

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 352, nays 53, answered "present" 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

YEAS—352

Ackerman	Danner	Holden
Allen	Davis (IL)	Holt
Andrews	Davis (VA)	Hooley
Archer	Deal	Horn
Bachus	DeGette	Hostettler
Baker	Delahunt	Houghton
Baldacci	DeLauro	Hoyer
Baldwin	DeLay	Hulshof
Ballenger	DeMint	Hunter
Barcia	Diaz-Balart	Hyde
Barr	Dickey	Insee
Barrett (NE)	Dicks	Isakson
Barrett (WI)	Dingell	Istook
Bartlett	Dixon	Jackson (IL)
Barton	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Bass	Dooley	(TX)
Bateman	Doolittle	Jefferson
Becerra	Doyle	Jenkins
Bentsen	Dreier	John
Berkley	Duncan	Johnson (CT)
Berman	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Berry	Ehlers	Jones (NC)
Biggert	Ehrlich	Jones (OH)
Bilirakis	Emerson	Kanjorski
Bishop	Engel	Kaptur
Blagojevich	Eshoo	Kasich
Bliley	Etheridge	Kelly
Blumenauer	Evans	Kennedy
Blunt	Everett	Kildee
Boehrlert	Ewing	Kind (WI)
Boehner	Farr	King (NY)
Bonilla	Fletcher	Kingston
Bonior	Foley	Kleccka
Bono	Forbes	Klink
Boswell	Fossella	Knollenberg
Boucher	Frank (MA)	Kolbe
Boyd	Franks (NJ)	Kuykendall
Brady (PA)	Frelinghuysen	LaFalce
Brady (TX)	Frost	LaHood
Bryant	Galleghy	Lampson
Burr	Ganske	Lantos
Buyer	Gejdenson	Largent
Callahan	Gekas	Larson
Calvert	Gibbons	Latham
Camp	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Canady	Gillmor	Lazio
Cannon	Gilman	Leach
Capps	Gonzalez	Lee
Capuano	Goode	Levin
Cardin	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Carson	Goodling	Lewis (GA)
Castle	Goss	Lewis (KY)
Chabot	Graham	Linder
Chambliss	Granger	Lipinski
Clayton	Green (TX)	Lofgren
Clement	Green (WI)	Lowey
Coble	Hall (OH)	Lucas (KY)
Coburn	Hall (TX)	Lucas (OK)
Combest	Hansen	Luther
Condit	Hastings (FL)	Maloney (CT)
Conyers	Hastings (WA)	Maloney (NY)
Cook	Hayes	Manzullo
Cooksey	Hayworth	Martinez
Cox	Herger	Mascara
Coyne	Hill (IN)	Matsui
Crowley	Hinojosa	McCarthy (MO)
Cubin	Hobson	McCarthy (NY)
Cummings	Hoefel	McCollum
Cunningham	Hoekstra	McCrey

McHugh	Porter	Smith (MI)
McInnis	Portman	Smith (NJ)
McIntosh	Price (NC)	Smith (TX)
McIntyre	Quinn	Smith (WA)
McKeon	Radanovich	Souder
McKinney	Rahall	Spence
Meehan	Rangel	Spratt
Meeks (NY)	Regula	Stabenow
Menendez	Reyes	Stearns
Metcalf	Reynolds	Stenholm
Mica	Rivers	Stump
Millender-	Rodriguez	Sununu
McDonald	Roemer	Talent
Miller (FL)	Rogan	Tanner
Miller, Gary	Rogers	Tauscher
Minge	Rohrabacher	Tauzin
Mink	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (NC)
Moakley	Rothman	Terry
Mollohan	Roukema	Thomas
Moore	Roybal-Allard	Thornberry
Moran (VA)	Royce	Thune
Morella	Rush	Thurman
Murtha	Ryan (WI)	Tiahrt
Myrick	Ryun (KS)	Tierney
Nadler	Salmon	Toomey
Napolitano	Sanchez	Towns
Nethercatt	Sanders	Traficant
Ney	Sandlin	Turner
Northup	Sawyer	Udall (CO)
Norwood	Saxton	Upton
Nussle	Scarborough	Velazquez
Obey	Schakowsky	Vento
Oliver	Scott	Vitter
Ortiz	Sensenbrenner	Walden
Ose	Serrano	Walsh
Owens	Sessions	Wamp
Oxley	Shadegg	Watt (NC)
Packard	Shaw	Watts (OK)
Pascarell	Shays	Waxman
Paul	Sherman	Weiner
Payne	Sherwood	Weldon (FL)
Pease	Shimkus	Wexler
Pelosi	Shows	Weygand
Petri	Shuster	Whitfield
Phelps	Simpson	Wilson
Pickering	Sisisky	Woolsey
Pitts	Skeen	Wu
Pombo	Skelton	Wynn
Pomeroy	Slaughter	Young (FL)

NAYS—53

Aderholt	Hefley	Riley
Baird	Hill (MT)	Sabo
Bilbray	Hillery	Sanford
Borski	Hilliary	Schaffer
Brown (FL)	Hutchinson	Stark
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E.B.	Strickland
Clay	Kucinich	Stupak
Clyburn	LoBiondo	Sweeney
Costello	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Crane	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
English	Miller, George	Udall (NM)
Fattah	Moran (KS)	Neal
Filner	Neal	Visclosky
Ford	Pallone	Waters
Gephardt	Pastor	Weller
Gutierrez	Peterson (MN)	Wicker
Gutknecht	Ramstad	Wolf

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

NOT VOTING—27

Abercrombie	Deutsch	Oberstar
Armey	Edwards	Peterson (PA)
Bereuter	Fowler	Pickett
Burton	Gordon	Pryce (OH)
Campbell	Greenwood	Snyder
Chenoweth	Hinche	Watkins
Collins	Kilpatrick	Weldon (PA)
Cramer	McDermott	Wise
Davis (FL)	Meek (FL)	Young (AK)

□ 1051

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall No. 337 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been here I would have voted "yea."

DISAPPROVING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT TO PRODUCTS OF PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 57) disapproving the extension of non-discriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of H.J. Res. 57 is as follows:  
H.J. RES. 57

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress does not approve the extension of the authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 recommended by the President to the Congress on June 3, 1999, with respect to the People's Republic of China.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 22, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and a Member in support of the joint resolution each will control 1½ hours. Is the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) in favor of the joint resolution?

Mr. STARK. I am in favor of the joint resolution, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) will state his inquiry.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, if all of these Members who are controlling time favor normal trade relations for China, I would ask unanimous consent to control half of the time on this side in opposition to normal trade relations for China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman from Ohio that the time has already been divided, half in favor and half opposed to the joint resolution.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on House Joint Resolution 57.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) in opposition to the joint resolution, and that he be permitted to yield further blocks of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield half of my time in support of the joint resolution to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), and that in turn, he be allowed to yield blocks of that time so yielded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of July 22 and the unanimous consent agreement of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) each will be recognized for 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution, which would cut off normal trade relations between the U.S. and China.

The relationship between China and the U.S. is very fragile now, as we all know, perhaps more fragile than ever. A number of developments have contributed to the precarious position in which we find ourselves today: the concern about Chinese espionage, escalating tensions between China and Taiwan, the mistaken bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade, and more recently, the repression of Chinese civilians who wish to practice their faith.

In no way should we discount the gravity of these developments, nor their impact on the U.S.-China relations. Rather, we should respect the significance of each and resolve to improve the situation. We should certainly not take steps that would cause relations to deteriorate even further, lest we risk far greater consequences for America, for China, and for the entire world in the future.

Mr. Speaker, denying normal trade relations to China at this volatile stage would be such a step, and that is why I strongly oppose this resolution. House Joint Resolution 57 proposes to subject all Chinese imports to prohibitive duty rates averaging about 44 percent. Of our 234 trading partners, only six, countries such as Cuba, Laos, and North Korea, receive this exclusionary tariff treatment.

As a practical matter, China would likely retaliate with mirror sanctions against U.S. exports of goods and services to China totalling \$18 billion and growing. Exports to China support 200,000 U.S. jobs. These are high caliber high-paying jobs, paying about 15 to 18 percent above the average manufacturing wage.

American firms and workers have competitors in Japan and Europe with a keen interest in this dynamic mar-

ket. China's infrastructure needs require a total of \$744 billion over the next decade, including transportation, power generation, telecommunication, and many, many other services. They must be sourced abroad. Japan and Europe will be more than happy to replace the United States as a reliable supplier to China, capturing the business Americans would be forced to forfeit.

The question is, who will be hurt? The answer is, not the Chinese. It will be American workers losing high-paid manufacturing jobs.

House Joint Resolution 57 penalizes U.S. consumers, as well. China supplies low-priced consumer goods such as toys and games, apparel, shoes, and simple electronics. Americans, particularly those in lower-income brackets, depend on access to these reasonably priced items for their families, to improve their family's standard of living.

□ 1100

Revoking China's NTR status would amount, in effect, to a \$300 a year tax increase on the average American family of four. Costs of goods used as inputs in U.S. factories would also skyrocket, reducing the competitiveness of finished American manufactured products worldwide. The question is: Who will be hurt? The answer is: Not the Chinese, it will be American families.

It is less easy to quantify how dangerous H.J. Res. 57 would be to U.S. national security interests in this turbulent region of the world. By throwing thousands out of work, revoking NTR would deal a devastating blow to the people of Hong Kong as they struggle to maintain their way of life and autonomy following the territory's reversion to China. Taiwan's economy, too, would suffer with severe disruption. Securing Chinese cooperation on dangerous issues such as North Korea and the weapons proliferation will never happen without a functioning trade relationship between the U.S. and China.

China is one of the world's oldest and most influential civilizations. I recognize that progress toward a more democratic and open society is slow, agonizing, irregular; but it is common sense to appreciate that China will not respond positively to draconian trade sanctions. Advancement of human rights, religious freedom, and democratic principles will not be achieved if we cut ties completely with the Chinese people.

American political business and religious leaders need to remain engaged in China in order to further our values there. The most valuable American export to China is American ideals. Religious freedom is increasing in China, and we even see free elections in Chinese villages where non-Communist candidates have been elected. The question is: Would this be happening

without the impact of Americans and American society on China: The answer is: No, it would not.

The open lines of communication that accompany a basic trade relationship with China support the economic and foreign policy interests of the United States in a strategically important and dangerous region of the world.

We cannot undermine U.S. political, economic, and security interests by unraveling the trade relations that benefit both countries. We cannot turn our backs on the Chinese people who compromise one-fifth of the world's population. I urge a "no" vote on H.J. Res. 57.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to distribute it as he sees fit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose renewing normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China. Indeed, it may be among the world's oldest civilizations, but today those wonderful people are led by barbarious fascists.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, asked: Who is hurt? I can give my colleagues a list of the people who are hurt now by our current relationships with China: Millions of Tibetans, 6 million having been killed since the Chinese occupation in 1949; 2,000 political prisoners, these are just religious dissidents; 30 to 40 million Muslims have suffered; women and children; women pregnant outside of family planning rules have been abducted and forced to have sterilization.

The inhumane treatment of human beings in China is documented over and over and over again. As far as national security, it has been documented recently by the Cox committee that China is stealing military secrets from us in preparation for nuclear war and has violated the proliferation and non-proliferation agreements and does not deserve our trading partnership.

Whatever help may go to Boeing and Hewlett-Packard and whoever wants to sell a bunch of roam phones and airplanes to China is paid for by the blood and sweat that makes the cheap T-shirts and cheap shoes that are sold by Wal-Mart and others who import the slave labor produced goods.

We cannot continue this. This is just a matter of will Americans do business with murderers, with torturers, with child molesters, with people who are being led by leaders who have no spark of humanity. This cannot go on.

The only message they understand is profit. They care not one whit for decency. The only thing we can do is cut

into our profit at some small risk to the richest manufacturing companies in this country. Let us do it. Let us make a statement for human rights. Let us make a statement for childhood suffrage. Let us make a statement for decency. Let us make a statement for all the American values and suggest that we are rich enough and strong enough in this country to support Boeing and Hewlett-Packard and all of those people, and McDonald's franchises, all of those people who would supposedly be hurt if we do not.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), one of the leading Members of the freshman class of the House of Representatives in the Democratic Caucus who has much experience and knowledge in this area.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as the first Chinese American to stand in this House, as a trade and international trade lawyer, I feel a special responsibility in this debate. But special responsibilities run deep in this House, because the Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled almost exactly 223 years ago committed themselves to the path of liberty and committed to each other their lives, their fortune, and their sacred honor.

America has lead the way for 223 years on the path of freedom, sometimes with a certain stride and sometimes through great adversity, but always leading the way and shining a light for others to follow.

What this debate is about, it is about who we are as a free people, what we stand for as a country, the courage of this Congress, and the integrity of each of us as individuals. What this debate is not about is engagement. Of course we must engage China, 1.2 billion people.

We are engaged with China, and we will be engaged with China. We must be engaged with China culturally. There are 6,000 Chinese on cultural exchange visas here in the United States. We must be engaged with China educationally. There are 14,000 Chinese on student visas in the United States. We must be engaged with China on environmental issues, on labor issues, on human rights issues. We must be engaged with China on issues where we agree and where we disagree.

Of course we must be engaged with China in business and trade. But the business of America must be more than business alone. An engagement must be through more than just the cash register. Let me give my colleagues the difference between cash register engagement and real engagement.

Cash register engagement would have us see the Chinese people as workers and as consumers, as 2 billion strong-

arms to do our work, as 2 million legs to wear American jeans.

Real engagement recognizes the Chinese people as real people, people who have hopes and aspirations, people who would walk the path of freedom without.

Cash register engagement would say they are not ready for freedom. Real engagement recognizes that freedom is young everywhere. It is only 220 years old here in America. It is 150 years old in Britain. It is 100 years old in France, 50 years old in Germany and Japan.

I stand here as living proof that the Chinese people can fully participate in democracy. I stand here as proof that all people deserve to walk the path of freedom.

Where have we been walking in the past 10 years? Through two administrations, we have been walking, not the path of freedom, but the moral wilderness. We have been called off the path of freedom by the siren song of the cash register, and we have closed our ears and our hearts and we have walked away from those who had walked the path of freedom with us.

What has it gained us? What has it gained us? A larger trade deficit, more people in jail than ever. We have tried the wrong way for 10 years. Let us try it the right way for this 1 year.

I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution and against most favored nation status for the Chinese Government.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution, and I call on my colleagues to vote against it. We, as Americans on the bridge of going into the next century, while we have a boom in our economy, there is no question that, in order to sustain this economic boom, we are going to have to continue to maintain our technological leadership and expansion in trade. The whole thing for the next century is going to be trade, trade, trade, and more trade.

It is true that we have lost a lot of our low-skilled jobs here, and we have to do more to protect those people that have been dislocated and placed out of work. There is no question that, as a result of our important leadership role in the world, that more and more is expected of us to protect the human rights and political rights of other people.

But I think that there is a lot of hypocrisy in terms of America's ability to monitor these things all over the world and, at the same time, to ignore many of the same inequities that exist in our country.

I was among those who lead the fight in sanctions against South Africa because the whole world saw exactly what was happening to majority rule there. But, now, America has singled out sanctions and trade punishment

when most of the time we stand alone, Cuba being an example of how just wrong trade policy can get.

It would seem to me that we have an obligation for the next generation to say what we have done to prove that America leads the way in moral leadership; that we never have to explain how we get on the Amnesty International list in terms of violation of human rights; that we should not have to explain why 1.8 million Americans are locked up in jail, why 90 percent of them are locked up for nonviolent crimes, and how we find that most all of them came from the most terrible schools that we have in America.

We have to make certain that this new technology, that we have investments in it, and that we move forward and turning away from countries that we trade with, but to take advantage of our power, our influence, to make certain that, by example, we show the people that we protect human rights and political rights in this country and throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to allocate that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1115

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the author of this legislation that we are discussing today, I dedicate this bill to Ginetta Sagan, a champion of human rights, who has inspired me for many, many years.

The legislation we are talking about will deny normal trade relations, formerly Most Favored Nation status, to Communist China. This preferential trade status should not be granted to a despotic regime. It should not be granted to regimes that are engaged in aggression, militarism, proliferation, and a systematic abuse of human rights of their own people.

I certainly disagree with the last speaker who suggested that the United States of America is in some way morally equivalent to this dastardly, dastardly tyrannical regime, the world's worst human rights abuser. By ignoring the nature of the Communist regime that rules China with an iron hand we are doing no favor to the American people and we are doing no favor to the Chinese people.

Mr. Speaker, we will be told time and again during this debate that bestowing this preferential trade status on Communist China will tend to civilize and moderate the gangster-like rulers there. All empirical evidence suggests the opposite. Since Tiananmen Square

10 years ago, which was a massacre of democracy advocates that the Beijing regime still denies, but since then the genocide continues in Tibet and the repression throughout China has escalated.

We have just heard today someone say that freedom of religion has never been greater in China. Yet, in fact, in the last few weeks a new generation of victims are being rounded up and brutalized, many disappearing into the Lao Gai prison camps, which are the Chinese version of the Nazi concentration camps, or the gulag system of the former Soviet Union. The latest victims are part of a meditation and exercise movement, a religious minority based purely on Chinese cultural and spiritual traditions. This has grown to some 70 million practitioners, including some members of the Communist party and their families.

Yet these innocent people, who have no political agenda, have now joined the Tibetans, the Chinese Muslims, and the Christians, who refused to register in their registered churches, in that they are all becoming enemies of the state.

The leaders of this same tyrannical regime that is persecuting these religious people still boasts in their meetings, and it has been quoted in their last meeting just a month ago, that they will "destroy capitalism." I think we can read that the United States of America is who they want to destroy.

This is the same regime that is using its annual \$70 billion trade surplus, and we are permitting them that trade surplus with our irrational policy that we are talking about today, they are using that to modernize their military. They are building nuclear-armed missiles based solely on American technology, and stolen American technology, missiles that are aimed at the United States and that could incinerate millions of Americans.

After 10 years of debating this issue in Congress, as their trade surplus with the United States continues to grow, there is absolutely no sign of moderation or liberalization on the mainland of China.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we will hear that China must be given this preferential trade status because we cannot isolate or refuse to trade with this vast potential market. Glassy-eyed businessmen can overlook any crime, shut their ears to any pleas for mercy in their quest for the China market. Well, China is the market of the future, it always has been, and as long as it is under Communist Chinese rule, it always will be. The Communist rulers are playing Americans as saps. Little Taiwan, with 20 million people, buys more from us than all of mainland China with its 1.2 billion people. So does tiny Singapore.

This debate, no matter how the other side may claim otherwise, is not about

isolating China or cutting it off from trade. Americans will still be free to trade with China at their own risk. But those are the operative words we are talking about today. They will be trading at their own risk. The reason these powerful business lobbies are pushing for normal trade relations status is that it will permit wealthy financial interests to invest in Communist China with the benefits of subsidies provided by the American taxpayer.

In short, American businessmen will be able to close down their factories in the United States, as they have been doing, and they will be able to move them to China with a subsidy by the taxpayers of the United States of America. And that is what this debate is really all about. Because people will still be free to sell their products over in China, no matter what happens in this particular debate.

This debate is not about free trade. Obviously, it is about subsidy, as I just said. But if it was truly about free trade, I would be on the other side. I believe in free trade. Free trade between free people. What we have is manipulated trade on their side and free trade on ours. That ends up benefiting the Communist Chinese and their clique that rules that country. It is not free trade; it is just a masking phrase for a totally insane policy that permits huge tariffs on any American product that they are trying to sell into China versus low tariffs on the Chinese goods that are flooding into the United States and putting our people out of work.

There has been a short-term profit. Sure, there has been a short-term profit, to a few billionaires in the United States. But it is not in the long-term interest of the American people, who are now in the shadow of Chinese nuclear weapons that are aimed at the United States and our cities.

I am asking my colleagues to join me in changing a policy that is out of control and self-destructive. Our current policy is not good for the American people, it is not good for the Chinese people, it is not making peace more likely, and America's technology is flowing to a regime that is very similar to the Japanese militarists of the 1930s. This is simply emboldening. Just like our trade policy did with the Japanese back in the 1920s and 1930s, we are simply emboldening the bully boys in Beijing to continue their repression, their aggression, and their belligerency.

This immoral policy of accommodating the Japanese back in the 1920s did not work and did not lead to peace or freedom, and it will not give us peace and freedom in our time. I ask my colleagues to join with me in standing up for democracy, for the economic interests of our people, and for a rational approach to world peace.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 57, which would terminate normal trade relations with China 60 days after enactment. By raising tariffs to the prohibitive levels that applied before 1980, and thereby prompting mirrored retaliation on the part of the Chinese against \$18 billion of U.S. exports, this resolution would effectively extinguish trade relations between our two countries.

And for my distinguished colleague and friend from California who was just on the floor, I would remind him that his State exported \$2.5 billion worth of goods. And these were not all those powerful interests, although maybe in the scrap and waste industry, because the gentleman's State exported \$124 million worth of scrap and waste. And I am glad that China was willing to take it instead of dumping it in my back yard.

But in addition to that, manufactured goods out of the State of California were \$2.5 billion, and that translates into roughly 40,000, almost 50,000 domestic jobs that pay, on average, 15 to 20 percent more than most jobs.

During the debate today, proponents of the bill will urge Members to send a signal to China in order to protest violations of human rights. Unfortunately, revoking normal trade relations is a rash policy that offers no practical plan for bringing the political and economic change to China that we all seek. I urge my colleagues to support a more pragmatic policy which acknowledges that a nation of 1.2 billion people is more likely to imitate our powerful example over time than it is to bend as a result of our threats.

My goal in maintaining normal trade relations is to support the continued presence of Americans throughout Chinese society, whether they be entrepreneurs, teachers, religious leaders, or missionaries. And speaking of missionaries, I might note that we had a visit here on the Hill with Ned Graham, Billy Graham's son, and they have been engaged in missionary activity in mainland China for several years and have distributed literally millions of Bibles in their missionary efforts. They have even contracted with a publishing firm in mainland China to print their Bibles. These contacts would be threatened if we revoked NTR.

Since the economic opening of China by Deng Xiaoping in 1978 and the transition in China from centrally planned socialism to a more capitalist system, 200 million Chinese citizens have been lifted out of absolute poverty. Likewise, while restrictions on organized religion remain, there has been a marked growth in religious activity in China during the last decade. To be sure, there are several severe problems remaining, but listen to Reverend Pat Robertson, who has urged Congress "to

keep the door to the message of freedom and God's love" open, not shut. "Leaving a billion people in spiritual darkness punishes not the Chinese Government but the Chinese people," he wrote. "The only way to pursue morality is to engage China fully and openly as a friend."

In the past few years we have observed democracy beginning to take root in the form of functioning elections at the village level in China. To date, one in three Chinese citizens have participated in local elections where many successful candidates have been non-Communists.

Many observers believe that freedom in China is greater now than at any time in its long history. The Chinese Government has allowed an unprecedented increase in the ability to own property, a home or a business, to travel and to keep profits. In a few years, more than half of the state-run industries will be privatized.

While preserving NTR trade status offers hope for improving the welfare of the Chinese people, it is also squarely in the U.S. national interest. Revoking NTR would be interpreted by the Chinese as an act of hostility. This would strengthen the hand of those in China who oppose further reform and opening to the West. It would jeopardize China's new willingness to embrace the market-oriented trade disciplines of the WTO as evidenced in the April 8 package of concessions put on the table by Premier Zhu Rongji at the summit meeting with President Clinton.

U.S. negotiators secured progress toward an expansive bilateral market access agreement, along with Chinese commitments to adopt WTO rules relating to such issues as technology transfer, subsidies, product safeguards, and state enterprises. China also agreed to end sanitary and phytosanitary bans on the importation of United States wheat, meat, and citrus products.

If implemented, these commitments could represent substantial new opportunities for U.S. exports to China, because Chinese markets, already huge, will grow even further in areas such as agriculture and information technology.

Unlike any other major trade agreement, this is a one-sided set of concessions. In exchange for steep tariff reductions and wholesale reforms of the Chinese trading system, the United States gives up nothing. At the same time, we preserve our positive influence over the direction of the turbulent change that is occurring in China.

I urge the administration to get back to the table with the Chinese as soon as possible. The United States has a unique opportunity at this point in time. In my view, the President should have seized this historic opportunity to lock China into a binding WTO agreement. Clearly, a protectionist move to

revoke normal trade relations with China would permanently derail the potential WTO deal. History in Asia and the political evolution in China will be entirely different if we allow this deal to slip through our fingers.

Maintaining normal trade relations is in the economic interest of all Americans because it preserves 200,000 U.S. jobs which are directly supported by U.S. exports to China.

□ 1130

My home State of Illinois sold almost a billion dollars of products to China in 1992. These are jobs that pay wages, as I indicated earlier, 15 to 20 percent higher than jobs supported by sales to the domestic market. They would be the first casualties in a war of trade retaliation.

Mr. Speaker, trade is the one area where the mutual advantage for China and the United States is clear; and, for that reason, I strongly urge a "no" vote on H.J. Res. 57.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I see nothing clear in the advantage of trade with China.

Ten years ago, the Chinese tanks rumbled into Tiananmen Square to crush an historic call for freedom and reform. Despite that danger, many demonstrators stood their ground. Hundreds were beaten; they were arrested; and they were shot.

Now, 10 years later, many of those arrested that grim day are still in prison. One of them, Zhang Shanguang, served 7 years. After Tiananmen Square, he was released, only to be rearrested because he dared to speak out on behalf of laid-off workers.

Just over the past week, Chinese authorities arrested more than 5,000 people solely on the basis of their religious beliefs. They joined countless others already locked away in dark cells and reeducation camps simply because they spoke about their faith or their right to form a union or their right to seek justice in their country.

By any measure, any measure conceivable, this is an abysmal record. And what is our response today? Well, some say we need to give the Chinese authorities more time, we need to give them more time by way of economic incentive to change. We are told to be patient.

Ten years is long enough to see that nothing has changed. In fact, it has gotten worse. The current regime continues to abuse human rights and political rights without the slightest hesitation.

The authorities even arrested a man recently in downtown Beijing for wearing a T-shirt and on the T-shirt were

the words "labor rights." They arrested him and threw him in prison for wearing a T-shirt.

Even as we speak, Nike is negotiating a deal with a sweatshop in China that pays teenage girls 16 cents an hour to make gym shoes that sell for \$120 a pair. They work 12 hours a day for 16 cents an hour. And they have no power, no power to speak up for a better deal or to organize or no right to basic dignity, no hope at all in this situation they find themselves in.

That is unless we do something about it, unless we use our courage to leverage our economic strength to enact real reform. We could give the people of China a chance to help themselves.

Our policy of granting China special trade status no matter what they do year after year has failed.

How long are we going to ignore China's policy of slave labor, of prison labor, of forced abortions, of ethnic persecution, of religious persecution? And what are we ignoring it for? A \$67-billion trade deficit?

Now, this is really surreal when we think about it. We sell more to Belgium than we do to over a billion Chinese. So let us adopt a common-sense approach, a new approach. Let us demand proof of progress before we grant China special trade status.

Let us not, as the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) so eloquently spoke just a few minutes here, engage in a system of cash register engagement with China. Let us be beyond that. Let us be bigger than that. Let us stand for the ideals for which our Founding Fathers came before this country and before the world.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the resolution to deny China MFN status.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time there is remaining on all sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 31 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 42 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) has 37½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 33½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 57.

Our relationship with China indeed faces many major challenges. The question in each case is whether using this annual review to withdraw NTR will confront the challenges.

I want to focus today on two of these aspects, our trade relationships and our human rights relationships.

First is the trade. Clearly, there are major problems to confront in our trade relationship with China. The large and growing current trade deficit; how we integrate a huge economy that

remains nonmarket-based in many vital respects and that does not operate within a clear rule of law into a world trading order based on free market rules and the rule of law.

Neither of these problems is easily solved. The current trade deficit results, in part, because China restricts market access and because it exploits and manipulates its nonmarket mechanisms, both capital and labor.

It is imperative we address these problems in negotiations with the Chinese in the bilateral WTO access talks. Some were addressed before the negotiations broke off, but others were not. And they were reasons the U.S. could not sign off on an agreement with the Chinese a few months ago.

The answer on key trade issues is not to withdraw NTR today but to insist on clearly adequate terms and conditions before NTR is granted on a permanent basis. Enactment of today's resolution would bring further trade negotiations with the Chinese to a halt, to a complete halt. It would indeed lower our trade deficit. It would do so by terminating most of our trade rather than by addressing the structural issues, issues which are helping to create the trade deficit today, which must be addressed as we look at the longer run when China will increasingly be a competitor as well as a consumer of American made products and services, and issues which must, as I said, be fully addressed before permanent NTR is even considered.

Now let me, if I might, address human rights issues, which indeed must be addressed. Recent events in China demonstrate that the U.S. must bring sustained pressure on China on human rights. The recent suppression of followers of Falun Gong demonstrates once again that, however more open in some respects Chinese society is today compared to a decade ago, and it is, when it comes to any perceived threat to communist authoritarian control, the power of central authority will trample individual rights.

The problem with the use of this annual debate as a main tool is that it involves an instrument, withdrawal of NTR, which, absent a cataclysmic event, everybody knows in the end will not be invoked.

On the one hand, I agree with those who say that withdrawal of an NTR is not a sufficiently relevant or effective mechanism to press ahead on human rights. On the other hand, I agree that the operation of a normal trade economic relationship will not likely by itself transform China on human rights and Democratic values.

In a word, we need to find an alternative instrument.

I realize it is not easy to find such, but I urge that we have not worked hard enough in its search. We debate once a year and then mainly wait for the next year.

We, the administration and the Congress, do not spend sustained time trying to persuade other nations to join themselves with us on human rights issues. There is no certain answer. But quite clearly, the withdrawal of NTR is not, partly because idle threats rarely create much, if any, pressure.

So, in both respects, both as to trade and human rights, a "no" vote on this resolution is in order. But, and I say this with the full depth of conviction, it must not be the end of this work on trade and human rights but a stimulus to further vigorous efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution. I oppose these so-called normal trade relations with China.

Trade with communist China is a one-way street. It now exceeds \$1 billion a week. Experts say it will exceed \$70 billion this year.

I want the Members to know that China, with money from Uncle Sam, is buying attack aircraft, nuclear submarines, and intercontinental ballistic missiles.

And we are continuing to simply talk about a trade scenario. Unbelievable.

The record is clear. China has already threatened to nuke Taiwan. And we are now kow towing to China with a one-China policy.

China, as we debate this measure, has 14 intercontinental ballistic missiles pointed at American cities according to the Central Intelligence Agency. China is arming terrorist nations who hate Uncle Sam. And we are today voting again to continue a policy that is anti-American and threatens our national security.

The bottom line of this debate: Congress is financing the greatest threat in our Nation's history.

We have got to be dumb, my colleagues. This is not just a trade matter. This is much more. The records show over the last several years China is spying and buying America right out from under us while Congress is granting Chinese officials gallery passes.

I heard about all of the trade surpluses. I am sure I am going to hear one from Ohio. Ohio has got a deficit with China. Ohio has got a deficit with Japan. The Nation has a \$70-billion deficit, and we are in fact threatening the future of each and every one of our constituents and citizens.

I do not know what it is going to take. I do not think Congress will wise up until there is a Chinese dragon eating our assets around here. I think that is what it is going to have to take.

I want a reciprocal trade agreement with China, with Japan. Engagement is fine if it is not a one-way toll bridge for American companies.

I think it is time for our committees who have jurisdiction over trade to start bringing out the trade measures. That is the most significant problem facing our country.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) our distinguished colleague.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know why we are doing this to ourselves. I mean, every single year we come up and beat the tambourine and hit the drum.

This is not going to go anyplace. We cannot cut off our relationship with China. We do not want to do it. It is the wrong thing to do. There are hundreds of ways to make China an enemy. This just happens to be one of them.

Now, it is very easy to get into specifics here, but I have been to China. I have done business there. I know what they are doing. We have a trade deficit. It is not going to get turned around soon. There are human rights problems. There are labor problems. There are environmental problems.

