

against human rights in the annual reports on the human rights practices of countries receiving United States security assistance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted on June 1, 1998:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary: Report to accompany the bill (S. 1360) to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify and improve the requirements for the development of an automated entry-exit control system, to enhance land border control and enforcement, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 105-197).

By Mr. CHAFEE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment.

S. 1531: A bill to deauthorize certain portions of the project for navigation, Bass Harbor, Maine.

S. 1532: A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 to deauthorize the remainder of the project at East Boothbay, Harbor, Maine.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. Res. 238. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding human rights conditions in China and Tibet; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. Res. 239. A resolution to authorize testimony and document production and representation of Senate employees in *Pointe Properties, Inc., et al. v. Michael J. Bevenour, et al.*; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 507

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 507, a bill to establish the United States Patent and Trademark Organization as a Government corporation, to amend the provisions of title 35, United States Code, relating to procedures for patent applications, commercial use of patents, reexamination reform, and for other purposes.

S. 831

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 831, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for congressional review of any rule promulgated by the Internal Revenue Service that increases Federal revenue, and for other purposes.

S. 980

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army to close the United States Army School of the Americas.

S. 1021

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs.

HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1021, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that consideration may not be denied to preference eligibles applying for certain positions in the competitive service, and for other purposes.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1081, a bill to enhance the rights and protections for victims of crime.

S. 1422

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1422, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to promote competition in the market for delivery of multichannel video programming and for other purposes.

S. 1645

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1645, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines to avoid laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 1717

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) were added as cosponsors of S. 1717, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to strengthen the naturalization process.

S. 1868

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1868, a bill to express United States foreign policy with respect to, and to strengthen United States advocacy on behalf of, individuals persecuted for their faith worldwide; to authorize United States actions in response to religious persecution worldwide; to establish an Ambassador at Large on International Religious Freedom within the Department of State, a Commission on International Religious Persecution, and a Special Adviser on International Religious Freedom within the National Security Council; and for other purposes.

S. 1970

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1970, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to provide assistance in the conservation of neotropical migratory birds.

S. 1993

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1993, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the formula used to determine

costs limits for home health agencies under medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2007

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2007, a bill to amend the false claims provisions of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code.

S. 2073

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2073, a bill to authorize appropriations for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

S. 2091

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2091, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure medicare reimbursement for certain ambulance services, and to improve the efficiency of the emergency medical system, and for other purposes.

S. 2095

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2095, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 94

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 94, A concurrent resolution supporting the religious tolerance toward Muslims.

SENATE RESOLUTION 176

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 176, A resolution proclaiming the week of October 18 through October 24, 1998, as "National Character Counts Week".

SENATE RESOLUTION 193

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 193, A resolution designating December 13, 1998, as "National Children's Memorial Day".

SENATE RESOLUTION 238—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS CONDITIONS IN CHINA AND TIBET

Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself, Mr. DURBIN and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 238

Whereas President Clinton will be the first United States head of state to visit China

since the 1989 crackdown on the pro-democracy movement at Tiananmen Square;

Whereas according to the State Department's China Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 1996, "The Government continues to commit widespread and well documented human rights abuses, in violation of internationally-accepted norms, stemming from the authorities' intolerance of dissent, fear of unrest, and the absence or inadequacy of laws protecting basic freedoms.":

Whereas the symbolism of the official arrival ceremony which will take place in Tiananmen Square could be interpreted as a message to the Chinese people that will override anything the President might say about human rights and the rule of law;

Whereas specific human rights preconditions should have been set forth before setting the date for the President's visit; and

Whereas the President can still make important human rights points during his visit to Beijing; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) at the upcoming United States-China summit the President should—

(A) secure from China's leaders a pledge to remove by a certain date the names on an official reentry blacklist, which now contains the names of more than fifty Chinese citizens living in the United States who cannot return to China because of their peaceful advocacy of greater rights and freedom; and

(B) visit family members of victims of the 1989 massacre, many of whom still suffer from political harassment, discrimination or persecution; and

(2) in the context of the upcoming United States-China summit, the President should urge the Chinese leaders to—

