

1960, Squaw Valley received an appropriation of \$20 million to assist in staging the Winter Olympic Games—about 25 percent of the total budget for the Games.

Let me be clear that I am not advocating an automatic 25 percent federal subsidy for a host city. But, I wish to make the point that this level of assistance is not unprecedented and could be construed as quite modest when compared with governmental subsidies foreign cities receive from their national governments.

Before I conclude, Mr. President, I would like to make one final point.

The Senator from Arizona suggested yesterday that the USOC should not consider bids of cities that do not have the capacity to host the Games.

Well, Mr. President, that would eliminate every city in America from hosting an Olympic Games, summer or winter. No city—not even New York or Los Angeles—could put on a 21st century, multi-week, international event like this entirely on its own.

Think about this: Lake Placid, New York, has hosted the Winter Games twice, in 1932 and in 1980. But, in 1990, Lake Placid had a population of fewer than 2500 people. There is no way metropolitan Salt Lake City, with a million people, let alone Lake Placid could host these Games under the proposed McCain criteria.

Allow me to suggest, Mr. President, that America itself will host the 2002 Winter Olympic Games, just as it did in Atlanta, Los Angeles, Lake Placid, or Squaw Valley. An American bid city is selected by the United States Olympic Committee for its organizational ability and world class sporting venues. It becomes America's choice. If chosen by the IOC, the city does not host the Games on its own behalf, but for our whole country.

When a U.S. athlete mounts the podium in Salt Lake City two years from now, the music you hear will not be "Come, Come Ye Saints." No, it will be "The Star-Spangled Banner," our country's national anthem.

I agree with the GAO and with Senator MCCAIN on one thing. I agree that we ought to give some consideration to how, if the United States ever hosts another Olympic Games, we should support the host city. There is much to commend a better process for such support.

I would be very happy to join Senator MCCAIN in such a mission. But, I wish that, in the meantime, he would join us in support of America's host city for the XIX Winter Olympiad.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will

read the names of some of those who have lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

September 20, 1999:

Donetta L. Adams, 26, Bloomington, IN; Barbara F. Allen, 65, Bloomington, IN; Eugene S. Bassett, Jr., 35, Davenport, IA; Antonio Butler, 19, Miami, FL; William Cook, 38, Detroit, MI; Rosa Gomez, 41, Miami, FL; Travis L. Harris, 27, Chicago, IL; James Hoard, 31, Bloomington, IN; Katherine Kruppa, 39, Houston, TX; Teal Lane, 19, Baltimore, MD; Mark Pitts, 22, Detroit, MI.

One of the victims of gun violence I mentioned was 65-year-old Barbara Allen of Bloomington, Indiana. Barbara's boyfriend shot and killed both her and her pregnant daughter, 26-year-old Donetta Adams, before turning the gun on himself.

Another victim of gun violence, 41-year-old Rosa Gomez of Miami, was shot and killed by her ex-boyfriend after having been harassed and threatened by him on several occasions.

We cannot sit back and allow such senseless gun violence to continue. The deaths of these people are a reminder to all of us that we need to enact sensible gun legislation now.

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADING RELATIONS FOR CHINA

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the vote I cast yesterday in support of H.R. 4444, the bill extending permanent normal trading relations to the Peoples' Republic of China.

While the vote we cast yesterday was to grant China PNTR, it cannot be viewed separate from the question of China's accession to the WTO. In our negotiations with the Chinese over their entry into the WTO, we agreed to end the annual exercise of renewing NTR and to extend NTR to China permanently. In fact, if we do not grant China PNTR we will be the ones in violation of the WTO's rules when China is ultimately granted entry into the WTO. And, as a result, we will lose access to their markets and the beneficiaries of this will be our trade competitors in Europe, Asia, and South America. Most importantly, we have gained some very important trade concessions in our negotiations with the Chinese over their entry into the WTO, and we stand to gain even greater trade concessions from them once they join the WTO and become subject to its rules and dispute resolution procedures.

By extending PNTR and allowing China entry into the WTO, the U.S. can expect to increase exports to China by an estimated \$13.9 billion within the first five years. And according to the

U.S. Department of Agriculture, American farmers will account for \$2.2 billion of that increase in exports to China. If our economy is to continue to grow and we are to continue to create more good-paying, skilled jobs so that unemployment remains low and Americans can take home more income, we must expand our economic opportunities. The best way to accomplish that is to find new markets for our products. And the most lucrative new market that exists is China.

As our colleague from Texas, Senator PHIL GRAMM, pointed out in a "Dear Colleague" letter he circulated earlier this week, things in China are changing significantly, if perhaps not as quickly or as comprehensively as we wish. Senator GRAMM quoted a report on China recently issued by the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, in which the observation is made: "Beijing's billboards no longer spout ideology. They advertise consumer products like Internet service, cell phones, and credit cards." There can be little doubt that China is changing. The task left to us to decide is how best to effectuate positive change there.

