

this year. That means the average citizen had to work until May 10 in order to pay their taxes. The rest of the year, he or she can work for his or her family. What a deal. And we are going to add \$868 billion to that burden? Pretty soon, we will be working more for the Government than for our families. If we think Government ought to be a bigger influence in this culture than families, I think we are sadly mistaken. Whether we succeed or fail in the next century is dependent on good, strong families. If moms and dads and families do their job, governing America will be easy. But if moms and dads and families can't do their job, governing America will be impossible. We cannot make it impossible for families to do the job that families ought to do in this country.

Total taxes as a share of total income have reached an all-time high in the United States of America. When I was born, in 1942, taxes as a share of the total income amounted to 21.1 percent. That was during the war—the big war, WW-II. Yet, that was 21.1 percent as a total share of income. We are approaching twice that much now. We are over 35 percent as a total share of income. It is time for us to come to the conclusion that if families are important in this country, leaving them with some of the money they earn is important, and an \$860 billion-plus tax increase would be inappropriate.

Today, the median two-income family can expect to pay 37.5 percent of its income in Federal, State, and local taxes—37.5 percent. Three-eighths—3 out of every 8 days are devoted to paying the Government. It is getting worse. Taxpayers are working longer, harder than ever before to pay their taxes. It is time for us to think carefully about providing relief, rather than a massive increase in taxes.

The proposed tobacco bill is nothing more than an excuse for Washington to raise taxes and spend more money on new Federal programs. I will fight to kill any tobacco tax bill that contains a tax increase of the magnitude being considered. I didn't come here, and I don't think we were sent here, to have a massive raid on the families of America and their ability to provide for the needs of their families. What we are talking about is a cut in pay for Americans. We cut their pay by taking it when they earn it. I just do not think a pay cut for American families is what is needed at this moment. I think this country knows that if there is a cut anywhere, it should be a cut in Government, not a cut in families. I think we have to understand that is what we are talking about. So I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, which is a massive tax increase. It is a tax burden focused on those making less than \$30,000 a year. The vast majority of the taxpayers who will pay the \$860-plus billion will be people making less than \$30,000 a year. I think of the kids of those moms and dads, who are both working and blue-collar folks, that

they want to be able to do well by and do well for. We plan to tax them with the most, the lion's share of the burden of an \$868 billion tax increase.

I reiterate again my position. I rose to object to moving to this bill when I thought we might be moving to it in haste; and that our consideration of the bill might be limited and compressed and inappropriately telescoped. It might be drawn together in such a way that we wouldn't have a thorough opportunity to debate this. It could be that I am wrong. With proper assurance that we would have the kind of full range of Senate debate, with the complete opportunity for amendment and that we will not be clotured so as to preclude the kind of debate that is necessary and appropriate in this respect, I don't mind moving forward to this issue. As a matter of fact, I wouldn't object to moving forward to the issue. We must, however, consider this issue based on its merits and not based on a schedule or convenience. This is too important an issue and too substantial a set of stakes for us to ignore the kind of full debate that the Senate rightfully should provide.

It is with that in mind that I rise to oppose this measure and to indicate my position on considering the measure. I hope when we have the opportunity to debate this measure fully, we will be able to see that a tax increase of that magnitude is not in the best interest of the American people. It is not in the best interest of the future of America. It is not a measure that really augurs well for the children of America. It is really a big government extension of the heavy hand of government in the pocketbooks of American families.

Thank you, Mr. President, for this opportunity.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I want to be recognized for a unanimous consent request.

Before I do that, let me commend the junior Senator from Missouri. He is right on target. I would like to share with him that in the last 2 weeks I had over 20 town hall meetings in the State of Oklahoma. In not one meeting did anyone bring up this thing and initiate the discussion. I think this is really a beltway issue. When I brought it up and told them about the massive tax increase—the largest single tax increase, with the stroke of one pen that this results in—they were all very, very much against it. I think some people will try to use this as somehow a way to stop children from smoking when, in fact, it would not stop children from smoking.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I be recognized for as much time as I may consume as if in morning business.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Lourdes Agosto be allowed floor privileges while I provide these remarks today.