But I can remember talking to one of the people in one of our plants over there who said, You can be philosophic about trade relations with China. You can cut it off or increase the tariffs. Let me tell you something, my job is on the line; and I want you to remember that, because I am trying to have an impact here not only with my company but also with my family.

□ 1145

We must be able to relate and to talk and share ideas and to trade. How else do things change? Just by shutting off things? No. So to cut off the normal trade status with China, I think, is wrong, and I think we must oppose H.J. Res. 57.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank my friend from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 57, to deny trading privileges to the People's Republic of China.

Every year when we debate this issue, America's CEOs stream into Ronald Reagan Airport seeking special favors for the world's worst abuser of human rights. They are helped by former government officials that know how the machinery of government operates, including former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, former U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills, and former Commerce Secretary Mickey Kantor.

This fall, Mr. Speaker, "Fortune" magazine is sponsoring a 3-day business trip to China. This gala, which CEOs by invitation only of the largest companies in America will attend, will feature dinner with the world's leading Communist, Jiang Zemin, and will feature lunch with Henry Kissinger. It

concludes just prior to the celebration on October 1 of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, the 50th anniversary of the victory of communism, the 50th anniversary of the "who-lost-China" debate.

These CEOs from America's largest companies, many of them will travel from Shanghai to Beijing on October 1 to watch a parade in Tiananmen Square. As this military hardware from the People's Republic of China goes by and is viewed by America's most prosperous and successful CEOs, most prosperous capitalists as they watch this Communist parade go by, as ludicrous as this all sounds, it is safe to say there probably will not be much discussion by these CEOs to each other or to Communist leaders about the forced abortions in China, probably not much discussion about nuclear weapons sales, technology sales to Pakistan, probably not much discussion about persecution of Christians, probably not much discussion among these capitalists and Communists about China's slave labor camps or its child labor or all of its human rights abuses.

Mr. Speaker, we should vote "yes" on this Rohrabacher resolution. We should demand to see if China, for only 1 year, can stop its human rights abuses; we should demand to see if China, for only 1 year, can stop its use of slave labor and child labor; we should demand if China, for only 1 year, can stop threatening the democracy, the democracy next door, Taiwan; and we should demand, if only for 1 year, that China open up its markets so that instead of a \$65 billion trade deficit, persistent trade deficit we have with that country, that maybe we could deal on an equal footing.

Mr. Speaker, a "yes" vote on H.J. Res. 57 is an opportunity to send a message to the American business community and most importantly to the thugs that run the Communist Party in China. It is an opportunity to send a message that this kind of behavior that they have exhibited is no longer acceptable.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), an expert on trade matters.

Mr. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that if you look at China's record on human rights, on the whole issue of espionage, the trade deficit, one would have to say that our relationship with China is a very difficult one, it is an uncertain one, and it is one that obviously has a lot of ups and downs.

I think the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) recently in an op-ed piece in the Los Angeles Times described it as a roller coaster ride that we have with China. But in spite of all

this, I think, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) mentioned, we are going to continue on our trade relations with China.

It is somewhat unfortunate that we have this debate tied with trade, because what eventually happens here is the fact that trade continues on and to some extent the comments made by the opponents of trade with China become diminished. We should really highlight the issues of human rights, the whole issue of proliferation, but it should be in a different forum, one in which we can all join together and deal with.

The reason we must continue on trade with China is pretty simple. China is 22 percent of the world population. One out of every five individuals on this planet is Chinese. Over the next 20 or 30 years, China will become one of the most dangerous players in the world if we begin to try to isolate them; or, on the other hand, if we engage the Chinese, perhaps, not certainly but perhaps, we can enter into a period where the U.S. and China and other countries of the free world begin to operate and work together. This is a strategic issue for the United States. This is an important issue for the United States.

Let me address, if I may, the issue of human rights just for a moment in conclusion. Yes, there is political repression in China and there is very little political rights in China. On the other hand, with the continuing engagement of the U.S. and other countries with the Chinese, there are probably more personal freedoms than we have ever had. Hopefully that middle class in China will begin to understand that it must, over time, change its own government. That is the key to trade with China and that is the key to make China a more open form of government, along with the open economy it is trying to achieve at this time.

I urge a strong "no" vote on this resolution.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Let me again state, this is not about isolating China; this is not about not trading with China. Those arguments are irrelevant. Those arguments are not what this is about. Normal trade relations, by providing this privileged status for Communist China, simply says that if we provide that, and I am saying we should not, and those voting for this resolution are saying we should not, provides that we can subsidize the investment in China by the American taxpayers.

If my resolution passes today, people will still be able to trade with China all they want. They can sell all their goods, they can try to set up their factories, but they have to do so at their own risk. The reason the business community is fighting this is because we are then, by taking away normal trade

relations with China, taking away their right to get government subsidies when they close factories here and set them up in Communist China. It does not isolate China. People can continue in engagement. We are just not going to subsidize them and subsidize the people who are providing them what they need to build their infrastructure to outcompete us. That makes all the sense in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill for a simple reason. This is not the time to reward a government which poses a threat to U.S. national security, which closes its markets to American products, which not only steals nuclear secrets from our labs but violates U.S. intellectual property rights. Before we extend normal trade relations to the PRC, we should ask ourselves what trading with this regime, an abuser of human rights, has accomplished thus far.

Has it accomplished the overall goal of changing unacceptable behavior by the Chinese Government? Are the Chinese people any freer? Are they able to exercise their rights as individuals and as citizens of the state without reprisals? Do American businesses have unlimited access to Chinese markets? Or are they subject to barriers and widespread discrimination? Are the American people any safer?

Reports by the Central Intelligence Agency show that 13 of China's 18 long-range strategic missiles have single nuclear warheads aimed at U.S. cities. China also has an array of strategic missiles that U.S. military and intelligence officials say are targeted on U.S. forces deployed in Asia.

Defense and intelligence experts show that China continues to transfer dangerous technology to Iran and Pakistan and is actively involved in the transfer of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and missiles to other rogue states. The PRC is subsidizing Chinese missile and nuclear industries and prolonging the status quo. We have all read with grave concerns the report by the Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China.

Looking at the issue from a strictly commercial perspective, looking at it as if trade is the most important aspect, affording China normal trade relations also makes no sense whatsoever. It would be rewarding China for its closed markets which in just the first 4 months of this year has resulted in an \$18.4 billion trade deficit for the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill to disapprove NTR for China.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article referred to by the gentleman from California (Mr.

MATSUI). It was an L.A. Times article that was written by the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

[From the L.A. Times]

END THE U.S.-CHINA ROLLER COASTER

(By David Dreier)

Twists and turns, slow and measured ascents followed by stomach churning plunges. A roller coaster at your local theme park? No, U.S.-China relations over the last few years. And it's a bad way for two enormous and important countries on opposite sides of the Pacific Rim to deal with one another. The U.S. should seize the upcoming opportunity to fashion common-sense trade rules that will offer the American and Chinese peoples greater hopes for stability, prosperity and freedom.

The U.S.-China relations roller coaster will crest this summer as the annual trade debate over normal trade relations—sometimes called “most favored nation” status—is merged with the more debate about China's admission to the World Trade Organization. These intricate trade negotiations and rules that are the stuff of lawyers and government officials are vitally important because prices, product quality, consumer choice, jobs and investments are ultimately tied to trade. Trade with Asia is critical to California's and America's continued economic growth.

The American people have been exposed to China in the last year like never before. Unfortunately, much of this attention has been the negative headlines of espionage, protests against the tragic mistaken bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade and illegal campaign activities. Though these all deserve to be discussed and examined in full, what has not received enough attention has been the truly revolutionary change sweeping across China.

China is literally revamping its entire economic system, an enormous undertaking. It's the equivalent of the people switching to driving on the other side of the road, repudiating their whole political ideology and changing their economic language all at once. This type of economic and political revolution can't happen overnight. If it did, there could be such instability and shock to the system that retrenchment, bloodshed and political repression might reappear. When China tried swift, radical change during the Cultural Revolution and the Great Leap Forward, 60 million people died.

But things are changing in China, and mostly for the better. We can be under no illusions about the fact that the Beijing government is a repressive, authoritarian dictatorship. Yet although political rights are largely nonexistent, there is no question that personal freedom is on the rise, due in large part to market reforms.

Year after year, the United States has extended normal trading relations to China over the objections of those who think that curtailing trade will solve our problems with China. I have never understood the argument that limiting Chinese interaction with America's vibrant free market, democratic institutions and renowned individual spirit of free enterprise would somehow strengthen democratic activists and weaken entrenched hard-liners. Trade with China is not a gift or reward that should be given and taken away; it is a crucial tool needed to foster change and reform in a very old, proud and different culture.

This annual debate over commercial relations with China will end once that country is admitted to the WTO and agrees to take

the painful steps necessary to bring its economy in line with world standards and practices. China's WTO membership will bring major benefits to Americans, by fully opening China's vast market to American manufacturers, farmers and service industries. Of particular importance to my state of California will be the protections of intellectual property rights of our world-class entertainers and high-tech industries. What a win-win scenario this is for American workers, businesses and consumers.

As Americans, we must pursue China for our own self-interest as much as to help China get better, with the top priority being the safeguarding of our national security. China is a business partner, but we cannot confuse that with a strategic relationship. We do share some mutual interests that it is hoped would be increased as friendly ties improve. But just as a business wouldn't share its confidential marketing strategies or cost structure with a competitor, the U.S. government and American businesses must take care not to leak sensitive material to the Chinese government. China is simultaneously our business partner and our competitor.

What we must do is approve normal trade relations and its entry into the WTO for the sake of both our nations. A stable and open trade relationship, divorced from the wild roller coaster ride of yearly fights and political trends, will increase prosperity and improve the lives of the American and Chinese people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution and urge a “no” vote.

I stand here today in support of free trade with China, our globe's most populous nation, our fourth largest trading partner. When we have issues such as this before this House, I am often asked, as I travel throughout the diverse district that I have the privilege of representing, what does this all mean. What does this debate that we are having today mean to the folks on the South Side of Chicago and in the south suburbs of Illinois?

Exports to China total almost \$1 billion from the State of Illinois. An economist will tell you that for every \$1 billion in exports, it is over 17,000 jobs that are at stake. Illinois sent over 775 million dollars' worth of manufacturing exports, tractors made in the Quad Cities, industrial heavy equipment made in Joliet, food products, textile mill products, apparel, lumber and wood products, furniture, paper products, printing goods, chemical products, rubber and plastics, leather products, stone, clay and glass products, fabricated metal products, transportation equipment, electronic equipment, farm goods, corn, soybeans, wheat, pork, beef, all from the State of Illinois.

I learned firsthand in the late 1970s what it means for free trade with China. After President Nixon opened up China, we sent a shipment of breeding stock, breeding swine from Illinois to China and they came from our farm. That was the first shipment of Amer-

ican breeding stock to China. We learned the advantage personally at that time. But for thousands of Illinoisans, free trade means jobs.

When you think about it, this vote today could jeopardize over 17,000 jobs in Illinois. I urge my colleagues when they consider how to cast their vote as to which of their neighbors will lose their job if this resolution succeeds. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to suggest that while there were \$14 billion of stuff that we exported to China, you figure 20,000 jobs per billion, that is 280,000 jobs. That is hardly as many as the Chinese have killed in Tibet since their horrid reign. It is how you decide you want to take care of people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the leader in the fight for human rights in China, for sensible and reasonable trade negotiations that will lead to nonproliferation and workers' rights and human rights.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of her remarks that she be allowed temporarily to control my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1200

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I have to husband the time very carefully because we proudly have so many people who want to come to the floor today to speak on behalf of human rights in China, fair trade for the United States, and a safer world.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because the President must request a special waiver to grant what is now called normal trade relations to China. He must request a special waiver for normal trade relations to China. What we are not here about today is to isolate China or any discussion of it. So anyone who is on the other side of this issue who wishes to characterize those of us who want to help the Chinese people as isolating them do a grave disservice to the debate.

The issue is not whether bringing this issue every year is productive or constructive or has improved human rights in China. The issue before this body is: Is the present policy, the Bush-Clinton China policy, working?

We were told when they delinked trade and human rights that it would lead to improvement in both. Wrong, it has led to failure in both.

Now we are calling this normal trade relations because we changed the name last year. There have been all kinds of name changes. For example, this policy was called constructive engagement before. It was neither constructive nor true engagement, so then they changed

it to a strategic partnership. It was not that either, so now they call it purposeful, principled engagement with our eyes open.

Do not take my word for it, it is in their book: Purposeful, principled engagement with our eyes open.

Mr. Speaker, that is a refreshing change from with our eyes closed, blinded to the atrocities in China and the unfair trade practices and the proliferation of weapons. And I am just waiting for next year when I think maybe it will be called purposeful, principled engagement with China with our eyes wide open and the wax cleaned out of our ears.

Because then, maybe then, the administration and the proponents of this absolute concession to China, maybe then with the wax cleaned out of their ears, they will hear the pleadings of the monks and nuns in Tibet who have been tortured for decades by the People's Liberation Army. They will hear them over the sound of the army of lobbyists here in Washington, D.C. here to lobby on this issue. And maybe then with the wax out of their ears, they will hear the crying of the Panchen Lama, the baby chosen by His Holiness to be the next Dalai Lama, kidnapped by the regime. And we have said nothing.

Maybe then they will hear that baby cry over the clinking of champagne glasses as they toast the abusers of human rights in China. And maybe with the wax out of their ears they will hear the cries of people still in prison for speaking freely. Maybe then they will hear the pleadings of the families and the prisoners still in prison, hundreds of them, for speaking freely in Tiananmen Square, and the thousands who are in jail because of their religious beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put in the RECORD the statement of the U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops opposing renewing MFN and in support of this resolution:

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL  
DEVELOPMENT AND WORLD PEACE,  
*Washington, DC, June 30, 1999.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The upcoming vote on extending "normal trade relations" status to the People's Republic of China presents the Congress with a significant opportunity and challenge to send an unmistakably clear message about our national concern for the protection of basic human rights.

Each time over the past several years when the issue has arisen, it has been our conviction that no Administration has been sufficiently committed to pressing the Chinese authorities on their systemic violations of certain fundamental human rights. Our Conference has focused particularly on the issues of religious freedom and we have repeatedly cited the persecution of religious groups, such as the unregistered Protestant and Catholic churches, and the intrusive interference by the state in the internal life of the "open" or recognized churches. The persecution and control of Tibetan Buddhism is especially shameful and known to all.

We acknowledge that the present Administration has made efforts to raise these issues with the Chinese authorities, but little, if anything, has changed on the human rights front in these last years of increased engagement. Indeed, the continued detention of religious figures as well as of democracy advocates only point up the necessity for unrelenting official U.S. firmness on issues of human rights and religious freedom.

The trade status debate may not be the best forum, but it does offer the Congress an important opportunity to raise the priority of human rights and religious liberty. Therefore, I urge you to send as clear a message as possible by voting to overturn the President's waiver of the relevant sanctions of the 1974 Trade Act. A strong vote to deny MFN/NTS status to China should strengthen the Administration's commitment to putting human rights at the top of the China agenda and send a strong signal that the status quo is not acceptable.

Sincerely yours,

MOST REVEREND

THEODORE E. MCCARRICK,

*Archbishop of Newark, Chairman, International Policy Committee, U.S. Catholic Conference.*

So, Mr. Chairman, I plead with my colleagues who have voted on the other side of this issue. Ten years is enough. The trade deficit has gone from 3 billion to 56 billion. It will be \$67 billion for this year.

It has not led to better trade relations, it has not led to more U.S. products going into China. Quite the reverse. A \$67 billion trade surplus for the regime to consolidate its power, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction continues, the human rights violations continue. And this past week, they have arrested between 10 and 20,000 people for the practice of their self-help, for their own self-help group. Ten to 20,000 people, no food, no water. Do not give the regime a waiver to abuse human rights, abuse trade practices, and proliferate weapons of mass destruction.

Vote for the Rohrabacher amendment. This is not normal.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of normal trade relations with China and do so because we are confronted with two choices. The choices are clear and simple. We can have a constructive and purposeful engagement policy with China or we can have a new Cold War with a new evil empire with new costs to our taxpayers for a larger defense budget.

Now I think that we have made some limited progress with China, probably the most important bilateral relationship that we are going to have with any country in the world over the next 50 years. What are some of the things that we have done where we have been successful? We hear a lot of the problems on the floor today. Well, one example is the East Gates International headed by Ned Graham, the son of the Reverend Billy Graham, has been able

to distribute 2.5 million Bibles legally in China since 1992 and help us work toward some more religious freedoms.

With respect to proliferation and arms control efforts, China has joined the nuclear nonproliferation treaty; they have signed a chemical weapons convention; they have signed the biological weapons convention; they have signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; and they have signed the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights.

Now there are some successes. Have they made enough progress on human rights? Absolutely not, and that is one of the reasons why we need to engage them, and I had a meeting with a host of my colleagues at Blair House with Premier Zhu Rongji a few months ago, and we pushed him and we pushed him and we asked questions and we tried to get him to do more and more and more on the human rights issue.

But the choice is clear. Are we going to have a constructive engagement policy with China or a new evil empire with China? Please vote down this policy on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 57, disapproving the President's request to provide "Normal Trade Relations" (NTR) in 1999 with products made in China. Since I have served in Congress, I have supported "constructive engagement" with China as a method of improving our critically important bilateral relationship and pursuing our foreign policy goals to advance human rights and religious freedom. While progress at times remains slow and painful, continued talks and diplomacy are key aspects of this important bilateral relationship.

Ten years ago in Tiananmen Square, Chinese students courageously demonstrated in support of democracy, but they were met by violence from a regime fearful of change. We continue to stand for human rights in China, and I firmly believe that a continued policy of principled and purposeful engagement reinforces our efforts to move China toward broader freedoms and openness. We have successfully influenced China to make significant progress, but much more must be achieved.

We continue to have serious differences with China on human rights, their efforts to acquire sensitive information, nuclear nonproliferation, regional stability and transnational threats such as drug trafficking, terrorism, and smuggling people across borders. We will continue to deal directly with these differences. As the President stated when he announced his decision to extend NTR: "We pursue engagement with our eyes wide open, without illusions."

Accordingly, we should continue to speak and negotiate frankly about our differences and to firmly protect our national interests. However, a policy of disengagement and confrontation would serve only to strengthen those in China who oppose greater openness and freedom. Through constructive engagement, we will remain sensitive and respond quickly to ongoing human rights violations, including China's recent massive crackdown on

members of Falun Gong and religious suppression in Tibet and against Protestant "house churches" in Henan.

In particular, we should call for the immediate release of three Chinese activists—Xu Wenli, Qing Yongming and Wang Youcai—who received stiff prison sentences for advocating the China Democracy Party last year. Earlier this year, I met Premier Zhu Rongji at the Blair House and wrote a follow-up letter that was signed by ten Members of the House of Representatives who support NTR in which we called for their immediate release.

Clearly, trade encourages human rights, and it has facilitated the work of Western religious ministries active in China. For example, East Gates International, headed by Ned Graham, son of evangelist Billy Graham, has been able to distribute 2.5 million Bibles legally in China since 1992. This organization can communicate freely with its contacts in China because of the proliferation of information-exchange technology such as e-mail, faxes, and cellular telephones—a development made possible by trade and economic reform. As Billy Graham has written, "Do not treat China as an adversary but as a friend."

Revoking NTR would rupture our relationship with a third of the world's population and jeopardize our political and economic security. Such an action would make China more defensive, isolated and unpredictable, weakening the forces of change and nullifying the progress achieved so far. Moreover, revoking NTR would undermine our efforts to engender constructive Chinese participation in international organizations that will promote China's adherence to international standards on human rights, weapons of mass destruction, crime and drugs, immigration, the environment, economic reform and trade. Indeed, constructive engagement means advancing U.S. interests in tangible ways.

As Brent Scowcroft said in a recent New York Times article, "The U.S. has at least another two decades to encourage China's responsible development before it presents us with a direct military challenge. As China's intentions are clarified by its actions, the U.S. and its regional partners will be able to make constant course adjustments." To be sure, we will keep a close eye on China, particularly in the wake of its recent moves in the disputed Spratly Islands where it has unilaterally installed military facilities, and its hostile posturing against Taiwan.

While the Cox Report uncovered troubling lapses in security at the U.S. national laboratories, we must maintain perspective on China's limited but emerging military capability. To that end, we should continue to engage China in easing tensions on the Korean Peninsula, as well as cooperative efforts to combat terrorism, drug trafficking and intellectual property piracy. As a result of our engagement policy, China has joined the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and Zangger Committee, the Chemical Weapons Convention, and the Biological Weapons Convention. Additionally, China signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and pledged to ratify it soon, and has ceased nuclear cooperation with Iran.

Furthermore, maintaining NTR with China—as every President has requested since 1980—is good for U.S. farmers, workers,

small businesses, and the economy. Last year, we exported \$14 billion worth of goods, making China our largest growing market abroad. Revoking NTR would invite retaliation against U.S. exporters and investors, as tariffs on imports from China would immediately increase from an average 6 percent to 44 percent. In turn, China would immediately start buying from our European and Asian competitors. This would seriously jeopardize more than 400,000 U.S. jobs which currently depend on exports to China and Hong Kong.

Moreover, withdrawing from our constructive engagement policy will preclude us from pursuing opportunities to open new markets to American products. Earlier this year, the U.S. negotiated far-reaching market access for agricultural and industrial goods as well as a wide range of service sectors. Additionally, significant agreements were reached on important rules of commerce, but differences remain on the implementation and duration of provisions governing dumping and product safeguards.

We also successfully negotiated tariff reductions with China from 80 percent to 25 percent in the year 2005, with auto tariffs decreasing to an average of 10 percent. However, without NTR, we cannot reasonably hope to pursue additional tariff reductions to further open Chinese markets to U.S.-made automobiles, nor improvements to improved consumer financing so that more autos can be purchased. We must also encourage China to update its antiquated distribution system which penalizes foreign competitors.

Improving trade relations is similar to peeling an onion, as numerous layers must be pared before the job is finished. I am hopeful that the Chinese will approach improving future trade relations with a view to the whole picture, rather than making small adjustments one layer at a time. At the same time, China must demonstrate progress for individual liberties by releasing arrested political, religious and human rights activists, if they hope to continue to enjoy strong relations with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that constructive engagement with China will lead to positive results, advancing our trade interests and foreign policy goals of religious freedom and improved human rights. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support constructive engagement and vote against this resolution to disapprove Normal Trade Relations with China.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to hear about all these agreements Communist China has signed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to MFN. I know it is a difficult vote for a lot of Members and there is a lot of soul searching, so I just want to tell people why I am strongly opposed to MFN.

For me it is an issue of the soul; it is an issue of conscience; it is an issue that 10 years from now when I look back, I want to know that I did maybe not what was right, maybe people differ, but what I think my God told me to do.

Now I think we maybe in a situation similar to the Parliament in the 1930's

in Great Britain when Winston Churchill tried to alarm people about what was taking place, and yet they still wanted to trade with Nazi Germany, and Nazi Germany went on to do horrific things. My sense is, and I hope I am wrong, but that is what is going to happen today with China.

And I would say to my friend from Indiana, they are the evil empire and they are the evil empire like Ronald Reagan said in 1983 with regard to the Soviet Union.

There are 13 Catholic bishops in jail in China today. I would change my vote if they set those bishops free. Bishop Su, who has been in jail because he gave holy communion to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH); he has been in jail for over 20 years. Thirteen Catholic bishops, a large number of Catholic priests are in jail. There is the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). He can tell my colleagues; go up and ask him. Bishop Su is in jail because of giving him holy communion.

So the next time on Sunday the call comes to go forward to the rail when colleagues take holy communion, think about Bishop Su. I hear all these missionaries quoted. Does anyone ever quote Bishop Su any more? Does anyone even ask to see Bishop Su any more?

There are a large number of Catholic priests in jail. There are a large number of evangelical house church people that are in jail. Muslims in China are being persecuted like my colleagues will not believe. I have a letter talking about electric volts and shocks being used on the Muslims.

Then there's Tibet. I am the only Member of Congress who has been to Tibet for years. When I was there, and we came in not as a Member of Congress, but as a tourist, I was told of unbelievable persecution. Lhasa is a Chinese city. It is no longer a Tibetan city. The Chinese government has destroyed 4,000 monasteries, not 4 monasteries, but 4,000 monasteries.

There are more slave labor camps in China today than when Solzhenitsyn wrote the book Gulag Archipelago. The book was a best seller. We all went out and hailed it, and it broke the world open. There are more gulags, more gulags in China today than there were when Solzhenitsyn wrote the book on the evil empire in Russia. If you don't believe it, call the CIA; they can share the pinpoint maps.

Then there are forced abortions. They track women down and throw them on the table. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) can tell my colleagues about forced abortions. In some respects this ought to be a major pro-life vote. Steve Mosher of the Population Research Institute told me the other day there were 12 to 15 million abortions last year in China, and it is basically the abortion capital of the

world. I do not understand, frankly, why this is not a pro-life vote.

Then there is slave labor. There are Chinese workers, slave laborers, in Sudan building a pipeline, and in Sudan every major terrorist group in the world, Abu Nidal, Hamas are all there.

What would my colleagues tell Bishop Su if we could see him today? I want to tell him that I know we will not take away MFN, but I wanted to send a message with my vote. I urge my colleagues to talk to the Romanian people. When we took MFN away from Ceausescu, the people told us that they heard the news on Radio Free Europe, and I want to send a message to the Chinese people on Radio Free Asia that the Congress stood with them on behalf of the persecuted church in China. There are good and decent men and women on both sides. For me, this is a vote of conscience and I urge support of the Rohrabacher resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 57, the resolution disapproving normal trade relations (NTR)—formerly called Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) status—with the People's Republic of China. I commend my colleague from California, Representative ROHR-ABACHER, for sponsoring this legislation. I also want to applaud the valiant and always steadfast efforts of Representative NANCY PELOSI. She is a consistent voice for freedom in China and a true advocate for human rights around the world.

Today, while we debate this issue on the floor of the House of Representatives, the Chinese government is suppressing and persecuting practitioners of Falun Gong. In the past several weeks, China has been engaging in one of the largest crackdowns of a group of people since the Tiananmen massacre of 1989. Thousands of Falun Gong practitioners, including many of its leaders and government officials, have been arrested. It is estimated that over 40 million people in China practice Falun Gong, many of them poor or unemployed. They are not involved in politics, but the Chinese government has chosen to crack down harshly on this movement.

This illustrates perfectly why I continue to oppose NTR for China. Many argue that the way to improve human rights in China is to keep giving China NTR status. The problem is that this has been our policy for the past ten years, but human rights have not improved. China's human rights record is as bad today as it was in 1989, when the Chinese government killed and injured hundreds of students who were peacefully demonstrating for political reform on Tiananmen Square.

The persecution of the underground Christian church continues.

Many Protestant pastors, Catholic bishops and priests are still being arrested, fined, beaten and imprisoned. Some have been in prison for many, many years—even decades. I will insert for the RECORD a partial list of Chinese Christians currently detained or imprisoned for religious reasons.

House church Christians and laypeople are still being arrested, fined, beaten and imprisoned.

Churches are still being destroyed.

Bibles are still being confiscated.

The Tibetan culture and religion are still being systematically destroyed. Tibetan Buddhist monks and nuns are being arrested and tortured. Tibetan Buddhist monasteries are still being controlled by cadres of Chinese communist security officials. The Tibetan people are still being deprived of their freedom, their livelihood and their culture.

I have seen the repression in Tibet with my own eyes. It is frightening.

Muslims in the Northwest portion of China are still being persecuted—Amnesty International issued a comprehensive report on persecution of Muslim Uyghurs earlier this year. Uyghurs are being arbitrarily detained. Thousands of Uyghur political prisoners are in jail and are being tortured. Recently, a group of Uyghurs shared with the Congressional Human Rights Caucus how they had been tortured in prison. I am submitting for the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Abdugheni Musa, who was arrested and tortured in 1995 for organizing a peaceful youth rally.

Democracy activists are still being watched, arrested, imprisoned, held under house arrest and sent to reeducation through labor camps. Scores of individuals associated with the Democracy Party have been arrested and given long sentences just in the last few months.

Over one hundred Tiananmen Square protesters are still in prison.

Those wishing to remember the 10th anniversary of the tragic events of spring 1989 when hundreds of protesters were brutally massacred at Tiananmen Square were prevented by the Chinese government from doing so. The families of the dead, wounded and exiled who are demanding an apology from the government of China for its actions in 1989 are being persecuted.

The Chinese government allowed and encouraged protesters to destroy the U.S. Embassy in Beijing. They bused in people. The Chinese Ambassador insulted the intelligence of the American people on Sunday talk shows with his demands.

China still runs a massive system of gulag slave labor camps—the laogai. The State Department's 1998 report on human rights in China said 230,000 people were detained in "re-education through labor camps" in China at the end of last year. People are sent to re-education through-labor camps without a trial or any kind of judicial proceeding.

China still has a program in which the kidneys, corneas and other organs are taken from executed prisoners and sold to foreign buyers for tens of thousands of dollars. Some of these organs are being peddled in the United States, against U.S. law.

It still engages in coercive population practices—including forced abortions and sterilizations. There are 7 to 15 million abortions a year in China, 6 to 12 times more than in the United States. According to the Population Research Institute, most of these abortions are performed under duress, with threats, bribes and sanctions—and sometimes outright force—used to elicit compliance.

So nothing has really changed with regard to human rights in China.

Our policy has done nothing to improve China's behavior regarding proliferation. Accord-

ing to Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet, China remains a "key supplier" of technology inconsistent with our nonproliferation goals—particularly missile and chemical technology to Pakistan and Iran. On April 15, 1999, the Washington Times cited intelligence reports that the Chinese are continuing to sell weapon technologies.

Finally, our policy has resulted in no improvement in ending China's unfair trade practices. The U.S. trade deficit with China continues to skyrocket (approaching over \$60 billion), U.S. goods are shut out of China's market and U.S. jobs continue to be lost to cheap Chinese labor. In 1989, at the time of the Tiananmen massacre, our trade deficit with China was only \$6 billion. today it is 10 times that.

This year a new element has been thrown into the mix that should make this Congress think twice about continuing our business-first policy—undisputed evidence of China's espionage in U.S. nuclear labs and its acquisition of knowledge about some of America's most advanced nuclear warheads.

As I look at this issue and the Cox report, I am concerned that the United States will be providing China the economic means through trade to develop missiles on which to attach advanced nuclear warheads designed with information stolen from the United States so these missiles can then be used to hit our grandchildren, or even our children.

The report of the bipartisan Select Committee on National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China chaired by Representative CHRIS COX found clear evidence that design information stolen from the United States will enable China to build thermonuclear warheads and attach them to ICBM missiles sooner than would have otherwise been possible. It said "the PRC has the infrastructure and the technical ability to use elements of U.S. warhead design information in the PLA's next generation of thermonuclear weapons. . . . The PRC could begin serial production of such weapons during the next decade. . . ." It also concludes, "The Select Committee judges that elements of the stolen information on U.S. thermonuclear warhead designs will assist the PRC in building its next generation of mobile ICBM's, which may be tested this year." China's mobile ICBM missiles will have the ability to hit the United States.

We are giving China the economic means to develop these weapons.

While it may be painful for some if we restrict China's ability to trade on favorable terms with the United States, China is now a greater threat to the U.S. national security than it has ever been in the past.

We also need to remember that China has deliberately tried to influence our political process through illegal campaign donations.

Our current policy has yielded very little progress on issues that the American people care about. Some 67 percent of Americans surveyed by Zogby earlier this year said that they would like the U.S. to put increased restrictions on trade with China because of China's human rights abuses. Many Americans are concerned about China's nuclear espionage as well.

It is interesting to note that in years past, when the Chinese government actually feared

that MFN would be taken away by this Congress, people were released on their treatment in prison improved. Wei Jingsheng, one of China's most noted dissidents, wrote in a recent message to Congress, "Although the lack of willpower and consistency in U.S. policy have prevented effective pressure on China to democratize, the effectiveness of the use of the MFN issue to improve conditions for political prisoners and limit arrest of dissidents has been clearly shown."

