

and managed within exclusively civilian programs. The Convention contains provisions to ensure that national security is not compromised and that Parties have absolute discretion as to what information is reported on material from military sources.

The United States has initiated many steps to improve nuclear safety worldwide in accordance with its long-standing policy to make safety an absolute priority in the use of nuclear energy, and has supported the effort to develop both the CNS and this Convention. The Convention should encourage countries to improve the management of spent fuel and radioactive waste domestically and thus result in an increase in nuclear safety worldwide.

Consultations were held with representatives from States and the nuclear industry. There are no significant new burdens or unfunded mandates for the State or industry that should result from the Convention. Costs for implementation of the proposed Convention will be absorbed within the existing budgets of affected agencies.

I urge the Senate to act expeditiously in giving its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, September 13, 2000.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2000

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 11 a.m. on Thursday, September 14. I further ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 444, the PNTR China legislation as under the previous order.

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

Mr. CRAIG. I further ask unanimous consent the two leaders have an extra 10 minutes each for purposes of morning business during tomorrow's session.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. CRAIG. For the information of all Senators, at 11 a.m. tomorrow the Senate will resume consideration of the China PNTR legislation. Under the order, there are 10 amendments remaining for debate and up to 6 hours of general debate remaining on the bill. Those Senators with amendments in order are encouraged to work with the bill managers on a time to debate those amendments. Senators should be aware that votes will occur throughout the day.

As a reminder, Senators should be in the Senate Chamber by 9:30 a.m. tomorrow to proceed as a body to the

Hall of the House of Representatives at 9:40 to hear an address by the Indian Prime Minister.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of up to 10 minutes of Senator GRASSLEY and up to 60 minutes of Senator JACK REED on the subject of China.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 2090

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I understand H.R. 2090 is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2090) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to contract with the National Academy of Sciences to establish the Coordinated Oceanographic Program Advisory Panel to report to the Congress on the feasibility and social value of a coordinated oceanographic program.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO S. 1374

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 394, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 394) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 1374.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 394) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

MARKETING OF VIOLENT FILMS AND VIDEOS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today the Commerce Committee had an oversight hearing on violence mar-

keted to children by the entertainment industry. This oversight is long overdue. I congratulate Senator MCCAIN for holding such a hearing.

The purpose of the hearing was to look at the FTC study that just came out that charged the entertainment industry with marketing of violent films and videos to children.

The bottom line is that as we have heard President Clinton and Vice President Gore respond to the FTC rulings, there is an inconsistency in their responses and how they have generally interacted with Hollywood over the last 8 years.

I establish as a basis for my remarks some quotes from the various newspapers of the recent month and a half. For instance, on September 12, the Washington Post, commenting on this, said:

In separate time zones, but with one message, President Clinton and Vice President Gore delivered a joint threat to the entertainment industry today that harsh regulation could come if the makers of explicit and violent movies, recordings and video games do not stop advertisement at children.

I continue to read from the same story in the Washington Post. Later on it says:

But Gore has not always appeared consistent on this issue. In 1987, as he was gearing up for his first presidential campaign, Gore and his wife held a meeting with rock music executives in which Gore apologized for his role in a 1985 Senate Commerce Committee hearing on rock music lyrics. A tape of the meeting was obtained by Daily Variety. Tipper Gore, who had testified at the hearing on behalf of the Parents Music Resource Center, called the hearing "a mistake. . . that sent the wrong message."

Last year, the Los Angeles Times reported that Gore met privately with potential donors in the entertainment industry in July 1999 and told them the idea for the FTC study—

Which I just referred to—

was Clinton's and not his, and that he was not consulted.

Then on August 18, the Chicago Tribune shows an inconsistency in how they react and work with Hollywood at different times. It says:

In southern California, records show, Gore and the Democratic National Committee so far have raised \$10.3 million—a 13 percent increase—at a time when the DNC's nationwide fundraising pace is lagging behind 1996, when Clinton ran for re-election.

Quoting further in the article:

Gore generated \$443,050 in hard money from the entertainment industry, 86 percent more than Clinton in 1996. He also took in \$340,375 from lawyers and lobbyists, a 66 percent increase, and \$124,350 from real estate interests, an 82 percent jump.

Now I will quote from the August 18 Los Angeles Times. The reference in the headline reads: ". . . The Vice President is building upon that legacy" to follow Clinton's close relationship with Hollywood. "He has already raised more than the President did in '96."

Later on in that article, referring to a person whom I do not know—his name is Reiner:

But Reiner . . . has expressed greater support for Gore than he had for Clinton. He has

hosted fund-raisers for Gore at his home, stumped for him on television and even flew to Ohio to join him at a campaign event last week.

A reference to the fact there were Hollywood types campaigning strongly for the Vice President because there was some chagrin in Hollywood, at least for a short period of time, about whether he is a legitimate crusader against Hollywood violence, which Senator LIEBERMAN is, that he was being selected as Vice President.

The Los Angeles Times reports on August 17, 2000—and this was Vice President GORE doing this.

The effort to blunt any dissent over Lieberman's selection started as word leaked out of his ascension to the ticket. Gore, according to an associate, made a round of soothing calls to Hollywood figures, including moguls Jeffrey Katzenberg and David Geffen.

