

helped guide the people of that delegation at the Convention to a resolution concerning this great document, and one who helped, along with John Jay and James Madison, to write those, if I might use the word, "immortal" papers, the Federalist Papers. He helped to win the approval of the State of New York for the Constitution.

There is no one with whom I would rather, very honestly, discuss this particular subject in the Senate than the Senator from New York because I am so opposed to the view that he has just expressed. I am so opposed to it. I could with much greater passion say that if it were someone else.

I respect the Senator. I admire him. I know he was and is the great teacher. I wish I had had the good fortune to sit in a class and listen to Senator MOYNIHAN speak as a Professor.

I am proud to say that I had much to do with Senator MOYNIHAN's being a member of the Finance Committee, as he also had to do with my becoming majority leader.

But I am very, very much opposed to this approach. I am very, very much opposed to and somewhat chagrined and disappointed, I say with due apologies to my friend, at the philosophy which seems to govern the Senate at the moment with respect to this legislation, with respect to not adopting amendments.

The distinguished Senator has had no hesitancy whatever. He is not doing something behind closed doors or under the table or under the desk, but sitting it on front of the desk: This we are doing and this is why we are doing it.

He honestly believes that is the best for his country. I admire that. I respect the Senator for that forthrightness. He would not be otherwise but forthright. I respect his reasons, therefore. However, I cannot agree with him. I am totally, absolutely, unchangeably, unalterably set in my viewpoint that this is not the right thing to do; it is not in accordance with the Constitution of the United States; it is not in accordance with the wishes, the intentions of the framers. So be it. I am not going to argue that point. We will just disagree and be as great friends as we have ever been. And the Senator will win when we cast our final vote on this. His conscience will be clear and mine will be clear.

My State has lost under these trade agreements—GATT. Our country has lost under NAFTA. It is my understanding that we have lost 440,000 workers in this country as a result of NAFTA. Those are the statistics my staff has been able to get from the administration.

As I say, I will not belabor the point further. I thank the distinguished Senator for leadership that he has given the Senate. He is a man who has always enjoyed the respect of his colleagues whether he agrees or disagrees

in a particular matter. He doesn't go out of this Chamber and carry it with him. We all love him, and we will all hate to see him go. But I will say to him, of his illustrious words that have been spoken in the Senate so many times, I have very carefully listened to them, and they will never dim from my memory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York's time has expired.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I ask for an additional 1 minute to thank my illustrious, incomparable colleague for his remarks.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, inasmuch as no Senator seeks recognition, and there is a little time remaining before the Senate goes back to the appropriations bill dealing with energy and water, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not to exceed 10 minutes without the time being charged against time under the rule.

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

#### FAITH AND POLITICS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Vice President GORE on his particularly fine choice of a running mate for the coming Fall election.

JOE LIEBERMAN is an able Senator. More importantly, he is a sincere and thoughtful Senator. He really fits no ideological sleeve, although some are already busily trying to label him. JOE LIEBERMAN is his own man, I believe. He follows his own conscience, I am confident of that, as even these early days of the Presidential campaign have already demonstrated.

Senator LIEBERMAN has firmly gripped the national political steering wheel, and he is bravely addressing one of the more fundamental issues before this Nation, namely the erosion of faith-based values from public life and public policy and the consequences of that regrettable loss.

On July 17, I took this Senate floor to express my own general concern and alarm over the direction this nation seems to be taking when it comes to spiritual values. My speech on that occasion was aimed in particular at a recent Supreme Court decision regarding voluntary prayer at a high school football game, but my remarks reflected my long-held general view that the Supreme Court has gone too far on such matters, and has increasingly misinter-

preted the Framers intent regarding the establishment clause and perhaps more to the point the free exercise clause of the first amendment.

During my remarks, I called for a Constitutional amendment which might help to clarify the Framers' intentions. I even wrote to both Presidential candidates, with the hope of focusing attention on the matter, and thereby starting a national conversation about the proper place of religion in our public life, in our political life, in our country's life.

My friend, JOE LIEBERMAN, has done this Nation a great service by making his belief that faith-based principles and religion must and ought to have a place in our national policy and in our discussions about directions and priorities.

To my utter amazement, however, JOE LIEBERMAN has been misunderstood, and even maligned by some.

My colleague, now a candidate for the second highest office in the land, is not trying to force his religion or any religion down the throats of any unwilling recipient. Nor is JOE LIEBERMAN claiming, at least I do not read his remarks in this way, that a person cannot be moral if that person is not religious—even though I have to say that George Washington made it clear that without religion, morality cannot prevail; George Washington, in his Farewell Address. So, upon that authority I would rest my case. JOE LIEBERMAN is simply saying that in trying to assure that no one is coerced into embracing any one religion, or any religion, for that matter, the pendulum may have swung too far. JOE LIEBERMAN is simply expressing his own, and many other people's views, that it sometimes appears that persons of religious faith are not allowed their full freedom to practice and live their various faiths as their consciences dictate. He wants to have a national conversation about that, and I applaud his courage, for it is a subject easily misunderstood.

Political correctness gets in the way of all too many things in this country of ours. I am not a subscriber of political correctness by any means, shape or form. It has gotten in the way of an honest and open dialogue about how to allow for the open expression of faith-based values and practices for those who want those things in their lives, without infringing on the rights and beliefs of those who don't.

