

His frank and fearless commitment to a better America challenged us all. As remembered by the Hellenic Chronicle, a Massachusetts publication, Senator Tsongas "changed the face of politics in the 1990's and reminded us that honesty and the power of ideas can still count for something in American politics." He was unwavering in his ideals because he truly believed them. At his funeral, Bishop Methodios of Boston spoke of Senator Tsongas' insight, integrity and intelligence; fitting qualities for a person who, as the Bishop said, "looked deep within his heart and soul and there discovered his vision for a better America."

The son of a Greek immigrant, Senator Tsongas went from working in his father's drycleaning store to Dartmouth College, Yale Law School, and the Peace Corps. He won his first bid for public office in 1969, when he was elected to the Lowell City Council, the beginning of an esteemed career that included service as Middlesex County Commissioner in 1973, fifth congressional district representative to the U.S. House in 1974—the first Democrat to win in his district in a century, and United States Senator from Massachusetts in 1979, an office never before held by a Peace Corps veteran.

In the Senate, I was privileged to serve with Senator Tsongas on the Banking and Foreign Relations Committees, where he fulfilled his duties with great capability and distinction. His understanding of the world beyond our borders, gained during his service in the Peace Corps, equipped him to make a significant contribution to a more effective American foreign policy. Senator Tsongas never took the privilege of being a U.S. Senator for granted. He was serious about his work and had high hopes and even higher standards for this country.

"Patriotism is like charity," wrote Henry James. "It begins at home." For Senator Tsongas, everything began at home. Whether it was Lowell, the town in which he made his life, or the family that was his life, Senator Tsongas never lost sight of what was most important. He often questioned the legacy he would leave behind for the people and places he cared for most. He should not have been concerned. Due to his efforts both in and out of office, the town of Lowell now claims a national historic park, thousands of jobs, a minor league baseball team, 14 new schools, and a real sense of pride. As the local paper noted, "We in Lowell need only walk through our city to celebrate—every day—what Paul Tsongas did for his hometown."

I will always remember Paul Tsongas, as will his fellow Americans, as a highly principled public servant who, unafraid of any challenge, was exceedingly able to affect the issues of his time. I will also remember him as the individual who inspired us all by confronting his own mortality with extraordinary grace and heroism. His faith in his own instincts not only gave

him the courage to step down from office when the time was right, it was also the source of his strength during his distinguished service in the Congress of the United States.

Senator Tsongas left an indelible mark on our hearts, which now go out to his wife Niki, his daughters Ashley, Katina and Molly, and his sisters Thaleia and Vicki. They have so much to mourn, but they also have so much of which to be proud.

There is a requiem hymn sung in the Greek Orthodox Church which, here, seems apropos: "Eonia e mneeme." It means, "may he live in our memories forever." In the last years of his life, Senator Tsongas struggled with the question of history, with what he would leave us. The answer is, clearly, much. Paul Tsongas will live in the memories and records of his country, his town, and his family, forever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I know that Senator KENNEDY wanted to be recognized, but because he is not here I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak in morning business for such time as I may consume.

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

CHINA: THE FUTURE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech that this Senator made to the Asia Society yesterday morning entitled, "China: The Future."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINA: THE FUTURE

(By Senator Dianne Feinstein)

As a Californian, I have been surprised to discover how Washington, and the whole East Coast foreign policy establishment tends to look primarily across the Atlantic to Europe, and how little it looks to Asia and the Pacific.

But the fact is that U.S. interests are no longer primarily in Europe. You've heard the phrase "the dawning of the Pacific Century" many times. Well, the Pacific Century is here.

Consider these facts: The Pacific trading theater has long since overtaken the Atlantic. Overall trade with Asia stands at \$570 billion. With Europe it is \$270 billion. Trade with Asia accounts for more than 30 percent of U.S. exports and close to 40 percent of U.S. imports. And today, more than 60 percent of the world's population lives on both sides of the Pacific Ocean.

All of this illustrates what Secretary of State John Hay meant when he said nearly a century ago: "The Mediterranean is the ocean of the past; the Atlantic, the ocean of the present; and the Pacific, the ocean of the future." That future is now.

CHINA'S IMPORTANCE

The single most important question facing the future of peace and prosperity in Asia is how China develops.

And there is no more important challenge facing U.S. foreign policy than the question of how to peacefully engage China in the international community.

