

of H.R. 4444, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4444) to authorize extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People's Republic of China, and to establish a framework for relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Wellstone amendment No. 4118, to require that the President certify to Congress that the People's Republic of China has taken certain actions with respect to ensuring human rights protection.

Wellstone amendment No. 4119, to require that the President certify to Congress that the People's Republic of China is in compliance with certain Memoranda of Understanding regarding prohibition on import and export of prison labor products.

Wellstone amendment No. 4120, to require that the President certify to Congress that the People's Republic of China has responded to inquiries regarding certain people who have been detained or imprisoned and has made substantial progress in releasing from prison people incarcerated for organizing independent trade unions.

Wellstone amendment No. 4121, to strengthen the rights of workers to associate, organize and strike.

Smith (of N.H.) amendment No. 4129, to require that the Congressional-Executive Commission monitor the cooperation of the People's Republic of China with respect to POW/MIA issues, improvement in the areas of forced abortions, slave labor, and organ harvesting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the distinguished ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator MOYNIHAN, and myself have been here for several hours for the purpose of making progress on the consideration of the permanent normal trade relations with China. We both agreed that this is the most important vote we will face this year. In fact, it may be the most important vote we have had this decade. But I am deeply concerned that we are not having any of our colleagues making themselves available to come down to bring up the amendments that they say they want to offer.

Time is running out. This is the third day we have been on this bill. I thought we made some very good progress yesterday. We considered a number of amendments. But it is absolutely critically important that we continue to make that kind of progress today and next week.

I point out that the regular order of business is that if there are no amendments we ought to proceed to the vote on the legislation itself.

I want every Senator to have the opportunity to offer any amendments they may care to offer because there is no question about the importance of this legislation. But we cannot wait indefinitely. I ask my friends on both

sides—on the Republican side and on the Democratic side—who have amendments that they want to offer on this critically important piece of legislation to please come down now. Time is running out.

Would the Senator from New York not agree with that?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I wholly agree with the statement by our revered chairman of the Finance Committee. The operative part of this measure is two pages. It is a simple statement. It came out from the Finance Committee almost unanimously.

Mr. ROTH. That is correct.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. That would be four months ago, in mid-May. There has been plenty of time to examine it. The House bill has a few additional features we find attractive and which we think we could adopt and send right to the President who would sign it. It is a bipartisan measure.

There are those who do not want this legislation.

It has been avowedly, unashamedly, and legitimately their desire to prolong the debate until time runs out. If they could just add one amendment, the measure would have to go back to the House, then to conference, then to the floor. Time would run out.

We have passed two appropriations bills. We are in a Presidential election year. That election is less than 60 days away. The desire to get back to our constituencies is legitimate and proper. Therefore, the device of delay is a legitimate, recognized, and familiar strategy.

However, this is not a matter on which to delay. The Chairman was absolutely right, this may be the most important vote we take this decade. In my opening statement, I referred to the testimony of Ira Shapiro, our former Chief Negotiator for Japan and Canada at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. He, just by chance, concluded his testimony, in the last testimony we heard, as it happened:

... [this vote] is one of an historic handful of Congressional votes since the end of World War II. Nothing that Members of Congress do this year—or any other year—could be more important.

Well, let us be about it. We look around and we are happy to see our friend from South Dakota, Senator JOHNSON, who wishes to speak on behalf of the measure. We welcome any other Member who wishes to speak. We have heard many. The real matter before the Senate is those who wish to offer amendments. A good friend, a distinguished Senator, the chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, laid down a measure last evening. We had to juggle our schedule to go to the water appropriations measure. But he is not here this morning. He claimed a place—which is fine, legitimately—but the place is empty. When I arrived, as when the Chairman

arrived, looking to start the amendment process, no one was here.

Now, sir, there can be only one response, and the Chairman has stated it. On Tuesday, I hope the Majority Leader will move to close debate by invoking cloture. It is a process with which we are familiar. We are not cutting off amendments; amendments will be in order afterwards. But we are sitting here asking for amendments, and none comes forward. This matter is of the utmost gravity, urgency, the issues that are in balance, and not just economic issues but political, military issues of the most important level. That is what is at stake. If nobody wishes to debate it, let's proceed to a final vote.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, let me say to my distinguished colleague, I could not agree more with his statement as to the importance of offering any amendments Members desire to offer. I am told we have actually been on this bill 4 days this week.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. And before we had the August recess.

