

a letter today, along with several of my colleagues in the Senate, urging that funding for this provision be increased to 10 percent—a level that I believe to be consistent with the needs that exist in my state of Nebraska and in others. Besides providing recreational funding support for community needs, this source of funds can have a significant impact on non-regulatory approaches to preventing wildlife species from being listed as threatened or declined under the Endangered Species Act—listings which often find landowners embroiled in private property rights vs. species protection laws. By enabling communities and states to preserve identified areas where habitat and species can be allowed to flourish with minimal or little disruption on the lives and activities of people, we can help to prevent future listings, and to safeguard against some of the social and economic disruptions that have often accompanied past listings.

Additionally, wildlife conservation, conservation education, and wildlife-associated recreational programs—all of which contribute increasingly significant tourism and recreational dollar returns to the state of Nebraska—are traditionally underfunded. The International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies estimates these needs nationally to be approximately one billion dollars per year.

Increasing Title III funding to 10 percent of Outer Continental Shelf receipts would give Nebraska approximately an additional \$1.7 million annually—money that I know from the people of Nebraska is both needed and would be well-spent.

The Nebraska State Legislature passed a resolution this year in support of this bill, as did the City of Grand Island in Nebraska. Nebraska Governor Mike Johanns is one of 27 Governors to officially support this legislation. All 50 state fish and wildlife agencies, including the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission, the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, and more than 3,000 local entities, businesses, clubs, and conservation organizations have endorsed the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999. Nationwide, more than 200 state and local ballot initiatives sought to commit billions of dollars for conservation, farmland protection, and urban revitalization policies. More than 70 percent of these initiatives were supported by voters. I enthusiastically add my support to this impressive list of supporters, and look forward to working with Senator LANDRIEU and our colleagues to finalize and pass this important legislation.

#### ONE GIANT LEAP FOR MANKIND

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to recognize a day that is certainly going to be remembered, as we go into the next millennium, as symbolizing this century. Each century has one or two things

that define it. It is what schoolchildren remember. It is what adults remember. Everyone remembers where they were when certain events happened, whether it was President Roosevelt saying on the radio that the war was over, whether it was the assassination of President John Kennedy, or whether it was Neil Armstrong taking one giant leap for mankind.

I believe July 20, 1969, 30 years ago, was clearly one of the defining moments of our century, although it would be very difficult to choose which moment had the most lasting impact. The day Neil Armstrong stepped on the Moon, the spirit of America was rejuvenated. It also was the culmination of years of discoveries, of scientific missions, of behind-the-scenes scientific experiments that were all a big show on July 20. I think it is important for us on a day such as today to recognize what all of those scientific experiences did and what we have gained from the space program.

In fact, when we look at the cost of the Apollo project, it cost about \$25 billion. In 1990 dollars, it would be about \$95 billion. It was an investment. The good news is, because America was willing to go for it, because America said the Moon is there and we can do it, we have had a 9-to-1 return on every dollar we have invested.

What is the 9-to-1 return? It is the newly created products and technologies and the new jobs that have come about as a result of those technologies that is the return on our investment. What space has given to our economy is a 9-to-1 return on our investment.

There have been 30,000 spinoffs from our space research. Let me tell you a few.

Satellites: Satellites are part of our daily lives. We now get instant access on the news anywhere in the world because of satellites. We can see press conferences anywhere in the world live because of satellites. We see satellites as part of our defense. A defense system for an incoming missile is going to result because we have satellite technology.

Computers: The microchip—how has that made a difference in our lives? Who can even ask the question about what computers have done. We see people with laptops in the airports, on airplanes. It is just phenomenal. This started with space research, not on the Senate floor, Mr. President.

High-quality software, high-performance computing, fiber-optic networks, water purification systems, Teflon—Teflon has improved the quality of life for all of us in this country who have spent even 1 minute in the kitchen. Digital watches, cordless tools, and, most notable, in my opinion, is space explorations' contribution to medical science. CAT scans and MRIs are revolutionizing our ability to detect tumors early enough so we can save lives.

Our quality of life has significantly improved since Neil Armstrong took

the giant leap for mankind. It was to that moment that all of us related what America had accomplished. That happened 30 years ago today.

I congratulate Neil Armstrong, the Apollo 11 crew, and all those at Johnson Space Center in Houston, TX, who contributed to the giant leap for mankind and the quality of life that all of us live, because those brave astronauts were willing to take the risk and the chance.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived and passed, the Senate now stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 1:05 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:19 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Mr. FITZGERALD pertaining to the introduction of S. 1396 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield the floor.

#### DISAPPROVING THE EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO THE PRODUCTS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH, is recognized to offer a motion to discharge the Finance Committee of S.J. Res. 27, on which there will be 1 hour of debate equally divided.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, pursuant to the Trade Act of 1974 and the rules of the Senate, I do make a privileged motion that the

Senate Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 27, a resolution disapproving the President's June 3, 1999 extension of normal trade relations with China.

It is my understanding that based on the parliamentary decisions made earlier, the 1 hour will be equally divided, a half hour under my control and a half hour under the control of the other side, not by majority/minority, but by the two sides, pro and con.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. It is also my understanding, for the benefit of my colleagues, that there will be two consecutive rollcall votes, the first one being on the China discharge and the second one on the Vietnam discharge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, notice of my intention to do these discharge motions was made to both the majority and minority leaders, the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee, and several other Senators on July 7, so there would be ample time for the leaders to adjust the time so we could have a vote prior to the House voting on this matter.

Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes out of my allotted time.

Despite President Clinton's 1992 campaign promise to link MFN certification to China's human rights record, the administration has chosen annually to grant Beijing what had been known as most-favored-nation status and is now called normal trading relations. It is amazing to me that that certification could be granted, given the dismal record of China in so many ways that we have talked about on this floor for so many weeks, especially in the area of human rights.

By offering this motion, I am asking the Senate to discharge S.J. Res. 27 from the Finance Committee. This legislation would disapprove the President's recommendation of normal trade relations status for China. Because of the rules of the Senate, it is in the Finance Committee. If I don't discharge it out, then it doesn't come out, and we don't get the opportunity to debate this issue.

This is a very important issue. Let me say, again, as I said earlier this morning on the Vietnam issue, whether my colleagues agree or disagree with me is not the issue. The issue is whether or not they will let us debate this on the floor. That is the issue. If they vote against my discharge motion, then they have said they do not want the Senate to debate this issue at all. They don't want to hear about the human rights violations in China or Vietnam. I would find that regrettable if the Senate made that decision.

If they feel strongly that they are right and there are not any problems in China which would justify holding up the NTR, normal trading relations,

then they ought to come down on the floor and defend that.

I have a few things I could share with Senators that I think will give them the opposite impression. I would want the opportunity to do that on behalf of so many Americans who are fed up with the fact that we keep giving MFN, or most-favored-nation trading status, to a country who has been so abysmal on human rights violations, not to mention stealing our nuclear secrets.

I have come to expect the President to ignore China's total disregard for human rights, its proliferation of nuclear weapons, and its piracy of U.S. technology by continuing Beijing's trading relationship with our country, but what I don't understand is why. Why are we doing this? Why are we afraid to debate this? Are we afraid we are going to find out how much technology has been pirated? Are we going to find out how much proliferation of nuclear weapons has actually occurred, how many human rights violations have occurred in China?

