

proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein for a period not to exceed 5 minutes each.

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

NEW SOLUTIONS TO CHINESE PROLIFERATION PRACTICES

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, an official of the People's Republic of China, who many say will be the next leader of China when the scheduled leadership succession occurs next fall, is making his first visit to the United States this week. Mr. H.E. Hu Jintao, the current Vice President of China, will be getting his first up-front taste of official Washington. This is an opportunity to make it clear how we feel about certain Chinese policies, most particularly in the area of Chinese proliferation practices. Let's hope he takes back with him the right impressions.

President Bush made a summit visit to China, and met with President Jiang Zemin this past February. I liked the tone that he set in the meeting with Chinese leaders. He was serious and businesslike, and eschewed what had been a practice of overly positive glad-handing which runs the risk of communicating the wrong message.

President Bush's approach, it would appear, did seem to be somewhat productive with the Chinese leadership. For example, during a speech at Tsinghua University in Beijing, the President made a strong case for American values and religious freedom. The speech was broadcast live and unedited throughout China, an unprecedented event for an American President. So that is a small step forward, and I commend the President on his speech, which I hope received wide attention in China.

Less successful were the President's attempts to bring the Chinese around on the matter of proliferation of technologies associated with weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems. This has been a bone of contention between the U.S. and China for many years, despite repeated assurances by the Chinese that they would cease providing these technologies to states such as Iran, Iraq, Sudan, Pakistan, North Korea, Libya and others.

For example, in November of 2000, the U.S. and China signed an agreement stipulating that China would stop its proliferation practices. The Chinese have not yet implemented that agreement. We should insist on implementation. The same goes for the multilateral Missile Technology Control Regime, the MTCR, a voluntary agreement among 28 nations to restrict the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. China, although not among the 28 member nations, has promised to adhere to the MTCR. Let's see some delivery on that. Although President Bush has made new proposals in this area to the Chinese leaders, to date, his efforts have been rebuffed.

The Chinese have also stated that they are ready to issue export control regulations that will make it clearly illegal for Chinese companies to proliferate specific items. Where is the list? We might wish to consider making certain transfers of technology or other items the Chinese want from us contingent on an acceptable export control list plus the implementation and enforcement of export control regulations. This is an area where we need to close some loopholes and demonstrate to the Chinese that the United States is serious about stopping this dangerous practice. The Chinese are very attentive to actions, and not overly impressed by rhetoric.

The Chinese seem to have the psychology backwards. In order for them to comply with commitments they have already made, they have said that the U.S. should provide more incentives to deliver on their promises. They would like, in particular, for the U.S. to free up and approve licenses for satellite launches in China. I see it the opposite way: in the face of noncompliance and lack of progress on the November 2000 pledges regarding missile technology exports, we should, first, refuse to grant any licenses for satellite launches in China; and, second, withhold or prohibit the export of additional high technology and science that the Chinese badly want.

What is the current situation? First, the so-called sanctions regime which penalizes such behavior does not work. When a Chinese company is found to have provided missile technologies to, let us say, Iran or Iraq, U.S. law today provides that the company be prohibited from doing business in the U.S. The prohibition may look good on paper, but it appears to provide no real deterrent to Chinese companies that deal on the international market.

Second, the Chinese government makes a pretense of not knowing that so-called private companies in China are engaging in this behavior. This boggles the mind. Of course the government knows, or can quickly find out. We need to help the Chinese government focus on this matter, and so I propose that we consider changing our sanctions laws in this area to penalize the Chinese government itself for this behavior, regardless of whether the culprit is the government or a private company. Restrictions could be immediately slapped on exports of various technologies and scientific advances from the U.S. that are of high importance to the Chinese, such as space launch and other technologies that they covet from us. Only by immediate and painful steps will the Chinese government be motivated to end this practice, and drop the pretense of being ignorant of these transactions.

The Chinese government is capable of practicing a very effective form of brutal dictatorship in areas, such as religious freedom, and freedom of the press and assembly, any time it chooses to do so. It has been very effective, for ex-

ample in crushing the Falun Gong religious movement in a very short period of time throughout China. Surely Chinese leaders can exert equal pressure to stop the proliferation of missile technology and end a practice that is anathema to civilized nations and the international community.