China's influence is felt in so many ways: China's population of 1.25 billion, is nearly one quarter of the world's inhabitants; China's sheer size—her geographical reach includes common borders with such key nations as Russia, Japan, Korea, and India, and includes vast quantities of untapped natural resources; China's expanding military prowess, including a 3 million-man army, and her status as one of the five declared nuclear powers in the world today; China's permanent seat on the U.N. Security Council; and China's remarkable economic growth of roughly 10 percent a year, which has vaulted it to the position of the world's 11th largest exporter—China is where Japan was in 1980, but growing much faster.

For all of these reasons, the U.S. relationship with China is probably our single most important undeveloped bilateral relationship in the world today.

In 1997, Sino-American relations are entering a crucial new phase, ripe with both danger and opportunity.

Events in the next year, and how they are handled by Washington and Beijing, will determine for some time to come the nature of the relationship between our two countries.

I was very pleased to hear our new Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, articulate the Administration's policy in clear terms during her confirmation hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee. She said: "Our goal is to expand areas of cooperation, reduce the potential for misunderstandings and encourage China's full emergence as a responsible member of the international community."

And, while she recognized that our two nations have important differences, the Secretary also stressed that we have a multifaceted relationship with China.

I want to make some comments this morning on what I believe to be the central issues in the U.S.-China relationship today: the question of engagement versus containment; the China-Taiwan relationship; nuclear proliferation; human rights; the trade imbalance; trade issues such as Most-Favored Nation status, Intellectual Property Rights, and China's accession to the WTO; and the transition of Hong Kong.

THE "ENGAGEMENT VS. CONTAINMENT" DEBATE

This question should be settled by now, but unfortunately it is not. There are still those who see China as an enemy, and who want the U.S.-China relationship to be modeled on Cold War strategies of the past. Containment is their mantra. But there are two problems with this approach:

First, it has not and will not work. No other country will join us in trying to contain the largest country and one of the fastest growing economies in the world.

Second, containment is not in the interest of the United States. We have far too many mutual interests with China—interests which far outweigh our differences, including: preserving stability, and preventing arms races in Northeast and Southeast Asia; a peaceful, non-nuclear Korean Peninsula; preventing nuclear escalation between India and Pakistan; preventing the introduction of nuclear or other destabilizing technology into the Persian Gulf; keeping sea lanes open for international commerce; maintaining the prosperity of Hong Kong and Taiwan; and curbing the trafficking of narcotics.

Attempting to influence these critically important issues by isolating China is a fruitless and very dangerous course of action. The only way we can make progress on these issues is through active engagement.

I have been saying for the past four years that I have been in the Senate that the U.S. needs to develop a long-term, strategic framework for building a relationship with China, based on our many mutual interests.

No single issue should be a litmus test for the entire U.S.-China relationship.

Managing and developing a positive relationship with China does not mean we must ignore the importance of key issues of concern with China—such as human rights, the transition of Hong Kong, or the issue of Taiwan. It does, however, mean that we should not allow our entire relationship to be called into question each time an incident occurs.

The United States must develop a long-range, strategic plan for our relationship with China.

The US must engage China. This engagement must be ongoing, it must be consistent, and it must be formed at the highest levels.

To date, interaction at the Presidential, Vice Presidential, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense level has not been frequent or deep enough. There is no "red telephone", no ability for the two Presidents to talk and work with each other during a crisis.

We cannot engage China solely at a second-tier level. Talks at the Deputy Assistant Secretary level are not sufficient, and, in the absence of regular higher level contacts, are probably counter-productive in the message it sends to China's leaders.

Secretary Albright will be meeting soon with Foreign Minister Qian Qichen, and she is committed to regular contact with her counterparts in Beijing. Vice President Gore will be traveling to Beijing this spring, setting the stage for an exchange of presidential visits this fall and next year.

These are positive steps that I hope will lead to development of sustained communication at the very highest levels.

President Clinton has an opportunity to shape the future course of Sino-American relations by developing a positive working relationship with Chinese President Jiang Zemin and other leaders, I hope he will seize this opportunity.

Congress also has an important role to play in this process.

It is critical that more members of Congress travel to China, meet with those in the Chinese leadership and others, and develop a working dialogue with those who are creating the China of the 21st century.

THE CHINA-TAIWAN RELATIONSHIP

Taiwan remains the one issue with the greatest potential to seriously disrupt efforts to stabilize the U.S.-China relationship. It is impossible to overstate the depth of Chinese feelings about Taiwan's role in the U.S.-China relationship. They are real, visceral, and deep.

