

Chafee	Harkin	Murray
Cleland	Hollings	Nelson (FL)
Clinton	Hutchison	Nelson (NE)
Cochran	Inouye	Reed
Collins	Jeffords	Reid
Conrad	Johnson	Rockefeller
Corzine	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Dayton	Kerry	Schumer
Dodd	Kohl	Shelby
Dorgan	Landrieu	Snowe
Durbin	Leahy	Stabenow
Edwards	Levin	Torricelli
Ensign	Lieberman	Warner
Feingold	Lincoln	Wellstone
Graham	Mukulski	Wyden

NAYS—27

Allard	Enzi	Lott
Allen	Fitzgerald	Lugar
Bennett	Gramm	McCain
Bunning	Grassley	McConnell
Craig	Gregg	Murkowski
Crapo	Hagel	Smith (NH)
Daschle	Hatch	Thompson
DeWine	Hutchinson	Thurmond
Domenici	Kyl	Voinovich

NOT VOTING—16

Bond	Inhofe	Smith (OR)
Brownback	Miller	Specter
Burns	Nickles	Stevens
Feinstein	Roberts	Thomas
Frist	Santorum	
Helms	Sessions	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 27. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I understand we are unable to get agreement to go to the Agriculture Supplemental Authorization. Therefore, I move to proceed to S. 1246, the Agriculture supplemental authorization, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on motion to proceed to Cal. No. 102, S. 1246, a bill to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American farmers:

Tom Harkin, Harry Reid, Jon S. Corzine, Max Baucus, Patty Murray, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Jeff Bingaman, Tim Johnson, Ted Kennedy, Jay Rockefeller, Daniel K. Akaka, Paul Wellstone, Mark Dayton, Maria Cantwell, Benjamin Nelson, Blanche Lincoln, Richard Durbin, and Herb Kohl.

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask unanimous consent this cloture vote occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, July 30, and I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum be waived.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, for the information of all Senators, this will be the last vote tonight, and we will have the next vote at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

Madam 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. 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 want to further elaborate on the comments I made just a moment ago. We made the motion to proceed to the Agriculture supplemental authorization bill because we could not get agreement to bring it up on Monday. As most of my colleagues know, this is a very important piece of legislation for just about every State in the country. It has passed in the House. It is important to pass it before we leave, only because, as most of our colleagues probably already know, if we are not able to utilize and commit these resources prior to the August recess, the Congressional Budget Office has indicated to us that they will not allow us the use of these resources prior to the end of the fiscal year. We will lose \$5.5 billion for Agriculture if this legislation does not pass prior to the time we leave in August.

I emphasize I am not making any threats. I am not trying to cajole. I am just trying to state the fact that we need to get this legislation done. This is not a partisan bill. The administration supports dealing with Agriculture. On an overwhelming basis, it passed in the House. We need to pass it in the Senate. I am very disappointed we are not getting the cooperation to proceed to this bill because it is such an important issue. It is for that reason, and only for that reason, that I have delayed the cloture vote on the Transportation bill.

There will be a cloture vote on the Transportation appropriations bill at some point, perhaps early in the week. But, nonetheless, it will happen. If we need to, we will run out the time to get to final passage and then vote on the bill. But I needed to get started on the Agriculture supplemental. And that is what the procedural motion that we just entered into entails.

I appreciate my colleagues' attention.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I wonder if the majority leader will yield for a question.

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. I am trying to understand what has happened. My understanding is that the majority leader is forced to file a cloture motion not to get the bill up but on the motion to proceed to the bill dealing with an emergency appropriation for family

farmers. My understanding is in the budget we reserved an amount of money that we all understood was necessary to try to help family farmers during a pretty tough time. Prices have collapsed. Family farmers are struggling. We all understood we were going to have to do an emergency appropriation to help them.

My understanding at the moment is that you are prevented not only from going to the bill but you are having to file a cloture motion on a motion to proceed to go to the bill to try to provide emergency help for family farmers.

