Police detained 10 democracy advocates just one week after President Clinton ended a tour of China, during which he emphasized the benefits of freedom and the rule of law, and praised Chinese President Jiang Zemin as a man who could transform this nation into a modern democracy.

The detainees included two cofounders of the opposition China Democratic Party, who tried to register it on June 25, the day Clinton began his nine-day visit.

These people were arrested for one reason: They dared to start an opposition party to the Communist Party in China. For daring to say we will be an opposition voice, for daring to say we will dissent from the ruling political party in China, they were arrested.

I asked an advocate of MFN today, a Member of the House of Representatives who is a proponent of MFN, ''Sir, what would it take for you to vote against normal trading status with China? What would they have to do? What abuse would they have to perpetrate in order for you to cast a vote against MFN?''

There was a thoughtful response, and I think a cause for pause. I ask all those who say we need to adopt a sense-of-the-Senate resolution today advocating MFN for China to ask themselves the question: What would it take? Is it forced abortion? Apparently not. So a nation that continues to practice taking women who are 7, 8 and 9 months pregnant against their will forcibly to a labor camp, putting them in a cell and forcing them against their will to have an abortion, if that is not enough to deny normal trading status or MFN, what does it take?

China today continues to persecute religious minorities, whether they are Hindus, whether they are Buddhists or whether they are Evangelical Christians, they continue to incarcerate them, they continue to require registration, they continue to monitor the messages.

If religious persecution is not enough to deny MFN for China, what does it take? What would they have to do? China continues to proliferate weapons of mass destruction. In committee testimony this week, officials of this Government admitted they cannot guarantee that China is not today continuing to proliferate. So if the proliferation of missiles and weapons technology is not enough to deny MFN, what does it take? What would it require that we say no to giving them normal trading status?

For us to go on record in light of the ongoing abuses—what a thumb in the eye to the U.S. Senate and to the United States of America and to the President of this country, within 1 week of our President's visit, to round up those who dare to say, ''We would like to be an opposition political party,'' and who dare to call their political party the Democracy Party. They rounded them up and put them in jail. How ironic that the President would refer to, and I quote the President's words in his speech in China, what he called ''a steady breeze of freedom blowing through China.''

That gentle breeze has become a brittle wind chilling any hope for true freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of political expression, freedom of religion in this Communist nation.

So while there were dazzling pictures and eloquent rhetoric about human rights, the President's tour of China was full of missed opportunities and mistakes that are sure to have a much more detrimental impact on human rights in China in the long run than the benefit of any short-term afterglow.

I will not today itemize what I think were the missed opportunities during the President's trip to China. But there is one—there is one—certainty, that on the heels of that trip, the Chinese Government once again cracked down on those who would make the mildest of political dissent and seek to register as a new political party.

Any pretense that the government, the regime, that dominates China today is moving toward reform and democracy should have been dispelled by what they did this week. And for the U.S. Senate to say, we are going on record in favor of most-favored-nation status, in view of what they did, I think would be a great mistake.

I would welcome the opportunity for the sponsors of this amendment to simply take the MFN provision out of this sense of the Senate; and I would wholeheartedly support it. But I think it is a mistake for us to go on that kind of record in view of what China has done in the wake of the President's recent trip in which he spoke so eloquently for freedom and for democracy.

I add, to my colleagues in the Senate, that it was this week that the Communist government in China rebuked the U.S. Senate for our audacity in passing a resolution reaffirming our traditional support for Taiwan.

I believe the President made mistakes in his trip to China, and I could enumerate them. But the greatest mistake was this: pinning our hopes for democratic reform in China to this regime. And the laudatory comments made about Jiang Zemin and the expression of the belief that he would be the leader to move in a transition from the current totalitarianism and repression to democracy and freedom, that hope was surely dashed in the actions of the Chinese Government this week.

I ask my colleagues to think again. I ask my distinguished colleague from Iowa, whom I admire and respect so much, to rethink the inclusion of a pro-MFN statement in this sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, my colleagues—I have been waiting for awhile—have asked me whether they could have a minute—a minute, I say to my colleague from Arkansas—to speak. But I understand their passion and know how strongly they feel about these issues.