During my trip this past November, Chinese officials and citizens made it clear: If the Taiwan issue is handled well, everything is possible in Sino-American relations; if it is mishandled, it will continue to shock, and possibly derail, U.S.-China relations.

The United States should, I believe, consistently and authoritatively reaffirm, both to Beijing and to Taipei, its commitment to the long-standing and bipartisan "One China" policy, as outlined in the three Joint Communiqués.

It must be remembered that the status quo has been beneficial to all three parties, allowing Taiwan to become prosperous and democratic, and the U.S. and China to develop normalized relations befitting two world powers.

So Taiwan must understand that its efforts to assert itself internationally cannot be a guise for moving towards independence.

For its part, China should consistently make clear that reunification would take place only through peaceful means, and should refrain from any aggressive military actions and rhetoric.

Any impression that China might try to settle the Taiwan issue by the use of force

presents a challenge not just to Taiwan but also, under the Taiwan Relations Act, to the United States as well. We could not stand idly by and countenance a military attack.

At the same time, Washington must make clear to Beijing that U.S. interests require continued robust—albeit unofficial—ties with Taipei, which are consistent with the "One China" policy.

Such unofficial access, however, should not be confused in either Beijing or Taipei as an invitation for official recognition by the U.S. We must not allow another incident such as the issuance of a visa to President Lee Teng-hui two years ago to needlessly provoke a crisis.

The United States should encourage Taiwan and China to resume the Cross-Straits Initiative that was conducted by China's Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Straits and Taiwan's Straits Exchange Foundation, which showed such promise until it was derailed a year and a half ago.

NONPROLIFERATION

One of the most important areas of concern in our relationship with China is nuclear nonproliferation.

Clearly China's record on nonproliferation is mixed. China has ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention—something the U.S. Senate has not yet done—and signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, as well as cooperated in efforts to extend the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) indefinitely.

China has made important commitments, such as abiding by the guidelines of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) and not providing assistance to unsafeguarded nuclear facilities.

Nevertheless, we continue to have concerns about nuclear and missile technology that China has provided to Pakistan, and the possibility of similar sales to Iran.

It is vital that China be engaged in a new security partnership, one that is cooperative rather than confrontational. As I said earlier, isolating a nation of China's growing power and influence makes little sense.

China has recognized our mutual interest in preventing nuclear proliferation in North Korea. It is also clearly in the interests of both China and the United States to ensure that tensions are de-escalated in South Asia, where both India and Pakistan have the ability to launch nuclear devices in a matter of days.

We should encourage China to join us in the development of a coherent nuclear nonproliferation strategy, as a co-guarantor of stability and security in these regions.

We must try to convince China that arms control regimes should be adhered to not for ideological or legalistic purposes, but because they are in China's own best interest.

If China is willing to become an active and responsible party to international treaties and regimes, China should be granted an equal say in setting the "rules of the game." China must, of course, then agree to abide by those rules along with every other nation.

A partnership between China and the United States toward nuclear non-proliferation and stability is the key to success in these regions.

HUMAN RIGHTS

As I said earlier, no issue should be a litmus test in our relationship with China. But at times, human rights has been just that.

The U.S. has tried lecturing China on human rights; We have expressed outrage, and our relationship has zigged and zagged with each arrest, newly reported case of torture, or other egregious happening; And we have tried linking human rights to Most Favored Nation trading status.

These efforts have clearly been unsuccessful.

Let me speak about the negatives first.

I am remain deeply concerned by China's treatment of dissidents and its constant persecution of Tibetans in Tibet. I have talked with Tibetan refugees personally—some in Nepal this past November—and I believe their stories to be true.

I believe there has been a tightening by the Chinese government on human rights in the last year.

For those of us who watch China closely, there are a number of signs. There has been a recent crackdown on religious liberties.

In Jiangxi province in November, 80 Catholics were arbitrarily arrested without warrants, beaten, and jailed.

There have been many recent arrests of leading dissidents, often resulting in disproportionately long sentences. For example: Wei Jingsheng was sentenced for 14 years; Chen Xi was sentenced for 10 years; Wang Dan was sentenced for 11 years in prison plus two years deprivation of political rights.

I cannot conceive of a reason why it is in China's interests to do these things. But whatever the reason, it is very disturbing, and it portends real danger for Hong Kong, which is a very religious Chinese community.