I would remind my colleagues that the Chinese themselves do not hesitate to use trade sanctions to correct what they see as unfair actions by other nations. Recently, when the Japanese slapped high tariffs on Chinese mushrooms and other agricultural products, the Chinese immediately retaliated by stopping the importation into China of Japanese automobiles. The Japanese got the message in very short order and dropped the agricultural tariffs. So the Chinese know how to fashion punishments to fit the crime. That is all I am suggesting here. We should consider a credible sanctions regime, on items that the Chinese really care about, that could stop in its tracks the very dangerous practice of the proliferation of advanced missiles systems and weapons to states which should not be getting them.

A related consideration is that the Chinese, who are relying more and more on imported oil, seem to be attempting to secure long-term energy contracts with the regimes which are the recipients of their advanced weapons technologies. To the extent that there is a quid pro quo here, and clearly that appears to be the case, we might consider helping the Chinese secure contracts for energy supplies from sources other than rogue states, on the condition that proliferation end. This form of carrot could well be used as an incentive to change behavior.

In sum, I am suggesting a mixed basket of disincentives and incentives, penalties and rewards, to encourage the Chinese to get out of the proliferation business.

Secretary of State Powell has called Chinese noncompliance on nonproliferation an "irritation" in the U.S.-Chinese relationship. I would characterize it as an open wound.

The Chinese are dragging their feet on implementing agreements and assurances with the U.S. on proliferation, and hiding behind various transparent excuses. It is time for Congress and the Administration to consider specific changes in the laws dealing with sanctions on proliferation practices.

CHANGES TO H. CON. RES. 83 PURSUANT TO SECTION 314

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to make adjustments to budget resolution allocations and aggregates for amounts designated as emergency requirements pursuant to section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

Pursuant to section 314, I hereby submit the following revisions to H. Con.

Res. 83 as a result of an emergency designation in P.L. 107-147, the Job Creation and Worker Assistance Act of 2002.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a table which reflects the changes made to the allocations provided to the Senate Committee on Finance and to the budget resolution aggregates enforced under section 311(2)(A) of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

		(\$ millions)
Current Allocation to the Senate		
Finance Committee:		
FY 2002 Budget Authority	703,971	
FY 2002 Outlays	703,440	
FY 2002-06 Budget Authority	3,767,770	
FY 2002-06 Outlays	3,765,024	
FY 2002-11 Budget Authority	8,335,364	
FY 2002-11 Outlays	8,328,746	
Adjustments:		
FY 2002 Budget Authority	5,984	
FY 2002 Outlays	5,755	
FY 2002-06 Budget Authority	5,464	
FY 2002-06 Outlays	5,675	
FY 2002-11 Budget Authority	1,067	
FY 2002-11 Outlays	1,328	
Revised Allocation to the Senate		
Finance Committee:		
FY 2002 Budget Authority	709,955	
FY 2002 Outlays	709,195	
FY 2002-06 Budget Authority	3,773,234	
FY 2002-06 Outlays	3,770,699	
FY 2002-11 Budget Authority	8,336,431	
FY 2002-11 Outlays	8,330,074	
Current Revenue Aggregates:		
FR 2002	1,668,665	
FY 2002-06	8,884,348	
FY 2002-11	19,990,123	
Adjustments:		
FY 2002	-39,465	
FY 2002-06	-95,348	
FY 2002-11	-35,269	
Revised Revenue Aggregates:		
FY 2002	1,629,200	
FY 2002-06	8,789,000	
FY 2002-11	19,954,854	
Current Aggregate Budget Authority and Outlays:		
FY 2002 Budget Authority	1,674,515	
FY 2002 Outlays	1,640,179	
Adjustments:		
FY 2002 Budget Authority	5,984	
FY 2002 Outlays	5,755	
Revised Aggregate Budget Authority and Outlays:		
FY 2002 Budget Authority	1,680,499	
FY 2002 Outlays	1,645,934	

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of last year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred in August 1994 in Sioux City, IA. Two gay men were assaulted in their home by two intruders. The assailants, Anthony L. Smith, 17, and Henry White, 18, were charged with first-degree burglary and second-degree criminal mischief under the State hate crime statute.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JOAN REISCHE

• Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to Joan Reische, this year's Families in Transition Volunteer of the Year. Joan has been a dedicated volunteer in the Manchester Community since the 1970's, proving time and again why she is so deserving of this year's award.