The answer is, yes, of course, we are going to find out, because I am going to present this on the floor if I get the opportunity to do it. Regrettably, the opposition is going to try to deny me that opportunity and probably will win. They win; the American people lose.

I will point out a few facts—I only have 30 minutes; I don't get the 10 hours I would have under the law, if, in fact, my discharge petition motion is approved. Unfortunately, I have to assume I am not going to get it and make the point as fast as I can in 30 minutes.

Since 1949, Communist China has operated one of the most brutal and repressive regimes the world has ever known. Indeed, the Beijing government has committed large-scale genocide in Tibet. It has killed millions of its own citizens, outlawed religion, obliterated freedom of the press, and fought against the United States in Korea and Indochina.

In 1989, the Chinese Government authorized a crackdown on thousands of students who had the courage to stand up for human rights and democracy, and crack down they did. We all know the sad stories that came out of that period of time in China's history. The actions of the Beijing government have also served to undermine international stability and U.S. national security interests. China continues to violate the missile technology control regime, exporting to rogue states like Iran, North Korea, and other nations. They export our most sensitive technology, which in some cases they stole and in other cases they bought, believe it or not, from the United States.

Moreover, China has failed to assist the United States in fully accounting for American POWs held by the Chinese forces during the Korean war. Certainly, the theft of our nuclear secrets by Chinese agents has been on our minds in the past several months. The Cox report provides extensive evidence

on the damage done to our national security by Chinese espionage. But I am also very concerned about China's notorious and seemingly blatant disregard for U.S. intellectual property laws.

Over the last decade, Chinese exports to the United States have increased seven times in comparison to American exports to China, creating a significant trade imbalance. During this time, some of the most rapidly growing and most competitive U.S. industries have been adversely affected by China's failure to enforce intellectual property rights. These include computer software, pharmaceuticals, agricultural and chemical products, and trademarks.

American businesses are losing billions because of this persistent problem. Yet the President marches forward saying normal trade relations is perfectly acceptable. I don't understand it. How can the administration justify their decision to reward the Communist Chinese Government NTR status when that government has such a deplorable record of protecting just one issue—U.S. intellectual property rights—not to mention many others which I will be getting into.

Peace and economic stability in Asia are in America's interest and require Chinese-American cooperation. Unfortunately, the President's decision to reextend NTR status to Communist China effectively rewards Beijing for rejecting reasonable American demands for protection from this intellectual property rights piracy, for cooperation on international non-proliferation efforts, and for a greater respect for basic human rights.

Now we are hearing the ominous signs of the saber rattling around Taiwan. These threats of military acts of violence threaten the stability of the entire region in the Pacific rim. How can you justify giving a nation that has done this, and is doing this, most-favored-nation trading status?

Perhaps the most egregious are the human rights violations which we appear to condone by granting this NTR status to China. It has a terrible human rights record. I have heard so many times from my colleagues, some of whom are going to be denying me by a vote the access to be able to debate this, how terrible the human rights violations are in China. Their policies on the political dissidents, religious freedom, and population control are abhorrent. The State Department report on China's human rights practices illustrates an appalling picture. It provides example after example of torture, forced confessions, suppression of basic human rights, denial of due process, and, worse of all, forced abortion and sterilization. Is this a government to which the United States of America should give most-favored-nation status? I don't think so.

All I am asking for is the opportunity to go into these matters in detail and debate this on the floor of the

Senate. This is not a vote on whether you agree or disagree. It is very interesting. I was thinking as I walked down to the floor from my office a few moments ago that the President of the United States took the U.S. military, put them in harm's way and bombed the sovereign nation of Yugoslavia to protect the human rights of the Albanian Kosovars. I can't even get the Senate to give me the opportunity to debate human rights violations in Vietnam and China. That is the bottom line. That is what we are talking about today.

The President—I will repeat this—went to war in Yugoslavia to protect the human rights of the Albanians in Kosovo, and I am going to be denied on this floor, by a vote, the opportunity to debate—just to debate—human rights violations in China and Vietnam. They don't want to hear it. That is the bottom line. If you can live with that in your conscience, fine. It is a sad, sad situation.

All I am asking for is what is required under the law. Give me 10 hours and I will agree to reduce the 10 to 2. I will say to my colleagues, wherever you are out there, it is 10 hours by requirement; but I will agree to 2 hours on my side if you will support my motion. Give me the opportunity to show you on this floor what China and Vietnam are doing by voting for both of these motions.

Mr. President, at this time, I yield the floor to give some time to the other side.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I appreciate the feelings and good intentions of the Senator from New Hampshire, but I respectfully oppose this motion to discharge the Finance Committee from considering the resolution to disprove extension of the Jackson-Vanik waiver for China. Why do I do so? First, I say to my good friend from New Hampshire, he has lots of opportunities to debate human rights, or any similar issues, on the floor. He can offer an amendment to any bill. That is a standing rule of the Senate. Any Senator can offer an amendment to virtually any bill at any time. He has that right. The rules of the Senate provide for unlimited debate. So he can talk for as long as he can physically stand on his own two feet. He has plenty of opportunity, as do all Senators, to raise issues that concern them.

I think it is inappropriate to discharge the Finance Committee from considering the resolution to disapprove an extension. Why? Very simply, because the current process has worked pretty well.

I am somewhat bemused when I think back on how furious the debate was on this issue—oh, gosh, it must be 4, 5, 6 years ago. In fact, I was one of the few Members of the Senate on the Democratic side who voted to sustain the veto of President Bush on this very

measure, as a consequence of President Bush's intention to extend unconditional MFN—now NTR—status for China, which prevailed. Ever since then, gradually, over the years, each President, each year, has reached the same conclusion after studying all the issues—that there should be a 1-year unconditional extension of most-favored-nation trading status. We have changed the name now to normal trade relations status. That is more accurate—more normal than most favored. In fact, for all intents and purposes, it is least favored. That is because the United States has trade agreements with many other countries which give them favorable terms of trade compared with the standard of MFN, or NTR.

Over the years, as more and more Americans have become more familiar with this question, and as the Congress has become more familiar, it has now come to the point where the vast majority of Members of Congress agree that annual unconditional extensions make sense, pure and simple. That is why we are here today. Several years ago, it was a huge debate. Now, over the years, it has come to be virtually a nonissue. It is virtually a nonissue because the vast majority of Members on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, and Presidents, Republicans and Democrats, know that to do otherwise would cause a tremendous upheaval of our relationships with a very important country—in this case, China.

I think it is important as we enter the next millennium that we deal with other countries with tremendous respect, recognizing that countries have interests. China has its own interests, and the United States has its own interests. The real question is how do we get along better with each other, in a way that accommodates American points of view.

The basic policy, as announced by the Presidents over time, has been engagement. I say it is basically engagement without illusions; that is, we talk with countries, but we are realistic about what they do or do not do. But we do not cut off something that is very basic, something that we grant to virtually every country in the world, including a lot of others that I can name that have foreign policies and internal policies that are inimical to the United States, but nevertheless we think to deal with those countries, it is best to maintain the current trade relationship with them.

