

they are warned about the dangers of this when the recruiters are out there to try to prevent this from happening in the first place; and an emphasis on how you can get economic development from microenterprise to opportunities for women. Part of the problem is the way in which women are so devalued in too many nations. Also, the grinding poverty.

Second, protection. The bitter, bitter, bitter irony, colleagues, is that quite often the victims are the ones who are punished, and these mobsters and criminals who are involved in the trafficking of these women and girls with this blatant exploitation get away with literally murder.

One of the problems is that these girls and women can't step forward because then they will be deported. So we have an extension of temporary visas for up to 3 years for the women, girls, and a final decision is made as to whether or not they can stay in the country.

In addition, there is some help for them. We have in Minnesota the Center for the Treatment of Torture Victims. It is a holy place. It is a spiritual place. Most of these women and men come from Africa. They have been through a living hell. We read about child soldiers. We read about what is happening. It takes a long time for people to be able to rebuild their lives when they have been through this, when they have been tortured.

There are 120 governments today in the world that are engaged in this systematic use of torture today; the same thing for these women and girls. Imagine what it is like for them. There is help for them.

Finally, prosecution, and taking this seriously, treating it as a crime so, for example, if you are trafficking a young girl under the age of 14 and forcing her into prostitution, you face a life sentence in prison.

And finally, not automatic sanctions but a listing of those governments which are involved in the trafficking, which have turned their gaze away and refused to do anything about it. With it being up to a President, be he Democrat or Republican or she a Democrat or Republican, in the future, as to whether or not there is an action to be taken.

It is a good piece of legislation. I think Senator BROWNBACK is right. I think it is the human rights legislation to pass the Congress. It will pass. Mr. Koh, Assistant Secretary of Human Rights at the State Department, has been great. The administration has been supportive. We have had a lot of support from Democrats and Republicans here, and I really feel good about it.

I said to Senator BROWNBACK, I think Senator BENNETT can appreciate this because I think he is like this—the first part I don't want to say is his

view—but there are some days where I just cannot decide whether or not I have really been able to help anybody. You try, but you just sometimes get so frustrated. I think this piece of legislation we passed will help a lot of people. I really do, I say to Senator BROWNBACK. I think it is a good model for other governments, other countries. I am not being grandiose here. I think we can get this out to a lot of fellow legislators in other nations and other NGOs. I know there is a lot of interest.

I rise to speak about this bill, to tell my colleague from Kansas, Senator BROWNBACK, I appreciated working with him, and to say to the Senate—all the Senators; after all, this passed by unanimous consent—thank you, thank you for your support.

THE DEBATE ON CHINA

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, if it is OK with Senator BROWNBACK, I want to briefly respond to my colleague from Montana. I will do it under 10 minutes, to anticipate the debate we are going to have on China.

I think some of this debate has already become confused. My father was born in Odessa, Ukraine, then moved to Russia in the Far East Siberia. His father was a latter trying to stay ahead of the czarist troops—Jewish. He then moved to Harbin, then to Peking, then came over to the United States of America when he was 17, in 1914, 3 years before the revolution. He then was going to go back, because first it was the Social Democrats but then the Bolsheviks, the Communists, took over, and his family told him not to come back. I believe his father lost all of his family to Stalin. I think they were all murdered, because all the letters stopped.

My father is no longer alive. He spoke 10 languages fluently and was really—you would have liked him, Mr. President.

My father taught me that we should value human rights. Our country is a leader in this area. When we turn our gaze away from the persecution of people and the violation of human rights of people in the world, we diminish ourselves.

This debate we are going to have after Labor Day is not about whether or not we should have trade with China. We have trade with China. We have a tremendous amount of trade. In fact, we have a huge trade deficit, I think to the tune of about \$70 billion.

It is not about whether we should have an embargo of China like an embargo of Cuba. I don't think the embargo of Cuba makes much sense, and certainly no one I know is recommending an embargo of China.

It is not about whether or not we want to isolate China. China is not going to be isolated. China is very much a part of the international economy.

The debate is about whether or not we maintain for ourselves the right to annually review trade relations with China so we at least have some small amount of leverage when it comes to human rights.

According to the State Department report last year on human rights in China:

The Government's poor human rights record deteriorated markedly throughout the year, as the Government intensified efforts to suppress dissent, particularly organized dissent. Abuses includes instances of extrajudicial killings, torture, mistreatment of prisoners, and denial of due process.

The Commission on Religious Freedom chaired by David Saperstein recommended that we not automatically grant normal trade relations with China because of the religious persecution in China and laid out a series of criteria that should be met, and that will be the first amendment I will introduce.

Yes, to us giving China most favored nation status. But not until they at least meet basic, simple, elementary criteria so the people in China have the right to practice their religion. Are we going to turn our gaze away from that?

According to Amnesty International, "throughout China mass summary executions continue to be carried out. At least 6,000 death sentences and 3,500 executions were officially recorded last year."

The real figures are believed to be much higher.

In the debate, I will talk about Wei Jingsheng and Harry Wu—people, in addition to these statistics. But let me be clear to my colleagues. After all the discussion about all the economic relations having led to opening up society and it has all changed, the human rights record has deteriorated. There is not one Senator who can come to the floor and make the argument that, because of trade relations—I understand investment opportunities making a lot of money—the human rights record has improved in China, or that the situation in Tibet has improved, or that people now can practice their religion. It is not true. Don't we want to maintain just a little bit of leverage and just say we have the right to annually review our trade relations with China?

One other point. I think what you are going to see is not more exports to China. I am going to hold every single Senator and I am going to hold the administration accountable as well.

