

Among these are the freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention; freedom of thought, conscience and religion; freedom from torture; freedom of expression; freedom of peaceful assembly, and the right to fair and speedy trial.

It agreed to sign this covenant last year at this time and doing so enabled China to avoid criticism at the 1998 Commission. The Clinton administration cited China's willingness to sign the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as the reason why it did not go forward with a resolution in 1998.

Mr. Speaker, this year there is no excuse. China's human rights record is as bad as ever.

Since July 1998, the Chinese government has arrested over 100 prominent democracy activists, giving many long prison sentences in unfair trials. Their crime was expressing their views—acting on their conscience. An intense crackdown earlier this year coincided with the start of talks between U.S. and Chinese officials in a so-called—and much touted—"human rights dialogue." The crackdown was a message—we are willing to talk about human rights but we know we don't have to take any action. Thousands of political prisoners remain in jail.

Religious believers in China have continued to suffer persecution. Catholic bishops and priests continue to be jailed and tortured. The Vatican reported earlier this year that Chinese authorities tortured a 31-year-old priest by subjecting him to physical and psychological pressure. They brought in prostitutes to tempt him and then video-taped his ordeal as a way to break his spirit.

Protestant house church leaders are on the run, fearful for their lives and freedom. Reports indicate that almost all the leaders of China's largest house churches—the name given to the vast network of underground churches—are forced to move from place to place to avoid arrest.

Though persecution of house churches varies from region to region, it is Chinese government policy to crack down on China's underground churches. A number of documents smuggled out of China in recent years have revealed the local communist party's plans to eradicate the underground church. For example, such a document revealed last year that in July 1998, municipal authorities in Hua Shen complained to their superiors about the activities of an "illegal missionary" whose preaching has begun to attract more and more followers. "He has been arrested and educated many times, and yet his heart has not died and his nature has not changed" party officials report. His religious gatherings draw people from neighboring towns—sometimes as many as 1,000 at a time—and has "become the largest illegal religious group * * * It has created an interference effect," the report says. It calls on all local municipal units to coordinate their activities in order to "effectively crack down illegal religious activities and create favorable conditions for the stability and development of our town."

That is not religious freedom, Mr. Speaker. This is religious persecution.

In Tibet where the Buddhist religion is a deep part of the culture, the communist party has begun a campaign to encourage Tibetan

Buddhists to become atheists. This is only the latest anti-religion campaign waged by the PRC against the Tibetan Buddhists.

The Chinese Government has closed monasteries and nunneries and expelled monks and nuns. Since 1996, some 9,977 monks and nuns have been expelled from their monasteries—7,000 in 1998 alone. A reported 492 monks and nuns have been arrested since May, 1996—135 in 1998. Of these, 13 died in prison from torture. Many others were released just before they died. Torture is rampant in Tibetan prisons. Hundreds of Tibetans continue to flee across the treacherous Himalayan Mountains to reach freedom in Nepal and India. Some even send their children—fearing there is no future left for them in Tibet.

Amnesty International reported that a group of young Uighurs were sentenced to death recently on political charges. Uighurs are Muslim people living in the Northwest province of Xinjiang. They have reported severe persecution, the closing of mosques, and overall discrimination against their population by the Chinese Government. It has also been reported that Chinese nuclear weapons are tested in areas populated by Uighurs—leading to birth defects and other problems.

But, Mr. Speaker, despite all these facts, the Clinton administration sits on their hands when it comes to exerting multi-lateral diplomatic effort to end China's human rights abuses. We dilly-dally and postpone our decision about sponsoring a resolution at the U.N. Human Rights Commission, making it almost inevitable that any such resolution will be defeated.

China is not sitting on its hands. It is probably already lobbying its friends hard against such a resolution. Human Rights Watch documented China's efforts to defeat a resolution in 1997—by dangling millions of dollars worth of contracts in front of governments willing to vote with them.

But the Clinton administration is not even willing to exert diplomatic leadership to generate support for a resolution of condemnation.

This is not leadership and it does illustrate a commitment to human rights on the part of U.S. Government.

We talk tough, then appease the PRC. We look the other way while China steals American technology to enhance its military capability and then appease the PRC by giving Chinese leaders state and high-level visits to the United States. We say we care about human rights, but we don't use multi-lateral frameworks to advance them.

Our policy is a failure.

I hope my colleagues will support H. Con. Res. 28 and I hope the administration will not let China off the hook in Geneva.

Mr. BERUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in strong support of H. Con. Res. 28, expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should introduce and seek to secure passage of a resolution criticizing Chinese human rights abuses at the annual meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

There is no question that the recent actions by the Chinese authorities to criminalize the activities of individuals seeking to organize a new political party are in direct contradiction to China's stated commitment to the Universal

Declaration of Human Rights and its signature last year of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The prosecution of some Chinese citizens for their contacts with foreign individuals and their alleged passing of "state secrets" in some instances also appear to be serious breaches of China's obligation to respect universally recognized human rights standards. Such efforts to control freedom of expression are deeply disturbing, and reflect a government that is unsure about its legitimacy.