Mr. ROTH. And before we had the August recess, we had discussion; that is correct.

I say to Senator MOYNIHAN, I think it is important we take some time today. I am delighted our friend from South Dakota is here. We will call upon him to make his remarks. I think it is important that the American people fully understand why this legislation is of such critical importance. It is important to our economy and to our growth. It is particularly important to provide better and more jobs to the working people of America. I can't stress how much I think it is important to agriculture in my little State of Delaware.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Did you say the "little State of Delaware"? Do you mean the first State to ratify the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. ROTH. You are absolutely right. I stand corrected.

In my State of Delaware, the people are waiting to see action on this.

For farmers, take poultry. It is critically important to the economy of my State. China is the second largest importer of poultry and has offered to cut the tariff in half. This makes a tremendous opportunity.

The same thing with automobiles. I bet the Senator didn't know this.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I bet I did, sir, because I heard it from your very self several times. I believe you are the second largest producer of automobiles in the Nation.

Mr. ROTH. We have more workers, percentage-wise, than any other State, including Michigan. There are significant concessions made with respect to automobiles.

Chemicals, likewise, are critically important to my State.

After my distinguished friend from South Dakota finishes, it might be

worthwhile to spell out to the American people why this legislation is of such critical importance.

Perhaps we ought to recognize Senator JOHNSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senators from Delaware and New York.

Mr. President, my purpose today is to share some thoughts about the critical importance of PNTR legislation. Because my good friend and colleague from Idaho, just prior to my opportunity this morning, discussed the role of my good colleague from South Dakota, Senator DASCHLE, relative to the timing of legislation, I do feel compelled to make a remark or two in that regard.

No one in this body has done more than Senator DASCHLE of South Dakota to move legislation forward in an expeditious and well-timed manner. Whether it is PNTR, where Senator DASCHLE has for months been trying to bring this bill to the floor, or the Patients' Bill of Rights, prescription drugs, school construction, minimum wage, and down the entire list of legislative agenda items before this body, Senator DASCHLE has been tireless in his efforts to bring them to the floor, to have consideration in a full manner. For anyone to suggest that somehow our good colleague from South Dakota would be playing some role in slowing down progress on these or other matters, I think, is a point simply not correct.

I comment as well that while the President of the United States is seeking additional fuel from Saudi Arabia, it strikes me, and strikes others who are not concerned about the partisan politics of this, that is what we would expect the President of the United States to be doing at this summit conference in New York—trying to address the various components of energy policy necessary to reduce costs and increase the availability of fuel for American consumers. If the President were not doing that, there is no doubt there would be criticism leveled at him for doing nothing to negotiate and use American leverage with our OPEC neighbors and the world.

I think some of this discussion earlier this morning has to be seen and evaluated in light of the fact that we are in this last month or two before a Presidential election. The partisan swords clearly have been drawn this morning. I should never be shocked at that, I suppose, particularly in an election year at this time of the year. But it is my hope that through all of this partisan political rhetoric, the American public will see through that. I think it is transparent.

We need to work together in a bipartisan fashion. One of the things I am pleased about this morning is the bipartisan nature of our support for per-

manent normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China. Our distinguished colleague, Senator MOYNIHAN, who, among his other talents, is perhaps the finest scholar in this body—for many years, many generations—has observed that this may be one of the half dozen most critically important votes that we as Senators will take since the end of World War II.

Obviously, this issue is of enormous import in terms of economic policy, economic strategy for the United States. It is a win situation for us. It is one sided. They give up limitations against the export of Americans goods. We give up nothing. But even if economic issues were a wash, even if there were not these kinds of obvious economic benefits for the United States, the geopolitical consequences of integrating the People's Republic of China's 1.3 billion people into the world rule of law, into the international community of nations to help stabilize the ongoing process of democratization and the free flow of ideas and scholars and business leaders is, in itself, reason enough for support for permanent normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China.