He has a personal example. In late 1993, after serving 14 years in jail, he was released from prison at a time when China wanted to be selected to host the year 2000 Olympics and President Clinton had publicly threatened now to renew MFN again unless human rights improved. He was arrested again in early 1994, but kept in a guest house where he was free to go out for dinner with a police escort. Once President Clinton assured the Chinese privately that he would delink trade from human rights in 1994, Wei was moved to a harsh prison where conditions were very bad. He was kept there until he was released on medical parole in 1997 after intense international pressure.

I submit for the RECORD a copy of his statement.

Nobody has been released in the last few weeks in China. Quite the opposite. China is engaged in one of the harshest crackdowns on dissent this decade.

China knows they have nothing to fear from this Congress. Beijing is confident that trade will trump everything else and the American government will continue to make any concessions necessary to ensure favorable conditions for trade.

This Congress must stand up for the values of freedom and democracy. We must be on the side of those fighting for freedom, not standing with the oppressors. The hundreds of political and religious prisoners in jail in China today are counting on this Congress to speak out for them. It may be the only thing that saves their life or wins their freedom.

Trade has not brought freedom to China despite ten years of unconditional NTR, but this debate and vote is not actually about restricting trade with China. We all know that at the end of the day the status quo will not change. But if the House were to disapprove NTR for China, it would send a powerful message to Beijing—one the Chinese government will not forget.

Let's change our course—let's vote for one year not to renew NTR.

Think about the Catholic bishops, the Catholic priests, the Tibetan Buddhist monks and nuns, the Falun Gong practitioners, the Uyghur Muslims, the democracy activists and the many, many others who are sacrificing their freedom for their beliefs. Think about them when you cast your vote. Our current policy has done nothing to help them. This vote may be the only hope they have.

#### PERSONAL TESTIMONY

Dear honorable congressmen and congresswomen,

Today I thank you very much for giving me this precious opportunity to testify before you. My name is Abdugheni Musa. I am a Uyghur from Ghulja City in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of P.R. China. I want to testify on the brutal torture meth-

ods of the Chinese government through my personal accounts of suffering in the Chinese prison.

In February 1995, some young Uyghur businessmen and I organized The Ili Youth Mashrap, a traditional Uyghur cultural event, in order to improve morality, say no to drugs, strengthen our religious faith and build local economy. This traditional event had a very strong social impact on the Uyghurs in Ghulja City and was welcomed everywhere.

However, the social impact of Mashrap shocked and worried the Chinese authorities. Thus, it became the very reason for the Chinese government to suppress the Mashrap and its participants.

First of all, the Chinese government labeled Mashrap as illegal and then started arresting the Uyghur youth that organized and participated in this event.

The Ghulja municipal police arrested me on June 7, 1996 and detained me in Yengi Hayat prison. In jail, I constantly and repeatedly faced physical and mental torture from the Chinese prison guards.

Two days after my arrest at 12:30 a.m., the Chinese prison guards dragged me into a basement interrogation cell and started interrogating and torturing me. Since then, the Chinese guards started a habit of torturing me every night.

All of these Chinese guards spoke very good Uyghur language. These Chinese guards put me in the electric chair for seven times. For five times, they put a high voltage electric shocker on my head that caused extreme convulsion all over my body. My heart irregularly pounded and my eyes blackened. I fainted several times during the tortures.

Exactly on the seventh day of my arrest, again the Chinese guards dragged me to the basement for confession in the middle of the night and inserted a wire with horsehair on top into my genital. The more the guard inserted the more he wound it. This caused severe damage to my urinary system. As a result, my genital swelled up and I urinated blood for more than a month.

During the torture, one of the Chinese guards pointed his finger at me and said, "We will castrate the inferior masculinity of your turban-heads and prostitute your girls. What can you turban-heads do to us great Chinese nation? With our spit, your will all drown." Then, they used electric club and knocked me down again and again.

For three times, the Chinese guards allowed the Chinese inmates to brutalize me. For many times, the Chinese inmates kept me standing awake for several days. I fainted almost every time when they did this to me. They forced me to squat and put my hands back to kiss the wall from a meter apart. The Chinese inmates kicked me, hit me and punched me whenever I failed to kiss it. I bumped into the wall and my nose started bleeding.

The Chinese prison guards seriously tortured, brutalized and severely injured me for more than one and a half-month. In the end, I collapsed because of fever, coughing with blood, sweating, frailty, lung problems and genital pain. I could stand and go to the restroom only with the help of others. I was bed-ridden for many days in the cell.

On July 20, The Chinese prison doctor came to see me. He was shocked to know my physical problems. Then, for fear of my death in jail, he ordered the jail to send me to the municipal military hospital on July 25th.

I stayed for only a week in the hospital. And then I escaped the hospital on August 3.

Later, I successfully escaped to Kazakhstan via Korghas border on August 5.

While I was in Chinese prison, the Chinese police but six of my Uyghur friends and me into the same jail. Like me, all of them faced serious tortures from the Chinese prison guards to confess. We were all forced and tortured to confess that Mashrap was organized to carry out anti-Chinese government activities and separating Xinjiang from China. However, in the face of extremely painful tortures, all of us denied these charges.

On July 5, the Chinese guards dragged all of us into the basement interrogation cell and forced us to confess our crimes. We told the guards that we had nothing to confess since we didn't break any law. The angry Chinese guards stripped Yusuf naked and forced him to confess. Since he denied all the criminal charges and said Mashrap was a traditional and cultural Uyghur event aimed at improving moral and social values.

The Chinese guards couldn't find a way for him to confess, and also hoping to teach all of us a lesson, brought in two German shepherds in the cell and started using the dogs to bite naked Yusuf. One of the dogs viciously attacked him and bit his genital. He fell and crawled on the floor holding his private area. But the ruthless Chinese guards continued to molest him with the dogs hoping to annihilate our will of resistance.

Yusuf and I were put into the same cell at that time. Today he is still serving prison terms in the Chinese prison.

To get his confession, the Chinese guards tortured my friend Abdusalam Keyim on a high voltage electric chair. Then he was stripped naked and forced into an extremely low degree freezer. Later, the Chinese guards nailed metal sticks into his fingers and pulled out his nails one by one. In the end, they hit the back of his head with an electric bar and permanently damaged his brain. Since then, he became mentally insane and released from the jail. Abdusalam was from the Watergate neighborhood in Ghulja City.

My friend Muhammad Eli Mamatimin faced the most brutal torture in jail. One day he was forced to confess his crimes by the Chinese guards. He denied every single charge. To punish him, the guards put a wine bottle into his anus and kicked the bottle every time he denied one charge. Immediately he internally bled and fainted. Then, we has taken into the cell. We was what the Chinese guards did to him and all of us cried. Since then, Muhammad couldn't sit or sleep on his back and walk straight.

The most shocking and heinous crime the Chinese prison guards committed in jail is that they allowed the Chinese inmates to rape the Uyghur girls by taking turns. On 27 in June 1996, the Chinese prison guards brought Peride, a 21-year old pious Uyghur Muslim girl, from the ladies cell into the men's jail. The Chinese guards striped her naked and told her to ask her God to save her. Later, they put her naked into a cell with six Chinese inmates. These six Chinese criminals took turn and raped her one by one.

We heard Peride's painful cries coming out of the Chinese cell. We yelled, cried, kicked the metal bars and the wall. Instead of punishing the Chinese inmates, the guards furiously rushed into our cell and beat us up with electric bars. Then, they held Peride out of the Chinese cell since she was already fainted. Peride was from the Konqi neighborhood in Ghulja City.

When I escaped to Kazakhstan, a friend of mine who was put in this jail told me the following account. One day in January 1997, the

Chinese prison guards stripped Rena, a 23-year old Uyghur girl, naked and put her into Chinese cell. Like Peride, Rena was group-raped by the Chinese inmates. Rena was from Kepekyuzi village at the Jilyuz County.

Now I want to give a list of names of my Uyghur friends and acquaintances that suffered and continually suffered in the Chinese prisons. Some of their whereabouts are still unknown or missing today.

1. Turghan Tursun, 27, religious student, arrested on February 5, 1997 as a "separatist". He was sentenced to 5-year in jail. Currently, Turghan is serving his prison terms in Ili Prefecture Jail. He was from Ghulja tannery.

2. Iminjan, 29, teacher, arrested after February 1997 as a "separatist". He was sentenced to 15-year in jail. Currently, Iminjan is serving his prison term in Ili Prefecture Jail. He was from Ghulja tannery.

3. Yusufjan Eysa, 29, private businessman, arrested in January 1997. He was missing for one year. Later found by his father in Qapqal jail. Yusufjan was sentenced to 5-year in jail. Currently, he is serving his term at Ghulji municipal prison.

4. Seydehmet Yunus, 24, religious student, arrested in April 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Erkin Street in Ghulja City. He is still missing.

5. Ablet, 26, religious student, arrested in April 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Mashrapbay Street in Ghulja City. He is still missing.

6. Tursun, 26, religious student, arrested in April 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Totdukan neighborhood in Ghulja City. He is still missing.

7. Kahar, 26, religious student, arrested in May 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Totdukan neighborhood in Ghulja City. He is still missing.

8. Ablidik Muhammadjan, 24, religious student, arrested in April 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Dong neighborhood in Ghulja City. He is still missing.

9. Mirzat, 25, religious student, arrested in April 1998 as a "separatist". He was from the Watergate neighborhood. He is still missing.

10. Zulpikar Mamat, 26, religious student, arrested in March 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Aydong neighborhood in Ghulja City. He is still missing.

11. Ilyar, 26, religious student, arrested in May 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Urumqi Nenming neighborhood. He is still missing.

12. Dawud, 28, religious student, arrested in May 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Azatyuz village at Jeliyuz County in Ghulja. He is still missing.

13. Ablet Karihajji, 53, a religious mullah, arrested in December 1996 as a "separatist". He was sentenced for 20 years. He was from Kepekyuz village at Jeliyuz County in Ghulja. Due to severe torture, he was taken out with a handcart to meet his wife and kids when they came to visit him in prison.

14. Muhammadjan Karim, 29, religious teacher, arrested in June 1997 as a "separatist". He was from Topadeng neighborhood in Ghulja City. He is still missing.

15. Sultan Tursun, 25, religious student, arrested in February 1997 as a "separatist". He was from Dong neighborhood in Ghulja City.

Dear ladies and gentlemen, all of these people are my good friends. The Chinese government has imprisoned a person from almost every Uyghur family in Ghulja City since 1996. At present, the Chinese government is still arresting hundreds of Uyghurs and mercilessly torturing them in the prisons. The Chinese human rights violation of

the Uyghur people is nowhere to be found in the world.

It is my sincere hope from the bottom of my heart that the United States, the United Nations, and the international community take necessary measures to guarantee the fundamental human right of the Uyghur people and help free all the Uyghur political prisoners in the Chinese prisons.

Thank you,  
Abdugheni Musa.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL  
DEVELOPMENT AND WORLD PEACE,  
Washington, DC, June 30, 1999.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The upcoming vote on extending "normal trade relations" status to the People's Republic of China presents the Congress with a significant opportunity and challenge to send an unmistakably clear message about our national concern for the protection of basic human rights.

Each time over the past several years when the issue has arisen, it has been our conviction that no Administration has been sufficiently committed to pressing the Chinese authorities on their systemic violations of certain fundamental human rights. Our Conference has focused particularly on the issues of religious freedom and we have repeatedly cited the persecution of religious groups, such as the unregistered Protestant and Catholic churches, and the intrusive interference by the state in the internal life of the "open" or recognized churches. The persecution and control of Tibetan Buddhism is especially shameful and known to all.

We acknowledge that the present Administration has made efforts to raise these issues with the Chinese authorities, but little, if anything, has changed on the human rights front in these last years of increased engagement. Indeed, the continued detention of religious figures as well as of democracy advocates only point up the necessity of unrelenting official U.S. firmness on issues of human rights and religious freedom.

The trade status debate may not be the best forum, but it does offer the Congress an important opportunity to raise the priority of human rights and religious liberty. Therefore, I urge you to send as clear a message as possible by voting to overturn the President's waiver of the relevant sanctions of the 1974 Trade Act. A strong vote to deny MFN/NTS status to China should strengthen the Administration's commitment to putting human rights at the top of the China agenda and send a strong signal that the status quo is not acceptable.

Sincerely yours,

MOST REVEREND THEODORE E.  
MCCARRICK,

Archbishop of Newark; Chairman,  
International Policy Committee, U.S. Catholic  
Conference.

FRC URGES HOUSE TO TAKE A STAND FOR  
HUMAN RIGHTS AND FREEDOM, REJECT "AB-  
NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS" WITH CHINA

WASHINGTON, DC.—"On June 3, President Clinton with callous audacity commemorated the eve of the 10th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre by asking Congress once again to reward China with renewal of its Normal Trade Relations (NTR) status. A strange thing to do, considering that there's nothing 'normal' about U.S. relations with China," said Bill Saunders, Foreign Policy and Human Rights Counsel for Family Research Council (FRC), on Thursday. "What is normal about conducting business as usual with a Chinese regime that lies

to its people about NATO's accidental embassy bombing and virtually holds our ambassador hostage in the U.S. embassy by staging riots around him?"

While the President insists that the Administration's policy of "constructive engagement" is having a positive impact in China, all of the evidence shows that this is not true. The State Department's annual Human Rights Report released in February found that human rights deteriorated significantly in China in the past year. Along with the ongoing crackdown on political dissidents, the report highlighted religious persecution of Protestant and Catholic groups, continued abusive reproductive policies including forced abortion, and persecution of ethnic minorities. The Cox Report reveals that espionage can occur and national security can be threatened when we treat an authoritarian regime as if it's a democratic ally sharing American interests.

"The last time America seriously debated China's trade status, two years ago, it went by another name, Most Favored Nation (MFN). Changing MFN's name can't change the fact that there is less reason for normal trade with China today than there was in 1997," said Saunders. "The situation in China has gone from bad to worse, and the U.S. government is enabling the Chinese regime to continue its stranglehold on the Chinese people.

"The Congress must take a stand for the self-evident truth that all people, including the Chinese people, are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. The Congress must turn rhetoric about freedom into action to secure freedom. The Congress must reject NTR for China."

GENERAL BOARD OF CHURCH AND SOCIETY OF THE UNITED METHODIST  
CHURCH,

Washington, DC, July 26, 1999.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: This week's vote on whether to extend most favored nation status to the People's Republic of China presents Congress with a basic choice about human rights.

Every year when the issue has been voted, we have watched carefully for signs of improvement in China's human, labor, and environmental rights record. Last year, we did not urge Congress to withhold this trading status from China. We were waiting to see if the Administration's overtures to China lead to changes in China's actions. In the past year, however, despite promises from the Clinton Administration, that China's policies were improving, we have observed slippage in the most basic rights in China.

The persecution of indigenous people and their religions is of special concern to me. The situation of the Tibetans is most well known, but all of the 50 or so indigenous peoples in China experience restrictions of their freedoms.

The Clinton Administration has made an effort to raise issues of human rights, labor rights, and religious freedom with the Chinese, but little has changed. The current detention of members of the Falun Gong sect suggested that the Chinese policies have changed in the wrong direction. Other religious leaders and democracy activists still languish in jail.

I urge you to deny what is now called "normal trading status" to China until the Administration can certify that China is respecting the basic human rights of all groups

in China. A "no" vote to this status will signal that the US Congress makes respect for human rights a priority.

Sincerely,

DR. THOM WHITE WOLF FASSETT,  
*General Secretary.*

THE CENTER FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, FREEDOM HOUSE, PRIORITY LIST—CHINESE CHRISTIANS PERSECUTED FOR RELIGIOUS REASONS, JULY 14, 1999

PROTESTANTS

1. Peter Xu Yongze. Pastor Peter Yongze Xu, China's most prominent underground Protestant leader, was sentenced to three years of labor camp on September 25, 1997, in Zhengzhou, Henan province, for "disrupting public order." His trial was closed to the public and he was denied a defense lawyer. Pastor Xu, the 56-year-old leader of the three- to four-million-strong New Birth Movement of evangelicals, was arrested on March 16, 1997, as he was meeting with other leaders of large evangelical churches in China. His wife and several of his associates were also imprisoned.

2. Liu Fenggang. A 37-year-old active member of a unofficial Protestant house-church in Beijing, Liu was arrested on August 9, 1995, at his home as part of a general crackdown on the dissident community in Beijing prior to the UN Fourth World Conference on Women. In early December 1995, Liu was sentenced to 2.5 years of "re-education through labor."

3. Wang Changqing. A 52-year-old house-church leader of the Zhoukou Prefecture, Henan province, Wang and five other Christian house-church leaders were sentenced without trial to three years of "re-education through labor" on August 14, 1995. The house-church leaders were accused of belonging to outlawed religious organizations and scheming to overthrow the Communist Party with foreign religious groups. Wang and the other Christian house-church leaders denied belonging to any of these "outlawed" religious groups because they consider them heresies. Wang has been transferred to Henan's Xuchang Labor Reform Center to begin his third prison term at a labor reform camp.

4. Zheng Yunsu. Leader of popular Jesus Family religious community in Duoyigou, Shandong province, Christian Zheng was arrested in June 1992 with thirty-six other community members, including his four sons. Their arrests are thought to be in part the result of the community's May 1992 efforts to prevent security forces from tearing down their church. The elder Zheng was charged with holding "illegal" religious meetings, "leading a collective life," disturbing the peace and resisting arrest. Sentenced to 12 years of imprisonment, he is thought to be held at the Shengjian Motorcycle Factory labor camp near Jinan city. Other community members received sentences of five years (another source says three). Public Security Bureau officials raiding the church compound in June 1992 leveled the church and confiscated personal property.

5. Pei Zhongxun (Korean Name: Chun Chul). The 76-year-old ethnic Korean Protestant leader from Shanghai, Pei, was arrested in August 1983 for counter-revolutionary activities. Accused of spying for Taiwan (because of ties to Taiwanese Christians) and of distributing Bibles and other Christian literature to others in the house-church movement, he was charged with "counterrevolutionary crimes," and sentenced to 15 years of imprisonment. He is re-

portedly imprisoned in Shanghai Prison No. 2. His family is permitted to visit him for half-an-hour each month.

6. Wang Xin Cai. Evangelical Wang was arrested with Pastor Peter Xu Yongze and imprisoned on March 16, 1997, in Zhengzhou, Henan. There is no further information on his legal situation.

7. Qin Musheng. Evangelical Qin was arrested with Pastor Peter Xu Yongze and imprisoned on March 16, 1997, in Zhengzhou, Henan. He has been sentenced to two and a half years of education through labor.

8. Qing Jing. Qing, the 30-year-old wife of Pastor Peter Xu Yongze, was arrested along with her husband on March 16, 1997, in Zhengzhou, Henan. She has been sentenced to one year of education through labor.

9. Sister Feng Xian. Evangelical Feng was arrested with Pastor Peter Xu Yongze and imprisoned on March 16, 1997, in Zhengzhou, Henan. She has been sentenced to two and one half years of education through labor.

10. Su Yu Han. The 37-year-old evangelical was imprisoned on July 25, 1996, and sentenced to a reeducation labor camp for one and a half years. He is from the Tongnan neighborhood in Wu Tong town in Tong Xiang Country, Zhejiang Province, an area that has been targeted for severe repression by a specific Party directive. His house church with eight rooms was destroyed completely on the night of his arrest. All of his property was confiscated.

11. Wu Bing Fang. The 22-year-old brother of imprisoned evangelical Su Yuhan was imprisoned on July 25, 1996, and sentenced to a re-education labor camp for one and a half years. He is from Xin Ku neighborhood, Hong Yong town, Jia Xing district, Zhejiang Province. All of his property was confiscated.

12. Cao Wen Hai. Evangelical Cao was imprisoned on August 10, 1997, in Ping Ding Shan, Henan. His hometown in Fang Cheng county, Henan Province, is known as the "Jerusalem of China" where the Chinese House church movement was initiated in the 1980's. He was helping in the ministries of millions of Christians in China.

13. Zhang Chun Xia. Evangelical Zhang was imprisoned on August 10, 1997 in Ping Ding Shan, Henan. Her hometown in Fang Cheng county, Henan Province, is known as the "Jerusalem of China" where the Chinese House church movement was initiated in the 1980's. She was helping in the ministries of millions of Christians in China.

14. Zhao Song Yin. Evangelical Zhao was imprisoned on August 10, 1997, in Ping Ding Shan, Henan. His hometown in Fang Cheng county, Henan Province, is known as the "Jerusalem of China" where the Chinese House church movement was initiated in the 1980's. He was helping in the ministries of millions of Christians in China.

15. Philip Guoxing Xu. Philip Xu is a 43-year-old evangelical traveling preacher and Bible teacher based in Shanghai, was arrested on June 16, 1997, and is presently in solitary confinement. Since late 1997, he has been allowed family visits and was allowed to send a letter from prison in May 1998. His legal situation is uncertain. He was sentenced without a trial to 3 years of labor camp (with labor at day and solitary confinement at night) in DA FUNG in northern Jiangsu Province. His wife was turned away when she tried to visit him on October 22, 1997, after traveling 20 hours by bus from Shanghai. Previously, he had been arrested on March 14, 1989 for a "thorough investigation." At that time the authorities found "no political motivation, no intention for collecting money, and no sexual mis-

conduct," he was released. He had also been arrested on November 6, 1989 while teaching a Bible study class, and was sentenced without trial to three years of labor camp. After completing that sentence, Guoxing was released. He is married, and now has a young daughter. His birthday is March 16, 1955. He lived in California between 1980 and 1982.

16. Huang Dehong. Huang Dehong, a Protestant from Baokang, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Baokang Prefectural Labor Educational Camp.

17. Huan Debao. Huan Debao, a Protestant from Baokang, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Wuwei Labor Educational Camp in Gansu.

18. Hei Qunhu. Hei Qunhu, a Protestant from Lushi, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Wuwei Labor Educational Camp in Gansu.

19. Dai Chenggang. Dai Chenggang, a Protestant from Baokang, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Zhenglin Labor Educational Camp, in Zhaoyang, Hubei.

20. Zhang Shangkui. Zhang Shangkui, a Protestant from Zhaoyang, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Zhenglin Labor Educational Camp, in Zhaoyang, Hubei.

21. Li Qingshu. Li Qingshu, a Protestant from Zhaoyang, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Zhenglin Labor Educational Camp, in Zhaoyang, Hubei.

22. Zhang Jun. Zhang Jun, a Protestant from Zhaoyang, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in a local township educational camp in Hubei since April 6, 1999.

23. Brother Song. Brother Song, a Protestant from Zhaoyang, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Shayang Labor Educational Camp in Hubei since April 6, 1999.

24. Hu Shoubin. Hu Shoubin, a Protestant from Qianjiang, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Shayang Labor Educational Camp in Hubei.

25. Jia Ping. Jia Ping, a Protestant from Xiantao, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Shayang Labor Educational Camp in Hubei.

26. Huang Zhihai. Huang Zhihai, a Protestant from Hebei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Tangshan Labor Educational Camp in Hebei.

27. Fan Jinxia. Fan Jinxia, a Protestant from Hebei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Tangshan Labor Camp in Hebei.

28. Yang Xiaofang. Yang Xiaofang, a Protestant from Hebei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Tangshan Labor Camp in Hebei.

29. Liang Fujuan. Liang Fujuan, a Protestant from Hebei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Tangshan Labor Educational Camp in Hebei.

30. Huang Xiaojuan. Huang Xiaojuan, a Protestant from Hebei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Tangshan Labor Educational Camp, in Hebei.

31. Zhu Qin. Zhu Qin, a Protestant from Beijing, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Tongxian Labor Educational Camp in Hebei.

32. Zheng Fang. Zheng Fang, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Shibalihe Labor Educational Camp in Zhengzhou, Henan.

33. Xu Ying. Xu Ying, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Shibalihe Labor Educational Camp in Zhengzhou, Henan.

34. Ye Kesheng. Ye Kesheng, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xinyang Municipal Labor Educational Camp.

35. Xiao Minghai. Xiao Minghai, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xinyang Municipal Labor Educational Camp.

35. Zhang Jinchun. Zhang Jinchun, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xinyang Municipal Labor Educational Camp.

36. Wang Xuchua. Wang Xuchua, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xinyang Municipal Labor Educational Camp.

37. Li Zhongchang. Li Zhongchang, a Protestant from Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Nanhu Labor Educational Camp in Anhui.

38. Zhan Guohua. Zhan Guohua, a Protestant from Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Hefei Labor Educational Camp in Anhui.

39. Li Liya. Li Liya, a Protestant from Huo Qiu, Anhui province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Nanhu Labor Educational Camp in Anhui.

40. Hou Feng. Hou Feng, a Protestant from Jianchuan, Anhui province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Nanhu Labor Educational Camp in Anhui.

41. Tian Lin. Tian Lin, a Protestant from Jianchuan, Anhui province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Nanhu Labor Educational Camp in Anhui.

42. Meng Qingli. Meng Qingli, a Protestant from Shangqiu, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Shangqiu Labor Educational Camp in Anhui.

43. Wu Guifang. Wu Guifang, a Protestant from Xingiang province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Urumqi Labor Educational Camp in Xinjiang.

44. Guei Chuan-Lun. Guei Chuan-Lun, a Protestant from Feng Yang, Anhui province, is being detained in Baofeng Labor Educational Camp in Xuanzhou, Anhui.

45. Liu Hai-Kuan. Liu Hai-Kuan, a Protestant from Feng Yang, Anhui province, is being detained in Baofeng Labor Educational Camp in Xuanzhou, Anhui.

46. Zhang Wan-Bao. Zhang Wan-Bao, a Protestant from Feng Yang, Anhui province, is being detained in Baofeng Labor Educational Camp in Xuanzhou, Anhui.

47. Lin Ke-Wei. Lin Ke-Wei, a Protestant from Li-Xin, Anhui province, is being detained in Nanhu Agricultural Labor Educational Camp.

48. Peng Shu-Xia. Peng Shu-Xia, a Protestant from Chang Feng, Anhui province, is being detained in Women Labor Educational Camp in Hefei, Anhui.

49. Wang Chuan-Bing. Wang Chuan-Bing, a Protestant from Qing-gang, Heilongjiang province, is being detained in Qing-gang Detention Center in Heilongjiang.

50. Wang Xincui. Wang Xincui, a Protestant from Lushan, Henan province, is being detained in Qiliyan Labor Educational Camp in Zhengzhou, Henan.

51. Wu Juesheng. Wu Juesheng, a Protestant, is being detained in Da-an Labor Educational Camp in the Biyang Prefecture of Henan province.

52. Zhang Chunxia. Zhang Chunxia is being detained in Shibalihe Female Labor Educational Camp in Zhengzhou, Henan province.

53. Xu Dajiang. Xu Dajiang, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xinyang Municipal Labor Educational Camp.

54. Zhao Wu Na. Zhao Wu Na is a 50-year-old (born 1948) evangelical Christian woman from Shanghai who was arrested on December 28, 1997, and detained in a labor camp. A graduate of the government-sponsored East China Theological Seminary, she resigned from the Patriotic Three-Self movement and began to evangelize independently. Her husband has disappeared and she believes that he has been kidnapped by government agents in a covert operation.

#### ROMAN CATHOLICS

55. Bishop Zeng Jingmu. [Transferred to house arrest on May 9, 1998]. The 78-year old Roman Catholic Bishop of Yu Jiang, Jiangxi province, Bishop Zeng was sentenced without a trial, in March 1996 to three years of "re-education through labor" in the laogai for his religious activities for being arrested the previous November. He had already spent about two decades in communist prisons for his faith. Reportedly, Bishop Zeng was weakened by a serious case of pneumonia which he had contracted during a short prison detention in October 1995. In 1994, he had been arrested on August 14, one day before an Assumption Day raid by Public Security officials from the town of Yu Jiang and held without charge until December 1994. He has been adopted by Amnesty International as a "prisoner of conscience."

56. Bishop An Shuxin. Bishop An was arrested in February 1996 as a preemptive strike against the popular annual May 24 Catholic Pilgrimage to the shrine of Mary in village of Donglu in Hebei. Police crushed all commemorations, other clergy from the area were imprisoned or placed under house arrest, and some churches and prayer houses in the area were desecrated. He remains in detention. He is an auxiliary bishop to Bishop Su.

57. Bishop James Su Zhimin. Bishop Su Zhimin, 65, the Roman Catholic bishop of Baoding in Hebei Province who respects the authority of the Vatican, has spent twenty years in Chinese prisons. During one prison stint lasting 15 years, he was subjected to extreme torture. In one incident, the board, which was used to beat him, was reduced to splinters. The police then ripped apart a wooden door and continued to beat Bishop Su until it also disintegrated into splinters. Other tortures used against him included being hung from his wrists while being beaten on his head, and on another occasion being placed in a cell which was partially filled with water. The Bishop was left there for days, unable to either sit, lie down or sleep. He suffered extensive hearing loss as a result. In 1996, Bishop Su wrote a courageous letter of protest about religious violations of Chinese government authorities. He was arrested most recently on October 8, 1997 for

religious reasons after 18 months in hiding. On October 24, the U.S. State Department reported that it had received word from Chinese authorities that the bishop had been released from jail, but this turned out to be false and local Catholics report that government agents are now blocking access to the bishop's residence. Bishop Su is believed to be in detention. Reliable reports indicate that on November 7, 1998 he was transferred from Qingyuan prison to a government guest house or apartment building in Qingyuan where he was held incommunicado and kept under strict 24-hour police surveillance. The transfer probably occurred to defuse protest during the Chinese president's state visit to Washington. The American religious delegation that traveled to China in February 1998 were refused permission by the government to visit Bishop Su. Chinese Ambassador Li Zhaozong continues to spread disinformation about the Bishop; on May 18, 1998, he wrote to Congressman Vince Snowbarger denying that Bishop Su was under detention, stating he "is a free man." His whereabouts and well-being are not known. He is in state custody, presumably in a labor camp.

58. Bishop Julius Jia Zhiguo. The 58-year-old Bishop of Zhengding, Hebei province, and secretary-general of the underground Chinese Bishop's Conference, Bishop Jia was arrested on August 27, 1995, and held at a detention center in Yong Nian until being released two months later. He had been subjected to frequent short detentions at the hands of the Public Security Bureau. He was arrested on January 7, 1994, and but released shortly thereafter, and re-arrested January 20, 1994, but subsequently released in early February. He was arrested again on February 9, 1994, and reportedly released in one month later. He had been arrested on April 5, 1993, with eight other priests, all of whom were released later that year. He is currently under police surveillance and severe restrictions of movement that are a form of house arrest.

59. Bishop Joseph Li Side. In his 60's, the Bishop of Tianjin diocese was arrested May 25, 1992, exiled in July 1992 to a rural Liang Zhuang, Ji county, and forbidden to leave. According to most recent report, he is being held under a form of house arrest on the top of a mountain. He had previously been detained several times, including 1989, when he was arrested for playing a role in the underground episcopal conference and reportedly tried in secret.

60. Bishop Gu Zheng Mattia. The Bishop of Xining diocese, Qinghai province, was arrested on October 6, 1994, but released sometime in early December 1994. He has been placed under police surveillance and restrictions of movement. Church sources report as of July 1997, he was again placed under detention by Public Security organs.

61. Bishop Joseph Fan Zhongliang. Bishop Fan, the 74-year-old acting bishop of Shanghai, is under ritual house arrest at his apartment in Shanghai. During Easter Week, Bishop Fan's residence was ransacked and his Bible, catechism, code of Canon Law, and meager diocesan treasury were confiscated by police. He has been previously imprisoned for his faith for 25 years between 1957 and 1982. He had also been arrested on June 10, 1991, reportedly in response to the Vatican's elevating to Cardinal another Chinese bishop, Ignatius Kung. On August 19, 1991, he was transferred to a form of house arrest in Shanghai, which was confirmed by a Freedom House delegation in mid-1997.

62. Bishop Casimir Wang Milu. The 55-year-old Bishop of Tianshui diocese, Gansu province, Bishop Wang was arrested April 1984 for

counter-revolutionary activities, including ordaining priests (after his own secret consecration as bishop by Bishop Fan Xueyuan in January 1981), having contact with the Vatican and other Chinese Roman Catholics, and criticizing government religious policy and the Catholic Patriotic Association. In 1985 or 1986 he was sentenced to ten years of "reform through labor" and four years of deprivation of political rights. He was imprisoned for a time at labor camp in Pingliang, Gansu and then transferred to a labor camp near Dashaping in Lanzhou. Released on parole on April 14, 1993, he remains under severe restrictions of movement, that are a form of house arrest. He was previously imprisoned for his faith during the Cultural Revolution.

63. Bishop Cosmas Shi Enxiang. The 71-year-old auxiliary Bishop of Yixian, Hebei province, Bishop Shi was originally arrested in December 1990 and held by Xushui County Public Security Bureau. His whereabouts remained unknown for close to three years. He was thought to have been held in a "reeducation through labor" camp near Handan or in an "old age home." On November 31, 1993, he was released and permitted to return home. Although reportedly in poor health, he resumed duties as Auxiliary Bishop of Yixian, thought under police surveillance and restrictions of movement.

64. Bishop Han Dingsiang. Bishop Dingsiang was arrested in Yong Nian. He has been arrested and released several times and it is believed he is currently in jail.

65. Bishop Han Jingtao. Bishop Jingtao has been prevented by police from exercising his ministry.

66. Bishop Liu Guandong. Bishop Guandong, of Yixian, is under strict surveillance by Chinese security forces.

67. Bishop Zhang Weizhu. Bishop Weizhu was arrested in Xianxian on May 31, 1998.

68. Rev. Guo Bo Le. A Roman Catholic priest from Shanghai, Rev. Guo was sentenced in January 1996 to two years of imprisonment at a "reform through labor" camp because of "illegal religious activity." He was arrested while celebrating Mass on a boat for about 250 fishermen. Guo's other "illegal" activities included administering the Sacrament of the Sick, establishing underground evangelical church centers, organizing catechetical institutes, teaching Bible classes and "boycotting" the Catholic Patriotic Association. Fifty-eight-year-old Guo has already spent thirty years—over half his life—in Chinese prisons because of his faith.

69. Rev. Vincent Qin Guoliang. Rev. Qin, a 60-year-old Roman Catholic priest, was arrested on November 3, 1994, in the city of Xining, Qinghai province, on unknown charges by Public Security officials. He was arbitrarily sentenced to two years' "reeducation through labor" at Duoba labor camp 20 kilometers from Xining. Father Qin was forced to carry rocks and blocks of ice in the camp, but after one month of this hard labor he became seriously ill. In March 1995, he was allowed to perform light duties and is now the treasurer of the prison. According to press accounts, the sentencing procedure circumvented the need for his name to appear on any legal documents, thereby preventing him from being officially recognized as a "prisoner." It is not known if he has been released but if he has he probably was returned to his previous status as an "employee detainee" for the State. He had been previously arrested on April 21, 1994, while celebrating Mass, and released on August 29, 1994. Beginning in 1955, he served 13 years of imprisonment because of his refusal to re-

nounce ties with the Vatican. Upon completion of prison term, he was transferred to a labor camp as an "employee detainee" to make bricks at No. 4 brick factor in Xining. After another 13 years of this forced labor, he was refused government permission to return to his home in Shanghai. He was forced to continue working at the No. 4 brick factor in Xining until his re-arrest in April 1994. He was secretly ordained a priest in 1986 and carried out his apostolic work in the province of Qinghai.

70. Rev. Liao Haiqing. Rev. Liao is a 68-year-old priest in Fuzhou, Jiangxi province. Arrested in August 4, 1995, he was last known to be detained at Lin Chuan City's detention center. Father Liao has a heart condition and high blood pressure, but he is not allowed to receive medication from his family, who are barred from visiting him. Previously arrested on August 11, 1994, on unspecified charges and held in detention until mid-November 1994. Prior to that, he had been arrested while celebrating Mass, on August 16, 1992, and held until March 1993. He has also previously served a ten-year term, which ended in July 1991.

71. Rev. Peter Cui Xingang. The 31-year-old Pastor of the Church of Our Lady of China in Donglu village, Hebei province, the site of the famous underground Catholic procession, was arrested in late March 1996 and detained along with Bishop Su Zhimin. He had been reportedly in and out of detention since then and at last report in mid-1997 was behind bars once again. He had been previously, arrested on July 28, 1991, and held without trial until being released in August 1995.

72. Rev. John Wang Zhongfa. Rev. Zhongfa, a 67 year-old Roman Catholic priest of Wenzhou diocese, Zhejiang province, was arrested on November 24, 1997, and sentenced in January 1998 to one year of re-education through labor for "disturbing the peace." He Wenzhou city council, which imposed the sentence, reportedly said that his sentence is to expire on November 23, 1998. The priest, labelled "Number One Evil" by security officials, was arrested for organizing an unauthorized Marian event last October. According to a report from a Catholic source in Hong Kong, Fr. Wang is out of 15,000 yuan (US\$1,800) bail but must report regularly to police. He was arrested while conducting a private funeral service for a nun.

73. Rev. Shi Wende. Rev. Wende, of Yixian diocese, Hebei province, was arrested on March 14, 1998, while visiting the home of an underground Catholic in Liu Li Quao, according to the Cardinal Kung Foundation. His whereabouts are not known.

74. Fr. Deng Ruolun. Fr. Ruolun, a first apostolic Administrator of the Diocese of Yujiang, was arrested in Jiangxi province on August 14, 1997, while celebrating Mass at a private home. His father was later detained on August 20, along with five others whose names remain unknown.

According to a report by Amnesty International released on March 31, 1998, over 200 Roman Catholics were detained in Jiangxi province in 1997. The arrests were apparently carried out in two separate incidents: the first in August 1997; and the second, between mid November and December. Some of those arrested were jailed or tortured. Their current whereabouts and legal status are unknown. The following 11 names are those identified as detained:

75. Zhang Jiyu. Zhang Jiyu is a 48-year-old Catholic woman, who are arrested and detained in Jiangxi province on August 13, 1997, after protesting the arrest of her 17-year-old daughter, who herself had been detained for religious reasons.

76. Liu Haicheng. Lui Haicheng was arrested in Jiangxi on August 15, 1997, for allowing a private mass at his home (where Fr. Deng Ruolun had been arrested). Police reportedly tortured Haicheng in order to extract a confession of guilt to criminal charges.

77. Zhou Xiaoling. Zhou Xiaoling, like Liu Haicheng, was arrested in Jiangxi province on August 15, 1997, and then tortured for allowing a private mass in his own home.

78. Xiao Lan. Xiao Lan, a 32-year-old Catholic nun, was arrested in Jiangxi province in mid August of 1997.

79. Long Mei. Long Mei, a 24-year-old Catholic nun, was arrested in Jiangxi province in mid August of 1997.

80. Yuan Mei. Yuan Mei, a 20-year-old Catholic nun, was arrested in Jiangxi province in mid August of 1997.

81. Cheng Jinli. Cheng Jinli, a 24-year-old Catholic nun, was arrested in Jiangxi province in mid August of 1997.

82. Hua Jingjin. Hua Jinglin, a 30-year-old Catholic nun, was arrested in Jiangxi province in mid August of 1997.

83. Jun Fang. Jun Fang, a Catholic nun, was arrested in Jiangxi province in mid August of 1997.

84. Zhang Jiehong. Zhang Jiehong, a 50-year-old Catholic laywoman, was arrested in Jiangxi province in mid August of 1997.

85. Fr. Lin Rengui. Fr. Rengui, of Pingtan county, was arrested during Christmas of 1997. His sentence is unknown.

86. Fr. Ma Qinguan. Fr. Qinguan, a priest from Baoding, is being pursued for capture.

87. Fr. Wang Chengli. Fr. Chengli, was arrested in December of 1996. He was sentenced to three years' imprisonment. He is currently at Shandong Jining Reeducation Camp.

88. Fr. Wei Jingkun. Fr. Jingkun, of Baoding, was arrested on August 15, 1996.

89. Fr. Xiao Shixiang. Fr. Shixiang, was arrested in June, 1996 and given a three-year sentence. He is currently at Tianjin #5 prison.

90. An Xianliang. An Xianliang, a Catholic from the village of An Jia Zhuang, was arrested in 1996.

91. Di Yanlong. Di Yanlong, a Catholic from the village of An Jia Zhuang, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years in prison.

92. Gao Shuping. Gao Shuping, a Catholic citizen of Lin Chuan, was arrested in November 1996.

93. Gao Shuyun. Gao Shuyun, a Catholic from Chongren County, was arrested in April 1995.

94. Huang Guanghua. Huang Guanghua, from Chongren County, was arrested in April 1995.

95. Huang Tengzong. Huang Tengzong, from Chongren County, was arrested in April 1995.

96. Jia Futian, from the village of Yangzhuang, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years in prison.

97. Li Lianshu. Li Lianshu, a Catholic, was arrested during Christmas of 1995. He was sentenced to four years and is currently at Shandong #1 Reeducation camp.

98. Li Quibo. Li Quibo, a Catholic, was arrested in Easter 1996. He was sentenced to three years and is currently at Shandong #1 Reeducation camp.

99. Li Shengxin. Li Shengxin, a Catholic from An Guo, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years in prison.

100. Li Xin. Li Xin, a Catholic, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years in prison.

101. Pan Kunming. Pan Kunming, a Catholic from Yu Jiang, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to five years.

102. Rao Yanping. Rao Yanping, a Catholic from Yu Jiang, was arrested in April 1995 and sentenced to four years.

103. Wang Chengqun. Wang Chengqun, a Catholic from Baoding, was arrested in April 1996 and sentenced to three years.

104. Wang Yungang. Wang Yungang, a Catholic, was arrested during Christmas 1996, and sentenced to two years and currently is at Shandong Changle Reeducation Camp.

105. Xie Suqian. Xie Suqian, a Catholic from Baoding, was arrested on August 15, 1998.

106. Yao Jinqiu. Yao Jinqiu, a Catholic from the village of An Jia Zhuang, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years.

107. Yu Qixiang. Yu Qixiang, a Catholic from Yu Jiang, was arrested in April 1995 and sentenced to two years.

108. Yu Shuishen. Yu Shuishen, a Catholic from Yu Jiang, was arrested in April 1995 and sentenced to three years in prison.

109. Zhou Quanxin. Zhou Quanxin, a Catholic layman, was arrested in Baoding, Hebei Province, during an underground Holy Mass on Pentecost Sunday, May 23, 1999, while aiding the escape of the presiding priest.

110. Zhou Zhenpeng. Zhou Zhenpeng, a Catholic layman, was arrested in Baoding, Hebei Province, during an underground Holy Mass on Pentecost, May 23, 1999, while aiding the escape of the presiding priest.

111. Zhou Zhenmin. Zhou Zhenmin, a Catholic layman, was arrested in Baoding, Hebei Province, during an underground Holy Mass on Pentecost Sunday, May 23, 1999, while aiding the escape of the presiding priest.

112. Zhou Zhenquan. Zhou Zhenquan, a Catholic layman, was arrested in Baoding, Hebei Province, during an underground Holy Mass on Pentecost Sunday, May 23, 1999, while aiding the escape of the presiding priest.

Sources: Cardinal Kung Foundation; Church sources in China; Family members of religious prisoners; Compass Direct; Fides (news agency under the auspices of the Vatican's congregation for mission countries, Propaganda Fides); Information Center of Human Rights and Democratic Movement in China (Hong Kong); The Oregonian; Reuters; U.S. State Department Human Rights Reports on Countries (1999); Zenit; Christian Solidarity Worldwide; Amnesty International; Union of Catholic Asian News.

See Center's Web site for further information: [www.freedomhouse.org/religion](http://www.freedomhouse.org/religion).

#### THE EFFECT OF MFN ON CHINA

(By Wei Jingsheng)

The reason that a representative of the highest level of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) met with me in 1994 was that many in the inner circles of the CCP believed that I could influence the future of MFN, due to my meeting with Secretary of State Warren Christopher.

Among the conditions which were promised to me at that time, some were met very faithfully. Even though I had been illegally taken into custody, they scrupulously fulfilled two agreements: one was the freeing of Wang Juntao, Chen Ziming and several other political prisoners. The other was that after I agreed to their conditions they would not arrest my associates, including Wang Dan, Liu Nianchun, Liu Xiaobo and many others who fell within the protective scope of the agreement.

However, there were promises that they did not keep. These include not allowing the democracy faction to carry out public activities and buy banks and newspapers, and re-

leasing another group of prisoners, such as Hu Shigen and Zhou Guoqing. Because U.S. President Clinton decoupled MFN from human rights considerations, many people inside the CCP decided that there was no need to continue to keep the promises they had made.

I found out in prison that the treatment of political prisoners followed the political atmosphere, changing as the atmosphere changed. The most important elements in the political atmosphere were U.S.-China relations and the question of MFN.

In 1994, after my secret negotiations with the CCP's representative, I was put under house arrest in a high-level guesthouse. Living conditions were quite good, and it was possible to go out to eat in the company of a policeman, for example; the only thing I could not do was have contacts with the outside world. They were obviously planning to release me after a short time, because they were concerned that my opinion could influence the future of MFN. They had no control over the future of MFN, and so they treated me a high degree of courtesy.

But about a month after Secretary of State Christopher returned to the U.S., they suddenly sent me to a place where conditions were even harsher than in a prison. It was damp, there were no facilities for washing, and I could not even go to the toilet without being under the scrutiny of a guard. There was no access to newspapers, TV or radio. Not only did I have no contact with the outer world, but even my sources of news were cut off. This occurred because, although the delinking of MFN with human rights had not been made public, the Chinese government had already received reliable assurances of this from the American side. At the time I guessed that this was the situation, and after I came to the U.S. in 1997 I received proof that confirmed my earlier suspicions.

While the Chinese government began to lobby in the U.S. for permanent MFN status, I was sentenced to 14 years and was sent to prison. From the end of 1996 until early 1997, as lobbying for "permanent MFN status" for China was called for openly in the U.S. Congress, the CCP convened a meeting on politics and law, and the ranking politics and law committee member, Luo Gan, publicly called for a crackdown on resistance, hunger strikes and other activities by political prisoners.

Conditions for political prisoners in China's jails quickly became more oppressive. Almost all conditions necessary to sustain life disappeared, many more were beaten and the use of handcuffs and punishment cells became more common. I also received this type of treatment. For details, please see the newspaper reports from the first part of 1997.

In June and July of 1997, revelations about the conditions of Chinese political prisoners were comparatively frequent. During discussions about MFN in the U.S. Congress, this issue was often discussed. Demands to suspend MFN increased, and, in China, the government ceased carrying out oppressive measures against political prisoners. The use of shackles and punishment cells stopped, prisoners were returned to their normal cells, and the most necessary items for daily life were restored.

The events described above show clearly that the strategy of using MFN to put pressure on the Chinese government is highly effective. Although the lack of willpower and consistency in U.S. policy have prevented effective pressure on China to democratize, the effectiveness of the use of the MFN issue to improve conditions for political prisoners

and limit arrests of dissidents has been clearly shown.

In other words, if the pressure of the MFN issue is lost, it means collusion with the hardliners of the CCP as they persecute and oppress China's opposition.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleague from Virginia to consult with the Reverend Billy Graham and Pat Robertson.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. Denying NTR to China will undermine our interests, United States economic interests. It is our twelfth largest market and increased imports from the United States 11 percent last year all on products made by highly skilled workers earning high wages.

Connecticut exports to China in 1998 totaled more than 301 million ranking it tenth in the Nation. Connecticut businesses and its workers have a direct interest in maintaining normal trading relations with China and with further opening China's markets. With a quarter of the world's population and the third largest economy, China's buying power will grow tremendously in the years ahead. If we do not engage this emerging major market, other nations will replace U.S. companies and these significant profits gained as a competitive advantage over us. That has already happened in the helicopter and other markets through short-sighted American policy.

Mr. Speaker, it is just a fact that China is making quiet but significant progress in many areas. Unlike Russia, China has recognized the need to recapitalize their state-owned businesses and has gradually sold many to foreign companies. They are modernizing their economy without the level of unemployment, crime, and turmoil that has plagued other nations faced with this challenge.

Furthermore, western companies have brought management practices to China that develop individual initiative and respect workers' ideas. They have brought more stringent health safety and environmental standards accomplishing goals like reducing industrial waste 35 percent and harmful air emissions 36 percent, as did Carrier since 1995.

And western companies have brought more opportunity to workers like Otis Elevator's home ownership program.

In addition, China has had direct elections in half its villages, gaining experience with secret ballots and multicandidate elections. In some provinces, 40 percent of the candidates are young entrepreneurs and not Communist Party members. In 1997, as part of the rule of law initiative the training of legal aid lawyers began.

In sum, China is modernizing its economy and governance through a

process that is harmonious with her long history and cultural traditions, but that should not obscure the growth of values in common with people in the west. It should certainly not obscure our common interest in the growth of trade between our nations based on the principles that undergird the WTO relationships. By renewing NTR and working with China to enter WTO we can help China adopt free and fair trade policies. Lower tariffs make our goods more affordable. Distribution rights under WTO will provide access to customers. Good for China, good for us.

I urge renewal of the normal trade relations with China and opposition to this resolution of disapproval.

I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. Denying NTR to China will undermine our entire U.S. economic interests. It is our 12th largest market and increased imports from the U.S. 11% last year. With a population of 1.2 billion, China imported approximately \$18 billion worth of U.S. goods and services in 1998, supporting thousands of high-wage, high-skill, export-related American jobs. This represents an increase of more than 11% from the previous year, making China the 12th largest U.S. export market.

Connecticut exports to China in 1998 totaled more than \$301 million, ranking it 10th in the nation. Connecticut businesses and its workers have a direct interest in maintaining normal trade relations with China and in further opening its markets.

With a quarter of the world's population and third largest economy, China's buying power will grow tremendously in the years ahead. If we do not engage this emerging major market, other nations will replace U.S. companies and use the significant profits gained as a competitive advantage over us. That has already happened in the helicopter market with U.S. producers guilty of short-sighted policy.

It is just fact that China is making quiet but significant progress in many areas. Unlike Russia, China recognized the need to recapitalize their state-owned businesses and has gradually sold many to foreign companies. They are modernizing their economy without the level of unemployment, crime and turmoil that has plagued other nations faced with this challenge. Furthermore, western countries have brought stringent management practices to China that develop individual initiative and respect workers' ideas, have brought management health, safety and environmental standards, accomplishing goals like reducing industrial waste 35% and harmful air emissions by 36% as did Carrier since 1995 and western companies have brought new opportunities to workers like Otis Elevator home ownership programs.

In addition China has held direct election in half its villages, gaining experience with secret ballots and multi-candidate elections. In some provinces, 40% of the candidates are young entrepreneurs and not communist party members. (They seek better schools and roads, and are cracking down on corruption.) In 1997, as part of a rule of law initiative, the training of legal aid lawyers began.

In sum, China is modernizing its economy and governance through a process that is har-

monious with her cultural traditions, but that should not obscure the growth of values shared by people in the West.

China is now on the verge of gaining membership in the World Trade Organization. WTO membership requires a country to adopt free and fair trade practices. We must encourage this progress toward a more open market economy because with it will come the opportunity for American companies to distribute their goods in China far more broadly and the lower Chinese tariffs will make our goods competitive in that growing market. It should certainly not obscure our common interest in the growth of trade between us based on the principles that undergird WTO relationships (transparency of law and regulation, equal treatment of foreign and domestic producers, lower tariffs and reduced non-tariff barriers, intellectual property protection and dispute settlement through a fair process.) By allowing NTR and working with China to enter the WTO, we can help China "adopt free and fair" trade practices and assure the growth of our economy. The lower tariffs required by WTO will make our goods more affordable and the distribution rights under WTO will provide us access to customers good for us and good for China.

Denying normal trade relations with China will only limit our ability to influence and work with China in other areas of mutual concern. Only a policy of principled and persistent engagement will promote American interests on all issues from economic security to non-proliferation, the rule of law, and human rights.

I urge the renewal of normal trade relations with China and opposition to this resolution of disapproval.

□ 1215

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), a champion for human rights throughout the world and at home.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the supporters of Most Favored Nation status may have changed the name to "Normal Trade Relations," but the situation in China has not changed. In fact, the conditions are getting worse.

Just a few days ago, the Chinese government conducted its largest crackdown since Tiananmen Square. Thousands of religious worshippers were arrested. Chinese soldiers took people from their homes and places of worship. Some were beaten. The human rights abuses continue, and yet there are those who would reward China with MFN.

Business as usual, trade as usual, and China does not change. We are sending the wrong message. We have a moral obligation, a mission, and a mandate to stand up for human rights and for democracy. We must send a strong message that China must change its ways if it wants to continue doing business with the United States. Our foreign policy, our trade policy must be a reflection of our ideals and values. Renewing MFN allows China to continue its terrible abuses without repercussion. That is not right.

Where are our morals? Where are our values? Where are our principles? I believe in free and fair trade, but it must not be trade at any price, and the price of renewing MFN for China is too high.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for taking the lead in standing up for human rights and for democracy in China.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we should continue normal trade relations with China. This is a very important issue to the United States of America, as well as to the future of China.

As is the case with almost all important legislation, the rhetoric is heated and the arguments are exaggerated. That is only natural, because the debate we are involved in is a complexity that oftentimes is far beyond the immediate issue in front of us: trade.

The debate ranges on both sides to economic, political, strategic, security, and humanitarian issues. Yet, we have this one vehicle to express our opinions, our positions, and even our frustrations about our relationship with China.

China is the largest emerging market in the world, and it is increasingly important politically and militarily to the United States. China's leadership will, whether we like it or not, shape much of what happens throughout Asia and the Pacific. We must try to influence what happens inside of China. We must influence the course of conduct by China's influence and leadership, and, of course, we must take the opportunity to see how best we can influence how China emerges as a greater economic and military power.

But how do we influence China if we refuse to trade with them and they retaliate against us? How do democratic values emerge? How do they learn to tolerate dissent? How do they come to respect human rights and religious liberties? Do we sit back and hope that the Europeans are willing to demonstrate these values, or do we actively engage the Chinese at all levels and patiently work for change within that country?

I do not think there is anybody who is willing to say that there has been no change in China during the last 20 years. I do not think anyone would say that that change has been sufficient. In fact, it seems painstakingly slow, but it is occurring, and we must see to it that it continues to occur.

We must not lose site of the penalty here. It is to deny to China what we give to almost every other nation in the world: normal trade relations, exactly what the term implies. The aberration is not with those who would

grant NTR to China; it is with those who would apply the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act to China.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations and a Member of this body who served in World War II in the Pacific and knows full well the price that we pay as a country for an unrealistic policy towards a militaristic regime.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 57, a resolution disapproving granting MFN, now called NTR, to the People's Republic of China.

It has been 10 years since the massacre of Tiananmen Square, and since then, the world has witnessed a marked deterioration of human and religious rights in the People's Republic of China and in occupied Tibet and in East Turkestan. Since 1989, our trade deficit has grown from \$6 billion to a projected \$67 billion. China's bold threats against democratic Taiwan and its naval actions against the Philippines directly reflect its new-found wealth and its military prowess. Both give unrestricted access to our U.S. markets.

U.S. industry estimates of intellectual property losses in China due to counterfeiting and due to trademark piracy have continually exceeded \$2 billion over the past several years. Some U.S. companies estimate losses from counterfeiting account for 15 to 20 percent of their total sales in China. It is my understanding that Microsoft alone has lost an estimated \$1 billion in software piracy by China over the past 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's transfer of American resources and wealth through our so-called "engagement policy" with the dictators in Beijing has led to serious long-term consequences. The engagement policy failure has fueled an enormous trade imbalance that dwarfs all reason. China's enormous foreign currency reserves permits Beijing to belligerently dismiss U.S. protests of its transfer of deadly weapons of mass destruction to terrorist nations. So-called engagement has cleared the way for China's regional hegemony.

China's experts within the administration have presided over this Nation's singular greatest foreign policy disaster. It has led to the thefts of our nuclear weapons designs, the weakening of our national security and strategic alliances, and the trivialization of respect for our American interests.

Last week, it was reported that a Protestant worshipper was killed by security forces; and this week, thousands of followers of Falun Gong, the spiritual movement that was recently outlawed, were arrested.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I support H.J. Res. 57 and I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), my neighbor.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution revoking Normal Trade Relations for China.

Many of my colleagues have said that this body should signal our disapproval of Chinese policy by denying NTR. I would caution those who seek to send such a signal to first answer one very basic question: Will your vote to revoke NTR for China today actually change the behavior of China tomorrow? Think about it. Will ending NTR free the political prisoners, reverse the abuse of human rights, and stop the persecution of religious groups? Will denying NTR teach the youth of China the values of democracy, the principles of capitalism, and the merits of a free and open society?

Make no mistake; ending NTR for China will not achieve these goals. It will portend, however, the end of U.S. trade with China and the end of our influence in China.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to retain our influence and our trade relations with China by voting against the resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote against the resolution to revoke Normal Trade Relations (NTR) for China.

Many of my colleagues have said that this body should signal our disapproval of Chinese policy by denying NTR.

Mr. Speaker, I would caution those who seek to "signal" China by ending NTR to think for just one moment today about the likely consequences and first answer one very basic question.

Will your vote to end NTR for China today actually change the behavior of China tomorrow? Think about it.

Will ending NTR free the political prisoners, reverse the abuse of human rights, and stop the persecution of religious groups?

Will denying NTR bolster the moderates or will it strengthen the hands of the hard-liners as they struggle to control the future course of China policy?

Most importantly, will revoking NTR teach the youth of China the values of democracy, the principles of capitalism, and the merits of a free and open society?

Mr. Speaker, if I thought that ending NTR would achieve these goals in China, I too would cast my vote of disapproval today.

But make no mistake: denying China NTR denies the U.S. the ability to influence China's workers, China's human rights policies, China's politics, and perhaps most importantly, China's future.

Make no mistake: ending NTR for China will effectively end all hope of gaining WTO accession. It will end our best hope of getting China to open its markets and live by the world's trade rules. And it will effectively put an end to our trade with China.

In short, revoking NTR for China will send much more than a signal: it will portend the

end of U.S. trade with China, and the end of our influence in China.

I urge my colleagues to vote to retain our influence—and our trade relations—with China by voting against the resolution today.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who has been a champion of human rights, particularly in the New Independent States and in eastern and central Europe, and a champion throughout the world for human rights.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding to me, who herself has been such a great leader on this issue.

I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 57 disapproving the extension of Normal Trade Relations to the People's Republic of China.

We have, of course, none of us a quarrel with the 1.2 billion citizens of China. But in extending this trading status we have to ask ourselves, what has the Chinese Government done, one of the last Communist dictatorships on earth, to deserve, to merit this consideration?

The Chinese Government's record reads, frankly, more like an indictment. China flagrantly violates the human rights of its own citizens and internationally recognized labor standards. It fomented anti-American hatred after our clearly accidental bombing in Belgrade. It recently began saber rattling against Taiwan, and it repeatedly, repeatedly has been unwilling to make vital democratic reforms.

This past June marked the 10th anniversary of the Chinese Government's crackdown on the advocates of democracy in Tiananmen Square. Has the injustice stopped since Tiananmen? No, not at all. Over the past few months the government has once again detained dissidents, handing down sentences of up to 4 years in prison for, and I quote, "subverting State power, assaulting the government, holding illegal rallies, and trying to organize workers laid off from a State-run firm." I suggest all of those are values that America holds dear.

The Washington Post reported this past Sunday that Chinese security forces have rounded up in this month 4,000 people in Beijing alone during a massive nationwide crackdown against the popular Buddhist-based spiritual movement, Falun Gong. But the human rights and labor standard violations are only one in a series of provocative acts by the Chinese Government.

China's recent threat of military action against Taiwan threatens the very security of that region. In addition, the breach in security at American nuclear weapons labs over the past 20 years threatens us.

I say to my colleagues, reject Normal Trade Relations, adopt this resolution. Send a clear, clear message of American values.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, could we be informed of the time on all sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 30 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 24 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has 25 minutes remaining; and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, trade with China is absolutely essential. We face the challenges that trade with China press, or we can turn our back and face the consequences: lost markets for America's farmers and the possibility of food shortages in China. China does not have enough food to feed its population. They have 25 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of the world's arable land. We have an agriculture trade surplus with China that is absolutely essential to our agriculture community. In 1997, U.S. agriculture sales to China totaled \$4 billion. We have a huge trade surplus in agriculture with China, 250 percent in our favor. They are one of our largest wheat customers.

China is a growth market. They are increasing food imports. NTR is critical to our market access. As the Chinese economy improves, more value-added goods will be bought. China will have to play fair to enter the World Trade Organization. China must show improved access to U.S. agriculture products and revoking NTR will derail this progress.

□ 1230

Engagement will result in improvements. We want a peaceful and prosperous China. One billion hungry people does not lead to a stable democracy. The U.S. is well-positioned to help feed their people while maintaining positive relations. Turning our back on China today would be a huge mistake.

I urge Members to vote to maintain trade with China. Vote no on House Joint Resolution 57.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), a great champion of American values.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to support House Joint Resolution 57, to disapprove the extension of what I call most-favored-nation trading status for China.

To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I say that we as Americans are not being true to our heritage if we continue to do business with people who are tyrants, who trample upon all that we hold sacred. Let me repeat that, we are foolish to do business with tyrants who trample upon all that this great Nation holds sacred.

Adam Smith wrote the Wealth of Nations, and we all use it as a guide in trade relations. He quotes three reasons to put up tariffs and protect American companies. One is for retaliation of unfair trade practices, which has been occurring. Two is to phase out trade tariffs in our country to protect obsolete industries. We should do this as a moral imperative. Lastly, it is to protect a nation's national security.

I submit to this body today, the question on this resolution is one of our national security. We cannot continue to do trade with a country that is arming itself to the teeth with our money, has provided missiles to Iran and nuclear technology to Pakistan, has fired missiles towards Taiwan to intimidate its government, has launched the greatest military buildup in Asia since Japan in the 1930s. It is continuing to warn Japan and trying to intimidate it.

Mr. Chairman, this is a country that is arming for war. It has stolen U.S. satellite missile technology, has targeted 13 of its 18 intercontinental ballistic missiles at the United States of America. It has ignored our protests of the persecution of Christians and political dissidents.

Are we being prudent? Are we going to turn our back on all the sacred heritage of our country for the dollar sign? I submit that China itself is dysfunctional, it is going to have a currency collapse soon and we should not go forward with this most favored nation status for China.

In the sixth century B.C., Chinese general Sun Tzu wrote, "The opportunity to defeat the enemy is often provided by the enemy himself." Are we providing China this opportunity? I urge the approval of this resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Chair will remind Members that all graphs and charts to be used on the floor should be put in place at the beginning of the speaker's presentation and then removed at the end of the speaker's presentation, so the Chair would ask Members to take down charts that are not utilized at that time.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I rise in opposition to this resolution and in support of continuing trade relations with China. For my part, I do not believe that isolating China economically will do anything to improve their human rights record. We must not make the mistake of now believing we can isolate one quarter of the world's population and then expect to have any influence on their social and political institutions.

I, too, am outraged by the political and religious oppression that has taken

place in China, but shutting the few openings in China that exist cannot stop it. Rather, I believe that the more involved we become, the more we are commercially engaged with China, the more results we can achieve in securing greater political and religious freedoms for the people of China, as well.

Mr. Speaker, trade does open the window of the world to the Chinese people and to our American ideals. We need to keep that window open. Closing it hurts us more than China.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 57 and in support of continuing Normal Trade Relations (NTR) with China.

This debate over China NTR gives focus to our economic, as well as strategic relations, with China. And this debate allows Members to express the deep concerns of all Americans about political and religious oppression that occurs in China.

For my part, I do not believe that isolating China economically will do anything to improve their human rights record. We must not make the mistake now of believing we can isolate one-quarter of the world's population and then expect to have any influence on their social and political institutions.

I, too, am outraged by political and religious oppression that has taken place in China, but shutting the few openings in China that exist cannot stop it. Rather, I believe that the more involved we become, the more we are commercially engaged with China, the more results we can achieve in securing greater political and religious freedoms for the people of China as well.

Trade does open the window to the world for the people of China.

In that regard, just let me talk briefly about just one industry—the telecommunications industry—and what its greater presence will do for the people of China. All of our lives are being changed dramatically by the "information" revolution. And, all of us realize that increased access to information for the people of China from sources outside China is one of the best ways we have of exposing Chinese citizens to new ideas, to broader horizons, and to new opportunities and choices for their future.

Our American telecommunications companies are at the forefront of building the infrastructure that makes information available to people around the globe.

So, let's look at China's market for these information technologies.

China is adding the equivalent of one million cell phones per month.

China is adding the equivalent of one Bell company per year.

In 1998, only ten percent of China's population had a telephone in their home.

In the U.S., roughly one half of all households have access to the Internet. In Brazil, one out of 70 families has access. In China, only one out of 400 families has access.

Yes, this is a vast untapped market for U.S. companies. And, I can assure that if we are not in China, all of our foreign competitors will be.

But it is also much more than an untapped market. Expanding access to information for the Chinese people is an untapped opportunity

to expose them to our ideals and our freedoms.

There are so many other examples of both the economic and strategic opportunities in China.

And those economic opportunities are significant.

Last year alone, the United States exported \$18 billion in goods and services to China, now our fourth-largest trading partner. Already, hundreds of thousands of American jobs are supported by trade with China.

For my State of New Jersey, China is now our fifth largest trading partner. Our exports to China amount to over \$350 million and that trade employs some 5,000 to 8,000 residents of my state. And the potential for growth is enormous.

Here are a few examples.

One New Jersey company that has been active in China for twenty years, signed a contract for the largest single boiler project in Chinese history. This project alone will yield \$310 million in orders for American goods and services, including sales for many small and medium sized companies.

Another New Jersey infrastructure company projects a market of \$18 billion for its products in China over the next decade. And their sales have already increased 100% over the past five years.

One of our energy companies anticipates a \$13 billion market in China over the next ten years.

For one of our insurance companies, 40% of their new premiums were sold in China in 1998.

It is clear from just these few examples that failing to extend Normal Trade Relations Status to China will slam the door shut for American products and services in the world's most populous market. It only serves to leave China open to our foreign competitors who all have normal trade relations with China. American companies and their employees would be punished by this shortsighted action, not the Chinese government.

Again, renewal of NTR is as much an economic decision as it is a key component of our national strategy to integrate China more fully into the family of nations. We need to maintain a stable political and economic relationship with China.

I believe that the best way to promote the cause of human freedom and democracy and our American ideals is our very presence, economically and otherwise, in China.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution and in support of extending Normal Trade Relations with China.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been so very hard at work on behalf of human rights in China and a fair deal for the American worker.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 57. I find it interesting that many of the same folks who talk about political espionage are here defending trade.

To those who argue for us to continue putting the leaders of Beijing

above the workers of America, I ask them to please listen for a moment. This is hypocrisy. After years of hearing the same arguments for most-favored-nation trading status, it is time for this Congress to say enough is enough.

Extending this status to China has failed to produce the results we want. We still see unconscionable human rights abuses, which we would not tolerate in other countries. We still see nuclear weapons proliferation, which we have not tolerated in other nations. We still see a widening trade deficit every year.

The annual exercise of reviewing and renewing China's NTR status has been a complete failure. It is an annual exercise in futility. America needs a new approach. The data tells us what we need to do today. We are told we need to engage China in order to achieve our economic goals. Let us get beyond the rhetoric and look at the facts.

We are on track to surpass last year's deficit with China, not close the gap. If the trend continues, our trade deficit would reach \$66 billion. What does this huge imbalance mean to American taxpayers, American workers? China has engaged that strategy to manage trade, not normalize trade. It ignores intellectual property rights, it evades restrictions on Chinese textile exports, and has put the Great Wall up to prohibit foreign products from entering the market.

The U.S. levies an average NTR tariff rate of 2 percent on the Chinese. They levy a 17 percent rate on NTR trade. This is a one-way street. We should think about the families in America, and stop holding our noses and allowing this unfairness to continue.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution that would end normal trade relations with China. With normal trade relations, our farmers and ranchers can sell their products in China on the same terms as their competitors from Canada, Australia, South America, and Europe.

Last year U.S. agricultural exports to China exceeded \$3 billion, making it the fourth largest market in the world for U.S. agricultural products. Demand for agricultural products is likely to increase as China's economy continues to grow at a rate of about 8 percent annually. That is why our competitors are eager for us to give up on the Chinese market.

In recent years the Canadian Wheat Board has worked tirelessly to promote its products in China.

The Australians hold an 8 percent stake in a flour and feed mill in Shenzhen, China, and it brought together a consortium to upgrade China's grain handling and storage facilities with \$1 billion worth of projects.

Our farmers are facing record low prices. While our competitors are out building market share in China, we sit here and debate whether we even want to have a normal trade relationship with its 1,237,000,000 customers.

We must continue to work towards WTO membership for China. However, we have consistently told China that its entry to the WTO depends upon a commercially meaningful agreement. China cannot expect to maintain indefinitely the \$1 billion per week trade surplus it currently enjoys with the United States.

In agriculture, the message seems to have been received. China is changing slowly, but it is changing surely. In connection with its bid to join the WTO, China has agreed to reduce overall average tariffs for agricultural products from the current 30 to 50 percent to 17 percent by 2004. For priority U.S. products, the rate will be even lower, 14½ percent. USDA estimates that with entry into WTO, China's net agricultural imports would increase by over \$8 billion annually. That is a benefit to the United States workers, men and women producing the tractors, making the fertilizer, making all of the products that are utilized here in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting normal trade relations with China by voting no on this disapproval.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), a healer, a doctor, a person concerned about human health and human beings.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have put a sign I know that not everybody can read, but this is a contrast between two countries, country A and country B. It is the exact representation made by the State Department as far as human rights in those two countries as of the end of 1998.

I want to share with the Members just a minute what our own government says about these two countries. Then I am going to tell Members what these two countries are. The government human rights record worsens significantly, there were problems in many areas, including extrajudicial killings, disappearances, torture, brutal beatings, arbitrary arrests, and detention. That is country A.

Country B, the government's human rights record deteriorated sharply beginning in the final months of the year with a crackdown against organized political dissent. Abuses included instances of extrajudicial killings, torture, mistreatment of prisoners, forced confessions, arbitrary arrests, detention, lengthy incommunicado detention, and denial of due process.

One other area let us look at, discrimination and violence against

women remain serious problems. Discrimination against women and ethnic minorities worsened during the year.

Country B, discrimination against women, minorities, and the disabled. Violence against women, including coercive family planning practices, which sometimes include forced abortion, forced sterilization, prostitution, trafficking in women and children, and abuse of children. They are all problems.

I want Members to know who these two countries are. Country A we just spent billions of dollars bombing. It is called Yugoslavia, the great enemy Yugoslavia, that perpetrated such terrible acts on the Kosovar Albanians. We spent billions bombing them.

The other country, country B, is China, which we have elevated and said we must trade with, regardless of what they do to their people. We are schizophrenic if we do continue to have normal trade relations with China. Why would we bomb one that has an identical record, and say the other must be our best trading partner?

It has to do with money, Mr. Speaker. Is America going to sell its soul?

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of extending normal trade relations to China. Trade between the United States and China is a net plus for the American people. It supports hundreds of thousands of high-paying jobs. It creates competition in the economy. It results in the American people receiving better goods and services at more affordable prices.

During today's debate, and I have heard much of it already, there has been a lot of talk about the trade deficit, about nuclear espionage and human rights. These are all very important issues. They deserve our immediate attention. However, disrupting our economic relationship with China will not do anything to solve these problems. It will only add more tensions to an already tense relationship with the Chinese and create bigger problems in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge my colleagues to protect the economic interests of the United States by supporting normal trade relations with China. Vote no on House Joint Resolution 57, and yes for better paying jobs and greater economic opportunities for the American people.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), who has been a hard worker for human rights throughout the world and a star in the freshman class.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to renewing normal

trade relations with China. I do believe that the United States needs to engage with China in an ongoing dialogue about joint economic concerns, but our dialogue cannot be limited to a discussion of trade. America's agenda needs to be broadly based, reflecting our democratic values, like free speech, freedom of religion, the right to privacy, and the right to organize. Trade is only a part of our relationship with China.

This is my first time participating in this annual ritual of NTR renewal. I call it a ritual because each year we walk through the same steps in which many of us criticize China's political and social repression. Then the majority decides we must continue NTR as our best hope for creating change in China.

□ 1245

It certainly seems to make sense except for one thing. It has not been working. Since 1980 when we began this NTR renewal ritual, we have seen some reforms. However, no similar progress is being made on human rights, labor standard, and democratic reform. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of H.J. Res. 57.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his courtesy in yielding me this time.

Today, the United States and China spend hundreds of millions of dollars spying on each other. But despite all the spying, I do not think we really know each other very well.

China is in fact a study in contradictions. Today, it is more modern and open than ever before in its 4,000-year history. Yet, it is in fact reacting defensively in an agitated fashion regarding the continued controversy with Taiwan.

We have our demonstrators outside here on the grounds of the Capitol dealing with the local religious movement, Falun Gong, that has captured so much interest in China.

It is an ancient nation that is modernizing rapidly, but this society filled with state-run activities is paying a substantial price as it downsizes its bureaucracy, modernizes its institutions, and privatizes its state-owned industry.

The United States has paid a terrible price in the past for misunderstanding China. During World War II, we bet on the wrong horse. Barbara Tuchman's brilliant biography of Joe Stillwell makes clear the waste of resources for the corrupt Kuomintang government of Chiang Kai-Shek, who was not interested in fighting the Japanese, when we could have done something more constructive with Mao Tse-Tung.

During the Korean War, we had thousands, tens of thousands, of needless American casualties because General McArthur, in flagrant disregard of orders and common sense, overplayed his hand. Yet, the Cold War was won more quickly in part because Richard Nixon had the courage to reverse his course of action and engage in a strategic alliance with China.

Lots of countries we disagree with abuse human rights and do not honor democracy or the free market. Sometimes, sadly, that happens with the United States complicity. We gave arms to terrorists with Ronald Reagan.

Normal trading relations does not mean we condone that behavior. It just gives us more tools and opportunity to do something about it. The world will be a better place sooner. One only has to review 4,000 years of Chinese history and look at where we are today to know that we are, in fact, on the right path.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time. I want to thank the gentleman for leading our debate and introducing his resolution.

Mr. Speaker, each year at this time, Congress has the opportunity to review the results of the administration's China policy, and each year it becomes more clear how miserably that policy has failed.

In the 5 years since President Clinton delinked China's MFN status from human rights, there has been significant regression, not progress in China. Now, even as we hold this debate, Beijing is conducting another major crackdown, the most important internal security exercise since the Tiananmen Square massacre against religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the Chinese government knows this vote is taking place today. We are being watched, and we are being tested. The test is simple. If we ignore the latest escalation in the brutality, if we just vote the same way we have in the past, then we fail. We will have abandoned the Chinese people. We will have abandoned our ideals of democracy and human rights.

I ask my colleagues, what will it take for us to say no more business as usual with Communist China? I would respectfully submit that any reasonable limit has been passed a long time ago.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's so-called policy of constructive engagement on behalf of human rights has been a disaster, even according to the administration's own benchmarks. In quarterly reports, Amnesty International tracks the seven human rights

policy goals that President Clinton announced before his 1998 trip to Beijing.

Those Amnesty reports detail a complete lack of progress in all categories. Let me explain. On the release of all prisoners of conscience and Tiananmen Square prisoners. Amnesty reports total failure, regression.

Two, review of all counter-revolutionary prison terms: Total failure, no progress.

Allow religious freedom. Amnesty reports total failure, no progress.

Four, prevent coercive family planning and harvesting of organs: Total failure, no progress.

Five, fully implement pledges on human rights treaties: No progress.

Six, review of reeducation through labor system: Total failure, no progress.

Seven, end police and prison brutality: Again, Amnesty reports total failure, no progress.

Mr. Speaker, the Communist government of the PRC blatantly and systematically violates the most fundamental human rights. It tracks down and stamps out political dissents. Just turn on television news. It is happening before our very eyes. The Beijing dictatorship imprisons religious leaders, ranging from the 10-year-old Panchen Lama to the elderly Catholic Bishop Su of Baoding. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) mentioned this holy and heroic man earlier. I led a human rights delegation to China a few years ago. Bishop Su met us and celebrated mass. For that he was put into prison. Bishop Su said nothing offensive about the government. He loved those who hated him.

The Chinese government also harvests and sells the internal organs of executed prisoners. Harry Wu—the great Chinese human rights leader testified about this practice at one of my hearings. China, as we all know forces women who have unauthorized pregnancies to abort their babies and then to be sterilized against their will. Brothers and sisters are illegal in China—forced abortion is common place. China continues to brutalize the indigenous peoples of Tibet and of Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region, and it summarily executes Muslim Uighur political and religious prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, when will we learn the lesson that, when dealing with the PRC, the U.S. cannot settle for paper promises or deferred compliance? The Chinese dictatorship regularly tells bold-faced lies about the way it treats its own people. It says, for example, that nobody died in Tiananmen Square. Mr. Cho Hao Tlea, the Defense Minister in this city, said no one died there.

Mr. Speaker, I convened a hearing of several of the leaders of the democracy movement, some of the dissidents in correspondence who gave compelling testimony about how people died at

Tiananmen Square; and, yet, the defense minister said nobody died. Incredible! I invited the defense minister to our hearing—he was a no show.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, the Chinese Government claims religious freedom exists in the PRC. We know now there is no religious freedom. But brother knows better.

Mr. Speaker, since my time is about to expire, I just want to remind Members that when the business community and the administration want to see intellectual property rights protected, what do we do? We threaten sanctions. I believe we should put people at least on par with pirated software, CDs, and movies. This Congress should declare that torture, forced abortion, and overt crimes against humanity count at least as much as protecting copyrights and consumer goods. Sanctions do work if consistently applied.

I urge a “yes” vote on the very important resolution of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER). And salute him for his wisdom in offering it today.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING).

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the resolution which would unilaterally isolate China from the U.S. only. Support normal trade relations with China. I support China being a part of the WTO. China will be one of the superpowers in the next millennium. Peaceful co-existence between us is to all of our benefit.

Now, we all understand that things are not as we would like them in China. But how do we most impact that? I think by engaging them, engaging them in how to handle human rights, by engaging them in fair trade, our intercourse with China since the close of the Cold War has paid dividends. To put our head in the sand and to back away from it would be ill-advised.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to again express my strong support for continuing Normal Trade Relations with China.

Since I came to Congress in 1991, this debate has gone on every year and every year I have come to the floor to explain how important trade with China is to our farmers.

It is essential that we continue to grant Normal Trade Relations to China. China will be the most important market for the United States in the 21st Century and granting Normal Trade Relation status is the foundation of any typical bilateral trading relationship.

The recent negotiations for China's accession to the World Trade Organization are proof that China is ready to join the international trade community and we cannot pass up this opportunity.

My home state of Illinois is the 6th leading exporter in the United States and over half a

million jobs in Illinois rely on exports. The current crisis in agriculture has placed a spotlight on the huge need for increased foreign market access.

USDA has predicted that 75% of the growth in American farm exports over the next 10 years will be to Asia—and China will make up over half of this amount.

China is already America's 4th largest agriculture export market and if the administration will complete the WTO accession agreement our farmers and ranchers will have the level playing field that they have been waiting for.

I urge members to vote against this resolution of disapproval and urge the Administration to complete the bilateral agreement for China's accession to the WTO.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), a person who has been a faithful trooper in the fight for human rights throughout the world and a great leader.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, we have been told that, with MFN, China has made progress in many areas. To that I ask, what progress?

Right now, as we speak, thousands of Buddhists have been and are being arrested and jailed, jailed and arrested for their beliefs, and that is their only crime. Repression of religion is not progress.

Just last year, last year, three founders of the China Democracy Party were jailed for expressing opposition to China policy. Repression of democracy is not progress.

Child labor and the forced labor of political prisoners continues to be business as usual in China. Denial of workers' rights is not progress. Forced abortion, nuclear proliferation, and an expanded trade deficit is not progress. Extending China's NTR status amounts to rewarding China for continuing its human rights violations.

Vote to support real progress. Vote for H.J. Res. 57.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we are not in conflict over the facts. I think we agree on the facts. What we are debating is the conclusions as to how to best address those facts.

We agree that forced sterilizations and forced abortions occur, and they are wrong. We are not disputing that. We agree that communism does not work, that it is a bankrupt ideology, that it offends the human condition, that it represses the human spirit, that it is just plain wrong.

But I would hope we would also agree on other facts that cannot be disputed. One such fact is that there is no other major Nation that does not extend normal trading relations with China. That is all we are talking about, continuing the normal trading relations that we extend to every other trading partner, but for a very few pariahs.

We would also hope that we would agree that there are about 200,000 American jobs involved here. We would also hope that we would agree that if we cut off normal trading relations with China and isolate them, that there is an adverse impact upon our economy, and that there will be other countries coming in to fill the gap, countries who, in many cases, have far less commitment to human rights and economic progress, and individual liberties than the United States does. We must all share a confidence in our universal commitments to human rights. Surely, no one on the other side is suggesting that we who will vote to extend NTR to China are so heartless that we don't care about the numerous violations of human rights that occur on a daily basis.

I think these things are clear. So when we weigh all the facts, we who agree that human rights are being violated every day, have come to the conclusion that the best way to change China's attitude is to improve their standard of living.

If we improve their standard of living, they will want to have individual freedoms. They will insist upon it. They will insist upon a free enterprise economy. Eventually, they will become a democratic state. That is what we want. We agree on the facts. We want to get to the same place. We are just as committed.

Support normal trade relations with China. Reject this resolution before us today. Give the Chinese people their best chance to break the chains of communist ideology.

I rise to oppose this resolution and support renewal of normal trade relations with China.

This is not a disagreement over facts but rather over judgement on how best to address those facts. I share the concerns expressed by some of my colleagues regarding human rights abuses by the People's Republic of China.

I am deeply troubled by the religious persecution that is occurring in China, including the recent crack-down on Falun Gong practitioners. Christians, Catholics and anyone who puts their God above their State is considered to be a threat to China's leaders today. However, I disagree with the premise that discontinuing normal trade relations will somehow positively improve human rights in China.

Promoting normal trade and continued economic engagement, over time, will help open up Chinese society. History has proven this inevitability. The very activities that trade and engagement bring to China help foster a climate under which religious teachings can spread and flourish.

Canceling or conditioning NTR further isolating China would only damage our interests and undermine support among our allies to keep pressure on the Chinese government to institute more fundamental political and economic reforms and human rights protections.

I would like to remind my colleagues that trade is not a partisan issue. NTR status for China has been supported by every President,

Republican and Democrat alike, who has confronted this issue.

By continuing normal trading relations with China, we extend ordinary tariff treatment that we grant to all but a few nations. We are not providing China special treatment and we are not endorsing China's policies. We are simply supporting the best way to promote U.S. interests.

But, we should continue normal trade relations with China for more than just economic reasons. It is in our national interest.

By resuming NTR with China, we advance our long-term national interests in achieving democratic and market reforms in the world's most populous nation.

Our national interest are best served by a secure, stable and open China. The way we engage the Chinese government will help determine whether China assimilates into a community of nations and follows the rule of law or becomes more isolated and unpredictable.

Continuing normal trading relations with China also serves our best economic interests. Approximately 200,000 U.S. jobs are tied directly to U.S. exports to China.

In the absence of this relationship, we would be placing our firms that are making great strides gaining new market share in China at a severe disadvantage.

We would be standing alone on a trade policy that neither our allies nor our trade competitors would follow. Our competitors would reap the benefits of business opportunities that would otherwise go to U.S. firms.

The United States is the only major country that does not extend "permanent" normal trade relations to China. Revoking NTR status with China would only increase prices which U.S. consumers pay for goods and services and ultimately cost U.S. jobs. If the Chinese do not buy our products, they will buy them from Europe and other Asian countries.

We would also be passing the cost of higher tariffs on Chinese exports, more than \$500 million annually, on to U.S. consumers. Clearly, it's the American consumer who loses if we do not continue NTR with China.

Higher tariffs on Chinese exports would only shift our demand for inexpensive, mass-market consumer goods to other developing countries and would not result in a net gain in U.S. manufacturing jobs.

China is the fifth largest trading partner of the U.S. Two-way trade between the U.S. and China has increased almost tenfold between 1990 and 1997, increasing from roughly \$10 billion to \$75 billion.

This growth is expected to continue to rise in the 21st century as more Chinese benefit from an improved standard of living and increased purchasing power.

Our current trade imbalance with China can best be narrowed through increased trade and liberalization of the Chinese economy. As their income rises, demand for high-quality U.S. products increases and our trade deficits decline.

In short, we have much to lose and little to gain by failing to continue our current trading relationship with China. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in our national interest and support normal trade relations with China.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from

Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the man who has studied this issue and realizes that Japan and Nazi Germany were both very, very developed in their economy, and they also were aggressors and human rights abusers.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. First we gift wrap and hand over to Communist China virtually all of our most sensitive secrets. Now we are going to grant them most preferential trade status. What in the world is going on?

China has stolen data on the W-88 nuclear warhead and the neutron bomb. They have funneled illegal campaign contributions to the Democratic party and the administration. They are transferring missile technology to countries like North Korea and Iran. They continue to violate basic human rights. They are circumventing our trade laws by transshipping their textile goods through third countries.

□ 1300

Does this sound like a country that deserves preferential treatment?

According to Paul Redmund, the CIA's chief spy hunter, China's spying was far more damaging to national security than Aldrich Ames and would turn out to be as bad as the Rosenbergs, who were executed back in the 1950s for that.

A team of U.S. nuclear experts practically fainted when the CIA showed them the data that China has stolen. The Chinese penetration is total, said one official. They are deep, deep into the labs' black programs, thus endangering every man, woman and child in this country.

Why are we rewarding China for its spying? For God's sake, this is the country that funneled illegal contributions to President Clinton's 1996 reelection campaign. This is the country that told Johnny Chung, we like your President, and then gave him \$300,000 to give to the Democrat Party.

Johnny Chung testified under oath that he was directed to make illegal contributions to the President's campaign by General Ji, who is the head of China's military spy operations worldwide. General Ji met with him three times and ordered that \$300,000 be directed to Chung for political contributions here in the United States.

One of its joint ventures was the Indonesia-based international firm called the Lippo Group, run by Mochtar and James Riady, close friends of the President, and who frequently visited the White House. James Riady's chief adviser on political donations was John Huang, a former employee of Lippo. John Huang received a job from the Clinton administration at the Commerce Department. He later left Commerce to work for the Democratic National Committee where, with the help of James Riady, he collected nearly \$3 million in illegal contributions from

China. Mr. Speaker, Johnny Chung, John Huang, and Charlie Trie together raised over \$3 million in illegal donations that we know of that have been linked to the Bank of China.

Over the past 2 years, my committee has been conducting an investigation into illegal fundraising, including illegal efforts by the Chinese Government to influence our elections. We asked the Bank of China to provide us bank records that would show the origins of millions of dollars in foreign money that was funneled to the DNC. The Bank of China turned us down flat.

We had 121 people take the fifth amendment or flee the country. A number of the most important people among this list are hiding in China. When my staff attempted to travel to China to interview these people, the Chinese Government denied us visas and threatened to arrest our investigators. Does this sound like a country that deserves preferential trade status?

Does it really make sense to give preferential trade status to a country that is helping North Korea build a missile capable of delivering nuclear warheads to the West Coast of the United States?

With respect to trade, in the last 10 years, 91 percent of all illegal transshipment cases have been filed against China. The U.S. Customs Department has cited China for illegally transshipping textile and apparel goods through more than 30 other countries.

Mr. Speaker, in just about every area I can think of China's record stinks. They spy on us, they try to buy our elections, they send missile technology to just about every rogue regime in the world, they are actively working to improve the missile technology of our enemies, and they thumb their noses at our trade laws and have one of the worst human rights records in the world. How all this merits preferential trade status is beyond me.

I urge a vote in favor of House Joint Resolution 57. It is time to show China some backbone and stop letting them walk all over America.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, everyone agrees that the Chinese Government is in desperate need of reform. Everyone agrees they violate human rights. Its leaders imprison dissidents, muzzle free speech, raid house church meetings, force women to have abortions, and outlaw opposition political parties. However, according to humanitarian workers in China, revoking normal trade relations would be counterproductive. They have told me that revoking NTR would strengthen the Chinese regime and actually intensify these human rights abuses.

We should listen to these people, many of whom have committed their lives to service in China. They know

the language, they know the culture, and they know the mentality. And I wish to share a couple of comments from them with my colleagues.

Reverend Daniel Su, a member of a Christian house church in China says, "To revoke China's NTR status as a way to better its human rights performance is like setting your car on fire when it stalls."

I have many quotes which I will not have time to say here, but listen to this quote of a letter signed by 32 Christian groups working in China. "NTR is the core of America's engagement policy toward China. Taking it away will hurt the Chinese people, particularly those who are persecuted because of their religious faith. When U.S.-China relationships deteriorate, Christians in China will be blamed and penalized."

Mr. Speaker, let us listen to these people who have a deep, longstanding involvement in China. They are working in China because they love the Chinese people and believe that revoking NTR will hurt those that we are seeking to help. I believe it is more effective for the U.S. to address our human rights abuses through the diplomatic perspective. Support NTR.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an inquiry about how much time is remaining in the debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 18 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) has 14½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 17½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 21½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a champion of human rights; and also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield control of the time back to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, China's human rights record ranks with the former Soviet Union and the former apartheid government of South Africa.

One of the proudest moments in the history of our Nation is when we used trade to bring about change in the Soviet Union, when we used trade to bring about change in South Africa, and we can do it again. The reason is quite clear. China needs the U.S. consumer. It gives us leverage to bring about change. It has worked in the past and it will work again.

U.S. consumers should not be financing the oppressive regime in China, and that is exactly what they do if we ex-

tend the Most Favored Nation status to China. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution of disapproval so that we can speak with a clear voice as to what is happening today in China.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for yielding me this time.

In the past, I have always supported normal trade relations with China, and this year it is much more difficult because of the response of the Chinese Government and the people of China to the accidental bombing of the embassy in Belgrade. A country that wants to be our friend and partner does not use misfortune or tragedy as an opportunity to attack our diplomats and also to damage United States property.

I have worked with companies in my district to expand their business in China. I expected a much different response from a country that has such a long history and is known for its courtesy. I hope the Government of China realizes they cannot expect our friendship and cooperation on one day and then attack our country's representative the next.

Our balance of trade deficit with China bothers me a great deal. Knowing the state of our relations with China, it is not the time to revoke normal trade relations. We need to have cooler thoughts, both in our government and in China. By not renewing normal trade relations for this year, we invite international competitors to establish a stronger foothold while further isolating our companies in what has the potential to be one of the largest consumer markets. Again, our competitors are not as concerned about the human rights in China as we are.

Also, we need to remember that this is just the annual renewal of normal trade relations with China. We have a lot of work to do before we admit China to the World Trade Organization, but we are heading down the right path, and this is one step in that direction. We will revisit this issue again, if not this fall, again next year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of this resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this measure which would disapprove continued normal trade relations trading status with China.

As we know, NTR trading status does not provide any preferential treatment but rather grants the ordinary tariff treatment that the United States extends to virtually every nation in the world. Fewer than a dozen countries do not have NTR status, including North

Korea, Cuba, Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, and Libya.

The problem with the underlying resolution, as well intentioned as it is among its sponsors, is, I believe, that it will alienate any type of relationship we may have with China. And while we have had severe problems because of their espionage program against the United States, and we all have severe concerns about their human rights violations, I do not think it is a country that we want to just cut off relations with. I think there are both foreign policy concerns and economic concerns.

Furthermore, I think, in my opinion, there really are two China's. There is the old hard-line China that is fighting the new market-oriented China. And we have a fight going on in the upper levels of the Chinese Government of whether or not to move the economy towards more market orientation, which we know will bring about capitalism and will bring about more freedoms in the countries; and the old-hard line regime that wants to stop that. I think by cutting off trade relations, as the underlying resolution would propose to do, it would undercut those who want to move towards a more market-oriented government.

Finally, what effect would this have? This would force the Chinese to devalue their currency, which would be incredibly destabilizing to the region where the U.S. has about 35 percent of its export market. That, in turn, would increase our trade deficit here, cost American jobs, not create American jobs; and I think that would be detrimental to the American economy. So to vote for this resolution, while well intentioned, it is, in my opinion, a vote against American industry and a vote against the American worker.

Mr. Speaker, maintaining China's NTR status is important because of the significant impact it has on the U.S. economy. In 1998, the U.S. exported over \$14 billion in goods and services to China, benefiting thousands of U.S. companies and hundreds of thousands of American workers. In the state of Texas, exports to China provide jobs and income for more than 33,000 families; and China and Hong Kong were the state's seventh-largest export market in 1998. In Houston, the trade ties to China are equally significant. Trade through the Port of Houston totaled \$577 million in 1997, with exports accounting for 76 percent of that total.

The relationship between the U.S. and China has undergone significant strain in recent months with the theft of nuclear weapons secrets, the accidental NATO bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, increased tensions between China and Taiwan, and China's recent crackdown on political demonstrators. While these are legitimate national security concerns, U.S. security interests would not be enhanced if relations with China worsen as a result of revoking NTR. The best way to bring about broad and meaningful change in China is through a continued policy of frank, direct

engagement that enhances our ability to work with and influence China on a broad range of concerns. While the bilateral relationship continues to be tested, it is vitally important that the fundamental elements of the relationship be maintained.

Failure to renew NTR would further destabilize the Pacific Rim region economically and politically at a time when many Asian countries are beginning to recover from their worst financial crisis since World War II. Revoking NTR would put additional pressure on China to devalue their currency, likely resulting in another round of currency devaluations in Asia that could undermine the efforts of the International Monetary Fund and the U.S. Treasury to contain the crisis and worsen our trade deficit.

Through our continued policy of engagement, the U.S. has worked to ensure that China's accession to the World Trade Organization is predicated on strong commercial terms that provide significant market access for exports of U.S. goods and services. Our policy of engagement has also obtained significant Chinese concessions on South Asian security, nuclear proliferation, drug trafficking and human rights. Much work remains to be done. Normal trade relations will continue to advance the process of opening China, exposing Chinese people to American ideas, values and personal freedoms.

A policy of principled engagement remains the best way to advance U.S. interests and create greater openness and freedom in China. The renewal of NTR trading status is the centerpiece of this policy, and I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution and support continued trade with China.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will defeat the resolution.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), a man who represents tens of thousands of U.S. Marines and their families in his district, and a man who cares deeply about American national security.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Resolution 57. For the last 5 years, I have opposed extending Most Favored Nation status to China. Every year the administration promises that our relations with the Communist country will improve, and every year China proves us wrong.

In 1995, Congress extended normal trade status to China. The conditions were to stop abusive human rights practices and stop exporting lethal weapons. China has not stopped these practices. The CIA reported in 1996 that China was the greatest supplier of weapons of mass destruction and technology to foreign countries.

China has not put an end to its long and established history of human rights abuses, like forced abortion and sterilization. China never lives up to its end of the bargain.

The Chinese citizens who seek democracy are often jailed, tortured, and even killed. Religious leaders are harassed and incarcerated, and places of

worship closed or destroyed when the faith and church are not sanctioned by the Chinese Government.

Mr. Speaker, what is more frightening is that our own government seems unconcerned about the security of America. This administration turns a blind eye when China sells technology to our enemies and steals our nuclear secrets.

Mr. Speaker, before we extend this economic advantage to China, we must see proof that China is serious about extending freedom to the Chinese people and becoming a partner in this world.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.J. Resolution 57 and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to the resolution.

