

EXPRESSING SENSE OF SENATE
REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS SIT-
UATION IN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
OF CHINA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AL-
LARD). Under the previous order, the
clerk will report the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 45) expressing the
sense of the Senate regarding the human
rights situation in the People's Republic of
China.

The Senate proceeded to consider the
resolution.

Mr. HUTCHINSON addressed the
Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-
ator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I
ask unanimous consent that Senators
SPECTER, HAGEL, COLLINS, and THUR-
MOND be added as cosponsors of the res-
olution.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to Senator
WELLSTONE for a unanimous consent
request.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I
ask unanimous consent that John
Bradshaw and Sarah Nelson, a fellow
and an intern, be granted the privilege
of the floor.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I
am grateful to our leadership for af-
fording us this time this morning to
debate and to vote on Senate Resolu-
tion 45. Some would say this is a sense-
of-the-Senate resolution so this isn't
important and that this is filling time,
or whatever. I suggest that there are a
couple of things that have happened
just recently which underscore the
value and the importance of the time
we are spending on the Senate floor
this morning and the vote on this res-
olution.

Mr. President, just this morning the
Associated Press reported that two
more members of the Chinese Democ-
racy Party were detained. They were
taken from their homes for trying to
set up a human rights meeting in
Wuhan. That was reported just this
morning. It has become all too fre-
quent, and almost daily, that there are
news reports of the continued crack-
down on human rights in China.

These today were detained only for
being members of the Chinese Democ-
racy Party, the fledgling opposition
party advocating democracy and
human rights in China. I think this in-
cident, just reported this morning, un-
derscores the value and the importance
of what we are doing and what we are
about today.

Then it is reported this morning as
well that Secretary of State Madeleine
Albright, in her testimony before the
Senate Foreign Relations Committee
yesterday, said the administration is
still deciding the most effective way
for the United States to persuade

China to improve its human rights
record.

The fact that the Secretary of State
admitted before the Senate Foreign
Relations Committee yesterday that the
administration has not yet decided
what they are going to do, that they
have not yet determined what course of
action they will take to try to per-
suade the Chinese to improve their
human rights record, I believe, under-
scores the importance and the value of
the resolution that is before us, one
that is incredibly important.

One of my colleagues yesterday, in
seeing the agenda for today, said,
"Well, TIM, there you are slamming the
Chinese again." Let me say that I have
the utmost respect and admiration for
the Chinese people. In fact, I cannot
think of any group that I have higher
admiration for than those Chinese citi-
zens today who are fighting coura-
geously and standing up for human
rights within their own country and
fighting for the democracy movement
in China.

This resolution today has nothing to
do with the Chinese people, but it has
everything to do with the intolerable
practices of the Chinese Government in
which they continue to abuse the basic
fundamental human rights of the Chi-
nese people. This resolution is impor-
tant because the administration has all
but said they are looking for a signal
from Capitol Hill. They are looking for
direction from the Congress as to
whether or not they should sponsor a
resolution in Geneva this summer call-
ing the world's attention to those
abuses that are ongoing in China
today. We need to send them that sig-
nal. This resolution affords us that op-
portunity.

If there is one thing the Chinese Gov-
ernment does take seriously, it is
international opinion. To the extent
that by this resolution and by our Gov-
ernment offering a resolution in Gene-
va this summer we can marshal the
international community in protest to
the ongoing human rights crackdown
in China, we will have done something
very significant and very worthwhile.

Mr. President, the resolution before
us today urges the administration to
sponsor a resolution at the United Na-
tions Human Rights Commission criti-
cal of China's human rights abuses.
The Commission will meet in March
and April in Geneva, Switzerland.

By passing this resolution, which en-
joys very strong bipartisan support, we
give Secretary Albright a clear mes-
sage to bring with her to China when
she travels there in the beginning of
March. That message is that the
United States will not accept China's
wholesale violation of internationally
accepted human rights standards. It is
an important signal. I have had discus-
sions with the administration and with
the Department of State, and I know
they are looking for the sentiment of
the Senate and the Congress on this
issue.

The Communist Government of
China has long committed a litany of

human rights abuses. Thousands of po-
litical prisoners remain in prison,
many of them sentenced after unfair
trials, others today languishing in pris-
on without any trial at all. At least 200
of these prisoners are still suffering be-
cause of their participation in or their
support of the 1989 Tiananmen Square
demonstrations.

Religious persecution runs rampant
in China. People who dare to worship
outside the aegis of officially sponsored
religious organizations face fines, they
face detention, arrest, imprisonment
and, too often, torture as well.

And the human rights movement in
China, the democracy movement in
China, and the house church movement
are very much intertwined. And many
of these home churches have become,
in fact, bases of the democracy move-
ment and human rights efforts within
China today. Thousands of peaceful
monks and nuns have been detained
and tortured in Tibet where the Chi-
nese Government is imposing a harsh
patriotic so-called education campaign.

Mr. President, under China's one-
family-one-child policy, couples face
punitive fines and loss of employment
for having unapproved children. But it
does not stop with monetary penalties.
Local authorities, with or without the
approval of the Communist Party
cadre, forcibly perform abortions or
sterilizations on women who are preg-
nant with their second child. Relatives
are held hostage until couples submit
to this coercion.

Furthermore, incredibly, prisoners
are executed in China after grossly un-
fair trials, and then their organs are
sold on the black market. The pattern
of abuse is clear. And in the eyes of
the Chinese Communist Government
human life seems to bear no value at
all.

What has been this administration's
response to these abuses? Under Presi-
dent Clinton's policy of so-called con-
structive engagement, the administra-
tion effectively disengaged human
rights practices from trade practices in
1994, while promising that efforts to
pass a resolution at the U.N. Human
Rights Commission would be increased.

However, Mr. President, last year,
President Clinton further unhinged his
policy by deciding not to pursue a res-
olution at the Commission in Geneva,
Switzerland, which was critical of
China. We historically had done that.
Year after year, we offered that resolu-
tion, but last year supposedly the ad-
ministration said in a good-faith ges-
ture we withheld offering that resolu-
tion.

That commitment was given to
China in exchange for their promise to
sign the International Covenant on
Civil and Political Rights, the ICCPR,
a covenant which affirms free speech
and free assembly. It is highly ironic
that the ICCPR itself is a product of
U.N. Human Rights Commission meet-
ings. China did sign the ICCPR in Octo-
ber, only to turn around and violate its
every principle since they put their sig-
nature to that document.

Since the President's trip to Beijing in July 1998, the Communist Government of China has renewed its crackdown on all who would dare to oppose the Communist Party. Some 100 members of the fledgling Chinese Democracy Party, the CDP, have been detained, excluding the two that were announced this morning. Some have been released, others await trial, and the most unfortunate have been sentenced to very long prison sentences.

Three visible leaders of the CDP, Xu Wenli, Qin Yongmin, and Wang Youcai were sentenced to 13, 12 and 11 years in prison, respectively, on charges of subversion and endangering state security, after highly dubious trials. In reality, these democracy activists exercised their legal rights under Chinese law to create and to form a political party. Their true crime, in the eyes of the Communist Party, was simply their love for democracy.

But the crackdown does not end there. In fact, incidents of harassment and imprisonment are almost too numerous to list. I will highlight just a few examples.

The Communist Government sentenced businessman Lin Hai to prison for 2 years for—listen to this crime—providing e-mail addresses to a pro-democracy Internet magazine.

Zhang Shanguang is in prison now for 10 years for this crime: Providing Radio Free Asia with information about farmer protests in Hunan Province.

The Government sentenced poet and writer Ma Zhe to 7 years in prison on charges of subversion for publishing an independent literary journal.

In addition, the Communist Government is cracking down on film directors, artists, computer software developers and the press, and continues to harass and detain religious activists. The list goes on.

In 1998, police imprisoned 70 worshippers from house churches in Hunan Province. And the pattern of human rights violations is undeniable. Rather than improving since the good-faith gestures of the American Government and our rewarding of the Chinese Government with favorable trade status, we have seen not a favorable response on the part of the Chinese Government but an exacerbated attack upon those who would simply advocate freedom and democracy.

I see that my friend and colleague from Florida, Senator MACK, has come to the floor to speak on this resolution. I appreciate his outstanding leadership on this issue. He was the lead sponsor of a similar resolution last year. And if Senator MACK is prepared to speak at this time, I will yield to Senator MACK. Is the Senator ready to speak now?

Mr. MACK. I am prepared.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I ask Senator MACK, how much time would you desire?

Mr. MACK. No more than 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, if there is ever a time and place to raise human rights concerns, it is at the annual meeting of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva, Switzerland. That Commission is meeting right now. And I rise today to urge my fellow Senators to join with me and the 17 other cosponsors of this resolution to make a simple statement. We disapprove of the human rights abuses occurring in China and in Tibet.

Since last year, when we passed this resolution with 95 votes, the President has engaged in two summits with Chinese President Jiang. During that time, many promises were made and agreements were concluded, and the United States did not introduce a human rights resolution in Geneva.

