

That is very disconcerting. But I guess one of the things that bothers me the most is that there is a connection here in Washington, DC, to what is going on in New Jersey. The connection here in Washington, DC, as the Senator from New Jersey announced, is that it is his intention, by trying to get his name removed from the ballot, to save the Senate for the Democrats. It was not to give the people of New Jersey a choice, as many of the pundits are arguing and many of the politicos are arguing, that the people of New Jersey deserve a choice. No, this was about potentially having a candidate who was going to lose the election and that could result in the Democrats losing control of the Senate.

So from the press reports, we see lots of pressure being brought to bear on the Senator from New Jersey, from a variety of different quarters, to take one for the party and step aside so the Democrats can continue to control the Senate. That is what this is about. This is not about giving the people of New Jersey a choice. It is about trying to keep power, whether breaking the rules or not, trying to keep power.

There are a lot of discussions in this Chamber about the rule of law, that we have to respect the rule of law. We preach all over the world about the importance of the rule of law. Yet we have a statute that is in place under the Constitution because the Constitution says the legislature shall set the laws of elections within the States, not the courts. The legislature clearly acted in New Jersey.

So what are people here trying to save the Democratic majority trying to do? Well, they are trying to change the law through the courts so they have a better chance of winning the election.

Again, the disturbing part is from press reports that some of that is being orchestrated out of Washington, DC. We have a report from the Washington Post that says:

Senate majority leader Tom Daschle warned McGreevey, the Governor of New Jersey, that substantial national party funding for the race would be in jeopardy. "It was basically, 'Not with my money,'" Democratic officials said.

—unless they picked a particular candidate to substitute for Senator TORRICELLI.

Again, I am hearing a lot of talk that the people of New Jersey deserve a choice. Yet it sounds like the choice is being dictated here in Washington, DC.

Another quote from the Newark Star-Ledger:

In what may be the strangest twist yet in a bizarre election year, New Jersey Democratic leaders last night chose Lautenberg as their standard bearer on the insistence of Senate majority leader Tom Daschle.

They quote a Democratic source saying:

"Lautenberg or nothing." The nothing in this case was a threat by the national Democrats to abandon New Jersey in order to put stronger campaigns for incumbent Democrats in other states where they stood a better chance of winning. . . .

So let's put this in context, the high-brow comments that "the people of New Jersey deserve a choice." Let the people of New Jersey understand whose choice it was. It was not their choice. It was a choice dictated by the political operation here in Washington, DC, and according to these reports, by the Senate majority leader, as to who that choice would be for New Jerseyans to choose from.

That is deeply disturbing. That is deeply disturbing that we see this kind of interplay, in an attempt to change the outcome of an election that did not seem to be going in a positive direction.

I find it very interesting we have another case that just occurred on the unfortunate death of a Representative in Congress from Hawaii, someone who served this country through a long and distinguished career, a very popular Member of the House, and very popular in her district. What I understand is that the Democratic Party in Hawaii is not going to remove her name—is not going to remove her name from the election ballot. Why? Because she is a very popular Member and there is the suggestion that has been reported in the press that even though she is deceased, that she would probably still win the election.

Yet we have in New Jersey someone who is alive and well who they are insisting must be removed from the ballot. This is the kind of crass political calculation that undermines people's faith in the electoral and political process in this country. The sad part is, in part, some of this is being orchestrated out of Washington, DC. This is a crude attempt by those who took power in the Senate, not through the electoral process, to regain power in the Senate through the court process, not through the electoral process that has been established by the State of New Jersey.

How far do we go to keep power? How important is power? What rules must be broken? What principles must be set aside to keep power?

That is what is going on here. That is why the public is outraged and deeply disturbed at what they are seeing in New Jersey.

I find it very troubling that we have Members from this body who are participating in orchestrating those developments. It is not something that reflects positively on the Senate. It certainly does not reflect positively on the electoral system in this country.

I yield the floor.

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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

BLOCKING THE WORK OF THE SENATE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to comment on two subject matters today. The first is some of the statements made by my friend, my counterpart, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, when he said he was disturbed we were not doing anything in the Senate. He talked about we had not passed any appropriations bills, and went through a list of things we had not done.

But I say, with all due respect to my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, we have not done these things because the minority won't let us do them. We have been here reporting for duty. Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS, on the appropriations bills, reported every one of them out of committee before the August recess. But a decision has been made by the minority not to let us move on any.

That is why we have been on the Interior appropriations bill. This has been the fifth week. So I appreciate the efforts by the minority to make this fact, that we have done nothing in the Senate, our fault, but the American public knows.

We have stated here many times that we are willing to do terrorism insurance, election reform, Patients' Bill of Rights, generic drugs, bankruptcy—all these things that are stuck in conference. We are willing to do every one of the appropriations bills. But they won't let us.

Now, people say: What do you mean, "they won't let us"? That is the way it is in the Senate, a simple majority does not do the trick in the Senate. You need 60 votes. They have 49. We cannot get up to 60. So you can clearly see what the next 5 weeks are going to be like in the States where there are serious Senate races. What you are going to see there is: The Democrats control the Senate, and they have not been able to get anything accomplished.

But the American people know we may not have been able to accomplish a lot because they would not let us, but we have been able to stop a lot of things that would have occurred had we not been here. And I think when those chapters of history are written about this Congress, that is what the big headlines will be: The stuff we were able to stop. We were a check and balance on a ramrod, and we were able to stop things from happening.

