

Gen. Chi Haotian, to Washington. Mr. Chi was one of the People's Liberation Army officers who led the military assault against the citizens of the Chinese capital on June 4, 1989—the massacre in Tiananmen Square.

Now the administration wants to welcome President Jiang with pomp and circumstance. These actions indicate that, where China is concerned, what we have is not a policy of constructive engagement, but one of unconditional engagement.

By agreeing to this state visit without receiving any significant concession on human rights, religious freedom and weapons proliferation, the administration may be squandering its strongest source of leverage with Beijing.

None of this is to recommend cutting off all dialog between the United States and China. Again, I would not object to having a visit for working-level purposes. But I feel the symbolism of a state visit is inappropriate given the current situation in China and our fundamental disagreements.

For this reason, I have cosponsored a resolution, with Senators FEINGOLD and HELMS, to downgrade the upcoming event from a state visit to a working visit. And I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution as well.

We must work, Mr. President, to put United States-China relations on a more substantive basis. And that requires hard work and tough negotiations.

The President must call for specific actions on the part of the Chinese leadership that will improve that country's treatment of its own people and stop its destabilizing activities in the world at large.

According to the Wall Street Journal, "[China] doesn't plan to discuss issues such as human rights" at this upcoming conference. A Chinese Embassy spokesman even said "we do not welcome" advice on such matters.

But, welcome or not, President Clinton must insist that China's leaders address crucial issues like human rights. Indeed, in my view, the administration has a moral duty to press a whole host of issues on the Chinese Government that it may not welcome, but that are of great importance to the people of China, to the United States, and to the world.

Specifically, I believe President Clinton should demand:

First, that the Chinese Government dismantle nonreciprocal tariff and non-tariff barriers to American exports to China, and stop the continued export to the United States of products made with prison labor;

Second, that the Chinese Government cease persecuting Chinese Christians, as well as members of other religious faiths, and release all persons incarcerated for their religious or other human rights related activities;

Third, that China end its coercive family planning practices, including its practice of forced abortion, forced sterilization and infanticide;

Fourth, that the Chinese Government stop its activities leading to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and advanced ballistic missile technology; and

Fifth, that the Chinese Government stop its evasion of United States export control and other laws.

Mr. President, by making these demands on the Chinese Government, the President would put in place the structure needed for a coherent China policy; a policy aimed at protecting our national interests and improving human rights conditions in China.

In addition, I believe it is crucial that the President express his determination to uphold and fully implement the Taiwan Relations Act. This act provides the framework for strong economic and security relations between the United States and the democratic government of Taiwan. Full implementation will show our commitment to freedom in the Asian-Pacific region.

If no progress is made through these means, Mr. President, Congress must act. If the Chinese leadership is not willing to make significant reforms on its own, we must pass legislation targeting its improper activities.

In preparation for that contingency, I have joined with a bipartisan group of colleagues to introduce the China Policy Act of 1997.

This legislation will set in motion a policy that will encourage the Chinese Government to reform its human rights policies, and end its sales of arms and weapons technology to renegade regimes like Iran.

To begin with, Mr. President, the bill contains targeted sanctions aimed directly at Chinese companies that engage in weapons and weapons technology proliferation.

The bill would institute targeted sanctions against PLA companies found to have engaged in weapons proliferation, illegal importation of weapons to the United States or military or political espionage in the United States. The U.S. Government also would publish a list of other PLA-controlled companies.

This would allow American companies and consumers to decide whether they wish to purchase products manufactured in whole or in part by the Communist Chinese Army.

As important, the bill includes provisions to encourage internal liberalization and cultural exchanges between our two countries. It would increase funding for international broadcasting to China, including Radio Free Asia and the Voice of America.

It also would increase funding for National Endowment for Democracy and the United States Information Agency student, cultural, and legislative exchange programs in China.

The bill would contain a variety of other provisions likewise aimed at trying to address the concerns on a targeted basis, Mr. President, as opposed to the approach which has been taken,

in my judgment, for too long, an approach which has focused exclusively on the issue of most-favored-nation treaty status with respect to the relationship between the United States and China.

