

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for yielding.

In my view, we have had a longstanding problem in the Congress with emergency appropriations, supplemental appropriations, or so-called disaster bills. The problem has been—and truly there has been a disaster such as in North Dakota and Minnesota with the Red River flooding, and that is legitimate. But then built on top of that is a lot of spending that has nothing to do with the emergency nature of this piece of legislation.

I went on ahead and supported this supplemental appropriations bill even though I had some concerns about the amount of spending that was in the bill. In my view, the truly emergency provisions that are in there run in the dollar range from \$2.5 to \$4 billion. The bill is an \$8.6 billion bill.

The only thing that made me go ahead and support this particular piece of legislation is a provision in there that said that we would not shut down the Federal Government. I felt it was an appropriate bill. I did not particularly like all the spending that was in there, but I wanted to get something moving ahead so that we could take care of the needs of the people in North Dakota and Minnesota.

Mr. President, I am disappointed that the President chose to put politics ahead of people. I kept this need to take care of those people in mind, even though I was not entirely happy with the bill. I am disappointed he took such a narrow view. By vetoing the 1997 supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill, he has actually delayed its progress after the Congress has moved ahead. This bill would have provided funding for future disaster relief needs and ensured that we would not face a disaster of another Government shutdown.

Now, the majority was accused by the minority of being "hard headed and cold hearted" for not submitting the bill to the President sooner. I cannot imagine how outraged they must be now that the President has vetoed the bill. I hope that those who promised to tie up the Senate until this bill is passed are now willing to fight just as hard to override this veto, thereby providing funding for disaster relief and ensuring that there will not be another Government shutdown.

Let's be clear, this bill is not about holding up money for the flood victims, as some have suggested. Flood victims are currently receiving disaster relief from FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency. To date, FEMA has already allocated over \$150 million to victims of the flood. Almost \$40 million in housing assistance checks have been issued to more than 21,000 flood victims. In addition, the Small Business Administration has approved more than \$75 million in disaster loans.

In short, the flood victims are being cared for. This bill replenishes funds for FEMA and ensures stability for future disaster funding.

Just as importantly, this bill is about preventing another disaster, the manmade disaster of a Government shutdown. This seems to be nothing more than a political move by the President designed to ensure that he can shut down the Government again, just as he did before when we were trying to balance the budget.

This is the same strategy we have seen from the President before. He impedes, stalls, and ultimately vetoes any compromise we reach, playing political games with public safety, and the productivity of our Federal employees. He then tries to get political mileage out of it by blaming the majority in Congress. When an agreement is finally reached, I have no doubt he will take credit for that, too.

I find it ironic that the President said during his State of the Union Address that the Federal Government should never be shut down again.

Why, then, does he now veto a bill that does exactly that: Ensure that the Government won't be shut down again? The continuing resolution portion of this bill has ensured that Congress and the President will be allowed to continue budget negotiations in good faith without harming the taxpayers or Federal employees and their families.

The President needs to put partisan politics aside and focus on what is good for our country.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, might I ask, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

MFN STATUS FOR CHINA

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, over the Memorial Day recess, I made a week-long trip to East Asia. This included stops in Seoul, South Korea; Pyongyang, North Korea; Beijing, China; Hong Kong, as well as Misawa Air Force Base in Japan. I spent most of my time on the three issues of most immediate concern to us in northeast Asia this year. First, food and security problems on the Korean Peninsula; second, the negotiations over China's entry into the World Trade Organization; and third, Hong Kong's transition to Chinese sovereignty, now less than 3 weeks away.

I also discussed longer term issues, including environmental protection, human rights, and United States-China security relations. These are complex subjects, with great implications for our national interest in all sorts of areas. With respect to the three im-

mediate issues, I think our basic strategies are well conceived, and we have good people in the military and the Foreign Service working on them. I am in the process of drafting a trip report that will address them in much more detail.

But we in Congress must first take up a different issue; that is, whether to support the President's decision to renew China's MFN status. So I will return to the floor in coming days to discuss the basic security, trade, environmental, and humanitarian issues we face in China and in East Asia generally. But today I will concentrate on MFN status—why it is legally right; why it is morally right, and why, given our compelling interest in issues like security in Korea, more fair and reciprocal trade with China, and a smooth transition for Hong Kong, it is right for our national interest.

LEGALLY RIGHT

First, renewal of MFN status is right under our law. The Jackson-Vanik law, which has governed renewal of MFN status for nonmarket economies since 1974, is the main law in place. It conditions MFN on two things: the existence of a bilateral commercial agreement, and freedom of emigration. Under the law, the President's choice is clear. We have a bilateral trade agreement signed with China in 1980, and China allows free emigration. Therefore, as a legal matter, the President was right to renew MFN and we should back him up.