We were told the United States would make progress by not introducing a resolution. And Wei Jingsheng, a prominent dissident, was released. Tomorrow, Mr. Wei will be here in Washington, DC, and he will urge the United States not to make the same mistake as last year. Mr. President, we must now make this statement of condemnation of China's human rights practices.

We received many promises from the Chinese Government last year as well. But we know that the human rights conditions have only deteriorated. The State Department's human rights report clearly delineates the atrocities occurring in China and Tibet. And we know from press accounts that the crackdown on human rights and political activists has hardened.

It is unconscionable that the United States would not take a stand against these blatant atrocities, especially when they are documented by our own State Department. By remaining silent, we do a great injustice to those fighting for freedom, democracy, and the rule of law inside China and Tibet.

Mr. President, I want to quote from a statement made by Mr. Wei not long after he was released and exiled from his country. And this is what he said:

Democracy and freedom are among the loftiest ideals of humanity, and they are the most sacred rights of mankind. Those who already enjoy democracy, liberty and human rights, in particular, should not allow their own personal happiness to numb them into forgetting the many others who are still struggling against tyranny, slavery and poverty, and all of those who are suffering from unimaginable forms of oppression, exploitation and massacres.

Mr. President, this is an easy one. It does not matter whether the world votes with us or against us or abstains in Geneva. It does not even matter if this resolution will change the minds of anyone in Beijing. We do know, however, from the firsthand testimony of released dissidents, that the actions of the United States are important to those engaged in the struggle for freedom. We know from those released that by simply making this statement we demonstrate our solidarity with those who are engaged within the daily struggle for freedom, justice, and the respect for human dignity.

I hope my colleagues will join me in calling for this expression of solidarity—this stand for freedom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the Senator from Florida. He has truly been a champion for human rights around the world, not just in China but around the world. I thank him for his leadership on this issue and his willingness to urge the administration to take this very appropriate action in Geneva this summer. And I thank him for his very eloquent statement.

Mr. President, at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank my colleague, Senator MACK, and I am certainly pleased to be here on the floor with Senator HUTCHINSON.

Mr. President, I want to build on the remarks of Senator MACK for a moment. He was talking about Wei Jingsheng. Wei Jingsheng wrote an op-ed piece in the New York Times in December. I ask unanimous consent to have this printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Dec. 24, 1998]

CHINA'S DIVERSIONARY TACTICS

(By Wei Jingsheng)

Last Saturday, when Liu Niachun, a prominent dissident, left his Chinese prison cell and arrived in the United States, many Western reports said he had been "freed" or "released." One year ago, after 18 years in a Chinese prison, I, too, was "released" and sent here. A Chinese official said that if I ever set foot in China again, I would immediately be returned to prison. I cannot identify any legal principle that explains how my expulsion or Mr. Liu's could be construed as a release.

Yet the State Department, in a report last January, used my forced exile as evidence that China was taking "positive steps in human rights" and that "Chinese society continued to become more open." These "positive steps" led the United States and its allies to oppose condemnation of China at a meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in April. In the months that followed, President Clinton and other Western leaders traveled to China, trumpeting increased economic ties and muting criticism on human rights.

Thus, without fear of sanction, the Chinese Government intensified its repression in 1998. Once the leaders achieved their diplomatic victories, they turned to their main objective: the preservation of tyrannical power. This year, about 70 people are known to have been arrested, and in recent weeks the Government has greatly stepped up that pace.

On Monday, Xu Wenli, another dissident, was sentenced to 13 years in prison for "subversion of state power." He was given only four days to prepare for his trial and was denied a lawyer of his choice. Two others, Wang Youcai and Qin Yongmin, were sentenced to 11 and 14 years, also for subversion. Both were denied legal representation.

It was widely believed that Mr. Liu's "release" was an attempt to deflect world attention from these harsh punishments. This

time, at least, the State Department didn't buy the deception. Deploring China's actions, a spokesman called the sentences "a step backward."

Whether this statement constitutes a change of American policy or merely a cosmetic change remains to be seen. If the American Government really wanted to punish China, it could, say, restrict Chinese imports to the United States. Or it could halt all questionable technology transfers to China.

Despite the Chinese Government's occasional lip service to "openness," the authorities have consistently and swiftly moved to quash not only political organizations but also trade unions, peasants' associations and unapproved religious gatherings.

As Li Peng, the speaker of the National People's Party Congress, declared recently, "If an organization's purpose is to promote a multiparty system in China and to negate the leadership prerogatives of the Chinese Communist Party, then it will not be permitted to exist."

This statement clearly shows that the Communist Party's primary objective is to sustain its tyranny, and to do so it must deny the people basic rights and freedoms. We must measure the leaders' progress on human rights not by the "release" of individuals but by the people's ability to speak, worship and assemble without official interference and persecution. Only that can be called progress.

Mr. WELLSTONE. The article talks about the release of Mr. Liu, a prominent dissident, who left his cell. He will be with us at a press conference tomorrow. What Wei Jingsheng had to say is that after Mr. Liu was released,

... many Western reports [the administration talked about this as a triumph] said he had been "freed" or "released" [to Wei Jingsheng].

He goes on to say,

One year ago, after 18 years in a Chinese prison, I, too, was "released."

Of course, the problem is he was told by the Chinese Government that if he ever set foot in the country again, he would be immediately returned to freedom. It is hard to argue that this is what in the United States we would call freedom at all.

Yet the State Department, in a report last January, [Wei Jingsheng goes on to say] used my forced exile [and that is what it is] as evidence that China was taking "positive steps in human rights" and that "Chinese society continued to become more open."

These "positive steps" led the United States and its allies to oppose condemnation of China at a meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights last April. Senator HUTCHINSON, I, and Senator MACK came to the floor. We got 95 votes calling on our Government to take the lead with the resolution condemning these widespread violations of human rights in China.

Here is the key part of Wei Jingsheng's piece:

Thus without fear of sanction, the Chinese government intensified its repression in 1998. Once the leaders achieved their diplomatic victories, they turned to their main objective: The preservation of tyrannical power. This year, about 70 people are known to have been arrested, and in recent weeks the government has greatly stepped up the pace.

My colleague, Senator HUTCHINSON, talked about Zhong Ji and Shao She

Chang today. I want to quote from the Washington Post: "Chinese police detained two dissidents." What did they want to do? Why are they now detained? Why do they face imprisonment? They want to meet with our Secretary of State when she visits China to talk about human rights. For that, they have been detained and face possible, probable imprisonment.

We have offered a resolution today that condemns China's human rights record. We call upon our Government to introduce a resolution condemning China's human rights record at the next session of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights which meets in March. We also call on our Government to begin immediately contacting other governments to ask them to cosponsor such a resolution.

When President Clinton formally delinked trade and human rights in 1994, he pledged on the record that the United States would "step up its efforts, in cooperation with other states, to insist that the United Nations Human Rights Commission pass a resolution dealing with the serious human rights abuses in China." That is what the President of the United States of America has said.

Now, he also said that we would speak out on human rights, but the fact of the matter is, we have increased our trade, our military contacts, we have gone forward with high-level summits. In the meantime, Chinese Government leaders continue to crack down on every last dissident in a country of over 1 billion people. We have seen what has happened this past year.

It is time for our country, the United States of America, which stands for democracy and freedom, to go to this United Nations Commission on Human Rights and to introduce this resolution supporting the brave people in China who stand up for human rights. That is what this resolution is all about.

The Chinese Government—and my colleague has talked about this—continues to commit widespread abuses and, since the President's visit in June, has flagrantly violated international human rights agreements.

Examples: Recently it sentenced three of China's most prominent prodemocracy advocates, Xu Wenli, Wang Youcai, and Chin Yougmin, to a combined prison term of 35 years. These disgraceful arrests were part of a crackdown by the Government on efforts—to do what? These Chinese citizens wanted to form a political party. For that, they face a combined 35-year prison sentence.

Further, a businessman in Shanghai, Lin Hai, is now being tried for providing e-mail addresses to a prodemocracy Internet magazine in the United States. Bill Gates, America Online, it is time for you to get engaged in this. You ought to be supporting human rights in China.

Another democracy activist, Zhang Shanguang, was convicted and sentenced to 10 years in prison for giving

Radio Free Asia information about protests by farmers in the Hunan province. This is all about organizing. I say to labor, this is all about the right of people to organize and to speak out. And for this, this man is now been sentenced to 10 years in prison.

These events are all part of a pattern of growing repression, with legislation passed, when artists and press are told: If you do anything to "endanger social order" or attempt to "overthrow state power," we will round you up and we will throw you in prison.

Mr. President, these dissidents and these courageous men and women in China deserve our full backing.

