

are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to speak for 5 minutes in morning business.

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

UNITED STATES-CHINA SUMMIT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor to talk a little bit about the summit that is coming up soon—as a matter of fact, the 29th and 30th of this month. President Jiang Zemin of China will visit Washington to have a summit meeting with President Clinton. It is a good time I think for us to do two things. One is to think a little bit about our role with respect to the summit, our role as Congress. Another is that it is a good time for us to take another look at our policy and our bilateral relationships and reevaluate both of those with respect to China and its goals.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asia and Pacific Affairs, this relationship, of course, and its ramifications in the future, its impact on the United States and the world is something that is very important to me. East Asia, of course, will be a source of one of our most important economic and strategy challenges as we move into the next century. China, with 1.2 billion people and an increasingly expanding economy, will continue, and increasingly, to be a center of attention in Asia. To adequately meet those kinds of challenges, obviously, why, we need to continue to articulate and develop a workable policy with respect to China and then, of course, to all of the countries in Asia.

This administration has and continues to refer to our China policy as a constructive engagement, which has a nice sound, a nice ring to it, but I am not sure anybody really knows what that means. Apparently, it can mean whatever one would like it to mean. If you ask 10 or 12 different people, each of them might give you a different explanation of what it is. Moreover, and probably even more important, the Chinese do not know what constructive engagement means. Many of them are not persuaded and talk often about the idea that our relationship with China is one of containment, which it really is not.

So I think it is a good opportunity to make clear what our policy is with respect to China. And it seems to me that that policy ought to reflect those things that are of concern to us, those things that are important to us, those

things that will over time allow us to have a relationship with China. I happened to have the opportunity to visit there in August. Most of the leadership was at the coast because of the summertime, but I did go there and visit with the Foreign Minister. We talked a good deal about the upcoming summit and what it is that it might be.

I was, and am still, a bit concerned that when you have a summit there may be a compelling interest among the administration people to be able to announce great things at the summit, which would be fine if, indeed, they are based on the kind of arrangements and the kind of agreements that really need to be made in order to have great things to announce. It would be a shame, on the other hand, if we rushed to agreement on some things and came up with unsatisfactory agreements simply in order to make the summit look as good as it should.

I agreed with the Foreign Minister that, indeed, it would be better to just have a summit to help our relationships, to talk about problems, if that is all we could do, than to have some artificial arrangements made in order to make some announcements.

So I think that is a little bit where we are. One of the things that I believe is important is that the Congress should be involved. In most countries like China and Indonesia that have a different system, of course, the people do not really understand that Congress has something to do with foreign policy, that Congress is involved in foreign policy. That is not the case in most countries. So I am hopeful, and I am now fairly confident, there will be some congressional involvement in this summit.

One of the things I am glad has not occurred, however, as sometimes does is that—of course, we are free here and should speak out on whatever we want—often you see a whole series of sense-of-the-Congress resolutions that are not very conducive to having a good meeting—some of them saying, well, if you do not behave, we will take away your visas and all that sort of business, which may have merit but it does not seem it is useful as we come up to a summit with the intention to try to improve the relationships we have. I think those things are counterproductive, as is the case generally with sanctions; sanctions do not work. There are less than a handful of objectives that the Chinese simply can't get somewhere else. We have sanctions on something when they are bargaining with Boeing for 777's and they go to France and buy Airbus. That is kind of the way that works. We hurt our own relationship for no positive reason.

Now, I am not an apologist for China. There are many things that are being done there that we think should be done differently, many things that are being done there that are not consistent with our values, but I think probably as important as anything, if China wishes to be part of the family of business in the world, then there are some rules they have to abide by or

else they are not part of the family. Countries have to stay with agreements that they have, the contracts they have.