I think the proper way to address the concerns that many of us have is to focus on the specific concerns themselves and to impose, if appropriate, sanctions with regard to those concerns on a targeted basis.

I firmly believe that it is America's duty as well as our interest to make the extra effort required to promote freedom and democracy in China and to integrate her into the community of nations.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and I call on the President to demand that the Government of the People's Republic of China bring itself into compliance with international standards on human rights and religious freedom.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISTEA

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I have been waiting all week to talk about some very, very important things in the highway and transportation reauthorization bill, also known as ISTEA or NEXTEA. I am disappointed we have been unable to move to that bill because I think everyone here can agree we have journeyed far in the transportation area not only over the last 6 years under the just-expired ISTEA bill but over the last century. We are ready to embark upon the next leg of that journey. I am very distressed and saddened that our colleagues are not willing to move forward on it.

I think everyone in this body and certainly most of our constituents around the country know the importance and the role that transportation plays in our everyday lives and especially in our economy. Our economic stability and progress is tied directly to transportation.

In my opinion, what really worked, what really got us moving on transportation infrastructure in this Nation was President Dwight Eisenhower's vision of an interstate system. That succeeded in building the first network of modern high-speed roads linking our States with each other and with markets around the world.

As my dear friend and colleague from Virginia, Senator WARNER, often says, this is one world market. Our country's transportation infrastructure makes it so.

Mr. President, my home State of Missouri has always been a leader in the

area of transportation. As one example, the first construction contract awarded under the interstate system was awarded for part of Interstate 70 near St. Charles, MO. In fact, the first three contracts awarded under this system were Missouri contracts. I think this demonstrates one more time Missouri's fundamental commitment to and belief in essential infrastructure.

Even though my friend and colleague from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, and I had some differences of opinion during the 1991 debate, I do agree with many of my colleagues when they give Senator MOYNIHAN and the 1997 ISTEA bill credit for moving our transportation policy forward. The 1991 bill was landmark legislation that enabled us to craft a new generation of highway and transit programs.

Now, let us all recognize that transportation in this country includes everything from transit systems, rail, waterways, air, pipelines, et cetera. However, as we move forward, we must build our new policy solidly on our commitment to the concrete and asphalt reality that roads and bridges are, and will continue to be the foundation of our transportation system. The new policy will be only as good as the foundation on which it is built.

This country has an inadequate highway infrastructure that contributes to 114 deaths on our Nation's highways each day. This is the equivalent of a major airline disaster each and every day of the year. And, tragically, many of these fatalities are our Nation's children. As a matter of fact, motor vehicle accidents are the No. 1 cause of death of American children of all ages. That is truly a remarkable and distressing and tragic fact.

I have to share with you, Mr. President, the fact that Missouri's highway fatality rate is above the national average. I was reminded of these highway tragedies just this past week during the Columbus Day work period in the State, as I have been on every opportunity I have had to travel around the State of Missouri. As I went back and forth across the State, I saw along the roads the little white crosses that had been marked for deaths of motorists and their passengers on Missouri's highways. Some of the highways have very, very frequent intervals of white crosses. And at every stop where I talked with people and listened to them talk about transportation, they told me of friends, neighbors, and loved ones who had been lost in highway accidents. Almost everyone of us in Missouri have experienced or know somebody who has experienced the loss of a loved one or a dear friend. Earlier this year, my good friend Gary Dickenson of Chillicothe, MO, was driving from Chillicothe toward Kansas City where he had business interests, where he traveled frequently on Highway 36, a highway that, because of the traffic, should have been a four-lane, divided highway. It was, in fact, a two-way, two-lane highway. He met a car driven

by a stranger to that part of the road who had crossed over the center line and he was killed.

We have had hearings in Missouri where families who have come to testify for the needs of highways have told us about the tragedy that their families have felt, like the Winkler family in Moberly, and many others, who lost a loved one because someone not familiar with that highway, not realizing that that heavily traveled road was a two-way road rather than a divided highway, crossed the center line and was in the wrong lane and crashed head-on into a fatal traffic accident.

