had a big focus on capital markets in China and opening up to more competition, because not only are we good in capital markets in this country, but capital markets can have a multiplier effect in China and help them rebalance their economy in a way in which it will benefit them and the rest of the world and their trading partners, with a focus toward more domestic-led consumption.

One of the things we've been talking to them about, and have been talking to them about for some time, is encouraging China to establish a legal construct that allows for limited liability companies to promote investments in private equity and venture capital.

You see some media reports today that indicate they're taking that first step. Again, when you look at capital markets, they go all the way from venture capital all the way through the mezzanine, in debt financing and equity financing, public and private.

So if China is going to get where they need to get toward an innovative society that's well balanced, they're going to need this kind of movement and this kind of reform, and opening it up to some of the outstanding foreign companies that will bring real expertise will help speed that along the way.

DISCUSSION ON CHINA

SECRETARY PAULSON: Why don't I stop there so we can have some time for discussion and questions? I just know, Carlos, you've spent a lot of time with China and in these discussions. Anything to add on your part?

SECRETARY GUTIERREZ: I think that we saw that the advantage of these dialogues is that when we're sitting across the table -- Chinese ministers and we've got seven or eight Cabinet members on our end, with that route we're able to talk about, where do you want to take this relationship, talk about the big strategic things. We need to negotiate a point and walk out of the room and talk about the negotiations at these strategic meetings. We have other forums for tactical discussions, but it's a unique opportunity.

I mean, imagine just to sit down with the largest economy and the fastest growing economy, to sit down in a room for two days and talk about, where are we going strategically and what do you need to do, and what do we need to do together? So it's just tremendously valuable and is something that we want to institute with the Chinese government so that it becomes part of our relationship.

SECRETARY PAULSON: And I would say, in terms

of the trade part, because we explained to the Chinese all the time that there is protectionist sentiment in this country, there's protectionist sentiment in China, there's protectionist sentiment around the world.

One of the things that I'm most concerned about is that, as the Chinese economy continues to grow and some of their domestic competitors who are not close to world class become more profitable, they become a political force, an economic force, a lobbying force in their own right. This is true not just in China, it's true everywhere in the world.

Anyone who participates in free markets, they love competition in every sector but their own.

(Laughter) So the longer they wait to open up some of these sectors to competition, the more difficult it will be and the bigger price that the Chinese people will pay.

So, I explain that I believe this economic relationship benefits both of our countries, and we benefit in a number of ways. But there is a very strong feeling—and the Chinese know this, we explain it to them all the time—that the American public does not believe that the benefits of this relationship are equally shared, or fairly shared, and that there's a strong sentiment in Congress.

The Chinese had an opportunity to go up, and we intentionally scheduled these meetings when Congress was in session so the Chinese would have a chance to go up and have a good dialogue with the leadership of the House and the Senate, and with Senate Finance and Ways and Means.

Again, I explain to them, it's as easy for me in general to fight for competition and open markets, but I will be a lot more credible doing that if I see the Chinese using their capital and their political will to open up their markets in the face of domestic resistance. It'll be easier for me to fight to keep our markets open to the Chinese, easier for all of us.

Yes?

MR. ITURREGUI: Good afternoon, Mr. Secretary.

Juan Carlos Iturregui. Thank you. Thank you for your leadership in other parts of the world, for showing up in Guatemala in March. That was important, in substance and in symbolism.

In the context of China, I am wondering if you are incorporating this new initiative about foreign direct investment here in the U.S., because the Chinese would come here and invest—they have \$1 trillion in cash, apparently—I think the American public will see them in a different light. It's a two-way street, so

we would like to see them coming here, too.

SECRETARY PAULSON: Yes. Thank you for making that point. This is something that Carlos, Frank and I have talked a lot about, and the President has talked about, open economies being open to foreign investment. The President came out with a very important statement on foreign direct investment several weeks ago and we did a number of things to highlight that. There's no doubt that this is very important to our economy.