My very good friend from New Mexico has also asked for some time, and I would be pleased to defer to him. I ask unanimous consent that I follow the Senator from New Mexico, and that then I will be free to speak and take more than a minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank my good friend.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

CBO MIDYEAR REVIEW

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, yesterday the Congressional Budget Office released its annual midyear review. I believe every Senator should acquaint himself with it. This CBO analysis speaks volumes about the success that the Republican-led Congress has had in putting the Federal Government's fiscal house in order—because policies aimed at reducing Federal spending, stimulating economic growth, coupled with the passage of the Balanced Budget Act last year have produced remarkable results.

The Congressional Budget Office, which is our official scorekeeper and economic analysis group, now projects that there will be a Federal budget surplus of $1.6 trillion over the next 10 years. Let me repeat, the Congressional Budget Office now projects a Federal budget surplus of $1.6 trillion over the next 10 years. This is up significantly from the $650 billion, 10-year number they gave us in January.

The Budget Office forecasts surpluses of $63 billion for this year; but they tell us that surplus will grow, rising to $80 billion in 1999; $251 billion in 2008. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the total accumulated surplus—I repeat —during the next 10 years will be a whopping $1.6 trillion.

More importantly, the Budget Office projects that in the second 5 years, from 2003 to 2008, we will produce a $168 billion operating budget surplus. That means a surplus, excluding the money borrowed from Social Security.

For those who said they wonder when the day will ever come when we will have a balanced budget, having returned to the Social Security trust fund whatever was used in the general funding of this Nation, the Congressional Budget Office says that day will arrive in the year 2003. And it will produce a very genuine and solid $40 billion a year, more or less, in a genuine surplus on budget, taking into consideration the Social Security trust fund in its entirety.

In other words, under the leadership of this Congress, we have moved from Federal budgets that produced deficits for as far as the eye can see to budgets that project surpluses for as far as the eye can see. I believe we must now

move to protect this surplus from those who would use it to expand Government. Rather, our first priority must be to protect and preserve the fiscal integrity of Social Security for the future.

We are committed to that goal. But we are also committed to providing needed tax relief to our hard-working families. We now know that we will have an operating surplus, roughly $40 billion a year, beginning in the year 2005. Therefore, I believe we must see to it that this surplus is available for tax cuts for the American people and that we not spend this money to grow Government. Let us spend this money to grow the paychecks of Americans.

Mr. President, there will be a lot of talk about this Congressional Budget Office's re-estimating of our national fiscal policy. I commend it to those who are concerned, legitimately concerned, about where we ought to go in the future based upon our successes.

I also would like Senators to know that the Congressional Budget Office did not assume a robust, strong, growing economy for the entire next 10 years. They have taken into consideration the potential, although we hope it will not occur, of a downturn in the economy, and we still have these kinds of surpluses—indicating that the economy is vibrant, productive, that the increases in productivity are far greater than we have estimated in the past, tax revenues are growing faster than we estimated in the past.

Clearly, an opportunity now is before us to make sure Social Security is taken care of and also to look carefully and surely right in the eye of, Should we give tax cuts to the American people? I think the answer is going to be a resounding yes.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak briefly as if in morning business, and then go right to this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Thank you, Mr. President, and I thank my colleagues for their courtesy. I will definitely speak to the amendment in a moment.

AUTOWORKERS OF FLINT, MICHIGAN

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, for more than 5 weeks, the Nation's largest industrial corporation has been locked in a labor dispute with workers in two of its Flint, MI, plants. I do not believe that we have had any discussion on the floor of the Senate about this. I want to speak about it. The company and the workers are fighting over local issues—health and safety, speeding up the production lines, and sending work to outside suppliers—but these local disputes also highlight a broader national concern that affects millions of working Americans: how U.S. corporations invest, how they compete, and where they invest.

GM's hard-line stance and labor-war tactics endanger the livelihoods of tens of thousands of workers in the automotive industry and in the industries that rely on auto production for their business. Ironically, these hardball tactics also undermine the very competitiveness that GM says it wants. Competitive firms need good labor relations; and good labor relations begin with a handshake, not a 2 by 4.

