

labor regulations, thus increasing opportunities for American workers by eliminating many of the incentives that currently induce firms to move production and jobs to China.

What about using PNTR status and WTO membership to pressure Chinese authorities into making significant improvements in other nontrade related policy areas? As I said earlier, while I have already registered my concerns about China's record in these areas, I am doubtful that directly linking PNTR status to changes in China's policies in these areas will produce overnight positive changes. I think all of us seek.

There is sufficient historical experience to suggest that linkage will not cause Chinese authorities to improve their behavior in these areas one iota. Quite the opposite seems to be the case. Over the last quarter of a century, Chinese authorities have responded very consistently and negatively to attempts by others to unilaterally dictate to them how they should govern their citizens. At such times, the very issues we have cared about most—human rights, religious freedom, Taiwan's security—have suffered. Rather, it has been during periods of U.S. engagement with Chinese authorities, when we have carried out a respectful dialogue between our two governments, that we have seen demonstrable improvements in China's policies in these areas.

More recently, U.S. engagement has resulted in China joining a number of major multilateral arms control regimes, in assisting us to defuse a nuclear crisis on the Korean Peninsula, and in participating constructively in international efforts to contain the escalating arms race between India and Pakistan.

I am not one who believes that China's accession to the WTO is going to convert the state-controlled Chinese society into a Jeffersonian democracy overnight. However, I would argue that China's adherence to the discipline of WTO's rules and standards have a greater likelihood to accelerate the pace of market economic reforms that are already underway in China. And, as a by-product of those reforms, the grip of the Chinese state on the day to day lives of the Chinese people will become weaker and weaker. Individual freedom may gradually fill the vacuum created by the withdrawal of state control. Whether that process will ultimately transform China's political system is impossible to predict with any certainty. Certainly isolating China isn't going to facilitate such a transformation.

I am not the only one who holds that view. A number of prominent human rights activists in China have spoken out publicly in support of the pending legislation and in favor of China's admission to the WTO. I am thinking of such individuals as Martin Lee, the internationally known leader of Hong Kong's Democratic party, His Excel-

lency the Dalai Lama, Dai Qing, a leading political dissident and environmentalist who was imprisoned for ten months following the 1989 Tiananmen Square Massacre, and Bao Tong, a senior advisor to ousted President Zhao Ziyang—both of whom were imprisoned for their opposition to the Tiananmen crackdown. None of these individuals have suggested that we deny China admission to the WTO until it becomes a democracy.

In fact, if we refuse to grant PNTR status to China or oppose its admission to the WTO, we will have delivered an enormous setback to the Chinese reformers and entrepreneurs who have been the driving force for the positive political and economic changes that have occurred in China over the last twenty years. We will also have given an enormous gift to our economic competitors in Europe and Asia by giving them a foothold in perhaps the most important emerging market in the global economy of the 21st century—a foothold that will be difficult for our own Nation to regain. American jobs would be the ones that suffer and American workers the ones who pay the price.

Denying China PNTR would also only exacerbate an alarmingly high existing trade deficit with the United States, in my view. In 1997, the U.S. trade deficit with China soared to nearly \$50 billion, making it second only to Japan as a trading deficit partner. Sadly, that number has only increased over time. By 1999, it had climbed almost \$20 billion more, to \$69 billion, and it continues to grow.

In closing, I believe the legislation we are considering today is in our national economic interest because it will enhance international growth and competition. It will strengthen the global trading system and foster adherence to rules and standards under which we want all nations to operate.

I also believe it is in our foreign policy interests, as well. China's obligation to open its markets and to abide by internationally prescribed trade rules is an important step toward Chinese adherence to other important international norms and standards which must, over time, lead to democratic transformation of that society, as I have seen occur in nearly every other corner of the globe in the past decade and a half.

No one in this body is naive enough to believe this is going to happen overnight, that these changes we talk about are necessarily going to occur at the pace we would like to see. But, at the very least, we must begin making strides in that direction.