But let me also mention the positive side.

It must be recognized that progress is taking place in China. For example, the National People's Congress just enacted legislation intended to: help protect individuals from arbitrary punishment by police and government agencies; limit the practice "administrative detention" to thirty days; and require the State Council to secure the approval of the National People's Congress before declaring martial law.

As one who has traveled to China dozens of times over the last 20 years, it is clear to me that there have been remarkable changes: an increasing standard of living, increased wages, and savings, and improved education of the people; greater mobility and a freer lifestyle for the average Chinese; local and provincial governments that are more independent from Beijing—with over 300 million Chinese participating in direct local and provincial elections; a growing web of private property ownership in the provinces, and greater legal protection for the owners and investors in private enterprises; a more accessible court system for Chinese citizens to contest government actions that infringe on their freedoms and property.

To appreciate the scope of these changes one only needs to look back a mere 35 years to the Cultural Revolution and Great Leap Forward, during which millions of Chinese lost their lives in unprecedented brutality.

Yes, these changes are in their infancy compared to Western standards, but it is important to understand that China is a 5,000 year old nation—a nation governed by the rule of man for most of its history. It will not transition to the rule of law overnight—no matter how much pressure is applied from outside forces.

It was interesting for me to read an article by Henry Rowen entitled "The Short March," in which he describes conducting a Lexis-Nexis search on China and human rights in five major U.S. publications.

For the period January 1991 through June 1996 he found "on the one hand, 356 stories on abuses of various kinds, and on the other hand, 3 on local elections, 16 on efforts to introduce a rule of law, and 10 on the liberalizing of the mass media: in short, an overall ratio of 12 to 1."

So clearly, the bad gets reported and the good does not.

I believe that China will not change its ways merely to please America. The real key to change is convincing China that it is China's interests to change. And I believe that this can be done.

Most importantly, the U.S. should work with China to develop a modern legal system with an independent judiciary, due process of law and a modern penal and civil codes. China is receptive to our help in this area.

Through engagement and assistance such as this we can do more to advance the cause of human rights in China in the long run than through constant castigation, or isolation.

I would like to make a proposal that may be acceptable to both sides. I would propose a presidential human rights commission or forum. This commission would be appointed by both presidents, with the mission of charting the evolution of human rights in both countries over the last 20 to 30 years.

In reports to be delivered to both presidents, the commission would point out the successes and failures—both Tiananmen Square and Kent State—and make recommendations for goals for the future.

THE GROWING TRADE IMBALANCE

Another area of increasing concern is the growing trade gap with China.

What is essentially a trade problem today will become an acute political problem in the U.S.-China relationship if it is left unaddressed.

I have communicated my concern about this issue to the Chinese leadership. They agree that this is a potential problem, but they dispute the size of the trade imbalance.

The United States calculates the imbalance at about \$38 billion, while the Chinese figure is closer to \$10 billion.

When I was in China in November I proposed to Zhu Rongji, the Executive Vice Premier, who is in effect China's economic czar, that the United States and China establish a joint working group to sit down and establish once and for all a common method of calculating the trade imbalance, especially after Hong Kong's reversion to Chinese rule. Zhu Rongji told me he would support such a proposal.

MOST FAVORED NATION STATUS

Another constant flashpoint is the annual battle over China's Most Favored Nation Trading status.

Every summer Congress and the Administration go through a sort of ritual dance over the extension of MFN status to China. Congress had never overridden a President's decision to extend MFN for China, but we have often voted on it anyway.

Last year, the House, by a resounding vote of 286-141, rejected an attempt to deny or condition China's MFN status. It would be helpful to have that vote settle it once and for all, but, unfortunately, we are less than five months away from the next go around, which I suspect may not be any less raucous.

The political implications of revoking MFN for China are great. For a country such as China, where face and respect are such central issues, the debate over revoking MFN is seen as tantamount to the United States telling China that we are still unsure whether to accept them as a member of the family of nations.

Denying MFN would seriously impair our ability to work with China on just about *any* issue.

Clearly, linking human rights with MFN has been a failure. I hope we do not make the same mistake twice by linking it to something else, like the negotiations on China's accession to the WTO.

MFN is our standard trading status, and it is granted to all but seven rogue states.

It is time to put an end to this destructive debate year after year. I support making MFN for China permanent.

