

include journalists from Hong Kong, Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Vietnam.

Without a doubt, Iowans have grown to depend on their hometown papers for school news, high school sports coverage, business items, local government and politics, community announcements, and human interest stories. Typical of any endeavor in my State, be it enterprise, education or entertainment, newspapers in Iowa place great emphasis on quality. Combining news reporting and advertising, the local newspaper is a constant and reliable source for the community.

The Iowa Newspaper Association each year awards top honors to newspapers in Iowa for general excellence; for delivering the best editorial, front, sports, and feature pages; for best coverage of local government, agriculture, and education; and, for overall community service.

Merchants and shopkeepers on Main Street rely on the local newspaper to advertise upcoming sales and promotions. And readers pay close attention to the ads.

For sure, Iowa's hometown newspapers wouldn't miss this once-in-one-hundred-and-fifty-years-opportunity to help spread Iowa's spirit. Visitors to the cafe on The National Mall will find a grand newspaper stand displaying many of Iowa's hometown papers. You can discover for yourself a trove of Iowa's ink in the *Herald*, *Journal*, *Gazette*, *Review*, *Leader*, *Express*, *Record*, *Bee*, *Chronicle*, *Register*, *Times*, and *Courier*, just to name a few. I would encourage those who plan to celebrate with Iowa—community style, to stop by and "read all about it."

THE LEGEND OF KATE SHELLEY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it may have started out like a normal day, but July 6, 1881, did not end in a typical manner. In the late afternoon, around suppertime, a terrifying storm struck central Iowa. It was a terror. Sensible people stayed indoors away from its wrath and fury. Creeks and streams became full to overflowing with the rainwater as the storm raged on.

Then there was a crash. It was heard by a family living close to one of the rain soaked creeks and the railroad bridge which crossed it. With that crash a young 15-year-old Iowa girl from Moingona stepped from obscurity into legend.

As H. Roger Grant wrote in "The Palimpsest," "the courage of Kate Shelley rightfully deserves to be remembered." For on that night she bravely faced her destiny.

Engine No. 11 was checking the Chicago & North Western Rail Road line for storm damage when it plunged into Honey Creek. The water was deep and the current was fast. The crewmen on that train needed help, and Kate Shelley knew she had to give that help. Putting all thoughts of personal safety

aside, she went out into the storm. As she later said, "The storm and all else was forgotten and I said that I must go to help the men, and to stop the passenger (train) that would soon be due at Moingona."

Kate put together a lamp with a wick made from an old felt skirt. Again in her own words, "(I) started out into the night and the storm, to do what I could, and what I thought was my duty, knowing that Mother and the children were praying to God to keep me from every harm." Kate's father, who had been an employee of the Chicago & North Western, had died some 3 years before.

Upon reaching the wreckage, Kate found that of the four-man crew, only two had survived. One clung to a tree and the other to tree roots as the deadly waters of Honey Creek swirled around them. Kate saw one of the men in the flashes of lightning. He shouted at her and she at him, but the noise of the storm was so great to be hearing each other was impossible.

Let me again turn to Mr. Grant's "Palimpsest" article,

Shelley (then) began the most perilous portions of her trek. Crossing the Des Moines River bridge, even in ideal conditions, was dangerous. The North Western had studded the ties along this 673-foot-long span with twisted, rusty spikes to discourage trespassers. And the ties themselves were spaced a full pace apart. 'I got down upon my hands and knees, . . . and guided myself by the stretch of rail, I began the weary passage of the bridge,' explained Shelley. 'I do not know how long I was in crossing, but it seemed an age. Halfway over, a piercing flash of lightning showed me the angry flood more closely than ever, and swept along upon it a great tree, the earth still hanging to its roots, was racing for the bridge and it seemed for the very spot I stood upon.' Added Shelley, 'Fear brought me up right on my knees, and I clasp my hands in terror, and in prayer, I hope, lest the shock should carry out the bridge. But the monster darted under the bridge with a sweeping rush and his branches scattered foam and water over me as he passed.'

Kate Shelley made it across that bridge and to the station at Moingona. There she found that the North Western had already stopped the eastbound passenger train. But that was not the end of her perilous night nor of her heroism. Those two men were still clinging to life in the tumultuous waters of Honey Creek. A relief locomotive was sent with Kate as the guide. Engineer Edward Wood and brakeman Adam Agar were saved.

Kate Shelley is an American hero for the ages. She is as much of a role model for all of us today and for our children's children's children, as she was to her contemporaries.

