

ratified it. Instead, it stepped up its repression of individuals seeking to exercise the very rights the covenant is designed to protect. And we do not speak out about this.

We make the argument, to grant this country the honor of hosting the Olympics, we should not raise questions about this because to raise questions would be to make a political statement about the Olympics. Isn't it also making a political statement about the Olympics not to raise questions, to legitimize and validate this repression?

Chinese courts have sentenced members of the Chinese Democracy Party, an open opposition party, to terms of 11, 12, and 13 years for "conspiring to subvert state power." This is a fact.

Charges against these political activists—do you know what they are? They included this: They organized a party—wound up in prison. They received funds from abroad promoting independent trade unions—they wound up in prison. They used e-mails to distribute materials abroad—they wound up in prison. And they gave interviews to foreign reporters—they wound up in prison.

Here is where the Olympics is going to go. Without a word from our Government? Without a word from the Senate?

Chinese officials have also ruthlessly suppressed dissent from ethnic minorities, including Xinjiang and Tibet. According to a report by Amnesty International, the Chinese Government has reportedly committed gross violations, including widespread use of torture to exact confessions, lengthy prison sentences, and numerous executions. Are we not going to speak up about a government that tortures its citizens and that executes its citizens for no other reason than they have had the courage to speak up for democracy or to try to practice their religion?

In an apparent attempt to stop the flow of information overseas about this crackdown, Chinese security officials continue to detain a prominent businesswoman, Ms. Rebiya Kadeer, in the Province of Xinjiang. Her husband is a U.S. resident who broadcasts on Radio Free Asia and the Voice of America, championing the cause of people. She was arrested by the Chinese security forces on her way to meet with members of a visiting Congressional staff delegation.

For years, the same Ms. Kadeer has been praised by the Chinese Government for her efforts to promote economic development, including a project to help women own their own businesses. She has also been praised in the Wall Street Journal for her business savvy. She owned a department store in a provincial capital, as well as a profitable trading company. But now she has been put out of business, charged with—here is the charge, Mr. President—"illegally offering state secrets across the border," and sentenced to 8 years of hard labor. Her son and her secretary were also detained and sent to a labor camp.

Given this horrendous record, I do not believe China should be rewarded for this sort of repression. I am not a cold war warrior. I am not trying to resurrect the cold war. My father was born in Odessa, Ukraine. Then, to stay ahead of Czarist Russia, he was a Jewish immigrant. They moved to Habarovsk in the Far East, Siberia, and then Harbin, and lived in Pakeen, lived in China, and he came to the United States of America at age 17, in 1914. I am an internationalist.

I look forward to the day that Beijing hosts the Olympic games. The Chinese people are some of the most extraordinary, talented, and resourceful people on the planet. I do not for a moment want to bash or overgeneralize. I dream of a day when I can come to the Senate floor and I can celebrate the idea of China hosting the Olympic games. But not now. Not with the persecution, not with the torture, not with the murder of innocent citizens, not with the political oppression, not with the religious persecution, not with what they have done to the country of Tibet, the people of Tibet.

I believe strongly China's authoritarian, repressive Government should not be granted the privilege of hosting the 2008 games. It does not deserve the international legitimacy and spotlight that this honor bestows. Instead, this Government's chronic failure to respect human rights, I believe, violates the fundamental spirit of the Olympic games and should disqualify Beijing.

This is perhaps my morning for tilting at windmills because I believe the international committee will probably give China the Olympic Games, but sometimes it is important just to make that statement on the floor of the Senate. I believe others should speak out as well.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN OFFICE ACT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to announce my cosponsorship of S. 570, the Violence Against Women Office Act introduced by my colleague Senator BIDEN. This bill will further our efforts in combating the problem of domestic violence. Domestic violence is not simply a localized, private issue, the ripple effect—socially and economically—from this problem makes it a concern for all Americans.

The statistics make my case. The crime of battering occurs every 15 seconds in this country. Over 50 percent of women will experience physical violence in an intimate relationship during their lifetime. Estimates range from 960,000 incidents of violence against a current or former spouse, boyfriend, or girlfriend per year to three million women annually who are physically abused by their husband or boyfriend.