One of the huge adverse consequences that have been caused by this in the past would be the clear setback of negotiations between the United States and China over China's membership in the World Trade Organization. That is a clear winner for the United States, as long as it is done on commercially acceptable principles. The last agreement that Premier Zhu tabled for the United States when he was in Washington not too long ago was clearly in the United

States best interest. Why? Because it was unilateral.

In every case, it was China that was making concessions. It was China opening up its markets to American products. It was China that changed its distribution system. It would be China that would agree to—a much more fancy term is “transparency”—much more openness, which undermines corruption, which undermines favoritism. It brings the Chinese economy much more into the modern world.

If this resolution were to pass, I will bet my bottom dollar we would have no WTO this year, and probably not for the next couple of years. Then the relationship with China, if you think they are risky now, would make today's relationship look like a cake walk. We have China's difficulties with Taiwan. They will be there for the indefinite future.

There are problems we have now with China over the tragic, mistaken bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade. We have very deep human rights concerns. We have concerns about China's—in the past, anyway—transfers of missile technology, and perhaps nuclear weapons, to rogue nations.

But let's remember, China has taken a lot of actions which have been very helpful to the United States. What is one?

China abstained at the U.N. Security Council when we wanted the Security Council resolution on Kosovo. China could have caused all kinds of problems and could have vetoed that Security Council resolution but did not.

China also signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. They have signed it. As far as we know, they have not violated it.

They helped us in the gulf war, particularly by their actions with the Security Council. They helped with North Korea and the problems we have with North Korea, and particularly the greater potential problems we might have if North Korea starts sending missiles farther out into the Pacific.

But if this resolution passes, all those problems I mentioned are going to be exacerbated and all the good points I mentioned will become irrelevant and not helpful in our relationship with that country.

It is a very important country to deal with in a very solid, commonsense way. China is the largest country in the world. China has the largest free-standing army in the world. China has the largest population in the world. China is a nuclear power. China is the fastest growing developing country in the world. It is a major power. We can't close our eyes to China.

I am not saying we should accept what China is doing. I am not saying we should accept what any country is doing that is adverse to American interests. But I am saying that we have to, with eyes wide open, look at China and engage China without illusion. That is the policy.

If this resolution were to pass, believe me, we would be disengaging

China. China would be so upset—and they should be, if it were to pass—and we would be dealing with China as an enemy and not as a country that is separate from us.

There is an old saying in life that if you stick your finger in somebody's eye and you treat somebody like the enemy, guess what. They are going to be an enemy; they will react adversely. That is exactly how this would be recognized if it were to pass.

There is another important point. It is procedural. Procedural matters, I might add, are not unimportant. This measure has been reported out of the House Ways and Means Committee unfavorably. So it is highly likely that this resolution will not come over to the Senate. If that is the case, why are we going through all of this? It doesn't make any sense.

I suggest, with deep respect to the other body, and with deep respect to my friend from New Hampshire and to my fellow colleagues, that if it comes up in the House, despite the recommendation of the House Ways and Means Committee, they pass the resolution, and it comes over here, then we will take it up and we will debate it. But it is premature to take it up at this time when it is clear, because of the House vote, that it will not pass the House and therefore will not be ripe as an issue over here.

But the fundamental reason is that this resolution, if it were to pass, would cause many more problems than the purported solutions that lie under the premise of this motion.

Again, all Presidents who have looked at this issue and all Congresses that have looked at this issue have reached the same conclusion—Republican and Democrat—that continuing the grant on an annual basis of unconditioned, normal trade relations with China will create the foundation and the condition for a much greater probability that we are going to achieve the success we want with various other issues that we have with China.

I oppose this move to discharge the Finance Committee from considering the resolution to disapprove extension of Jackson-Vanik waiver authority for China. It is an unnecessary attempt to alter a process that has worked well in providing for Congress' role in the annual NTR debate.

America's economic and trade relations with China have developed significantly over the past decade. I fervently hope that we will be able to resume WTO negotiations with China, complete a good commercial agreement, and extend permanent NTR quickly and in time for China to join the WTO in November in Seattle.

This is important for our businesses, important for our workers, and important for our country. I have no illusions about the serious problems we have with China, whether it is human rights, arms proliferation, espionage, Taiwan, or other areas. But using NTR,

whether it is the annual extension or the permanent granting of that status, is not an effective way to influence China and move them in a direction we would like to see that society go. It holds our economic interests with China hostage to other aspects of the relationship. We need to regularize and normalize our trading relationship with China. We need to put predictability and stability into that trading relationship so that our industries can improve their ability to do business with China.

This resolution to discharge, although seemingly procedural, has an intent that damages our businesses, our workers, our farmers, and our Nation. I urge my colleagues to reject this effort.

I see my colleague. I guess he is going to yield time to one of our colleagues.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise today in opposition to the President's decision to extend normal trade relations status to China.

I especially thank the Senator from New Hampshire for bringing up the issue today.

I have objected to the President's policy on this issue since 1994, when he first de-linked the issue of human rights from our trading policy in China. The argument made then was that trade privileges and human rights are not interrelated. At the same time, it was said, through "constructive engagement" on economic matters, and dialogue on other issues, including human rights, the United States could better influence the behavior of the Chinese Government.

I have yet to see persuasive evidence that closer economic ties alone are going to transform China's authoritarian system into a democracy, or even reduce the current level of oppression borne by the Chinese people. Unless we continue to press the case for improvement in China's human rights record, using the leverage of the Chinese Government's desire to expand its economy and increase trade with us, I do not see how U.S. policy can help conditions in China get much better.

Virtually every review of the behavior of China's Government demonstrates that not only has there been little improvement in the human rights situation in China, but in many cases, it has worsened—particularly in the weeks preceding the tenth anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre on June 4th. More generally, five years after the President's decision to de-link trade from human rights, the State Department's most recent Human Rights Report on China describes once more an abysmal situation.

In my view, it is impossible to come to any other conclusion except that "constructive engagement" has failed to make any change in Beijing's human rights behavior. I would say that the evidence justifies the exact opposite conclusion: respect for human rights by the Chinese government has deteriorated and the regime continues to act recklessly in other areas vital to U.S. national interest.

This year—1999—is likely to be the most important year since 1989 with respect to our relations with China. Not only does it represent a significant milestone for the victims of Tiananmen Square, but 1999 is also the 50th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic. This year has also seen the emergence of new thorny issues between the United States and China, including the accidental embassy bombing, faltering negotiations regarding accession to the World Trade Organizations, and the recent release of the Cox report on Chinese espionage.

If moral outrage at blatant abuse of human rights is not reason enough for a tough stance with China—and I believe it is, as do the American people—then let us do so on grounds of real political and economic self-interest.

For example, China has failed to provide adequate protection of U.S. intellectual property rights; it has employed broad and pervasive trade and investment barriers to restrict our exports; it has made illegal textile shipments to the United States; it has exported products to the United States manufactured by prison labor; and it has engaged in questionable economic and political policies toward Hong Kong.