Kate Shelley did not have to go out into that ferocious storm in the middle of the night in 1886. But she did. She knew that her actions would make a difference. Her actions would help people she did not know, but that she never the less cared for. Her actions would help to prevent destruction, injury, and death. Her selfless actions would save two lives. What an example for all Americans to follow.

Mr. Grant quotes several contemporary newspaper accounts of the night in his article. One states,

Ed Wood says he was well nigh overjoyed when he saw the light approaching the clearing near the end of the bridge, and that he will never forget the sight of Kate Shelley making her way over the twisted and broken trestle work to the last tie yet hanging over the wreck in the boiling flood below.

Another newspaper wrote Shelley crossed the Des Moines River bridge,

. . . with nothing but the ties and rails (with) the wind blowing a gale, and the foaming, seething waters beneath. Not one man in five hundred (would) have (gone) over at any price, or under any circumstance. But this brave, noble girl, with the nerve of a giant, gathering about her, her flowing skirts, and on hands and knees she crawled over the long weary bridge.

Yesterday I said that the Iowa spirit was almost too big to describe. It is. But I think that I can in all honesty say the spirit of Kate Shelley is the spirit of Iowa. And it is a part of the American spirit, the spirit of helping others in a time of need and danger without expecting something for yourself. I hope that all of us can learn from this brave young woman's example.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for some time now, and on more than one occasion, there has been an effort to clear a number of judicial nominees that have been pending on the calendar awaiting action. As a matter of fact, there are now 17 such judicial nominations that are on the Executive Calendar. Some of them date back as far as December 1995. The latest group that was reported from the Judiciary Committee to the Senate came on May 9.

Now, on each occasion when there has been sort of an agreement worked out that one, two, three, or four judges could be cleared and moved, there have been objections to those. I know the majority leader would very much like to be able to move as many as possible of these judicial nominations. He said so publicly. He has been working on it today. I know he will continue to work to find what problems might exist and see if more could be approved. He will continue to do that. On his behalf, as the majority whip, I will do all I can do.

I feel like while it might be ideal under some conditions to some people to get them all done at once, under Senate prerogatives every Senator can raise concerns about a nominee for a variety of reasons—their qualifications for the job and other considerations. But I think if we cannot get them all done, we need to start moving down the road. You get as many as you can, and you come back and work some others.

I know there are a number of judges that Members of the minority party support and would like to get approved. Some of these that were recommended

by Democrats are also supported by Republicans. We should continue our effort to show that we can move these nominations. We are getting to that point in the year where it will get more and more difficult.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc on today's Executive Calendar: Calendar No. 511, Joseph Greenaway of New Jersey; Calendar No. 514, Gary Fenner of Missouri; Calendar No. 591, Walker Miller of Colorado; and Calendar No. 575, Charles Clevert, Jr., of Wisconsin.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc; that any statements relating to the nominations appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senator's actions; and the Senate then return to legislative session.

Mr. BAUCUS. Reserving the right to object, I ask the acting leader about another nominee that was considered before the Senate Judiciary Committee, reported out favorably, I believe the date was April 25, and has been on the calendar for some time now, and who is strongly supported by the people of Montana and for whom I have heard no objection, no substantive objection whatever. His name is Don Molloy. Might I ask if Don Molloy might be added to that list and included in the acting leader's request?

I say that in part, Mr. President, because there have been no judges confirmed in this session of Congress—none. I might say that many judges were referred by a Democratic-controlled Senate in years when there were Republican Presidents. I might say, for example, in 1992, this Senate confirmed 66 district and circuit court judges. I might add, none has been brought up or passed by this body in this session of this Congress. In 1988, the Senate confirmed 42 district circuit judges for President Reagan. I could go on down the list. I will not take the Senate's time.

As the Senator from Mississippi said, there are now 17 judges on the calendar, far short of the 66 and 42 that were passed in previous years. This is already June. I do not know how many more days this Senate will be in session this year. I ask, basically, why not all the 17 that are on the calendar? There is no reason why they should not be added.

Specifically, I inquire about Don Molloy, who has been nominated by the President and has been reported out favorably by the Judiciary Committee, has been on the calendar, for, gosh, over a month, why his name cannot also be added to that list.

Mr. LOTT. If the Senator would yield under his reservation for me to respond to his questions, we have tried on other occasions, at least two that I am personally familiar with, to move a group-

ing of these judicial nominations. I think on one occasion it was not even this same four. There may have been a different one that was considered on this. It was objected to by Members of the minority party. So we have been trying to move some of these judges that we could get approved through the process. Some of them were objected to on the Senator's side, as you have done—or as you are apparently prepared to do today—and others have objected to other judges. We cannot get them all cleared right now. We would like to get the ones we can get cleared done, and come back again later, as we work through this list.