Mr. Speaker, China's internal situation clearly remains a complex mixture of positive and negative developments. The resolution correctly refers to other areas of ongoing concern with respect to China's human rights performance, including family planning practices, the situation in Tibet, freedom of religion and the penal system. At the same time, this Member believes it is important not to lose sight of some of the progress being achieved, for example, in the area of multi-candidate elections at the village level in certain regions and in the continued trend toward increased personal freedom of Chinese citizens to pursue their economic betterment.

While not discounting improvements where they are discernible, this Member also believes that when China takes steps that are clearly retrograde in the area of human rights, the Administration must condemn such actions forthrightly, both bilaterally and in appropriate multilateral settings. The Administration's decision not to introduce a resolution on human rights in China at the 1998 meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights was a serious error, and was correctly criticized at the time by a number of Members of this body. This Member welcomes the clear statements by the Secretary of State during her visit to China last week. The Administration must now reverse the mistake it made last year in Geneva by introducing and advocating strongly for a resolution critical of China's human rights violations.

Mr. Speaker, this Member urges all of his colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 28.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 28, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject matter of House Concurrent Resolution 28.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR USE OF CATAFALQUE IN CRYPT BENEATH ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL IN CONNECTION WITH MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE HONORABLE HARRY A. BLACKMUN, FORMER ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 45) providing for the use of the catafalque situated in the crypt beneath the rotunda of the Capitol in connection with memorial services to be conducted in the Supreme Court Building for the late honorable Harry A. Blackmun, former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I have no intention of objecting, but I will ask the chairman if he has any comments he wants to make with reference to the legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for yielding.

This is a serious occasion when an Associate Justice of the United States, after 24 years of service, passes away, and it is entirely appropriate that the catafalque reserved in the basement of the Capitol, known as the Lincoln catafalque, since he was the first to use that catafalque, be provided for the Supreme Court for this occasion.

It is always a sad time when the catafalque is used, but the memories and the history of this country, intertwined with the catafalque, I believe, carry with it the appropriate seriousness and ceremonial nature of recognizing one of America's finest former Justices of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I echo the chairman's comments, Mr. Speaker. I believe that it is appropriate in this instance for us to authorize the use of the catafalque by the Supreme Court, as the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has said, to honor

someone who has given such long and honored service to the country.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 45

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to transfer to the custody of the Chief Justice of the United States the catafalque which is situated in the crypt beneath the rotunda of the Capitol so that such catafalque may be used in the Supreme Court Building in connection with services to be conducted there for the late honorable Harry A. Blackmun, former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS AT DULLES AND NATIONAL AIRPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just come from a markup where a unanimous vote was taken for an historic breakthrough similar to what this body achieved last year with the highway trust fund monies.

We voted H.R. 1000 in the House Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to allow the gasoline taxes to go for what the taxpayers intended them for, and that is to pay for infrastructure improvements in our airports. We hope to break a stalemate that developed last year.

My interest is very special, because the National Capital region, through which most Members travel, has been the subject of a special spotlight. The trust fund will undoubtedly do for other airports what it will do for National and for Dulles. For example, to triple the amounts that would be forthcoming for these two airports, if this bill passes.

□ 1445

I do not need to remind Members that 25 million people come through these airports, many of them your own constituents, so you have surely the

same kind of concern and interest I do, that these funds be released.

Some of my colleagues may wonder why the new terminal is completed but the historic old terminal is as it was, and that is because our funds have been held up quite apart from the reauthorization but because National and Dulles have been caught in the slot and perimeter controversy; that is to say, in the controversy over how many takeoffs and landings will be there. Republican and Democrat, Maryland, Virginia and the District, we have stood side by side saying no more slots at National, no more slots, because despite economic benefits for the District which I would ordinarily be for, there are such significant safety hazards, insufferable noise and increased ground and air pollution that it made no sense to crowd overcrowded National. At the same time we would seriously hurt Dulles Airport which, instead of having its competitive advantage increased, would lose millions of dollars' worth of business.

In our subcommittee, we reached a reasonable accommodation with the addition of only six slots, and those going at only two per hour for underserved airports with no increase in the perimeter, that is, the number of miles from Washington that can be traveled, so there will not be increased noise in our neighborhoods. Remember, we are talking about an airport that is essentially located in downtown Washington.

We have also succeeded in getting \$200 million released that was held up irrationally because in 1996 a link between getting nominations to the Metropolitan Airport Authority and the release of this money appeared in a bill. Our subcommittee delinks this so that when Members go to National Airport, they in fact will see the whole airport being renovated. We are to the point where if we do not proceed, the burden will be very great and we simply cannot wait much longer.

The other body has a provision in its reauthorization of the FAA, that is what is here, H.R. 1000, they have in S. 82, the companion bill, an additional 48 slots. I just want to say to this body here and now that the one thing National cannot accept is 48 new slots. That is unacceptable special interest legislation. It is this body that some years ago instituted a slot rule because National is one of the most dangerous airports in the country to fly into. It is greatly overcrowded. We hope that we can reach out in accommodation with the other body.

This is an airport for the world and for the country. In its wisdom, this body gave oversight of this airport to a metropolitan regional authority a few years ago. That authority has done a spectacular job. You can see it with your own eyes in the additions that are being made at Dulles, with the renovation of National Airport. Nevertheless,