So there are many things that make it more difficult to embrace people in the international community. In the case of China, there are concerns about Tibet, concerns about human rights, religious persecution, rule of law, intellectual property rights, relationships with Taiwan. All of those things are concerns. But the issue is how do we best deal with them. Nobody denies that there are problems we have to deal with, but as in the case of most favored nation, then you say I understand the problem. The question is how do we best deal with it. Do we best deal with it by standing away? Do we best deal with it by sanctions? Or do we best deal with it by articulating a foreign policy and then saying we are going to stay with that policy? I believe that is the best answer for us.

There are a number of things that ought to be talked about, I believe, at this summit. I have met with Sandy Berger, who is the President's adviser and the person I think most responsible for the meeting, who seems also to be in tune with this. There are about four real issues that I hope are talked about very candidly and talked about in depth. One is nuclear proliferation—the idea of parts shipped to Pakistan, the idea that Iran and the PRC have a nuclear cooperation agreement, changes to domestic law to prevent dual use. These kinds of things. Now, we are in the course of the President certifying that these things are not in fact happening, and I hope they are not. But we need to talk about that. We need to have an understanding. We need to be able to have visibility to see if, indeed, that is happening.

Another is human rights. I think we need to continue to speak out about religious freedom. We need to continue to speak out about personal freedom. Those are our values. We are not going to be able to tell everybody else how to live, but we can promote values that we believe are important. And among those at the top is human rights.

Trade. China, of course, wants to belong to the World Trade Organization, and I, indeed, hope they do. I think it would be better for us so that when you have trade problems, it is not a unilateral kind of thing but, indeed, would fall within the purview of the World Trade Organization. And some measures could be put on by other countries as well as ours.

Finally, security. We have had good cooperation from the PRC with regard to North Korea. But one of the reasons that we are involved as we are in China and in Asia is, of course, to stabilize the security of this part of the world, which is terribly important to us. I think we have been relatively successful in doing that.

Mr. President, as this summit comes close, I am pleased that the Congress is somewhat involved. I am actually pleased that these have kind of been four issues that at least the National Security Council has set forth. I hope we have honest, candid talks with the President of China. I hope we say in very understandable terms what our policy is in regard to human rights, in understandable terms what our policy is with regard to trade. We obviously have to open up China so that our trade deficit doesn't worsen.

So we have real problems to resolve. We do not resolve them by simply saying we are going to have "constructive engagement." I think we need to be specific on a relatively small number of things that are important to us and then, by golly, stick with them. If we have an agreement on intellectual property and it is not adhered to, then we need to do something about it. We should not try to run everything that everybody else does in another country, but those things that are important to us I think we ought to stay with. I look forward to the summit. I hope it is a useful one. I hope it contributes to world peace. I hope it contributes to stability in world trade and perhaps most of all the improvement of human rights in that part of the world.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION'S ACTIONS AGAINST RESTRICTIVE JAPANESE PORT PRACTICES

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission [FMC], Mr. Harold Creel, and the other Federal Maritime Commissioners, Mrs. Ming Hsu, Mr. Joe Scroggins, and Mr. Delmond Won for their resolve in pursuing trade liberalization of Japan's restrictive port practices.

The problem of unfair, restrictive port practices in Japan is a long standing one. The United States carriers and United States Government have asked the Japanese to reform their system for over a decade. The Japanese had refused even to acknowledge that this was a problem, much less to resolve it.

Two years ago, the carriers, weary of the futility of diplomatic and commercial pressure, asked the FMC to address this. This was not a matter of the FMC grandstanding or attempting to justify its existence. In fact, I would note that the same Japanese restrictive port practices were challenged at the World Trade Organization [WTO] by European carriers. To date, the WTO has not acted on the European carrier petition. However, the FMC acted vigorously at the request of United States industry interests to address a long-standing, Japanese-created situation that could not be resolved through more amicable means. In September 1995, the FMC issued orders to gather information on the subject.

In November 1996, the FMC issued a proposed rule, with monetary sanctions to go into effect April 1997.

In April 1997, an agreement between the United States and Japanese Governments resulted in Japanese commitments to achieve certain steps toward reform by July 1997. Accordingly, the FMC postponed the effective date of the sanctions until September 1997.