(A) engage in a meaningful dialogue with the Dalai Lama with the aim of establishing genuine cultural and religious autonomy in Tibet;

(B) revise China's vague, draconian security laws, including the provisions on "endangering state security" added to the criminal code in March 1997;

(C) release unconditionally all imprisoned political, religious, and labor activists detained for their peaceful, nonviolent involvement in public protests;

(D) review the sentences of more than 2,000 convicted so-called "counterrevolutionaries" with a view towards granting full amnesty and releasing those convicted solely for exercising their internationally recognized rights of free speech and association, especially since the crime of "counterrevolution" has itself been abolished;

(E) encourage greater cooperation by the Chinese government with the United Nations' human rights mechanisms and greater transparency in China's legal and detention system;

(F) ease religious repression by abolishing the requirement that all religious sites register with the official Religious Affairs Bureau and implementing the 1994 recommendations of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Religious Intolerance;

(G) lift government mandated quotas on the number of monks and nuns in monasteries and nunneries, end the government's current "reeducation" campaign, and immediately reinstate all monks and nuns expelled from their monasteries and nunneries for failing to denounce the Dalai Lama;

(H) allow access by credible, independent human rights or humanitarian organizations to the nine-year-old boy recognized by the Dalai Lama in 1995 as the reincarnation of the Panchen Lama; and

(I) allow regular, unmonitored access to Tibet and Xinjiang province of China by independent human rights monitors.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am going to introduce a resolution today that I will send to the desk. This will be on behalf of—I will do it after my remarks—myself and Senators DURBIN and LEAHY.

This is a resolution calling upon the President to make human rights a major priority in his June visit to China. Probably later on we will introduce this resolution in the form of a sense-of-the-Senate amendment to the Department of Defense bill.

Mr. President, I rise today to submit a resolution calling upon the President to make human rights a major priority in his June visit to China. Thus far, the Administration has not articulated any concrete goals or objectives for the upcoming summit, other than to demonstrate a friendly relationship between the U.S. and China. Preliminary negotiations with the Chinese leadership on the summit agenda indicate that Beijing is unlikely to make any major policy concessions when it comes to human rights.

I am not opposed—I think I need to say that again—to high-level discussions with the Chinese leadership. In fact, I think they can be very useful. But I am worried about the symbolism of a Presidential visit, and I think it may backfire if the President does not continue to speak out about our strong concerns when it comes to China's human rights record. The summit could be interpreted by many as legitimizing policies of the Chinese regime which, despite some legal reforms, continue to repress religious freedom and political freedom as well as political dissent.

The Chinese have avidly sought a Presidential visit because it signals to all at home and abroad that the U.S. has muffled its opposition to, and endorses cooperation with the Beijing government, the same government that continues to deny its citizens basic human rights and freedoms. By agreeing to a Presidential visit, without significant human rights preconditions—not merely token gestures—I fear that the Administration may be squandering a tremendous source of leverage with the Chinese government.

Since the May 1994 decision to delink trade and human rights, the Administration has not yet developed an effective bilateral or multilateral strategy for promoting meaningful improvements in human rights conditions in China and Tibet. I was deeply disappointed this year that despite a 95 to 5 vote in support here in the Senate, the Administration did not sponsor a resolution on China's human rights record at the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva, which is exactly the place you would bring such a resolution forward. We didn't do so. Mr. Wei, China's best known political dissident, has pointed out that the Chinese people view the commission's work as "barometer" to the human rights commission which met in Geneva by which to judge whether there is any inter-

national backing for their democracy movement in their country of China.

Our current policy may send a message to those brave men and women who risk their lives to campaign for democracy and freedom that the United States is not behind them.

By the way, I apply the standard to human rights or violations of human rights in all kinds of countries, be they left or be they right; it makes no difference.

In a speech that Mr. Wei presented at the Commission in Geneva, he recalled, "Last year, when the Commission failed to adopt a resolution on China, my prison guards laughed at me and said: 'Look at your so-called friends. They betrayed you,'" He went on to say, "This is precisely the time when support from our friends is most needed. And this is precisely the time that Western democracies have chosen to withdraw their support."