The Violence Against Women Act is a strong indication of our commitment to address this problem. Any possible action we can take to enhance the ef-

fectiveness of our government's efforts in this arena must be taken. This bill is one such action.

Establishment of the Violence Against Women Office, (VAWO) by statute will provide permanency in our federal efforts to combat domestic violence. This bill will institutionalize the office and will help to fulfill the federal government's responsibility to meet the goals embodied in the Violence Against Women Act, (VAWA).

This office will be located within the U.S. Department of Justice, placed within the Associate Attorney General's Office, and will be led by a director appointed by the President and approved by the Senate. In addition to running the VAWO, the Director will serve as Special Counsel to the Attorney General on all issues related to violence against women. The office is responsible for the development of policy, programs, public education initiatives, and management of all grant programs funded under the VAWA. I would underscore that this legislation does not contemplate increased staff or require any expenditure of funds beyond that currently appropriated.

In the past, the VAWO director has brought visibility and credibility to the matter of violence against women, making it an issue of national concern and earning the respect of police, prosecutors, and victim service providers. This precedence should be furthered by establishing an office to address violence against women by statute. The Office and its Director will reflect the importance that Congress and the Administration place on making this issue a priority for the federal government and the country.

In addition, this step will insure that succeeding Administrations will continue to fully implement the provisions of the VAWA. An office placed under the direct supervision of the Associate Attorney General will reflect the Justice Department's understanding that non-criminal justice system services should be offered as part of a community coordinated response. By employing a specialized knowledge of the best practices in the field, a statutory mandate will guarantee that grant funds are well utilized. A strong and visible office is necessary to implement the recommendations embodied in the National Agenda and Call to Action on Violence Against Women.

I am proud that New Mexico has many dedicated individuals offering services to battered women in our state. The Violence Against Women Act has bolstered their means to provide shelters for women in crisis, get access to legal assistance, and transition out of abusive situations. Further, VAWA funding is provided for educational outreach to medical providers and local law enforcement to increase their abilities to identify and respond in domestic violence cases.

Just last year, New Mexico entities received numerous grants as a result of the Violence Against Women Office. These grants included:

El Refugio, Inc. of Silver City received \$304,931 from the Civil Legal Assistance Grant Program, an increase from their 1998 grant of \$295,596. With these monies, they will be able to continue existing project activities in their legal assistance program from low income and indigent battered women.

Likewise, The Eight Northern Indian Pueblos, Inc., the Jicarilla Apache Tribe, the Pueblo of Laguna, and the Santa Ana Pueblo have collectively received \$331,593 from the STOP Violence Against Indian Women Discretionary Grant Program. This allocation will be used to enhance and maintain current programs aimed at decreasing violence against women.

Since enactment of VAWA, other grants totaling over \$1.5 million have been provided to the City of Albuquerque in support of the Albuquerque Police's Domestic Abuse Response Team (DART), to Santa Fe County for implementation of a judicial oversight program to enhance offender accountability, and to Dona Ana County's efforts to expand prosecutorial services for victims, DART and La Casa Inc., the local battered women's shelter.

This nation-wide problem demands a local response. Federal funding is being effectively used to leverage existing community-based organizations and local law enforcement officials to help prevent and persecute domestic violence.

Last year I cosponsored the Violence Against Women Act. This year I am supporting full funding of VAWA programs for the Justice Department programs and in the Health and Human Services budget, despite the tight fiscal constraints and competing priorities for those agencies.

Domestic violence is a scourge. We must commit to addressing it. This legislation is one concrete step in the right direction.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, before we adjourned for the Fourth of July recess, we spent two weeks on the Senate floor discussing the Patients Bill of Rights. I supported the strong, enforceable bill which the Senate finally approved on June 29th. After years of consideration and a hard legislative battle, the bipartisan vote this bill received reflects the overwhelming support the bill has from the American people.

Over the next several months we will continue to discuss the importance of reforming our health care system to make it more affordable and more accessible to the American people. But as we debate the subject, we must not ignore an issue that is often overlooked as a public health problem. I'm talking about gun violence. Because, Mr. President, accompanying the tremendous human costs of gun violence are enormous public health costs that we cannot afford to ignore.

