United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 20, 1996 No. 71

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LAUGHLIN].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 20, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable GREG LAUGHLIN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

At the first moments of dawn we are reminded, O God, that Your grace has come upon us, as free and as available as the morning Sun. When the cool of the evening ends the day and the rush of business is hushed and the tumult of all life's concerns is at ease, we are reminded of the rest and the peace that Your word does give. For all these gifts and Your daily blessings we offer this word of prayer and thanksgiving. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WOLF led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2066. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide greater flexibility to schools to meet the Dietary Guidelines for Americans under the school lunch and school breakfast programs.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 1296) ''An Act to provide for the administration of certain Presidio properties at minimal cost to the Federal taxpayer,'' disagreed to by the House, and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. JOHNSTON, and Mr. BUMPERS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1005. An act to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to improve the process of constructing, altering, and acquiring public buildings, and for other purposes.

S. 1710. An act to authorize multiyear contracting for the C–17 aircraft program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 4355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. KOHL, from the Committee on Appropriations, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy vice Mr. REID.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the Senate:

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H.R. 2202) entitled ''An Act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes'', including the Senate amendment thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senate is agreed to, and H.R. 2202, together with the accompanying papers, will be returned to the Senate.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 17, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope from the White House on Friday, May 17th at 3:00 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he notifies and transmits a Supplementary Agreement on Social Security between the U.S.A. and Austria.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND REPUBLIC OF AUSTRIA ON SOCIAL SECURITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–217)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95–216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith the Supplementary Agreement Amending the Agreement Between the United States of America and the Republic of Austria and Social Security (the ''Supplementary Agreement''). The Supplementary Agreement, signed at Vienna on October 5, 1995, is intended to modify certain provisions of the original United States-Austria Social Security Agreement, signed July 13, 1990.

The United States-Austria Social Security Agreement is similar in objective to the social security agreements with Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Supplementary Agreement, which would amend the 1990 Agreement to update and clarify several of its provisions, is necessitated by changes that have occurred in U.S. and Austrian law in recent years. Among other things, it would introduce a new method of computing Austrian benefits under the Agreement that will result in higher Austrian benefits for certain people who have divided their careers between the United States and Austria. Another provision in the Supplementary Agreement will allow U.S. citizens hired in Austria by U.S. Foreign Service Posts to be covered by the Austrian Social Security System rather than the U.S. system. The Supplementary Agreement will also make a number of minor revisions in the Agreement to take account of other changes in U.S. and Austrian law that have occurred in recent years.

The United States-Austria Social Security Agreement, as amended, would continue to contain all provisions mandated by section 233 and other provisions that I deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of section 233(c)(4).

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report prepared by the Social Security Administration explaining the key points of the Supplementary Agreement, along with a paragraph-by-paragraph explanation of the effect of the amendments on the Agreement. Annexed to this report is the report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the effect of the Agreement on income and expenditures of the U.S. Social Security program and the number of individuals affected by the Agreement. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration have recommended the Supplementary Agreement and related documents to me.

I commend the United States-Austria Social Security Agreement and related documents to the Congress.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 17, 1996.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE DUNCAN HUNTER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable DUNCAN HUNTER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 17, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that a member of my staff has been served with a subpoena issued by the Superior Court of California, County of San Diego.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER,
Member of Congress.

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL MIKE BOORDA, ONE OF OUR GREAT NAVAL OFFICERS

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I commend you for being the Speaker today from the 14th District of Texas. We will miss you.

Admiral Mike Boorda was laid to rest in Arlington Cemetery Sunday, where only his immediate family were present. Tomorrow, Tuesday, at 11:30 a.m., memorial services will be conducted for Admiral Boorda at the National Cathedral in Washington.

Mike Boorda will be remembered as one of the great naval officers. The morale and quality of the enlisted naval personnel is the best I have seen it in my 30 years with working with the Navy. Admiral Boorda deserves a lot of the credit for the esprit de corps of the Navy fleet.

I know we have the best Navy in the world today. I wish someone would show me a Navy that is better. We will all miss Admiral Boorda, especially our young sailors who are protecting our freedoms around the world. Our thoughts and gratitude go to Bettie and the family. God bless.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

UNITED STATES JOBS AND TECHNOLOGY BEING EXPORTED TO CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today President Clinton announced that he was going to ask Congress to renew most-favored-nation status with China unconditionally for the coming year. Unconditionally. As you know, Mr. Speaker, under the law the President must request a special waiver for China in order for China to have most-favored-nation status. That request comes to the Congress, and then Members have the discretion to have a motion to deny.

The President in his statement today talked about trade with China leading to democratization. There he talked about why it was important for us to have most-favored-nation status with China, because of American benefits to American business, because of China's potential cooperation over Korea and China's potential cooperation on the proliferation of weapons. Indeed, if China is a responsible country, and let us hope that it is, it should be working to keep the Korean peninsula nonnuclear, and it should be working to stop the spread of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction.

But I want to focus today on the trade deficit itself because when others say why should we use trade as a lever to improve human rights in China, I think it is very important for all of us to understand just what that trade situation is.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, and I call to our colleagues' attention, a chart of the trade with China in the past 10 years. In 1995, the United States trade deficit with China was $10 million. In 1995, the trade deficit was just under $34 billion. This is all at a time during mostly the Bush and Clinton policies which said that this was going to be good for American jobs. Indeed it is not.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing, the United States is doing, by its policy is exporting jobs to China.