So I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 4444, legislation which would grant PNTR to the People's Republic of China. In the past, Congress has had to pass legislation each and every year to ensure mutually beneficial relations between our two nations. Now we have reached the point where permanent normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China is appropriate and will help pave the way for the World Trade Organization, WTO, membership for the PRC, and will strike a blow for the rule of law throughout the world.

I am joining the leadership of both parties to oppose all amendments to PNTR, due to the very late stage of the congressional session in which we are taking up this bill. Many Senators will offer important amendments to H.R. 4444 concerning worker's rights, religious freedom, and human rights in the PRC. I support efforts to improve China's human rights record, the right of workers to organize, and religious freedom in China. But, I believe that jeopardizing H.R. 4444 is exactly the wrong approach. As a nation, we have attempted to promote global human rights, democracy, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion. While each nation ultimately determines for itself whether to pursue democracy and other American-supported values, I support efforts to open China to trade with democratic cultures. I am also opposed, obviously, to religious persecution and will support efforts to discourage it in China. However, there are other pieces of legislation that can be used to achieve these goals. The PNTR bill must be adopted in an amendment-free fashion if we are to avoid its ulti-

mate defeat. With few days remaining in Congress, a PNTR bill adopted by the Senate that differs from the clean bill passed in the House of Representatives would force us to convene a conference committee to iron out the bill's differences. The result—significant delay which would be compounded by the margin in which the House adopted H.R. 4444 in May. Sending PNTR back to the House for another vote very likely means its ultimate defeat for this year. At this late stage in Congress, that is not an acceptable strategy for any of us to endorse.

It is true this vote is of significant importance to family farmers, ranchers, and independent businesses in South Dakota and the entire country. However, this vote means much, much more—I believe this vote signifies one of the most critical geo-political votes the U.S. Senate will take since World War II.

China, with its 1.2 billion people and one of the fastest growing economies in the world, needs to be required to live by the discipline of international law. That is what World Trade Organization—[WTO] membership would mean. China would have to open up its agricultural and other markets to the world, and it would not be permitted to violate international rules on copyright or patents. As a result of PNTR, I believe the presence of western consumer products, the exchange of democratic principles, and the free flow of ideas via technology and internet communication will do more to undermine authoritarian aspects of China's government than any kind of isolation could possibly accomplish—particularly unilateral isolation on the part of the United States. I feel very strongly that we need to build more bridges of understanding and cooperation between western democracies and the PRC, rather than work for the contrary. In the meantime, the biggest winners of all in establishing the same normalized trading relationships with China that we have with almost every other nation on the planet will be American farmers and ranchers and small businesses.

The bilateral deal struck between the United States and China on November 15, 1999 is a completely one-sided trade agreement. China will be required to allow more of our goods into their country, while the United States will not be required to change a thing. Frankly, a failure to enact PNTR will simply mean that every other country in the world would have open access to Chinese markets, but the United States would have virtually none. Since the United States has few barriers to trade, and current trade restrictions are almost exclusively on the part of China and other nations, WTO agreements in general are overwhelmingly to the benefit of the United States.

I have been to China and witnessed first-hand the opportunities for greater

market access there. Since 1998, I have facilitated a series of trade missions to improve relations with China. The relationships we have built in this course of time may open markets for the farmers and ranchers of South Dakota and the United States.

In March of 1998, my office hosted senior trade and agriculture officials from the Chinese Embassy on a trade mission to South Dakota. The officials toured the John Morrell meatpacking plant in Sioux Falls, the South Dakota Wheat Growers Cooperative in Aberdeen, and the Harvest States Feed Mill in Sioux Falls. During their visit, the Chinese trade officials also witnessed the ingenuity of South Dakota businesses like Gateway of North Sioux City, Daktronics of Brookings, and Wildcat Manufacturing of Freeman. The officials were impressed with our diversified economy and the quality and pride in our products.

In a follow-up mission, in December of 1998, I led a delegation of South Dakota farmers to the PRC. We met with trade officials and scholars at the Ministry of Agriculture, Beijing University, and Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation.

Finally, in May of 1999, a 29-member delegation of Chinese trade officials traveled to South Dakota at my request to further explore agricultural trade opportunities. These Chinese officials met with farm group leaders, toured farming and ranching operations, and visited the South Dakota Soybean Processors plant near Volga.