The Administration claims that China has made progress in the area of human rights. In my view, this is simply not true. The recent steps taken by the Chinese government are merely token, cosmetic gestures—diplomatic bargaining tactics that do not amount to a more open, free society. The overall pattern of human rights violations remains fundamentally unchanged.

While I wholeheartedly welcome China's announcement to sign the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, until it is actually signed and ratified, it is not fully binding. Two months after their pledge to sign, the Chinese have still not specified when they will sign or ratify this treaty. Even more importantly, once ratified, the Chinese must implement this treaty, which will require major changes in domestic laws and policies. So, it will be a long process before this covenant translates into concrete change or greater freedom for the Chinese people. A mere non-binding verbal agreement to sign should not be trumpeted as a huge victory and certainly did not warrant dropping the Geneva resolution.

That is what happened. Our Government, the administration, said to me that we are not going to go forward because the Chinese have agreed to sign this international covenant on civil and political rights. Several months have gone by. They haven't signed it. Even if they sign it, there is no evidence that they are necessarily going to implement a nonbinding international agreement, and it should not be a reason for having brought a resolution protesting their violation of human rights before the Geneva commission on civil rights. As my colleague Senator BIDEN said, "I don't agree with Senator WELLSTONE and others." The presiding Chair might not as well, when it comes to linking human rights with trade policy. That is too blunt an instrument. But if there was ever a place to bring this up, it should have been at the human rights gathering; it should have been in Geneva.

I am very happy that both my dear friend Wei Jingsheng and Wang Dan are in good health, safe and out of prison. However, we must be clear. These men were not released. They were forced into exile. Should either of them return to their homeland, they would be thrown into prison upon arrival. The Chinese government maintains a re-entry blacklist which contains the names of more than fifty Chinese citizens living in the U.S. Just last month two Chinese American democracy advocates were detained and deported upon their arrival in China. The forced exile of Wei and Wang does not represent systematic change. In early 1995 Wang wrote, "A society still needs idealists—people who are willing to sacrifice themselves to uphold the basic ideals of freedom and democracy."

I have to tell you that I don't know how they do it in these countries. I don't know how they do it. Maybe if it were I, myself, and I lived in a repressive country, I would speak out. Maybe I would have the courage to do it—maybe. But if I thought that my children, or my spouse, my loved ones, could also be rounded up, that they could be imprisoned, that they could be tortured, that they could be murdered—which is too often the case in too many countries; there are at least 70 countries that systematically practice torture in our world today—I don't know whether I could ever speak up. I think I would be afraid to, given what could happen to my loved ones.

It is cruel irony that these brave men's exiles are being used as evidence of China's progress.

Human rights advocates in China and around the world fear that the release of high profile dissidents could be used to justify a reduction in international pressure for systematic change in China, where according to the government's own count, some 2,000 people remain imprisoned for the crime of "counterrevolution," now called "endangering state security." Thousands more—political, labor, and religious dissidents—are serving terms of up to three years of "re-education through labor" without trial. The releases of Wei and Wang are clearly political calculations by the Chinese leadership, who have become adept at trading well-known prisoners in pre-summit diplomatic bargaining. Engaging the Chinese in this game of saving face and trading diplomatic favors sends out a message that we are not serious about human rights.

For years before the world ever saw the televised massacre at Tiananmen Square, peaceful demonstrations in Lhasa have been crushed by the PLA. Once imprisoned Tibetans, particularly monks and nuns, face unimaginable torture at the hands of prison officials. Furthermore, the Chinese government's policy of forced migration of Han Chinese into Tibet has rendered Tibetans a minority in cities such as Lhasa, where they are marginalized

and alienated. As the Chinese presence grows stronger, Tibet's unique culture faces the threat of extinction.

The Tibetan people have remained steadfast in their commitment to the path of non-violence. However, some Tibetan exiles are growing impatient, as indicated by one man's recent death through self-immolation. In a desperate attempt to draw the attention of the international community to the worsening situation in Tibet, Thubten Ngodup, a 50-year-old Tibetan exile in Delhi, India, set himself on fire.