This does not present a picture of a nation with which we should have normal trade relations. Alternatively, if the Administration accepts these practices as normal, perhaps we need to re-define what normal trade relations are. The current practices are certainly not any that I wish to accept as normal.

Nor, Mr. President, do I wish to accept as normal the practice in our country of using campaign money to influence policy decisions, but I'm afraid that the China/NTR decision is far from an exception to this rule.

No, Mr. President, U.S.-China trade policy epitomizes how our campaign finance system can influence important decisions. The corporations and associations lobbying in favor of China NTR, as well as on China's accession to the World Trade Organization, represent a virtual who's who of major political donors. In an effort to inform my colleagues and the public about who's who in the push for NTR for China, I'd like to Call the Bankroll on some of the companies and associations involved in this fight.

These big donors represent industries that run the gamut of American commerce—from agribusiness to telecommunications and everything in between—but they all have in common a keen financial interest in China winning normal trade relations status.

One of the major coalitions lobbying to boost China's trade status, USA Engage, has a membership list brimming with top PAC money and soft money donors.

Let me name just a few examples of the political donations some of these USA Engage members gave during the last election cycle:

Defense contractor TRW Inc. gave more than \$195,000 in soft money and \$236,000 in PAC money.

Financial services giant BankAmerica gave more than \$347,000 in soft money and more than \$430,000 in PAC money.

The powerful business coalition of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce gave nearly \$50,000 in soft money and \$10,000 in PAC money.

Exxon, one of the world's largest oil companies, gave \$331,000 in soft money and nearly half a million dollars in PAC money.

Communications giant Motorola gave more than \$100,000 in both soft money and PAC money.

Mr. President, this is just the tip of the iceberg. The list goes on and the money is piled high.

Over in the other body, junior members—who of course sit in the most remote offices in the far corners of the House office buildings—say that the only reason corporate CEOs come visit their offices is to push for NTR status for China.

So you see, Mr. President, on the one hand, some of the most powerful interests in America come to our offices to call on us to grant NTR status to China. We hear them loud and clear, and more than that we know too well the influence they wield as a result of their political donations.

But Mr. President, what about the other side? What about the voices we don't hear? The faces we don't see? I am talking about the human rights organizations who oppose de-linking trade from human rights, but are virtually nonexistent in the world of campaign contributions. I am talking about the thousands, if not millions, of Chinese people living without basic human rights who don't have access to the Halls of Congress.

I fail to see anything normal about the United States extending favorable trading status to a government that routinely denies basic freedoms—of expression, of religion, and association—to its people.

I fail to see what is normal, what is acceptable, or what is just about the United States tacitly condoning the actions of a country where our own State Department reports that the human rights situation is—quote—"abysmal."

Mr. President, my main objective today is to push for the United States to once again make the link between human rights and trading relations with respect to our policy in China. As I have said before, I believe that trade—embodied by the peculiar exercise of NTR renewal—is one of the most powerful levers we have, and that

it was a mistake for the President to de-link this exercise from human rights considerations.

So, Mr. President, for those of us who care about human rights, those of us who long for freedom of religion for others, and those of us who believe America should demonstrate moral leadership in the world, I urge colleagues to join me in disapproving the President's decision to renew normal-trade-relations status for China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. I yield 8 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee, I rise in strong opposition to the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 27. My objections to the motion and the underlying resolution, and to bringing them up at this point in time, are both procedural and substantive.

My first procedural objection is that while the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] is within his rights to move to discharge the joint resolution pursuant to 19 U.S.C. §§2192(c) and 2193, by doing so he is effectively seeking to bring it to the floor by completely circumventing the committee process. S.J. Res. 27 was referred to the Finance Committee on June 7 of this year. As my friend the distinguished chairman of that committee [Mr. ROTH] has noted today, the committee has had no opportunity to hold hearings on the relative merits of the resolution, to amend it, or to prepare a report on it to the full Senate. A piece of legislation this important, that would—if passed—have a huge effect on what I believe will be our most important bilateral relationship in the next century, deserves to be considered fully by the committee of jurisdiction without having that process short-circuited by a single Senator—especially one that is not a member of the committee in question.

Second, the Senate still has a number of vitally important appropriations bills to complete before Congress recesses for August. There is no connection whatsoever between these legislative matters and the joint resolution. There exists no time exigency which makes it important to lay aside debate on appropriations bills in order to debate China NTR nor, for that matter, which makes it important to circumvent the statutory process set out for the consideration of resolutions like S.J. Res. 27.

And that brings up my third procedural objection. Pursuant to the Trade Act of 1974, it is the practice of the Senate that a resolution of disapproval of a renewal of NTR status must originate in the House. Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. §2192(f)(1)(A)(ii) and 2192(f)(1)(B), any resolution of disapproval which

passes the Senate before receipt from the House of a similar or identical joint resolution is required to be held at the desk until the House acts and passes such a joint resolution. H.J. Res. 57, the companion resolution to S.J. Res. 27, was introduced in the House on June 7, 1999, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. On July 1, the committee considered the resolution, and ordered it to be reported adversely by voice vote. The full House has yet to act on that report. So even if for some reason which escapes me the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] can justify his urgent desire to bring his legislation to the floor, where is the logic in putting the procedural cart before the horse and acting before the House does?

Those are my procedural objections to the motion. But I also oppose the resolution, and thus the motion to discharge it, on substantive grounds. In my five years as subcommittee chairman, I have always fully supported unconditional NTR status for China and done so for several reasons: some practical, some policy-based.

First, from a practicality standpoint, I firmly believe revoking NTR would hurt us more than the Chinese—the economic equivalent of cutting off your nose to spite your face, or, as the Chinese say, "lifting up a rock only to drop it on your foot." In 1998, U.S. exports to China directly supported over 200,000 U.S. jobs. In 1995, China bought \$1.2 billion worth of civilian aircraft, \$700 million of telecommunications equipment, \$330 million of specialized machinery, and \$270 million of heating and cooling equipment. Those figures have grown since then.

China is now the world's third largest economy, and will continue to grow at an impressive pace well into the next century. The World Bank estimates that China will need almost \$750 billion in new investments to fund industrial infrastructure projects alone in the next decade. Cutting off NTR—and the Chinese retaliation that would surely follow—would only serve to deprive us of a growing market. China is perfectly capable of shopping elsewhere and our "allies" are more than happy to step into any void we leave. We recently saw a prime example of that willingness; in 1996 then-Premier Li Peng traveled to France where he signed a \$2 billion contract to buy 33 Airbuses—a contract that Boeing thought it was going to get.

Second, instead of using the NTR issue as a carrot-and-stick with the PRC, I believe the best way to influence the growth of democratic ideals, human rights, and the rule of law in that country is through continued economic contacts. I think anybody who has been to China, especially over the course of the last 15 years, has seen that for themselves. One of the strongest impressions that I take away from every trip I make to China in my capacity as subcommittee chairman is the dramatic effect that economic reform has had on the population. As you

travel south from Beijing to Guangzhou where the greatest economic development has taken place, it is clear that economic development and contact with the West through trade has let a genie out of the bottle that the regime in Beijing will never be able to put back.