My visit to China, and discussions with Chinese trade officials, indicate that family farmers and ranchers in South Dakota are ideally situated to help satisfy the needs of China's 1.2 billion residents, who exhibit a growing appetite for a more sophisticated diet. China's agricultural production capabilities just cannot satisfy their people's needs right now, especially considering the country represents a mere 7 percent of the world's arable land.

South Dakota agricultural exports in 1998 reached \$1.1 billion and supported nearly 17,000 jobs. While Congress needs to place a much greater emphasis on improving domestic policies—like reforming the 1996 farm bill—greater access to closed-off markets will provide a boost to our agricultural economy too. Two-thirds of the prosperity or decline in South Dakota agriculture still depends upon a fair marketplace price here at home. I believe Congress has failed to make common sense reforms to the farm bill which may allow farmers to take advantage of a fair market. Nonetheless, one-third of our agricultural economy requires trade with other nations. Under the agreement we struck with China, South Dakota farmers and ranchers will no longer have to compete with unfair tariffs, unscientific bans, and export subsidies on China's agricultural goods.

Beef cattle receipts represent the largest share of South Dakota's agricultural economy. China currently imports very little beef, but a growing middle class and rising demand from urban areas are expected to result in significantly increased demand for beef imports. China has agreed to lower tariffs on beef meat products from 45 to 12 percent, which may mean better returns for independent cattle ranchers in South Dakota. In addition, tariffs on pork imports into China will decline from 20 to 12 percent, aiding South Dakota's pork products as well.

Wheat farmers in South Dakota desire greater access to the Chinese marketplace. As a result of our agreement with China, they will eliminate their unscientific ban on Pacific Northwest wheat imports from the United States. They will also agree to a substantial increase in the amount of wheat they purchase under their tariff rate quota. In 1998 China imported a mere 2 million metric tons of wheat. Our agreement will allow China to purchase up to 9.6 million tons of wheat below tariff rate quotas. In fact, in February of this year, China bought nearly 800,000 bushels of hard red winter and spring wheat from South Dakota and several other wheat growing states. While a relatively small transaction, their commitment to more open trade with the U.S. is exhibited with this purchase.

Furthermore, as a large soybean producer, South Dakota's soybean farmers and farmer-owned processors of soybeans will benefit from a tariff cut China agreed to make on United States soybean exports. South Dakota farmers also produce substantial bushels of feed grain and corn. China agreed to make market-oriented changes to their tariff rate quota system on corn, nearly doubling the amount of corn they import under their tariff quota rate.

While South Dakota agriculture is poised to benefit from greater trade with China, other businesses in our state are set to become major exporters under a more market-oriented trading system granted by PNTR for China as well. In fact, electronics and electronic equipment today comprise 78 percent of total South Dakota exports to China. More than half of the South Dakota firms, 58 percent, that export to China are small and mid-sized enterprises—with fewer than 500 employees—and several are family owned. China will liberalize quotas on manufacturing equipment, information technology products, and electronic goods produced right in South Dakota. This means our computer manufacturers like Gateway and equipment firms like Wildcat Manufacturing will find greater access to that nation.

From 1993 to 1998, South Dakota's exports to China nearly doubled—increasing by over 91 percent. I believe that if the Senate adopts H.R. 4444, South Dakota farmers, ranchers, and businesses

will see tremendous new trade opportunities.

Now is the time for the Senate to take advantage of this historic opportunity before us. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of a clean PNTR bill so that it can be sent to the President and signed into law in a proper fashion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky will indulge me for a 90-second comment, I thank my friend from South Dakota for that superb address of the importance of a mixed economy and the contacts they already have. I ask to be indulged a moment from an academic past.

I was once a colleague and remained a good friend of Raymond Vernon, an economist who developed the theory of the product cycle: How a product begins to be produced in one nation, then will be exported, consumed abroad, then produced abroad and exported back. This goes on.

The soybean—I now have to invoke my age in this regard. I remember as a boy in the 1930s reading in the Reader's Digest about this magic little bean that was grown in China and contained proteins of unimaginable consequence and would some day come to our country and be grown, and we would all be so much healthier and happier.