In a recent meeting with President Jiang Zemin, Secretary Albright brought up the subject of Tibet and the American desire for a dialogue between Dalai Lama and the Chinese leadership. The Chinese sharply dismissed the Dalai Lama and flat out refused to enter into negotiations in order to bring about a peaceful settlement to the Tibetan issue.

The resolution I am submitting outlines concrete steps that would indicate a serious commitment to human rights concerns. In the context of the upcoming summit, we call upon the administration, at the highest level, to urge the Chinese leadership to revise their vague, draconian security laws, including provisions on "endangering state security" added to the criminal code in March 1997; to release unconditionally large numbers of imprisoned political, religious, and labor activists; and to review the sentences of more than 2,000 prisoners sentenced for "counterrevolutionary" activities, a crime that itself has been abolished.

With regards to religious freedom, the Administration should encourage the Chinese leadership to abolish the requirement that all religious sites register with the official Religious Affairs Bureau; to lift government mandated quotas on the number of monks and nuns in monasteries and nunneries; and to immediately reinstate all monks and nuns expelled from their monasteries and nunneries for failing to denounce the Dalai Lama.

This resolution also calls upon the administration to encourage the Chinese leadership to engage in a meaningful dialogue with the Dalai Lama with the aim of establishing genuine cultural and religious autonomy in Tibet.

Another concern is the symbolic significance of the President's official arrival ceremony which will take place in Tiananmen Square. We ask the President to make time in his schedule to meet with family members of at least one of the victims of the 1989 massacre, many of whom still suffer from political harassment, discrimination or persecution. We also ask the President to secure from the Chinese a pledge to get rid of the re-entry blacklist, which contains the names of more than fifty Chinese citizens living in the U.S. who cannot return to China. Allowing pro-democracy activists, journalists or labor organizers to return to China would be a significant gesture by

the Chinese authority. Finally, until the Chinese leadership takes serious, concrete action on the concerns outlined above, we would strongly oppose lifting the trade sanctions imposed after the 1989 crackdown on demonstrators at Tiananmen Square.

Some say that we cannot influence what happens in China, that the country is too proud, too large, and that changes take too long. I disagree. For years we have pressured the Chinese on human rights, and to let up now is tantamount to defeat for the cause of human justice. Dissidents who have been freed and come to the United States have thanked advocates for keeping them alive, by keeping the pressure on, and focusing attention on their plight. It is our duty and in the interest to make the extra effort required to promote freedom and democracy in China, and to bring it into compliance with international standards on human rights.

Let me just make one other point. For years, before the world ever saw the televised massacre of Tiananmen Square, Peaceful demonstrations in Tibet have been crushed. Once imprisoned, Tibetans, particularly monks and nuns, face unimaginable torture at the hands of prison officials. Furthermore, the Chinese Government's forced migration of Han Chinese into Tibet has rendered the Tibetans a minority in their own country, and as the Chinese presence grows stronger an stronger, Tibet's unique culture basically faces extinction. So let me just be crystal clear. Whether it is in China or Tibet as well, we ought to be speaking up for human rights.

Jiang Zemin, in a recent meeting with Secretary Albright, made it crystal clear when the subject of Tibet was brought up that the Chinese are not interested in sitting down in any negotiations with the Dalai Lama and are unwilling to bring about any kind of peaceful settlement to the Tibetan issue.

So in this resolution, this is what we call upon the administration to do at the highest level: to urge the Chinese leadership to revise their vague, draconian security laws, including provisions on "endangering state security," added to the Criminal Code in March of 1997; to urge the Chinese to release unconditionally a large number of imprisoned political, religious, and labor activists, and to review the sentences of more than 2,000 prisoners sentenced for "counterrevolutionary activities," a crime that has been abolished.

With regard to religious freedom, the administration should encourage the Chinese leadership to abolish the requirement that all religious sites be registered with the official Religious Affairs Bureau, to lift Government mandated quotas on the number of monks and nuns in monasteries and nunneries, and to immediately reinstate monks and nuns failing to denounce the Dalai Lama.