MORALLY RIGHT

Second, renewing MFN status is morally right. At times, people in Washington are tempted to see a vote to revoke MFN as something which might promote human rights in China. This is a fine sentiment. People who advocate revoking MFN status to promote human rights are very well intentioned. But the effects of revoking MFN would be the opposite of what they intend.

To revoke MFN status, very simply, is to raise tariffs from Uruguay round to Smoot-Hawley levels. To take one example, that means raising tariffs on toys and stuffed animals from zero to 70 percent overnight, again, automatically, from zero to 70 percent tariff overnight. That hits one of China's major exports to the United States, at about 6 billion dollars' worth last year. And who makes them? On the whole, it's young Chinese working people trying to improve their lives.

What would happen if we revoke MFN status? The result should be obvious. Millions of innocent Chinese workers in toy factories and in other walks of life would lose their jobs. The Chinese Government would certainly be hurt, but it would still be there the next day. But the lives of these workers would be ruined. So, far from improving human rights, revoking China's MFN status would cause immense human suffering in China.

Of course, that would discredit our human rights efforts with the Chinese

public. No rational person can expect anyone in China to thank us for harming their economy and inflicting misery on them, their families, or their fellow citizens.

By contrast, if human rights is our motivation, MFN is an irreplaceable part of an effective policy. As the Democracy Wall activist Wang Xizhe—until recently, a political prisoner—says:

The goal of exerting effective, long-term influence over China can only be achieved by maintaining the broadest possible contacts with China, on the foundation of MFN, thus causing China to enter further into the global family and to accept globally practiced standards of behavior.

A long-term policy may emotionally be hard to accept. There are real human rights problems in China: About 3,000 political prisoners remain in jail, strict limits on freedom of assembly exist, very severe policies in Tibet. We would like to solve them all in a day, but the fact is, that won't happen. Only by staying the course, staying involved through trade and human exchange, as well as diplomacy, can we hope to make a difference.

RIGHT FOR THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Finally, we are Americans first, and we are responsible to the American public on our policy decisions. And renewing MFN status is right for our own national interest.

Security issues are an example. I can say from firsthand experience that we have a very complex, very dangerous situation at hand in the Korean Peninsula.

North Korea is a politically isolated government, with very severe food and economic problems, and a large and well-armed military machine. We have a commitment to joint defense of South Korea, we Americans and the South Koreans, and we have 37,000 men and women permanently on the line just a few miles south of the DMZ. We owe it to them to pursue a very serious, responsible policy that can keep the peace and ensure a swift victory if, God forbid, there is any conflict. And Chinese cooperation is absolutely essential to that. Deliberately antagonizing the Chinese Government and armed forces by revoking MFN will not help at all.

We are also responsible to our own people to make trade with China more fair, more reciprocal, and more beneficial to our country. We have an opportunity to do that this year by bringing China into the World Trade Organization on a commercially acceptable basis. Cutting off MFN status would put us on the opposite track: it would balance trade at close to zero, cutting off jobs and prosperity here as well as in China.

As we look into the next century, we must work to slow global warming, ocean pollution, and the loss of biodiversity. To take just one statistic, in the next 20 years, world greenhouse emissions will grow from 6 to 9 trillion tons a year. Fully 1 trillion of the addi-

tional 3 trillion tons will come from China. That is, one-third of all greenhouse gas emissions in the next 20 years, if nothing is done, will come from China.

We have a chance now to moderate that trend. And a political crisis caused by revoking MFN would make that mutually beneficial effort very difficult.

VIEWS OF OUR FRIENDS AND ALLIES

Our own common sense should tell us that China is a key player on all these issues. Wantonly picking a fight with the world's largest country by revoking MFN status, when only 6 countries in the world lack MFN status and 151 countries actually get tariff rates better than MFN, would be foolish.

And our allies tell us the same thing. During my trip last month, I met top national security officials in the South Korean Government. I spoke with senior officers of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces. And I met with Chinese dissidents and democratic political leaders in Hong Kong.

These are our friends, our strategic allies, people we work with every day, people who wish us well. Not a single one of them supported revoking MFN status. To the contrary, they all felt that a good relationship between the United States and China is crucial.

The right course to take, therefore, is very clear. From Korea to human rights to global warming to Hong Kong and Taiwan and trade, we have very serious issues to discuss with the Chinese. And the annual MFN debate is an artificial, unnecessary crisis that makes results on all of them more difficult.

