unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DORGAN. On behalf of the Senator from Minnesota, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota and all Senators who believe we should honestly debate issues, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, so we can debate the Patients' Protection Act, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a quorum call.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

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

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

RECESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 11:30, at which time there will be a period of morning business not to exceed 1 hour equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, my understanding is there is a conference occurring on the other side that the two Members of the majority party in the Chamber wish to attend. We want to allow that to happen.

I point out, under my reservation, it is my hope that when we reconvene with the hour of morning business, whatever transpires beyond that will be an agenda that allows Members on the floor of the Senate to come and discuss the issues they want to discuss. I will not object with that caveat.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from Oklahoma to amend the unanimous consent request to allow the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE, to have 10 minutes during our block of time.

Mr. INHOFE. Before amending my request, I ask the Chair, would the Senator from Minnesota be entitled to 10 minutes of the half hour that they already have under my request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only if he were recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. I so amend.

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:58 a.m., recessed until 11:30 a.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, might I inquire, where are we parliamentary-wise?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business for 60 minutes equally divided.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD INDIA AND PAKISTAN

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to address the Senate on an issue regarding an amendment which we have recently passed on this floor: U.S. policy toward India and Pakistan. I want to address the Senate on that issue.

We passed an amendment on a defense appropriations bill that would allow the President to waive certain sanctions we have against India and Pakistan and also suspend economic sanctions we have against India and Pakistan. That passed this body and has gone over to the House. This is something the House is going to be considering, and it is important U.S. policy in a number of regards.

Our relationship toward India has been one where we have been willing to sanction them rapidly and readily, in spite of the fact that they are a democracy and we share a number of institutional values and we have worked together sometimes in the past. But it seems as if we are very willing to sanction them. Yet, at the same time, we are willing to go toward China and say: China, you may steal our weapons technology, you may have human rights abuses, you may be shipping weapons of mass destruction to countries that are opposed to our interests; you have forced-abortion policies in place. Yet we are going to overlook all of those things because we want to have a good, open relationship with you, a good trade relationship. But, India, you tested here and you broke into these areas, so we are going to put economic sanctions on you, put these other sanctions on you, and we are going to hit you hard. It is the same with Pakistan.

I think we have the wrong policies in place, and I don't understand it. I want to draw that to the attention of my colleagues because it appears as if we are putting these on with different balances, that we are saying in the case of China we are going to overlook the problems, overlook the situation, all these abuses, and with India we are going to smack you no matter what you do. They have a democracy, a vibrant democracy and a free press. The same with Pakistan, as far as their issues go, but we are willing to hit them so hard.

So I don't understand why we are doing that, why the Clinton Presidency looks at the two countries differently, and lets China get away with virtually anything, if you look at the record that has built up over a period of time. Toward India, we say we are going to smack you.

Senator ROBERTS and I have put forward an amendment that has passed this body and is going to the House. It

would suspend these sanctions, the economic sanctions, toward India and Pakistan.

I think it is high time that the United States aggressively build its relationship with India and aggressively build its relationship with Pakistan. We need to do this. We need to have a broad-based relationship and not one that just has very narrow sanctions associated with it. For instance, as well, the administration is pushing that to lift these sanctions on India, they are telling the Indian Government, basically, they have to agree to CTBT, the Conventional Test Ban Treaty, in spite of the fact that the Senate may never pick this up. They are saying unless they agree to this, we are not going to lift these sanctions. It is a very narrow discussion point that they have with India, instead of having this broad-based discussion about how can we expand trade relationships, expand diplomatic relationships, and work together on issues of key concern.

We should be asking: How can we expand relationships in the broad set of fields that we have? Instead, it is they have to agree to the CTBT, or we are not going to lift these economic sanctions on them, period. That is too narrow of a relationship for us to build with a great nation. India will be the largest nation in the world in the next 10 years, population-wise. It has an extraordinarily large middle class. It has a number of people in a very poor situation, as well, but it has a large middle class.

Look also at Pakistan. It is in the amendment where we suspend economic sanctions for 5 years and have a waiver on others. Pakistan sits in a difficult spot, right next to Afghanistan. They have had a lot of problems with Afghanistan. Pakistan seeks to be a friend of the United States. It is partly, obviously, an Islamic country and has been a key ally of ours in defeating the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. After Afghanistan, the Soviets backed off and we pulled out altogether. We not only sanctioned them under the Glenn amendment, we also had the Pressler amendment that basically removed our relationship with Pakistan, an Islamic country that seeks to be our friend, and we just nail them.