My primary concern, in evaluating how to vote on PNTR and China's accession to the WTO has always been: "What is in the best interests of Michigan's workers and businesses?"

China was Michigan's 15th largest export market in 1998. That rank has almost certainly risen since then. Michigan's exports to China grew by 25 percent during the 5 years between 1993 and 1998, increasing from \$211 million to \$264 million. Businesses in the Detroit area accounted for \$180 million of those exports in 1998, an 11 percent increase over its 1993 figure. Other areas of Michigan are seeing truly phenomenal growth in trade with China. Exports to China from businesses located in the Flint and Lansing areas grew by more than 84 percent from 1993 to 1998. And exports from Kalamazoo and Battle Creek businesses to China grew by an astounding 353 percent during that same period, according to the U.S. International Trade Administration.

The growth in China trade outside of Detroit is due to the surprisingly high number of small and medium-sized businesses in Michigan that are exporting to China. According to the Commerce Department, more than 60 percent of the Michigan firms exporting to China in 1997 were either small or medium-sized companies. Of the 149 small and medium-sized Michigan businesses exporting to Michigan in 1997, as substantial majority of these were small businesses with fewer than 100 employees. This trend extends beyond Michigan as well. Nationwide, not only did small and medium-sized businesses in 1997 comprise 35 percent of all U.S. merchandise exports to China—up from 28 percent in 1992—but this 35 percent share of the Chinese market was higher than the share small and medium-sized businesses had of overall U.S. merchandise exports that year—31 percent.

While Michigan's manufacturing sector certainly stands to benefit from passing PNTR and China's accession to the WTO, we must not overlook the tremendous benefits that Michigan farmers also stand to gain from these agreements. Agriculture is Michigan's second largest industry, and exporting is a vital component of the state's agricultural business. Michigan agricultural exports totaled almost \$1 billion in 1998, but that figure was down almost \$100 million from two years earlier. With increased competition in agriculture at home and abroad from the European Community and major S. American exporters such as Chile, opening up a massive new market such as China would be of tremendous benefit to a state like Michigan that relies so heavily on agriculture production and export.

The agreement the U.S. negotiated with China, which includes PNTR, contains significant trade concessions by the Chinese in four areas critical to Michigan agriculture. Michigan exported \$240 million worth of soybeans and soybean products in 1998, and China is the world's largest growth market for soybeans. China has agreed to lower tariff rates on soybeans to 3 percent with no quota limits. Michigan is also a large feed grains producer, exporting \$163 million worth of feed grains and products in 1998. China has agreed to lower their quota to a nominal 1 percent within an agreed upon import quota schedule. However, that quota grows at a tremendous rate, starting at 4.5 million metric tons and growing to 7.5 million metric tons by 2004. By comparison, China imported less than 250,000 metric tons of corn from all countries in 1998. The circumstances are much the same for two other very important Michigan agriculture products—vegetables and fruit. On vegetables, China's tariff rates are scheduled to drop anywhere from 20 to 60 percent by 2004. With respect to fresh and processed deciduous fruit, China has committed to tariff reductions of up to 75 percent. To a state like Michigan, which is known for its cherries, apples, pears, and peaches, this is a significant breakthrough for our fruit growers.

Of course, Mr. President, this is not the end of the story. While many of these tariffs will be substantially reduced and quotas are lifted or expanded considerably, tariffs and quotas will still remain on many U.S. goods—as they in fact will continue to exist on certain goods coming from China into the United States. But once China is a member of the WTO, the U.S. will continue to push to have Chinese trade barriers reduced even further and eliminated altogether.

A critical element of this debate that too often gets overlooked is the degree to which our membership in the WTO helps us eliminate unfair trading practices amongst our trading partners. The WTO provides a forum to which we can take trade disputes with our trad-

ing partners involving unfair trading practices by them. One of the primary functions of the WTO is to provide procedures to settle trade disputes promptly, eliminating a significant deficiency of the previous GATT system in which the process often dragged out indefinitely. The WTO procedures are inherently more fair and more predictable—and that is to our benefit as the world's largest economy and as the world's foremost promoter of free and fair trade.

The United States has filed more complaints to the WTO against other countries—49 of them as of April of this year—than any other WTO member country. The U.S. has also prevailed in 23 of the 25 complaints acted upon up to that time—clear evidence that the WTO is of tremendous assistance to us in getting other countries to stop their unfair trading practices. This is also why we can be confident that once China becomes a member of the WTO that we will be able to further reduce the remaining trade impediments they have against our goods and that we will be able to ensure that they live up to the commitments they have already made to us in exchange for PNTR and our support for them joining the WTO.