The President came to my State of Minnesota. He said we were going to have all these exports in agriculture, and it was going to help out family farmers who were struggling to survive. I don't know if that is going to be the case. There are 700 million farmers in China. I do know this. What is more likely to happen is there will be more exports in China and multinational corporations will go to China and

China will become even more of a low-wage export platform or, for that matter, you will have large grain companies producing corn in China well below the cost of production for family farmers in our own country.

Wal-Marts pay 14 cents an hour. Other U.S. companies pay 5 cents and 6 cents an hour. If you should try to organize a union in China, you would wind up in prison.

So I will have three other amendments, and I will yield the floor on this. I will have an amendment that deals with forced prison labor conditions in China and says: Enough of this, if we are going to have normal trade relations. I will have another amendment that says the people in China should have the right to form independent unions and not wind up in prison. And I will have a final amendment that will basically say that in our State, our workers should have the right to organize; there should be labor law reform; no longer should it just be the company that gets to talk to employees during an organizing drive; no longer should companies be able to illegally fire workers, have it be profitable, and not have to pay stiff back penalties, back fines.

We are forever being told now that we live in a global economy. And that is true. But the implications of that statement are seldom recognized. To me that means, if we truly care about human rights, we can no longer just be concerned about human rights at home. If we live in a global economy and we truly care about religious freedom, then we can no longer just be concerned about religious freedom at home. If we are in a global economy and we truly care about the rights of organizers to organize and be able to make a decent living so they can take care of their families, then we have to be concerned not just about the rights of organizers in our country but organizers in the world. And if we truly care about the environment, then we can no longer concern ourselves with just environmental protections at home, but environmental protections in other countries as well.

Do you know that a large majority of the Senate is all for this—automatically extending normal trade relations with China or most favored nation trade status? Do you know what the polls show? The polls show Americans oppose eliminating any review of China's human rights record by 65 to 18 percent; 67 percent oppose China's admission to the WTO, although that is not what this debate will be about; and 83 percent of the people in our country support inclusion of strong environmental and labor standards in future trade agreements.

My colleague—1 minute left—my colleague from Montana, whom I enjoy, said: I am going to call on all Senators to vote against all amendments.

I am going to tell Senators a lot of these amendments are substantive and they are serious. Look at what we had happen on several of these tax bills, the majority leader came out after we had passed amendments and then introduced an amendment that wiped out all those amendments.

I am going to remind Senators of that precedent. I am going to remind Senators that you cannot go back home and explain with much credibility to the people you represent that you would not vote for the people in China to have the right to practice their religion; you would not vote for basic support for human rights; you would not vote for people to organize a union and not wind up in prison; you would not vote for labor law reform because you said: Oh, well, you see, we had to go into conference committee and we had to keep it clean and I could not vote for that.

A, that is not true; B, it is the ultimate Washington insider argument. One has to vote for what one thinks is right. One has to vote for the substance of each one of these amendments. That is the challenge I present to my colleagues. I look forward to this debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BROWNBACK pertaining to the introduction of S. 2982 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Washington.

THE NEED FOR PIPELINE LEGISLATION

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, on June 15, under the leadership of Chairman MCCAIN, the Senate Commerce Committee passed a bill reauthorizing and amendment the Pipeline Safety Act. This bill is, in my view, the single most important piece of legislation the committee will address this session. Following a June 10, 1999, accident in Bellingham, WA, that killed three children, blackened a magnificent city park, and sent shock waves through the community and State, Senator MURRAY and I have been working in front of and behind the scenes to see

the Federal law regulating the operation of pipelines is changed; that communities and citizens are better informed about pipelines; that States can obtain a clear role in the oversight of interstate pipelines; that the Federal Office of Pipeline Safety adopts more meaningful safety standards; and that funding is increased for Federal and State pipeline safety operations.

While we are well on our way to accomplishing this last goal—the Senate has provided a significant increase in funding for the Office of the Pipeline Safety, and I have earmarked matching Federal funds for Washington State to supplement the funds appropriated by the State legislature for expanded safety activities—securing passage of the authorizing legislation has proven more difficult. I come to the floor to tell my colleagues that I will not rest in seeking the enactment of meaningful legislation this year. I am by nature a determined man, and my resolve on this issue has been strengthened by the example set by the Mayor of Bellingham, whose interest in this matter has not been half-hearted or expedient, but who has devoted and continues to devote time, resources, and thought to what we can do to make pipelines safer. I am committed to seeing that his efforts and my own are not in vain.

The bill that passed the Commerce Committee is a good one. It makes meaningful changes in Federal law. S. 2438 requires the Federal Office of Pipeline Safety to implement the recommendations of the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation by completing rulemakings that are long overdue, collecting better information to determine the causes of pipeline accidents, and providing better training to OPS inspectors. It accelerates the deadline for operators to prepare plans for training and qualifying their employees. It requires that information about pipeline incidents and safety-related conditions be made available to the public and that operators work with local communities to educate them about the location and risks of pipelines and what to do in case of an accident. The bill increases fines for violations, and explicitly provides a role for States in the oversight of interstate pipelines. It provides more funding for the Office of Pipeline Safety and direction on areas of research and development to focus on to improve safety.

In addition, the bill imposes on operators of pipelines of any length—not just longer pipelines as suggested by the administration—an obligation to conduct risk analyses and to adopt integrity management plans for high consequence areas—plans that provide for periodic assessments of pipelines' integrity. S. 2438 ensures that OPS will have easier access to operator information, and lowers the liquid spill reporting threshold to 5 gallons. It creates a