

the survival of the constitutional system of checks and balances. The President had to convince Congressional leaders, including Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson, to go along with the plan, which was carried out in the greatest secrecy for over forty years. The secrecy was necessary, because the bunker at the Greenbrier was not designed to withstand a direct hit, but, rather, to ensure security through a combination of physical design and camouflage. The remote shelter of the West Virginia hills proved a perfect combination of cover, concealment, and denial.

Now, the bunker is open to the public for tours. It is fascinating to see the level of detail that was included in the bunker, but it is also sobering to reflect upon the real fear of Armageddon that existed in this country during those years and which justified this kind of contingency planning. As you finish the tour and return to the sunlit world of golf, lazy country walks, luxurious settings, and fine dining that is the hallmark of the Greenbrier experience, it is difficult to recall those not-so-distant times when school children practiced hiding under their desks in the event of a conventional or nuclear exchange.

I encourage my fellow Senators, and, indeed, anyone listening, to visit the Greenbrier, to tour the bunker, and to relish the history and the service that are so much a part of this precious piece of West Virginia. Avoid the current high gas prices and road congestion, and take the train as so many have before you. Leave steamy, contentious, Washington behind for a time, and step out at the Greenbrier's rail depot wondering at the beauty, the cool breezes that smell of fresh, clean air and wildflowers. Allow yourself to be swept along by the attentive, unobtrusive service of an earlier age and be deposited in a bright, flower-bedecked room before a pre-dinner stroll about the grounds. You will be walking with the celebrities of the past as you write a wonderful new chapter in your own history.

I was mentioning the Amtrak train. My recollection went back to a time in England when the distinguished Senator from Washington, SLADE GORTON, and his nice wife Sally, and Erma and I rode the train from London up to York. Oh, my, what a wonderful time we had in York, visiting through the countryside with its narrow roads and its hedges and having our meetings with the British. Those were most enjoyable days and memorable ones.

But riding the train in itself is a real treat. I like to ride trains, and I know SLADE GORTON does, too. Has he ever told about his bicycle journey across the United States? He and his wife and their children traveled by bicycle, a bicycle odyssey, across the United States of America, all the way from the Pacific to the Atlantic. That would be something worth reading about. Better still, talk with him in person about it.

I close with the immortal words and images of the poet William Wordsworth, who lived from 1770 to 1850, when the Greenbrier was yet in its early days. But his lines eloquently capture the sights one can now happen upon when strolling through the magical grounds of this wonderful outpost of gentle civilization amid the mountains, and they capture the happiness such beauty inspires:

I wandered lonely as a cloud
That floats on high o'er vales and hills,
When all at once I saw a crowd,
A host, of golden daffodils;
Beside the lake, beneath the trees,
Fluttering and dancing in the breeze.

Continuous as the stars that shine
And twinkle on the milky way,
They stretched in never-ending line
Along the margin of a bay:
Ten thousand saw I at a glance,
Tossing their heads in sprightly dance.
The waves beside them danced; but they
Out-did the sparkling waves in glee:
A poet could not but be gay,
In such a jocund company:
I gazed—and gazed—but little thought
What wealth the show to me had brought:
For oft, when on my couch I lie
In vacant or in pensive mood,
They flash upon that inward eye
Which is the bliss of solitude;
And then my heart with pleasure fills,
And dances with the daffodils.

Like the Greenbrier, the forests in West Virginia.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 20 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I say to the Senator from West Virginia how much I appreciate that rendition and bringing us back to a better reality here from time to time.

I remember the comments by that same poet who once said:

Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers,
Little we see in nature that is ours.

I don't think anyone can ever say that about the senior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. He said, "we lay waste our powers." But I can assure you that the Senator from Tennessee doesn't lay waste his powers. He is a busy man, and he serves his country and his State in a great fashion.

I thank the Senator for his kind words.

Mr. THOMPSON. I appreciate that very much.

PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I rose on the floor on June 22 to address a matter of great concern to everyone, the issue of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

A couple of years ago, I was watching late night television and ran across a

seminar being conducted by former Senator Sam Nunn. Someone asked him during a question and answer period what he considered to be the greatest threat to the United States of America. He mentioned terrorism and the new emerging threat of weapons of mass destruction.

A short time after that, I was watching the Charlie Rose Show late one night with former Secretary of State Warren Christopher. When asked the same question, he gave the same answer: That post cold war, we have not concerned ourselves perhaps very much with some of these issues but that we should, and there are emerging threats out there.

I think the Senator from West Virginia is contemplating a proposal that deals with this very issue.