I have already congratulated Senator MCCAIN for holding this hearing. We need to do what we can to stop violence being peddled by Hollywood so our young people do not think it is right to kill anybody. I do think it is wrong for the very people who are carrying on this crusade—the Vice President and the President—schmoozing at the same time they are carrying on this campaign with Hollywood.

I want to comment on Vice President GORE's curious interest in criticizing the entertainment industry for producing violent movies, television shows, and video games that promote immorality and attack traditional family values.

I do not doubt for 1 minute, as I have already indicated, that Senator LIEBERMAN is very sincere in his views on this matter, but the fact is that the Vice President is at the top of the Democratic ticket, and everyone knows that he will set the real tone should he be elected in November.

The fact is that the Vice President has taken a record amount of money from the entertainment industry. I refer, again, to the Chicago Tribune. The Vice President and the Democratic National Committee have raised \$10.3 million from southern California as of August this year, a 13 percent increase over 1996, and the Vice President has gotten \$443,050 in hard money from the entertainment industry, 86 percent more than President Clinton received in 1996.

The Clinton-GORE administration has been a real friend to the Hollywood liberals over the years. I guess all of those campaign contributions have had some effect. I think that when Hollywood producers hear one of their best friends in Washington criticize the entertainment industry, they just look to their "cozy relationship" with Clinton-Gore. The Hollywood moguls know GORE does not really mean what he says; at least that is a clear signal. Hollywood knows GORE does not really want to "rock the boat."

For instance, how many times at these fundraisers that they had was the opportunity taken to protest the vio-

lence coming from Hollywood through their films and their videos?

According to the L.A. Times, the Vice President privately told a group of Hollywood donors that he had nothing to do with President Clinton's effort to study whether Hollywood markets violence to children and that he was not consulted on the issue. That was in 1999.

But now that the study is out—this study came out this week—Vice President GORE is talking it up and taking credit. The Vice President is acting as if he has not made private promises to his big campaign donors and to Hollywood notables that they should not worry about a crackdown on Hollywood excesses. But we have heard all of this before.

In 1988, then-Senator GORE made similar promises after holding hearings into offensive music lyrics. It appears the Vice President will say what he wants to say, what he needs to say, to anybody he needs to say it to, just to get elected. I think the American people will not be fooled by these kinds of bait-and-switch tactics. They know a phony act when they see one.

In fact, Hollywood liberals are actively campaigning for the Vice President. For example, according to press reports, stars and movie producers have hosted GORE fundraisers, and some have even stumped for GORE around the country. So much then for standing up to Hollywood as opposed to schmoozing with them.

The American people need their leaders to take a genuine interest in building a civil society of which we can all be proud. We need leaders who will make sure children are protected from violence and immorality peddled under the guise of entertainment.

What we do not need is the Vice President telling the American people one thing while—with a wink and nod towards Hollywood, towards the big shots of the movie industry—assuring the Hollywood elite he does not mean what he says as he pockets their cold cash.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we have, for many days, been debating the momentous decision of extending permanent normal trade relations with China.

At the essence of our debate is a very simple question: Will we continue a policy of economic engagement with China or will we turn away? I believe we have to continue this policy of engagement. We have pursued this policy for almost 30 years. It has contributed to profound change in China. But it has not transformed China into a classical liberal democracy. It has not led to the establishment of a multiparty democ-

racy, with an independent judiciary protecting the rights of China's people, particularly the rights of expression. It has not cramped China's policy which supports the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. But it has placed China on a very different historical trajectory than could have taken place.

This notion of the change brought in China came to me with great force last August when I was traveling through China. I was at Dandong on the Yalu River. We were looking across into North Korea. One of our guides pointed out that in the 1950s and early 1960s, North Korea had a higher per capita income. North Korea was seen as the model of socialist development in Asia. North Korea had had a heavy industrial sector that was competitive with many parts of the world.

Yet today—at that time last year—we were peering into a country that was starving, that had an economic system in collapse, that we were concerned could be so unstable they could threaten the peace of the region.

They did not choose the trajectory of international trade. They did not choose the path of engagement with the West. One can ask: Had China gone that route, had we not tried to engage China, would we be facing today a country with over 1 billion people hermetically sealed in an economically failing and ideologically driven country, armed with nuclear weapons? If we were confronting such a country, I think we would be much worse off than we are today, even with the frustrating and uneven relationship that we have—and we must admit we have—with China. So I believe that we must continue this policy of engagement, which is at the heart of the extension of permanent normal trade relations.

China is now a part of the world and the world economy, but it is also still China. It is a mixture of modernity and also a mixture of the old, indeed, the ancient.

One of the examples that I have seen in China—this one occurred just a few weeks ago when I was traveling there again—is the contrast in Wuhan. Wuhan is a city on the Yangtze Sea in China. It is an old city, not like the new cities on the coast such as Shanghai and other cities. It is in some respects the Pittsburgh of China. It is a highly intense, heavily industrial city. You can tell that from the extraordinarily bad air pollution.

There are two companies we saw. One was the Wuhan Iron and Steel Company. It is right out of the industrial age. Andrew Carnegie would have been right at home, except for the 386 computers that were running the facility.

Then we saw another factory, the Yangtze Fiber Optic Company. Modern; it could have been in Silicon Valley in California, producing fiber optic cable, producing it to world standards, initially a product of investment by the Dutch company Phillips, now a wholly owned enterprise by Chinese owners. These are the examples of the economy—the old and the very modern.