Is that the circumstance we are in and, if so, who is forcing us to do this?

I watched this week while for a couple of days nothing happened on the floor. The appropriations subcommittee chair was here wanting amendments to come, and no amendments came. It looked like the ultimate slow motion on the floor of the Senate. Now we are told—those of us who come from farm country—that not only can we not get to the bill but we have to file cloture on the motion to proceed for emergency help for family farmers.

What on Earth is that about, and who is forcing us to do this?

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, will the leader yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. I am forcing it as someone who has stood on this floor for the last 4 years and fought for nearly \$8 billion a year for family farmers such as you have. We have stood arm in arm in that. But the bill that is coming to the floor is \$2 billion over the budget that you have talked about and that slot in the budget that we prepared.

I must tell you that this Senator is going to vote for emergency funding for farmers in agriculture, but we are not going to go above a very generous budget to do so.

I thought it was most important. Yes, the House has moved. I believe the chairman of the authorizing committee is here, and he can speak for himself.

But it is my understanding that this bill will come to the floor about \$2 billion ahead of where the House was. The House complied with the budget resolution. We are rapping on that door of spending that surplus in Medicare.

I don't care how you use the argument. The reality is very simple. The majority leader is moving us—and he is right—to a very important debate. But it was important for some of us who support farmers but also support fiscal integrity and the budget to stand up and say, Mr. Leader, we are out of budget, we are out of line, and we are \$2 billion beyond where we ought to be. That is why I objected.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, if I could regain the floor, let me say that I appreciate and respect the position of the Senator from Idaho. I am not sure that having this debate on the motion to proceed is the appropriate place to

do it. It seems to me that it would be an appropriate subject for an amendment to reduce the amount of emergency assistance from \$7.49 billion to \$5.5 billion. To say, we don't need to spend \$7.49 billion. We could have that amendment and have a debate about it. But having a motion to proceed and then having a debate and a filibuster, if that is required on the motion to proceed, just delays when we can actually get into the discussion and debate about whether or not it ought to be \$7.49, or \$7.1 billion, or \$5.2 billion. But we will finish this legislation only because of the ramifications of not finishing it, whether it is Monday, or Friday, or at some other time.

I put my colleagues on notice. I have no other recourse. This is not a threat. It is simply a fact that this is a piece of must-pass legislation. I hope people understand that.

I would be happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, if the majority leader will yield for one additional question, of course, the Senator from Idaho would have every right to come to the floor and protest that the amount of help for family farmers is too much, too generous, and this, that, or the other thing. The Senator has every right to do that. But I think that is different than trying to delay our ability to consider legislation that responds to an emergency need for family farmers.

My question to the majority leader was not about how much money was involved. My question was who is delaying this and why. I urge my friend from Idaho not to delay us. He has every right to come to the floor of the Senate and try to cut it or try to reduce it if he thinks it is too much, but allow us to immediately go to this on Monday because it is an emergency appropriations bill.

We all understood earlier this year that we needed an emergency supplemental. We provided the money for it. Now the Senator from Idaho has a dispute about how much money is going to come to the floor. Allow that bill to come to the floor and then offer an amendment. But don't force the majority leader to file a cloture motion on the motion to proceed. Speaking as somebody who represents farm country—I know the Senator from Idaho does as well—delaying on the motion to proceed is the worst way, in my judgment, to serve our family farm interests. All of us have the same interests.

I say to majority leader, I hope if there are disagreements about the amount of aid that we will have a debate about it. But I certainly hope that Members will allow us to get to this bill. It is an emergency appropriations supplemental bill designed to address an emergency. It ill-serves those who we intend to help to have to file a cloture motion on a motion to proceed to the actual bill.

Let's not do that. Let's get it to the floor and have at it on Monday, get it passed, and help family farmers.

I appreciate the majority leader yielding to me.

Mr. DASCHLE. I would be happy to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the leader for yielding.