There were a number of countries around the world that, because of some of the publicity surrounding Dubai ports, some of the other issues, that began to question whether we were as open as we should be for foreign direct investment.

We are the most open country in the world, and we've been working hard to get, and I think it's quite likely we will get, Sythius legislation, because we already have bills reported out in the House and in the Senate.

We've done some things to, again, publicize how open we are for foreign investment. We obviously need to protect the national security, but when we look at the way our system works, it has been great for foreign investors and great for the U.S. economy.

Now, as part of that, the Chinese are

interested in investing. They've invested in Treasury securities and in other financial instruments, and there's been some direct investment by the Chinese in a number of industries. But there is an opportunity to do more, and that's one thing we've talked about in the dialogue. We've talked about investment going both ways. So, I am glad you pointed that out.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Anyone else?

MR. STYSLINGER: Will you speak, Mr. Secretary, to the exchange rate issue with China--it's obviously a very hot topic--and kind of what the outview is there?

SECRETARY PAULSON: Thank you for asking me that because I sometimes forget to talk about the most obvious issue that we talk about repeatedly with the Chinese. I think I'd like to put this in perspective. The Chinese, the renmimbi, has moved to about 8.2 percent against the dollar since July of 2005, so the Chinese have recognized the principle of flexibility.

But actually, when you look at the deficits and the level of reserves that China would have in their trade balance, there's really more need to move the renmimbi now than there was in July of 2005. If you look at it on a trade-weighted basis, it clearly bears it out. If you make, even relative to the

dollar, adjustments for productivity gains, there's a great need to move.

Now, I have—and all of us when we emphasize this—emphasized to the Chinese how strongly it is in their best interests to move. They're not going to get where they need to get unless they move. We think that there's a much greater danger to them in moving too slowly as opposed to too quickly because they're largely integrated into the global economy in terms of goods and services that are not really integrated in terms of their capital markets or in terms of their currency.

So one of the real benefits of competitive capital markets is that will let them get to a market-determined currency quicker. In the meantime, we need more movement. The nuance I place on this is that, even if the currency were trading where it should be trading, if it was trading at a level that recognized the underlying economic reality, we would still have a big trade deficit because of the structures of our two economies.

But having their currency more accurately reflect market values is going to help them rebalance their economy, going to send the right market signals, and is going to help their citizens have the financial

products that is going to let them reduce their rate of savings and have more domestic consumption, and so on.

So this is something that's very important and it has rightfully become a symbol for the speed and progress they're making with their reform. So, thank you for that one.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. We're running out of time, so I'm going to turn the balance of the time over to Secretary Gutierrez.

SECRETARY GUTIERREZ: Thank you. I would be willing to share my minute with Cecilia.

MS. LEVINE: I have just a question. How is China going to concede on this exchange situation where they have to think about social stability and keeping people working? Is that going to play any role in that?

SECRETARY GUTIERREZ: You know, the only person in the administration who's allowed to talk about currency just left the room. (Laughter) But I'll get him that question.

I just wanted to thank everyone for participating and for your leadership. You know, it's interesting. In a time where we're questioning the value of trade, we as a country, this is when leadership from this Council is required. It's just

very good to see that the leadership is here. Now is when it's needed. When things are going fine and everybody thinks trade is great, it's easy. But when it gets tough is when people start questioning trade, something we believe in passionately.

So, I look forward to working with you to continue to convince Congress, the American people, that trade and exports are to our benefit. So, I thank you for your leadership, and look forward to it.

CHAIRMAN MARRIOTT: Thank you.

Thank you very much. We are adjourned. Our next meeting will be in the winter. We will get in touch with you as soon as we have a date.

(Applause)

(Whereupon, at 4:37 p.m. the President's Export Council was adjourned.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing proceedings of the President's Export Council, held on Thursday, June 7, 2007, were transcribed as herein appears, and this is the original of transcript thereof.

LISA DENNIS

Court Reporter