That happened, and now those very Chinese are coming to South Dakota negotiating the sale of soybeans back to China. This is Vernon's product cycle, part of the dynamism of trade. It is never one way. It goes back and forth, not to be feared, not by us. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to granting permanent normal trade relations to China, and in support of Senator THOMPSON's China Non-proliferation Act.

It is a sad time in the Senate. Soon we are going to vote on extending permanent normal trade relations—PNTR—to China. And it looks like it is going to pass.

If we grant PNTR and give our seal of approval to China's application to join the World Trade Organization, Congress will not only relinquish its best chance to scrutinize China's behavior on a regular basis, but it will also give away what little leverage we have to bring about real, true change in China. I think that is a serious and dangerous mistake.

For years, we have been able to annually debate trade with China in Congress, and to use the debate to discuss the wisdom of granting broad trade privileges to Communist China.

When the Chinese troops massacred the students in Tiananmen Square, or when the Chinese military threatened democracy on neighboring Taiwan, or

when revelations came to light about China spreading weapons of mass destruction to terrorist nations, we had a chance in the House and Senate to shine the spotlight on Communist China.

I served on the House Ways and Means Committee for 8 years, and every year we debated most-favored nation trade—so-called MFN status—for China. Supporters of MFN always had the votes to pass it, but it was still an important opportunity to focus attention on China's misdeeds and to make sure the American public knew about China's dirty little secrets. Now we are going to lose that ability.

I would like to take some time today to talk about why we should not grant PNTR to China and explain my reasons for opposing it. While I know that the votes are probably there to pass PNTR, I want to lay out for the record what is at stake and also to argue that we should at a minimum take the step of also passing Senator THOMPSON's bill to maintain some semblance of accountability for Communist China.

First, let's look at China's record when it comes to arms control and the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

There is no doubt that China's practice of making weapons of mass destruction available to rogue states like North Korea, Iran, and Libya has made the world a more dangerous place.

The commission led by Former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld that recently examined this problem pointed out in its final report that China is "a significant proliferator of ballistic missiles, weapons of mass destruction and enabling technologies."

We know Communist China has sold nuclear components and missiles to Pakistan, missile parts to Libya, cruise missiles to Iran, and that it shared sensitive technologies with North Korea.

In the last few months it has even been reported in the press that China is building another missile plant in Pakistan, and is illegally using American supercomputers to improve its nuclear weapon technology.

Many of these technologies are being used by enemies of America to develop weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them.

In short, Beijing is guilty of spreading the most dangerous weapons imaginable to some of the most treacherous and threatening states on the globe.

That is about as bad as it gets.

From experience, we know that China doesn't change its policies just because we ask them to. China only makes serious non-proliferation commitments under the threat of the actual imposition of sanctions.

We have to hold their feet to the fire. A memorandum from the assistant director at the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to the Clinton White House in 1996 makes the case:

The history of U.S.-China relations shows that China has made specific non-prolifera-

tion commitments only under the threat or imposition of sanctions. Beijing made commitments [to limit missile technology exports] in 1992 and 1994, in exchange for our lifting of sanctions.

Over the years, it is only when the United States has clearly brought economic pressure to bear on China that we have seen real, hard results from Beijing.

For instance, economic pressure in the late 1980s and early 1990s led to China's agreement to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty in 1992.

In 1991, the Bush administration applied sanctions against China after Beijing transferred missile technology to Pakistan. Five months later, China made the commitment to abide by the missile technology control regime.

In 1993, the Clinton administration imposed sanctions on Beijing for the sale of M-11 missile equipment to Pakistan in violation of international arms control agreements. Over a year later, Beijing backed down by agreeing not to export ground-to-ground missiles in exchange for our lifting of sanctions.

Time and time again we have seen that Chinese respond to the stick, and not the carrot. And this experience certainly points to the fact that the threat of sanctions like those in the Thompson bill, and not the olive branch of greater trade, is what the Chinese will respect.

Beijing's behavior has not been much better when it comes to democratic Taiwan.

I have been to Taiwan, and seen how its commitment to democracy and the free market has enabled that country to build one of the most vibrant economies in the world.

Taiwan is a friend of the United States and a good ally.

But time and time again Communist China has rattled its saber and threatened the very existence of free Taiwan. Less than 5 years ago, China actually fired missiles over Taiwan.