According to a 1999 report from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, every day in the United States, 93 people die as a result of gunshot wounds and an additional 240 sustain gunshot injuries. The report states that "the fatality rate is roughly equivalent to that associated with HIV infection—a disease that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has recognized as an epidemic." In addition, according to a 1997 study cited by the Violence Policy Center, the cost of gunshot wounds exceeded \$126 billion in 1992 alone. That same year, the injury cost per bullet sold in the United States exceeded \$25.

So as we in the Senate work to improve health care for all Americans, we should work just as hard to address the loopholes in our gun laws. Only by doing the latter can we reduce the costs to public health that result from gun violence.

BURMA MILITARY PURCHASES

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the illegitimate regime in Rangoon has once again shown its true colors. On this bright, sunny morning in Washington, I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to gathering storm clouds in Southeast Asia.

According to Jane's Defence Weekly, Burma's State Peace and Development Council, SPDC, has signed a contract to purchase 10 MiG-29 fighter aircraft from the Russian Aircraft-building Corporation. These fighters were built in the early 1990s and are being stored at the Lukhovitsy machine-building plant. The total cost of the 10 MiGs to the SPDC is \$130 million, 30 percent of which will be paid up front and the balance settled over the next decade.

This purchase is troubling for several reasons, and underscores that despite its name the SPDC is neither committed to peace nor the development of Burma. Thailand—and the United States—should be concerned with the acquisition of these aircraft, which boosts the junta's capabilities well beyond the 42 Chengdu F-7M and Nanchang A-5C currently sitting on Burmese runways. Tensions between the Thais and the junta have already spilled over into exchanges of gunfire and mortars; an escalation to an air war would be destabilizing to the entire region. China may be the only country to view the sale in a positive light, as it strengthens the military capability of one its staunchest allies in the region.

From drug dealing to the forced use of child soldiers, the Burmese military has distinguished itself as a world's leading violator of human rights and dignity. This purchase serves as evidence that the regime is committed to remaining in power at any and all costs. The international community must now double its efforts to ensure that even greater human rights abuses are not waged against the innocent people of Burma by the military, which is corrupt to the core.

The acquisition of MiG fighters adds 10 more reasons why the United States should view skeptically the discussions between Rangoon's thugs and thieves and Burma's legitimate leader Daw Aung San Suu Kyi. The contract with Russia sends a signal that despite all the rhetoric and few prisoner releases, the talks may be hollow. What meaningful concessions can the generals make to Suu Kyi if they are arming themselves?

The \$130 million contract—and where is that money coming from, Mr. President?—demonstrates yet again that the junta has not made the welfare of the people of Burma a priority. From an escalating HIV/AIDS crisis to forced labor practices, the junta has yet to demonstrate the political will to tackle the hardships the Burmese face every day.

Finally, the sale is an indication that the Russians are willing to sell military hardware to anyone, anywhere. We can add Burma to the growing list, which includes Iran and North Korea, of Russian client countries.

RACISM

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today I rise to call attention to racism in our society.

There are certain moments when we are reminded that it exists, and that it is a very ugly thing. Recently, the Committee of 100, a group of prominent Chinese-Americans, published a survey that measured attitudes toward Asian-Americans, especially those of Chinese descent. It was the first such comprehensive survey—the group wanted to establish a baseline that can be compared to future studies so that we can determine whether racist attitudes against Chinese-Americans are rising or falling.

The result of this first survey was distressing. Apparently, one-quarter of Americans hold "very negative attitudes" toward Chinese-Americans, and one-third think that Chinese-Americans are more likely to be loyal to China than to the United States. Stop and think about that: a charge of disloyalty is a sensational accusation when it is leveled by one American against another. This survey suggests that 90 million people in this country accuse millions of their fellow Americans of disloyalty.

The same poll also tested attitudes toward Asian-Americans in general, with similar results. Twenty-four percent of Americans would be upset if someone in their family married an Asian-American; 23 percent would be uncomfortable voting for an Asian-American president; and 17 percent would be disappointed if an Asian-American moved into their neighborhood.

Prejudice toward Chinese-Americans, and toward Asian-Americans in general, is not unique. Immigrants from all parts of the world have been stereotyped and reviled at some point in our