At the June meeting in Beijing, President Clinton engaged in a spirited debate on human rights with President Jiang Zemin. In light of this brutal recent crackdown, all of which has taken place since the President visited China, all of which has taken place since the United States refused to bring a resolution before the Human Rights Commission in the United Nations, I and my colleague, Senator HUTCHINSON, urge, and I think we will have 90-some votes that will urge, the administration to bring a resolution at Geneva in March and to continue to register our deep concern about the absence of freedom of expression and association and the use of arbitrary detention in China. Past experience has shown that if we apply the pressure, it can make a difference. By sponsoring a resolution at the United Nations Human Rights Commission, the United States will be showing our commitment to international human rights standards.

Mr. President, my colleague from Arkansas spoke about this. On October 5, 1998, China finally signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. When I talked to Sandy Berger, a friend, last year, he said to me: Look, we don't think we need to go forward with this resolution condemning China on human rights abuses at the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, because they are going to make a commitment, and they will sign this International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

What have they done? They have not taken the steps to make it binding, and, more importantly, they violated what the whole agreement is.

We have seen in this last year a very clear pattern of more and more and more repression, Chinese citizens imprisoned for trying to form a political party, Chinese citizens imprisoned for writing articles, Chinese citizens in prison for trying to organize so they can get a better price as farmers, so they can get better wages as workers. It is time for the United States Government to provide the leadership which the courageous people in China depend upon.

Mr. President, I have had the great honor—and I don't know about Senator HUTCHINSON, but I think he would say the same thing—of becoming friends, and I feel almost small saying that, because Wei Jingsheng is such a great

man, I have to pinch myself to remind me there is somebody who spent over 20 years in prison because he had the courage to stand up against a government, he had the courage to write and to speak out for what he thought was good and right for people in China. I don't think I could ever have the courage to do so. Thank God, I live in the United States of America. He is a Chinese dissident who spent so much time in prison because of his courage.

In an article published shortly after his release, Mr. Wei Jingsheng stated,

Democracy and freedom are among the loftiest ideals of humanity, and they are the most sacred rights of mankind. Those who already enjoy democracy, liberty and human rights in particular, should not allow their own personal happiness [this is what he said, Mr. President] to numb them into forgetting that many others who are still struggling against tyranny, slavery and poverty, and all those who are suffering from unimaginable forms of repression, exploitation and massacres.

We shouldn't forget such people. We shouldn't take our freedom for granted. And we, the United States of America, ought to take the lead in bringing this resolution before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

When you talk to people around the world—and we are talking about China today—Senator HUTCHINSON, they will tell you that maybe Senators don't realize this, maybe we have this debate on the floor of the Senate, and then we have a vote, but what a difference this makes to the people in these countries who have the courage.

We are going to get a strong vote at 12 o'clock today and we are sending a signal to the White House it is time for our Government to take the lead. I hope we will get the leadership from the White House. I hope we get the leadership from the Secretary of State. I certainly hope that the U.S. Senate will go on record today with a strong bipartisan vote.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator WELLSTONE for his commitment to the issue of human rights. When PAUL WELLSTONE comes to the floor and I come to the floor and we work our own human rights issues together, we both want to make it clear that we can agree very rarely. There are few political issues that we are going to be united on, and our votes will more often than not cancel each other out on the issues coming before the U.S. Senate. But I admire and respect PAUL WELLSTONE for his deep commitment to democracy and to human rights around the world, and for his involvement in this issue. I am glad to be able to work with him on this. I think it is a very important resolution.

I reiterate that this resolution is important, and it is important for several reasons. It is important because it will be a message to the administration. It is very timely, and I appreciate our majority leader for ensuring that this

vote occur this week because our Secretary of State will be traveling to China next week. It is important for this vote to occur. It is important for it to be a strong bipartisan vote and for our Secretary of State to have that message as she goes to China. So I think it is important from that standpoint.

It is also a very, very important message to our European allies. Many of our allies in Europe are looking for our leadership. Germany has had a change in government. They are much more sympathetic to the cause of human rights, in my estimation. The French press reported that this vote in the U.S. Senate was going to occur today. They are looking for a message and a signal from political leaders in the United States. So it is important from that standpoint as well. It is a message to the Chinese Government, not just through our Secretary of State, but that we as the elected Representatives of the people—the U.S. Senate, the House of Representatives—as we speak out on this issue, it conveys a strong message to the Chinese Government, and they are concerned about what this country thinks.

I think one of the great failings of this administration has been that it has rewarded human rights abuses and crackdowns in China, whether it is religious freedom crackdowns, press crackdowns, Internet crackdowns, or any host of human rights abuses; they have, in effect, rewarded that by increasing economic opportunities through trade with the United States—most recently, their plan to bring China into the World Trade Organization, almost as a reward for the very terrible abuses that have occurred during the last several months.

And then, may I say that this resolution is critically important because of the message it sends—as my colleague from Minnesota said, the message that it sends to the Chinese activists for democracy and human rights within China today, which is that when we take the floor of the U.S. Senate and speak on this issue, they are listening—Radio Free Asia—through the Internet and through other means by which our activities and the news of our activities gets into China. They are listening and they are interested and it is an encouragement to them to know that there are those who stand with them in the cause of freedom in our country and our Government.

Mr. President, in my opinion, it is wholly appropriate for the United States to advance a resolution at the Commission in Geneva critical of China's ongoing human rights abuses. The Commission is a multilateral forum authorized to deal with the very abuses perpetrated by the Chinese Government today—a resolution that the Commission will pierce any notions that China's violations of human rights will be quietly accepted by the world community.

There are some in the administration—and I think it is reflected in Sec-

retary Albright's statement yesterday—that are undecided on how they are going to proceed, and whether or not they are going to offer this resolution. There are some within the administration who argue that a resolution critical of China at the Human Rights Commission should not be pursued and is in effect pointless because, as they put it, it is certain to fail.

I think Senator MACK said, "Well, I don't believe it is certain to fail"; but whether it was certain to fail or not, it should be offered on the basis of principle, on the basis of the encouragement and the emboldenment it will provide for those within China. But the very sentiment that the administration expresses when they say it is certain to fail becomes a self-fulfilling sentiment, a self-fulfilling prophecy. The more halfhearted the administration is in its attempts to advance such a resolution, the less chance that such a resolution will have to pass.

The longer the administration refrains from exercising leadership in the international community on this matter of human rights, the less likely it is that the resolution will be successful. Bringing forth a resolution at the Commission is, as Senator MACK so accurately put it, a matter of principle. Success will be measured by the statements of truth that flow from the debate at the Commission. A resolution at the Commission this summer will proclaim boldly that the human rights abuses in China are an affront to the international community and its values.

Mr. President, these values are not uniquely American values. There are those who have argued in the past that it is wrong for us to speak of these values and to try to, as they put it, force these values upon the Chinese Government. But I would assert—and I believe that this country is built on this belief—that these values are not uniquely American values, that they transcend any national boundary, that they are fundamental human values and human rights. Thus, it is highly appropriate that we pursue such a resolution. The U.S. must take steps to protect internationally recognized human rights, or we will take a back seat to those who openly and blatantly abuse them.

As Senator WELLSTONE said, last year, this body passed a resolution very similar to the one before us today by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 95-5. I hope we can send an equally strong signal to the administration again this year. In light of the affront to the administration's policy that the Chinese Government has committed in the recent crackdown of the last 2 to 3 months, I think it is a very timely resolution and an appropriate time for the administration to reverse field, to reverse its decision last summer in not pursuing such a resolution and, in fact, to say the abuses, the crackdowns, have been so flagrant that now the administration will pursue with a new aggressiveness a human rights resolution in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, promoting human rights is now, and must remain, an important component of our overall relationship with China. That is why I support Senate Resolution 45, calling on the administration to voice our concerns about China's human rights abuses before the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva.

Even as we try to expand cooperation in areas of mutual interest—stability on the Korean peninsula, nonproliferation, trade, and the environment—we must take note of China's violation of international norms in the area of human rights.

Last year, the administration decided to remain silent in Geneva, arguing that more progress could be achieved through quiet diplomacy than through public pressure. China did, in fact, release some high profile political prisoners. China also signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

In recent months, however, we have witnessed a crackdown on dissent, including the arrest of prominent democracy party organizers. China continues to jam the broadcasts of Radio Free Asia and to closely monitor China's domestic media.

With respect to Tibet, China's leaders have yet to establish a dialogue with the Dalai Lama, and they refuse even to meet with U.S. officials responsible for coordinating U.S. policy on Tibet.

Mr. President, we should not stand mute in the face of China's continuing violation of basic human rights. Our silence would be deafening.

If we are not going to call on China to respect human rights before the UN Human Rights Commission, where will we make our concerns known?

And if we must act alone, without support from our European and Asian allies, so be it. There is no shame in being alone on the right side of history.

Ten years ago this June the world watched in horror as Chinese authorities used lethal force to suppress the Tian-an-men democracy movement. I am convinced that the gradual improvement in human rights in China over the past decade would not have occurred without concerted diplomatic pressure—public and private.