Joan has spent countless hours volunteering and enriching the lives of those less fortunate. She has been extremely active in the Manchester Area League of Women Voters, serving as President of the Chapter. She has also been a member of the Board of the Manchester Historical District Commission, a member of the Board of the Palace Theater for Performing Arts, a member and President of the Manchester Area Family Planning Council and current chair of Families in Transition. Joan also serves as a guest reader for the Manchester Elementary Schools, working with children learning English as their second language.

I applaud Joan's commitment to serving and improving her community. Her time spent volunteering is above and beyond any standards set forth by her fellow philanthropists. Joan serves as a positive example for all in the Granite State. I commend her dedication and wish her continued success in her endeavors. It is an honor to represent you in the U.S. Senate.●

HONORING THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION

• Mr. BUNNING. Madam President, I rise today to honor the members of the American Heart Association, AHA, for all that they have accomplished in this nation's ongoing struggle against heart disease and stroke.

Founded in 1924 by six cardiologists, the American Heart Association has worked for more than 70 years to accurately inform the American public of the dangers of heart disease and stroke. Through their effective fundraising efforts, the AHA has been able to perform extensive research on cardiovascular diseases and their effects on the American people. Research has shown that cardiovascular diseases, including heart disease and stroke, kill nearly 960,000 Americans each and every year; nearly a death every 33 seconds. Cardiovascular diseases also cost more than any other disease, with an estimated \$330 billion in medical expenses and lost productivity in 2002.

Yesterday, Kentucky representatives of the Ohio Valley Affiliate of the AHA visited my office here in Washington. The information they provided proved to be quite shocking. In the Commonwealth of Kentucky, heart disease is the #1 killer. In fact, heart disease and stroke accounted for an astounding 43.5 percent of deaths in Kentucky in 1999; 12,098 Kentuckians died of heart disease and 2,710 died of stroke in 1999. Furthermore, Kentucky has the 6th highest death rate from heart disease, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases in the nation. As can be seen through statistical data, cardiovascular diseases are killing Americans, specifically Kentuckians, in mass numbers every year. We must realize the severity of this problem and actively join the fight to ensure that future generations of Americans are well informed on how to prevent these diseases from occurring.

I applaud the work of the American Heart Association, especially that performed by the Ohio Valley Affiliate in Kentucky, and thank them for striving to create a healthier America. I ask that my fellow Senators join me in praising all involved with the AHA, for their work truly makes a difference to current and future generations of Americans.●

THE ZACHARY AND ELIZABETH FISHER DISTINGUISHED CIVILIAN HUMANITARIAN AWARD FOR 2001

• Mr. BURNS. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to a wonderful group of people from the Great Falls, MT. Today, The Great Falls Area Chamber of Commerce Military Affairs Committee, MAC, will receive the Zachary and Elizabeth Fisher Distinguished Civilian Humanitarian Award for 2001 at the Pentagon on May 1, 2002. The competition for this award encompassed the entire Department of Defense.

The First Award is given to individuals or organizations that demonstrate exceptional patriotism and humanitarian concerns for the members of the armed forces or their families.

As you may know, Great Falls, MT, is home to Malmstrom Air Force Base. The 341 Space Wing controls 200 Minuteman III missiles. I have had the pleasure to speak to members of MAC on several occasions over the years at their monthly luncheons held at Malmstrom Air Force Base. Let me tell you, as this award signifies, they are second to none. The support they show for our Malmstrom Air Force Base men and women is more than just these monthly luncheons. For many years, MAC has sponsored a free picnic for military members and their families, with over 5000 people attending the annual event. At these picnics, MAC gives away over \$15,000 in prizes, which comes from the local merchants. They also sponsor annual golf tournaments, raising money for military support programs. The leadership of MAC and