In this trade deficit we are not even including the piracy of American intellectual property. The genius of America, as our colleague, Congresswoman ESHOO said, a product made in a free system, a freedom of expression and entrepreneurial spirit. The Chinese have been pirating flagrantly our intellectual property to epidemic proportions.

That is not even counted in this trade deficit.

In addition to that, when American businesses enter into agreements with China to produce goods there, they also must agree to a program for exporting back to the United States and internationally as well as a transfer of our technology, and that is again exporting jobs.

One example of that is that a few years ago Boeing closed a plant in Wichita, KS, which made the tail section of the 737. That plant was closed, and a plant in China where 20,000 Chinese workers worked for $50 a month, they now produce the tail section which was formerly made in Wichita, KS, and this is just in the last few years.

So over the next month or so as we debate this issue, I think it is important for us to have the real facts about United States-China trade. Indeed why should we give preferential trade treatment to China when they for the most part do not even allow United States products into China; barriers to market access, piracy of intellectual property, transfer of technology as a term for doing business with the Chinese, export of prison goods made by prison labor to the United States and unfair competition to the American worker as an addition to being a violation of human rights.

Why should the American worker have to compete with slave labor? It just is not fair trade; it is not free trade.

So as we go forward, many of my colleagues and I will be laying on the table what the trade picture is. It is not a rosy one. It is about profits for certain elitist companies which are allowed to export to China. Most products made in America are not allowed into China.

The President says that economic reform will lead to political reform. I reject that kind of trickle-down liberty just as I reject other trickle-down policies in our country. But the fact is that you cannot in one breath say that promoting democracy in Asia is a principle and a pillar of our foreign policy there and that we are going to shed the light of democracy on what goes on in China and then not do it at all.

And then I know that my time is drawing to a close. I just want to say this is an opener. The President made his statement today. They will have, the President has, the power, the business community has the dollars, but we in Congress have the floor, and we are going to try to educate the American people and our colleagues as to the real extent in terms of jobs for the American workers.

I urge our colleagues to listen carefully to this debate and to keep an open mind.

□ 1415

CHINA'S MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAUGHLIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Viringia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I hope all the Members listened to what the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] said on the trade issue. We are losing big time. I thank the gentlewoman from California for her statement and letting the Members take a focus on that.

As the gentlewoman said today, the President announced before the Pacific Basin Economic Council that he is going to extend most-favored-nation trading status to the butchers of Beijing, who have done so many things. We are not surprised that he made that announcement, because this administration has flip-flopped on this issue of human rights, but I want the American people, but more important, everyone, to focus as they are listening to the President and they talk about MFN on what they should think about when they hear the words ''MFN.''

When we hear MFN, and we will hear the business community and the Clinton administration and we will hear others in certain Republican leadership positions say they want MFN, we have to think of the following: We have to think MFN, then think of the suffering evangelical Christians in China who, according to Freedom House, have said ''This is the most repressive period since the pre-Deng period in the late 1970's.'' So when you think of MFN, think of the evangelical Christians that are being persecuted.

Mr. Speaker, we should also remember that in 1995 the Chinese Government intensified its crackdown on religious believers by enacting strict new laws restricting religious worship. I know you did not hear that in the President's speech, and I know you will not hear that by the leadership of both sides of this Congress; but when you hear MFN, think of religious crackdowns.

Mr. Speaker, did my colleagues know that the officials in China's Religious Security Bureau said that house churches, China's system of unofficial Protestant and Catholic churches, should be pulled up by their roots, and a Hong Kong newspaper reported last month on many new reports of harassment of Protestants and Catholic believers in certain areas of China. Think of that when you think of MFN. Remember that the police have vowed to hit and eradicate five Christian-based religious groups in the Anhui Province in China. When you think of MFN, think of that.

My colleagues should also know that an American missionary reported earlier this year that the Chinese Government was circulating an arrest warrant with the names of 3,000 Chinese evangelical preachers and house-church movements. When Members on both sides think of MFN, think of that.

Remember that in February and March of 1996 in the Baoding region of the Hebei Province, authorities went school to school weeding out Catholic students and teachers, and ordering them to join the State church. Students who refused were kicked out of school, and teachers who refused were demoted or fired. You did not hear that in the President's statement today before the Pacific Economic Council, oh, no, but you should remember it as you think of MFN.

Remember that in November 1995, 150 public security officers destroyed a newly built Catholic Church in Baoding Province and severely beat 7 Catholic construction workers. This was the fourth incident in 16 months. You did not hear that in the President's speech, but Members on both sides of the aisle should remember that when they think of MFN.

Remember that scores of priests and religious believers were detained during the First Lady's visit to Beijing in September 1995 in order to silence them. We never heard anything about that from anybody in this Congress who is concerned, talking about giving MFN. When you think of MFN, think of Bishop Jingmu, a 76-year-old Catholic bishop who was arrested in November and secretly sentenced to 2 years in prison without a public hearing.

When you think of MFN, think of Bishop Su Chimin, a Catholic bishop in the Baoding diocese, who was rounded up in 1994, after the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH, visited him in China, and beaten severely in prison. He was rearrested in March 1996, this year, March 1996, and is being held incommunicado without charge.

Think of these things, I would urge my colleagues on both sides. If the administration has forgotten about them, we should not forget about them. Think of these things.

So when you think of MFN, think of religious persecution. Then, when you think of MFN, think of Tibet. When you think of MFN, remember that the Government of the People's Republic of China tightened its grip on Tibet in 1994 and 1995 by restricting religious practices of Tibetan Buddhists. Remember that Tibetan monks and nuns were reportedly required to strip off their clothes before beatings, and are routinely raped in jail. Over 50 percent of Tibetan prisoners of conscience in detention by Chinese authorities are monks and nuns. You did not hear that today when the President spoke. You will not hear that when Members of Congress get up and say they want MFN, but you should think of MFN persecution in Tibet.