This resolution also calls upon the administration to encourage the Chinese leadership to engage in meaningful dialog with the Dalai Lama with the aim of establishing genuine cultural and religious and political freedom and autonomy in Tibet.

Another concern is the symbolic significance of the President's official arrival ceremony, which will take place in Tiananmen Square. We ask the President to make time in this schedule to meet with family members of at least one of the victims of the 1989 massacre, many of whom still suffer from political harassment, discrimination, and persecution.

We also ask the President to secure from the Chinese a pledge to get rid of the reentry blacklist which contains the names of more than 50 Chinese citizens living in the United States who cannot return to China. Allowing pro-democracy journalists or labor organizers to return to China would be a significant gesture by the Chinese authority. Finally, until the Chinese leadership takes serious, concrete action on the concerns outlined above, we would strongly oppose lifting the trade sanctions imposed after the 1989 crackdown on demonstrators at Tiananmen Square.

As a U.S. Senator, I cannot forget the courage of those students, cannot forget the murder of those students, and cannot forget their struggle then and their struggle now for democracy in their country. It took us a little time, but that is why I am really pleased that I believe our Government has really come out on the side of the students in Indonesia, and I think we are making a difference.

Mr. President, some say that we cannot influence what happens in China; the country is too proud, too large, and the changes take too long. I disagree. For years, we pressured the Chinese on human rights, and to let up now is tantamount to defeat for the cause of human justice. Dissidents who have been freed and have come to the United States have thanked advocates for keeping them alive by keeping the pressure on, by focusing on their plight. It is our duty and it is in our interests to make the extra effort required to promote freedom and democracy in China and to bring it into compliance with international standards on human rights.

Mr. President, there will be a great deal of activity this week that will be focusing on the President's upcoming visit, and I really hope that when Senator DURBIN and Senator LEAHY and I bring this resolution to the floor as a sense-of-the-Senate amendment, we will get a very strong vote.

I really do believe, whether it is in China or whether it is in Indonesia or whether it is in North Korea or whether it is in a whole lot of countries, the former Burma, you name them, there simply has to be a way that we, as a nation, lead the way. There has to be a way that the United States of America

can be there to support people. We cannot do everything. We don't directly intervene in all of these countries. But it saddens me that all too often we just simply turn our gaze away from people who are willing to almost stand alone to challenge repressive governments. We ought to be more on their side. We ought to be speaking out more about human rights. We ought to be speaking out more about the importance of democracy in other countries.

I really believe that the President's visit to China will be a test case. If the President of the United States of America is going to go to Tiananmen Square—I wish he wouldn't. I wish he would not do so, but if he is going to visit, then he needs to visit with the families of those who gave their lives for freedom in that country. He needs to speak out about human rights. He needs to use the leverage of our country and the leadership of the United States of America to make a difference. We just can't say, well, markets, markets, markets; there will be all sorts of markets; we will make all kinds of money; it will be great for the business community.

Great. I come from a State that is an export State. The Presiding Officer comes from a State where agriculture is very important. Agriculture is very important in Minnesota. I am really proud of agriculture. I am proud of the business sector in our State. But these are not mutually exclusive goals. I am not arguing that we are not interested in trade. I am not arguing that we don't look to future markets. But what I am saying is that it just makes me uneasy as an American citizen and it makes me uneasy as a Senator that we focus exclusively on commercial ties, exclusively on markets, exclusively on money to be made, all of which is fine up to the point where we just turn our gaze away from human rights violations, countries that systematically round up and imprison people because they speak out. That is wrong. That is wrong. That is not what our country is about.

Since I have time to speak about human rights today, I will finish this way. All of us, I think, develop our viewpoints based upon our own life experience. I was a teacher for 20 years before having the opportunity to become a Senator, before the people of Minnesota gave me this chance, and I used to ask students to write on the same essay question at the end of every take-home paper, and the question was: Why do you think about what you think about politics? I never graded it. I just wanted them to think about what shaped their viewpoint—why do they care about some things and not others? Why do they consider themselves a liberal or conservative, whatever label you use? Was it their religion? Was it their family, mother or father? Was it some kind of powerful, crystallized experience where maybe—I remember one student wrote an essay and he talked about how his brother

was born with disabilities, developmental disabilities, and that just completely changed his life and his family's life. Their whole view about whether or not maybe some people needed help, their whole view about health care policy changed on the basis of what he saw with his brother and his struggle and the struggles of his family.

