

This center stands as a prime example of success in our Nation's social services. A division of the Department of Veterans Affairs, it provides comprehensive and personalized counseling, not only to male and female veterans but also to their spouses and children. Although the center's responsibilities include 91,513 eligible veterans in 13 eastern Wisconsin counties, its workers strive to make personal contact with as many veterans as possible. Its outreach programs engage veterans in the context of their communities, granting a fuller knowledge of where each individual stands geographically, psychologically and socially. Working with other specialized organizations, the center provides individualized services for native American and African-American veterans, among others.

Those who enter the Milwaukee Vet Center seeking help know they are dealing with some of America's most experienced social workers. Collectively, the center's employees possess decades of experience in the fields of drug and alcohol abuse, mental health problems, vocational rehabilitation, women's health treatment, and psychiatric treatment. They have worked in the public and private sectors, schools, hospitals, even disaster areas.

The Vet Center provides hands-on field experience for students in local colleges and universities such as the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, the Milwaukee Area Technical College, and the Stratton Business Institute. By sharing their wealth of experience, the Vet Center's professionals enrich these students' education and more importantly guide them on the path to a fulfilling career in public service.

I commend the heroic efforts of these public servants, and personally thank them for playing an important part in making Wisconsin great.●

MFN FOR CHINA

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr President, I rise to comment briefly on an action taken by the Senate last week. We voted on an amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, Senator HUTCHINSON, expressing the sense of the Senate that China should not receive most-favored-nation tariff treatment.

I voted against the Hutchinson amendment, but not because I necessarily support the further extension of most-favored-nation status to China. I opposed the amendment because I believe this kind of amendment should not have been offered to a must-pass appropriations bill, especially when the Senate had limited time to debate it.

At the appropriate time, we do need to have an extensive debate concerning our trade relationship with China. That debate is long overdue and greatly needed, and that debate should cover a range of issues. One of the issues that we should debate is the geometric growth in our trade deficit with China. In the past dozen years, our merchan-

dise trade deficit with China has grown from \$10 billion to the staggering total of \$40 billion.

Mr. President, trade is only beneficial if it is a two-way street. And right now there is no way that we can characterize our trading relationship with China in that way. We do not have reciprocal, free, and open access to China's markets.

Yes, our exports to China may have grown threefold and more since 1980, from \$3.6 to \$12 billion. However, Chinese exports to America during the same period grew almost fiftyfold, from \$1.1 to \$51.5 billion.

China is a critical part of the overall trade crisis that we face right now. We have the largest merchandise trade deficit in our history. Our second highest trade deficit is with China. China is rapidly working to build its manufacturing base and export trade. It is following in the footsteps of Japan, which has consistently been the country with which we have had our largest individual trade deficit.

We need to be concerned because trade statistics released last week indicated that for the third time in history, our monthly trade deficit with China exceeded our monthly trade deficit with Japan. That should give us cause to take a second look in considering what the future may bring in our trade relationship with China.

So I am very concerned about our trading relationship with China. But we ought to have a substantial debate on this issue. We ought not offer an MFN amendment to an unrelated appropriations bill, have a quick little debate, and then vote.

At the proper time, let us have a real debate about our trade relationship with China. Let us talk about trade deficits, market access, and reciprocity. Let us talk about selling more American wheat, oilseeds, beef, pork, and other agricultural commodities to China. Let us talk about China's tariff and nontariff trade barriers, content rules, and labor systems. Let us debate most-favored-nation status for China and the MFN law itself. And, most certainly, let us debate the issues of religious freedom and human rights in China, since these should have a bearing too on whether we grant MFN status to China.

These are important issues that deserve full and thoughtful consideration by this body and our entire Nation. I look forward to contributing to that debate, and hope that it can be done in a way that is productive and useful for the people of this country.●

MARVIN SONOSKY

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who spent his life and career working on behalf of Indian tribal governments and ensuring that the United States fulfilled its trust responsibility to Indian people, Marvin Sonosky of Alexandria, VA. On July 16, Mr. Sonosky died of

heart failure. He was 66 years old. I join his many friends in mourning the loss of one of Indian country's greatest advocates. I would like to convey my sympathy to his wife, Shirley Freimuth Sonosky, and his daughters Judith Kreisberg, Joann Hirsch, and Karen Hecker and his seven grandchildren and one great grandchild.

Mr. Sonosky was born in Duluth, MN, and received his undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Minnesota. After 4 years of private practice, Mr. Sonosky came to Washington in 1937 and joined the Lands Division of the Department of Justice where he served for 17 years. As a special assistant to the Attorney General he frequently argued before the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 1951, Mr. Sonosky returned to private practice. In 1976, he formed the firm of Sonosky, Chambers & Sachse, where he practiced until his death. He remained active in the trial practice of the firm through the last week of his life.

Mr. Sonosky was a unique individual in this city in that he was one of the best advocates in his field yet he never sought the accolades or tributes that so many seek. Instead his tribute came from knowing that every day that he worked he had the potential to improve perhaps just one Indian person's life.

I would like to share with this body some of the many legislative initiatives involving Indian tribes that were the brainchild of Mr. Sonosky. These are but one measure of the impact that he had in improving the lives and opportunities of Indian tribal governments and their people and ensured that the United States stands behind its trust obligations to them.

Following devastating losses of Indian reservation land and its resulting poverty, Mr. Sonosky worked with Congress to secure the enactment of federal statutes that returned over 1 million acres of undisposed surplus lands within those reservations to the tribes—the resources from these lands have been vital to the economies of many of these Indian communities.

Mr. Sonosky also brought to the attention of Congress the need to amend Federal law authorizing Indian tribes to recover just compensation for lands taken by the United States so that the damages awarded would not be unfairly diminished by the value of food and rations that the United States had promised in exchange for the lands it acquired. When Government officials unlawfully offset welfare claims against trust funds of individual Indians, Mr. Sonosky successfully challenged the practice in Federal court. He subsequently worked with Congress to ensure that all individual Indians who had been harmed by this practice were properly reimbursed.

While much of Mr. Sonosky's congressional efforts focused on righting past wrongs, an equal part of his work resulted in legislation that will protect Indian rights for generations to come.