Now, in regard to your specific nomination, we were not able to get that cleared today. There have been some reservations or objections raised. We are continuing to explore that. I do not personally know what the reasons are, or how many objections there are. But I plead with the Senator from Montana, once again. These four have been cleared. Hopefully, we can get an agreement on more—perhaps even within the next few days. But if we do not break this down and start getting some approved, the whole thing stays dammed up.

So any one Senator might have a judge on the list of 17, and his one judge may not be qualified, or may have some sort of a judicial problem based on his experience, or there may be some personal problem. As a general rule, if any Senator says a judge or a judicial nominee is personally repugnant to that Senator, that carries great weight around here.

So is the Senator saying today that until we can get all 17, we will get none of them? Any one Senator can walk in here and say, "I object to that group unless my judge is on there." I am trying, on behalf of the majority leader, to say, let us get started. These four have been cleared. Let us do these four, and maybe there will be another four. But you cannot say to the Republicans, "Well, there have not been any done this session," if they are being objected to by Democrats. Let us get started. I have told the Senator that I am willing to work and see what the problems are, and maybe they are problems that can be worked out. I cannot make a commitment on how that would be done, or when it will be done. But I am prepared to get into it as much as I can, within my role as it is, and see what the problems are.

Please consider moving these. These are judges that have been approved, that we can clear and move today off the calendar—nominations recommended by Senator BRADLEY of New Jersey, Senator KOHL, and I am not even quite sure who made the recommendation on the judge from Missouri or the one from Colorado. I presume they have broad bipartisan support in those respective States, even though those States do not have a Democratic Senator. Let us do these and see what else we can do.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, with some bemusement, I listen to my good friend from Mississippi. When a vacancy occurred in Montana for a Federal district court judge, I saw this as an opportunity to find the best person in the State of Montana for this position. This is one power, one thing that a U.S. Senator can do—that is, to recommend to the President of the United States who the President might, in turn, nominate to a Federal district court judgeship.

I took this very, very seriously. I sat down and surveyed the State of Montana to determine who I regarded as the best, the brightest, the most thoughtful persons—Republicans and Democrats, just good thoughtful people—and put together a nominee commission. I called each of them up personally—six, seven, or eight of the best Montana minds and the most thoughtful persons in the State of Montana, Republicans and Democrats—and asked if they would serve. They all said they would love to. I said to each of them, "I would like you to nominate or recommend to me the best people in our State." I said precisely, "I am not carrying water for any Republicans, any Democrats, liberals or conservatives; it makes no difference. I want the best." My commission, my group, then nominated three different people whom they regarded as the best people in Montana to serve in this position as a Federal district court judge. I then sat down with each of the three, interviewed each of the three for hours. I then called my group again and asked their opinions. I talked to all the Federal judges in Montana, all the State district court judges in Montana, and I asked their views.

I can tell you that Don Molloy is the top choice in the State of Montana for this position—by Republicans and by Democrats. There is just no denying that.

I say, in addition, to my good friend from Mississippi, that they need to have this position filled. That is because there is going to be a backlog in our State in the Federal district courts. Why? Basically, because of the unfortunate problems with the alleged Unabomber in Montana, and the Freemen are causing all kinds of problems in our State, which is putting an additional pressure on the law enforcement personnel in our State. Many of those actions will be in Federal district court.

So I ask my good friend from Mississippi why Don Molloy's name cannot be added to the list of four. I am personally not pleading for all 17 on the calendar. But I make a very reasonable suggestion to add one more to the list of four—that is, Don Molloy.

I have heard no substantive objection. I have heard no objection to him. He passed the committee. I believe that these nominees, to avoid this deadlock, probably should be brought up on the floor one by one and let Senators speak in favor or against the

nominees. Let them stand up and say what they think. Let them vote the way they want to vote. I might say to my very good friend from Mississippi that my colleague, Senator BURNS, a Republican from the State of Montana, supports this nominee. He supports this nominee. If you have bipartisan support for our nominee, Don Molloy, I see no reason why he should not be added to that list of four.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, there has been objection to this point to this particular nominee. I do not know him. I do not know his record. I am not on the Judiciary Committee. I can only say that we have not been able to get any other than these four approved to this point. Maybe there is some problem there. I do not know. Maybe there is not.