Well, for me, I don't come to the floor to try to make life difficult for our President. I don't come to the floor to criticize for the sake of criticizing. But my father, who is no longer alive, fled persecution in Russia, and the one thing that he talked about more than anything else was the importance of freedom and how much he loved our country.

Well, I come from a background of an immigrant who fled persecution. I come from a background of an immigrant who fled persecution from Russia whose family was probably murdered by Stalin, who at age 17 left Russia and never saw his family again.

I don't even know why I am talking about this on the floor of the Senate, but I think it applies somehow. At the very end of my dad's life he had Parkinson's disease, and we would spend the night with him. Sheila and I would rotate spending the night with him. Here he lived in the United States of America for 60 years and spoke perfect English, but all of his dreaming was in Russian. But it was not good dreams. It was shouting, it was torment, it was agony. As a son, I just cried. I didn't know what he was saying. I don't know the language. But I knew that this was anguish.

What I always believed, and what I believe as I speak on the floor of the U.S. Senate today, is that this is what happens when you can never go back to your country, when you never can see your family again. Americans, thank God, don't have that experience too often. What does it mean when you can never go back and see your family again? What does it mean when you probably know, because you work for the U.S. Government, and my dad worked for the Voice of America, that your mother and father and sister were probably murdered?

We should support human rights in other countries. We should be supporting human rights in China.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent a "Dear Colleague" from myself and Senator DURBIN, and a letter, dated May 29, 1998, that I sent to President Clinton, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, May 29, 1998.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As you know, President Clinton will be the first U.S. head of state to visit China since the 1989 crackdown on the pro-democracy movement at Tiananmen Square. We intend to introduce a resolution next week urging the President to use the opportunity of the upcoming U.S.-China summit to press for significant, concrete

human rights progress in China and Tibet. We are also sending a letter to President Clinton, expressing our concerns. Copies of both are enclosed.

Some specific steps which would indicate a true commitment to greater openness and freedom on the part of the Chinese leadership include the unconditional release of imprisoned political, labor, and religious activists; an end to the formal process of requiring all religious groups to register with the authorities and submit to state control; the initiation of a meaningful dialogue with the Dalai Lama and steps to ease repression in Tibet; and a revision of China's vague, draconian security laws, including the provisions on "endangering state security" added to the criminal code in March 1997.

Given the importance of a Presidential visit to the Chinese leadership, this summit provides an excellent opportunity for President Clinton to act and speak out strongly on behalf of internationally-recognized human rights. Please join us in signing the enclosed letter and cosponsoring the resolution. If you have questions or would like to cosponsor the resolution and sign the letter, please let us know or have your staff contact Debra Ladner at 224-5641.

Sincerely,

PAUL WELLSTONE,
U.S. Senator.
RICHARD DURBIN,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, May 29, 1998.

President WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON,
The White House, Pennsylvania Avenue, NW,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During the summit meeting in Washington last October with Chinese President Jiang Zemin, you spoke out clearly to condemn the brutal 1989 crackdown on the pro-democracy movement, declaring that China's leaders were "on the wrong side of history." As you prepare to visit China—the first U.S. chief executive to go to China since 1989—we are writing to urge you to act and speak out just as strongly on behalf of internationally-recognized human rights.

For China to become a fully reliable member of the global trading community, its leadership must demonstrate greater respect for fundamental rights and the rule of law. In the crucial weeks leading to your visit, we hope the Administration will press for significant, concrete human rights progress in China and Tibet. This is a time of enormous opportunity, given the importance of your visit both to the Chinese leadership and to U.S.-Sino relations.