I say to my friend from Idaho that we enjoyed his being on the Agriculture Committee for a number of years. I am sorry that he is not now on the Agriculture Committee. Perhaps if my friend from Idaho were on the Agriculture Committee and had been involved in our debate and deliberations and the markup of the bill, he might not be holding this bill up because it was reported out on a unanimous voice vote. We only had one amendment to take it down to \$5.5 billion. That fell on a 12-9 vote.

Two things: There are farmers who are hurting all over this country—not just in Iowa, or North Dakota, or Kansas but even in Idaho. Quite frankly, this Senator went out of his way to accommodate the wishes of Senators in this Chamber representing family farmers in their States to put into that bill what was necessary to meet some of those needs.

In fact, I say to my friend from Idaho, there are provisions in the bill that will help his farmers in Idaho that are not in the bill they passed in the House.

Second, I say to my friend from Idaho that the budget that was passed here allows in the 2001 fiscal year for the Agriculture Committee to spend up to \$5.5 billion. It allows the Agriculture Committee to spend for the year 2002 \$7.35 billion. The Agriculture Committee in the bill we are trying to consider here adheres to those limits. It is absolutely within the budget. The \$5.1 billion goes out before September 3.

The Agriculture Committee recognized that the crop-year and the fiscal year don't coincide. The needs that farmers will have this fall as a result of the crop-year happen in the 2002 fiscal year. I think a lot of us thought that we could under the budget go into that \$7.35 billion in 2002 and spend it in 2002. None of that \$2 billion is spent in 2001; it is spent in 2002. That is allowed by the budget. We could have gone up to \$7.35 billion, but we didn't. We wanted to hold some in reserve. By taking that \$2 billion, we are able after the first of the fiscal year, October 1, we are able to have help for farmers until we get a farm bill passed or until we are able to perhaps come again some other time and expend the rest of the \$7.35 billion.

I say to my friend from Idaho, this is within the budget the \$5.5 billion we spend this year before September 30; the other \$2 billion is spent in 2002, and there is nothing in the budget that prohibits the Agriculture Committee from saying in 2001 how we want that money spent in 2002. We have met all the requirements. There will be no budget point of order because we are well

within the budget. I point that out to my friend from Idaho. He is no longer a member of the committee. I know that. I am sorry he is not. Maybe had the Senator been there he would have realized and recognized how we went about this and how we are not busting the budget in 2001.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRAIG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank my colleagues for all of those considerations and I wish I did serve on the authorizing committee of agriculture. I serve on the appropriating subcommittee for agriculture, the appropriations, so I watch Agriculture budgets closely.

What the Senator from Iowa said is absolutely right. It is forward-funding; it is reaching into 2002 and pulling money out for 2001. I understand that. I know it will be spent in 2002 in a 2001 supplemental. I understand what is being done. I also understand that is not necessarily the way it is done. But it is OK if you can get the votes on the floor to do it. It is not necessarily how we work budgets around here.

I will also say, whether I am holding this up or not, we will be on the Agriculture bill come Monday, and Monday evening you will get cloture and we will be there and probably move it quite quickly, depending on the amendments that come. The leaders know this. There are several amendments that may be very protracted in their debate.

The reality is, last year somebody made us file cloture on the Agriculture appropriations conference report. I don't believe that was talked about in such dramatic terms, but that is exactly what happened last year. I have it in front of me, Agriculture appropriations, 106th Congress. After all the work was done, the bill was ready to be sent to the President and be signed so the money could go out and somebody had to file cloture to move the bill.

I don't know that this is so unprecedented. Thou doth protest a bit too much.

We will be on the Agriculture bill come Monday. I do appreciate the work the Senator has done. He has worked thoroughly.

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I would like to try to summarize where we are and see if my leader, the majority leader, can confirm if this is accurate.