Now, some fatalities on our roads are as a result of drunken driving and improper child safety restraints. But it is clear to me that the major role in these fatalities is the unsafe condition and inadequate capacity of our highways, and we really can't allow this to continue. It is totally unacceptable and we have to do something about it. We must improve upon our existing infrastructure and we have to determine better ways to manage our transportation needs, not only to address the tremendous safety needs, but for our economic competitiveness.

We must not forget that Americans depend upon our transportation infrastructure, mainly our roads and bridges, each day, to get to and from work, school, the shopping center, doctor appointments, ball games, to see friends, and to go to church. But we also know that those highways and byways, those roads and those bridges are vitally important to maintaining economic prosperity. They take workers to and from jobs, and bring goods and supplies into the workplace, and they bring the finished products out. And only if they do so in an efficient and effective manner can we make sure that our products are competitive against the products of other nations in the world.

Well, the condition of our roads and bridges, once the envy of the world, should embarrass all of us. I have listened over the years, and just recently on the Senate floor, to my colleagues from Northeastern States talking about their transportation needs and how they think they are somehow more deserving of additional highway funds than are the Southern and Midwestern and the Western States. On this floor, before the Columbus Day State work period, a Senator from the Northeast alluded to that part of the country as "the crux of our economic mix."

Well, Mr. President, I have to disagree and, like my colleagues who make those statements, be a little parochial because I argue that the crux is the middle part of the country. It is Michigan, it is Missouri, it is Iowa, it is Arkansas, it is Illinois, it is Kansas, it is Oklahoma, it is Louisiana, it is Minnesota, it is Wisconsin, it is Louisiana, it is Mississippi, and Texas. Why, Mr. President? Because not only is this the heartland of the country, but in my

opinion this is where the country's current and future growth will be.

Now, my State of Missouri is "geographically privileged" to be located not only near the geographic center of the United States, and it not only has the demographic or population center of the United States, but it is at the center or at the confluence of our Nation's two greatest waterways, the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. Not only has Missouri proven itself to be the gateway to the West, but today it is the gateway to the North, South, East and West. Like spokes from a bicycle wheel, Missouri's roads and bridges are fast becoming the arteries that feed not only our country's heartland, but the whole of North America.

Already, according to the Federal Highway Administration, Missouri has the country's sixth largest highway system. According to the Road Information Program, vehicle travel in Missouri grew by 51 percent between 1985 and 1995, compared to a national average of 37 percent. It is the home of the second and third largest rail hubs, the second fastest-growing airport in the world, and the second largest inland port in the United States.

A further example of the dynamic growth in Missouri is Branson, MO, population 4,725. I hope my colleagues—and not just those of us who enjoy country music—know about Branson, because in 1996 alone, Branson was visited by 5.8 million guests. That requires a lot of transportation to bring that many people into a community of less than 5,000 residents.

In addition, we look at our two largest trading partners, Canada and Mexico. One of the main north-south highway routes in this country is Interstate 35 from Laredo, TX, through Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Duluth, MN.

Unfortunately, many coastal States forget about inland States when it comes to the global economy. But for our State of Missouri, and many other "inland" States, our highway infrastructure, coupled with rail, air and waterways, makes us strong players in "our one-world market."

Missouri alone serves over 100 different countries around the world with our exports. In 1995, our exports exceeded \$5.5 billion.

Not only does Missouri export electronics, machinery, and chemicals, but Missouri is one of the largest exporters in the country of agricultural products. In overall agricultural exports, Missouri is ranked 15th among all 50 States in the value of its agricultural exports. Missouri is the sixth largest soybean producer and eighth largest feed corn producer in the country. Missouri ranks 6th in rice production and 13th in wheat production.