Now is not the time to let up.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the resolution. In the past, the U.S. has rightfully been the strongest critic of human rights abuses in China. So I was disappointed, as I think most in the Senate were, that the President chose not to sponsor a resolution condemning China's human rights practices at last year's annual meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. The United States has sponsored such a resolution at each of these annual meetings since 1990.

Although I didn't agree with that decision, I understood the reasoning behind it. China seemed to be making some progress. It had signed the UN Covenant on Social, Economic, and

Cultural Rights, and committed itself to signing the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). Perhaps reform was at hand. And I certainly favor building a constructive and mutually beneficial relationship with China.

But recent history indicates that China often makes such concessions until the world's attention is focused elsewhere, and then quickly reverts back to its policy of severe intolerance and repression. In 1993, for instance, when human rights became an issue in Beijing's bid to host the Olympics, China released its most prominent dissident, Wei Jingsheng. The Olympics were awarded to Australia, and Wei was detained again the following year.

Similarly, just last December, 6 months after signing the ICCPR, China sentenced three democratic activists to prison terms of 10 years or more for trying to organize a political party. A fourth dissenter was given a 10-year sentence for allegedly "providing intelligence to hostile foreign organizations." His crime? He gave an interview to Radio Free Asia about farmer protests. And the Chinese premier, Jiang Zemin, recently stated that China needed to "nip those factors that undermine social stability in the bud, no matter where they come from," and that "the Western mode of political systems must never be copied."

However, this is not about "western political systems," it is about internationally recognized human rights. Respect for these rights must be real, and it must be systemic. Empty commitments and token gestures are meaningless, and we should not allow them to sway us from advocating on behalf of those who are imprisoned in China, or will be, for exercising freedoms acknowledged by the world community. An international resolution condemning China's human rights practices is strongly supported by human rights groups like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch. By passing such a resolution, the international community can demonstrate that we will no longer be duped by false promises.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, I rise in begrudging support for S. Res. 45. I say begrudging only because while I agree that the UN Human Rights Commission should address China's human rights record, I neither believe that the UNHRC will place the issue on its agenda nor do I feel that this resolution has been brought to the floor in the most constructive manner.

I agree with the other Senators who have spoken this morning that there has been a disturbing increase in China in the last six months in crackdowns on the freedom of expression, crackdowns evidenced by an increase in the number of arrests and convictions of prodemocracy activists. Moreover, despite attempts to establish a dialog with Beijing, China still refuses to

meet with His Holiness the Dalai Lama to discuss the future of Tibet and instead continues to facilitate the increasing immigration of Han Chinese into Tibet and the jailing of Buddhist nuns and lamas. Christian churches not registered with the central government continue to be subject to harassment and closure and their congregants subject to arrest.

I believe I understand, although I certainly in no way condone, the impetus behind the crackdown. China has recently embarked on a program to restructure its economy to a market-oriented system and to open more to the world around it. These changes are obviously potentially destabilizing for a communist regime governing 1.3 billion people. And as with other campaigns in China's past designed to restructure society, such as the "Let 100 Flowers Bloom" campaign, once the program took hold and began to accelerate, the central authorities got anxious about continuing to be able to control the pace of reform and about it getting out from underneath them. They have consequently begun slamming on the brakes and stifling any perceived dissent. And it is that movement to stifle peaceful dissent and universal human freedoms that should prompt the US to press this issue before the UNHRC.

In a perfect world one would think that these are exactly the type of actions the UNHRC would want to address, but sadly we all know the reality of the eventual outcome. This year, as in years past, the United States will fail by a significantly wide vote margin to place China on the Commission's agenda. We will be deserted by most of our purported allies who, while nominally paying lip service to the sanctity of human rights, appear more interested in securing their commercial interests in the PRC. Well Mr. President, so be it. As Senator BIDEN has noted, there is no shame in standing alone on the right side of history, and I fully support that stand under the conditions prevailing in China this year.

But Mr. President, while I support the consideration of this resolution today, I am less enthused about the terms of the unanimous consent agreement which brought it here. As the Chairman of the subcommittee of jurisdiction, in past Congresses I have strongly disfavored the practice of discharging the Foreign Relations Committee from the consideration of legislation which the Committee has not had the opportunity to address first. My disapproval of discharges is especially acute when the legislation in question is sponsored by a Senator not a member of the Committee. I intend this to be my practice in this Congress as well.

I have, however, made exceptions in the case of legislation which is completely non-controversial or is somehow time-sensitive. Since the UNHRC meetings this year in Geneva are imminent, and since there was not enough time to consider the legislation

in Committee, it made sense in this narrow case and for those reasons I agreed to the discharge.

I am also uneasy with the terms of the unanimous consent agreement because they preclude any amendment to the resolution, thereby preventing members from offering what I feel would be constructive changes to the text. In addition, Mr. President, I am unsure why—when the Senate should be focused on more pressing domestic issues such as the Y2K problem or Social Security—we are taking the Senate's time to debate and then vote on a resolution about which there is no difference of opinion and which will most likely pass 100 to 0. This could have just as easily been disposed of by unanimous consent yesterday. For those that argue that a unanimous roll call vote somehow sends a stronger signal than passing legislation by unanimous consent, I would note that it is my longstanding experience that very few people if any outside the Beltway—especially in foreign countries—understand the nuanced differences between the two.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, how much time is remaining that I control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A little over 7 minutes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A little over 19 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD. I think his model is one of consistency. He is consistent on human rights questions, and he is absolutely one of the most forceful and effective leaders in the U.S. Congress for human rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I especially thank my friends from Arkansas and Minnesota. I am extremely proud of their leadership on this issue. Having this matter become one of the first matters we take up in this Congress is exactly the right way to go. We need to be as aggressive as we can on this issue. That is why I am cosponsoring the resolution. I strongly commend them for their leadership on this.

The resolution expresses the sense of the Senate that the United States should initiate active lobbying at the United Nations Commission on Human Rights for a resolution condemning human rights abuses in China. And it calls specifically for the United States to introduce and make all efforts necessary to pass a resolution on China and Tibet at the upcoming session of the Commission, which is due to begin next month in Geneva.

This resolution makes a simple, clear statement of principle: The Senate believes that there should be a China resolution in Geneva, period.

The Commission is a focal point for the protection of human rights, and as such, is an ideal multilateral forum in which the United States should voice its concerns. Under the pressure of previous Geneva resolutions, China has finally reacted. China signed the U.N. Covenant on Social, Economic and Cultural Rights in 1997 and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in October 1998. Unfortunately, neither of these important documents has been ratified or implemented.

But at least the kind of pressure the United States put on this situation led them to sign these documents.

The effort to move a resolution in the Commission is particularly important this year, in light of the Administration's decision, contrary to the nearly unanimous sentiment of the Senate, not to sponsor such a resolution last year. That was a real disappointment for all of us.

Their misguided belief that progress could be achieved by other means was clearly not borne out by events in 1998, when, particularly in the last quarter, China stepped up its repression.

As we all know, for the past few years, China's leaders have aggressively lobbied against efforts at the Commission earlier and more actively than the countries that support a resolution. Last year, Chinese officials basically succeeded in getting the European Union Foreign Ministers to drop any European cosponsorship of a resolution. In the past, China's vigorous efforts have resulted in a "no action" motion at the Commission.

I will say, on a bright note, that in 1995 a "no action" motion was defeated and a resolution was almost adopted. But, unfortunately, on a downbeat note, it lost by only one vote. A little more effort could have made the difference. I sincerely hope that we do not end up with that kind of a loss at this year's meeting.

Nearly five years after the President's decision, which I deeply regretted, to delink most-favored-nation status from human rights, we cannot forget that the human rights situation in China and Tibet remains abysmal. While the State Department has not yet provided its most recent human rights report, I have no doubt it will be as critical of China as the 1997 report was when it noted that "the Government of China continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in violation of internationally accepted norms, including extrajudicial killings, the use of torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, forced abortion and sterilization, the sale of organs from executed prisoners, and tight control over the exercise of the rights of freedom of speech, press, and religion." I encourage Secretary Albright to actively raise these concerns with her counterparts during her visit to Beijing next week. Unfortunately, in the past bilateral discussions have produced only empty promises

from China's leaders on the subject of human rights. Regardless of what assurances China may provide to the Secretary, we should not let Beijing's easily abandoned promises deter us from seeking international condemnation of its practices. Only through strong US leadership can we gain the broad international consensus necessary to maintain the pressure on China to demonstrate sustained progress in providing the basic human rights its people deserve.

Mr. President, again my thanks to these two Senators. The time is now, and the place is Geneva. We are going to keep pushing this until it gets done.

I thank the President, and I thank my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I want to say to my colleague from Wisconsin that we are really going to put the pressure on. We are going to have this vote today. It is going to be an overwhelmingly strong vote.

Tomorrow, the State Department will be releasing its report on human rights conditions in other countries. It surely has to be critical about China, because of the action we are going to take.