I have been specifically concerned with that issue with regard to China for a couple of reasons: One, they continue to lead the nations of the world in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, according to our intelligence community; two, because we are now getting ready to embark on the issue of permanent normal trade relations with China.

Many of us are free traders; many of us believe in open markets; many of us want to support that. I think the majority of the Senate certainly does. Is there not any better time, and is it not incumbent upon us in the same general timeframe and the same general debate, that we couldn't, shouldn't, consider something so vitally important to this country as the issue of our nuclear trading partner, that we are being asked to embrace in a new world regime, that sits with us on the Security Council of the United Nations? Is it too much to ask of them to cease this dangerous proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the supplying of these rogue nations with weapons of mass destruction—be they chemical, biological, or nuclear—which pose a threat to us?

We are considering now the issue of the national missile defense system. Many people in this Nation, I think a majority of people in this Congress, are very concerned that we have no defense against such a terrorist attack, an accidental attack, an attack by a rogue nation with weapons of mass destruction, and that we need such a missile defense.

One of the primary reasons we need a national missile defense system has to do with the activities of the Chinese and their supplying of rogue nations with these materials, expertise, capabilities, military parts that have nuclear capabilities which we are so concerned that, by the year of 2005, could be turned against us. Must we not consider this as we consider permanent normal trade relations? As important as trade is, is it more important than our national security? I think that question answers itself.

I pointed out on June 22 that the Rumsfeld Commission reported in July

of 1998 that: China poses a threat as a significant proliferator of ballistic missiles, weapons of mass destruction, and enabling technology. The commission went on to say China's behavior thus far makes it appear unlikely that it will soon effectively reduce its country's sizable transfer of critical technologies, experts, or expertise to the emerging missile powers.

A little later, on June 22 of this year, the Far Eastern Economic Review reported:

Robert Einhorn, the U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Nonproliferation, left Hong Kong on June 11 with a small delegation bound for Beijing.

The article said:

Neither the American nor Chinese side reported this trip. Einhorn is on a delicate mission to get a commitment from Beijing not to export missile technology and components to Iran and Pakistan.

It went on to say:

... U.S. intelligence reports suggest that China may have begun building a missile plant in Pakistan. If true, it would be the second Chinese-built plant there.

If that article is indeed true, it would certainly be consistent with what we know about other Chinese activities. There is a recent report that there is growing Chinese support for Libya and their missile program. We know they have supported the Iranian missile program. We know they have supported the North Korean missile program. So those are some of the things we discussed back on June 22.

Let's bring ourselves up to date now. Just this last Sunday, Sunday a week, July 2, the New York Times reported:

American intelligence agencies have told the Clinton administration and Congress that China has continued to aid Pakistan's effort to building long-range missiles that could carry nuclear weapons, according to several officials with access to intelligence reports.

The story goes on to say:

... how China stepped up the shipment of specialty steels, guidance systems, and technical expertise to Pakistan ... since 1998.

That is very recent activity. Shipments to Pakistan have been continued over the past 8 to 18 months, according to this story.

This, of course, would be in violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime to which the Chinese Government agreed to adhere. Strangely enough, weeks ago, our Secretary of State praised the Chinese for complying with the MTCR. It is pretty obvious now they are not complying. Some answers need to be forthcoming from the Secretary of State with regard to that.

But things are more serious than that because we now know, because of these recent developments and, perhaps, because of some of the issues we are considering in this Senate, the administration sent another envoy to the Chinese for 2 days of talks concerning some of these proliferation problems. On July 9, we got a report back from that latest trip, where our people went over there to plead with the Chinese to

change their behavior at a time when we are about to consider permanent normal trade relations. We have gotten the results back. According to the New York Times on July 9, this visiting American official, who is Mr. J.D. Holum, adviser to the Secretary of State on arms control, said:

After 2 days of talks, the Chinese would not allay concerns about recent Chinese help for Pakistan's ballistic missile program.

He is quoted here as saying:

We raised our concern that China has provided aid to Pakistan and other countries ...

That is according to Mr. Holum.

The article goes on to say:

Some Chinese arms experts say that China is unlikely to promise to end exports of missile technology anytime soon because such trade, or the threat of it, gives China a bargaining chip over the scale of American weapons sold to Taiwan.

Apparently, what the Chinese Government is saying is that as long as we assist Taiwan—which we are determined to do—for defensive purposes against the aggression of the Chinese Government, they are going to continue to assist these outlaw nations in their offensive designs that might be targeted toward the United States.