Specifically, we urge you to:

Reconsider your decision to visit Tiananmen Square, as we feel it is inappropriate. However, if you do choose to visit, as reports indicate, visit family members of the victims of the 1989 massacre, many of whom still suffer from political harassment, discrimination or persecution;

Call for the unconditional release and amnesty of political, religious and labor activists, imprisoned solely for non-violent, peaceful protests, including some 150 Beijing residents still imprisoned since the 1989 crackdown;

Press for revisions in China's state security laws to bring them into conformity with international standards, and steps to abolish arbitrary administrative punishments, particularly the use of "re-education through labor;"

Urge steps to protect freedom of association for Chinese workers, including the right to form free trade unions as guaranteed in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which China signed in October 1997;

Promote religious freedom in China by calling for an end to the current process of formally requiring all religious groups to register with the authorities and submit to state control;

Encourage a meaningful dialogue with the Dalai Lama and steps by Chinese officials to ease repression in Tibet, such as the release of imprisoned Buddhist monks, nuns and other Tibetans; an end to the "re-education" campaign by Chinese authorities resulting in the expulsion of thousands of monks and nuns who refuse to denounce the Dalai Lama; and regular access to Tibet by international human rights monitors.

We hope your visit will lead to meaningful progress on these critical human rights issues of such urgent concern to members of Congress and the American people.

Sincerely,

PAUL WELLSTONE,
U.S. Senator.

SENATE RESOLUTION 239—AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY, DOCUMENT PRODUCTION, AND REPRESENTATION OF SENATE EMPLOYEES

Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 239

Whereas, in the case of Pointe Properties, Inc., et al. v. Michael J. Bevenour, et al., No. 96-CA-009720, pending in the Superior Court for the District of Columbia, testimony has been requested from Mike Morrill, an employee on the staff of Senator Barbara A. Mikulski;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. 288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony or the production of documents relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved That Mike Morrill, and any other employee from whom testimony or document production may be required, are authorized to testify and produce documents in the case of Pointe Properties, Inc., et al. v. Michael J. Bevenour, et al., except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Mike Morrill, and any other employee from whom testimony or document production may be required, in connection with Pointe Properties, Inc., et al. v. Michael J. Bevenour, et al.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will meet

in open session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 3, 1998 beginning at 9:30 a.m. to conduct an oversight hearing on Tribal Justice Programs. Focus on joint Department (DOJ/DOI) Indian Country Law Enforcement Initiative and other related tribal justice issues. The hearing will be held in room G-50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. Those wishing additional information should contact the Committee on Indian Affairs at 202/224-2251.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

MEDICAL INNOVATION TAX CREDIT ACT OF 1998

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I wish to draw attention to legislation I have cosponsored that will create the Medical Innovation Tax Credit. This bill will facilitate the development of lifesaving medical treatments at medical schools and teaching hospitals. I am pleased to join my colleagues, Senators D'AMATO, FEINSTEIN, BOXER, and HUTCHISON, in this initiative.

In my own State of West Virginia, and throughout this country, academic medical centers are feeling the changes in the health care marketplace. With limited reimbursement under managed care and cuts in Medicare payments, these medical institutions are under increasing financial pressures.

To compound these stressors, academic medical centers also support certain services, such as burn units or trauma centers, which are vital to the community but financially draining to a hospital's budget. West Virginia University's Ruby Memorial Hospital, for example, operates a trauma unit which serves as a lifeline to victims of serious injuries. Our legislation would help these academic medical centers to avoid choosing between research and the day-to-day activities associated with the running of a hospital.

Under the Medical Innovation Tax Credit, pharmaceutical or biotechnology companies would receive a tax credit equal to 20 percent of the funds spent for medical research expenses conducted at eligible sites. This incentive will make them a more attractive site for clinical trials. Given the important role played by academic medical centers, I believe this support is warranted.

Mr. President, our bill will add a freestanding section to the Internal Revenue Code to create this research incentive. It is intended to complement the existing research-targeted tax credits—the Research and Experimental Tax Credit and the Orphan Drug Tax Credit, both of which have been credited with stimulating billions of dollars in research. Initial clinical studies are just the beginning, however. Additional studies are frequently needed to determine combinations for administering drugs and for providing the most appropriate therapies to patients. The Medical Innovation Tax Credit is