The Chinese Embassy is going to have a press conference here in Washington as well. We are going to have a press conference tomorrow bringing together any number of different people—those Senators and Representatives who are still here. We are going to be joined by Mr. Wu, a very courageous man, Harry Wu, Wei Jingsheng, and human rights organizations.

We are going to keep the pressure up. We are going to keep the pressure on.

The end of our resolution says:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that at the 55th Session of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva, Switzerland, the United States should introduce and make all efforts necessary to pass a resolution calling upon the People's Republic of China to end its human rights abuses in China and Tibet.

As I said to my colleague, Senator HUTCHINSON, we haven't talked much about Tibet. Let me just say in deference to some of the work of Senator HELMS, who really wanted us to have an ambassador to Tibet, the compromise agreement was to have Julia Taft become our Special Coordinator on Tibet out of the U.S. State Department. The Chinese Embassy has refused to meet with Julia Taft. They won't even meet. The Chinese Embassy, whatever they say in their press conference tomorrow, will not even meet with Julia Taft, State Department Special Coordinator on Tibet. What we were told last year was, no, we shouldn't go forward as a government and introduce this resolution on human rights at the Human Rights Commission in Geneva.

Senator HUTCHINSON is right. This is the forum. This is the place. This is the international body. When we do, as an international community, focus on

human rights issues—and we were silent last year. Silence is betrayal. And we are insisting today on the floor of U.S. Senate that our Government no longer be silent on these questions.

We were told last year, first of all, there will be a lessening of repression. The Chinese Government is going to sign this covenant. They did. We see more repression. We were told that in Tibet that visitors would be allowed to Tibet. You know what happened. Mary Robinson, who was our ambassador on human rights to the United Nations, went to China. Her visit took place in September 1998. But Chinese officials produced none of the information she requested on prisoners, denied her access to Panchen Lama. Panchen Lama is the youngest political prisoner that we know of in the world. She had no access to him. And they made no specific commitments on ratification of two U.N. human rights treaties. They signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, but they produced no timetable for ratifying it. And they clearly violated it.

I ask you. I ask the administration. I ask the President. The President made a commitment that when we deal in trade in human rights—that is what this debate is about. This is not a debate about MFN. It is not about whether or not trade should be linked to human rights. I think that it should and others don't. I don't know if Senator HUTCHINSON and I agree or not agree. This is about a different issue. The President of the United States of America said he would put the pressure on at Geneva at the Human Rights Commission. That is the place. And we haven't done it.

Last year we had this vote. We have a stronger vote this year. And in spite of our vote, our Government ignored the wishes of the U.S. Senate. This time we are saying don't do that. We are saying you can't argue, our Government can't argue, the State Department can't argue, the President can't argue, the Secretary of State can't argue—that what has happened is, after the President's visit, we have seen now more respect for human rights. They can't argue that there is less repression. They can't argue that there is progress in China or Tibet.

We are saying today that if our Government does not introduce this resolution condemning the widespread violations of human rights by the Chinese Government at this important U.N. Human Rights Commission gathering in Geneva in March, then our silence will be betrayal.

We should introduce this resolution. As Senator HUTCHINSON said, we should garner support for it. We should urge the European Community also to come out with a strong resolution.

I want to tell Senator HUTCHINSON that I understand the German Government is looking at the wording of this resolution, and they may very well lead the way with other European countries. It is time to do so.

I feel strongly about this. I don't want to be self-righteous at all, but my father fled persecution in Russia in 1914 when he was 17 years of age with czarist Russia. Then there was the revolution. And he thought all the country would be better. And then his parents wrote and said, "Don't come back." The Communists had taken over. And he never went back.

My dad passed away in 1983. Sheila and I finally visited where my dad grew up in 1991. It was pretty clear to us that his family was probably all murdered by Stalin. All communication was broken off during the Stalin era. The letters stopped.

I was raised in a home where I was told by my dad really almost every day—every night, at 10 at night, starting in high school—he was kind of an embarrassment when I was younger, because he was very "old country." He was almost 50 when I was born, and he wasn't "cool." But when I got to be high school age, I realized what a treasure he was. He could speak 10 languages fluently, and was the wisest, best person I ever knew in my life.

We would have hot tea and sponge cake at 10 at night—not on the weekend, but Monday through Thursday, and I would listen to him talk about the world. My father Leon would talk about the importance of the first amendment rights, about the importance of human rights, and about the importance of freedom.

I am telling you that I feel as if that is what our Government is all about. That is what the United States of America is all about. That is what we are all about. And we ought to be speaking out on this and we ought to be taking the lead in Geneva. That is what our resolution says, I say to the Senator.

Mr. President, I think what I will do, we will have a vote coming up soon, and although I love to speak on this and I am very committed to this, I would like for Senator HUTCHINSON to make our concluding remarks, because I want to say to Senator HUTCHINSON, he is right, we don't agree on everything. In fact, this could be the end of my reputation, being out on the floor of the Senate with him.

Actually, being a little more serious, it has been a labor of love, working with Senator HUTCHINSON on this. We are just starting. We are not going to let up. I would like the Senator to conclude on this. I thank the Senator very much for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator yielding back his time?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I yield back the rest of my time.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I am also glad to join in this effort, one that we will continue to fight and one on which we will ultimately prevail, I believe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BUNNING be added as a cosponsor to this resolution.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I think we have covered many of the reasons why this is important. We have reiterated them. I do believe we will have a strong vote today.

One of the individuals whose name has been mentioned several times by Senator MACK, by myself, Senator WELLSTONE, is Wei Jingsheng, truly one of the courageous heroes of our generation. And I, too, am glad to be able to call Wei Jingsheng a friend. Wei Jingsheng has been in my office on numerous occasions, and he will be at our press conference tomorrow.

As I am able to conclude our presentation of this resolution today, I want to just mention a little bit about Wei Jingsheng.

I see Senator FEINSTEIN has come to the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I have a little problem in that Senator WELLSTONE has yielded his time.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. If possible, I would like to speak in favor of this resolution for 5 minutes, if I may.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I wonder if I could ask unanimous consent to gain my time back. I would like Senator HUTCHINSON to finish. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, we can yield back 6 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. May I give 5 minutes to the Senator from California?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Absolutely. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank you. I would like to thank the Senators for their courtesy.

I rise to add my support to the resolution offered by the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Arkansas.

I do so with a considerable sense of disappointment because for much of 1998, politics in the People's Republic of China appeared headed toward an authentic transformation. The government began to tolerate—and even encourage—discussion among intellectuals, academics, and reformers of the gradual development of democracy in China, to the point that many began to speak of a "Beijing Spring."

After many years of stalling, China signed the U.N. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which, when ratified, would require China to allow much closer international scrutiny of its human rights practices. Cross-strait discussions resumed with Taiwan.

And during President Clinton's visit to China last summer, President Jiang Zemin, an old friend of mine, did two extraordinary things; he allowed the Chinese people to hear President Clinton directly by televising both his speech at Beijing University and the two leaders' joint press conference; and, in the press conference, President Jiang implied that the Chinese leadership would be prepared to meet with

the Dalai Lama to discuss the question of Tibet if the Dalai Lama would make certain statements about the principle of One China and Tibet and Taiwan's status as a part of China.

That was a major step forward for many of us who have advocated this for years.

Each of these developments seemed to represent a hopeful shift toward a new, more open attitude by the Chinese government. It seemed to reflect the confidence of a new generation of Chinese leaders, firmly in control, unafraid to allow their people to stretch their minds, and willing to deal forthrightly with difficult political questions like Tibet and Taiwan through negotiations. But now these hopes appear to be in abeyance.

I now believe that the hardliners appear to be strengthening their hand, and in so doing are causing their President, Jiang Zemin, to lose face as they prevent him from allowing a further opening-up of Chinese society and from carrying out a negotiation to solve real issues of deep concern to six million Tibetans.

The recent spate of arrests of dissidents of China, followed by summary trials and convictions of several of the most prominent among them—Xu Wenli, Wang Youcai, and Qin Yongmin—raise the ugly specter of a renewed tightening on political freedom in the months leading up to the tenth anniversary of the Tiananmen Square tragedy.

On Tibet, the Dalai Lama abandoned plans to use his recent visit to the United States to make far-reaching statements intended to open the door to negotiations with China, amid unmistakable signals from Beijing that it was not prepared to begin a dialog regardless of what he said. Meanwhile, China's persecution in Tibet has only intensified. The brutal tactics of brainwashing, intimidation, and torture—tools of the Cultural Revolution—are now in use in Tibet.

The United States can continue to make contributions toward systemic changes that will instill the rule of law in China, which would, for example, make summary trials a thing of the past. Congress failed to fund the President's rule of law initiative last year; we should not repeat that mistake this year. Congress and the Administration should continue to resist sanctions and economic penalties that will only make the situation worse, but we must develop a stronger policy to put pressure on China to begin a dialog with the Dalai Lama on providing autonomy for the people of Tibet. An important step was taken last month when Assistant Secretary of State for Population, Refugees, and Migration Julia Taft was named the State Department's Special Coordinator for Tibet.