Local government officials do not want to talk about the Taiwan dispute; they want to talk trade. Local businessmen do not want to talk about political ideology; that want to talk about increasing their profits and establishing a legal framework in China within which to do business. Local citizens do not care about the latest pronouncements from the Central Committee; they care about increasing their incomes and bettering their living conditions. People of the hundreds of thousands of villages where local democratic elections have been held have made it clear they would not quietly return to the old way of doing things.

The development of a market economy is the best way to encourage democratic reform. We have seen it in South Korea, we have seen it in Taiwan, we have seen it in the former Soviet Union, and I believe that we are beginning to see it now in China.

Third, revoking NTR would have a damaging effect on the economies of Hong Kong and Taiwan—two of our closest friends in the region. A vast majority of our China trade passes through Hong Kong and Taiwan; in addition, revoking NTR would have the greatest impact in the southern China provinces of Guangdong and Fujian where Hong Kong and Taiwanese businessmen have made substantial investments. Just for the limited sanctions and countersanctions proposed during our dispute over Chinese infringement of our intellectual property rights in 1996, the Hong Kong government estimated that Hong Kong would lose 11,500 jobs, \$13.4 billion in reexport trade, and 0.4 of a percentage point from a 4.6% GDP. The effects would be much more pronounced were NTR to be involved.

Fourth, NTR is not some special treatment or favor that the United States passes out rarely; it is the normal tariff status with our trading partners. Only 8 countries are not accorded that status: Afghanistan, Zerbaijan, Cambodia, Cuba, Laos, North Korea, Vietnam, and Serbia. To cast China into that grouping of pariah states would do irreparable damage to our bilateral relationship, and to the security and stability of East Asia as a whole.

With the demise of the cold war, and changing world realities, we would do better to repeal Jackson-Vanik and the yearly theater that surrounds the China NTR debate. It only serves: to make U.S. businesses nervous—they never know from one year to the next whether they will have NTR, and their investments in China, yanked out from underneath them; to complicate our re-

lationship with the Chinese—the annual debate always reminds them that we treat them differently than almost every other country and some of the ensuing rhetoric in the debates is less than helpful to the relationship; and, to compromise our credibility both with the Chinese and in Asia in general—threats to revoke NTR have yet to be carried out and conditioning has never worked.

I am not an apologist for the PRC—far from it. My subcommittee has held numerous hearings highlighting Chinese human rights abuses, oppression in Tibet, saber rattling aimed at Taiwan, unfair trade practices including tariff and non-tariff barriers, and the recent allegations of espionage—all issues I have raised personally with Chinese leaders from President Jiang on down. But no matter how maddening or ill-advised Beijing's behavior, I do not believe that withholding NTR is an effective instrument of foreign policy vis-a-vis China. In fact, I believe that there is no more effective way to influence the PRC than engaging China and slowly drawing it into the family of nations. If there is a way, I have yet to be made aware of it; I just know that the revocation or conditioning of NTR is not it.

For all these reasons then, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to discharge S. J. Res. 27.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to my very good friend, the distinguished Senator from the State of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in opposition to the Smith resolution on normal trade relations for China. Once again, the Senator is confronted with an effort to circumvent the legislative process and radically change U.S. policy towards China. I oppose this effort. But I also caution my Senate colleagues, that the approach advocated here today is very dangerous to U.S. foreign policy.

United States-China relations are at a very delicate stage now. The relationship is very troubled at the moment. The accidental U.S. bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade and accusations of Chinese nuclear espionage have given policymakers in both countries numerous reasons to be cautious about this important relationship.

Today's debate will be a brief one. With my time, I want to make a couple of points to articulate why we must once again defeat the effort to deny NTR or MFN status to China.

First, trade is the foundation of the United States-China relationship. Certainly, there are problems on the trade front. We have a troubling deficit, problems with issues like transshipment and intellectual property

rights violations, and market access issues—to name just a few. Many of these issues are under consideration in the talks led by the United States over China's accession to the World Trade Organization. I continue to support China's accession to the WTO on commercially viable terms. I think we are very close to a WTO agreement that will be strongly supported by the Congress.

Yes, trade with China is very important. But, perhaps more important, is the fact that trade has opened China's doors to the world. Our government is able to engage China on a number of issues from drug smuggling to cooperation on issues like human rights, North Korea, nuclear expansion in South Asia, and global environmental problems. Like it or not, if we end our trade relationship with China as some suggest, all of these beneficial openings to China will be curtailed or lost.

It is not just government-to-government contacts that we should be worried about. My personal opinion is the American people are having a far greater impact on the Chinese people than any congressional debate could ever have. Students and scholars, adoptive parents, business and tourist delegations, sister city delegations, and local government officials from my state are actively engaged in China. These folks are making a difference that benefits both the American and Chinese people. I do not want to see these people-driven initiatives for change jeopardized by passage of this resolution.

One in five people in Earth live in China. It is an immense population that impacts Us all in so many ways—the world's food supply, pollution problems, and the use of natural resources, to name a few. The United States has the ability to cooperatively assist in China's development; we must not shy from this opportunity to aid both the Chinese and American people.

My second point addresses reform in China. Within China today a furious debate is raging. Leaders like President Jiang Zemin and Premier Zhu Rhongi are under attack by more conservative anti-Western forces. The Embassy bombing and other issues have emboldened the hard line forces within China's leadership. There are elements within the Chinese Government that do not want to move forward with constructive ties with the United States.

The resolution before the Senate today, in my estimation, sends a very dangerous message to China. The message is the United States is recoiling towards a more confrontational posture towards China. Passage of this resolution will strengthen those in China who argue that China should treat the United States as an adversary. If that happens, the relationship will certainly spiral in dangerous directions for both the Chinese and American people.

If we undermine the reform forces in China, it will have dangerous implications for this country. At the United

Nations, where China is a permanent member of the Security Council, the United States will have a very difficult time as the world's lone superpower. In Asia, where economic recovery is beginning to take place and where we have 100,000 military personnel, our efforts to preserve decades of peace will be jeopardized. And, the United States will be alone in the world in seeking to isolate China economically, potentially causing problems with our allies in Europe and Asia.

Though I strongly oppose this resolution, I do not mean to imply that the China relationship is easy or that the United States should make concessions to the Chinese. That is simply not the case. The United States-China relationship is very difficult for this country and will be so for some time. I have many objections to Chinese actions. But, I believe, to change China, we must be an aggressive participant in the global effort to engage the Chinese Government and the Chinese people.

This resolution before us today would seriously threaten our ability to contribute to change in China. And that is clearly not in our national interest. I urge my colleagues to defeat the Smith resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes 55 seconds remaining.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I cannot let go unchallenged on the floor the accusation that I am circumventing the legislative process. I think my colleagues know that is not true. This is the act, the Trade Act of 1974. I have it in my hand. I would encourage my colleague to read it before making accusations that are simply false.

In the committee of either House to which a resolution has been referred, that has not been reported at the end of 30 days after its introduction, and counting any day which is excluded under section 154(b) it is in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution associated with this.