I would like to take a few moments to discuss the effects of trade on our economy. Whenever trade policy is discussed, people forget the many benefits that free trade bestows on our Nation. Today, tradeable goods represent approximately 30 percent of our gross national product, and the export sector remains one of the shining lights of our economy. Exports have grown rapidly in the last decade, creating thousands of new jobs, and these jobs pay considerably more than jobs that are unrelated to trade.

Trade also benefits consumers. As these trade barriers fall, resources are able to flow more efficiently. American companies engaged in international trade become leaner and more competitive. As a result, consumers in all our districts enjoy lower prices and better products.

Indeed, the efficiencies created by trade have been a critical component to the economic prosperity we now enjoy. I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution.

□ 1315

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) a leader in the fight for human rights and my neighbor.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. STARK) for his consistent work on behalf of human rights throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined with my very courageous colleague from Oregon (Mr. WU) in support of this resolution to not oppose normal trade relations with China.

I do not cast this vote lightly. My district is part of the wonderful gateway to Asia. Our local economy is heavily dependent on our trade with China even with the trade deficit increasing from \$63 billion to about \$70 billion.

However, I am acutely and painfully aware of the importance of basic human rights for people throughout the world. There continues to be major violations by the Chinese Government of the rights of the Chinese people.

I am a firm believer of self-determination for China. China has chosen communism. That is their right. However, it is wrong to round up, to intimidate, and to arrest people, place them in slave labor camps with no due process.

The time is now to send a strong, unyielding message that the United States will not condone mass suffering and oppression.

We are not talking about cutting off our relationship with China. We want to modify our trade relations so that people of China and the United States can benefit from a fair and free trade policy.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to this resolution of disapproval regarding normal trade relationships with China.

Clearly, the United States' relationship with China is complicated. Recent events, including the bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, China's reaction to the bombing, and evidence of spying in our national labs have only added complexities to our relationship.

We are all in agreement that we must take steps necessary to protect our national security interests and to ensure that our counterintelligence programs prevent future security breaches. But at this critical juncture, we would be foolish to abandon our economic and political relationship with China and with it our ability to influence their economic, political, and humanitarian policies in the future.

I agree with Presidents Clinton, Bush, Reagan, Carter, and Ford that a policy of engagement is better than a policy of isolation. We cannot afford to embrace a Cold War mentality that would demonize and isolate China.

A policy of economic and political engagement is the surest way to promote U.S. interests in China, to advance democracy and human rights within China, and to enhance future economic opportunities for U.S. workers and businesses.

In addition to today's important vote, we must move swiftly to finalize a WTO agreement that will bring China into the international trade community. The United States is aggressively pursuing a WTO agreement for the past 21 months, and Ambassador Barshefsky should be complimented for the agreement that she has negotiated to date; and, hopefully, it will soon be finalized.

While a WTO agreement would present tremendous opportunities for

U.S. workers and businesses, bringing China into the WTO is more than just a matter of market share. China's accession into the WTO would lock China into a rules-based international organization and bring them into the legal framework of the international community through the WTO.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the problems that currently exist in China. I appreciate the efforts of some of my colleagues and remain committed to improving in the area of human rights and trade policy and proliferation.

Since the reestablishment of diplomatic relations with China in 1979, total trade between our two nations has increased from \$4.8 billion in 1980 to \$75.4 billion in 1997. This makes China our fourth largest trading partner. China's economy is growing at an average rate of almost 10 percent a year, making it one of the fastest growing economies in the world.

In order for the United States to remain the dominant economic power in the world, we cannot close the door on the most populous nation in the world. China will continue to have a growing influence on the world's economy. For U.S. businesses and workers to continue to prosper and grow, we need continued economic engagement with China by renewing Normal Trade Relations.

In addition to today's important vote, we must move swiftly and finalize a WTO agreement that will bring China into the international trade community. The United States has been aggressively pursuing a WTO agreement for the past 21 months, and while an agreement has not been finalized, the deal currently on the table presents tremendous market opportunities for all sectors of the U.S. economy including agriculture, information technology, financial services, and manufacturers. Ambassador Barshefsky and her negotiating team are to be commended for their extraordinary efforts in reaching this unprecedented agreement.

As a member who represents the nation's number one agricultural district, I want to thank the Administration for negotiating an agreement that presents tremendous opportunities for U.S. producers. With respect to agriculture, high Chinese tariffs on nearly all agricultural products would be reduced substantially over the next four years. It is projected that by the year 2003, 37 percent of the world food demand will come from China. America ranchers and farmers are the most efficient and competitive in the world. The WTO agreement on the table would move to level the playing field and allow U.S. agriculture tremendous access to the world's largest agricultural market.

And agriculture isn't the only sector that would benefit. The agreement would also open Chinese markets to a number of U.S. industrial products and services including information technology products, automobiles, insurance and financial services. Quotas on information technology products would be reduced from 13.3 percent to zero, and China would agree to adhere to the Information Technology Agreement negotiated in 1996. In addition, the agreement offers U.S. investment in telecommunications and entertainment for the first time, and would subject China to

WTO requirements on intellectual property protection to ensure respect for U.S. copyrights, trademarks and patents. Automobile tariffs would be reduced from 80-100 percent to 25 percent. American insurance companies would be able to sell a wide range of products throughout China, as compared to the current policy that limits life insurance sales to Shanghai and Guangzhou. And American banks would be able to operate anywhere in China.

In addition to tariff reductions and other market access agreements, bringing China under the umbrella of the WTO would make China accountable for its trade practices and subject to WTO enforcement actions.

I support the Administration's policy, and am encouraged by recent reports that negotiations will resume in the near future. In spite of the recent strains place on our relationship with China, it is in our overwhelming interest to finalize a WTO agreement and maintain our policy of economic and political engagement. A policy of continued engagement is the most effective tool we have to protect our national security interests and promote our economic political ideals.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the problems that currently exist in China, and I appreciate the effort of some of my colleagues in remaining committed to improvements in the area of human rights, trade policy and proliferation. However, I strongly disagree with the philosophy of isolation and disengagement, and believe it would be a mistake to disapprove the extension of NTR.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), a new member of the Committee on International Relations, a strong voice for America's values and American security.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 57, which was commendably introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) in direct defiance to the Jackson-Vanik waiver renewed by the President on June 3.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to address an issue that we characterize as normal trade status, normal trade relations, and we want to extend it.

The implications, of course, going along with that phrase "normal trade status," "normal trade relations," would be that something good is happening as a result of it and, therefore, we want to continue it, normal trade relations. But in reality, Mr. Speaker, nothing good is happening as a result of having these trade relationships with China.

Now, we in fact do not export very much and as a matter of fact every year it gets worse. The amount of products that we actually export from the United States to China is relatively small. A variety of reasons: The Chinese, of course the government keeps a number of obstacles in place to prevent us from actually exporting our merchandise. And beyond that, of course, there is no market.

Relatively few people in China can buy anything when the at average income is \$600 a year. That is one problem.

On the other side, of course, we do import a great deal from China; and we say that this is a good thing because we can import products that are cheaper, our consumers can buy cheaper products.

Well, it is absolutely true that we can buy cheaper products from China. It is much more difficult for American workers to compete with workers in China because, of course, workers in China, for the most part, are not paid anything. They are, in fact, slave laborers.

A recent South China Morning Post article stated, China directory contains detailed financial information on 99 labor camps with annual commercial sales of \$842 million to the United States.

In other words, we import almost a billion dollars of slave labor products, slave labor produced products. How proud does that make my colleagues feel?

Vote for the amendment.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), our distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the continuation of normal trade relations between the United States and China.

There is no doubt that China has, in fact, been a significant factor in the economic expansion we have all enjoyed in this country during the 1990s.

In my own district, in Cincinnati, Ohio, we have almost doubled our exports to China during that time period. That means more jobs for my constituents, more prosperity for the families and businesses that I represent in southwest Ohio, and a healthy economy for my area, for the State of Ohio, and indeed for the entire country.

China is far from perfect. The lack of respect for human rights, the findings of the Cox report, the situation in Taiwan and other issues are serious problems. But none of these problems can be solved by disengagement.

In fact, our involvement with China, our engagement with China is one of the major reasons that the Chinese Government is continuing to stumble and lurch in the right direction with regard to liberalizing their economy in particular, but also relaxing restrictions on human rights, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PRITS) pointed out a moment ago based on the testimony of missionaries who are in China.

Mr. Speaker, today this Congress is presented with a very clear and stark choice. We can choose to be constructive agents for positive change in China by continuing normal trade rela-

tions, or we can choose to be virtual enemies, returning to an antagonistic Cold War style relationship.

I would just ask my colleagues a few questions. Will our Nation's best interests be served by putting the world's most populous country into the rare category of only six countries who do not have normal trading relations, countries like Cuba, Laos, North Korea? Will our Nation benefit by denying NTR status to China when not one of our competitors in Europe or Asia are not likely to follow suit?

Finally, will our children live in a safer and more secure world if we spend the next 50 years in a costly and distracting Cold War in China?

Mr. Speaker, I support continued engagement.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, there is a grotesque quality to this debate. If someone walks into this room, he really does not know whether he is listening to people who favor or oppose extending preferential trade relations with China because almost everybody begins by denouncing the horrendous human rights conditions in China.

Well, they are indeed horrendous. Ten years ago, I put up in my office this poster demonstrating how a single individual with the courage of his convictions stood up to this monstrous, corrupt, communist dictatorship.

Nothing has changed. Nothing has changed. What moral authority this body has, it relinquishes it every year as we debate this issue.

The future of China does not rest with the communist leadership of this country. It rests with the new people who are passionately committed to a free and Democratic vote, are arrested daily, and are persecuted by this rotten dictatorship.

Support the resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALOMAVAEGA) our distinguished colleague and a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. FALOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, although I understand and deeply respect the arguments of my colleagues who believe it is in the best interests of the United States to remove NTR with the People's Republic of China, I must respectfully oppose adoption of the measure before us.

Mr. Speaker, the fact cannot be contested that it is the direct fruit of our policy in China engagement which has been upheld in bipartisan fashion by five administrations since President Nixon.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with my colleagues that China has much more progress to make, especially in the areas of human rights, weapons proliferation, fair trade, and Taiwan's sta-

tus. However, punishing China with NTR removal will not further these meritorious aims.

An economic war with China will result in disengagement with the U.S. I believe this will fundamentally isolate the forces for continued progress and gradual reform in China, while propping up strongmen and hardliners like Li Peng and the PLA leadership who would relish, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity for heightened conflict with our country.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous move at a time when even China is already volatile and extremely unstable both economically and politically.

In the interest of peace and stability for the people of China, people of the United States, and the peoples of the Asia-Pacific nations, I urge our colleagues to consider carefully the ramifications of H.J.Res. 57 and vote against this measure.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a man who served in Vietnam and a man who represents many military personnel deeply concerned about the security of our country.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Let us kind of review the bidding here. China has stolen American nuclear secrets. China has used hard American dollars that we have sent them pursuant to this trade loss that we experience with them every year to buy missile cruisers from Russia which have one mission, and that mission is to kill American aircraft carriers.

China has proliferated the components for weapons of mass destruction to terrorist nations which have a stated goal of using those weapons of mass destruction on America.

A lot of my friends have talked about this policy of engagement. And yet what do we see in terms of China's real view of the United States? I think China's view of the United States is one that is seen through a very cynical lens. They view America's policy toward China as being one that is driven by corporate greed. And because of that, they see no reason to change their policy in any of the very important areas where we would like to see a change of policy because they feel that America's real goals, our goals of trying to secure the world, our goals of trying to help our friends and allies, some of whom are threatened by China, will always be superseded by what they view as corporate greed.

Let us prove them wrong. Let us pass Rohrabacher.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending normal trade relations with China and in support of keeping open the lines of communication and the doors through which we not only trade goods and services but also promote ideas and sell democracy.

The House should soundly defeat this resolution.

For many, China's spying and its poor record on human rights are reason enough to pass this resolution. But, it's not enough. And it would be counter-productive. Ignoring and trying to punish this country of 1 billion accomplishes nothing but further isolating the very people we want to help. And we risk jeopardizing a peaceful relationship with a country emerging as a world superpower.

The lines of communication and trade must stay open. It is through them that the power of American ideals, such as respect for the individual and the importance of individual freedom, can be shared. I will agree with many of my colleagues who have taken the floor today to call this a vote about abortion, but I disagree that a vote for this resolution is a pro-life vote. I want to keep open the means we have to touch those lives and let those poor people know there is a form of government that would never allow coerced abortions and force sterilizations upon its citizens.

By engaging China, we have and do make a positive difference. Change has been slow in China, but change will continue only with our continued input and influence.

No less important are the benefits to Americans of NTR. We must consider what denial of NTR will do for our exporters, especially US farmers and ranchers. We're in the depths of a price crisis in agriculture. Our producers haven't received prices this low for decades. Closing off even one trade avenue would only worsen the situation, and it would have only a negligible affect on China's behavior.

By 2003, China will account for 37 percent of the world's food demand. That's a lot of mouths to fill. With China's growing middle class and their growing demand for our superior products, this presents a tremendous opportunity for US producers.

I urge my colleagues, please don't "cut off our nose to spite our face" with China. Our farmers and ranchers need this market, and the people of China need our ideas and support if they are to bring about change in their government and in their lives. Let's keep the doors open.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to disapproving normal trade rela-

tions status for the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has had some serious issues with China: China's abysmal human rights record, its alleged attempts to influence the White House by way of illegal campaign contributions, its theft of our military secrets.

□ 1330

These are legitimate points of concern between our nations. But supporters of this resolution are wrong to state that these issues are connected or can be somehow corrected by revoking normal trade relations with China.

Let me repeat what has been said many times before. Engaging China through trade does not constitute an endorsement of China's actions or policies. As Secretary of State Madeleine Albright correctly stated in a letter to Congress, "Revoking normal trade relations would do nothing to encourage the forces of change in China. It would not free a single prisoner, open a single church, or expose a single Chinese citizen to a new idea. It would seriously disadvantage America's growing economic interest in China, rupture the overall United States-Sino relationship, and place at risk efforts to bring China into the rules-based international community."

I would hasten to add that revoking normal trade relations with China would also jeopardize thousands of American jobs and would dramatically drive up prices for American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the most constructive step Congress can take today to fortify our Nation's political ideals and economic foundation is to say "no" to renewing China's "special" trade status. There is nothing "normal" about China's trade relationship with the United States today. It is astoundingly abnormal, with gigantic and growing trade deficits.

This year it will amount to over \$60 billion more of Chinese goods coming into this country than our exports allowed into their nation; over half a million lost jobs in the United States; China, now the second largest holder of U.S. dollar reserves and buying political influence around the world with that money, restructuring their markets and transshipping goods through Japan here to the United States.

All I can say is our ancestors in the Kaptur and Rogowski families came to this country for freedom. They were freedom lovers. They were opportunity lovers. I refuse to be a placeholder in this Congress for Chinese state monopolies or the Communist Party, and I am certainly not going to be a

placeholder for some of the largest multinationals on the face of the globe who merely want to make profits off the backs of those who work as slaves.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 57 which would cut off normal trade relations with China.

We have heard a number of bad things that have been occurring in China and certainly all of us would concur that they are bad and they must change. But there are, I think, a number of issues that have to be raised before we deal with the issue of normal trade relations and decide what we should do with a country as large and as important as China.

I respect the point of view of my colleagues who have expressed support for this resolution, especially the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) who have been so adamant on this issue and so in many ways responsible in what they have done. We must change that trade imbalance that we have with China. That is not tolerable. The human rights conditions in China must improve. We all know that. And the piracy of American ingenuity, our intellectual products, whether it is our films, our music, we must protect all of those things from piracy that we see going on in China. But you cannot negotiate and you cannot settle anything if you are not willing to sit down at the table with folks. You have to engage. There is no way we can ever deal with the piracy issues, the human rights issues, the issues of the trade imbalance, if we are not willing to sit down with the Chinese and say, "This is where we need to go together." It would be foolish for us to just all of a sudden break.

Are the Europeans, any European country breaking relations with China on economic matters? Are the Asians, any Asian country breaking economic relations with China? Are the Latin Americans, any Latin American country breaking relations with China because of the issues that we have raised here that are of concern to all of us? Not a one. Not one country that is part of the WTO has said, "We're going to treat China the way this resolution would have the U.S. treat China."

How would we want to unilaterally try to do this and hope to accomplish anything, whether on human rights, on trade, on piracy, if we are not willing to sit down and talk to either friend, foe or otherwise? We must be there at the table to try to get from them something. Otherwise, they are going to treat us the way we would treat any other enemy, like someone they do not need to deal with.

What about all the jobs in places like Los Angeles? We must protect those as well. At the end of the day it is better for us to engage and treat these folks like people we would sit down with rather than as economic pariah.

I urge Members to vote against this resolution.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would like to remind the Members exactly what we are debating here. We are debating not whether or not we are ever going to talk to China again. We are not talking about cutting all relations or isolating China. We are talking about whether or not China should continue to have huge tariffs on our products while we let them flood their products into our country with low tariffs on their products while they keep our products out of their country with high tariffs.

We are also talking about whether or not our businesses that shut down factories here, whether those businessmen should be able to get taxpayer support, subsidies for their loans in setting up factories over there to use slave labor. Those are the issues we are talking about today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, somewhere in America today, someone who served honorably in the American Armed Forces will be denied care at a Veterans' Administration hospital for lack of funds. Twelve thousand young soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines will continue to be eligible for food stamps because of lack of money. Military retirees who served our country honorably for 20 years will be told you can no longer go to the base hospital for lack of money.

Yet this Congress today will vote whether or not to give the Communist Chinese a \$20 billion tax break so they can continue to enjoy a \$60 billion trade surplus with our country which they will use to build the weapons, the technology of which they stole from us over the past decade.

That is what it is all about. No one wants to say it. This is a \$20 billion tax break for the most repressive government on this earth. A "yes" vote says that, "No, we're going to treat you the way you treat us and charge you what you charge us." A "no" vote is a \$20 billion tax break for the Communists.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in opposition to this resolution and in support of free trade.

Mr. Speaker, the reason a country engages in free trade is not altruism—we do not encourage trade and low tariffs for the benefit of a trading partner. Even if the reciprocal country does not lower its tariffs we can still benefit.

Open and free trade with all nations, short of war, should be pursued for two specific reasons. One, it's a freedom issue; the right of the citizens of a free country to spend their money any way they see fit, anywhere in the world. And two, free trade provides the best deal for consumers allowing each to cast dollar votes with each purchase respecting quality and price. The foreign competition is a blessing in that it challenges domestic industries to do better. The Japanese car industry certainly resulted in American car manufacturers offering more competitive products.

In setting trade policy we must not assume that it is our job to solve any internal political problems of our trading partners any more than it is their responsibility to deal with our internal shortcomings.

Our biggest problem here in the Congress is that we seemingly never have a chance to vote for genuine free trade. The choice is almost always between managed-plus-subsidized trade or sanctions-plus-protectionism. Our careless use of language (most likely deliberate) is deceitful.

Genuine free trade would involve low tariffs and no subsidies. Export-Import Bank funding, OPIC, and trade development subsidies to our foreign competitors would never exist. Trading with China should be permissible, but aid should never occur either directly or through multilateral banking organizations such as the IMF or World Bank. A true free trade policy would exclude the management of trade by international agencies such as the WTO and NAFTA. Unfortunately, these agencies are used too frequently to officially place restrictions on countries or firms that sell products "too cheaply"—a benefit to consumers but challenging to politically-favored domestic or established "competitors." This is nothing more than worldwide managed trade (regulatory cartels) and will eventually lead to a trade war despite all the grandiose talk of free trade.

Trade policy should never be mixed with the issue of domestic political problems. Dictatorial governments trading with freer nations are more likely to respect civil liberties if they are trading with them. Also, it is true that nations that trade are less likely to go to war with one another.

If all trade subsidies are eliminated, there is less temptation on our part to impose conditions on others receiving our grants and loans.

Before we assume that we can improve the political liberties of foreign citizens, we must meet the responsibility of protecting all civil liberties of our own citizens irrespective of whether it is guaranteeing first and second amendment protections or guaranteeing the balance of power between the states and the federal government as required by the ninth and tenth amendments.

Every argument today for trading with China is an argument for removing all sanctions with all nations including Cuba, Libya, Iran and Iraq. None of these nations come close to being a threat to our national sovereignty. If trade with China is to help us commercially and help the cause of peace, so too would trade with all countries.

I look forward to the day that our trade debate may advance from the rhetoric of managed trade versus protectionism to that of true

free trade, without subsidies or WTO-like management; or better yet, free trade with an internationally accepted monetary unit recognizing the fallacy of mismanaged fiat currencies.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, rejecting this resolution and renewing NTR with China will help to safeguard American security with respect to a potential adversary, will serve American economic interests, and will encourage policies that will allow individual liberty, the rule of law and thus respect for human rights ultimately to flourish in China.

On the security front, NTR and the expanded trade opportunities that it brings in nonmilitarily sensitive goods reduces the likelihood of military conflict between the United States and China. Countries with extensive trade relations are simply less likely to go to war with each other than countries without these ties.

Renewing NTR with China will benefit our economy by expanding U.S. export opportunities and by providing American consumers access to low-cost goods.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, renewing NTR with China will help the Chinese people to liberate themselves from the dictatorship under which they live. Chinese Communist leadership has embarked on, what is for them, a dangerous course. Unlike most other Communist dictatorships this century, Deng Xiaoping chose to open China to foreign investment, limited free enterprise and engagement with the West. His bet was that he could enjoy the economic benefits of capitalism without losing the Communist Party's monopoly on political control.

If we engage China, Deng's successors will lose that bet and the people of China will be the winners of freedom. Freedom is ultimately indivisible and once tasted, Mr. Speaker, it is irresistible. People who enjoy economic freedom will demand political freedom. People who read American newspapers will eventually demand their own free press. People who travel to the United States on business will see the incomparable superiority of freedom and in time demand it for themselves.

I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this is supposed to be about trade, but I also think it might be about a form of genetic engineering. We are taking a gene of the global multinational corporation with its campaign to drive down wages and lower working conditions and knock out workers rights and

we are genetically combining it with a totalitarian Communist government which uses slave labor, violates human rights, attacks religious liberties, tortures children, forces abortions and attacks people who simply want to survive, and the same government is involved in the manufacturing of weapons of mass destruction.

Now, this is genetic engineering and we are combining this and we call it normal trade relations. There is nothing normal about this combination. We are talking about creating a Frankenstein. We should go back to the laboratory and work with the living.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment generally on the overall policy that the United States has had with China over the years. I think it is important to note that this is not a Democratic issue or Republican issue. In fact, even in the good will and intentions of the Nixon administration in opening the door to China, we might have misstepped even there.

And so we come to this point where annually we go through a ritual of dealing with a country that seems not to listen. I am troubled in both our debate and what we are requested to do. And so I would like to just offer what I hope as the votes are taken today and as I reluctantly vote to provide the NTR with its continuation, that the American policy, both Republican and Democrats, both this administration and Congress, be focused on action items of what we should be doing.

First of all, I think that it is horrific, of the siege of the American embassy even after the terrible act of bombing of the Chinese embassy in the former Yugoslavia which we apologized, I think we should demand compensation for the U.S. embassy and its consul offices. I believe we should demand, of course, the relationship between Taiwan and China, actively engage in making sure that there is a fairness and an ability to negotiate and not to oppress. I think that we should ensure that there is no transshipment and no dumping along with some of the other issues of slave labor. We have been too meek and mild in our negotiations. And, yes, we did offer a resolution in the United Nations which failed, and I do compliment our administration for doing that, but we should do it over and over and over again. And then we have not been successful in the trade imbalance. What we need to do is to make as part of our key trade efforts, to emphasize small and medium-sized businesses.

The policies with China have been wrong for Democrats and Republicans. It is time for the United States to get some guts and gumption and to do something about it.

I rise today to express my serious concern regarding normal trade relations with China. Opponents of the resolution argue that while China continues to engage in many noxious practices, they believe that revoking normal trade relations is too drastic a step and would most likely prove to be counterproductive.

This year's annual vote on the trade status between the United States and China has drawn more than its usual amount of attention. This year has presented the U.S./Chinese relationship with many obstacles and hurdles to maintaining a normal dialogue between our two nations. We are all more than familiar with the issues in this relationship including:

The trade deficit with China which continues to widen. Second only to Japan, Chinese predatory trade practices have resulted in a trade deficit of an estimated \$60 billion. This trade deficit is growing at a faster rate than that with any other major trading partners.

The unresolved status of Taiwan continues to go unresolved. The Chinese refusal to agree to renounce the use of force continues to alarm its Asian neighbors.

China's slow and often times stagnant pace of reform in the area of human rights. The Chinese seemingly have learned little from the Tiananmen Square massacre; ten years later they continue to hamper pro-democracy efforts and religious freedom.

Chinese efforts to stem the proliferation of nuclear-arms continue to proceed at a snail's pace. They continue to transfer advanced ballistic missile technology to Syria and Pakistan, provides nuclear and chemical weapons technology to Iran, and refuses to comply with the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

In addition to these issues, the United States is still reviewing the ramifications of the Cox Report. We are also still struggling to come to an understanding of the Chinese government's reaction to the mistaken bombing of the China's embassy. The tragic bombing was clearly a mistake and the administration apologized for this mistake but despite these efforts the Chinese government allowed a violent protest to go unchecked and threaten the lives of our embassy personnel.

Opponents of this legislation have stated that the argument over normal trade status is not just about what kind of country China is—it is about what kind of nation we are. I agree with this statement because I believe that we are not a nation who quits in the middle of the race. Our relationship with China is not a sprint but rather a marathon race. A relationship begun in earnest during the Nixon administration, China has continually opened itself largely due to the insistence of the United States.

The stakes in this year's Normal Trade Relations debate are higher than ever. The United States and China are on the verge of a major trade agreement regarding the terms for Chinese accession to the World Trade Organization. Such a breakthrough would open China's markets to American products, companies, workers, and farmers and bring China under global trade rules and enforcement procedures. A strong show of House support for Normal Trade Relations is important to our efforts to complete a World Trade Organization. The China market is particularly important for American agriculture, which is experiencing a

serious economic downturn because of declining U.S. exports to Asia.

Removing Normal Trade Relations would almost certainly remove all hope of reducing the widening gulf between our two nations and building a lasting bridge of communication. In simple dollar and sense terms it will cost Americans both exports and jobs. United States exports to China have tripled over the last decade and supports over 170,000 American jobs.

America's relationship with China will go through many ups-and-downs, just like our relations with every other nation. Difficult issues may require the strong assertion of U.S. interests. But it is vital that the fundamental elements of stable U.S.-China relations remain intact. Revoking Normal Trade Relations or enacting anti-China legislation is not a solution and would threaten America's vital stake in cooperation with China on proliferation, security, and trade. However, the United States must be firm in its relationship with China on its Human Rights abuses compensation for the trashing of the U.S. Embassy in China after the accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy during the Kosovo conflict, the continuing trade imbalance that must end, the dumping of Chinese goods in other countries to avoid U.S. import laws and many other concerns. I reluctantly vote no on this resolution.

□ 1345

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE), a friend of the steelworkers, a man who has sometimes disagreed with me, but always in a very pleasant way, but one who shares our basic values and concern for the working people of our country and his district.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I got here in 1995 and I certainly was no expert in trade matters. So I was persuaded by the proponents of normal trade relations that engaging China would be the way that we could help lower this trade deficit we had, and engaging China was the only way to help China grow and lessen these human rights abuses, and I voted for Most Favored Nation status for China in 1995, and I waited a year, and it got worse. And in 1996 we heard the same arguments over again, engagement was the only way to lower the deficit and improve human rights. And I voted for it again, Mr. Speaker, and it got worse, and the same the following year, and the same last year.

When I got here in 1995, the trade deficit with China was \$33 billion. Today it is projected to be \$67 billion.

I have heard a speaker say that there is no argument about the facts here, only about what the end result is going to be. Well, Mr. Speaker, the facts are this: our engaging China and Most Favored Nation status has not worked.

It is time to try a different approach. This year I intend to vote with the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution, in support of normal trade relations.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific and a member of the Cox Committee, I rise in opposition to the resolution. I strongly support the continuation of NTR status for China because it is clearly both in America's short-term and long-term national interests. Continuing NTR is not about granting a favor or a preference to China; it is about acting in our own national interest. That is what this debate is all about. Rather than ranting and raving about problems in human rights and democratic freedoms, I prefer to focus realistically on doing something about them. This is not the right forum for addressing those issues.

Mr. Speaker, ever since President Nixon traveled to China, U.S. policy has sought to promote a stable and peaceful Asia where America's trade interests could be advanced without sacrificing security. Successive administrations have made expansion of trade relations and economic liberalization key tenets of our China policy. The goal is not only to expand U.S. trade, but also to provide a means of giving China a stake in a peaceful, stable, economically dynamic Asian Pacific region and pulling that country into an international community.

Overall, this responsible approach has been successful despite the increasingly problematic nature of Sino-American relations. It has protected not only our own national interests, but also those of our friends and allies.

The U.S. has convinced nearly every other country in the region that the best way to avoid conflict is to engage each other in trade and close economic ties. Abandoning this basic tenant of our foreign policy with respect to China would be a serious shock and would be an extraordinary setback for much of what our Nation has been trying to achieve in the entire Asian Pacific region. Mr. Speaker, it would send many countries scrambling to choose between China and the United States.

Finally, remember that it is certainly premature to view China as an enemy or an adversary, although we can make it our adversary if we adopt a policy of trying to isolate and ostracize China.

There is perhaps no more important set of related foreign policy issues for the 21st century than the challenges and opportunities posed by the emergence of a powerful and fast-growing China. However, today we are not having a debate focused on those important challenges. Instead, we are debating whether to impose 1930s Great Depression-

era Smoot-Hawley trade tariffs on China that the rest of the world and China know for our own American interests we realistically will never impose.

This particular annual debate has become highly counterproductive; it is very damaging to Sino-American relations with almost no positive results in China or in our relationship with that country and its people. It unnecessarily wastes our precious foreign policy leverage and seriously damages our Government's credibility with the leadership of China and with our allies. It hinders our ability to coax the Chinese into the international system of world trade rules, non-proliferation norms, and human rights standards. Moreover, Beijing knows the United States cannot deny NTR without severely harming American workers, farmers, consumers or businesses, or do it without devastating the economies of Hong Kong and Taiwan.

It is true as NTR opponents argue, that ending normal trade relations with China would deliver a very serious blow to the Chinese economy, but the draconian action of raising the average weighted tariff on Chinese imports to 44 percent harm the United States economy as well. China is already the 13th largest market abroad for American goods and the 4th largest market for American agricultural exports. If NTR is denied to China, Beijing will certainly retaliate against the over \$14 billion in U.S. exports to China. As a result, many of the approximately 200,000 high-paying export jobs related to United States-China trade would disappear while the European Union, Canada, Japan, Australia, Brazil, and other major trading nations would rush to fill the void.

Maintaining NTR is crucial to being able to re-engage in negotiations with China on its accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO), negotiations which could result in a much greater opening of China's markets to U.S. agricultural, industrial and service exports. As the pending agreement is export-oriented, it is the American worker, farmer and businessman who benefit from increased sales to China. The agreement would also institute important reforms that reduce the competitive coercion on American businesses to transfer their industrial technology to China or for China to require manufacturing offsets to transfer jobs from the United States to China.

Just focusing specifically on agriculture for a minute, it is certainly worth remembering that the American Farm Bureau has called China "the most important growth market for U.S. agriculture in the 21st century." The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that, over the next decade, 75 percent of the growth in American farm exports will be to Asia, of which half will come from increased U.S. exports to China. In the China WTO accession negotiations and have been halted but which the Administration quite rightly wants to resume having mistakenly rejected a commercially viable package during Premier Zhu's visit last April, it is China that is making all of the concessions. The United States is not giving up anything. In manufactured goods and service exports, the news was almost all incredibly good. In agriculture, for example, the pork, beef, soybean, corn and wheat markets in China that are essentially closed to Amer-

ican exports today would be opened significantly with tariffs dropping from over 40 percent today down to 12 percent or lower. Indeed, the National Pork Producers Council has called this deal a "grand slam home run."