So we should not debate this question into the misty and indefinite future. Instead, we should back up the President this year, renew China's MFN status, and when China faces up to its WTO responsibilities, then make MFN permanent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an acknowledgement on the East Asia trip be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MAX BAUCUS—ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ON EAST ASIA TRIP

Mr. President, we in Congress oversee the work of government. It's our responsibility to eliminate waste. Fix what's broken. Find what's wrong. That's an essential part of the job. But every once in a while, we ought to stop and remind ourselves what's right. And today I'd like to take a few minutes to do that.

I recently returned from a week-long trip to South Korea, North Korea, Beijing and Hong Kong, with a brief stop at Misawa Air Force Base in Japan as well, on official business for the Finance Committee.

In the future I will make a more formal report to the Committee on these visits. But setting the policy issues aside for a moment, this trip reminded me once again that both here in Washington and overseas we have talented, patriotic people who are doing their very best for our country. And today, I would like to take some time to thank for helping to make my trip a success.

In Washington:

Chairman William Roth, and Jane Butterfield of the Finance Committee staff;

Lt. Col. John Wohlman, who served as my military escort officer in Seoul, Pyongyang and Beijing;

Assistant Secretary of Defense Dr. Franklin Kramer and Rear Admiral William Wright, who gave me a very enlightening brief on Korean security issues and our military dialogue with the Chinese armed services, and Col. Martin Wisda of the POW/MIA office;

Charles Kartmann, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Howard Lange, State Department China Desk Director and John Long of the State Department's East Asia Bureau;

Peter Scher of the U.S. Trade Representative on the state of our agricultural trade talks with China; and

Teri Patin and the staff of the State Department Office of Congressional Travel.

In Seoul:

With the U.S. Embassy:

Charge d'Affaires Richard Christiansen, an extremely capable and knowledgeable public servant who is one of our country's real experts on Korea; and

Larry Robinson, Political Officer and my Control Officer. Larry worked hard on very short notice to arrange my schedule, and gave me some very good advice about China as well; and

David Schoonover, Agricultural Minister-Counselor.

With US Forces—Korea:

Gen. John H. Tilleli, Commander of US Forces—Korea;

Gen. George W. Norwood and the other USFK officers, who helped brief me on the security issues we face in Korea; and

The Korean-American Cowboy Association for inviting me to the Memorial Day Rodeo to meet and talk with some of our enlisted men and women.

At Misawa Air Force Base in Japan:

Gen. Bruce Wright, USAF; and

Col. Mark Rogers, USAF.

In Beijing:

Ambassador Jim Sasser and the other participants in the Country Team Briefing;

Kelley Snyder, Second Secretary, Economic Section. Ms. Snyder was principally responsible for arranging meetings with Chinese political leaders, and officials from the National Environmental Protection Agency, the Agriculture Ministry, the People's Liberation Army, the Trade Ministry, the Foreign Ministry and the Hong Kong and Macao Office of the State Council.

Bill Brant, Agricultural Minister, who handled the Embassy's participation in the Mansfield Pacific Center Conference on Food Security and Agricultural Trade, and helped make it a resounding success;

Jim Brown, the Embassy Interpreter.

In Hong Kong:

Consul General Richard Boucher;

Scot Marciel, Economic Officer and my control officer. Scot helped me arrange meetings and gain an understanding of the spectrum of Hong Kong opinion on the transition;

Dr. Douglas Spelman, Chief of the Economic and Political Section;

Robert Tynes of the Consular Section and his staff, who handle a tremendously busy and important office very efficiently; and

Victor Chan of General Services.

Our country has a lot at stake in all these places. We face some difficult issues, and in the case of Korea some very dangerous ones. But I must say that we have some very good people on the job. I could not have had better advice on setting an itinerary, more efficient logistical help in scheduling it, and more informed briefings than I received from them.

They have my gratitude, and America is lucky to have them.

Mr. BAUCUS. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE ALL-NIGHT DISASTER VIGIL

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to take a couple of minutes of the time allotted to thank so many of our colleagues from both sides of the Congress for their participation in our all-night vigil last night.

We began at 6 o'clock yesterday evening and worked through until 9 o'clock this morning, nonstop. We had about 25 Senators who participated, Senators from all over the country, and some Senators from States that were not affected by the disaster, not included in the supplemental legislation. We had Members of the House of Representatives who participated and came all the way over to express their concern and to participate. I am told we had close to 50 Members of Congress who participated throughout the night. Many of them stayed up all night. I myself had the opportunity to get a couple hours of sleep.

Especially, I want to thank all of the leadership committee staff for the tremendous job that they did, the DTCC staff, the DPC staff, certainly the steering coordination people, and my staff in the leadership office. They deserve our commendation and a heartfelt thanks for all of the work they did in bringing this about. We had the opportunity, as some of my colleagues have already noted, to talk to people around the country and express to them our sincere hope that they know how hard it is sometimes to get this legislation back on track, but also recognize how desirous we are of making that happen soon.