This resolution argues for an additional step the United States can take. It urges the Administration to support and work for the passage of a resolution condemning China's human rights

abuses at the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that precise individual documentation and statements of this be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. These statements were recently given by refugees coming out of China directly to some of our friends in Nepal.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair. Whatever the reason for China's entrenchment, it now presents a serious challenge to strengthening of relationships between our two countries.

I happen to remain convinced that sustained, active dialog and engagement with the Chinese leadership is the wisest course, but in these discussions we must be frank and open and the interests of both our Nations must be served. The United States can continue to make contributions towards systemic changes that will instill the rule of law in China which would, for example, make summary trials a thing of the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Is it possible—

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague, the problem is we are going to have a vote soon.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. May I ask unanimous consent just for 2 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Congress failed to fund the President's rule of law initiative last year. We should not make that mistake this year. Congress and the administration should continue to resist sanctions and economic penalties that will only make the situation worse, but we must develop a stronger policy to put pressure on China to begin a dialog with the Dalai Lama and providing autonomy for the people of Tibet.

An important step was taken last month when Assistant Secretary of State for Population, Refugees, and Migration Julia Taft was named as the State Department's Special Coordinator for Tibet.

This resolution argues for an additional step the United States can take. It urges the administration to support and work for the passage of a resolution condemning China's human rights abuses at the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva. While we should acknowledge China's progress in many areas and continue to encourage China in search of greater progress, we should also use the forum of the United Nations Human Rights Commission to let China and the world know that China's human rights abuses are unacceptable.

Ultimately, China's leaders must come to understand that the economic freedom that have until recently championed—and which they still know is

necessary for China to fully modernize its economy—must advance together with social and political freedom. As in Hong Kong and Taiwan, China's ability to withstand economic turmoil will depend in part on the ability of Chinese citizens to make judgments for themselves. Political leaders cannot expect to draw a line between economic and political judgments. Both must be allowed to flourish hand-in-hand. And that means viewing the efforts of Xu Wenli, Wang Youcai, and Qin Yongmin to organize a more pluralist Chinese polity, and viewing the efforts of the Dalai Lama to promote dialog and religious and cultural freedom, as encouraging signs of China's modernization, not as dangerous signs of China's instability.

EXHIBIT 1

TESTIMONY OF TIBETAN REFUGEES IN NEPAL— NOVEMBER 1998

(Names have been removed for their protection)

I rode on trucks and other vehicles many days' travel from Kham to Lhasa, where I purchased a business permit for Yuan 250 to travel onward. There, a younger cousin and I paid Yuan 1,200 each to a Nepali guide to smuggle us across the border at night. We completed our walk mostly at night.

I was a monk at Rinchen Lingpa monastery in Dzong, and had to leave because of a new policy reducing the number of monks from 45 to a maximum of 30. But already, severe economic conditions were forcing me to look for other opportunities; my father, who was imprisoned for 15 years after 1959, is 73 years old now and unable to support me and himself. Because of Dzong's proximity to the recent summer's flooding along the Yangtze, officials were coming and "shaking down" the monasteries for contributions to the relief efforts. Also, livestock, farm product and head taxes and other fees have increased steeply and consistently over the past few years, and especially so recently. So many people want to escape from Tibet, but most are afraid of getting caught, shot at or encountering great hardship along the way.

I would like to go to Drepung Monastery, in southern India, and resume my Buddhist practice there.

In Tibet, I lived for many years in Ko-lung, a Nyingma sect nunnery, except for one trip to India in 1994. Earlier, there were 60 nuns, and recently that number was officially reduced and limited to 45, along with enactment of other strictures such as a ban on all morning prayers [an important foundation of Tibetan Buddhist practice].

In April of 1998, I was drawn into an argument with the head nun, who accused me of being aligned with the Tibetan community in exile. (When I returned to Nagchu from my trip to India in '94, I was kept in solitary confinement for 20 days before being released). As a result, I was turned over to the authority in charge of the political re-education program, which I was inducted into. I, and others, were forced to renounce our allegiance to and relinquish all photos of the Dalai Lama (which we tried to hide), and to state in writing that Tibet is and always has been an inalienable part of China. However, knowing that I faced imprisonment in doing so, I refused to write that I agreed with their "re-education" points. I was not imprisoned, but fined Yuan 1,400. My parents and I realized that we were unable to pay my fine, and that without the nunnery there was nothing left for me there, so I decided to leave.

From the age of 15, I had been a monk at Ganden monastery, and a teacher and part time translator for tourists. I was expelled in September, 1996, along with 200 other monks as a result of suspicions that authorities had developed following the Ganden uprising on May 6 of that year: 50 officials had arrived at Ganden, and the monks began throwing stones. That night, the monastery was surrounded and about 100 monks were arrested the next morning; most of those are now serving 9-15 years sentences. During the night, I had helped a photographer escape with film, resulting in a news story that was broadcast on VOA wherein the photographer thanked the Ganden teachers for advising him to escape that night. I became very cautious, careful to clean my quarters and hide all my Dalai Lama photographs, but officials tracked me down on the basis of that VOA news report.

The situation in Tibet is getting worse, month by month. Monks are being expelled from monasteries, and now an entrance exam in which you have to write well in Chinese is required for every job, even low level jobs. The culture of Lhasa has also deteriorated, with Chinese prostitution and other vices found everywhere, now.

In Lhasa, I bought a fake internal travel pass to the border, and came with my pregnant wife. We paid Rs. 30,000/—and were smuggled across.

When I was 15, I left Amdo to train as a monk at Ganden, but I was there for less than 2 years. In 1987 and '89, I witnessed the uprisings and demonstrations in Lhasa, and was emotionally very moved by them. That's when I realized that I had to stand up to the Chinese, and I have been helping the Tibet cause since that time.

After 1992, I was constantly on a PSB (Public Security Bureau) watch list, and several times was harassed, interrogated and detained. I was first arrested in 1992, and was held in solitary confinement and interrogated and beaten for 8 days. Continuously, three policemen had me kneel on a cement floor and kicked me on the body and face. One of them did all the kicking and beating, one watched, and the other sat at a desk and took notes. They were Chinese and Tibetan, but I don't harbor ill feelings toward the Tibetans because I feel their circumstances in being there were not their fault.

They couldn't get any information out of me, so they fined me Yuan 6,700 and made me swear that I would never reveal the place of confinement—which looks like a normal government office, but with confinement rooms attached at the back. I believe that there are many other such places of confinement; I know others who have been similarly interrogated and beaten.

In 1993, I went on pilgrimage to India to attend His Holiness's Kalachakra initiation in Sikkim, and when I returned to Lhasa I had to hide and move my residence frequently, in order to avoid being arrested. Even my parents were being watched, in Amdo. I had opened a shop in Amdo with a friend, and he was arrested and sentenced to five years imprisonment, so I realized that I was in imminent danger of arrest.

In 1994, I returned to Amdo and changed my name, stopped wearing monks' robes, and stayed mostly in remote areas. But in August of 1995 I came back to Lhasa, and in October opened a restaurant there. In December of 1995, right at the time when the Chinese appointed their selection for the Panchen Lama, one of my teachers was arrested and kept in confinement, and I was arrested shortly thereafter. The PSB questioned me about my time in India, and tried to force me to agree that the Chinese-selected Panchen Lama was the genuine one. They closed

and ransacked my restaurant, which they suspected of being a meeting place for people to talk about freedom for Tibet.

I was sentenced to 2 years in prison on 3 counts: for going to India to see the Dalai Lama, for running a restaurant suspected of being connected to the Tibet freedom movement, and for being suspected of engaging in political activity. I was first held at Gutsa prison, about 5 kilometers from Lhasa, for 10 months. I was kept chained and was beaten for the first 15 days (one of my testicles was crushed), and was given no food or water for the first 5 days. They offered food and water, trying to tempt me to tell them what I had been doing. I was beaten so much that I really thought I had died and gone to Hell. I had a cell that was only big enough to lie down in, with a pan to use as a toilet. Our child died during delivery, in June, 1996, when I was in prison.

On January 10, 1997, I was transferred to Tolong Dzong prison, where I stayed for the remaining 14 months of my sentence. I was released on April 2 of 1998, and then on May 30 was re-arrested by a plain clothes PSB officer, on political grounds, and held for 45 more days. After that, I had to report every month to the police, and was not allowed to travel. That's when my wife and I decided to leave for Nepal.

My wife gave birth to a boy on November 3. Now, my first priority is to find work, in order to repay a large loan that I own in Lhasa. I'd also like to learn at least some rudimentary English, to work for the Tibet cause, and to help my friends who are still in Tibet, many of them in prison.

