

recognize how important this is to our country, to the region, and to the world.

That is why I will continue to urge the Majority Leader to set a firm date to bring the PNTR bill to the floor so we can move this legislation. I ask my colleagues, Republican, as well as Democrat, to join me in delivering that message to the Majority Leader.

Once it comes to the floor, there will likely be a plethora of amendments, some germane and others non-germane. The Senate has its own rights and prerogatives. I will always defend the right of Senators to offer amendments to a bill. But, I am concerned that amendments in the Senate, which would force the bill into a conference with the House, would lead to delaying, and perhaps jeopardizing, final passage of this landmark legislation. We cannot afford such a development.

H.R. 4444 is a very balanced bill. It deals with the major concerns relative to China's entry into the global trading system. Therefore, along with many of my colleagues, I have made a commitment to oppose any amendment to H.R. 4444, no matter how meritorious the amendment might be on its own terms. Prompt passage and enactment of this bill should be a top bipartisan priority. I urge all my colleagues to join me in making the commitment to oppose any attempt to amend this legislation.

H.R. 4444 ensures that future U.S. administrations will closely monitor China's compliance with its WTO obligations and with other trade agreements made with the United States. It will make the administration in the future act promptly in the case of damaging import surges. It provides for a vigorous monitoring of human rights, worker rights, and the import of goods produced by forced or prison labor. H.R. 4444 also provides for technical assistance to help develop the rule of law in China. It enhances the ability of U.S. government radios to broadcast into China. And it states the sense of Congress regarding Taiwan's prompt admission to the WTO.

To repeat, extending PNTR to China is vitally important to America's economic and strategic interests. Our top priority should be a bill approved by the Senate identical to H.R. 4444 so that it can immediately be sent to the President for signature. I hope we complete action rapidly in July.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, June 28, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,649,147,080,050.00 (Five trillion, six hundred forty-nine billion, one hundred forty-seven million, eighty thousand, fifty dollars and no cents).

One year ago, June 28, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,640,294,000,000 (Five trillion, six hundred forty billion, two hundred ninety-four million).

Five years ago, June 28, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,948,205,000,000 (Four trillion, nine hundred forty-eight billion, two hundred five million).

Twenty-five years ago, June 28, 1975, the Federal debt stood at \$535,337,000,000 (Five hundred thirty-five billion, three hundred thirty-seven million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,113,810,080,050.00 (Five trillion, one hundred thirteen billion, eight hundred ten million, eighty thousand, fifty dollars and no cents) during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HOW NOT TO SQUANDER OUR SUPERPOWER STATUS

• Mr. BIDEN. I rise today to comment briefly on an extremely thought-provoking opinion piece by Josef Joffe in the June 20th edition of the New York Times. The article was entitled "A Warning from Putin and Schroeder." It describes how the current global predominance of the United States is being countered by constellations of countries, which include allies and less-friendly powers alike, and how American behavior is aiding and abetting this development.

Mr. Joffe is the co-editor of the prestigious German weekly *Die Zeit*. He received his university education in the United States and is well known and respected in American foreign policy circles. In short, his thoughts are advice from a friend, not hostile criticism from an embittered or jealous antagonist.

The take-off point of the article, from which its headline is derived, was the recent summit meeting in Berlin between German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder and Russian President Vladimir Putin during which Putin employed the classic Muscovite tactic of wooing Europe's key country in an effort to have it join Russia as a counterweight to us.

Fair enough, Joffe says. Whenever the international system has been dominated by one power, a natural movement to restore the balance has arisen. With regard to the United States, this is nothing new—the Chinese, as well as the Russians, have been decrying a "unipolar world" and "hegemonism" for years.

But Germany—the country the United States practically reinvented from the ashes of World War II, ushered back into the civilized family of nations, and then stood out as the only champion of re-unification only a decade ago? No matter how gushy a host he wished to be, how could the Chancellor of this Germany suddenly be calling for a "strategic partnership" with Russia?

One answer, according to Joffe, is the obvious and passionate hostility to the

U.S. national missile defense project, known popularly as NMD, which the Russians and our German allies—for that matter, all of our European allies—share.

A second reason can be traced to the obvious shock at the overwhelming American military superiority shown in last year's Yugoslav air campaign. The manifest European military impotence impelled the European Union to launch its own security and defense policy, which NATO is now struggling to integrate into the alliance.

To some extent, then, the very fact of our current power—military, economic, and cultural—makes attempts at creating a countervailing force nearly inevitable.

But there is more. It is not only the policy that spawned NMD that irritates our European allies. What also irks them is the cavalier way in which we neglected to consult with them in our rush to formulate that policy. As Joffe trenchantly puts it, "America is so far ahead of the crowd that it has forgotten to look back."

In this, the second half of his explanation, I fear that Joffe is on to something: a new kind of American hubris. Again, his use of English is enviable. He describes the behavior of Congress these days as "obliviousness with a dollop of yahooism" (I assume he isn't talking about the search engine).

Mr. President, no one loves and respects this body more than I do. I believe that the American people is exceedingly well served by the one hundred Senators, all of whom are intelligent and hard-working.

Nevertheless, I note with dismay an increasing tendency in this chamber—I will leave judgments of the House of Representatives to others—for Members to advocate aspects of foreign policy with a conscious disregard, occasionally even disdain, for the opinions of our allies and the impact our policies have on them.

This kind of unilateralism was exhibited in the floor debate last fall on ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by one of my colleagues who, in responding to an article jointly authored by British Prime Minister Tony Blair, French President Jacques Chirac, and German Chancellor Schroeder, declared: "I don't care about our allies. I care about our enemies."

No one, Mr. President, is advocating abandoning or compromising the national interest of the United States simply because our allies oppose this or that aspect of our foreign and security policy.

But power—in the current context, our unparalleled power—must be accompanied by a sense of responsibility.

Mr. Joffe alludes to this power-and-responsibility duality in recalling the golden age of bipartisan American foreign policy in the years immediately following the Second World War, when