The bottom line is, this went to the committee on June 3. It has remained there to this day. More than 30 days have passed. The bottom line is, which is perfectly legitimate under the rule, the Finance Committee does not have to discharge it. If they do not discharge it, what happens is China gets its NTR status, and Jackson-Vanik is waived.

So I am exercising my right in doing what I am doing. And for colleagues to come down here and say I am circumventing the legislative process simply is not true. I would like to go back and see how some of my colleagues voted on some of these matters.

I have heard on the floor that it is inappropriate to debate this issue; it is inappropriate to talk about it. "Take morning business and come down here," or "speak at midnight when nobody is watching."

There is a process here. It is written in the law that the Senate has an hour on the motion to determine whether or not to discharge, and then if we pass these motions I am offering on China and Vietnam, we have the opportunity to debate this.

So I am hearing that it is inappropriate for the Senate to debate something provided under the law. Why in the world is it inappropriate to debate anything on the floor? If you want to know what is wrong with this place, this is a pretty good example. "It is inappropriate to debate what's going on in China and Vietnam on the Senate floor."

Let me tell you what is inappropriate. With all due respect, what is inappropriate is the fact that the Communist Chinese are threatening Taiwan with missiles. What is inappropriate is what the Chinese Communist Government did to the people of Tibet. What is inappropriate is the fact that the Chinese Government put hundreds of thousands, maybe millions of dollars into U.S. elections. What is inappropriate is that they have tried to take over the Long Beach shipyard. What is inappropriate is that the Chinese have gobbled up the port leases on both sides of the Panama Canal. What is inappropriate is population control. What is inappropriate is forced sterilization. What is inappropriate is killing unborn children, female children. That is what is inappropriate. What is also inappropriate is trying to run over peaceful protesters with tanks in Tiananmen Square.

So do not tell me it is inappropriate to debate something on the floor. It is an outrage that this Senate will not approve this motion and allow the opportunity to do that.

Let me come to the floor and debate these issues. They do not want me to come to the floor, I say to the American people. That is why my resolutions are going to go down, because they do not want to hear about it, because the administration has made a decision to grant most-favored-nation status, normal trade relations—a decision to look the other way while China does these appalling things.

I say, with all due respect—I said it earlier, and I will say it again—this President went to war and put American forces in harm's way to protect the human rights of the Albanians in Kosovo. And I can't get a resolution passed to debate human rights violations in China or Vietnam. What does that tell you? Is this America? Do you want to know what is wrong with politics? This is what is wrong with politics.

In China, they can do what they want. China is a sovereign nation. I guess, under the Clinton policy, we

may be bombing them tomorrow. I do not know if it is human rights violations. Apparently, we cannot talk about them in the Senate. However, let me read you a little bit about what goes on in China from the 1998 State Department Human Rights Report.

Disciplinary measures against those who violate policies can include fines (sometimes a "fee for an unplanned birth" or a "social compensation fee"), withholding of social services, demotion, and other administrative punishments . . . intense pressure to meet family planning targets set by the Government has resulted in documented instances where family planning officials have used coercion, including forced abortion and sterilization, to meet government goals. During an unauthorized pregnancy, a woman often is paid multiple visits by family planning workers and pressured to terminate the pregnancy.

It goes on and on and on.

Are we going to give most-favored-nation status to this country? This is the issue. We are going to give it to them without giving me and other Senators in this body the opportunity to debate it on the floor? Welcome to America, for goodness sakes.

I thought the Senate was the greatest deliberative body in the world where all of the great debates took place. I am standing at Daniel Webster's desk. He would probably turn over in his grave if he heard that we would refuse to debate something as important as this. Daniel Webster stood on this floor, the strong advocate, year after year, against the outrage of slavery—and we cannot talk about China and Vietnam because my colleagues will not allow me to bring these resolutions out.

It is outrageous. I just do not understand it. It is exactly everything that is bad and wrong and outrageous about politics and about the process around here. I am sick of it. It is wrong.

Yes, bringing these motions is within the rules. Somebody put it in there. But for goodness sakes, what is fair is fair. It is not a question of me coming to the floor and saying: Well, nothing is happening in China; I'm just going to come down on the floor and create some problems here and tell you about things I made up, or I'm going to say nothing is going on in Vietnam.

I am not making this up. Right today, in the Washington Times:

Chinese companies transferred missile components to North Korea last month in a sign Beijing is stepping up arms sales in response to the NATO bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade. "We are concerned about Chinese entities providing material for North Korea's missile program," a senior administration official told the Times. "In our judgment, the Chinese government has no interest in seeing North Korea develop its missile technology." The Pentagon believes that some of the missile technology contains material of U.S.-origin, and that the transfers violate Chinese promises not to ignore international missile export controls barring such sales to rogue states, said U.S. intelligence officials.

Apparently we are not upset enough, are we? We are going to give them normal trade relations and look the other way. You steal our secrets; you abort your children; you forcibly abort female children; you saber rattle in Taiwan; you threaten to run over peaceful demonstrators with tanks. A priest was murdered a couple of months ago on the streets of Beijing. You give contributions to one of the major political parties in America, and we are going to look the other way.

We are not even going to debate it. I say to the people out there in America: Watch the vote. You will see it. One right after another, they will come down here and SMITH will lose on Vietnam and SMITH will lose on China. And the American people will lose the opportunity to debate it.

I cannot do this in 30 minutes. I would like to go into some of these matters in detail, but I do not have the time. That is the rule. I have 30 minutes, an hour equally divided. That is it.

So I just say to my colleagues, give me the opportunity to debate these matters on the floor so I can point out to you the human rights abuses and the flagrant violations of both of these countries. Vietnam does not deserve the Jackson-Vanik waiver and China does not deserve to be given normal trade relations.

Mr. President, I see my time has expired. I yield back the last minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. ROCKEFELLER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I point out to my friend from New Hampshire that he did, indeed, have the floor. The parliamentary process seems to be working. He has mentioned those aspects on which he disagrees with China five or six times apiece now since I have been on the floor in only the last 10 minutes. I don't think he should be that concerned about not being able to debate.

There were those of us on the other side of the aisle who were trying to debate something called the Patients' Bill of Rights for several weeks, and we were denied that. Well, this is a tough body. One does the best they can.

I think terminating normal trade relations with China would be an enormous mistake. I have often said one of the greatest speeches I have ever heard on the floor was given by Senator Jack Danforth. It was the last one he ever gave on the floor. It was a number of years ago when he retired. He talked about the fact that every Senator wants to be a Secretary of State, and every Senator thinks that he or she is a Secretary of State. Every Senator thinks that he or she ought to act as Secretary of State, and that about half of us try to. There is an endless oppor-

tunity because you can bring up other countries and bring up all the things you don't like about them.

The Senator from New Hampshire doesn't approve of different of their social policies, so he brings them up. He has a chance to speak about them. None of this, in my judgment, has to do with the self-interest of the United States of America. What is foreign policy? What is trade policy? It is meant to be the self-interest of the United States of America.

The Senator, as he concluded his argument, actually said that China was taking over, implying that they had taken over the Panama Canal. That came as a surprise to me because I read the news fairly diligently and haven't heard that. What I do know is this: China has been through 5,000 years of history, and I have studied it quite carefully. They have never had a single day of stability that they could count on. In fact, even under Confucian philosophy, the people always have, in the so-called five relationships, the right to overthrow the emperor any time they want, and they frequently have.