Remember that the Chinese Government restricts the number of monks and nuns allowed in Tibetan monasteries, sharply restricts teachings in the church, and sharply curtails renovation of buildings and monasteries.

So when you think of MFN, think of what goes on in Tibet.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I want to support the gentleman's very strong statement about human rights in China. Unfortunately, in the President's speech today, he made a statement which I think, while his statement about most-favored-nation status for China was no surprise, it surprised me that he would go to the length of saying, ''Where we differ with China, and we will have our differences, we will continue to defend our interests. We will keep faith with those who stand for greater freedom and pluralism in China.'' I have not seen that happen, but the President declared that.

But this is the discouraging part: ''As we did last month, in cosponsoring the U.S. resolution condemning China's human rights practices.'' Something else you did not hear in the President's speech was that the administration's resolution was a total failure; that the administration failed to rally the vote to even get the resolution to be heard; that the Chinese succeeded in using, with their economic leverage, other countries to join them in tabling that resolution. That is something else we did not hear in the President's speech.

Frankly, with all the respect that I have for the President, and I think he is a great president, I was embarrassed for him, that he would even bring that up and think that that would be something that he could boast of as promoting human rights in China.

It would be interesting to see, where he says they are going to stand with those who stand for greater freedom and pluralism in China, that simply has not happened yet. That is probably what this debate is about, is to say to the administration, let us see what you are going to do.

We know that it is almost impossible to override a Presidential veto on most-favored-nation status, so China will have most-favored-nation status. So this debate is not about isolating China and cutting off MFN, as others will characterize it. It is about who we are as a people.

Mr. Speaker, if we say, as this President does, that he should have an embargo on Cuba, which I do not agree with, that we should have an embargo on Cuba and that is going to create democracy in Cuba, how can he then say that we cannot even raise tariffs on certain products coming in from China in order to use our leverage?

As the gentleman knows, over one-third of the products for export made in China come into the United States, so China needs our marketplace. They need the preferential treatment MFN, most-favored-nation status, gives them, and the President could use that considerable leverage as a way of shining a light on pluralism and democratic reform in China.

It is not up to us to decide what form of government China has, but it is a universal tenet that we believe that people are worthy of respect and have a right to practice their religion. I want to get back to your point about religious repression in China, which is rampant, and Tibet, which is rampant.

Actually, the most recent report that I saw was in yesterday's paper about the Chinese Government cracking down on the Tibetan monastery right outside of Llasa. The Chinese Government decided it will choose the Panchen Lama and intervene in the succession in a religion. Imagine if the government of Italy decided they were going to choose who the next Pope was, the uproar that would go up around the world. But the Chinese Government is trying to intervene in the succession within the Buddhist religion. Of course, as we all know, they have a full-fledged, full-blown public relations campaign to undermine His Holiness, the Dalai Lama.

So for issues of what is going on in Tibet and what is going on in China, it is clear that we must, as a country, be true to our values and speak out on these issues, and demand in the course of a debate on whether China will have most-favored-nation status what our Government is tangibly going to do to advance freedom throughout the world, including China and Tibet.

The other point is that freedom does exist in parts of China now. if you believe in the one-China policy, then Taiwan has a thriving democracy. And just today, but yesterday in terms of the international clock, the Chinese on Taiwan inaugurated their first democratically elected President in the history of China. Hong Kong, as we know, is going through a transition. Democratic freedoms exist there.

In 1 year China will take over the governance of Hong Kong. It will be incorporated back into China. Let us see what this administration and this Congress is willing to do to preserve democratic freedoms where they exist now, in Hong Kong and in Taiwan, and what kind of leverage we are willing to step up to the bat and use in order to preserve those freedoms, and in doing so, validate the whole idea of freedom in China.

From my own personal observation, I know that the most discouraging part of the President's announcement today was that he was ill-advised by his advisers or somehow thought that it was OK to say that our commitment to pluralism and democratic reform in China was served by our offering a resolution which we did not get behind sufficiently, which we allowed the Chinese to use economic leverage against, which was tabled, which was a humiliation for the United States and for the Western allies in the United Nations. It calls into question the very need for a U.N. Commission on Human Rights, if the Chinese can exploit the situation to that extent, that there is not even a resolution that can be heard there.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of human rights, even the President's own country report of the State Department this year has stated very clearly that economic reform has not led to political reform; that the repression continues, and my reading of that is that this policy has not worked in terms of promoting human rights in China.

But we are going to have a month or so, I say to the gentleman from Virginia, where we can put the facts on the table for the American people and this Congress to see. People will have the opportunity to vote. It does not mean if you vote for MFN or against it that you are for or against human rights in China, but it does say how far you would be willing to go on that issue.

As I say, fundamentally, if we just argued this on the trade issues, China should not have most-favored-nation status, because they do not give it to the United States, because they have barriers against our products, they pirate our technology and intellectual property, they insist on the transfer of technology, in the course of trade they insist on a plan for export on anybody manufacturing in China in joint ventures, and they export products made by slave labor to the United States. All of this undermines our international competitiveness.

So this administration can no longer say they are shining the bright light of freedom on China, instead of using MFN. They can no longer say this is about jobs, because the figures simply do not lie in that direction. America has been losing jobs on the basis of its policy with China.

Then on the issue of proliferation, that is just really a sad one, because in any given day the most serious thing that could happen is that there will be proliferation of nuclear weapons technology. The Chinese Government has not been taken to task on this. This administration has taken a sort of a silent, tacit agreement that they will not proliferate nuclear technology to unsafeguarded countries, and called that a great diplomatic victory. That is the reason they said they did not put sanctions on the Chinese national nuclear corporation, which is the company that transferred the magnet rings.

The administration wants to believe that the Chinese Government did not know about the transfer of the magnet rings. Let us agree with them for a moment. Maybe they did not. I believe they did, but let us take the administration's position for a moment. There is no question, and it is an undisputed fact, that the Chinese national nuclear corporation knew exactly what it was doing when it sold the ring magnets for centrifuge to enrich uranium to Pakistan for their nuclear program, making the world a less safe place.

In doing so, the administration called the Eximbank and said to the Eximbank, ''You are now free to provide loan financing with American companies doing business with the Chinese national nuclear corporation.'' A

deal was in the pipeline that went forward. Imagine, it was well known that they had transferred the nuclear technology, and right now, today, American taxpayer dollars are subsidizing a deal with that very corporation because the administration did not want to sanction them.

□ 1430

Then of course the list goes on about Iran. Our country has an embargo on Iran, yet looks the other way as China, undisputed fact, has transferred missile technology to Iran and chemical technology, making the Middle East a much more dangerous place. As we spend billions and billions of dollars to promote and preserve the Middle East peace, we are looking the other way and not taking China to task.

It is always a special case. I do not think China should be treated any better or any worse than any other country, but I do think it is important for us to understand how they are being treated and how dangerous it is to the world.

Over and over we have said on this floor that our policy with any country should be to make trade fairer, people freer and the world safer. On none of those scores has this Clinton administration and the Bush administration policy before it met that test.

So I would say that as we go into this time, we have been given a free ride, almost. Because Senator DOLE and President Clinton, the two candidates, the leaders of the parties going into that race, both agree on the same policy, that frees us up not to be taking sides within the Presidential race on China MFN, for Members to follow their conscience, follow the facts.

As I have said before, the President has the power, the businesses have the money, we have the floor and we must use it to shed the light of our great democracy on the repression in China, to shed the light on the unfair trade practices, and to shed the light on the proliferation issues making this world a much more dangerous place.

With that, I thank the gentleman for his great leadership. Those who aspire to practice their religion in China have no greater friend than my colleague from Virginia, Mr. WOLF. I am pleased to participate in his special order, and yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I will go with my statement, but I do want to comment on one thing. She is exactly right, and look how far we have slipped in this country, in both Republican and Democratic Parties, on the issue of human rights.

In 1984 and 1985, if any Member of Congress had gotten up on the floor of the House and said that the Soviet Union should get the most-favored-nation trading status, when Scharansky was in Permanent Camp 35 in the gulags in the cold, snowy Ural Mountains. And when Sakharov was under house arrest, no Member of Congress, no administration would have had the courage, the guts, the stupidity or whatever to ever get up and say that they felt that the Soviet Union should get the MFN.

Now we see people in both parties now saying that China should get MFN, when we see all of these things that have taken place and many more that I will go through before I finish.

The second point is, the gentlewoman makes the case about Hong Kong. What will the Congress and the administration say next year when the Chinese troops come marching into Hong Kong, almost like a World War II movie? What will they say then? I will be interested in what Members of Congress of both parties will say and what this administration will say, or the next administration, if there is a change.

Third, the American people are farther along on this issue than is the Congress or the Clinton administration. The latest surveys and polls show how strongly and deeply the American people care about MFN and China and human rights and nuclear proliferation. I think the latest survey had it will over 70 percent of the Americans were concerned, and yet I wish 70 percent of the Clinton administration was concerned. I wish 7 percent of the Clinton administration was concerned.

So what will they say? And, frankly, if the American people could vote on this issue, China would not get MFN.

Let me move right along. This photo I have here, which I would like to cover, when you hear the President talk about MFN, you must remember, I tell my colleagues, this photo.

When you think of MFN, remember that public executions are taking place in China, where the Government of China routinely executes so-called criminals by shooting them in the back of the head in front of crowds. Remember that school children are herded to execution sites in buses to watch the killings and the workers are given the day off. And remember the executions are carried out as part of an official effort to quiet the masses.

What you have here are security police lined up in back of young men who have been convicted. They are pulling out their pistols, almost reminiscent of a World War II movie of Nazi Germany, and they put the pistols in the back of the heads of these men and they shoot them. They kill them.

I would urge any Member of Congress who wants to know more about this, I have the video, the actual video in my office that we will give to any Member's office to look at this video. What they then do is after they kill these individuals, they take the corneas and their kidneys for transplantation. If the Soviet Union had ever done that, who would have ever gotten up saying that they should get MFN?

Yet we have it on film, and actual shots of soldiers and police killing these people and taking their kidneys out for transplantation. No Member of Congress on either side, whether you are for MFN, whether you are against MFN, whether you are undecided on MFN, no Member of Congress should vote on this issue without seeing the film and the video where the Chinese police and army are killing these people by putting a pistol in the back of their head and shooting them, and later taking them and using their kidneys for transplantation.

Remember when you hear MFN that the kidneys and corneas are taken from the dead bodies minutes afterward and are sold for transplantation for profits for those in the Chinese Government, some as high as $30,000 apiece. I know you did not hear about that in President Clinton's statement. He would not have the courage or the guts to talk about that.

But when you think of it, Members of Congress, on both sides, you have to think in terms of these violations of human rights and executing people before you vote on this issue.

When you think of MFN, remember that the Chinese Government continues to force women to have abortions in an attempt to keep down the population, and deny health and medical care and economic opportunity to families that refuse to comply with these draconian policies.

Remember when you think of MFN, the credible evidence of children each year in Chinese state-run orphanages being denied food and medical care and tied into their cribs to die. I know that was not in President Clinton's statement. I know it was not in his statement, but just remember when you vote on MFN, this is one of the issues that you are dealing with, whether you like it or not.

And proliferation. When you think of MFN, remember that the Chinese Government sold ring magnets to Pakistan that can be used to make nuclear weapons, yes, nuclear weapons that can be pointed against this country or other innocent people around the world.

Remember that the United States Government found out about these controversial sales and urged the Chinese Government to cut it out. They have refused twice. They have said they did not know about the ring magnets. Some confusing signals were sent. Some confusing statements were issued.

In the end, embarrassingly so, the Clinton administration said it reached a deal, a promise from the Chinese Government, a promise from the Chinese Government that they would not do it again, a promise from the Government that has executed people like this that they would not do it again; a promise from the Government that is tracking down women on forced abortions that they would not do it again; a promise from the Government that is putting Catholic priests and bishops in jail, some for up to 35 years, they promised they would not do it again; that is raiding house churches and persecuting evangelicals, that they would not do it again. How much do you

think that promise from the Chinese Government is worth?

And remember when you think of MFN that the intelligence sources indicate that the Chinese Government also sold M–11 missiles to Pakistan and patrol boats to Iran, and remember no sanctions were imposed for these actions. Remember, no sanctions were imposed for these actions.

Remember that on April 17, 1996, the Washington Times reported that Chinese nuclear technicians would be going to Iran to help build a uranium plant that will ''help Tehran's nuclear weapons program.'' Remember that, Members on both sides, when you think of MFN, remember that.

And also remember Taiwan. When you think of MFN, remember that the belligerent Government of the PRC conducted missile tests, military exercises, off the coast of Taiwan just weeks before the first democratic Presidential election in Taiwan's history.

So when you think and hear the words MFN, MFN, it is like a free word or term thrown around this town. Oh, some of the big, large K street law firms will do pretty well representing a few handful of businesses that are doing business in China but, as the gentlewoman from California has stated, it is a bad deal for us.

Economically, trade, blue-collar workers all over the country, from New England to the South, textile workers from the Midwest all the way to the west coast are losing jobs because of this trade.

Our Members should know that Windows 95 was available in pirated version in the streets of Beijing before it was available here, the intellectual property that the Chinese Government are exploiting with regard to American businesses. Remember those things.

And remember all of the other things, that the economic liberalization has done nothing to improve our relations. Remember Harry Wu, how he documents that there are more slave labor camps and gulags in China than there were in the Soviet Union.

I visited Beijing Prison No. 1, where we saw workers working on socks for export to the United States, and they were making jelly shoes that youngsters wear in the United States for export to the United States. Do you think an American company could compete with Tiananmen Square demonstrators working for nothing in a cold, snowy prison where there is no OSHA requirements, there is no EPA requirements, there are no minimum wage requirements? There are no requirements except you meet your quota or else.

So as we think of the word MFN, I hope we will think in terms of all the different issues, from religious persecution, Catholic priests and bishops in jail, evangelical pastors in jail, prisoners working in slave labor, even people working in sweat shops for 12 to 15 hours a day at 9 cents an hour that are taking away American jobs. Yet this administration and some in Congress on both sides of the aisle are clamoring to see that this Congress and this administration gives MFN to China.

I hope and pray that when the Congress votes on this issue this summer there will be a majority of men and women on both sides of the aisle that would join hands and vote to deny MFN for China, even though Clinton may veto the bill. Let it be on his conscience, not on ours. Even though Clinton may allow it to go through and we may not override the veto, let it be a burden that he has to carry, not that we have to carry.

This is, I think, one of the leading moral fundamental issues that this Congress will have to deal with in this country, because we all quote in these speeches we give on July 4 what the Declaration of Independence says. It says, ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men and women are created equal, endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.''

They did not come from Congress. It said ''by their Creator,'' their God. These are God-given rights. An individual, a Chinese person, man, woman, or child in China, is as entitled to the rights of freedom of speech and freedom of worship and life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as somebody in any other part of the world.

□ 1445

It says in the Bible: To whom much is given, much is expected. And much has been given to our country, because we have stood firm on these fundamental values on both sides of the aisle. I remember when the persecution took place in the Soviet Union, it was Senator Jackson, a Democrat, and Charlie Vanik, a Democrat, that passed Jackson-Vanik to put tight restrictions on the Soviet Union that would not give them MFN. We joined hands in a bipartisan way.

Let us hope when the roll is called, when the roll is called and we are given the opportunity to vote, let us hope that an overwhelming majority, not everyone, we are not going to get everyone, but an overwhelming majority will vote to deny MFN, most-favored-nation trading status, for a country that should not be given a most-favored-nation trading status because of all the very bad and very evil things, not only that it has done, but it continues to do and appears that is will do in the future.

GAS TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAUGHLIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] is recognized for 15 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to point out how much in agreement I am with the statements of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] on the issues of China and the extent to which they stand in contempt of the values which this country hold so dear.

There use of slave labor in their country to undercut the prices of goods that are then sold in this country and others around the world is reprehensible. Their sale of nuclear materials to Pakistan and into the Middle East is also reprehensible and will ultimately come back to harm us and harm other countries in the world.

Their pirating of goods from our country, software, intellectual property, while only at the beginning, is going to finally wind up hurting us in the one area which we believe this country should be in the lead in terms of ensuring that we are guaranteeing each child the opportunity to work in these high end skill areas in computers, in software, in telecommunications. These are not areas where we should allow the Chinese to take our intellectual property. What they have done in Taiwan, what they have done in other areas of their foreign policy, all of its is absolutely unacceptable. I hope that the wisdom of Ms. PELOSI and Mr. WOLF are heard here on the floor of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time, however, on a different subject. This week, the House will vote on the 4.3-cent gas tax repeal. This is perhaps the most unnecessary, most misguided legislative back flip of the 104th Congress. President Clinton already acted to break the oil price spiral of this spring by moving against the wishes of the oil industry to speed up the sale of the 12 million barrels of oil from the strategic petroleum reserve.

He has also wisely initiated an investigation into the true causes of the 20- to 40-cent increase that some motorists have been forced to pay at the gas pump in March and April and May. And now, just today, Saddam Hussein has finally accepted the demands of the United Nations for allowing him to sell Iraqi oil on the world market. Oil prices may not finally come down from their 6-year highs, but we have just begun pumping up the hype over cutting the gas tax.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Republican rhetoric will soar. Never mind that most economists say that this 4-cent cut will go right into the pockets of, you guessed it, the oil companies, Even the oil companies themselves have conceded that they are unlikely to pass this tax through to consumers. They intend to keep it, plain and simple. And there is nothing in the package we will vote on tomorrow to prevent the outrageous outcome.

I asked the Rules Committee for an amendment to fix this diversion of the tax cut to the oil companies, but the Rules Committee has prevented me from offering that alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I had a quite simple amendment for this body. If you own a car, all you have to do is just check off

on your tax form next year that you own a car and get back 30 bucks. The average American drives 12,000 miles a year. As a result, at 20 miles to a gallon on average, that is 600 gallons. You multiply the 600 gallons by 4.37 cents, and you get about 30 bucks. That is what this whole debate is about, by the way, 30 bucks.

The simplest way of making sure that the American taxpayer gets it back is just putting it right on the tax form. If we are going to give a tax cut, why would we give it to the oil companies and ask them to perhaps at the pump at some point in the future to see, pretty please, if they would pass it on to the consumer when we can just put it as a line on the tax form? And that way the taxpayer gets it back guaranteed if they own a car and they check it off on the form.

But, no, the Republicans refused to allow that to be made in order as an amendment so that we can make sure that it is the consumer and not the oil companies who get this tax break.

Now, my constituents are appalled that Congress would respond to soaring gas prices by sending a rebate to the oil companies. They just do not trust the oil companies and neither should you. Just this weekend a preliminary study from the Interior Department uncovered a royalty ripoff by the oil companies of over $850 million owed but not paid to the Federal Government, to the Federal taxpayers. Why should we rebate the gas tax to these deadbeat drillers who raise gas prices?

Mr. Speaker, if the Interior Department investigation of the royalty ripoff found $850 million in overcharges, what will the Department of Energy investigation of the gas price rip-off find? Well, guess what. The Republicans are proposing to pay for the gas tax by taking it from the Department of Energy. That is right, they are cutting $600 million from the very agency which is investigating the gas price ripoff. Looks like they want to call off the DOE bloodhounds before they catch up with the oil companies. Not since Hogan's Heroes have we had so many Sergeant Schultz characters averting their eyes from wrongdoing while chanting ''I hear nothing, I see nothing.'' This is the response which we get from the Republican side. But the American people can see it more clearly.

Gas prices go up, oil company profits have gone up. The pay of oil company executives in the last 60 days has been soaring. The top 30 executives at the biggest 6 oil companies have seen their incomes increase on an average of $700,000 just for those 60 days. Investigations of the oil companies get curtailed. Deadbeat drillers do not pay royalties. Congress cuts a tax that has nothing to do with the increases, allowing the industry to make even more.

Let us defeat this unfair rule on the gas tax repeal so that we can amend the bill to ensure that all of the savings are passed on to the consumer. That is, after all, the entire intent of this exercise, to make sure every driver, every owner of every automobile gets back the $30 that the 4 cents a year per gallon represents.

Now, how did we get into this mess? Well, as all consumers know, their oil prices have gone up at the gas pump 20 to 40 cents a gallon in 1996. But the Republicans and the oil companies, they keep pointing back to a 4.3-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax in 1993. Why do they not have the hearings? Why do we not have the investigation into why gas prices went up this year 20 to 40 cents? We know it had nothing to do with that gas tax in 1993. What did it have anything to do with? Well, it had everything to do with the issue of the oil companies keeping their inventories at historic lows. What had happened was, they bet, the oil companies, that Saddam Hussein would be allowed to sell 2 billion dollars' worth of oil each 6 months into the global economy. As a result, what they did was they took their oil stocks that they keep here in the United States, and they reduced them down to 100 million barrels a day below where they historically had had them.

In other words, like a reckless driver on a bet, the industry simply drove with the needle on empty, passing right by any number of global filling stations that were, by the way, awash with oil all last year in this, in a foolish attempt to buy cheap from a terrorist who wanted to sell oil to get money to buy guns, and he would not accept any restrictions upon the sale of that oil in terms of where the profits would go.

Of course, the oil companies are not gambling with their own money. They are gambling with your money. In a free market, the oil industry would be punished for this outrageous behavior by consumers switching to other fuels. But cars cannot be switched overnight to alternatives. So instead of being punished, this inelastic market rewards the negligent parties with higher prices at the pump and higher profits in the board room.