Since then China has conducted a massive military buildup across the Taiwan strait.

Last year, CIA Director Tenet reported to Congress that while China claims it doesn't want conflict with Taiwan, "It refuses to renounce the use of force as an option and continues to place its best new military equipment across from the island."

This belligerent attitude threatens not only Taiwan, but more ominously relations throughout East Asia.

The Pentagon's 1998 East Asian strategy report notes that many of "China's neighbors are closely monitoring China's growing defense expenditures and modernization of the People's Liberation Army, including development and acquisition of advanced fighter aircraft; programs to develop mobile ballistic systems, land-attack and anti-ship cruise missiles, and advanced surface-to-air missiles; and a range of power projection platforms."

Recently there seems to have been a thaw in relations between China and Taiwan. This is a hopeful sign. But who knows when Beijing will change course and revert to its belligerent ways. We need to help keep the pressure on.

Eliminating the annual debate on China trade in Congress will remove one of our most effective and high-profile options in pressuring the Chinese. In dealing with an adversary as tenacious and patient as China, this is exactly the wrong philosophy to adopt.

Even more ominous than threats to Taiwan have been recent signs of increased Chinese belligerence toward the United States.

In February, 1999, the CIA reported to Congress that China is developing air and naval systems "intended to deter the United States from involvement in Taiwan and to extend China's fighting capabilities beyond its coastline."

And we should not forget the recent threat from a Chinese general to fire a nuclear weapon at Los Angeles if the United States were to interfere in Taiwan-China relations.

There are even indications that China's military could be anticipating a confrontation with the United States.

In January, 1999, the Washington Times reported that for the first time, China's army conducted mock attacks on United States troops stationed in the Asia-Pacific region.

Intelligence also reported that United States troops in South Korea and Japan were envisioned as potential targets of these practice attacks.

President Reagan used to talk about adopting a policy of peace through strength in approaching the Russians during the cold war. That policy worked then, and it should be the policy we follow in confronting the Chinese.

All of the experts tell us that China potentially poses the strongest military and economic threat to America in the 21st century.

Passing PNTR sends the signal to China that we want trade more than we want peace.

Instead, we should heed the lessons we learned in winning the cold war and understand that the Communist Chinese are more likely to respect our strength than to fear our weakness.

Finally, the strongest case against PNTR can be made based on China's pathetic, indefensible human rights record.

Let me quote from the very first paragraph of our own State Department's most recent report on human rights in China:

The People's Republic of China is an authoritarian state in which the Chinese Communist Party is the paramount source of all power. At the national and regional levels, party members hold almost all top government, police and military positions. Ultimate authority rests with members of the Politburo. Leaders stress the need to maintain stability and social order and are committed to perpetuating the rule of the Communist Party and its hierarchy. Citizens

lack both the freedom peacefully to express opposition to the party-led political system and the right to change their national leaders or form of government.

The report goes on to note that in 1999:

The government's poor human rights record deteriorated markedly throughout the year, as the government intensified efforts to suppress dissent, particularly organized dissent.

That is our own State Department saying that. It doesn't sound like a nation that we want to encourage with expanded trade privileges.

Many of my friends in this body argue that China is making progress on human rights, and that expanded trade and western influence will help turn the tide. They tell me that in China things have improved dramatically in recent years.

I say, tell that to the tens of thousands of members of the Fulan Gong who have been hunted down and punished by Beijing over the past 2 years.

Tell that to the prisoners in China's Gulags who continue to suffer under conditions that, in our own State Department's words, are "harsh" and "degrading".

Tell that to the political dissents who are jailed out without charge only because they threaten the communist party's political dominance.

Tell that to the children who were murdered because of China's brutal one child per family policy.

Tell that to the people of Tibet.

Mr. President, all those who say that things are getting better in China and that PNTR will help improve conditions in China are wrong.

It's been 11 years since the Tiananmen Square Massacre, and the Chinese Government still carries out the same brutal, repressive tactics.

Things aren't getting any better in China. They're only getting worse.

The supporters of PNTR made the same argument year after year during the annual debates on most-favored-nation status for China. And year and year, Beijing showed no sign of changing its ways. None.