For those reasons, while I will support various amendments that I think are an important expression of how my constituents feel in Connecticut and how the American public feels on a number of very important non trade-related issues, when this debate is concluded, I happen to believe it would be in the best interests of my Nation that

we grant this status to China in the hopes that the improvements we all seek in this land of more than 1 billion people will occur sooner rather than later.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon on Monday, September 11, the Senate resume consideration of Senator BYRD's amendment regarding subsidies. Further, I ask unanimous consent that there be 60 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form with no amendments in order to the amendment. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following the debate time, the amendment be set aside, with a vote to occur on the amendment at a time determined by the majority leader after consultation with the Democratic leader.

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that when Senator BYRD offers an amendment relating to safeguards, there be 3 hours for debate equally divided in the usual form, with no amendments in order to the amendment. Further, I ask consent, following that debate time, the vote occur on the amendment at a time to be determined by the majority leader after consultation with the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

THE DEMOCRATS ARE NOT STALLING

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished Senator from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, came to the floor to respond to an article that appeared in the newspaper, USA Today. I want to take just a moment to respond to the article, as well as to some of his comments. He responded, I think, as I would if I had read the article. It is entitled, "Senate Democratic Leader Plans Stalling Tactics," and makes reference to the fact that we are running out of time at the end of the year and it claims to know that I have a simple strategy for winning the final negotiations over spending bills—and I am now reading from the article: "Stall until the Republicans have to cave in because they can't wait any longer to recess," and noted there are a lot more vulnerable Republican Senators than there are Democratic Senators.

As often is the case—I don't blame this reporter, and I am not sure I know who the reporter is—I think that was taken from a comment that I made in my daily press conference, where I simply noted that those who were in the majority oftentimes are the ones who pay a higher price the longer we are in session, the closer we get to the election, noting that we have experienced that rude realization ourselves on at

least two occasions, in 1980 and 1994, and that the longer one goes into the campaign season while we are still in session, the more it requires that Senators remain present here in Washington and not available for the demands of a rigorous campaign.

That was all I said. I made no reference to our desire to stall anything. In fact, it is not. The reason I have come to the floor is to emphasize our strong hope that we do not see any stalling whatsoever; that we move on with the remaining appropriations bills. Eleven of them have yet to be signed into law. I note for the record that two have not even left subcommittee. The District of Columbia appropriations bill and the HUD-VA bill are still pending in the subcommittee.

We finished our work on the energy and water appropriations bill this week. It would be my hope that we could go to the only other pending appropriations bill on the calendar, which is the Commerce-State-Justice bill, next week. I do not know that is the intention of the majority leader, but clearly it is a bill that must be considered and completed at the earliest possible date.

Our hope is that as we work through these appropriations bills, we will have the opportunity to work through other pieces of unfinished business. We are hopeful we can make real progress, maybe as early as next week, on the minimum wage bill. Our hope is that we can finish our work next week on the legislation granting permanent normal trade relations to China. Our hope is that we can actually finish a Patients' Bill of Rights bill and maybe gun safety legislation. Our hope is that we can deal with the prescription drug benefit bill. There is an array of pieces of the unfinished agenda that we would love to be able to address—education issues having to do with reducing the number of students in every class, hiring teachers, afterschool programs, school construction. Those issues have to be addressed at some point.

Whether it is authorizing or appropriating, we remain ready and willing to work with our colleagues to accomplish as much as possible. I do not know whether or not it is conducive to that goal not to have votes on Fridays or Mondays. It seems to me, with all the work that remains, Senators should be here casting their votes and participating fully in debates that will be required ultimately if we are going to complete our work on time.

