

No one in this body is naive enough to believe this is going to happen overnight, that these changes we talk about are necessarily going to occur at the pace we would like to see. But, at the very least, we must begin making strides in that direction.

For those reasons, while I will support various amendments that I think are an important expression of how my constituents feel in Connecticut and how the American public feels on a number of very important non trade-related issues, when this debate is concluded, I happen to believe it would be in the best interests of my Nation that we grant this status to China in the hopes that the improvements we all seek in this land of more than 1 billion people will occur sooner rather than later.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon on Monday, September 11, the Senate resume consideration of Senator BYRD's amendment regarding subsidies. Further, I ask unanimous consent that there be 60 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form with no amendments in order to the amendment. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following the debate time, the amendment be set aside, with a vote to occur on the amendment at a time determined by the majority leader after consultation with the Democratic leader.

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that when Senator BYRD offers an amendment relating to safeguards, there be 3 hours for debate equally divided in the usual form, with no amendments in order to the amendment. Further, I ask consent, following that debate time, the vote occur on the amendment at a time to be determined by the majority leader after consultation with the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

THE DEMOCRATS ARE NOT STALLING

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished Senator from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, came to the floor to respond to an article that appeared in the newspaper, USA Today. I want to take just a moment to respond to the article, as well as to some of his comments. He responded, I think, as I would if I had read the article. It is entitled, "Senate Democratic Leader Plans Stalling Tactics," and makes reference to the fact that we are running out of time at the end of the year and it claims to know that I have a simple

strategy for winning the final negotiations over spending bills—and I am now reading from the article: "Stall until the Republicans have to cave in because they can't wait any longer to recess," and noted there are a lot more vulnerable Republican Senators than there are Democratic Senators.

As often is the case—I don't blame this reporter, and I am not sure I know who the reporter is—I think that was taken from a comment that I made in my daily press conference, where I simply noted that those who were in the majority oftentimes are the ones who pay a higher price the longer we are in session, the closer we get to the election, noting that we have experienced that rude realization ourselves on at least two occasions, in 1980 and 1994, and that the longer one goes into the campaign season while we are still in session, the more it requires that Senators remain present here in Washington and not available for the demands of a rigorous campaign.

That was all I said. I made no reference to our desire to stall anything. In fact, it is not. The reason I have come to the floor is to emphasize our strong hope that we do not see any stalling whatsoever; that we move on with the remaining appropriations bills. Eleven of them have yet to be signed into law. I note for the record that two have not even left subcommittee. The District of Columbia appropriations bill and the HUD-VA bill are still pending in the subcommittee.

We finished our work on the energy and water appropriations bill this week. It would be my hope that we could go to the only other pending appropriations bill on the calendar, which is the Commerce-State-Justice bill, next week. I do not know that is the intention of the majority leader, but clearly it is a bill that must be considered and completed at the earliest possible date.

Our hope is that as we work through these appropriations bills, we will have the opportunity to work through other pieces of unfinished business. We are hopeful we can make real progress, maybe as early as next week, on the minimum wage bill. Our hope is that we can finish our work next week on the legislation granting permanent normal trade relations to China. Our hope is that we can actually finish a Patients' Bill of Rights bill and maybe gun safety legislation. Our hope is that we can deal with the prescription drug benefit bill. There is an array of pieces of the unfinished agenda that we would love to be able to address—education issues having to do with reducing the number of students in every class, hiring teachers, afterschool programs, school construction. Those issues have to be addressed at some point.

Whether it is authorizing or appropriating, we remain ready and willing

to work with our colleagues to accomplish as much as possible. I do not know whether or not it is conducive to that goal not to have votes on Fridays or Mondays. It seems to me, with all the work that remains, Senators should be here casting their votes and participating fully in debates that will be required ultimately if we are going to complete our work on time.

I come to the floor this afternoon only to clarify the record and ensure that if anybody has any doubt, let me address that doubt forthrightly. We want to finish our work. We want to work with our Republican colleagues. We have no desire to stall anything. Our hope is that we can finish on time and complete all 13 appropriations bills no later than the first of October. There is no need for a continuing resolution. We can complete our work in the next 3 weeks. That is our desire, and that certainly will be our intent as we make decisions with regard to what agreements we can reach on schedule, as well as on substance, in the coming days.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under consideration is H.R. 4444 and the Smith amendment No. 4129.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 2000

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I again ask why the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000 is being held up. Senator CAMPBELL and I, and others, both Republicans and Democrats, introduced this bulletproof vest bill to help our police officers. We introduced it last April. It was stuck in the Judiciary Committee for a time despite my requests that it be brought forth. It finally was allowed on the agenda and was passed out of there unanimously in June.

I find it hard to think that anybody who would be opposed to using some of our Federal crime-fighting money for bulletproof vests for our police officers. In fact, most Senators with whom I have talked, Republican and Democrat, tell me they are very much in favor of it. They saw how this worked in its first 2 years of operation. The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program under the original Campbell-Leahy bill funded more than 180,000 new bulletproof vests for police officers across the Nation.

We have a bill, though, that has been stalled, unfortunately, by an anonymous hold on the Republican side. This is a bipartisan bill that is being held up in a partisan fashion.