In one way, this is a hard vote for me, Mr. President. Many of my friends support expanded trade privileges for China, and they make an enthusiastic argument for expanding access to Chinese markets in order to help American business compete with their overseas competitors.

My gut reaction is to vote for free and expanded trade. In my mind, there isn't any doubt that the world is really drawing closer and closer together, and that it will be through trade that the United States can take advantage of its economic and technological advantages to maintain our dominant position in the world.

But in other, more important, ways this vote is easy is for me—because the issues are so clear when it comes to

China, and because China's behavior has made it so undeserving of improved trade ties with the United States.

Mr. President, I've tried to simplify this issue in my mind and I've boiled it down to a single question that I've asked of everyone I have talked to about China trade:

Why should we give the best trade privileges possible under our law to a communist nation that so clearly threatens us and our values?

We didn't grant most-favored-nation status to Russia during the cold war. But now we are on the verge of passing the most privileged trade status we can give to the communist nation that is bent not only on supplanting America as the dominant economic power in the world, but is also actively supporting dangerous, rogue nations that threaten our citizens and our way of life.

It just doesn't make sense.

In conclusion, I urge a "no" vote on the China PNTR bill, and a "yes" vote on the Thompson bill. The Chinese have not earned the right to trade with us, and they have show no inclination to change their ways.

Senator THOMPSON's proposal is at least a modest attempt to preserve our options and to keep closer tabs on Communist China in case things take a turn for the worse.

For years, the pro-China trade forces have argued that expanding trade with China is the carrot we can use to bring about democratic change in that country. The evidence has proven them wrong time and time again.

Years of continuing MFN, or NTR, or whatever you want to call it haven't changed things in China. When it comes to China, the old saying still holds true: the more things change, the more they stay the same.

Trade has not worked before as a carrot, and it certainly won't work in the future if we remove the stick of annual reviews and possible sanctions. That's why it's so crucial that we pass the China Non-Proliferation Act.

Mr. President, when President Reagan negotiated arms control with the Russians, he used an old Russian phrase to sum up his approach—trust but verify. That strategy worked.

But by granting PNTR we are trusting, but failing to verify. In fact, we are even giving up what little ability we even have to verify. The Chinese certainly haven't given us any reason to take them at their word.

We need to verify and the Thompson bill is our best hope of insuring that China will live up to its word. Otherwise, why should we blindly trust a country that has proven time and time again that it doesn't live or play by the rules.

I yield the floor.

EXTENSION OF VITIATION ORDER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vitiation order with respect to S. 1608 be extended until 2 p.m. today.

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

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACTION, 2001

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, with respect to the energy and water appropriations bill, I ask unanimous consent that two previously submitted amendments, Nos. 4053 and 4054, be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The amendments (Nos. 4053 and 4054) were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4053

(Purpose: To revise planning requirements to make them consistent with sections 3264 and 3291 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act)

On page 83, strike line 20 and all that follows down to the end of page 84, line 23 and insert the following:

"SEC. 309. (a) None of the funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration in this Act or any future Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act may be expended after December 31 of each year under a covered contract unless the funds are expended in accordance with a Laboratory Funding Plan for Nuclear Security that has been approved by the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration as part of the overall Laboratory Funding Plan required by section 310(a) of Public Law 106-60. At the beginning of each fiscal year, the Administrator shall issue directions to laboratories under a covered contract for the programs, projects, and activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration to be conducted at such laboratories in that fiscal year. The Administrator and the laboratories under a covered contract shall devise a Laboratory Funding Plan for Nuclear Security that identifies the resources needed to carry out these programs, projects, and activities. Funds shall be released to the Laboratories only after the Secretary has approved the overall Laboratory Funding Plan containing the Laboratory Funding Plan for Nuclear Security. The Secretary shall consult with the Administrator on the overall Laboratory Funding Plans for Los Alamos National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and Sandia National Laboratories prior to approving them. The Administrator may provide exceptions to requirements pertaining to a Laboratory Funding Plan for Nuclear Security as the Administrator considers appropriate.

"(b) For purposes of this section, 'covered contract' means a contract for the management and operation of the following laboratories: Argonne National Laboratory, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, and Sandia National Laboratories."

AMENDMENT NO. 4054

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section: