

complaint is before his committee, or that Mr. Bunning and Mrs. Johnson participated in GOPAC activities," Mr. Jost said.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that Members should not make references to members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct concerning pending investigations.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear any references made by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] as to pending matters. These are not matters before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; these are stories in the paper and not before the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is stating that as a general admonition from the Chair at this time.

SUPPORT THE ADOPTION PROMOTION AND STABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address an issue of great importance to everyone who cares about children. Today, there are hundreds of thousands of children who should be thriving in the love and care of adoptive parents. Tragically, they are not. Instead they are shuttling from foster family to foster family. In fact, this year a mere 10 percent of the 500,000 children in State foster care programs will move into permanent adoptive homes. This is not something out of Charles Dickens. It is happening today—in the United States of America.

We have come to this sorry state of affairs for many reasons, but two are paramount. First, the cost of adoption for many moderate-income families is prohibitive. Second, liberal social welfare policy has made interethnic adoption nearly impossible.

According to the National Council for Adoption, as many as 2 million families could be waiting for a child to adopt. But barriers like cost get in the way. Adoption expenses can total us to \$20,000. This financial burden is a major disincentive for moderate-income families wishing to adopt children.

A second barrier to adoption is the Federal law that permits States to use race in the placement of children in foster care and adoption. This law has clearly backfired. The use of race-matching has delayed the adoption of minority children, who remain in fos-

ter care at least twice as long as non-minority children. Today, 49 percent of children in foster care are minorities. A third of foster children are black.

I ask my colleagues: Is it fair to these innocent children to trap them in the foster care system simply because of the color of their skin? The love of a family knows no race. It is unconscionable that any child needing the love and care of a family he can call his own would be denied that love and care simply because the prospective adoptive family is of a different race. That is a grave injustice to the child who needs a home and to the family who waits with open arms.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress can help remove these barriers to adoption through swift passage of H.R. 3236, the Adoption Promotion and Stability Act. This bill makes two important reforms.

First, the bill revises the Tax Code to make adoption more affordable for families. H.R. 3236 provides a \$5,000 tax credit for adoption expenses. The bill also provides a \$5,000 per child tax exclusion for employer-paid adoption assistance. I believe this provision will encourage more moderate-income families to adopt children.

Second, the bill removes barriers to interracial adoption. Currently, the law allows placement agencies to use the racial background of the child as a criterion in making placement decisions. This bill prohibits the use of race to delay or deny placement of a child into a foster or adoptive home. I believe this provision will go a long way to end the intolerable delay associated with race-matching. It will ensure that placement agencies make the best interests of children their top priority.

In addition, I must note that many American Indian children are suffering in the current foster care and adoption system. Currently, tribes can delay the adoption of a child of American Indian descent because of the Indian Child Welfare Act. This law was intended to protect the integrity and heritage of American Indian tribes. Yet the law allows tribes to interfere with adoption decisions due to its ambiguity and broad application. As a result, litigations out of control, and Indian children are not being adopted. A provision of H.R. 3286, which was stripped from the bill in committee, would have established safeguards against the arbitrary, retroactive designation of children as members of a tribe. This would prevent a tribe from invoking the Indian Child Welfare Act to interfere with legitimate, voluntary adoptions. Should an amendment be offered to restore this provision of the bill, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Children must be afforded every opportunity to live in a happy, safe, secure, and—perhaps most important—permanent family environment. The provisions of this bill help to achieve this goal. I want to thank Ms. MOLINARI and Mr. ARCHER for their leadership on this issue. I also commend Mr. BUNNING, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr.

TAHRT, and Mr. SHAW for their strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot take the hundreds of thousands of children languishing in foster care and match them with loving parents overnight. But with passage of the Adoption Promotion and Stability Act, we are taking an important step. I urge my colleagues to meet the needs of foster children across the country. I urge you to support this bill.

RENEWAL OF MFN FOR CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is about to enter its annual debate on the renewal of China's Most Favored Nation status. The need for renewal has existed since the United States first granted MFN to China back in 1980. It has been a difficult debate ever since 1989 and the events at Tiananmen Square. There is good reason to believe that the debate this year will be very difficult. This is because of two particularly large problems affecting the debate.

First, there are the policies of the Beijing Communist leadership. That government's disregard for international obligations on nonproliferation, intellectual property rights, trade, human rights, and on Taiwan mandate an effective response.

Second, there is a lack of leadership on the part of the administration. The policy has been ad hoc, dependent on domestic pressures, as Robert Zoellick testified before our committee last week when he said:

In an effort to please all constituencies, the administration has squandered our strength, failed to achieve its aims, and demonstrated weakness to both China and to others in the region.

Because of these problems, I fear that Congress will lose sight of the critical point, and that critical point is just this: Our policy on MFN for China should take these problems into account, but it must not be determined by them.

Rather, our decision on MFN must be determined by one thing and that one thing is, what is best for the United States? It is my view, though, that there are four basic reasons why extending MFN is in the best interests of our country.

First, revoking MFN would harm U.S. workers, U.S. businesses, and U.S. investment. Changes made in China's MFN status will curtail access to the Chinese market. Huge levels of trade and investment will still occur, but it will be other nations, not the United States, that will be making the investments, and we will lose all of our control and leverage. The effect will be losses of U.S. trade, U.S. investment and, quite frankly, many U.S. jobs.

The size of this potential hardship must be recognized by us in congress as