If we in Missouri are going to continue to compete globally for foreign trade opportunities of the next century, not only do Missourians need "fair" trade to compete, but we need a "fair" return of our transportation dollars so Missourians have "fair" access

to global markets which coastal States now dominate because they already enjoy such access. A fair return to Missouri is imperative because Missouri's highways and bridges are in tremendous need of more dollars—more of our dollars that we have been sending to Washington, more of our dollars that we have shared in large measure with other States. It used to be, prior to the 1991 act, that we were getting about 75 cents back on every dollar we sent to Washington. We got it up to 80 cents after 1991. And we are hoping—hoping against hope—that maybe we can pass a measure which will get us up to 92 cents, still sharing 8 cents of every dollar that we send to Washington with other States for their transportation needs.

Permit me to quote from testimony provided by Tom Boland, a good friend and chair of the Missouri Highway and Transportation Commission, at a field hearing we held in which the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Senator CHAFEE, and the Senator from Virginia, Senator WARNER, were kind enough to participate. Mr. Boland said:

In Missouri, we can demonstrate the need for increased Federal funding to improve the safety of our highways and bridges all too well. Let me take you on a short tour down the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. The Missouri River enters the State at our far northwest corner, flows southward to Kansas City, then crosses the entire State and joins the Mississippi River at St. Louis. The Mississippi River forms the entire eastern boundary of Missouri.

More than 40 bridges on the State and Federal highway system cross these two rivers in Missouri. More than half of these bridges are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete when evaluated by Federal criteria. They are too narrow or have severe weight restrictions, or both, that prevent commercial vehicle use and obstruct the economic vitality of many of our communities.

Using the Federal Highway Administration rating system, Missouri has approximately 11,000 centerline miles of highways rating fair or worse, or a lower rate. This is nearly one-third of the total State highway system. According to the Surface Transportation Policy Project Report, 81 percent of Missouri's urban highways alone are not in good condition. Over 42 percent of Missouri's 23,000 bridges are substandard.

Missouri has transportation needs that need to be met.

Ever since my arrival in the U.S. Senate, I have worked on transportation issues, mainly on getting my State of Missouri a fair return on its highway dollars. I will be honest; it has been an uphill battle. Even under the bill as reported from the Environment and Public Works Committee, Missouri, and several others, are still donor States. As a member of the committee, I worked with my colleagues, Senators CHAFEE, WARNER, and BAUCUS, to come up with a formula that

was fair. Again, let me be honest; it is not everything I would like. If I got what I wanted, Missouri would be getting a return of \$1.72 or \$2.15 on every dollar they sent in. That is the return that some of the Northeastern States are receiving. But Missouri is not receiving that much.

Yet, I am the sponsor of this bill because it has moved the formula by leaps and bounds in the right direction, and I believe it is a reasonable compromise. It is a compromise that recognizes both the political realities of this place and, I think, the legitimate concerns of all the States involved.

The bill which I am proud to have sponsored with a number of my colleagues addresses three of the top priorities I have.

The bill, No. 1, increases the overall amount of transportation dollars that we invest in our infrastructure.

Two, it gives a fairer return of transportation dollars to the State of Missouri.

And, three, it provides additional flexibility to State and local planners, decisionmakers, and officials to address their specific transportation needs.

I hope that we can move forward on this vitally important legislation so we can address the numerous issues pending, such as transit, safety, and the Finance Committee title, which includes another critically important issue to Missouri and the rest of the country—that is ethanol.

The Finance Committee amendment includes an extension to 2007 of ethanol's tax incentives. This exemption promotes energy security by lowering our dependence on foreign oil. It is cleaner burning. It is a cleaner burning fuel, so it is good for the environment. And it is a renewable resource that really benefits our rural economy. The Senate voted overwhelmingly this summer to support this extension in the Taxpayers' Relief Act, and we defeated those who attempted to end the exemption in 1998. Senator GRASSLEY and others have done an outstanding job of leading our bipartisan coalition. I am proud to be part of that coalition, and I expect us to prevail if and when we are challenged again on this issue.