Revoking the extension of NTR for China would have the effect of scuttling these stalled negotiations during what we hope will be their final phase and jeopardizing the substantial benefits to American exports and jobs a new trade agreement and China's accession to the WTO promise. Revoking NTR would turn our grand slam home run into a dismal strike-out. Rejecting NTR status for China is self-evidently neither in our short term nor our long term national interest.

Some have advocated the revocation of NTR status for China in order to punish Beijing for its espionage operations against the United States. As one of the nine members of the bipartisan Cox Select Committee (Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China) which investigated and reported on Chinese espionage, and as a former counter-intelligence officer in our military, this Member adamantly rejects such linkage. The United States has been and will continue to be the target of foreign, including Chinese, espionage. We should have expected China to spy on us, just as we should know that others, including our allies, spy on us. While our outrage at China for spying is understandable, that anger and energy ought to be directed on correcting the severe and inexcusable problems in our own government. Our losses are ultimately the result of our own government's lax security, indifference, naivete and incompetence, especially in our Department of Energy weapons laboratories, the National Security Council and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The scope and quality of our own counter-intelligence operations, especially those associated with the Department of Energy's weapons labs, are completely unrelated to whether or not a country like China has NTR status. Indeed, revoking NTR status for China does absolutely nothing to improve the security of our weapons labs or protect militarily sensitive technologies. However, this feel-good symbolic act of punishment would inflict severe harm on American business and the 200,000 American jobs that exports to China provide. It makes no sense to punish American farmers and workers for the gross security lapses by our own government of which the Chinese—and undoubtedly other nations—took advantage.

We should first remember to do no harm to our own Nation and America's citizens. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this Member is strongly opposed to House Joint Resolution 57 and urgently urges its rejection.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, we currently have a \$67 billion trade deficit with China which equates to the loss of 1 million jobs. It also is lowering real wages for American workers. Should the working people of this country be forced to compete against desperate people who are paid 20 or 30 cents an

hour? Should we continue a policy where corporate America throws American workers out on the street and runs to China and hires those people? I think not.

Let us support this sensible resolution. Let us end the policy which just does not work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

I am not anti-Chinese.

I am not a xenophobe.

I do not want another cold war with China, and I want to see our country do everything it can to establish warm and positive relations with China.

I support this resolution because our current trade policy with China is a disaster. We currently have a \$67 billion trade deficit with China, in a year in which we are experiencing a record breaking \$224 billion overall trade deficit. Economists tell us that for every one billion dollars we have in a trade deficit we lose 17,000 jobs—many of them decent paying manufacturing jobs. That means that our trade deficit with China is costing us approximately 1,139,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned that, over the last 20 years, many of the largest corporations in America have invested tens of billions of dollars in China in the search for very cheap labor. They are not investing in Vermont, New York or Mississippi. They are not hiring young American workers. They are not re-building our manufacturing base. Instead, they are hiring desperate workers in China at 20 or 30 cents an hour to produce products which are then sold in the United States and elsewhere—products not meant for the Chinese market but for the world market.

The result of this whole trend is that corporate profits soar, the average American worker today is earning 12% less in inflation accounted for weekly earnings compared to 1973. In terms of hourly wages, in 1973 the average American worker earned \$13.61. Today, in the midst of this so-called booming economy, that worker is earning \$12.77 an hour—6% less than in 1973. I should also add that that American worker is now working 160 hours a year more than was the case 20 years ago in order to make up for the drop in his or her real wages.

Mr. Speaker, we must stop the race to the bottom. I want to see the people in China and all developing countries improve their standard of living, but we must help that happen in a way that does not hurt American workers. We must not continue to play American workers off against Chinese workers. American workers should not have to compete against the workers in China who are paid extremely low wages, who cannot form unions, who cannot even elect their political leaders.

In fairness to the working people of this country, we must not continue MFN with China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. 57, a resolution to disapprove normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China.

It is clear to see that our trade deficit with China has skyrocketed over the years, and hundreds of thousands of good paying American jobs have been exported. In 1993 we had a \$22 billion trade deficit with China. Last year the deficit was \$60 billion. Thanks to this administration's misguided trade policies, we have traded away good paying American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, over the years we have been bending over backwards for Beijing. I ask the question: Why?

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. J. Res. 57, a resolution to disapprove normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China.

It's clear to see that our trade deficit with China has skyrocketed over the years, and hundreds of thousands of good paying American jobs have been exported. In 1993, we had a \$22 billion trade deficit with China. Last year, the deficit was \$60 billion. Thanks to the Administration's misguided trade policies, we've traded away good paying American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, over the years, we've been bending over backwards for Beijing.

Why?

They need us more than we need them. They need the American market. We have one of the strongest and wealthiest consumer markets in the world. They sell billions of dollars of their products in our market. They need us. They need America. But while they insist we open up more of our markets, they've steadfastly refused to open up theirs.

Then why should we give NTR to China? Supporters argue that by staying engaged with China is the only way we can improve their behavior. But I would ask those supporters, in the last twenty years, have we seen any improvements?

Has China improved their human rights record? No. They're still considered one of the most egregious offenders in the world. They prosecute Christians, throw pro-democracy activists in labor camps and gulags, and promote forced abortions and sterilization.

Has China improved their unfair trade practices? No. They continue to keep out American products by imposing high trade barriers. They dump our shores with their cheap products, but won't allow us to fairly sell American goods in their market. Democratic Taiwan, a little island of only 23 million people, buys more American products than all of Communist China, a huge land mass of over 1.2 billion consumers.

Has China been our friend in the international arena? No. They send spies over to steal our nuclear technology. They continue to threaten their democratic neighbors in the Pacific region. They recently renewed threats to keep Taiwan from declaring itself an independent state. They refuse to join international efforts to control nuclear proliferation. They continue to sell advanced missile technology to rogue nations.

We've given China opportunity after opportunity to show their friendship. We've offered our hand in friendship, but they've refused to take it. They continue to confront us as enemies.

A recent article in The People's Daily, a Communist controlled newspaper in China, the

U.S. was likened to Nazi Germany. Is that the action of a friend?

Mr. Speaker, extending NTR to China is not in line with our strategic interests, and it is not in line with American ideals. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this resolution and against NTR for China.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Rohrabacher amendment, and listening to the arguments that have been made today that suggest we discontinue normal trade relations with China, one of the points that is being made is that we need to send a message to China that we disapprove particularly of some of the reprehensible behavior that appeared to have occurred recently with their government.

I agree we need to send a message to China. They certainly should not be engaged in conduct that is contrary to the very values which we stand for and practice every day. But I strongly disagree that this is the proper means by which to send a message.

This is not just a sense of Congress, this is not just a message. This is a complete collapse of our trade relationship with China.

Listen to what some of the missionaries have said who serve in that country and care very deeply about many of the human rights issues that we have discussed here on the floor of the House today. They have argued for constructive engagement to continue in China.

Let us not set off another trade war just to send a message. The United States trade representative has estimated that it could cost consumers as much as half a billion dollars in increased prices for shoes, clothing, and small appliances if we were to end this trade relationship entirely and set off a trade war.

Now the question has been raised today by a number of very eloquent speakers, what has changed since we have allowed normal trade relations to continue over the years? Where have we seen progress? Well, what is about to change is that we hopefully will have a debate on the floor of the House in just a few months about whether China enters the World Trade Organization, and this will be an incredibly fundamental debate. It will be an opportunity for us to engage China on a broader scale than ever before in an attempt to expose them to our values and to expose them to more people from our country.

A number of us met with the premier of China just a few months ago, and many of us told him that, as we begin to trade more with this country, we invariably will expect more from that country as we expose them to our values, as we exchange more citizens on a regular basis. We believe democracy will be contagious, we believe our values will be contagious because we

think that we stand for many universal truths. That is when constructive engagement really begins to have a dramatic and long term impact, when we begin the debate on WTO accession, and we talk as a Congress about how we are going to use that to really have truly long-term improvement in the lives of the citizens of China regardless of what their government chooses to do and the progress the government chooses to make.

So today let us send the appropriate message which is this is not an endorsement of policies that China is engaged in that we strongly disagree with, but it is a clear recognition once again that a trade war is not in our Nation's best interests and that we should defeat this motion today.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for the moment.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of normal trade relations with China and in opposition to this resolution of disapproval. I have grave concerns about the Chinese Government. Their policy and practice include religious persecution, stealing our national secrets, unfair trade practices, and military intimidation of their neighbors.

Let us be clear. The Chinese government is no friend of the United States or democracy. However, I would subscribe to Ronald Reagan's philosophy on dealing with potential adversaries: contain them militarily, engage them diplomatically, and flood them with Western goods and influence.

Sadly, the Clinton-Gore administration has failed on the military front, is suspect on the diplomatic front; yet on the trade front where Congress has a say, we should not fail. Maintaining normal trading relations is important to the Chinese people, but it is also important to California farmers. These hard-working farmers support 1.4 million jobs in California, have led the Nation in production since 1948. California's agricultural exports to China have risen nearly 50 percent since 1993 and now total over \$2.4 billion annually.

With all these exports to China, California sent an equal amount of American ideals, moral values, and capitalism.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to just take a moment to respond to some comments I have heard here today.

First, we are here to complain about a policy that does not work. To those who say that the trade will lead to human rights, this trickle-down notion, this trickle-down liberty notion

has not worked. So we do not want to start a trade war with China. I am going to tell my colleagues why that is not going to happen.

First of all, though I want to recognize once again that the name has been changed from Most Favored Nation status to Normal Trade Relations, and that the name was not changed to protect the innocent. The human rights violations continue. As we speak, the regime that we want to hand \$67 billion to is rounding up people for their freedom of expression in China.

On the trade issue, here is the item: \$71 billion. So if we threaten to revoke MFN or NTR, whatever colleagues want to call it, the Chinese are not going to walk away. Where are they going to sell 71 billion dollars' worth of goods? They cannot. The same threat that the administration used on intellectual property violations should apply here. So they are not going any place with 72 billion dollars' worth of goods.

I urge my colleagues to vote aye on the resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Chair.

Is there some notion or plan for a quorum call? So we just finish this debate in the next few minutes, and there will be no quorum call?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Then I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At this point a point of no quorum is not in order. The debate will proceed until closing when Members are recognized for closing statements. Members will be recognized in reverse order of opening. First, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER); secondly, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN); third, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK); and, fourth, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

□ 1400

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. It is just like clock work. As spring turns into summer and the throngs of tourists begin their dissent on the Nation's Capital once again, we come to the House floor for what has become an almost ritualistic debate about trade re-

lations with China. Once again, we find ourselves driven to view our trade relations with 1.3 billion people through the narrow prism of a decades-old statute that was not even designed to fit this situation. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to end this kind of debate. If we are ever to develop a truly coherent and a comprehensive policy towards this nation, the largest on the face of this planet, we have to break free from this debate.

Our relationship with China is complex, and it is increasingly important. There are a myriad of issues that are intertwined in this relationship: nuclear proliferation, regional security, the bilateral trade balance, intellectual property protection, religious freedom, the future of Taiwan, Tibet and Hong Kong, and political and economic freedom for the people of China. How can we possibly deal with these complex issues through an annual congressional debate that asks a single question: Should we conduct commercial relations with China on the same basis that we do with other countries?

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to take a step forward with me today. Vote down this resolution of disapproval and join in forging a truly comprehensive policy towards the People's Republic of China.

I believe to my very core that the most important thing we can do for human rights in China is to help bring a rules-based system of trading to that country, and the only certain way we can do this is to get China into the World Trade Organization. We must help those who are reformers in China to help themselves. We must continue to work to bring the rule of law to China. We must strengthen our relationship with our allies by maintaining a strong military presence in that region, and we must be clear and consistent in our message to the Chinese government.

But one thing is clear. This annual debate over whether we will continue our political and economic relations with China is never constructive. It hampers our ability to formulate a comprehensive and effective policy toward the region, and I believe it is time for it to end.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a renewal of Normal Trade Relations. History has shown economic growth to be an effective catalyst for political change. The principles of individual liberty and a freedom embodied in economic liberalization will prevail, but only if we have the political courage to make the right choice to let them flourish, and that means renewing Normal Trade Relations with China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, last year legislation overhauling the Internal

Revenue Service included a provision changing the term Most Favored Nation trading status to Normal Trade Relations. Apparently, supporters of MFN for China decided that changing the name would make this debate go away. The debate is the same. Only the names have been changed in order to protect the guilty.

And make no mistake about it, the People's Republic of China is guilty. They are guilty of stealing American nuclear weapons secrets. They are guilty of proliferating weapons of mass destruction around the world. They are guilty of gross violations of human rights. They are guilty of a wide array of unfair trade practices. China has already been convicted in the court of public opinion. The question is, what is this Congress going to do in response to China's reckless behavior? Are we going to extend Normal Trade Relations for another year, or are we going to stop business as usual until China reforms its ways?

Let us look at Beijing's proliferation rap sheet. They refuse to join international efforts to stem proliferation of nuclear arms, continue to transfer advanced ballistic missile technology to Syria and to Pakistan; and they provide nuclear and chemical weapons technology to Iran, and they refuse to comply with the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. The Central Intelligence Agency has reported in February of this year that China remains a key supplier of technology inconsistent with nonproliferation goals.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing that will really make them reexamine this behavior is if this Congress actually denies them Most Favored Nation, Normal Trade Relations. Let us not forget that we already have a \$60 billion trade deficit with them. Only Japan exceeds it, and that will not last for long. They continue to engage in proliferation activities; they continue to engage in human rights violations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this disapproval motion.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, in an imperfect world, we do not have the choice of dealing with perfect nations. Certainly, China is far from perfect as a nation, as are we, and I must admit I am especially bothered by recent detentions in China, and I hope the Chinese know that this Congress is sensitive to those detentions.

But we have a choice today. It is engagement, or it is isolation. Let us see how that has worked in other circumstances. We chose isolation in the case of our dealings with Cuba. What has happened? Thirty-eight years later Castro is in power. Let us choose engagement and look at that and its track record. We chose to engage the former Soviet Union. Today, they are a

democratic nation, struggling with an economy, albeit, but a democratic nation.

The choice today is not dealing with perfect nations; it is a choice between isolation and engagement. I would suggest that the policy of engagement with China, as important of a nation as it is, makes sense for America and the world in the 21st century.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) to be used for yielding on his side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the joint resolution and in opposition to the extension of MFN to China.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and in opposition to the extension of normal trade relations with China.

Our agricultural economy is in a desperate situation and we need to move to improve access to international markets. But China has had years to prove that it is a viable market for American agricultural products and has failed to do so.

Despite years of engagement and normal trade relations, our trade with China has been going backwards and we still face severe roadblocks in agricultural goods.

Let's review some of the supposed benefits the United States has realized from normal trade relations:

- Our overall trade deficit had increased from \$6.2 billion in 1989 to \$56.9 billion in 1998.
- The average Chinese tariff on agricultural imports is 40%.
- Some agricultural commodities are assessed tariffs greater than 100%.
- Agricultural exports to China have actually decreased by nearly \$100 million since 1989.

Such a deal! I am sure those that claim trade benefits from this relationship have some "lake front" property in the Gobi desert for us too.

I believe we must increase our access to international markets for a variety of agricultural commodities, especially meat like pork.

Like many of my colleagues and my constituents, I am concerned about the future of America's pork industry. China is a huge potential market—there are more than one billion people in China and they consume vast quantities of pork.

Well, let's take a look at how this market has treated the American pork industry under normal trade relations:

Chinese pork production in 1997 was 42.5 million metric tons compared to the 7.8 metric tons produced in the U.S. How can we expect to increase our pork exports to this market that produces 6 times the amount of pork we do when there are agricultural barriers in place?

U.S. pork exports to China in 1997 totaled only 150,000 metric tons—less than 2% of our domestic production.

Overall pork and swine exports to China in 1998 amounted to only \$6.5 million dollars.

Some point to recent reductions in agricultural tariffs on certain products as an indication of Chinese capitulation. Yet, they fail to note that China continues to implement several non-tariff trade barriers.

The U.S. Trade Representative reported this year that China still conducts import substitution. In other words, the Chinese government can and does deny permission to import foreign products when a domestic alternative exists, or, given their closed society, whenever they want.

Look at the numbers I just cited: China produces a lot of pork. NTR will not alter this competitive structure.

Normal trade relations have not altered these protectionist policies and will not promote changes in the future.

Years of normal trade relations have not resulted in a significant reduction in trade restrictions. Normal trade with China has not resulted in a better trade relationship.

Instead, China has sold us a bill of goods in which realization of potential markets remains perpetually around the corner.

The result has been an increase in our trade deficit with a Communist regime.

Let's think about that. We can argue the benefits and detriments of trade with China all day. But we also need to consider that this Communist government spied on American nuclear facilities.

They stole vital American nuclear secrets. They have the capability to strike American soil with nuclear weapons!

How can we reward such actions with Most Favored Nation trading status. That's right—we may have changed its name, but the impact is the same—Most Favored Nation.

What kind of message do we want to send to the international community? We can send one of two messages:

"Steal from us, threaten your neighbors and violate your people's basic human rights and you will reap the benefits of American capitalism."

Or, "Play by rules, respect the security of your neighbors and preserve the rights of your people, or feel the consequences of your actions."

Let's send the right message. That America will not be violated or manipulated.

I urge my colleagues to vote against rewarding this country with preferential trade status and vote for House Joint Resolution 57.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), the distinguished chairman of the Cox Commission, a bipartisan select committee that was set up to investigate certain national security challenges that we face with Communist China.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to debate the President's waiver of the Jackson-Vanik law, which, by its terms, requires that in order to get low tariff treatment, the People's Republic of China must have fair immigration policies. Yet, having listened

to the debate, I have not heard the substance of Jackson-Vanik come up at all; neither the supporters nor the opponents of this resolution have even mentioned the PRC's immigration policies. Instead, this debate has been cast by the opponents of the resolution as a debate about free trade, and by the supporters of the resolution as a debate about political, economic, religious, civil and other human rights concerns in the People's Republic of China.

If this resolution really were about free trade, if this debate were really about free trade, then I would vote in support of free trade, because it is in America's interests and it is in the interests of all of our trading partners. It is at least arguable that human rights violations are a separate issue from the question of tariff rates on beanie babies being imported into the United States.

Yet, sadly, in order to assure the defeat of this resolution, its opponents are whitewashing the government's record, making extravagant, that is to say the People's Republic of China's record, making extravagant claims about the progress of democracy in China; there is none, or the liberal limbs of certain of China's Communist rulers. That certainly requires a double standard. Or the more favorable economic standards that some Chinese find themselves in now as compared to, say, the time of the cultural revolution. That is a fact, but it is also a fact that the Communist portion of China has an economic product per person that is less than Guatemala's, while the democratic government and people and society in Taiwan buy far more from the United States than all of the PRC and have one of the highest standards of living in the world.

Whitewashing human rights abuses in the PRC, which is what this debate has come to symbolize is not in our Nation's interests, nor in the interests of the people of China. It is for this reason, especially on a vote that is largely symbolic, because the President has already granted this waiver and everyone knows that there will not be a two-thirds vote in the Senate or the House or both to override, so especially on a symbolic vote, I cannot join with the opponents.

The PRC really does deny freedom of speech; the PRC really does deny freedom of thought. The Communist government really does persecute religious groups that it cannot control, and it really has jailed millions of people, prisoners of conscience, in the notorious laogai slave labor camps that Harry Wu has so courageously documented.

Last year, President Clinton signed a law passed by this Congress that required the Secretary of Defense to send us a list of People's Liberation Army-controlled companies operating in the United States. The administration is in violation of that law; they have been

for half a year. What that means is that the extension of Normal Trade Relations to the People's Republic of China is also an extension of normal trade relations to the People's Liberation Army. I know of no responsible U.S. corporation that wishes this.

This debate and this vote is not about tariff rates. It is about sending a signal to Beijing. I cannot rubber stamp the Clinton policy towards China, and I am heartened that a big number of Republicans and Democrats today will not do so either.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, this is not a lot of time to debate such a sensitive issue, but I will say this. After having served a mission from my church among the Chinese people, after having learned about their language and their culture and communicating one on one with these people for 2 years in my youthful life, I learned a lot of things, I thought, not only about their society, but about our society. I have learned one thing painfully clear in my life, and that is you never improve any relationship by walking away from it. Right now I think this relationship is at an all-time low and I think both sides have some culpability in that situation.

But I will say this: the last speaker was right on. There are human rights violations, there are problems with Taiwan, there are nuclear nonproliferation problems. But I will say this as well: when it comes to the espionage issue, I do not fault China nearly as much as I do this administration for falling asleep at the switch. Let us not try to penalize China what we should take out on this administration for not doing its job. Let us not close the door on a lot of people who would like to be able to open up their doors to Christianity, and they would not get that opportunity, I believe, if we revoke MFN. Please, let us vote against this measure.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 11 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) has 2 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 5½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 6½ remaining.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is important that we recognize that in a community of nations, there are going to be differences between nations. And in fact, the differences between our Nation and China represents a fundamental difference in the political system where we honor representa-

tive government; in the economic system, where we recognize the value of capitalism and free markets; and in the value system that underpins our society where we recognize the fact that we answer at the end of the day to a higher being. Frankly, the Chinese reject all of that. They do not share our political objectives; they do not share our political system; they do not share our economic system; and they do not share our value system.

□ 1415

Does that mean we should totally isolate them and walk away? The answer is no. But in the course of relations, there are times when we will get along better than when we will not get along.

But the problem has been that the Chinese continue to engage in proliferation, including recent reports that involve proliferation of sensitive technology to the North Koreans, of all nations of the world, that perhaps provides for us the most complicated set of problems. Yet, the Chinese have proliferated to the North Koreans, in addition to other nations in the world.

Secondly, they have stolen our secrets. And to blame us for the fact that they stole our secrets I think is really the wrong way to pinpoint the problem. The fact is that nations should not be engaging in stealing of secrets, which violates fundamental values.

Thirdly, they have engaged in constant abuse of human rights.

Finally, their recent relationship and difficulties with Taiwan.

This all underscores the fact that because they do not share our political system, our economic system, or our value system, now is not the time to reward them. This is a down time between U.S. and China.

Does it mean it is the end of the road? Of course not, because they live on the same street where we live. But just like when we have a neighbor that breaks the fundamental rules of the neighborhood, it is necessary for Nations to punish other countries that do not share their values, and break the fundamental rules and values that have been established in the neighborhood.

Accept this resolution. It will do this country well, and it will send an important message to the entire world.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. I have listened to some of my colleagues today who want to revoke normal trade relations status for China. I, too, am deeply concerned that top nuclear secrets were stolen from U.S. nuclear labs, but I blame the United States more than I blame China. In my judgment the Clinton administration failed to understand the fundamental difference between promoting a strong

business relationship with China and maintaining a strong strategic military advantage with that Nation.

The distinguished Cox Report counsels changes in our counterintelligence and military security, but it does not call into question our business relationship with China. I continue to support maintaining normal trade relations with China, not favored, but normal relations.

We should not give up on trade relations between our two countries. A nation cannot have a prosperous free market economy without educating its citizens. The more educated a country's citizens become, the more they will demand an open society and freedom. Only through economic and social engagement will this transformation truly take place making, China, the United States, and the world a better place.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 57, which would revoke normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China. I fully recognize the emotional content of the debate today.

Some have characterized this as a debate about whether China has violated human rights and whether China has much of a defensible record on religious freedom, or whether they have much of a progressive record towards democracy. But I readily concede, and I think most people who stand in opposition to the resolution readily concede that China does not have a sterling record on any of these items. In fact, it has an abysmal record.

But this is really a debate as to whether the denial of normal trade relations will have much of an effect on any of these matters. Closing the door to the PRC, and in de facto punishing it with high tariffs, is not the answer to alleviating human rights conditions there or preventing espionage in the future. This is just simply too simplistic.

The United States is already tied to the rest of the globe in a sophisticated and integrated tapestry of economic, political, and social coexistence. We need to maintain our policy of engagement with China.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 57, which would revoke Normal Trade Relations (NTR) with the People's Republic of China (PRC).

Closing the door to the PRC and de facto punishing it with high tariffs is not the answer to alleviating human rights conditions there or preventing espionage in the form of stealing nuclear secrets. This so-called solution is too simplistic a plan. The fact is the United States is already tied to the rest of the globe in a sophisticated and integrated tapestry of economic, political and social co-existence. This punitive act will only serve to harm our interests in global commerce and leadership. What evidence do we have that suspension of NTR

would lead to a conciliatory PRC ready to bend at the will of American morality and ethics? None. On the other hand, free traders and many observers will attest that NTR suspension will backfire on the United States guaranteed. A minimum of 400,000 American jobs, which depend on exports to the PRC and Hong Kong, will be threatened. In addition, Asia's recovery from the Asian financial crisis will stall and further hurt American businesses and workers. Our economic competitors would be more than eager to supplant the United State's position as one of the PRC's largest trading partners. It takes little genius to realize that the phenomenon that has protected the United States from the Asian crisis has been our aggregate consumption. This measure would be sure to stymie this indeed.

The political ramifications of suspending NTR with the PRC are clearly negative. There is the very real threat of hard-line PRC leaders coming to the fore as feelings of American attempts to ostensibly contain the PRC are heightened. In addition, our ASEAN and Asian allies fear that political instability in the PRC will mean instability in the Asia-Pacific region. Americans living in the continental United States may feel insulated from the turmoil in the Asia-Pacific, but for the Americans living in the area, such as the residents of Guam, this threat of tumult, whether economic or political, is very real. While the rest of America rode on an economic high during the height of the Asian financial crisis, Guam experienced an economic depression which has catapulted our unemployment level to 14% today.

I am fully in support of improving the lives of PRC citizens, which includes greater democracy, respect for human rights, and regional stability, but suspending NTR is not the way to do it. Engaging the PRC is the answer. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.J. Res. 57 in the interests of all Americans.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, as the first Chinese American to serve in this House, as a high technology and international trade attorney, I have a special responsibility in this debate. I thank my colleagues for the honor of speaking now.

This debate is not about engagement, because we all believe in engagement; but not just business engagement, because the business of America must be more than just business, and engagement must be through more than just the cash register. This debate is about how we view the Chinese people and about how we view ourselves.

Cash register engagement views the Chinese people as just workers and consumers, 2 billion strong arms to do our work, 2 billion legs to wear American jeans. Full engagement recognizes that Chinese people are people like us, people with hopes and aspirations, aspirations to walk the path of freedom that we have blazed.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what this debate is really about. It is about who we

are as a free people, what are our values, what does this Congress stand for; our integrity as individuals. Can we live up to the legacy of our forebears, those in this Congress who swore themselves to liberty, and in so doing, pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor?

In this debate, in this debate I would like to address three groups.

First, to the Chinese people, so rich in culture and history and heritage, I encourage them to strive not just for prosperity but for freedom, also, because if they achieve prosperity, their children will thank them. But if they achieve both prosperity and liberty, their children will view them the way that I view my parents, as ordinary people who rose to extraordinary challenges. And in rising to these great challenges, they became giants of their era. Just as I measure each day what I achieve against what my parents achieved in their era, their children will measure themselves against the legacy of freedom and prosperity that they can leave them. Rise to the challenge of history.

To the people of Oregon, those who have honored me back home with the greatest honor that an immigrant boy who came to this country not being able to speak English could ever hope to have, to represent them in this Congress, I know that we have a trade-dependent State, but they and I understand that the business of America must be more than just business.

We understand that those who came West, whether they came West across the ocean in creaking wooden ships or whether they came West across the prairie in creaking wooden wagons, they came West not just to get rich, they came West to be free.

Oregonians expect to be represented by men and women of conscience. Join me in my vote of conscience today. Stand with me and stand with our forebears.

Finally, to my colleagues in this Chamber, they know what it means to cast this vote in a trade-dependent district, but I ask them to stand with me and to stand with our forebears who put their lives, their liberties, and their sacred honor on the line. Stand with me, and stand with all those who would walk the path of freedom with us.

For the past 10 years we have strayed from the path of liberty. Through two administrations we have listened to the siren song of the cash register. We have walked into a moral wasteland. What has it gained us but 10 years of growing trade deficits, \$60 billion in an annual trade deficit, more Chinese prisoners of conscience than ever?

We can change this with a vote today. Let me make this perfectly clear. If Members take away nothing more than this from this debate, know this, that with our vote today we can

make one of the clearest differences of our congressional service. When we take this voting card and we insert it into that slot, when we insert it into that slot, we are literally reaching into the deepest, darkest dungeons ever built by man. When we face that red button and that green button, we can literally set people free by choosing that green button, because years ago, 6 or 7 or 8 years ago when the vote was close in this Chamber, the government in Beijing would set people free every single year in order to affect the vote in this Chamber. By choosing the green button, we can set people free today.

For us, it is merely a choice between two buttons, green and red. For our forebears, it was their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honors. Because of their sacrifice, we have an easier choice today. Choose the green button. Choose freedom today.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Seattle, Washington (Ms. DUNN), who will be hosting the WTO ministerial this fall.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, by a previous agreement, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution and in support of our continuing policy of engagement through normal trade relations with China.

The open exchange of goods and services has been a critical component of fostering understanding between nations for centuries. Creating an environment of normal relations and ongoing engagement only serves to lower the walls of fear and suspicion while building a spirit of cooperation through joint venture.

Make no mistake, our relationship with China is complex and evolving, a road filled with obstruction. We have legitimate concerns about nuclear proliferation: our own security protection, the security of Taiwan and the rest of the region, and human rights.

So what should be our objective with China with respect to trade relations? I believe that liberalized trade with a Communist society in the process of opening itself up to the community will some day deliver to our trading partners our most precious gift, and that is the gift of freedom.

There is important work being done in China by western groups attempting to fan this flame of democracy. The National Endowment for Democracy and the International Republican Institute are just two such groups sowing the seeds of freedom inside China. Ned Graham, a resident of my home State of Washington and son of evangelist Billy Graham, has been very successful

in spreading the message of religious freedom in China.

His group, Eastgates, International, has distributed 2.5 million Bibles in China since 1992. According to Mr. Graham, he can communicate freely with his contacts in China because of the proliferation of information exchange technology, a development that has been made possible by trade and economic reform.

Continuing normal trade relations with China, the United States' fourth largest trading partner, will only serve to build on this success. I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

□ 1430

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the honorable chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, by prearrangement, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of my friends for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a debate between those who care about national security and the security of our Nation's labs and those who care about trade. In fact, national security is our number one priority and should continue to be. In a bipartisan way, we are going to work to address that.

At the same time, we can not ignore the very important issues of human rights and of religious persecution. Mr. Speaker, I will take a back seat to no one when it comes to raising concerns about those human rights issues.

Ten years ago this summer, I joined with my colleagues marching to the Chinese Embassy to protest the Tiananmen Square massacre. Just last week, I met with family members of the Falun Gong religious movement whose relatives are being persecuted in China.

The fact of the matter is, our national interests are best served by maintaining commercial relations with our fourth largest trading partner and an emerging power in the Pacific. The key fact today is that the very same market reforms that underpin our vibrant commercial relationship have been the single most powerful force for change in the 5,000-year history of China.

Now, in the last 2 decades, China has undergone a remarkable transformation. I should say to my colleagues who have raised the issue of Taiwan that, 2 decades ago, in Taiwan, there was a very repressive regime. Yet, we maintain commercial relations, and that was key to bringing about democratization.

So in the last 2 decades, if we look at China, it has, in fact, undergone a remarkable transformation driven by

market-based economic reforms and an open door to trade and foreign investment. Now this transformation is changing Chinese society and accelerating progress towards increased personal freedom, individual economic choice, and access to outside sources of information.

Many thoughtful analysts who study these changes that are taking place in China believe that the best hope for freedom and democracy in China lies along this path of reform.

About 10 days ago, I called professor Harry Rowen at the Hoover Institution who served in the Reagan administration, in fact one of the great experts on China. I asked him if this year's bad news in U.S.-China relations has caused him to change his mind about the long-term prospects for political freedom in China, which he wrote about 3 years ago in "National Interests." While repression is a reality today, it is just as true that we are witnessing several remarkable pro-democratic developments in China.

