

rights in return for normal trade relations were jettisoned in 1994. Looming on the horizon is the ballyhooed trade war over our threat to impose higher tariffs on some Chinese goods, in retaliation for China's blatant continuing violation of United States intellectual property rights, IPR. We have been down this road before. It was only in February 1995, when threatened with higher tariffs on \$1 billion of its goods, that China signed an agreement to curb IPR piracy. In the 15 months since, by the estimate of the Motion Picture Industry Association, the harm to U.S. copyrighters has actually increased.

Let us see if we can briefly discern a pattern here. In 1992, the administration promises to link trade preferences to improvement in human rights. Two years later, that policy is abandoned. In 1995, our intelligence agencies discover Chinese violations of non-proliferation obligations. Sanctions are threatened and then abandoned in the face of promises to do better. Also, in 1995, the Chinese promise to do better on IPR and the problem worsens. Our response: more tough talk, and this time "we mean it." If I were sitting in Beijing, I would come to the conclusion that the threats are empty, the rhetoric hollow.

Constructive engagement has failed to alter Chinese behavior to the good. So let us drop the pretense and cut to the quick. We trade with China and extend to it normal trading privileges because our Government believes it benefits American business, the United States economy, and, therefore, the national interest. We look the other way, in practice if not in word, on Chinese violations of human rights, non-proliferation—perhaps in the end even on IPR—because it is good for business. As I said at the outset, I find this rationale perplexing.

Our trading relationship with China is really quite one-sided. Writing in the *New York Times*, May 16, Alan Tonelson, a research fellow at the U.S. Business and Industrial Association, argued that our \$34 billion trade deficit with China depresses job creation, wages and growth of the United States economy. This tremendous deficit—which has helped China amass more than \$70 billion in foreign reserves, a war chest useful to riding out any trade war—is not the result of fair-trading practices. China is a protectionist nation, Mr. Tonelson notes, with some of the highest tariffs in the world. It dumps artificially low-priced goods—products manufactured by children and convicts—on American markets, hurting U.S. competitors. According to Mr. Tonelson, China extorts know how and high-skill jobs from American companies, such as Boeing, seeking to set up shop in China. Certainly China is a vast market, with tremendous potential. But our 1995 exports to China of \$11.7 billion—only 0.12 percent of our GNP—were less than what we send to Belgium or Hong Kong.

On the other hand, we buy up to 40 percent of China's exports and that allows China to finance its industrial and military modernization program. We have the leverage to make them play by the rules of the game. Does it not make sense to use that leverage now, from a relative position of strength, than try to make the Chinese play fair 10, 20, or 30 years from now when by many projections it will be a legitimate superpower? As Mr. Tonelson notes, even the higher tariffs imposed on China under a non-MFN scheme would still be lower than China's tariffs on our products.

Mr. President, if mortal outrage at blatant abuse of human rights is not reason enough for taking a tough stance with China—and I believe it is and that the American people do as well—then let us do so on grounds of self-interest.

United States credibility is at stake; a firm stance which refuses China the privilege—not the right—of MFN will enhance United States stature and, in the long run, benefit United States business, the American consumer, and, we can hope, ultimately leads to an improvement in China's economic and political behavior.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 459

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, a bill to provide surveillance, research, and services aimed at prevention of birth defects, and for other purposes.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to clarify the liability of certain recycling transactions, and for other purposes.

S. 684

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 684, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for programs of research regarding Parkinson's disease, and for other purposes.

S. 1389

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] and the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] were added as cosponsors of S. 1389, a bill to reform the financing of Federal elections, and for other purposes.

S. 1703

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1703, a bill to amend the Act establishing the National Park Foundation.

S. 1714

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the names of the Senator from Alabama

[Mr. HEFLIN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] were added as cosponsors of S. 1714, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure the ability of utility providers to establish, improve, operate, and maintain utility structures, facilities, and equipment for the benefit, safety, and well-being of consumers, by removing limitations on maximum driving and on-duty time pertaining to utility vehicle operators and drivers, and for other purposes.

S. 1735

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM] and the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1735, a bill to establish the United States Tourism Organization as a nongovernmental entity for the purpose of promoting tourism in the United States.

S. 1743

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1743, a bill to provide temporary emergency livestock feed assistance for certain producers, and for other purposes.

S. 1756

At the request of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] were added as cosponsors of S. 1756, a bill to provide additional pension security for spouses and former spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 1757

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to amend the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act to extend the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1771

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1771, a bill to amend the Consolidated Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1985 to clarify that the fee for providing customs services in connection with passengers arriving on commercial vessels making a single voyage may be collected only one time from each passenger, and for other purposes.