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

NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of National Peace Officers Memorial Day, a day to commemorate and acknowledge the dedication and sacrifice made by the men and women who have lost their lives while serving as law enforcement officers.

The men and women who serve this Nation as our guardians of law and order do so at great personal risk. There are very few communities in the United States that have not been touched by the senseless death of a police officer.

In Oregon we have seen our share of loss. In January in a standoff between the Portland police and a man with a high-powered SKS military rifle, Colleen Waibel, a 17-year veteran of the Portland Police Bureau, was shot and killed. Two other officers, Kim Keist and Sgt. James Hudson, were wounded in that same standoff. In July of last year, Thomas Jeffries, a Portland police officer, was shot and killed. In 1984, a Washington County sheriff's deputy, Robert Talburt, also died in the line of duty.

Mr. President, because of the dedication and sacrifice of our Nation's police officers, our communities are safer and our children have a better chance of receiving their education in a crime-free environment.

Today, more than 15,000 peace officers are expected to gather in our Nation's Capital, together with the families of their recently fallen comrades. The National Peace Officers Memorial Day provides our country an opportunity to show these public servants that their efforts on our behalf and those of their fallen comrades are greatly appreciated.

To the surviving families of those officers who have paid the ultimate price, this day will show that their sacrifice will always be remembered.

Mr. President, I am a proud cosponsor of Senate Resolution 201 designating May 15, 1998, as National Peace Officers Memorial Day. I urge my colleagues to join Senator KEMPTHORNE, myself, and others, in recognizing this important day.

I thank the President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first, I would like to say to the Senator from

Oregon that I applaud him for this, and I would ask that my name be included as one of his original cosponsors.

PROHIBITING CONVEYANCE OF
LAND AT LONG BEACH NAVAL
STATION

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise today to share with you and with my colleagues something I think is quite significant that is taking place, and also to correct some of the things that I have said that I found to be untrue.

I was on the floor yesterday introducing an amendment to the 1999 Senate defense authorization bill. In this authorization bill, I have an amendment that would stop the transfer of land in California at Long Beach to the COSCO, which is the Chinese Ocean Shipping Company. I would like to share why this is an important amendment.

I don't criticize any of my fellow Senators. But when I started talking about this yesterday, and I moved to set aside the Feinstein amendment in order to consider my amendment to stop the transfer of land to COSCO out in California, there was objection to that unanimous consent request. In a way, I think that is good because it gives me an opportunity to go into a lot more detail and to talk on some talk radio shows to alert America as to the seriousness of something that is happening out there.

I would like to start off by saying, however, that when I talked on the floor about the fact that President Clinton signed a waiver back in 1996, and then another waiver in 1998 that allowed the transfer of technology to the Chinese, this was something that I thought was done in secret. I found out just this morning that it was not done in secret. He signed a waiver. He apparently did not disobey any law or violate any law in so doing. However, since I am a member of both the Intelligence Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee, and I was not aware that he signed the waiver in 1996 or 1998, and not one of my colleagues who I have talked to was aware of it, I reasonably assumed that it was done in secret.

To kind of give you the sequence in which this happened, I will tell you, Mr. President, that in June of 1989 we all saw what happened on the Tiananmen Square. At that time, as a result of the Tiananmen Square massacre, our country imposed some sanctions banning U.S. trade in dual-use technology. The President retains the power to grant waivers on a case-by-case basis. It seems to me that this President has an obsession in granting waivers and preferential treatment to China. In a minute I am going to read an article from this morning's New York Times that might shed a little light as to why the President was doing this. Let me finish with this sequence of events.

From 1990 to 1995, there were some waivers given for certain technologies.

In 1995, President Clinton offered a waiver for commercial satellites, allowing U.S. satellites to be launched on Chinese rockets. The Loral Corporation—maybe it was a coincidence—which was the single largest contributor to the Democratic National Committee in two Presidential elections, in 1992 and 1996, took advantage of this waiver. So we had our commercial satellites placed on rockets that were designed and manufactured by the Chinese government. Anyway, one of these rockets went off, and there was an explosion in 1996, and they went in to investigate as to why the explosion took place. In 1998, just 2 months ago, in February of this year, the President granted another waiver allowing the transfer of information to China which gave them more reliability and accuracy in their missiles.