Another amendment that is important will reauthorize the act providing assistance to States for fish restoration, wetlands restoration and boat safety, commonly known as "Wallop-Breaux." I am particularly interested in a new provision to authorize a new "National Outreach and Communications Program" designed to introduce additional segments of the public—especially America's youth—to the healthy fun of fishing and boating, to increase awareness of boating and fishing opportunities, and to promote safe and environmentally sound boating and fishing practices. Fishing is very important, in my State, to the recreational industry, and it is a favorite pastime of thousands and thousands of enthusiasts. I was out there, I confess.

Most people with good judgment wouldn't be out on a wind-blown lake in 35 degree temperature getting their feet wet, getting cold to the bone but going after the mighty sport fish, a tremendously important part of our heritage, and I am going to keep doing it until one of these days I quit being outsmarted by the fish.

Mr. President, moving our transportation policy into the 21st century will be a challenge. There is no denying that. I hope we can move forward and move forward soon on this vitally important legislation so that these amendments that I have mentioned and other important amendments can be debated and voted on.

It is important to realize that maintaining our Nation's roads and bridges is not a glamorous undertaking, but as with the debate raging in education circles about improving our Nation's crumbling schools, so goes the equally important debate about improving public infrastructure.

Mr. President, as we prepare and plan our transportation policy for the 21st century, I hope all of us remember four basic principles that our new policy must ensure. First and foremost is safety, but also fairness, efficiency, and economic competitiveness.

Mr. President, when we do move to the consideration of this bill—as I said, I hope that will be soon—I intend to offer an amendment with Senator BREAUX, an amendment that has been cleared on both sides of the aisle, because it makes good sense. This is an amendment that affects both the EPA and the Corps of Engineers. They reviewed the amendment. They have no objection to it. It is consistent with administration policy and its Federal guidance issued November 1995. It is supported by the Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. And, beyond that, it is good for wetlands protection. It promotes private-sector efforts to protect wetlands. And it saves money that can be used on highways or other authorized uses under this act. Truly a win-win-win amendment.

Now that I have your rapt attention, let me tell you what this amendment would do.

This amendment provides that when highway projects result in impacts to wetlands that require compensation mitigation under current law, preference should be given, to the extent practicable, to private-sector mitigation banks. The amendment mandates that the banks be approved in accordance with the administration's Federal guidance on mitigation banking issued in 1995, and it requires that the bank be within the service area of the impacted wetlands.

The administration's definition of mitigation banking is

... the restoration, creation, enhancement and, in exceptional circumstances, preservation of wetlands and/or aquatic resources expressly for the purpose of providing compensatory mitigation in advance of authorized impacts to similar resources.

Mitigation is usually accomplished by restoring or creating other wetlands. Isolated, on-site mitigation projects, however, are expensive and costly to maintain. Wetlands mitigation banks are typically large tracts of land that have been restored as wetlands.

A State department of transportation building a highway project which impacts wetlands merely buys credits generated in the bank based on the acreage and quality of the restored wetlands in order to satisfy its obligation to mitigate the harm to the impacted wetlands by the construction of the highway. The bank sponsor assumes full responsibility for maintaining the restored wetlands site, and the State department of transportation has thus fulfilled its mitigation requirement.

The amendment does not change in any way the mitigation required. It provides simply that mitigation banking will be the preferred alternative once mitigation requirements are determined.

Last year, the Committee on Environment and Public Works held a hearing where witnesses from the administration, the private sector, the environmental community, and the scientific community spoke to the promise of mitigation banking as being an important instrument to protect wetlands and to do so with less red tape and, most importantly, at less expense to our highway and transportation programs.

Now, this proposal is strongly supported by the Missouri and the Ohio Departments of Transportation and by the nationwide association AASHTO. A September letter from the Ohio Director of Transportation notes that "the Ohio department's costs for on-site mitigation have ranged as high as \$150,000 an acre when the cost of design, real estate, construction and mitigation monitoring were combined. These costs are not out of line with the high end costs experienced by many other departments of transportation around the country. Our lowest costs for on-site mitigation have generally exceeded \$35,000 per acre. The cost of banking, in our experience, has ranged from around \$10,000 to \$12,000 per acre and includes all of the above-cited cost factors. This equates to about one-quarter the cost of our average on-site mitigation."