S. 1840

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1840, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to authorize appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and

Natural Resources to receive testimony regarding S. 1844, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to direct a study of the opportunities for enhanced water based recreation and for other purposes.

The hearing will be held on Thursday, June 13, 1996, it will begin at 9:30 a.m., and will take place in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

For further information, please call James P. Beirne, senior counsel or Betty Nevitt, staff assistant.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that the hearing scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to receive testimony regarding S. 1804, a bill to make technical and other changes to the laws dealing with the territories and freely associated States of the United States, amendment No. 4039 and oversight into the law enforcement initiative in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, have been postponed from Tuesday, June 25, 1996, to Wednesday, June 26, at 9:30 a.m. and will take place in room SD-336 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

For further information, please call James P. Beirne, senior counsel or Betty Nevitt.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 3 p.m. on Thursday, June 6, in executive session, to mark up a proposed SASC amendment to S. 1718, the intelligence authorization bill for fiscal year 1997, and to vote to report S. 1718 to the Senate.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 6, 1996, to conduct a hearing on S. 1317, the "Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1995."

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be allowed to meet during the Thursday, June 6, 1996, session of the Senate for the purpose of conducting an executive session and markup.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Finance Committee requests unanimous

consent to conduct a hearing on Thursday, June 6, 1996, beginning at 9:00 a.m. in room SD-215. Most-favored-nation renewal for China.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 6, 1996, 2 p.m. to hold a hearing.

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

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee to meet on Thursday, June 6, at 10 a.m., for a hearing on "Oversight on IRS Financial Management."

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 6, 1996, at 5 p.m. to hold a closed markup on the DOD authorization bill.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EASTERN AND SOUTH ASIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 6, 1996, at 10 a.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 6, 1996, for purposes of conducting a subcommittee hearing which is scheduled to begin at 2 p.m. The purpose of this hearing is to consider S. 1703, a bill to amend the act establishing the National Park Foundation.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE SOCIAL SECURITY FAMILY PROTECTION ACT

• Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague and friend the Senator from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, in introducing legislation to correct an inequity that exists in our Social Security system.

The Social Security Family Protection Act that we are introducing today

expands upon legislation I have introduced since 1992 which calls for the prorating of Social Security benefits in the month in which the recipient dies. Currently when a Social Security beneficiary dies—regardless of whether it is the first day of the month or the 29th day of the month, his or her last monthly benefit check must be returned to the Social Security Administration. The current system ignores the fact that the beneficiary runs up expenses during that last month and that the survivors are left to pay for those expenses, without the assistance of the Social Security check. In many cases, the loss of this benefit causes serious financial problems for the surviving family members because they are unable to financially subsidize the expenses accrued by the late beneficiary in their last month of life.

My original legislation prorates the Social Security benefit based on the date of death and allows the check to go to the surviving spouse. Under the Social Security Family Protection Act, the beneficiary's check will be prorated and it will go to the surviving family members. Under the prorated system in the bill, if the beneficiary dies before the 15th, the family will receive 50 percent of the benefit, if the beneficiary dies after the 15th, the family will receive the entire check. The expansion of this bill is based on Senator MIKULSKI's own family experience with Social Security after her widowed mother died, at the end of the month.

The Social Security Family Protection Act will correct the inappropriate assumption in current law that a beneficiary has not incurred expenses during his or her last month of life. I know that my colleagues have heard, as have Senator MIKULSKI and I, from constituents who have lost a husband or wife, father or mother toward the end of the month, received the Social Security check and spent all or part of it to pay the bills only to receive a notice from Social Security that the check must be returned. Under our bill, the surviving family members—whether it is a spouse, a son, or a niece—would be able to use the check to help pay the final bills incurred by their loved one.

I would like to read a part of a letter I received from a constituent about the experience of his family when his brother-in-law died. This letter, along with Senator MIKULSKI's own experience, serves to highlight why this bill is necessary.

On February 29, 1996 at 9:20 p.m. He passed away. The way I figure it, the month of Feb. has 696 hours in it. He was alive for 693 hrs and 20 min. of the month, missing a full month by 2 hours and 40 min. Or to put it another way, he was alive for 99.99617 percent of the month missing a full month by 0.0038314 percent. With this evidence in hand, the SSA then decided that his check for the month of Feb. had to be returned to them. Unfortunately, his debts for the month didn't disappear just because he failed to live the extra 0.0038314 percent of the month.

And since they waited till April to let anyone know of this policy, we paid his out-