I have had the opportunity to talk to Senator LOTT this morning. I am hopeful that as a result of our conversation and the conversations that I know he is having with other Members, especially on the House side, that we might actually find some way to reach an agreement sometime before the end of the day. I think that is possible. I think there still has to be a lot of good discussion and good-faith effort to try to find a compromise procedurally. But I certainly am hopeful that can be done today.

Last night we talked to people who simply said that they cannot wait any longer, and there are those who said that the problem they are concerned about now is the very short timeframe that we have within which to do any

real construction work in the Dakotas and Minnesota. We have no more than 120 to 125 days. In some cases it is less than 100 days depending on the kind of construction project they are considering. So the bottom line is that if you do not get started soon, you miss an entire construction period in the northern part of our country.

That is why it is imperative that these people know exactly how much money they can expect so they can budget for purposes of letting contracts and making plans on infrastructure. There are going to be projects that are going to require more than 1 year. The mayor of Watertown said she felt that it is going to take 2 to 3 years to deal with all the infrastructure problems that are out there.

So there is no doubt that we are not going to be able to deal with all of the problems we have right now. But we are going to be able to prioritize as soon as we know what the budget is. We are going to be able to let contracts. We are going to be able to address these needs one by one and make some effort at trying to resolve the most difficult priorities first—the most contentious and problematic issues that many of these people have to deal with.

So, Mr. President, I think it is so critical that we get on with this legislation, that we pass it, and that we take out the extraneous legislation.

I indicated that we would be more than happy—and I will repeat it again this morning—to work with leadership on both sides of the Congress and with our Republican colleagues in particular to design a way in which to have a time certain to consider these provisions with even an amount of time to be debated. We could even perhaps consider limitations on amendments—I am not suggesting that today—but perhaps even an amendment limitation in an effort to expedite consideration of these extraneous matters. The two most contentious, of course, are the census and the continuing resolution. They are the ones that we would want to find a way in which there could be a separate debate, a date, and a time certain for consideration and ultimately a vote. Let's do that. We can do it simultaneously with the passage of the disaster bill. But that would allow us the opportunity to move forward even this afternoon.

So I am hopeful that we can accomplish that. I am hopeful that perhaps now in the last 24 or 48 hours there can be a growing appreciation of the need to do something like that. I remain ready to sit down and discuss the matter with anybody who has another idea. Until that time, I think it is important that we begin working on this effort.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, how much time remains on the amount of time allocated to the leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes twenty seconds.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me follow on his remarks just for a few minutes and read a couple of letters from some folks because, after all, this is not some theory or some debate about policy. It is a discussion about how this issue impacts the lives of citizens. I thought it would be useful to read a couple of the letters that we have received.

This is a letter from a fellow in Grand Forks, ND, who writes, "The people here have no homes, no jobs, no other homes to go to. They have no toys, no bikes, no clothes, nor anything else, for that matter, for their children."

And he says, "You go home and take a break for Memorial Day recess," addressing that to the Congress. He said, "I am very angry at the way people are playing with the disaster relief bill and the lives of the people who need help now. They have no right to delay this bill or add to this bill. They want to add things, add more money. We will not have enough money even with this bill to repair our lives."

This is a letter from someone named Tim, who is a disaster victim. "I am a victim of the flood of 1997, as well as my family and friends and businesses who are victims of the flood. As you know, we have suffered a great deal, and as long as you continue to stall on the legislation for disaster relief our pain and suffering is prolonged. Perhaps you should visit here and see and feel the pain and devastation. Spend 3 days here and you will soon understand why people are depressed and why the anxiety level is extreme." He said, "We strive to help each other out in this country in times of need. Americans like to spread the burden of disaster among everyone. That is what it means and that is why it makes us a great country, and we need your help now. On behalf of my family, my wife, our two daughters, we need your support."

Rodney and Judy wrote this letter to the Congress and to the President. "We were evacuated from our homes on the 19th of April 1997. It sat under water for a period of 10 to 12 days with 56 inches of sewer and flood water on the main floor of our home. Currently the house is sitting empty because we are waiting on a bill to be passed by Congress providing flood relief. I am a staff sergeant in the Air Force. My wife and my child also happen to be from Grand Forks, North Dakota. We are proud of our community, and we hate to see it wasted as it is. Right now, even through all of the mess, I have my bags packed and am ready to go at a moment's notice to fight and possibly die for our country. That is our calling in the Air Force. But what Congress is doing to us really hurts. I still make a house payment for a home that sits empty." He said, "The home is getting worse day after day. I can't do anything but wait. Do you think this is fair? How did you enjoy your vacation