In fact, the personal compensation of oil executives has gone up nearly as fast as the price of gasoline. As I have said, oil company stock, executive stock options rose $33 million in just the last 60 days for the top five executives in the six largest oil companies. They must be crying all the way to the bank.

Mr. Speaker, in the meantime, we have absolutely no response from the Republicans in terms of conducting the hearings that are necessary to find out exactly what did happen. If they did, we would be putting the moral pressure, which we should, upon these oil companies to keep inventory high. We sent 500,000 American men and women to the Persian Gulf in 1991, not to prop up a nascent democracy in Kuwait. No, we did it in order to ensure that the oil supply would come to our country.

The oil companies should not be under price controls, but they should have a moral responsibility to every other industry in this country, to every consumer in this country to keep their tanks filled in case Saddam Hussein or any other dictator in this world decides to play games with our oil marketplace. That is all we ask from them in return for the deployment of 500,000 men and women in 1991, billions of dollars on a yearly basis to keep the oil lines open into our country. If the store runs out of Cheerios, you buy corn flakes. If they do not have orange juice, you buy grapefruit juice. But if there is no gasoline, there is nothing else you can put in your tank and they know it.

The oil companies have no right to conduct themselves in that way, oblivious to the impact it has on our entire economy. That is why oil prices went up 20 to 40 cents at the pump. And that is why this whole debate over the 4.3-cent gas tax in 1993 is a political diversionary tactic by the Republicans intended to ensure that there would be no inspection of what the oil company responsibility is to our country.

So I ask once again for the Republican leadership to give us the opportunity to put in order an amendment which will ensure that the tax break will go directly to the consumers. Under their formulation, it goes to the oil companies. Out of all industries in this country after the last 6 months with their spike, with the spike in the prices that they are able to charge for this one good that goes in every gasoline tank in our country, we should ensure that it does not go into their pockets.

So that is why I rise, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that my colleagues tomorrow would defeat the rule, which denies us the ability of ensuring that this tax break goes directly to consumers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLF) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WICKER, for 5 minutes, on May 21.

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, on May 23.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. STOKES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLF) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. FUNDERBURK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MARKEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. COX of California.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1710. An act to authorize multiyear contracting for the C–17 aircraft program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security; and

S. 1005. An act to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to improve the process of constructing, altering, and acquiring public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 21, 1996, at 12:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3071. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Onions Grown in South Texas; Change in Regulatory Period (FV95–959–3FR) received May 17, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3072. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle, Bison, and Cervids; Payment of Indemnity [APHIS Docket No. 94–133–2] received May 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3073. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a fiscal year 1997 budget amendment in support of the Israeli Government's requirement for counterterrorism assistance, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 104–216); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3074. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the animal report on the Youth Conservation Corps Program in the Department for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1705; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

3075. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled ''Model Comprehensive Program for the Treatment of Substance Abuse, Metropolitan Area Treatment Enhancement System (MATES),'' report to the Congress of the United States fiscal year 1995, pursuant to Public Law 102–321, section 301 (106 Stat. 419); to the Committee on Commerce.

3076. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Contractor Litigation Cost Policies; Policies, Terms of Law Firm Engagement, and Allowability of Costs—received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3077. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rules—(1) Control Techniques Guidelines Document: Wood Furniture Manufacturing Operations (FRL–5507–5), (2) Protection of Stratospheric Ozone; Listing of Substitutes for Ozone-Depleting Substances (FRL–5467–1), and (3) Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Offset Remand (FRL–5504–4) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3078. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Elimination of Establishment License Application for Specified Biotechnology and Specified Synthetic Biological Products—received May 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3079. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Turkey (Transmittal No. 19–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3080. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the U.S. [TECRO] (Transmittal No. 18–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3081. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning a cooperative project with the United Kingdom concerning conventional air-to-ground missiles (Transmittal No. 09–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

3082. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies on international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3083. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled ''Fiscal Year 1995 Annual Report on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47–117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3084. A letter from the Chairman, Cost Accounting Standards Board, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the sixth annual report of the Cost Accounting Standards Board, pursuant to Public Law 100–679, section 5(a) (102 Stat. 4062); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3085. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subpart D; Subsistence Taking of Fish and Wildlife Regulations; Extension (RIN: 1018–AC82) received May 17, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3086. A letter from the Director, Office of Fisheries Conservation and Management, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area; Reserve Apportionment [Docket No. 960129019–6091–01; I.D. 050396A] received May 17, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3087. A letter from the Director, Office of Fisheries and Conservation and Management, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area; Pacific cod by vessels using trawl gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands management area [Docket No. 960129019–6091–01; I.D. 051396A] received May 17, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3088. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Fisheries Conservation and Management, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 960129019–6091–01; I.D. 051396D] received May 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3089. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Fisheries Conservation and Management, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area; Other Nontrawl Fisheries in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 960129019–6091–01; I.D. 051396E] received May 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3090. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Scope of Rules: Prevention of Acts of Violence and Terrorism (RIN: 1120–AA54) received May 17, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3091. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Drug Abuse Treatment Programs: Early Release Consideration (RIN: 1120–AA36) received May 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3092. A letter from the Chairperson, United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the ''Civil Rights Commission Amendments Act of 1996''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3093. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the ''State Infrastructure Bank Improvement Act of 1996''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3094. A letter from the Regulatory Policy Officer, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Materials and Processes Authorized for the Production of Wine and for the Treatment of Juice, Wine and Distilling Material (93F–059P) (RIN: 1512–AB26) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3095. A letter from the Chair, Physician Payment Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's recommendations for the fee update and Medicare volume performance standards for 1997, pursuant to Public Law 101–239, section 6102(a) (103 Stat. 2176); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