My brother was killed by the Chinese in 1958, and since then the situation in Tibet has only been getting worse. In 1975 and '76, the state took possession of all the private farm lands in our area, and has been leasing them back to the farmers. Beginning this year, we have not been allowed to sell our crops (primarily barley and wheat) to the open market, but are forced to sell 70-80% of it to the government at a fixed rate that is about half the open market rate. And now, we're not allowed to keep pictures of the Dalai Lama even in our homes.

I came over a high pass, though we started as a group of only 18 and merged with other groups from Amdo and Lhasa.

This year at the Gawa monastery, where I was a monk, officials recently forced us to publicly denounce the Dalai Lama, and they now prohibit monks younger than 18 from joining the monastery. This is a very shrewd tactic on the part of the Chinese, because they understand that by the time young people are 18 they have already been exposed to modern distractions and bad habits, such as drinking and gambling and prostitution, which spoils their desire for religious practice. Historically (before 1959), our monastery had 800 people, but in recent years it has remained at around 300. About 3 months ago, though, 225 monks were expelled, including me and most of the senior monks. It is now nearly impossible to get admitted to a monastery—and entrance to Sera, Drepung or Ganden is impossible—because the officials are reducing the numbers of monks allowed at monasteries everywhere. Some of the Gawa monks have nowhere to go, and so they wait until the officials are gone and then discreetly join the activities in the monastery, hiding when necessary.

The Chinese have appointed their own Panchen Lama, and we don't even know where the genuine Panchen Lama is. I have been told that the public is prohibited from meeting the genuine Panchen Lama's parents.

Also, taxes have increased beyond what Tibetans can afford. We used to pay pasture

taxes of 7 per yak and Yuan 200 per horse each year, but these have been raised recently, plus farmers and herders have to pay in-kind taxes of meat and butter each year to the authorities—taxes totaling about 30% of our total production. I don't have parents, nor any livestock, and all else that I owned I gave to the monastery. But now my brother and I have had to repay many debts that my parents accumulated, and we have no livestock as a source of income for this.

During the severe snowstorms of 1996, we heard on American radio that we would be receiving relief in the form of blankets and money. Some foreign donors did come, and in front of them the officials handed us blankets and Yuan 200 each, but after they left the officials returned and collected all the blankets and money. I think the Chinese are very skilled at tricking outsiders.

My brother (age 36) joined me on this trip, and we are relieved to finally be outside of Tibet. After an audience with His Holiness the Dalai Lama, I want to become a monk at the Sera Monastery in southern India.

Eighteen years ago, my parents owned a house near the Mosque. A few years ago, the authorities said they would tear down the house and provide us with improved housing there, in the same place. The new complex was built, but then promptly sold to developers. We did get compensation of Yuan 30,000, but this is half what the old house was worth.

My mother and I had a very small table on the Bargkor (market area and circumambulation route) where we sold cloth and shirts. We had to pay a Yuan 300 monthly fee to 3 different government departments—for a business permit, for the space itself and also income tax.

When I was around 10 years old, I remember getting tear gassed during the rioting, and then staying inside for several days. Nowadays, you might occasionally see a small group of monks or nuns demonstrating, but they never make it more than half a circuit around the Bargkor before being arrested. In August of this year, the authorities entered all the homes in our area, banging on doors loudly and threatening severe penalties, in a search for Dalai Lama photos. We had hidden all of ours ahead of time.

My parents and I decided that if our family was to get ahead financially, one of us would have to leave, and we agreed that I should go, hopefully to get an education. I wasn't able to study in Tibet because I didn't have a residency permit for Lhasa, and studying there is very expensive, anyway—as is living there. Right now we are paying Yuan 450-500 for tuition for my younger brother, which doesn't include his uniform or books. Each year it is getting worse. We don't have a family member in government service, but many Tibetans now are being fired, and you now have to take a written exam in Chinese for even a low level job. Tibetan language is hardly used in Lhasa, there are no high lamas left there, there are far fewer monks than there used to be, and anyone showing a sign of resistance to the Chinese is sentenced to 6-7 years' imprisonment. The Chinese immigrants are bringing infectious diseases to Tibet with them [likely in reference to STDs], while prostitution, gambling and night clubs are thriving.

In October 1997, four women from our village were called for sterilisation.

Two had children already and two did not. One evening the Chinese took the four of them to another place and sterilised them. Two got sick and the others remained healthy. About one month before this, officials from the birth control office came and summoned a meeting. During the meeting

the Chinese said that they would operate on women from the age of 18 to 40. They said that those women who didn't undergo the operation would be expelled from their jobs. All of them were farmers.

I heard from the people of the village that one evening a truck belonging to the birth control office arrived in our village and the 4 of them were taken away to get operated on, totally by force. The officials told the 4 of them that the government would pay everything and no problems would result from the operations. They said that one needed rest for 7 days after the operation, and should take proper medicine, and the food and expenses would be provided by the government. But the women were in bed for more than 2 weeks and hardly recovered, and the expenditures were paid by their families and not by the government.

I used to distribute booklets and other literature that dealt with our cause and also I put up posters. As a result, I was caught three times by the Chinese authorities and suffered from imprisonment and torture.

When I was first arrested, apart from handcuffing me, they gave me a few kicks and slaps but I wasn't beaten very badly. On the third day I was specifically charged with possession of a book. It was Friday and I was given the ultimatum to hand over any books or literature dealing with Tibetan affairs by Monday. When I reported on Monday, I was asked where the book was, I told them that I didn't have it and was once again imprisoned.

For the next two months I was interrogated by using all sorts of tactics but I refused to hand over the book. In the end, my friends paid 2000 yuan and I was released on the conditions that I report daily to the police, confine myself within the monastery and not engage in any subversive activity. I was also told to be an informer. If I did well as an informer, I would be paid secretly and if not I would be re arrested. For the next year I was constantly harassed by the police. Sometimes, they visited me in the middle of the night in my monastic room and asked me questions like whether I had been working sincerely for them and whether I was doing any subversive work.

In July 1994 I was arrested for the 3rd time by the Chinese authorities. I was bound in chains both on my hands and feet and taken to the local detention centre. This prison is an interrogation centre for those prisoners who had not confessed their crimes of mistakes. There were no permanent prisoners there. The main reason I was taken to this prison was to keep me away from contacting any Tibetans. While I was being interrogated at this prison, no one knew anything about my whereabouts. I learned later that on the day of my arrest my grandmother died, out of shock and worry.

The torturing began every day at 8 in the morning and went on till 9 in the evening. They adopted all sorts of methods to torture me. My hands were tied at the back in a most painful manner and they put electric rods in my mouth. They used the electric stick on me so many times, I can't say how many times. They made me kneel on the floor with a stick under my knees and another stick on the calves of my legs so that the skin was rubbed off my knees. At the same time my hands were handcuffed together on my back, with one arm over my shoulder and the other arm over my lower back. In addition to this, I received countless numbers of slaps and kicks throughout the day.

In the coldest month in Amdo, every morning before the sun rose, I was subjected to 2 hour cold baths and I was told to strip myself completely naked and then they kept on

pouring buckets of icy cold water on me until I completely blacked out. Sometimes I was subjected to a treatment in which they hit with me with thin, sharp bamboo all over my body. After some time, my whole body became like a plucked chicken, very blue with patches of white. Sometimes after throwing countless buckets of ice cold water on me, they would bring me before a red glowing fireplace, if they felt I was about to faint. They gave me this type of torture for 15 days.

I was also fed very poorly with 2 glasses of black tea and some meagre food. I was almost starving because sometimes if I could chew a single pea, I used to feel very happy. However, no matter what type of torture they it was, I didn't admit or confess anything except the possession of the book, which I had already done earlier. I suffered rigorous torture for about 4 months in this prison and since I didn't confess anything they eventually transferred me. In the new prison I was chained and made to sit on a chair, and the security personnel kept me from sleeping for 14 days. The food given to me was the same as they gave to their pigs. I was charged for being a spy of the Tibetan government. The final verdict was that I was a counter-revolutionary who had been engaged in propagating their cause. Thus, I was sentenced for two years and 7 months imprisonment. They took away my political rights for a period of 2 years. After serving my imprisonment I was finally released at the beginning of 1997. After my release I was constantly harassed by the local police.

I was arrested and imprisoned because I called for Tibet's independence. At Gutsa detention center, we were placed in a room with a cement floor where there were no beds and blankets. It was mid winter, and they kept us for over 3 months without blankets, which they allowed only when our relatives brought them from home. We were given small amounts of food, just 2 dumplings per day. It didn't fill our stomachs.

When we were interrogated they questioned us about who was behind the demonstration, but we told them that we had done it independently. Then they beat us with the use of an electric baton. They put it everywhere, on my head, hands, mostly on the veins, and here where it is very painful. We would lose memory because of that. They also kicked us and slapped us in the face. They interrogated me three times a day, every day for one or two hours at a time. They asked the same questions and we wouldn't answer them properly. There were 3 or 4 police questioning us.