I think the word of the day is "delay." We are seeing an Agriculture bill, an emergency bill, being delayed. We are not going to be on it. We are going to have to debate a motion to proceed. For those people who don't know the rules of the Senate, you can invoke these rules and it can go slow. We are seeing a delay in getting help to our farmers; and we are seeing anything but a delay in the day we will have the Mexican trucks come barreling through our highways and byways when we should delay that until

we have enough inspectors. We are only inspecting 2 percent of the trucks, and out of that 2 percent, 35 percent of the trucks are failing and a lot of them have no brakes.

I will not reiterate the horror stories and nightmares we heard in the committee.

Where we have a delay, we don't want a delay; that is, to help our American farmers. And where the other side is trying to do away with the delay is the day that we have trucks coming through our border into the interior of our country that are ill-equipped for those journeys.

I wonder if my leader would agree that is where we are right now.

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator has described it very well. We have spent a week delaying completion of our work on the Transportation appropriations bill, fundamental investments in our Nation's infrastructure. Why have we done that? Because there are those who are opposed to the regulatory commitment that we want to make for truck safety in this country. They are willing to sacrifice public investment in our Nation's infrastructure not for days but for weeks because they don't think we ought to support a rigorous inspection and a rigorous standard of quality with regard to safety on our Nation's highways.

That is what this debate has been about now for several days. I am disappointed that only because of absentee Senators we lost the cloture vote tonight, but we will win that vote and inevitably we will win on the final passage of the Transportation bill. This has been nothing more than delay. This delay has been unnecessary, unproductive, and very unfortunate.

The Senator from California could not have said it better. She is right. There will be another day. We will deal with these issues. I will say, as I said a moment ago, there are some things we must do before we leave. We have no choice. So we can delay now and we will compound the problems and the circumstances involving our departure later.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. I say to the majority leader in the form of a question, we don't have nearly as many farmers—we call them ranchers—in the State of Nevada, but we have some. They have benefits from this Agriculture bill—not as much as we think they should.

I say to the leader, farmers all over America are not concerned about the partisan politics. There are Democrat farmers and Republican farmers. Isn't that right?

Mr. DASCHLE. That is correct.

Mr. REID. The American public wants us to accomplish results. The fact that you have been a leader for a short period of time should not mean we cannot move forward with the legislation. Is that fair?

Mr. DASCHLE. I would say that is fair.

Mr. REID. We had the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from California, the Senator from South Dakota, huge producers of food and fiber for this country. I know how important it is for your respective States that we move forward on this Agriculture supplemental.

I say to the leader, if I had been in my office I would have taken more calls, but I have been here most of the time, and I have had many, many calls from people interested in the high-tech industry, people on the cutting edge of what is going on in America today with computers. They want to be competitive. They think they are unable to be competitive because we cannot move forward on the Export Administration Act. There are Democrat and Republican farmers. There are also Democrat and Republican people involved in this high-tech industry. They don't care who gets credit for it.

Would the leader agree if we can move forward on the Agriculture supplemental and the Export Administration Act, there will be lots of credit to go around for Democrats and Republicans, and it would help this country?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is absolutely right. The Senator has spent a good deal of time on this floor over not only of the past few months but of the past few years trying to pass the Export Administration Act. He ran into the same problems last year that we confront this year. There are those who are unwilling to consider the tremendous, negative repercussions that this country will continue to experience as a result of our inability to update the Export Administration Act now.

Further delay, and it expires. I might add, it expires in August. Further delay further undermines our ability to be competitive abroad. I don't know why anyone would want to be in a position to put this country into that kind of a situation, but because of objections on the other side, we have so far been unable to move the bill.

Mrs. CLINTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mrs. CLINTON. As the majority leader well knows, I am new to this body and I think what we have just seen raises, in my mind, serious questions about what it is we are trying to accomplish for the people of our States and our country.

As I understand the response of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, the delay is because somebody "unnamed" delayed something last year. That, to me, is a strikingly inadequate explanation for a delay that is holding up our efforts to help our oldest industry and our newest industry.