For the first time in Chinese history, the judicial system gives criminal suspects the same basic rights afforded our system. Forced confessions have been ruled invalid as a means of proving guilt. These reforms have led to a rapid rise in commercial litigation and in cases being brought against the Chinese Government. There are even civil rights lawsuits that exist.

Now, I have been following for years, having served as a board member of the International Republican Institute, the work of that arm of the National Endowment for Democracy. We have been working to bolster freedom in village elections. Thanks to our efforts, we have seen in rural life a whole thrust towards elections. Today 500 million Chinese experience local democracy by voting in competitive village elections where half of the winners have been nonCommunist candidates.

China's Internet users have doubled to 4 million since the end of 1998, and we now have seen just a report this morning that there are going to be 280 million cell phone users there. This is the right thing to do to maintain our commercial ties. I urge a "no" vote on the resolution.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about maintaining commercial relations with Communist China. It is about maintaining the current commercial relations with Communist China. This is not about isolating Communist China or disengaging from Communist China. It will not prevent anybody from talking to Communist China. This is not about banning trade with Communist China or ending trade with Communist China. It is about altering the current rules of the game with trade.

This is about what? H.J. Res. 57 raises tariffs on Chinese goods as long

as they keep their high tariffs and roadblocks to American manufactured products. In other words, it ends the Chinese tariff advantage against our products.

What does it also do? It eliminates the subsidies. This resolution, H.J. Res. 57, would end the trading status which eliminates the subsidies. Our resolution eliminates the subsidies and loan guarantees that are now given to U.S. businessmen to close their factories in the United States and set them up in Communist China in order to take advantage of slave labor. Do we really want to subsidize businessmen this way? This resolution ends that practice.

Yes, it changes the current rules of the game. Under the current system, under those rules of the game where they can have high tariffs against our products, we let them flood their products into our country, and we subsidize the investment of our businessmen in China, in Communist China, to give jobs to their people and put our people out of work, give them the ability to outcompete us with our technology.

Under those rules of the game, we have had a \$70 billion trade surplus. What have they done with that? They have used it to modernize their weapons. With that technology that they stole from us, from our missiles, and our weapons systems, they are using that \$70 billion to build weapons to aim at us and to threaten American cities and threaten the lives of every American person.

Does a government like this deserve normal trade relations? I say no. It is time to change the rules of the game to protect America's interest, America's security.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I feel deeply about the outstanding issues with China. We have had, indeed, a healthy debate. These are the right issues. Unfortunately, this resolution is the wrong answer.

I want to talk about trade and human rights. We have to be concerned about the imbalance of trade as shown on this chart. We have to be concerned about how we integrate a still non-market economy and one that is not based on the rules of law into a system that is based on the rule of law and on free market economy rules. We have to worry about that integration and how it is going to occur.

I very much disagree with those who think it is easy, that we should have just signed on the dotted line when Premier Zhu was here. There were outstanding issues that needed to be resolved, both in terms of market access and also in terms of the role of capital markets and labor markets in China when it is still not anything close to a market-based society.

How are we doing that? The best hope is to negotiate these issues in WTO ac-

cession by China. That is the best way to do it. Are we there yet? No. Can we get there? Perhaps. If we do not, I will vote "no" on permanent NTR. If we make more progress, I could vote "yes".

But look, face it, all of our concern about market issues, about the imbalance here, all of our hopes to, in a rather soon fashion, address these issues will be pulled away from us if we were to pass this resolution. China accession, WTO accession negotiations would come to a careening halt, not only now, but for the foreseeable future. We have got to do the hard work on trade.

I want to say a word about human rights. I feel deeply about this, too. One of my family entered China the day of Tiananmen Square. But, look, this discussion every year is not moving the ball forward. Everybody knows that, if we were to pass this resolution, it would not pass the Senate. If it were ever to pass the Senate, it would be vetoed by the President. We have got to do the hard work on human rights beyond this annual discussion.

So, look, the issues are the correct ones. But we need more than symbolism. We need more than symbolism. We need to do the hard work every day, day-to-day, on these trade issues and human rights issues. In that sense, this resolution is a diversion.

I hope out of this discussion will come a dedication to do WTO China right in the interest of American workers and businesses and on human rights to every day find new mechanisms to express ourselves.

We do not take ourselves seriously enough when we devote ourselves only once in a year. This is an every-year job on trade. It is an every-day job on trade. It is an every-year job on human rights. It is an every-day job on human rights.

Let us roll up our sleeves and do more than symbolism. I urge that we vote "no" on this resolution and then get busy solving the trade and human rights issues that are embedded in our present relationship with China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the distinguished minority leader, to close debate for our side.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I commend the leadership of the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) who has truly been the leader on this issue. I want to commend all of my friends on the other side of the aisle who have also stood and spoken their minds on this issue.

I want to commend the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), a new Member of the House who comes from a district that is heavily dependent on trade. I want to commend his courage in making the statement he made today. He

obviously did it from his heart and his mind, and I really, really admire the statement that he made.

I rise today to ask Members to vote for this resolution. It is clear to me that, on any of the grounds that we must look at, trade, rule of law, human rights, that not only has China not made progress in the last year, in fact, I would say that they are moving in the exact wrong direction that they ought to be moving in.

Let us first talk about trade. In 1988, the year before Tiananmen Square, we had a \$3.5 billion deficit with China. In 1997, it was \$50 billion. This year, it will be \$70 billion. In fact, our exports to China in this year will decline to less than \$14 billion. We export more to Belgium, a country of 10 million people, than we export to China.

Why is this the case? It is the case because we are not allowed to export our items to China. They do not want our goods. They want one-way free trade. They want to support the deficits they have with most every other country in the world with what they can sell to the United States. They want to play us for a sucker because we are willing to let them do it.

If we continue to be willing to let them do what they want to do, the trade deficit with China will be \$100 billion soon, \$140 billion, \$200 billion. How much unfair trade do we want to put up with? It makes no sense.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) says we have to maintain commercial relationships. This much? How much is enough commercial relationship to allow them to make so-called progress? This is ridiculous. There is no common sense in it whatsoever.

Now let us talk about rule of law.

□ 1445

Trade relations depend upon rule of law. Rule of law in China would benefit our businesses. Our business community comes to us and says, when are we going to get intellectual property protected in China? If we do not take a stand ultimately on MFN, how do we expect to get them to accept the rule of law?

A country that arrests people for speaking their minds is not about to protect people's property. A country that seizes political dissidents is not about to protect our property. A country that seizes the assets of foreign corporations is not about to protect our property. If we do not take a stand on MFN, ultimately there is no way to get China to ultimately accept a rule of law and protect our property.

Finally, let me talk about human rights. Abraham Lincoln said that our Declaration of Independence gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world for all future time. The issue of human rights is not just an American issue, it is an issue for every human being in

this world. And the primary reason to take this stand today against MFN for China is because they refuse, right till today, to give their people basic, decent human rights.

We remember Tiananmen Square, but let us fast forward to today. There is a group in China that wants to practice its own form of religious belief, Falun Gong. They are arresting people today who they do not want to express their beliefs. They are arresting people in their own government who are suspected now of allowing the people to carry out these beliefs in China.

Tell me if they are making progress. They are making progress in the wrong direction. When will America stand up and finally say that the human rights we enjoy must be enjoyed by every citizen in this world, including the billion people who live in China.

Today is the day to take that stand. Vote for this resolution. Let us stand for trade, let us stand for rule of law and let us stand, most importantly, for the human rights of the people in China.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Before I get into the thrust of my comments, I think we must all once again be reminded that what this debate is really all about is extending normal trading ties with China for another year.

Normal Trade Relations, or NTR, does not grant some special benefit to the Chinese. Rather, it simply grants the Chinese the same trading status that the U.S. has with most of the rest of the world.

China is our fourth largest trading partner. We exported \$14 billion in goods and services to the Chinese in 1998, which supported over 200,000 high-wage American jobs.

Revoking NTR would push tariffs on Chinese goods from four to 40 percent, resulting in an effective tax increase of nearly \$300 per American family.

I understand and appreciate the concerns opponents of NTR have with the government of the People's Republic of China. I harbor no illusions about the benevolence of the PRC's leadership.

However, I firmly believe that engagement with China offers the best hope for democratic reform there. I have to ask what opponents of engagement hope to accomplish by revoking NTR. To my mind, it would be a step backward.

Again, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution and promote, rather than stifle, positive change in China.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me wrap up by expressing my total commitment to the traditional bipartisan support we have given toward advancing normal trade relations with China, and I am talking about all of our presidents, President Ford, President Carter, President Reagan, President Bush, President

Clinton, all of them; and most recently, in addition, 17 former secretaries of State, Defense and national security advisers, all of whom endorse the wise, prudent policy we have pursued of continuing normal trade relations with China.

Normal trade relations supports U.S. jobs. In addition to that, it maintains our ability to create a positive change in China, paves the way for further trade liberalization, and preserves our security interests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 57.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the resolution which would unilaterally isolate China from the United States. I support Normal Trade Relations with China. I support China being part of the WTO. China will be one of the superpowers in the next millennium. Peaceful coexistence is of benefit to us all.

Now, we all understand that things are not as we would like them in China. But how do we most impact that? I think by engaging them in fair trade, our discourse with China since the close of the cold war has paid dividends. To put our head in the sand and to back away would be ill advised.

I come to the floor today to again express my strong support for continuing Normal Trade Relations with China.

Since I came to Congress in 1991, this debate has gone on every year and every year I have come to the floor to explain how important trade with China is to our farmers.

It is essential that we continue to grant Normal Trade Relations to China. China will be the most important market for the United States in the 21st Century and granting Normal Trade Relation status is the foundation of any typical bilateral trading relationship.

The recent negotiations for China's accession to the World Trade Organization are proof that China is ready to join the international trade community and we cannot pass up this opportunity.

My home state of Illinois is the 6th leading exporter in the United States and over half a million jobs in Illinois rely on exports. The current crisis in agriculture has placed a spotlight on the huge need for increased foreign market access.

USDA has predicted that 75% of the growth in American farm exports over the next 10 years will be to Asia—and China will make up over half of this amount.

China is already America's 4th largest agriculture export market and if the administration will complete the WTO accession agreement our farmers and ranchers will have the level playing field that they have been waiting for.

I urge Members to vote against this resolution of disapproval and urge the administration to complete the bilateral agreement for China's accession to the WTO.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of this debate agree that the Chinese government behaves badly, and does things we don't like.

We agree that we want a future China that is more democratic, more respectful of the rights of its citizens, and a member of the international community that plays by the rules.

We also agree that U.S. policy should promote a better China.

But we disagree on the best way to do that. One side argues that the best way is to punish China for past behavior.

The other side argues that the best way is to engage China to encourage better behavior in the future.

I agree with the latter.

If we approve this resolution, and cut off Normal Trade Relations with China, we can say we have punished China for bad behavior. But will it cause them to release the members of the Fulan Gong religious group? Will it cause them to stop threatening Taiwan? Will it cause them to drop market barriers to our products, and equalize our trade balance? I have not heard a convincing case that, if we withdraw NTR, China will make these improvements we seek.

China has 1.3 billion people. It has a larger landmass than the U.S. We can't push China around. Dictates by our government will have minimal, if any, effect on the degree of freedom and democracy with China. These values are more effectively transmitted to the Chinese people through non-governmental means: business engagement, global financial linkage, cultural and educational exchange, non-governmental organization involvement and, most of all, the Internet.

The United States-China relationship is very complex, and requires careful management and diplomacy. The sledgehammer approach will not solicit better behavior, and will likely backfire on us.

Change in China will not happen overnight. We must be firm and strong in communicating our differences with the Chinese government. But at the same time, we must recognize that long-term change is best nurtured through engagement with the Chinese people.

I urge members to vote against H.J. Res. 57.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my deep concerns with our continued relations with the People's Republic of China. Mr. Speaker, today we must send a crystal clear message to China that their business-as-usual attitude must not continue. On almost every level China is promoting and advocating policies which indicate an unwillingness to negotiate honestly with the United States.

Whether it be on copyright infringement, use of prison labor, religious freedom, military build up, trading of weapons of mass destruction, labor rights, the illegal importation of guns into the United States, espionage against the United States, illegal campaign contributions to United States candidates and general repression of the rights and freedoms of the Chinese People, the government of the Peoples Republic of China must change their policies. They must understand that if we are going to consider their inclusion into the World Trade Organization (WTO) they must make substantial, measurable progress in all of these areas.

As world leaders in commerce and industry and the world's only remaining superpower, we must set the example for the rest of the world to follow on this issue. This afternoon, my good friend the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), spoke on the floor of China seeing the United States as a "paper tiger." That rings of truth. The government of the Peoples

Republic of China will not take our words seriously unless we are willing to back our demands for action and negotiation with concrete actions of our own.

Let me be clear, I do not stand here today advocating for passage of H.J. Res. 57. Passage of this joint resolution would send the wrong message. I voted against H.J. Res. 57 and was pleased that it failed. We should not unilaterally cut off trade relations with China. That is the wrong policy and will only serve to fuel the forces of repression and lawlessness in China. Today I speak for the development of a new relationship with the government of the People's Republic of China. A relationship that rewards positive, measurable actions and penalizes them for double dealing, theft and repression. I call on the Administration to develop new relations with China based on these principles before China's government descends further down the wrong path.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the resolution pending before us today to deny Normal Trade Relations (NTR) Status for the People's Republic of China.

I cast this vote with some reluctance. I do believe that there is value to a policy that engages China—the most populous country in the world and permanent member of the United Nations Security Council—in an effort to move it in the right direction. My vote against the renewal of NTR does not mean that I do not support free trade or the possibility of including China in the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Having said that, however, I continue to be deeply troubled by aspects of Chinese behavior—behavior that in my judgment ought to impede forward progress on the NTR issue. It is because I still have grave concerns about a variety of issues regarding China, that my vote on this bill will remain consistent with my votes in previous years.

First, the revelations of the Cox Report raise profound questions in my mind about the suitability of conferring NTR status on China at this time.

Second, despite commitments by Chinese leaders, China continues to engage in the proliferation of technologies related to weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. Press reports only last week indicated that Chinese companies continue to sell missile technology to North Korea, despite our nation's active efforts to prevent further transfers to that country.

I have also expressed concern in recent years about Chinese companies that are owned by the Peoples Liberation Army (PLA). Legislation I proposed called on the Defense Department to publish the names of Chinese companies exporting products to the United States that are owned and operated by the PLA. Despite this legislation being signed into law last year, this process has not been put into action. The bill also allowed the President to take additional action against PLA-owned companies by doing things like denying these particular companies NTR status. However, the Administration has not taken advantage of this part of the law either.

At this time, the PLA uses U.S.-derived profits to build weapons—weapons that may well be used against the United States. In other

words, the PLA continues to run a number of Chinese companies, and is able to take profits from these companies—who sell their products in the U.S.—and turn around and use these profits to build weapons. Free market capitalism is an admirable objective, but it must be pursued without supporting PLA.

In addition, there are the continuing concerns about religious and human rights in China. The country continues to pursue policies in these areas that warrant condemnation.

The latest saber-rattling over Taiwan is another deeply troubling development in regard to China.

Finally, I am not able to support NTR for China due to the fact that, although we have been voting each year since 1980 to renew NTR, there still has not been a sufficient move toward a balance of trade between the two countries. We continue to maintain a United States trade deficit with China, and over the past decade it has increased from \$6 billion to an expected \$305 billion by the end of 1999.

I am hopeful that consideration of the inclusion of China in the WTO will be the start of a move toward more open access to the Chinese market, and that it will provide a fundamental change in dynamics between the two countries that will result in fair trade practices. While I understand the importance of maintaining trade relations with China, I also think that it is important that our country be on an equal footing with China in regard to trade.

If China were to resume negotiations on entry into the World Trade Organization and reach a bilateral agreement with the United States on the terms of participation, the issue of NTR would merit a thorough reconsideration. In that case, the primary benefit, in my judgment, would accrue to the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 57, which would disapprove the President's extension of Normal Trade Relations—what used to be called Most Favored Nation status—with the People's Republic of China.

Let me stress, I have no quarrel with the more than 1.2 billion citizens of China. They are a good, industrious and honorable people. But, in extending this trading status, we have to ask ourselves: What has the Chinese government—one of the last communist dictatorships on earth—done to deserve it?

The Chinese government's record reads more like an indictment. China flagrantly violates the human rights of its own citizens and internationally recognized labor standards. It fomented anti-American hatred after our clearly accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade. It recently began saber rattling against Taiwan. And it repeatedly has been unwilling to make vital democratic reforms.

Just last week, this House passed a resolution marking the 10th Anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall and the West's victory over communism. Ironically, this past June also marked the 10th Anniversary of the Chinese government's crackdown on the advocates of democracy in Tiananmen Square.

An estimated 5,000 Chinese were killed on June 3 and 4, 1989, when government troops crushed pro-democracy protests. Another

10,000 were injured and hundreds more were arrested.

Has the injustice stopped? Not at all. Over the past few months, the government has once again detained dissidents, handing down sentences of up to four years in prison for “subverting state power, assaulting government, holding illegal rallies, and trying to organize workers laid off from a state run firm.”

And the Washington Post reported this past Sunday that Chinese security forces have rounded up more than 4,000 people in Beijing alone during a massive, nationwide crackdown against the popular Buddhist-based spiritual movement Falun Gong. The government banned the group last week.

At the dawn of the New Millennium, China—in many respects—has barely entered the 20th Century on human rights. And that simply is not acceptable. Nor should it be countenanced by the greatest democracy in the world.

But the human rights and labor standard violations are only one in a series of provocative acts by the Chinese government.

China's recent threats of military action against Taiwan threaten future stability in the region. Although Taiwan's President Lee Teng-hui has retreated on remarks declaring his nation a separate state from the mainland, China has proceeded with “war-time” mobilization drills in protest of those remarks.

In addition, the breach in security at American nuclear weapons labs over the past 20 years and recent revelations concerning the development of the neutron bomb and the long range DF-31 missile raise serious concerns about China's advancing military capability and its commitment to non-proliferation of weapons.

Furthermore, China has shown no compunction about violating U.S. intellectual property rights, shipping products made with prison labor and prohibiting thousands of foreign products from entering the Chinese market through a maze of regulations.

Now, in fairness, it can be said that the people of China are somewhat better off than they were 10 years ago. The government has extended some basic rights to its citizens. Whether starting a business, choosing a job, or watching a foreign movie—these rights, albeit restricted, signal some progress.

But has China gone far enough in adopting democratic policies and respecting human rights. The answer clearly is no.

Undeniably, China is one of the great powers in the world today, and our ability to influence its decisions is limited. But we do know that more than one-third of China's exports today are sold in the United States. In the month of May alone, the Department of Commerce reported a trade deficit with China of \$5.25 billion and it is projected to reach \$67 billion in 1999.

The extension of Normal Trading Relations is one of the few economic levers we possess that can spur China to improve its behavior on these critical issues. We should not forfeit our economic leverage outright. Coddling has never worked.

I implore my colleagues to vote for this Resolution, which would send an unmistakable message to the Chinese government that it cannot continue business as usual.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 57, a resolution of disapproval of normal trade relations (NTR) status for products from China. I believe that it is in the best interest of United States agriculture to continue, and eventually expand, our trading relationship with China.

U.S. agriculture exports to China were more than \$3 billion last year. China represents an agriculture market that is vital to the long-term success of our farmers and ranchers. Agriculture trade with China can strengthen development of private enterprise in that country and bring China more fully into world trade membership.

More than 60 agricultural organizations representing producers, processors, and exporters support extension of normal trade relations with China.

There are few countries that do not have normal trade relations (NTR) status with the United States. NTR status allows a country's products to enter into the United States at the same tariff rates that apply to other trading partners. In fact, NTR provides no special treatment. It allows us to treat all countries' imports in the same manner. Failure to do so often has a serious negative impact on American agriculture, the first to feel the impact of embargoes and retaliation.

Recently the United States signed a bilateral agreement with China that will break down the artificial barriers China erected for certain U.S. exports. China has closed its market for far too long to high quality U.S. meat, wheat, citrus and poultry. Under this agreement, China will accept specific science-based standards and our farmers and ranchers will have access to the vast Chinese market.

Failure to continue normal trade relations with China may jeopardize this agreement.

Additionally, I am encouraged by the progress made by the U.S. Trade Representative in negotiating the rules for China's accession to the World Trade Organization. The goal is to open China's marketplace and secure China's agreement to trade concessions that result in lower tariffs and improved access. Based on the information provided by the USTR, if the preliminary agreements reached remain a part of a final agreement with China, significant progress has been made. I urge the Administration to continue its negotiations. Free and fair trade agreements are good for U.S. agriculture.

International trade is important for American agriculture and for the success and prosperity of American farmers and ranchers.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.J. Res. 57.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution and in support of extending Normal Trade Relations with China.

U.S. exports to China have quadrupled over the past decade and last year alone, our exports to China totaled over \$14 billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the U.S. economy is envied by the rest of the world. Our economy has rebounded and flourished because we decided it was more prudent to engage our trading partners than to build walls around our borders.

We do have the responsibility to actively continue an aggressive push for human rights and environmental reforms, recognizing that these responsibilities need not come at the ex-

pense of our economic prosperity. They can and should be addressed in concert with economic issues.

The U.S. policy of engagement "with our eyes wide open" best exemplifies the vision needed for global trade success in the new economy.

Today, we should renew this policy and defeat this resolution. I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution and support the continuation of Normal Trade Relations with China.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 57, a motion disapproving of normal trade relations (NTR) with China. I support the continuation of normal trade relations with China because it is in the best interests of both the United States and China.

We must realize that normal trade relations does not confer any special benefits upon the Chinese government. NTR status simply means that the United States will not impose prohibitive tariffs on Chinese products. In return, China must agree to extend NTR treatment to the United States. NTR is a well-established principal under international trade laws and the guidelines of the World Trade Organization.

Nearly every American agrees that China has a long way to go in providing its people with greater political, social, and economic freedoms. Furthermore, concerns about China's development of weapons of mass destruction and espionage activities are troubling. If I believed revoking China's NTR status would address these concerns, I would oppose this extension.

Instead of turning our back on China, a policy of continued engagement will allow the United States to continue to press the Chinese government to give its people greater freedoms and a better standard of living. Since the establishment of normal trade relations with China 20 years ago, living standards for average Chinese citizens has increased dramatically. The continued American presence in China has provided the people with access to more outside information and ideas than ever before. Finally, increased American trade and investment in China has provided a foundation for bilateral cooperation that has led to a more open forum to discuss sensitive topics such as foreign policy and international security matters.

Trade with China is extremely important to the American economy. According to the National Association of Manufacturers, American businesses exported \$14 billion of goods to China in the past year. These sales support roughly 400,000 high-skill and high-paying jobs in the United States. There is also the vast potential for further sales of American products to China. China has 1.2 billion people—one-fifth of the world's population. Its economy will only continue to expand as China spends more than \$700 billion on infrastructure projects. To close the Chinese market to American businesses would have a devastating impact on our economy.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I support a continuation of normal trade relations with China because it is in the best interest of both nations. American trade and investment in China will afford the Chinese people with greater freedom and a better life. It will also preserve hun-

dreds of thousands of high-skill, high-wage jobs for future generations of American workers.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, the decision that Congress will make today with regard to maintaining Normal Trade Relations with the People's Republic of China represents another important step in defining our future relationship with China.

The Select Committee on U.S. Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China, on which I served as Ranking Minority Member, found some very disturbing information with regard to the theft of nuclear technology from our research labs by the PRC. However, the most disturbing findings of the Committee were that these losses resulted from our own security and counter-intelligence failures. Together with the Administration, we have begun to take steps to address this problem, and I am hopeful that our plan will be successful in preventing another severe security breach.

Although I fully recognize the seriousness of these thefts, I do not believe that they should deter us from maintaining our trade partnership with China.

Trade between the United States and China is of tremendous benefit to both nations. China, with one-quarter of the world's population, represents the world's largest emerging market. Although many segments of China's economy have not yet matured, the United States today exports \$14.3 billion worth of goods to China annually—four times greater than 10 years ago—supporting more than 400,000 high-wage jobs. Within the State of Washington alone, exports to China totaled nearly \$1.1 billion in 1996, and more than \$8 billion worth of goods passed through the ports of my state either going to or coming from China.

China represents a huge potential market for future sales in my state for the sale of aircraft, high-tech products, agricultural goods, and forest products. For aircraft alone, the Chinese market is worth over \$140 billion during the next 20 years. Lack of NTR trading status would not only jeopardize access to that market, but also bring retaliation against our country's trading sectors and hundreds of thousands of workers.

The people of China also benefit from trade with the United States. As that market opens wider and the Chinese economy develops, the Chinese middle class grows in strength, both political and economic. I believe that developing a viable middle class in China is the best way to provide a solid foundation upon which an open, democratic society may be created. Denying NTR status through this Resolution today will run counter to that objective, greatly hindering this transition, and is clearly not in our nation's best interests.

Supporters of this Resolution argue that by denying NTR status to China, we will be forcing the government to make significant changes to their policies. I believe the exact opposite result would occur.

If we choose not to renew NTR status to China, our international competitors will not hesitate to fill the void that will be left by our absence. Effectively, we will be excluding ourselves from the economy of the largest nation on the earth.

In the aerospace industry, for example, the European consortium Airbus is both willing and capable of replacing Boeing as the leading supplier of commercial aircraft to China. Similarly, I believe it would be exceedingly more difficult for our government to make progress on curbing the enormous problem of software piracy that robs Microsoft and the many other American software companies of hundreds of millions of dollars each year. Let me assure my colleagues that in the long run, denying NTR status will be much worse for our economic well-being than it will be for China's.

As we vote today to decide the future of our relationship with China, I urge members to support continued engagement with China by opposing the Resolution to disapprove Normal Trade Relations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 22, 1999, the joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 170, nays 260, answered "present" 1, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

YEAS—170

Abercrombie	Condit	Gejdenson
Aderholt	Cook	Gephardt
Baldwin	Costello	Gibbons
Ballenger	Cox	Gilman
Barcia	Coyne	Goode
Barr	Cubin	Goodling
Bartlett	Cummings	Graham
Barton	Danner	Gutierrez
Bishop	Davis (IL)	Hall (OH)
Bonior	Deal	Hastings (FL)
Bono	DeFazio	Hayes
Borski	Delahunt	Hayworth
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	Hefley
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Hilleary
Brown (OH)	Dickey	Hilliard
Burr	Doolittle	Hinchee
Burton	Doyle	Hobson
Capuano	Duncan	Horn
Cardin	Ehrlich	Hostettler
Carson	Engel	Hoyer
Chambliss	Evans	Hunter
Chenoweth	Everett	Hyde
Clay	Forbes	Jackson (IL)
Clyburn	Fowler	Jones (NC)
Coble	Frank (MA)	Jones (OH)
Coburn	Galleghy	Kaptur
Collins	Ganske	Kasich

Kennedy	Pascrell	Strickland
Kildee	Payne	Stupak
Kilpatrick	Pelosi	Sweeney
King (NY)	Pickering	Tancredo
Kingston	Pombo	Taylor (MS)
Klink	Rahall	Taylor (NC)
Kucinich	Riley	Thompson (MS)
Lantos	Rivers	Thompson
Lee	Rogers	Tiahrt
Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher	Tierney
Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen	Quinn
LoBiondo	Rothman	Traficant
Markey	Royce	Udall (CO)
Martinez	Sabo	Udall (NM)
Mascara	Sanchez	Velazquez
McIntyre	Sanders	Vento
McKinney	Sanford	Visclosky
Meek (FL)	Scarborough	Walsh
Meeks (NY)	Schaffer	Wamp
Menendez	Schakowsky	Waters
Miller, George	Scott	Watt (NC)
Mink	Sensenbrenner	Waxman
Mollohan	Sisisky	Weldon (FL)
Nadler	Smith (NJ)	Wexler
Ney	Smith (TX)	Weygand
Norwood	Souder	Wise
Obey	Spence	Wolf
Olver	Spratt	Woolsey
Owens	Stark	Wu
Pallone	Stearns	Wynn
		Young (AK)

NAYS—260

Ackerman	Dooley	Knollenberg
Allen	Dreier	Kolbe
Andrews	Dunn	Kuykendall
Archer	Edwards	LaFalce
Army	Ehlers	LaHood
Bachus	Emerson	Lampson
Baird	English	Largent
Baker	Eshoo	Larson
Baldacci	Etheridge	Latham
Barrett (NE)	Ewing	LaTourette
Barrett (WI)	Farr	Lazio
Bass	Fattah	Leach
Bateman	Filner	Levin
Becerra	Fletcher	Lewis (CA)
Bentsen	Foley	Lewis (KY)
Bereuter	Ford	Linder
Berkley	Fossella	Lofgren
Berman	Franks (NJ)	Lowey
Berry	Frelinghuysen	Lucas (KY)
Biggert	Frost	Lucas (OK)
Bilbray	Gekas	Luther
Bilirakis	Gilchrest	Maloney (CT)
Blagojevich	Gillmor	Maloney (NY)
Bliley	Gonzalez	Manzullo
Blumenauer	Goodlatte	Matsui
Blunt	Gordon	McCarthy (MO)
Boehlert	Goss	McCarthy (NY)
Boehner	Granger	McCollum
Bonilla	Green (TX)	McCrery
Boswell	Green (WI)	McGovern
Boucher	Greenwood	McHugh
Boyd	Gutknecht	McInnis
Brady (TX)	Hall (TX)	McIntosh
Bryant	Hansen	McKeon
Buyer	Hastert	McNulty
Callahan	Hastings (WA)	Meehan
Calvert	Heger	Metcalf
Camp	Hill (IN)	Mica
Campbell	Hill (MT)	Millender-
Canady	Hinojosa	McDonald
Cannon	Hoefel	Miller (FL)
Capps	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary
Castle	Holden	Minge
Chabot	Holt	Moakley
Clayton	Hooley	Moore
Clement	Houghton	Moran (KS)
Combust	Hulshof	Moran (VA)
Conyers	Hutchinson	Morella
Cooksey	Inslie	Murtha
Cramer	Isakson	Nyrick
Crane	Istook	Napolitano
Crowley	Jackson-Lee	Neal
Cunningham	(TX)	Nethercutt
Davies (FL)	Jefferson	Northup
Davis (VA)	Jenkins	Nussle
DeGette	John	Ortiz
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Ose
DeMint	Johnson, E.B.	Oxley
Deutsch	Johnson, Sam	Packard
Dicks	Kanjorski	Pastor
Dingell	Kelly	Paul
Dixon	Kind (WI)	Pease
Doggett	Kleczka	Peterson (MN)

Petri	Sandlin	Tauscher
Phelps	Sawyer	Tauzin
Pickett	Saxton	Terry
Pitts	Serrano	Thomas
Pomero	Sessions	Thompson (CA)
Porter	Shadegg	Thornberry
Portman	Shaw	Thune
Price (NC)	Shays	Thurman
Pryce (OH)	Sherman	Toomey
Quinn	Sherwood	Towns
Radanovich	Shimkus	Turner
Ramstad	Shows	Upton
Rangel	Shuster	Vitter
Regula	Simpson	Walden
Reyes	Skeen	Watkins
Reynolds	Skelton	Watts (OK)
Rodriguez	Smith (MI)	Weiner
Roemer	Smith (WA)	Weldon (PA)
Rogan	Snyder	Weller
Roukema	Stabenow	Whitfield
Roybal-Allard	Stenholm	Wicker
Rush	Stump	Wilson
Ryan (WI)	Sununu	Young (FL)
Ryun (KS)	Talent	
Salmon	Tanner	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Slaughter

NOT VOTING—3

McDermott Oberstar Peterson (PA)

□ 1510

Messrs. HOEFFEL, SIMPSON, PETRI, and SHADEGG changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WISE, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed their vote from "nay" to "aye."

So the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2465, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. HOBSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2465) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106-266)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2465) "making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

*That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:*

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

*For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and*