They kept us in Gutsa for one year and 9 months and interrogated us. After that they brought us to court to pass our sentences. I got 4 years imprisonment. They then took us to a hospital where we were supposed to get a medical check up. But they didn't give us any treatment and instead took one bottle of blood from each of us forcibly. Because of that we became thinner and thinner. Then finally they took us to Drapchi prison where we had to do work with wool for making carpets. There wasn't any education and the food was very poor. They treated the political prisoners very harshly while they treated normal prisoners better.

We were kept in the prison for a very long time and were not allowed to meet our family. We were able to receive small things such as things to eat. They didn't allow us to meet our family members except after we were sentenced. After our sentencing, they allowed us to meet our family, but only one person could visit at a time.

I suffered from a stomach disorder while at Drapchi, from food which was not properly cooked. We used to eat packaged noodles

which led to stomach ailments, and whatever I ate, I had to vomit with blood. I suffered from this for about 8 months after I was released from prison. I start vomiting when the weather turns cold. In prison I asked to visit the hospital, but they only used to take (prisoners) to the hospital when they were almost dead. Otherwise they don't care for political prisoners.

When I was in prison there were some foreign visits but we were watched all the time so we couldn't talk to them. Before they came we were made to clean the rooms and then we had to do whatever work we had to do. They brought big pieces of meat to the kitchen and stuck up list of food telling the visitors that they give us such food. But in reality we didn't get to eat this meat. After the heads had left they took it away.

They put at least one female common law prisoner in each cell to watch the nuns so that we wouldn't talk about things like independence. She would tell the authorities information about us and because of that her sentence was decreased. They were put in a separate room because they feared that we would harm them. They were very happy in their rooms which were better than ours.

In Drapchi prison we were made to do exercises which were not for the purpose of our health. It was like military training. When we were doing the exercises we had to shout something in Chinese which meant that we were confessing to our mistakes and that we would come out to society as a new person. Once we understood the meaning of the words we protested and didn't say them. Then many soldiers came and beat us. It was during winter and at that time it is very cold in Tibet. We were made to stand on the cold cement floor in the shade barefooted for a whole day, our shoes and socks removed. This made our feet cold as ice. Then we had to run while they didn't give us any water. Some of us fell unconscious. If someone fell down they said we were not allowed to help. They also stopped the monthly opportunity for our families to visit us. We had to stand in the sun and put our faces in the direction of the sun as a result of which some of us had blisters on our face.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for her very significant statement. I know we have not always agreed on China, but I think that was a very candid and very honest statement. I appreciate her making it.

I want to publicly thank, on behalf of Senator WELLSTONE and myself, our staffs: On Senator WELLSTONE's staff, Charlotte Oldham Moore and John Bradshaw, for their very persistent and hard work on this issue; on my staff, Samuel Chang, for his hard work and continued interest in the human rights issues in China.

As I said, one of my heroes, and I think one that has been mentioned repeatedly, one that will be with us at the press conference tomorrow, is Wei Jingsheng, who spent about 20 years in solitary confinement in China back in the 1970s, arrested for his involvement at the Democracy Wall effort.

At that time he was sentenced to spend 14½ years in solitary confinement, went out and was involved in Tiananmen Square. He was truly a friend and truly a hero. I thought, when I visited with him in my office, while I was going on annual vacations, while I was rearing three boys and seeing them grow up and going out and

playing basketball with them and coaching their soccer games, this man, who is about my age, was languishing in a Chinese prison.

I recently read the book "China Live" by Mike Chinoy. Mike was the CNN correspondent and before that, the NBC correspondent—in Beijing, then Hong Kong. He went to China as a young man in the seventies, very idealistic, believing the Chinese regime was going to bring human rights and democracy and freedom to the people of China. He left disillusioned to a great extent, but he tells about the trial of Wei Jingsheng. I want to read this as I conclude. He talked about Wei Jingsheng, on October 9, 1979, going on trial.

Pictures from the proceedings were broadcast on Chinese TV. They showed a youthful-looking Wei, dressed in prison garb, his head shaved and bowed, listening to the verdict before a panel of stony-faced judges and a carefully selected audience of five hundred people. I had read his essays and seen for myself the hope generated by Democracy Wall. Now, working late at the NBC bureau in Hong Kong on the day Wei was sentenced to fifteen years in jail for "counterrevolutionary incitement", I was angry and upset.

Although intellectually I recognized that profound changes were still under way in China—holding out, over the long term, the possibility of a more humane society—it was hard to be neutral and dispassionate watching such a travesty of justice. My feelings became even stronger when I acquired a copy of the transcript of Wei's trial, which had been surreptitiously tape-recorded and distributed by other activists not yet under detention. Standing before his accusers, Wei refused to admit to any crime. Instead he forcefully defended his ideas of democracy. His courage in the face of a certain guilty verdict and long prison term was astonishing. I wished I could do something to help.

He said, "I wished I could do something to help." Twenty years after that trial, things are not better in China, and we see a new round of the same kind of show trials, phony trials and repression. Mike Chinoy said, "I wished I could do something to help." Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, we have a chance today to do a little something to help. This year marks the 10th anniversary of the Tiananmen massacre. This is an incredibly important year in China and for the democracy movement in China. We can take an important step and cast an important vote with overwhelming bipartisan support for this resolution today.

I ask my colleagues to call upon the administration to sponsor this resolution in Geneva this summer, condemning the human rights abuses ongoing in China today.

Mr. President, at this time I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The distinguished majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I do have a unanimous consent request to pro-
pound, and I know we would, then, be prepared to go to a recorded vote. But before we do that, I want to take a moment to commend the distinguished

Senator from Arkansas for the work he has done and the fact that he has been joined by the Senator from Minnesota in addressing this very important issue. I know they have been joined by a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle.

This is not something new with the Senator from Arkansas. Senator HUTCHINSON has been trying to emphasize his concerns about the terrible human rights policies in the People's Republic of China ever since he has been in the Senate. I know he worked on it last year. He has been trying to make the point this is a serious problem, and I think the justification for this serious expression is the fact that it is still not what it should be. He has been talking about it for quite some time, as have others, and there continue to be terrible human rights violations.

So I think it is appropriate that the Senate, in its second legislative action of this year, would express its very strong concern regarding this human rights situation in the People's Republic of China. I have read the resolution. I think it is well stated. And the timeliness is also very important. As we now are about to have the annual meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, Switzerland, for the Senate to go on record taking a stand for this human rights position, I think, is very commendable. I am glad I have been able to work with Senator DASCHLE and both sides of the aisle to make it possible for us to consider this separately, to highlight the fact that we are not just sticking this on as a sense-of-the-Senate resolution in a bill, this is a Senate resolution that states clearly our concern and our position. I am very pleased to be supportive of my colleague's efforts.

I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I know Senator HUTCHINSON thanked the majority leader. I also want to thank the majority leader for his support in doing this. He is right. It is timely. We do want to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1999 AND TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 1999

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, before we go to the yeas and nays, let me pro-
pound my unanimous consent request. We have worked this out on both sides of the aisle with the chairman of our select committee with regard to the Y2K issue and the ranking member, Senator DODD. This will be the schedule, then, for the balance of this week and Monday and Tuesday of next week.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business

today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. on Monday, March 1, for a pro forma session only. Immediately following the convening on Monday, I ask that the Senate then adjourn over until 9:30 on Tuesday, March 2, and proceed immediately to consideration of S. 314, providing for small business loans regarding the year 2000 computer programs, and that there be 1 hour of debate to be equally divided between Senators BOND and KERRY of Massachusetts, with no amendments or motions in order.

I further ask that the vote occur on passage of S. 314 at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, and that paragraph 4 of rule 12 be waived.

I also ask that, immediately following the passage of that bill, Senator BENNETT be recognized to make a motion to recess the Senate in order to allow the Senate to hear confidential information regarding the Y2K issue in S-407 of the Capitol, and I further ask the Senate stand in recess for the weekly party caucuses between the hours of 12:30 and 2:15 on Tuesday, March 2.

I further ask at 2:15 on Tuesday, the Senate immediately proceed to S. Res. 7, having discharged the resolution from the Rules Committee, and there be 3 hours of debate, being equally divided between Senators BENNETT and DODD, with no amendments or motions being in order, and a vote to occur on adoption of that resolution at the conclusion or yielding back of that time.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in light of that order, the Senate will not be in session on Friday and will be in pro forma session only on Monday. The Senate will debate the Y2K loan program bill on Tuesday morning, with a rollcall vote on passage at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday. Therefore, the next rollcall vote will be at 10:30 on Tuesday. Following that vote, the Senate will proceed to the briefing in S-407. I want to encourage Senators to attend this briefing because it does involve very important, classified information with regard to the Y2K issue.

At 2:15, the Senate will proceed to the funding resolution for the special committee on the year 2000 technology and related issues, for up to 3 hours.

I thank my colleagues for their cooperation and, again, I commend those who have been involved in S. Res. 45. I yield the floor.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The Senate continued with the consideration of the resolution.