With the fact that New York's largest economic sector is agriculture, which most people outside New York would have no idea of, I have a great interest in the Agriculture supplemental bill because we have some aid in there for farmers who are following

in the tradition of those having farmed in New York for more than 400 years. Our apple farmers are on the brink of extinction if they do not get some emergency help. We had hail last year that destroyed the crop in the Mid-Hudson River Valley; it took out orchards in the north country. So this is not any geographic issue. This is a national issue that has to be addressed.

At the same time, in New York, we have some of the cutting edge high-tech industries that are begging for the kind of direction the Export Administration Act will give them, the certainty about what they can and cannot export, whether we can be competitive globally. Both of these important pieces of legislation have to be addressed in the next week.

It is regrettable that instead of doing the people's business, dealing with the agricultural needs and the high-tech needs that really cut across every geographic and political line we have in our Nation, we see this kind of delay.

But I would ask the majority leader, is it your intention to do everything you can possibly do, as our leader, who has done, in my view, an absolutely tremendous job since assuming the leadership, to make sure that the people's needs are met? And that includes the Agriculture bill and the Export Administration bill.

Speaking just as one Senator, I do not think there is anything more important than doing the work we were sent here to do, casting the votes that will help people, and it is striking that we do not seem to have the cooperation we need on the other side.

But I would ask the leader if it is his intention to make sure that we do the people's business before we leave for the recess that is scheduled.

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator may be new here, but she certainly understands how this institution must work. It can only work with cooperation. As she has so rightfully indicated, the situation today is that on issues of great importance, as she said, to our oldest and our newest industries, there is no question that we cannot put any higher of a priority on the work that must be done in the next week than to address both of these bills.

The agricultural supplemental package represents, for many of our program crop farmers, a significant portion of the income they will receive in this calendar year. A large portion of the income they are depending upon rides on whether or not we get this bill done in the coming week. I do not know what percent some of our high-tech companies relate to the ability to export abroad, but I would not be surprised if it were not just as great.

So she is absolutely right. We cannot leave without addressing these critical pieces of legislation. Why? Because they expire. The authorization literally expires during the month of August. So we can do it Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or we can work into the weekend, or the following week, but we really

have to understand that these are critical bills that must be addressed. And the only way we can address them, as she correctly points out, is through the cooperative effort of both parties, and I would hope both leaders.

Mr. REID. Will the leader yield just for one more brief question?

Mr. DASCHLE. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. REID. There have been comments the last several days about what has happened in the last year. I want the RECORD to be spread with the fact—I want this confirmed by the leader—one of the assignments you gave me as assistant leader was that when difficult matters arose on the floor, one of my assignments directly from our leader—TOM DASCHLE to HARRY REID—was to do what you can, HARRY REID, to help move legislation. If it benefited the Republicans, I still had that responsibility. And there are many statements in the RECORD by Senator LOTT of how he appreciated the work we did—my name was mentioned on occasion—to move legislation.

I did that because you believed it was the right thing to do to move legislation. That is why we were able to move eight appropriations bills last year—does the Senator remember that—before the August recess?

Mr. DASCHLE. I remember that vividly. I remember how it was that we were able to work through these important matters, because we understood that October 1st is the deadline to complete all of our work on appropriations and that when you fall short of that deadline, you find yourself in a very precarious situation, making decisions without careful thought and, in some cases, making mistakes.

We want to complete our work on time. We want to be able to finish these bills. I appreciate so much the cooperation, the effort, and the leadership shown by the Senator from Nevada in reaching that goal.

Mr. REID. Does the Senator from South Dakota, our distinguished majority leader, agree that when you were the minority leader, one of your primary responsibilities was to move legislation, no matter whether it was sponsored by a Democrat or a Republican, but to move legislation off this floor?