THE NEW JERSEY SENATE RACE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is another thing I want to talk about. The Senator from Pennsylvania talked about the terrible situation in New Jersey. It is a very unique situation in New Jersey. A sitting Senator had a procedure before the Ethics Committee. It took a lot of time, and the only focus of the election for the Senate seat in New Jersey was that ethics procedure.

I said yesterday, on the Senate floor—and I say again today—BOB TORRICELLI is my friend. We came to Washington to serve in the House of Representatives together. We sat together in the same committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, in the House.

We developed a friendship then, 20 years ago, that has remained. I feel so bad for my friend, BOB TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I cannot determine all he went through, but he went through enough that he dropped out of the Senate race. He did it because, for those of us who know him, the emotional toll was tremendous.

Now, would it be better for the people of New Jersey to have no Senate race? The sitting Senator is out of the race. Would it be better that the people of New Jersey have no election, no choice?

The paramount interest that the New Jersey Supreme Court determined was that the people of New Jersey should have a choice. Now, they heard that argument today, and they have already decided by a 7-to-0 vote. It was, as they say in basketball, a slam dunk. This was not a difficult legal proceeding. The people of New Jersey should have a choice as to who is going to serve in the Senate.

I would hope people would drop all the litigation. I am sure some of my friends in the minority are clamoring to get to the Supreme Court and have an election determined there like they did a couple years ago. But I think it would be to everyone's best interest to let the people of New Jersey decide that, with a 7-to-0 determination by the New Jersey Supreme Court, and let these two people—Lautenberg and his opponent—have a race where they have debates and public forums, run TV ads, and have an election like we have in America. New Jersey deserves that. That is what this is all about.

So I hope the election can go forward, as the New Jersey Supreme Court, by a 7-to-0 vote, said it should. And I am sure it will. I cannot imagine even this Supreme Court would change that.

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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF CONGRESSIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON CHINA

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to speak in my capacity as Chairman of the Congressional Executive Commission on China. This commission was created in the China PNTR legislation two years ago and has the mandate to monitor human rights and developments in the rule of law in China. Today, we transmitted the first annual report to the Congress and to the President.

With passage of PNTR the Congress, and the country, declared that economic engagement was important—in terms of our own economic and strategic interests and in terms of our ability to promote and encourage change inside China. The commission was created to ensure that concerns about human rights and rule of law issues in China would continue to have a high priority in our government—in Congress and in the administration. That is why it includes members from both branches nine Senators, nine House members, and five Administration representatives appointed by the President.

The commission membership itself reflects the broad range of views of China within the Congress. Yet we were able to develop a report that is supported by an overwhelming majority of our members. The vote in the commission was 18 to 5 in favor of the report.

Let me turn to the report itself. This is the most comprehensive document produced by Congress on human rights in China. It pulls no punches in describing current human rights conditions in China. And it recommends actions to Congress and to the Administration that we believe will help promote change in China.

The underlying assumption of the report is that human rights cannot be enjoyed without a legal structure to protect those rights. Although China protects many rights on paper, this is often not the case in practice.

This is a time of uncertainty in China as they adjust to their WTO membership, go through a political transition with the senior leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and the government, and face increasing demands from their citizens for greater economic, social, religious, and political freedom.

In fact, the last 20 years has seen a period of profound change inside China—economic reform and the development of a market economy, decentralization of power, individual Chinese citizens gaining more individual autonomy and personal freedom. Yet the government continues to resist political liberalization and suppresses any threat to the Communist Party's grip on power. There are no free labor unions; all religious groups must register with the government and submit to its control; the media and Internet are restricted; there is tight control in minority ethnic regions.

The United States has limited means to influence change within China. The Chinese people, ultimately, must determine how they want to be governed and under what conditions. But we can help contribute to improving the situation inside China.

Let me stress that the commission is not seeking to impose American standards on China. But, from the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, to the International Labor Organizations' Declaration on Fundamental Principles, China has agreed to respect internationally recognized human rights for its citizens. Our desire is that the Chinese government abide by the terms of these international commitments, as well as the guarantees enshrined in China's Constitution and laws. That is the standard we, and others around the world, need to encourage—constantly.

Our report stresses that the United States must take a dual approach.

First, we need to pursue high-level advocacy on core human rights issues and cases of individuals who are denied their fundamental rights. The President, senior Administration officials, and members of Congress, should raise these issues at every opportunity. It also means multilateral advocacy. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights has many tools at its disposal. The International Labor Organization is becoming increasingly involved in labor rights issues in China. We need to work with other nations to pressure China in these areas.

Second, we need to provide increased technical and financial assistance to help build a legal system in China that protects human rights. Elements of this include training lawyers and judges to build a more professional legal system; promoting grassroots legal aid so Chinese women, workers, and farmers will understand their rights and how they can try to assert them; assisting with the drafting of new laws and regulations; teaching about experiences in other countries in the West, in Asia, in the former Soviet states, regarding how they dealt in a non-authoritarian way with some of the economic, social, and political problems that confront China today; providing currently unavailable information to the average Chinese using radio, cable, and the Internet; and working with nascent Chinese NGOs who are trying to deal with the staggering social and economic challenges in China.

The range of issues is huge. This past year, our commission examined some of the major areas of human rights and rule of law, including religious freedom, labor rights, free press and the Internet, Tibet, and the criminal justice system. Next year, we will continue to pursue these problems and address many others, including the role of foreign companies in Chinese society, women's rights which includes the one-child policy, HIV/AIDS, and the 2008 Olympics and human rights, to name just a few.