They are, as the Senator from Washington indicated, one-fifth of the world's population. They are an absolute key. The very worst thing I can imagine us doing at this time would be to terminate normal trade relations.

If the Senator from New Hampshire, as he says, believes that the Chinese are not treating the Taiwanese well, if you want the Taiwanese-Chinese relationship, the PRC-Taiwanese relationship, it is not a zero-sum game. The best relationship between the PRC and Taiwan is always going to be under those conditions wherein the United States and the PRC have the most normal, natural, and efficient relationship. That means we will disagree on many things, but we will also do a number of things, which we have been doing for years: For example, trading, exchanging students, learning more about each other. Americans have always had a kind of love/hate relationship with China. It is part of the mysticism, the mystery of our intangible history of the past centuries with them.

We have never really understood China very well. We don't understand China very well today. But one thing I know, if we terminate normal trade relations, it is going to give the upper hand to the very people in the People's Liberation Army, some of the younger turks there who are the people that, in fact, in 1996 led the move to point missiles at Taiwan and who are probably right now doing everything they can to destabilize Zhu Rhongi and President Jiang Xemin, who are trying to reform China, to stabilize China, to deregulate China, to make China into a more modern economy with, all the time, 120 or 140 million people that are completely homeless wandering around the country.

I strongly advise my colleagues to vote against what is quite an out-

rageous resolution, which has no place whatsoever on the floor.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I also rise to urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to discharge the Committee on Finance from further consideration of the resolution disapproving the extension of the Jackson-Vanik waiver authority for normal trade relations with China.

Beyond the procedural problems my colleagues outlined regarding taking up this measure today, there are clear and crucial reasons to oppose this motion because the underlying disapproval resolution should also be opposed on its merits.

Let me state that I agree with my colleague on the goals he seeks to achieve by pursuing this motion, but I disagree with his methods.

I too am concerned about the recent espionage reports and the implications for our national security.

I too am concerned about China's destabilizing weapons sales.

I too want China to resolve peacefully her territorial disagreements in the South China Sea.

I too want China to lower barriers to U.S. exports and to reduce her trade surplus with the United States.

I too want China to end her military threats against Taiwan and to resolve peacefully her differences with Taipei.

And I too want China to respect the basic human rights of its citizens.

But I do not believe that withdrawing normal trade relations status will force China to satisfy any of our objectives. Indeed, sanctioning China by withdrawing NTR runs the risk of making that country more belligerent and less cooperative on these and other issues.

Moreover, revoking NTR would be contrary to American interests and the interests of the American people.

Experience shows that unilateral trade sanctions generally don't work. The chances of success only improve when sanctions are applied in cooperation with our major allies. However, not one of these allies is even debating whether to withdraw NTR status from China.

Let's be clear on this point. If we revoke NTR status for China, Beijing would certainly be hurt, but so too would the United States.

As a result of withdrawing NTR, U.S. duties on goods imported from China would immediately rise to the tariff rates established under the highly protectionist, depression-era Smoot-Hawley tariff law.

Because NTR is provided on a reciprocal basis, China would respond to higher tariffs on her goods by slapping higher tariffs on U.S. goods. Such a move will slam the door shut on U.S. exports to the Chinese market—the fastest-growing market in the world for the highly competitive American aircraft, telecommunications, and automotive equipment industries.

These export opportunities will go instead to the Europeans, the Japanese,

the Canadians and firms from all the other countries in the world which continue normal commercial relations with China.

In addition to severely damaging U.S. exporters, the small and large American firms that have invested billions of dollars to penetrate the Chinese market would see their efforts and investments jeopardized.

The economic fallout from withdrawing China's NTR status is not only going to hit American companies, but also American consumers. Our lowest income citizens, in particular, would suffer from the dramatically higher prices they will have to pay for a variety of basic goods as a direct result of the imposition of substantially higher duties on Chinese imports.

There are those who claim that pricing Chinese goods out of our market through higher duties would be beneficial because the products we now import from China would be produced in the United States. But any business person will tell you the truth is that in almost all cases imports from China will be replaced not by American products but rather imports from other developing countries.

We must also recognize that cutting ourselves off from China by withdrawing NTR will severely limit our ability influence developments in China, including how China treat its citizens and whether it permits the development of a freer society.

Mr. President, it is also important to recognize that the United States already has specific, measured and targeted tools at our disposal that allow us to address problems with China without resorting to the indiscriminate and destructive approach of revoking NTR.

For example, we can adopt the Kyl-Domenici-Murkowski amendment to reorganize the Department of Energy to prevent further losses at our national weapons laboratories.

We can involve targeted Section 301 sanctions for discrete discriminatory and unreasonable Chinese trade practices.

We can continue to expose and condemn China's repressive human rights record in this Chamber and in organizations around the world.

We can counter China's threats to Taiwan by considering sales of upgraded defensive weaponry to Taipei, as well as by reaffirming our unwavering commitment to a peaceful resolution of the dispute between Taiwan and China in the context of our one China policy.

We can rely on international law and the shared interests of the countries of Southeast Asia to counter aggressive Chinese territorial claims.

I want to note here, moreover, that neither the Taiwanese—who are never shy about voicing their opinions to Members of Congress—nor the countries of ASEAN which have territorial disputes with China, support the United States revoking NTR for China.

The bottom line, Mr. President, is that revoking NTR would not advance the goals for China which I share with my colleague, and will likely worsen our problems with China. And it would put at risk hundreds of thousands of American jobs and billions of dollars worth of American exports and investments.

With so much to lose and nothing gained, I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise today in strong opposition to the motion to discharge the Finance Committee from further consideration of S.J. Res. 28. I oppose the efforts of the Senator from New Hampshire because I believe passage of S.J. Res. 28 would be a step backward and would jeopardize our efforts to encourage political and economic change in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I am confident my colleagues on both sides of this debate share the same goal: helping to create a democratic Vietnam. We all want to see a Vietnam that respects the rights of all of its citizens. A Vietnam whose society is based on the rule of law. A Vietnam that protects private enterprise and abides by international commercial standards. A Vietnam that cooperates with the United States in seeking to end the pain and the lingering questions of the thousands of American POW/MIA families.

While we share the same goal, we fundamentally disagree on how best to achieve a democratic Vietnam. Those who support S.J. Res. 28 believe we are more likely to promote democratic reforms and the human rights of the Vietnamese people by discontinuing our dialogue with the Government of Vietnam. They believe we can encourage the transition to free market economics by putting U.S. businesses in Vietnam at a disadvantage relative to their global competitors and making it more difficult for them to operate. Finally, they believe we can improve Vietnamese cooperation in solving outstanding POW/MIA cases by jeopardizing successful, joint investigative and recovery programs.

Proponents of this legislation will argue passage of S.J. Res. 28 would only have the minimal effect of denying the President's waiver of the provisions of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. The truth is, this vote is a referendum on our entire policy of engaging Vietnam. Those who support this Resolution have opposed every effort to normalize U.S.-Vietnamese relations. With this Resolution, they are trying to take us back to the policy of the 1980s that sought to isolate Vietnam from the United States both diplomatically and economically. This policy failed in the 1980s, and will undoubtedly fail again.