That bears some serious consideration. The Chinese Government is saying if you continue to be friendly with Taiwan and assist them in defending themselves against us, we are going to continue to make the world more dangerous for you and the rest of the world by continuing to assist these nations of great concern. We have to ask ourselves: Are we willing to acquiesce to that kind of blackmail? We have a policy with regard to Taiwan. It is well stated. Are we going to withdraw our support for Taiwan, which might assist in doing something about this proliferation? I don't think so. I would certainly oppose it. I think most every Member of this body would oppose that. So you can take that option off the table.

What are we going to do? The other option would be to continue to sit pat, continue our policy, and see the continued proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We will try to build a missile defense system that will catch them. While they are building up over there, we will build up over here.

There is a third option, of course. That is to tell the Chinese Government that, yes, we will trade with you; yes, we want to engage with you; yes, we will help you see progress in human rights and other issues; yes, we acknowledge you have taken a lot of people out of poverty and opened up your markets somewhat; yes, we will do all those things, but if you continue to do things that pose a mortal threat to the United States of America, we will respond to that in an economic way. There will be consequences to you.

It does not have to be directly related to trade. We can do some other things that would not hurt our people. For example, the Chinese have access

to our capital markets. They raise billions of dollars in our capital markets. It is free and open to them. It is not transparent at all. We don't know what they do with that money. Some people think they use it to build up their army. But Chinese interests raise billions of dollars in our capital markets. Should we allow them to continue to doing that when they are supplying these rogue nations with weapons that are a threat to us? It makes no sense at all.

Must we read in the paper someday that the North Koreans or the Iranians, sure enough, have a missile and have the nuclear capability to send a nuclear missile to the United States of America?

People say: They know they would be wiped off the face of the Earth. We could retaliate and they would never do something like that. No. 1, we made a lot of mistakes in this country by assuming other people think the same way we do. No. 2, I am not sure we are always going to be able to detect the source of a missile such as that. The United States would not likely, as some people say—having it trip off their tongue so easily—wipe a nation off the face of the Earth unless we were absolutely sure. So there is no need to go down that road. We must do something on the front end that will ameliorate the possibility of our ever getting into that situation and that condition. That is why 17 of my colleagues and I have proposed a bill called the Chinese Nonproliferation Act, which basically calls for an annual assessment of the activities of the Chinese Government and Chinese Government-controlled entities within China, to see how they are doing on a yearly basis in terms of their proliferation activity. Then, if there is a finding that they continue their proliferation activity, the President has the authority to take action.

I believe that is the least we can do under the circumstances. Our bill has become quite controversial because many people think it complicates the issue of permanent normal trade relations with China. They do not want to do anything—No. 1, they say—to hurt our exporters. We have made changes. No one can arguably say our bill hurts U.S. exporters now. We don't want to hurt our agricultural industry. We have made changes to accommodate that concern. We are not designing this in order to hurt our agricultural industry, so that is not an issue anymore.

When you get right down to it, the opponents of this bill are primarily concerned about doing anything to agitate the Chinese at a time in which we are trying to get permanent normal trade relations passed. I don't think we ought to gratuitously aggravate them. But if we are not prepared to risk the displeasure of a nation that is doing things that pose a mortal threat to our national security, what are we prepared to do?

What is more important than that? I am not saying let's cut off trade with

them. I am not saying let's take action against them for precipitous reasons or reasons that are not well thought out. I am saying we must respond to these continued reports from the Rumsfeld Commission, from the Cox Commission, from our biennial intelligence assessments, from these reports from our own envoys coming back saying the Chinese are basically telling us to get lost. We know what they are doing, and they are apparently not even denying it anymore. And we are going to approve PNTR without even taking up this issue?

We are trying to get a vote on this bill. So far we have been unable to do so. I ask my colleagues to seriously consider what kind of signal we are going to be sending. We talk a lot about signals around here. I ask what kind of signal we are going to be sending to the Chinese Government, to our allies, to the rest of the world, if we are not willing to take steps to defend ourselves? A great country that is unwilling to defend itself will not be a great country forever.

I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, in less than 10 minutes, under the previous order, the Senate will move on to another subject. We have completed opening statements on the Interior appropriations bill. The two Senators from Minnesota have offered an amendment, and we have had notice of several others.