While I have supported annual renewal of NTR each year I have been in the Senate, I have also been a severe critic of many of China's policies and actions and their human rights record. In 1997, I introduced the China Policy Act, in which I attempted to outline a new paradigm for dealing with the Chinese. Specifically, I felt it was unwise for us to use trade continually as our weapon of first resort each time an issue arose between our two countries, whether it be nuclear non-proliferation and missile sales to rogue nations, religious persecution, repression in Tibet, forced abortion, or threatening gestures towards Taiwan.

I feel it unfair to American companies and farmers doing business in China to make them constantly bear the brunt of our efforts to get the Chinese to modify their behavior. I am also concerned about pursuing such a strategy when it would likely result in U.S. companies and farmers losing market share and market access in China to our trade competitors in Europe, Asia, and South America. The China Policy Act legislation I introduced in 1997 essentially said, "Let us reserve using trade as a weapon only for those occasions when our dispute with China is trade related."

My China Policy Act took a very tough stand on what I believe was unacceptable behavior by the Chinese in the area of missile sales and nuclear proliferation. In response to China's sale of 60 cruise missiles to Iran, which I viewed as a direct violation of the Iran-Iraq Non-Proliferation Act of 1972, my legislation required the President to impose the sanctions provided for by the 1972 act against China. In addition, because I believed the Chinese sale was so dangerous, my legislation suspended

the President's ability to waive those sanctions.

I have also taken other steps to thwart China's ability to export dangerous armaments and weapons of mass destruction. I voted for the Cochran amendment to the FY '98 DoD Authorization bill to control the export to China of supercomputers that could be utilized by them in their development of missiles and in exploiting nuclear technology. I also supported the Hutchinson amendment to the FY '99 DoD Authorization bill to study the development of U.S. Theater Missile Defense systems against potential Chinese ballistic missiles.

Based on this track record and of my continuing concerns for China's actions in this area, I felt compelled to support the Thompson amendment because I believed it was the wisest approach to dealing with this very real threat to our national security. To those who argued that the Thompson amendment would undermine the very principles upon which PNTR was based, I would counter that Senator THOMPSON made a number of significant modifications to his legislation to address these very concerns.

The Senator from Tennessee went to great lengths to ensure that American agriculture would be spared the brunt of any trade actions taken against China. This ensures that our farmers are not unfortunate victims of attempts by U.S. policymakers to punish the Chinese for their behavior in non-trade areas. Senator THOMPSON also gave the President greater flexibility to respond to crises by making sanctions against supplier countries under the act discretionary rather than mandatory. And the evidentiary standard in the legislation for imposing mandatory sanctions on companies identified as proliferators has been raised to give the President discretion in determining whether a company has truly engaged in proliferation activities.

So I believe the most problematic areas of Senator THOMPSON's original legislation have been addressed responsibly and that made it worthy of support. While I remain a staunch supporter of PNTR for China and supporting China's accession into the WTO, I simply cannot ignore China's past practices in the area of missile sales to rogue nations and its role in nuclear proliferation. The U.S. must maintain the ability to confront such aggressive arms practices abroad as a means of protecting its own national security.

In conclusion, I am keenly aware of the deeply divided feelings Americans have over the questions of PNTR and China's accession to the WTO. There are few, if any, states in which feelings are more polarized on this subject than in Michigan. I respect the fact that sincere people can and will draw a conclusion different from mine. To those who came to a different conclusion, I say that we here in Congress have promised to pay close attention to the reports

issued by the Congressional-Executive Commission on Human and Labor Rights created in this legislation. If China's behavior does not improve and if they do not abide by the agreements they have signed, I am sure that Congress will respond accordingly. I certainly intend to.

As many of my colleagues may know, both my wife and I grew up in union households. Her father was a member of the United Auto Workers. And my father was a UAW member as well. That is not an uncommon situation in a state like Michigan, as you can well imagine, where a significant percentage of the population is employed either by one of the automakers or one of the various supplier companies. But like most Michiganders who grew up in a union household or are currently living in one I know what it's like to see a father or mother come home celebrating a raise or some benefits they had secured in a recently ratified contract. And I also know the pain and stress that goes with layoffs or plant closings, things my state has had all too much experience with in the not too distant past.

Many current union workers and their families have come up to me in the past year and said they were scared about what will happen if we pass PNTR and allow China into the WTO. They fear that the Chinese will not live up to the commitments they have made with respect to eliminating trade barriers or that American companies might choose to move their operations overseas leaving workers here unemployed and without any available jobs or careers into which to move. Those are very real fears. And I take those concerns very seriously and to heart.