In my humble opinion, we must, as a Nation have this dialogue. The pendulum has swung too far. The Framers did not intend surely for a totally secular society to be forced on the populace by government policy. They only wished for individuals to be free to embrace whatever faith they wished, or none at all, if they desired none.

Prayer abounds throughout the speeches of our great men. References

to God virtually drip from our public buildings, and invocations of the Creator's blessing crop up at every important public gathering throughout our history. We have wandered off the Framers' track on this, and we need to work toward a better understanding of what was intended, what was to be protected and why.

I hope that our fine colleague, Mr. LIEBERMAN, continues to try to further the conversation. Not to do so would be detrimental. I fear that the misunderstanding about this issue is huge and growing. There is a new sort of intolerance about religion that I find most disturbing. It has become the thing we don't talk about, because it is not politically correct, so many of us are driven into a closet. It is seen as a divider in our culture, instead of the force for good it certainly can and should be.

Where we do not want to go, and where we have rapidly been heading, is toward an instituted governmental policy which is prejudiced against all religion. We need to think long and hard about this together, as a country. How sadly ironic it would be if, after over 200 years, a nation grounded in religion and founded by religious men and women, with shining faith-based ideals about equality, fairness, freedom, and justice, and decades of effort to make those ideals a reality, wound up reflecting in its laws and policies a prejudice against religion and religious people.

---

#### SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN'S INJURY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor—I seek recognition again for 1 minute simply to express my joy in seeing my friend and our illustrious, highly respected, and able colleague, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, back with us on the floor today. We are sorry that misfortune has for the moment seen fit to not deal with her fairly, but in time all will be corrected and I am sure she will be just as always, as new. She is a fine Senator. She is a great friend of mine. I consider her to be someone we should all try to emulate. It might be very difficult for some of us to emulate her. But we are proud of her, proud of the work she does. I salute her today, and I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I very much appreciate those comments. Last Friday night, I took a tumble down stone stairs and managed to have a compound fracture of my tibia and crack a couple of ribs, so I can't say I am none the worse for wear, but I thank the Senator very much for his warm words. I greatly appreciate it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for some time in morning business for the purposes of introducing a bill.

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

The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mrs. FEINSTEIN and Mr. SPECTER pertaining to the introduction of S. 3007 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, under rule XXII of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that my hour to speak under cloture for the motion to proceed be yielded to Senator MOYNIHAN.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a postcloture situation on the motion to proceed to the PNTR.

---

#### TO AUTHORIZE EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. THOMAS. I will proceed with PNTR on that basis. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4444, a bill to establish permanent normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China.

Let me begin today by disposing of the principle argument offered by opponents of this bill—that this bill somehow is a "gift" to the PRC, a reward. To hear the opponents of this bill talk, you would think that we were on the losing end of this equation.

However, examining the basic facts shows there is a fatal flaw in that assertion. Our markets are already open to the Chinese and to Chinese goods;

the same is not true about our ability to enter China's markets. This bill, and the accompanying accession of China to the WTO, changes that. This bill opens up their markets to the United States. This bill lowers tariff and non-tariff barriers to our goods and services. This bill gives us a level playing field. In other words, it is a win-win situation for the United States.

It is estimated that in the first year after this bill is enacted, and China accedes to the WTO, our trade with China will increase by \$14 billion; in other words, almost double today's volume. And that translates into more jobs for U.S. workers and U.S. companies.

To use my home State of Wyoming, as an example, which is not a large export State, China ranked as Wyoming's 15th largest export destination in 1999; that is up from 16th in 1998 and 19th in 1997. Our largest exports are agricultural products, such as beef, grains, and, in addition to that, minerals.

Under this agreement, Wyoming farmers and cattlemen will no longer have to compete with export subsidies China uses to make its agricultural products unfairly competitive. China has agreed to eliminate sanitary requirements which are not based on sound scientific bases and which act as artificial barriers to products from America's Northwest, which includes Wyoming. Wyoming producers will benefit from a broadening of the right to import and distribute imported products in China, and from wide tariff cuts on a wide range of products.

To illustrate, under the agreement, China has cut its tariff on beef from 45 percent to 12 percent. It has cut its tariff on pork from 20 percent to 12 percent. And, significantly for a great number of my constituents in Sweetwater County, it will reduce its exorbitant tariffs on soda ash—90 percent of which is mined in Wyoming—from double-digits to 5.5 percent.

Passage of this bill means fewer barriers to U.S. exports. Fewer barriers mean more exports, and more exports mean more jobs for Wyoming farmers, ranchers, cattlemen and small business owners.

I don't need to tell my colleagues about the present sorry economic state of many of our agricultural sectors and small businesses. The key to their continuing viability and growth is increasing their share of foreign markets. It is for that principal reason that I support this bill and for China to go into the WTO. Clearly, it is going to be more advantageous for us to deal with the People's Republic of China through this organization than on a unilateral basis which we have done for the last number of years. By the way, this same trade arrangement has been available to them on an annual basis.

Let me make one more observation before moving on. Defeating the bill will not keep the PRC out of the WTO.