Mr. President, proof of the failure of disengagement is found in the fact that since renewing our diplomatic relations with Vietnam we have seen progress on the issues we care about. I attribute most of this improvement on

the ability of our government to communicate with Vietnam through normal, diplomatic channels. This progress will continue if we allow people like Ambassador Pete Peterson to continue to impress upon the Government of Vietnam the seriousness with which we attach to issues such as democratization, human rights, and POW/MIAs. Passage of this Resolution will undermine Ambassador Peterson's efforts, will force us to step back from our policy of engagement, and will endanger the progress we have already achieved.

This is not to say that we do not continue to have issues with which we disagree with the Vietnamese government. Economic and social reforms are not progressing quickly enough. We continue to hear of cases where the rights of political dissidents are not respected. And until every POW/MIA is accounted for, we will continue to press the Vietnamese government for answers. However, the authors of S.J. Res. 28—those who oppose continued normalization of our relations with Vietnam—have failed to explain how disengaging from Vietnam will encourage their government to take positive action on any of these issues.

Mr. President, those who prefer isolation simply fail to fully understand the power of the United States to act as a catalyst for societal and economic change. We cannot be this catalyst for the Vietnamese people if we are not fully engaged in Vietnam. I would argue we need to be more engaged than we are today. Where we disagree with Vietnamese government, we should forcefully challenge them. And where we see the budding signs of reform, we should foster its growth. We cannot do this if—as those on the other side propose—we do not continue to move forward in our relationship with Vietnam.

Passage of S.J. Res. 28 is a step backward. Rather than going back, I believe we should look forward. We should look for ways to fully unleash the power of our people, our ideals, and our system of government to help the Vietnamese achieve the goal of democracy. I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 28.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I believe that concludes the number of speakers who wish to speak on this matter and, therefore, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays on both resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on both resolutions: the China resolution and the Vietnam resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE  
S.J. RES. 27

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 27.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 87, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 213 Leg.]

YEAS—12

Bunning	Hollings	Sessions
Collins	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Feingold	Inhofe	Snowe
Helms	Leahy	Wellstone

NAYS—87

Abraham	Durbin	Lugar
Akaka	Edwards	Mack
Allard	Enzi	McCain
Ashcroft	Feinstein	McConnell
Baucus	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Bayh	Frist	Moynihan
Bennett	Gorton	Murkowski
Biden	Graham	Murray
Bingaman	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Reed
Boxer	Grassley	Reid
Breaux	Gregg	Robb
Brownback	Hagel	Roberts
Bryan	Harkin	Rockefeller
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Byrd	Hutchison	Santorum
Campbell	Inouye	Sarbanes
Chafee	Jeffords	Schumer
Cleland	Johnson	Shelby
Cochran	Kerrey	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerry	Specter
Coverdell	Kohl	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Landrieu	Thompson
Daschle	Lautenberg	Thurmond
DeWine	Levin	Torricelli
Dodd	Lieberman	Voinovich
Domenici	Lincoln	Warner
Dorgan	Lott	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Kennedy

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the statute, a motion to reconsider a motion to table is not in order.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE  
S.J. RES. 28

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now vote on the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 28. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 5, nays 94, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 214 Leg.]

YEAS—5

Campbell	Helms	Smith (NH)
Feingold	Hollings	

NAYS—94

Abraham	Enzi	McCain
Akaka	Feinstein	McConnell
Allard	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Frist	Moynihan
Baucus	Gorton	Murkowski
Bayh	Graham	Murray
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Biden	Grams	Reed
Bingaman	Grassley	Reid
Bond	Gregg	Robb
Boxer	Hagel	Roberts
Breaux	Harkin	Rockefeller
Brownback	Hatch	Roth
Bryan	Hutchinson	Santorum
Bunning	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Burns	Inhofe	Schumer
Byrd	Inouye	Sessions
Chafee	Jeffords	Shelby
Cleland	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Kerrey	Snowe
Collins	Kerry	Specter
Conrad	Kohl	Stevens
Coverdell	Kyl	Thomas
Craig	Landrieu	Thompson
Crapo	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	Torricelli
DeWine	Levin	Voinovich
Dodd	Lieberman	Warner
Domenici	Lincoln	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lott	Wyden
Durbin	Lugar	
Edwards	Mack	

NOT VOTING—1

Kennedy

The motion was rejected.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe we have worked out some consent agreements now that will allow the Senate to go forward in a constructive way. One has to do with the campaign finance reform issue, and the other one has to do with how we will handle the intelligence authorization bill this afternoon.

I see Senator MCCAIN here. I know Senator FEINGOLD is here.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader, but no later than Tuesday, October 12, 1999, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a bill to be introduced by Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD regarding campaign reform, and that the bill be introduced and placed on the calendar by the close of business on Wednesday, September 14, 1999.

I ask unanimous consent that debate on the bill prior to a cloture vote be limited to 3 hours to be equally divided in the usual form.

I also ask unanimous consent that only amendments related to campaign reform be in order, with time on all amendments, first and second degree, to be limited to 4 hours each, equally divided in the usual form, and that if an amendment is not tabled, it be in order to lay aside such amendment for 2 calendar days.

I further ask consent that no sooner than the third day after the bill is brought to the floor, a cloture motion

be filed on the McCain-Feingold bill, and if cloture is not invoked, the bill immediately be placed back on the calendar.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that it not be in order at any time prior to the pendency, or during the remainder of the first session of the 106th Congress, for the Senate to consider issues relative to campaign reform, except as the issues pertain to the appointment of conferees and any conference report to accompany the McCain-Feingold legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, I haven't quite finished reviewing this. If the majority leader will give me about 2 minutes, I think I will be ready.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there other reservations of objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask, does this mean that the majority leader will not fill up the tree with first- and second-degree amendments? In other words, the intent is to move forward with the amending process, up-or-down votes on the amendments and move forward? That is the intent of the majority leader?

Mr. LOTT. The intent is to have amendments and that they be voted on, on this bill.

My purpose in trying to get this worked out is so we can go ahead and complete our appropriations bills process but also recognizing the Senator's desire to have this issue considered, finding a time which was most satisfactory to all involved on both sides of the aisle to have it considered. And it is our intent to have ample time for debate and for amendments to be offered and voted on.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the majority leader.

This is a time now where we will be able to have a legitimate amending process. Amendments to perfect the legislation will be placed on the calendar by the close of business on September 14 so that we can improve or not improve. However, the legislative process will move forward, as we normally do on pieces of legislation before the body, with the exception, of course, that respecting the fact that the Senate does act with 60 votes to cut off debate, if Senator FEINGOLD and I fail to get 60 votes, then there is no sense in prolonging the debate or the discussion, including that we would not raise the issue again during the 106th Congress. We would have debates and amendments and votes on those amendments.

Mr. LOTT. Ordinarily, the way we do these unanimous consent agreements, I would have required the bill to be filed immediately after this unanimous consent agreement. But as the Senator indicated, that is over 2 months away