China will open its markets in the very near future. The question is: Will U.S. firms be among those competing for these new markets, competing for a portion of the one billion new consumers that are going to be available in China? Or are we going to cede those new opportunities to our competitors in Europe, Asia, and South America? Likewise, the question is not whether U.S. companies will eventually do business in China. The question is whether it will be on our terms or on China's. Will companies be forced to move over to China in order to avoid high tariffs, quotas on U.S. produced goods, or other restrictions which make it difficult for them to do business there? Or will we attempt to eliminate such barriers to market access now through negotiation, so that U.S. companies can continue to operate here in the States, employing U.S. workers and paying U.S. Taxes, and still export goods and services to China in a competitive environment with our trading competitors?

I think when most workers consider the options we face, they will agree that the best course for our nation is to join with the other nations of the world in accepting China into the WTO and attempting to work with the pro-

cedures available there to open their markets further and ensure they live up to the commitments they have already made.

That is the conclusion to which this Senator has come. That is why I voted for permanent normal trade relations for the Peoples' Republic of China. That is why I support China's accession to the WTO.

ARMED FORCES CONCURRENT RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY PROVISION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as the defense authorization conference is meeting, I rise today to urge my colleagues to stand behind the Senate version of the bill with respect to Section 666 of H.R. 4205. This provision permits retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service connected disability to receive military retired pay concurrently with veterans' disability compensation.

Veterans from Nevada and all over the country care about this legislation.

Career military retired veterans are the only group of federal retirees who are required to waive their retirement pay in order to receive VA disability. Simply put, the law discriminates against career military men and women. All other federal employees receive both their civil service retirement and VA disability with no offset.

This inequity is absurd. How do we explain this inequity to these men and women who scarified their own safety to protect this great nation? How do we explain this inequity to Edward Lynk from Virginia who answered the call of duty to defend our nation? Mr. Lynk served for over 30 years in the Marine Corps and participated in three wars, where he was severely injured during combat in two of them.

Or George Blahun from Connecticut who entered the military in 1940 to serve his country because of the impending war. He served over 35 years during World War II, the Korean War and the Vietnam War. He is 100% disabled because of injuries incurred while performing military service. He asks that Congress stop giving veterans the "arbitrary bureaucratic rhetorical nonsense" and truly support this legislation. We must demonstrate to these veterans that we are thankful for their dedicated service. As such, we must fight for the amendment in the Senate version of the national defense authorization bill for FY 2001.

This is an absolute injustice to our career military retired veterans. Federal employees, for example a member of Congress or a staffer here on Capital Hill or an employee from the Department of Engery, are not penalized if they receive disability benefits. While career military men and women that have incurred injuries while in the line of duty are prohibited from doing so because of an archaic, out-dated 109-year-old law.

The amendment in the Senate bill represents an honest attempt to cor-

rect this inequity that has existed for far too long. Allowing disabled veterans to receive military retired pay and veterans disability compensation concurrently will restore fairness to the entire Federal retirement policy.

It is unfair for our veterans not to receive both of these payments concurrently. We must ensure that our veterans who are facing serious disabilities as a result of injuries sustained during their service do not have to choose between retirement pay and losing a portion of their disability benefits.

We have an opportunity to show our gratitude to these remarkable 437,000 disabled military men and women who have scarified so much for this great country of ours.

We are currently losing over one thousand WWII veterans each day. Every day we delay acting on this inequity means that we have denied fundamental fairness to thousands of men and women.

The Senate passed this provision by unanimous consent and the House companion bill, H.R. 303 from Congressman BILIRAKIS has 314 cosponsors. Our veterans have earned this and now it is our chance to honor their service to our nation. Freedom isn't free—and this is a small cost to the Federal government given the immeasurable sacrifices made by these dedicated Americans.

SPACE TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I rise today with two purposes in mind. The first is to compliment the men and women who labor on behalf of the nation at the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Alabama on the occasion of Marshall's 40th Anniversary. My second purpose is to share some thoughts on the importance of Space Transportation in light of the VA/HUD Appropriations Bill that will come before this body in the not too distant future. These two issues are inextricably linked in that Marshall Space Flight Center is the world leader in space transportation yet ever dependent on the funding that the VA/ HUD appropriators provide. For that reason, I compliment Senator KIT BOND, and his superlative staff in advance of the bill being debated for all they continue to do on behalf of NASA and the nation. Their foresight will ultimately make the difference as we continue to move forward as a nation of explorers.

In September, 1960 President Dwight Eisenhower dedicated the Marshall Space Flight Center which soon began making history under the mentorship and direction of Dr. Wernher von Braun. From the Mercury-Redstone vehicle that placed America's first astronaut, Alan B. Shepard, into sub-orbital space in 1961, to the mammoth Saturn V rocket that launched humans to the moon in 1969, Marshall and its industry partners have successfully engineered