HONG KONG

In the short run, the transition of Hong Kong is seen by some as a bellwether for China's willingness to act as a responsible great power.

It is key and critical that "one country, two systems" be carried out. The world is clearly watching to see whether in fact it is possible to have within China an autonomous region that charts its own domestic policy.

The Sino-British Joint Declaration and the Basic Law provide the foundation for the transfer, and for the future governance and economic life of Hong Kong.

I am troubled by the legislation submitted last week to the National People's Congress that would undo the Hong Kong bill of rights. Lu Ping, the Chinese official in charge of the Hong Kong transition, told me directly in Beijing in November that the question of public protest and assembly was a matter for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR), and if SAR law permitted public expressions of dissent, China would have no objection.

If the central government of China reverses Hong Kong's Bill of Rights, and other civil liberties, it would be a blow to the credibility of "one country, two systems."

Additionally, I would hope that the provisional legislature meeting this week in Shenzhen is sensitive to the pledge of domestic autonomy for Hong Kong.

I strongly agree with Secretary Albright when she said that the way events play out in Hong Kong will have an important effect on the overall U.S.-China relationship.

CONCLUSION

With this new Congress, and an Administration now seasoned in its second term, we now have the opportunity to move beyond some of the events that have soured Sino-American relations in the past several years.

President Clinton and Secretary Albright must immerse themselves fully in the details of this most delicate and critical of American relations.

In the final analysis, the goal of American policy must be to encourage China toward a full and active relationship with the West and to work together toward a China that is able to take its role as a stable leader of Asia and a guarantor of peace and security in the world.

WELFARE REFORM

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, we begin the 105th Congress with a sober recognition of the fact that the Federal Government cannot solve all problems. Anyone who questions this premise need only look at painful choices that must be made in order to balance the Federal budget, our first and most difficult task this session.

Having said that, the clearest message, I think, sent to us this past November was that the people of America want Republicans and Democrats to work together to solve real problems. I have been very concerned and I might even say dismayed by statements made by Members of this body and the House, that under no circumstances will there be any changes, no matter how meritorious, no matter how necessary, to the welfare bill which passed last year.

Mr. President, when this body debated and approved the historic welfare reform bill last year, I outlined to my colleagues what I saw as some of the major flaws in the drafting of that bill, and as a result, the impact that this legislation will have on the largest State in the Union—California. I want to take an opportunity this afternoon to update those comments.

The impact of this bill on California is huge. At this stage, it really is not

fully known or even understood. Some estimate that California will absorb about \$17 billion of the \$55 billion saved by this bill. That is a body blow to our safety net. It could have a catastrophic impact both financially and in terms of human lives. I voted, because of this, against that welfare bill.

I am not alone in my concerns. Even the Republican Governors, many of them poster-children for the reform effort, are looking at the fine print now and saying, "How is my State going to pay for these costs? How are we going to provide the necessary care? How are we going to meet these requirements without turning people out on the streets?"—for some, in large numbers. Even the Republican Governors are asking for changes.

A headline in the Washington Post 2 days ago said it pretty clearly: "After getting responsibility for welfare, States may pass it down," something that I, as a county supervisor and a mayor for some 18 years, recognize that it is exactly the way it goes. The buck usually stops with the lowest rung of a government. That is just what is going to happen with this bill. In California, a proposition 13 State, there is no way for local governments to raise their taxes or their revenue potential to deal with the problem.

In the months since the passage of the welfare bill, I directed my staff to examine how this bill would impact California counties. To date, my staff has met with the welfare directors of 22 out of California's 58 counties. Their pleas were nearly universal. I will share them with you. The work requirements, they say, as currently outlined in the bill will most probably not be attainable even under the most optimistic of circumstances. The child care funds in the bill for California are not enough to satisfy the requirements of the bill. The legal immigrant provisions denying food stamps and SSI, particularly to the elderly, the sick, and the disabled, will have a devastating impact on county general assistance programs. The biggest impact will be on the largest county in the State, Los Angeles County. And the counties tell me they have no computer ability to track and monitor recipients under the new rules. How do they comply?

Some of the changes asked for by these counties are technical in nature, such as increasing the time permitted for job search to be more realistic for areas where the average search even for nonwelfare recipients is twice as long as that permitted under the bill. Other changes are more fundamental, such as restoring some assistance to the elderly and disabled legal immigrants. I know President Clinton shares many of these concerns, and will propose a number of changes in his budget soon to be released.