I can sympathize with the Senator, because I remember one time that my State of Mississippi agreed to go along with a nominee from Louisiana, who was particularly well qualified to be a member of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals—basically, a Mississippi position. Because there was such a uniquely qualified nominee, a former Congressman and Governor that we withheld with the insistence that it be a nominee from our State. So that nomination went forward, and then it languished, and it laid there, and it seemed to be objected to. Finally, the term ended, or that session of the Congress, whatever that was—maybe the 98th session. At any rate, there was never an explanation of what the problem was. There was an objection by the Democrats to this fine man, who clearly had judicial temperament, was highly rejected, ethical, a former Congressman and Governor and, yet, it just stayed there and never was considered.

So I understand how the Senator feels about this. But it is a unique thing to the Senate to make the recommendations to Presidents for the Federal district judges, as well as appellate courts, even though appellate courts are treated a little differently than Federal district judges. It is also a unique Senate prerogative to have an objection to a judge. Obviously, it can come from some other State, some member of the Judiciary Committee—who knows? Sometimes it is very difficult to find out exactly what the problem is. But they have a way, in many instances, of working themselves out.

Again, the majority leader has said to the minority leader that he would like to move as many of these as possible.

Mr. BAUCUS. I can help the Senator move one more right now. That is my suggestion. That is helping the leader. He can move one more.

Mr. LOTT. We do not have that one cleared and the other 12. But we do have four cleared. When those are done, we will try some others. I make one last plea to the Senator. I believe that if he would let these four go, it would help break down the dike, and we would see others move.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my very good friend. We simply have heard no good reason why Don Molloy should not be on the calendar.

It is with great reluctance that I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa for allowing us to have this exchange in an effort to try to clear some judicial nominations.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Iowa.

CHINA MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, earlier today the Senate Finance Committee heard testimony on the issue of most-favored-nation trade policy for China. As you know Mr. President, the President of the United States, President Clinton, on May 20 announced that China would be granted most-favored-nation status for another year. This is an annual determination made in the case of China. For the other 100 and some nations that have most-favored-nation trade status with us it is more on a permanent basis. It does not have to be annually like it is for China.

I might say, too, for the benefit of my colleagues that there are only about five or six countries that would be called major trading partners, or potential major trading partners that do not have most-favored-nation status. So I am not sure that the terminology is very good when it really kind of refers to normal trading status between the United States and any other country. But it has been titled like this for decades. So it sounds like maybe really more than what it really is. But the President made that decision.

I wanted to announce my support of the President's decision. So we are going to enter a period of time here where Congress debates whether or not the President is right to have granted most-favored-nation status to China, and also we will do that through a resolution of disapproval of the President's action. So if the resolution of disapproval does not pass the Congress then, of course, the President's actions will stand. If it would pass Congress by a majority vote but the President would veto, which you would assume that he would, then presumably unless there are votes to override—which means two-thirds majority—that the President's action would still stand.

So I think it is fair to assume that regardless of the annual exercise we go

through, regardless of the motion of disapproval being approved, in the final analysis there will not be a two-thirds vote to override the President's actions. So China will have most-favored-nation status for another year.

I personally believe—and I support, of course—that the President's decision should and will be upheld. But there is a lot of sentiment against China on Capitol Hill, and recent developments in our relationship with China has not helped China's chances of success in fighting the motion of disapproval.

Most recently on trade issues in regard to China our United States Trade Representative announced sanctions against China to the tune of \$2 billion. These sanctions will take effect on June 17 unless China comes into compliance with the bilateral agreement on intellectual property rights that was reached in 1995. In response to our own Government's announcement of sanctions against China, they in turn said that they would levy 100 percent tariffs on many U.S. exports. These include agricultural products such as cotton, beef, chicken, and vegetable oils.

So it appears that we could be on the verge of a trade war with one of our major agricultural export markets. I want to reflect on this issue by briefly discussing how we got into this position, and what it means for China's chances on MFN.

Mr. President, as you know, the Clinton administration's position on how to deal with China has never been very clear. In fact, I suppose you could put it in a class with a lot of other issues that the President has taken positions on in the past. He has changed his view on this one as well.

In addition, since he has been President, I can say he has had no long-term view on what a relationship with China ought to be. Some have said that the President seems to make policy according to the last person he has spoken to on a given day. That has been a very general comment about the President. But it is one, if you look at specific actions on China, that I think you can apply even more specifically to our China policy.

In 1992, when he was a Presidential candidate, Bill Clinton harshly criticized the Bush administration for being soft on human rights in China. Candidate Clinton vowed at that time to condition China's most-favored-nation status on—these are his words—“respect for human rights, political liberalization, and responsible international conduct.”

That is what the President said was wrong with President Bush's position on China.

Just 2 years later, President Clinton favored separating human rights from most-favored-nation status, and he favored that year granting China MFN status, as the Bush administration had done, and as the Reagan administration had done. And it even goes back beyond that.