Monday's Washington Post reported that high-level negotiations to end the strike broke down Sunday ''amid signs the auto maker now may be willing to risk an all-out labor war.'' The company has asked an arbitrator to rule on the legality of the strike. The union has said fine. But GM's vice president in charge of labor relations broke off negotiations, refusing to even participate further in talks to reach an overall solution to the strike. The Post further reported, ''A GM source said some top company officials are pushing for a form of drastic action to 'send a clear message to the UAW' * * * Options reportedly under consideration, the source said, range from a legal action challenging the walkout * * *; cutting off health-care benefits to all UAW members idled by the strike; or shutting down the two strike-bound parts plants in Flint, Mich., and contracting out the work. Such a move,'' the Post explained, ''would amount to an all-out war.''

GM has taken the first step, filing a lawsuit against the union. GM would apparently rather sue than negotiate. They would rather fight than talk. The Post has reported that, ''Company sources said the lawsuit is probably the first step in an escalating war between the company and the union.''

This is no way for the Nation's largest industrial organization to treat its workers and their representatives. The duly recognized representatives of GM workers, the United Auto Workers, had sought to negotiate a global settlement. GM senior representative should come back to the table.

Yes, GM has every right to seek to improve productivity and profits. But as yesterday's New York Times reported, ''G.M.'s biggest productivity problem lies in its auto parts factories, which were * * * starved of investment during the 1980's * * * and have antiquated machinery as a result.''

GM entered into agreements with the United Auto Workers to invest more in its American operations but has fallen short of making new demands on workers before it would comply with what it had already promised.

What is really at stake here are American jobs—good jobs, with good benefits. The workers at GM's Flint parts plants are fighting to preserve those American jobs. Over the next 2 years, in this act alone GM threatens to transfer about 11,000 of these jobs to subcontractors or out of the country altogether. GM's workers are justifiably concerned with what the New York Times calls ''G.M.'s steady push to build factories overseas while slowing investment in its low-profit American operations.''

GM should stop fighting its workers and get back to investing in the creation of those good jobs which bring good benefits right here in the United States. Strikes are hard on everyone—on the company, on the economy, and hardest of all on the men and women on the picket line. The best way for GM, or any corporation, to avoid picket lines is to address the underlying problems that lead to strikes, not to challenge the right of workers to strike.

The free world looked upon strikes in the 1930s with hope, because, as Franklin Roosevelt said in 1939, ''Only in free lands have free labor unions survived.'' As long as there have been unions, we have known that the right to strike and liberty go hand in hand.

That is why, in 1860, Abraham Lincoln told striking New Haven shoe factory workers, ''Thank God we have a system of labor where there can be a strike.''

I have confidence in the auto workers of Flint, MI. Although I stand here today on the floor of the U.S. Senate, in my heart I stand with the auto workers of Flint, MI. They know the history of work, the auto workers of Flint, MI.

It was the auto workers of Flint, MI, who, on December 30, 1936, called another strike against the same company, General Motors. The goal of that strike was simple, too. All the strikers wanted was for GM to recognize the union. For over 6 weeks, the auto workers of Flint, MI, stopped production in the famous Sit-Down Strike of 1937. They slept on unfinished car seats and ate what food their families could slip through the factory windows. The auto workers of Flint, MI, faced tear gas, heat shutoffs, and company security guards. Led by their new 29-year-old president of Local 174, a man named Walter Reuther, and the great union leader, John L. Lewis, the auto workers of Flint, MI, prevailed.

Because the auto workers of Flint, MI, were willing to strike, the auto industry was forever challenged. Because the auto workers of Flint, MI, were willing to strike, over the years the automotive industry became a source of good jobs with good benefits and the Nation prospered. GM was the most successful auto maker in the world when it paid the highest wages, not the lowest. Americans want to be the beneficiaries of a more competitive firm, not their victims. And that is exactly why the auto workers of Flint, MI, walk the picket lines today.