3096. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medicare and Medicaid Program; Criteria for a Rural Hospital to be Designated as an Essential Access Community Hospital (EACH) (BPD–856–FC) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

3097. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's report entitled ''The Effects of Great Lakes Contaminants on Human Health,'' pursuant to Public law 101–596, Section 106 (104 Stat. 3004); jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Commerce, and Science.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3068. A bill to accept the request of the Prairie Island Indian Community to revoke their charter of incorporation issued under the Indian Reorganization Act (Rept. 104–584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. H.R. 1227. A bill to amend the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 relating to the payment of wages to employees who use employer owned vehicles; with an amendment (Rept. 104–585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3448. A bill to provide tax relief for small businesses, to protect jobs, to create opportunities, to increase the take home pay of workers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104–586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOX (for himself, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 3493. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the provision of funds in order to provide financial assistance by grant or contract to legal assistance entities for representation of financially needy veterans in connection with proceedings before the U.S. Court of Veterans Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CANADY (for himself, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 3494. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to identify violent and hard-core juvenile offenders and treat them as adults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 835: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1024: Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 1572: Ms. PRYCE.

H.R. 2270: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2531: Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 2779: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 3000: Mr. PORTER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 3328: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. HORN.

H.R. 3346 : Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H. Con. Res. 155: Mr. HORN and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. BROWNBACK

AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of title III insert the following new section:

SEC. 306. RESTRICTIONS ON INTELLIGENCE SHARING WITH THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end of title I the following new section:

''RESTRICTIONS ON INTELLIGENCE SHARING WITH THE UNITED NATIONS

''SEC. 110. (a) PROVISION OF INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS.—(1) No United States intelligence information may be provided to the United Nations or any organization affiliated with the United Nations, or to any official or employee thereof, unless the President certifies to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that the Director of Central Intelligence (in this section referred to as the 'DCT'), in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, has required, and such organization has established and implemented, procedures for protecting intelligence sources and methods (including protection from release to nations and foreign nationals that are otherwise not eligible to receive such information) no less stringent than procedures maintained by nations with which the United States regularly shares similar types of intelligence information. Such certification shall include a description of the procedures in effect at such organization.

''(2) Paragraph (1) may be waived upon written certification by the President to the appropriate committees of Congress that providing such information to the United Nations or an organization affiliated with the United Nations, or to any official or employee thereof, is in the national security interest of the United States and that all possible measures protecting such information has been taken, except that such waiver must be made for each instance such information is provided, or for each such document provided.

''(b) PERIODIC AND SPECIAL REPORTS.—(1) The President shall periodically report but not less frequently than quarterly, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives on the types and volume of intelligence provided to the United Nations and the purposes for which it was provided during the period covered by the report. Such periodic reports shall be submitted to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives with an annex containing a counterintelligence and security assessment of all risks, including an evaluation of any potential adverse impact on national collection systems, of providing intelligence to the United Nations, together with the information on how such risks have been addressed.

''(2) The President shall submit a special report to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives within 15 days after the United States Government becomes aware of any unauthorized disclosure of intelligence provided to the United Nations by the United States.

''(c) LIMITATION.—The restrictions of subsection (a) and the requirement for periodic reports under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall not apply to the provision of intelligence that is provided only to, and for the use of, appropriately cleared United States Government personnel serving with the United Nations.

''(d) DELEGATION OF DUTIES.—The President may not delegate or assign the duties of the President under subsection (a).

''(e) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

''(1) impair or otherwise affect the authority of the Director of Central Intelligence to protect intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure pursuant to section 103(c)(5) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403–3(c)(5)); or

''(2) supersede or otherwise affect the provisions of title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.).''.

(b) CLINICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 109 the following:

''Sec. 110. Restrictions on intelligence sharing with the United Nations.''.

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC 502. TIER III MINUS UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE.

In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated by title I, there is authorized to be appropriated an additional $22,000,000 for the tier III minus unmanned aerial vehicle.

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT NO. 8: At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 502. TIER MINUS UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated by title I, there is authorized to be appropriated an additional $22,000,000 for the tier III minus unmanned aerial vehicle.

(b) PROCUREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall procure sufficient vehicles to conduct the approved advanced concept technology demonstration of the tier III minus unmanned aerial vehicle.

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 502. TIER III MINUS UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE.

In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated by title I, there is authorized

to be appropriated an additional $25,500,000 for the tier III minus unmanned aerial vehicle.

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 502. TIER III MINUS UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated by title I, there is authorized to be appropriated an additional $25,500,000 for the tier III minus unmanned aerial vehicle.

(b) PROCUREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall procure sufficient vehicles to conduct the approved advanced concept technology demonstration of the tier III minus unmanned aerial vehicle.

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. RICHARDSON

AMENDMENT NO. 11: At the end of title III, insert the following new section:

SEC. 306. PROHIBITION ON USING JOURNALISTS AS AGENTS OR ASSETS.

An element of the Intelligence Community may not use as an agent or asset for the purposes of collecting intelligence any individual who—

(1) is authorized by contract or by the issuance of press credentials to represent himself or herself, either in the United States or abroad, as a correspondent of a United States news media organization; or

(2) is officially recognized by a foreign government as a representative of a United States media organization.