In Florida, the department of transportation pays its department of environmental protection \$75,000 for every acre it impacts for mitigation. By contrast, the Florida wetlands bank acres in Broward County are sold for a reported \$50,000 to \$55,000. The State of Illinois in the Chicago area has had a similar experience.

The savings can be significant and they can be achieved because of specialization and economies of scale. As a result, less Federal highway money is spent on mitigating impacts to wetlands. More Federal highway money is

made available for highway construction. And the wetlands, wildlife and conservation benefits are achieved in the most efficient manner possible. The Vice President and others have said we should pursue ways in which we can make environmental protection a profitable enterprise while actually reducing the permit process times for citizens weaving their way through the burdensome wetlands permitting process.

This does just that. Many agree that mitigation banks, which must be approved, will have a greater long-term rate of success in protecting wetlands because, one, the people who sell the credits are in the business of wetlands protection; two, the banks are easy to regulate and be held accountable; three, there is more time and flexibility for a bank to procure and identify high-quality wetlands.

Again, this is a good amendment. It is good for the environment. It is good for the efficiencies. It will save highway dollars and make sure we deliver the wetlands protection with the wildlife, environmental and conservation benefits that go along with it in the most efficient use possible of our precious highway dollars.

I hope that all of my colleagues will support the bipartisan amendment when we are enabled to present it in the Chamber in the consideration of the highway transportation reauthorization bill, ISTEA.

Mr. President, I see others in the Chamber so I will yield the floor at this time. I thank the Chair.

MITIGATION BANKING

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I'm pleased to cosponsor with Senator BOND the mitigation banking amendment to the highway bill. I thank Senator BOND for his leadership and am pleased to continue working with him on wetlands-related issues.

The Bond-Breaux amendment is direct and straightforward. It simply says that mitigation banking shall be the preferred means, to the maximum extent practicable, to mitigate for wetlands or natural habitat which are affected as part of a Federal-aid highway project and whose mitigation is paid for with Federal-aid funds.

In addition, the amendment identifies three factors that are to be met in order to use a mitigation bank: first, the affected wetlands or natural habitat are to be in a bank's service area; second, the bank has to have enough credits available to offset the impact; and third, the bank has to meet federally approved standards.

So, Senator BOND and I, through this amendment, are simply trying to establish a reasonable, responsible wetlands and natural habitat mitigation policy as part of the Federal-aid highway program.

Our proposal has two key components: First, we say give mitigation banking a preference, to the maximum extent practicable, which is reasonable. Second, we say a bank should meet cer-

tain conditions to ensure its effectiveness and viability, which is being responsible.

Let me emphasize that our amendment does not mandate the use of mitigation banks. Nor does the amendment require their use nor does it say they shall be the sole means or the only method used to mitigate affected wetlands or natural habitat.

The Bond-Breaux amendment simply says mitigation banks shall be the preferred means, to the maximum extent practicable, and they must meet certain responsible conditions before they can be used.

Louisiana's transportation department officials have said that the State already uses mitigation banks and areas as an option for some of its highway projects.

Mitigation banks can offer several advantages when constructed and operated responsibly. They can achieve economies of scale. They can provide larger, higher quality and diverse habitat and they can make mitigation costs less expensive when compared to costs for some isolated mitigation sites which are not part of a bank.

The Bond-Breaux amendment certainly is in line with the environmental provisions and direction of the proposed highway bill we have before the Senate, S. 1173.

For these reasons, I urge the Senate's adoption of the amendment when it comes up for consideration.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes until the hour of 6:30 p.m.

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

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, October 22, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,421,844,508,272.92. (Five trillion, four hundred twenty-one billion, eight hundred forty-four million, five hundred eight thousand, two hundred seventy-two dollars and ninety-two cents)

One year ago, October 22, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,228,756,000,000. (Five trillion, two hundred twenty-