It makes no sense to me why we do these sorts of things, and why the President, the Clinton administration, seeks to sanction a country that seeks to work with us, and closely with us, while with China we have had all this theft of technology, shipment of weapons of mass destruction, all the human rights abuses, and we are willing to look the other way.

I think we ought to have trade relationships with China. I think it is important that we have a broad-based relationship with China. But at the same time we need to be expanding our relationships with India and Pakistan. These are countries—particularly in India's case—that share a lot of our traditions. I think it is wrong for us to have a double standard, particularly against a country that should be a very valuable future partner.

I chair the Foreign Relations subcommittee that deals with both India and Pakistan, and it has been beyond me to understand the difference in U.S. policy toward these giant Asian countries. I think it is wrong of the administration to have this different policy. I think we really need to be much more aggressive and engaged and be a vibrant, broad-based partner with India. I think it can be a good future relationship. It is something we can use as an offset toward China, in some respects, and our large dependency on China. I think it can be a future growth market for States such as mine and many others that have agricultural and aircraft products that we export. I think it can be a growing, vibrant market for us, one that shares a lot of our relationships and views and needs.

I wanted to bring to the attention of my colleagues what is really happening in foreign policy. We also had a hearing yesterday on the issue of Iraq. I wanted to mention this tangentially because I think it is appropriate. We had people testifying from the Iraqi National Congress—a representative of the INC, Mr. Chalabi—and we had other witnesses testifying that Saddam Hussein is probably at his weakest point since the United States was engaged with Iraq. They are having daily reports of insurrection in the southern part of Iraq, and the northern part of the country is no longer in the control of Saddam Hussein.

There are other factions that are controlling much of this Kurdish region. Yet the United States, in the Iraq liberation, provided $97 million of drawdown authority and support for the opposition movement, and all we are giving the opposition movement is file cabinets and fax machines. Why aren't we really supporting this opposition movement that seeks to meet inside Iraq to set up more of a civil society in the region that Saddam doesn't control? Why aren't we really supporting these guys?

I asked the administration witness yesterday—Under Secretary Beth Jones, a bright and good person—Do you think Saddam Hussein is going to outlast another U.S. President? Is he going to outlast President Clinton?

She says: I really don't know.

I said we know how to aggressively push and prosecute these issues in Kosovo. Why is it that we can't do this in Iraq? Why can't we support the opposition groups and give them lethal and nonlethal assistance that we can find truly necessary? Why can't we help them have a meeting of the Iraqi National Congress inside Iraq where they want to meet? It would send a powerful statement across the world that the INC, a potential opposition government, is meeting within Iraq.

Yet the administration is not willing to step forward and is saying they are not so sure about whether or not we should do this. We are willing to give the opposition file cabinets and fax machines, but we won't give them training and lethal technology or the ability to fight. This is an extraordinary situation. It is one on which the Congress needs to speak out more.

We need to aggressively move forward now on Saddam Hussein. We need to do that by supporting the opposition. This isn't about sending in U.S. troops. This is about supporting an opposition that wants to fight with Saddam Hussein, that wants to put the parts together to have a democratic Iraq, that wants to be an ally—not just that but wants the Iraqi people to be proud of and pleased with their government, instead of constantly harassed and killed by their leadership.

Why on earth are we not pushing this and stepping forward and being more aggressive? I fail to get adequate answers from the Clinton administration on why. We know how to push forward aggressively on Kosovo. Why can't we deal in such a manner with Iraq? We know how to build a relationship with China. Why can't we build relationships with India and Pakistan? I really don't understand what is taking place. I ask these questions, and we are going to continue to hold hearings on these issues. We need to move forward in building a better relationship with India and Pakistan and dealing with the situation in Iraq.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have 18 minutes on the Republican side and 30 minutes remaining on the Democrat side. Ten minutes have been reserved for the Senator from Minnesota.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am not going to take my time at this moment. Senator KERREY will precede me.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Alexis Rebane and Sofia Lidshog, two interns, be allowed floor privileges for the debate today.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CLELAND be allowed to be in order as the Democrat to speak after I speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

READING SCORES

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I am here to take a couple of minutes to