I come to the floor this afternoon only to clarify the record and ensure that if anybody has any doubt, let me address that doubt forthrightly. We want to finish our work. We want to work with our Republican colleagues. We have no desire to stall anything. Our hope is that we can finish on time and complete all 13 appropriations bills no later than the first of October. There is no need for a continuing resolution. We can complete our work in

the next 3 weeks. That is our desire, and that certainly will be our intent as we make decisions with regard to what agreements we can reach on schedule, as well as on substance, in the coming days.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under consideration is H.R. 4444 and the Smith amendment No. 4129.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 2000

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I again ask why the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000 is being held up. Senator CAMPBELL and I, and others, both Republicans and Democrats, introduced this bulletproof vest bill to help our police officers. We introduced it last April. It was stuck in the Judiciary Committee for a time despite my requests that it be brought forth. It finally was allowed on the agenda and was passed out of there unanimously in June.

I find it hard to think that anybody who would be opposed to using some of our Federal crime-fighting money for bulletproof vests for our police officers. In fact, most Senators with whom I have talked, Republican and Democrat, tell me they are very much in favor of it. They saw how this worked in its first 2 years of operation. The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program under the original Campbell-Leahy bill funded more than 180,000 new bulletproof vests for police officers across the Nation.

We have a bill, though, that has been stalled, unfortunately, by an anonymous hold on the Republican side. This is a bipartisan bill that is being held up in a partisan fashion.

I am continually being asked by police officers who know how well the original Campbell-Leahy bill worked on bulletproof vests why we cannot pass this continuation of it. It is strongly supported by police officers all over the country. The President has made it very clear he would sign such a bill into law, as he did the last one. It is something that, if it were brought to a rollcall vote in the Senate, I am willing to guess 98, maybe all 100 Senators, would vote for it. Certainly no fewer than 95 Senators would vote for it.

When we could not pass it by unanimous consent before our summer recess because there was a hold, I wanted to make sure I could tell these police officers that there was no hold on this side. We actually checked with all 46 Democratic Senators. All 46 told us they would support it. All 46 said they would consent to having it passed any-

time we want to bring it up by a voice vote.

I have told these police officers that while a significant number of both Republicans and Democrats support it or have cosponsored it, and while every single Democrat has said they support having it passed today, there is an anonymous hold on the Republican side. I hope that hold will go away. I urge these same police departments that have contacted me to contact the Republican leadership and say: Please ask whoever your anonymous Senator is to take the hold away and let the Campbell-Leahy bill pass.

That it has still not passed the full Senate is very disappointing to me, as I am sure that it is to our nation's law enforcement officers, who need life-saving bulletproof vests to protect themselves. Protecting and supporting our law enforcement community should not be a partisan issue.

Senator CAMPBELL and I worked together closely and successfully in the last Congress to pass the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 1998 into law. This year's bill reauthorizes and extends the successful program that we helped create and that the Department of Justice has done such a good job implementing.

We have 19 cosponsors on the new bill, including a number of Democrats and some Republicans. This is a bipartisan bill that is not being treated in a bipartisan way. For some unknown reason a Republican Senator has a hold on this bill and has chosen to exercise that right anonymously.

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, more than 40 percent of the 1,182 officers killed by a firearm in the line of duty since 1980 could have been saved if they had been wearing body armor. Indeed, the FBI estimates that the risk of fatality to officers while not wearing body armor is 14 times higher than for officers wearing it.

To better protect our Nation's law enforcement officers, Senator CAMPBELL and I introduced the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 1998. President Clinton signed our legislation into law on June 16, 1998. Our law created a \$25 million, 50 percent matching grant program within the Department of Justice to help state and local law enforcement agencies purchase body armor for fiscal years 1999–2001.

In its first two years of operation, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program has funded more than 180,000 new bulletproof vests for police officers across the country.

The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000 builds on the success of this program by doubling its annual funding to \$50 million for fiscal years 2002–2004. It also improves the program by guaranteeing jurisdictions with fewer than 100,000 residents receive the full 50–50 matching funds because of the tight budgets of these smaller communities and by making the purchase of stab-proof vests eligible for grant