But then the Japanese failed to meet their April commitments. In September, the Japanese again asked for a postponement of the FMC rule. The FMC refused, and beginning in September, fees of \$100,000 per voyage began accruing. The fees for the month of September, which totaled \$4 million, were due and payable October 15, 1997.

Despite frequent assurances by the Japanese carriers that they would pay the fees, when the October deadline was reached, they refused to do so. Accordingly, the FMC took the next step, which is authorized by statute and specifically spelled out in the final rule: to request that Customs deny clearance of Japanese vessels at United States ports, and to request the Coast Guard to detain the vessels. This action is entirely avoidable upon payment by the Japanese carriers of their now overdue debts to the United States.

The Japanese port practices at issue result in costly, arbitrary, and unnecessary expenditures by United States carriers and prevent them from making their own decisions on whom to hire for stevedoring services, from being licensed to operate their own terminals, and from operating efficiently. These practices are injurious not only to U.S. carriers, but to all U.S. importers and exporters who rely on ocean shipping, and to the American consumer. Japanese port costs are the highest in the world, and American consumers of Japanese goods ultimately foot the bill. Moreover, Japanese carriers are not subject to such restrictions in their operations in the United States.

None of these achievements of the FMC would have been possible were the FMC not an independent agency, separate from the executive branch departments. Only an independent agency, free from political pressure and the host of other concerns which frequently paralyze larger executive branch agencies, could have acted so swiftly and effectively. We must ensure that the FMC continue to retain its independent status.

It is my understanding that United States and Japanese negotiators are coming close to an agreement that would resolve this issue. This issue would not be resolved, but for the actions of the FMC. Bravo, keep up the good work, and ensure that whatever issues the Japanese Government agrees to are enforced for the benefit of the shipping public.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, October 17,

1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,418,064,201,028.31. (Five trillion, four hundred eighteen billion, sixty-four million, two hundred one thousand, twenty-eight dollars and thirty-one cents)

One year ago, October 17, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,226,593,000,000 (Five trillion, two hundred twenty-six billion, five hundred ninety-three million)

Twenty-five years ago, October 17, 1972, the Federal debt stood at \$436,027,000,000 (Four hundred thirty-six billion, twenty-seven million) which reflects a debt increase of nearly \$5 trillion—\$4,982,037,201,028.31 (Four trillion, nine hundred eighty-two billion, thirty-seven million, two hundred one thousand, twenty-eight dollars and thirty-one cents) during the past 25 years.

RICHARD JOHNSON: 43 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is my privilege today to honor Richard Johnson of Baltic, SD. Richard recently retired after 43 years of service in the Baltic Fire Department—half of the department's 86 years of existence. His friends describe him as a man who can always be relied upon and who never failed to answer the call when an emergency struck his community.

Nearly 20 years ago, a grain elevator exploded in this quiet town in southeastern South Dakota, tragically killing two people, and starting a furious blaze that could be seen for miles. Richard, an assistant manager at the elevator, was the first firefighter on the scene. Fighting large fires is a particular challenge in rural South Dakota, where fire departments depend upon teams of volunteers and often lack adequate supplies of water. On this day, firefighters were called in from all over the region and a pump truck was brought from Sioux Falls to draw water from the Big Sioux River. Together, they worked throughout the afternoon to bring the blaze under control before finally extinguishing it. For all of that long, exhausting afternoon, and for the 3 days of cleanup that followed, Richard was there.

These days tell us a lot about Richard. Quiet and reserved, he never asked for the spotlight, but for 43 years he was always there when he was needed. After all his long years of service, it is an honor to recognize his accomplishments before the Senate. Mr. President, September 26 was declared Richard Johnson Day in Baltic, and he was named parade marshal for the Baltic Homecoming Parade held that same day. As part of the celebration, 14 of the 18 fire chiefs Richard served under during those 43 years came to honor him—a testament to the respect Richard earned during his years with the department.

I wish Richard the best as he begins his retirement, and hope that he has many happy years together with his friends and his family.