Now, I would like to put this in a context that is easier to understand for a lot of people who are not involved in these issues. I am from the State of Oklahoma. It is a known fact—there is nothing classified about it—that both China and Russia have missiles that can reach the United States from anyplace in China or Russia. Specifically, in the case of China, they have their CS-4 missile that has a range of 8,000 kilometers, and by going the polar route, it will reach anyplace in the continental United States or any part of the United States. So this missile will do it.

However, with the technology the Chinese had before the President allowed our technology to go over there and give them more accuracy, their missile could hit my State of Oklahoma but it could not pinpoint any particular city like Oklahoma City or Tulsa or Fort Sill or any of our military establishments. With this technology, it gives them the accuracy to do that. So that is what the President did. I am very concerned about this obsession that the President has to share everything that we have with the Chinese.

Let's keep in mind we are talking about the China Ocean Shipping Company. It is not just owned by the Chinese. It is owned and run by the Communist Chinese military. It was only a week ago Monday that the Washington Times came out and disclosed the content of a CIA report. This report stated that there were some 18 CS-4 missiles that China had that were targeted at various places around the world, and 13 of those missiles are targeted at cities, major cities in the United States of America.

Now, when you get a little bit concerned about the President giving preferential treatment to China with all these waivers, allowing them to have our technology so they can pinpoint their targets, and then we find out, as I think most of us knew anyway, that there are rockets in China, ICBMs aimed at major cities in the United States of America, it is very, very distressing.

This morning in the New York Times this article on the front page right here says, "Democrat Fund-Raiser Said to Name China Tie." This is a major breakthrough, and it may shed some light as to why the President has been granting these waivers and giving this Presidential treatment, and in my opinion changing his policy to the Far East from what it was when he ran for President in 1992. I recall that he made statements in opposition to MFN status for China. Now he is the leading advocate for MFN status for China. He was one who was opposed at one time to the normalization of our relations with Vietnam, and, of course, now, as we all know, he has headed up an effort that has successfully normalized those relations. He is right now spending much of his time trying to convince Congress to let the IMF bail out some Far Eastern banking concerns to the extent of \$18 billion.

Let me just read, Mr. President, the first four paragraphs from this article in the New York Times, "Democrat Fund-Raiser Said to Name China Tie."

A Democratic fund-raiser has told Federal investigators he funneled tens of thousands of dollars from a Chinese military officer to the Democrats during President Clinton's 1996 re-election campaign, according to lawyers and officials with knowledge of the Justice Department's campaign finance inquiry.

The fund-raiser, Johnny Chung—

We all remember Johnny Chung, this friend of President Clinton's of long-standing—

told investigators that a large part of the nearly \$100,000 he gave to Democratic causes in the summer of 1996—including \$80,000 to the Democratic National Committee—came from China's People's Liberation Army through a Chinese lieutenant colonel and aerospace executive whose father was Gen. Liu Huaqing, the officials and lawyers said.

General Liu was then not only China's top military commander but also a member of the [top] leadership of the Communist Party.

It goes on to talk about this. It says.

... investigators regard the identification of Ms. Liu—

This is his daughter—

as a breakthrough in their long search for conformation of a "China Plan." The hunt was prompted after American intelligence intercepted telephone conversations suggesting that Beijing considered covertly influencing the American elections.

I am quoting all this out of an article that is in today's New York Times.

Now, Mr. President, I do want to go back and address my amendment because my amendment is going to be before this body this coming Tuesday, and when it is, I want to make sure that all of my colleagues who are watching right now, or listening, hopefully, have full knowledge of exactly what this amendment is all about.

First of all, I think it is important to look at what is COSCO. COSCO—that stands for the China Ocean Shipping Company—is owned by not just the Chinese Government, but it is run by China's military. COSCO reports to the Chinese Ministry of Communication which falls under the State Council