This is simply to announce to my colleagues that sometime tomorrow—I hope relatively early tomorrow—we trust we will be in a position to make a unanimous consent request stating that there is a deadline for the filing of amendments. I do believe we will be able to begin to discuss actual amendments fairly promptly tomorrow morning, but as the majority leader said, in the evenings from now on, we will move to the Defense authorization bill. So Members who wish their amendments to be considered should notify both managers as promptly as possible, should file those amendments as promptly as possible, and should begin to arrange with the managers for times relatively convenient to all concerned to bring them up.

The majority leader would like to finish this bill tomorrow. I must say that I join him fervently in that wish, a wish that is not, however, a prediction. Nonetheless, a great deal remains to be done this week. The more promptly Members can come to the floor with their amendments and see whether or not we can deal with them informally or whether they will require a vote the better off all Members of the Senate will be. It is doubtful we will get anything more accomplished be-

tween now and 3:30, however. So at this point I will suggest the absence of a quorum and will ask that it be called off at 3:30 so we can move to the next matter of business. 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. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I will use my leader time to make a couple of comments.

SENATE AGENDA

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I welcome everyone back from our week away for the Fourth of July recess. I did not have an opportunity to talk this morning with the majority leader, and I understand he was able to come to the floor and indicate there is a lot of work to be done, and I share his view about the extent to which work should be done.

I hope we can work as productively this coming work period as we worked in the last work period. We had an arrangement that I think worked very well following an unfortunate confrontation prior to the time we went away for the Memorial Day recess. The cooperation and partnership that was demonstrated over this last work period is one that I hope we can model again.

I say that because I am concerned about the precarious way with which we are starting this week. Senator LOTT has filed a cloture motion on the motion to proceed to the estate tax, and then it is my understanding his intention is to file a cloture motion on the bill itself. I remind my colleagues that is exactly what got us into the position we were in prior to the Memorial Day recess. I hope we can work through that.

I have offered Senator LOTT a limit on the number of amendments to the estate tax bill and a time limit on the amendment. I am very disappointed that we are not able to do what we have been able to do on so many bills, and that is reach some sort of accommodation for both sides. We still have some time this week, and I am hopeful that will happen.

Let me also say that I am increasingly not only concerned but alarmed that we have yet to schedule a date certain for the consideration of permanent normal trade relations with China. I had a clear understanding we would take up the bill this month. Yet I am told now that at a Republican staff meeting today there was a good deal of discussion about the need to move it to September.

I inform my colleagues that we will ask unanimous consent to take up PNTR. If that fails, at some point this

week, we will actually make a motion to proceed to PNTR by a time certain this month. We cannot fail to act on that issue any longer. We must act. So we will make that motion to proceed to PNTR if the majority leader chooses not to make the motion for whatever reason.

I will also say that, as he has indicated, there is a good deal of business left undone that, for whatever reason, has been blocked by some of our colleagues on the other side. We will want to address those issues as well.

We will offer a motion to proceed to the Patients' Bill of Rights. We will certainly want to do that, as well as prescription drugs, minimum wage, and a number of issues relating to common sense gun legislation, such as closing the so-called gun show loophole and dealing with the incremental approaches to gun safety that the Senate supported as part of the juvenile justice bill.

I will say, we will also want to move to proceed to the H-1B legislation that passed in the House overwhelmingly. We want to be able to offer amendments. We would like to take it up. It should happen this week; if not this week, next week. But we ought to take up H-1B as well.

You could call this week the "Trillion Dollar Week," the Trillion Dollar Week because our Republican colleagues are choosing to ignore all of the legislation I have just noted, given the limited time we have, and instead commit this country to \$1 trillion in two tax cuts relating, first, to the marriage penalty, which we are told by CBO would cost a little over \$250 billion over a 10-year period of time; and the estate tax repeal, which, over a fully implemented 10-year period, costs \$750 billion.

That is \$1 trillion dealing with just two issues: the estate tax and the marriage penalty. It does not even go to the array of other tax-related questions that some of our Republican colleagues have addressed in the past. We could be up into \$3 or \$4 trillion worth of tax cuts if all of the tax proposals made by our Republican colleagues were enacted. But we may want to call this the "Trillion Dollar Week" if our Republican colleagues have their way: \$750 billion on the estate tax; \$250 billion on the marriage tax penalty—and, I will say, \$1 trillion, with very limited debate, with no real opportunity to offer amendments, with no real suggestion about whether or not we ought to have at least the right to offer alternatives to spending that much money.

The Democrats believe very strongly in the need to ensure that small businesses and farms are protected and that the ability is provided to transfer small businesses and farms. But we can do that for a lot less than \$750 billion. We believe very strongly in the importance of the elimination of the marriage tax penalty. But we do not have to spend \$250 billion to deal with it.