Mr. DASCHLE. By and large, that was exactly what we attempted to do. Obviously, there were many times when there were disagreements, but we tried to work through those disagreements. I am hopeful we can do so again in the coming week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I will return the floor to the Senator in just one brief minute. I just want to say that I think no one knows more than I do how passionately this majority leader, the then-minority leader, worked with us to get legislation passed. That is why I repeat, eight appropriations bills were passed in this body last year before the August re-

cess. That was hard work. It only came as a result of the direction of the majority leader saying, we have to get this stuff done, that is the responsible thing for this country; and we did it.

I know there are people who come in and make little snippets about the fact that things have happened in the past. Look at our record. Look at our record of how we helped move legislation. Of course, there were disagreements on our side, but they passed quickly. Lots of amendments were filed on bills. We worked through those.

I just say, I hope people will look at what we did and work with us to try to move legislation. We want to do that. If we do something that is good, there is credit for everyone to go around. If we do not do things, there is blame to go around, as well it should. But the blame now should be with the minority because they simply have not allowed us to proceed on important legislation for this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. CLINTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

NOMINATIONS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I have noted with interest the comments of Senators DASCHLE and REID regarding unfinished legislative work before the recess. What is also unfinished business before the recess is nominations. Over the past week, Senator REID and I have had a series of continued conversations regarding nominations, and we will continue to talk in good faith to make progress on nominations.

But our unfinished work here in the Senate is not just legislative in nature. It is necessary that we work hard to clear a sizable number of nominations before the recess, to give the President the public servants he needs to staff his administration, make it run, have it work, and see it accountable to the American people.

I look forward to seeing the Senate head towards the recess with work on both the legislative and executive calendars. I yield the floor.

PLIGHT OF DETAINED PERMANENT UNITED STATES RESIDENT LIU YAPING IN INNER MONGOLIA

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I rise today to bring to my colleague's attention a terribly distressing, and I am afraid, all too familiar situation; the arrest and detention of American citizens and permanent residents traveling in China. I specifically want to comment on the case of Mr. Liu Yaping.

Mr. Liu is a resident of my home State of Connecticut and is married to a United States citizen. He has an American son and has been granted permanent residency in this country. Nevertheless, on a trip to his home country of China this past spring, he was abruptly detained and arrested on charges of tax evasion. More than four months after his initial arrest, the evidence against him for this alleged crime has yet to be produced by the Chinese authorities, and he has not been officially charged with a crime. In the meantime, he is being detained indefinitely.

Liu Yaping has been held in near isolation in Inner Mongolia, and we suspect that he may have been mistreated during his time in prison. He has been unable to contact his family, and because he is a permanent resident of the U.S., and not a citizen, he has been denied the right to consult with United States diplomats while in detention. He has been granted only very limited access to his attorneys, and has been unable to answer the charges against him.

The most troubling part of this story is that we have learned that Mr. Liu is ill and may die at any moment. It has been reported that he is suffering from a cerebral aneurysm, possibly caused by torture or beatings, for which he has gone largely untreated. Without immediate and appropriate medical attention, the aneurysm will continue to leak, and the danger is very real that he will die. His family has asked to review his medical records, but thus far this request has been denied. Instead, they receive only bills for medical services performed, without documentation or description. Mr. Liu's family has asked that he be transferred to a hospital in Beijing, but this request has been rejected by the Chinese government.

I cannot begin to imagine the toll that this ordeal has taken on Mr. Liu's wife, and 15 year-old son. Knowing their loved one is alone and in danger, they wait anxiously for any notice from the Chinese authorities indicating that his situation has improved. Mrs. Liu has been in steady contact with my office and grows increasingly distraught with each day that passes with no news of her husband. The U.S. embassy in China, despite their best efforts, has not been able to make inroads in this case, and due to Mr. Liu's grave medical condition, time has become an important factor when considering his case.

We cannot allow gross human rights violations to continue on our watch. It is the responsibility of all of us to ensure that our citizens and permanent residents receive just and equal treatment at home and abroad.

As my colleagues know, in the past year, several American citizens and permanent residents have been detained in China. Gao Zhan, an American University researcher, was sentenced to 10 years on July 24, after a