

Mr. Speaker, I would simply conclude by saying I am sure that my family is watching, and they heard the reference by the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) to the agency that placed Kathryn with the Pomeroy family, and I do not want to leave the floor and receive a telephone call, so I really want to acknowledge the Holt International Children's Services in Eugene, Oregon, giving me the greatest gift of all, which was my daughter, Kara.

I particularly want to acknowledge Susan Cox, who several years ago I encountered and engaged me in this particular legislation; but, as I said, in my remarks, it certainly is a good day.

Mr. Speaker, it is a good day for hopefully tens of thousands of children all over this planet who will find a deserving home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend all of our Members who took part in today's debate and, once again, all of the staff members who worked so diligently to bring together this bipartisan measure. And I, too, want to commend the Holt agency. I am very familiar with them; it was formerly the Pearl Buck Group that started this agency. They have done such good work in bringing children and parents together, and I want to thank particularly the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) as we gave him his gift for his birthday today. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, our children are our future and they represent our hopes and dreams. Many families decide adoption is the right path for them to build a family and we should do all we can to promote life-affirming policies like adoption. As an adoptive father, I believe every child deserves love, shelter, security, and a permanent home yet the orphanages around the world are filled with children seeking loving homes and families. Many Americans choose to adopt a child from another country because they know they can make a difference in a child's life. America is a rich country and our citizens are very generous in opening up their homes to orphans. The Hague Intercountry Adoption Act builds upon the spirit of the thousands of American parents who have adopted their child from another country.

I am a proud cosponsor of the Hague Intercountry Adoption Act because I am committed to ensuring intercountry adoption remains a viable option for American families. American families are very altruistic because they spend thousands of dollars and are willing to travel to a foreign country to build a family. Unfortunately, some people took advantage of adoptive parents and legislation was needed. The Hague Intercountry Adoption Act attempts to guarantee the child's safety and fully protects the rights of the adoptive parents and birth parents.

In the days ahead, Congress must ensure the process of crafting rules and regulations

for the Hague is done in an expeditious manner. Congress must also ensure that the regulatory process is not abused and used in a manner to reward the efforts of those who failed to achieve their policy initiatives through the legislative process. I strongly believe the Central Authority must be fully staffed and have personnel with adoption experience. Inadequate staffing levels and/or lack of staff familiar about adoption policy could lead to a dramatic decline in the number of intercountry adoptions.

Today is a momentous day for adoption. This legislation provides hope for orphaned children worldwide and it will improve the lives of countless children and families.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last summer I introduced legislation with Representative BALLENGER that approached this issue differently than H.R. 2909 as introduced.

Through the committee process, however, we were able to reach a compromise between H.R. 2342 and H.R. 2909. Through the efforts of Chairman GILMAN and Ranking Member GEJDENSON the legislation we are considering today takes the best of both bills, and I would like to thank them for their hard work in moving the process forward. I would also like to thank Representative DELAHUNT, who perhaps more than anyone in this body appreciates the positive impact this legislation can have. He is to be commended for his role in the process as well.

I would like to extend a special thank you to those parents of children adopted from overseas who contacted me with their concerns and for sharing their experiences with me. Their input was critically important, and I appreciate their active interest in this legislation and the process we have gone through.

It is an unfortunate reality that there are people willing to exploit the vulnerability of needy children and their prospective parents. The willingness of these families to go through the international adoption process, despite its flaws, is testimony to their character. The passage of this legislation affirms our commitment to creating a framework that better protects children and their families in the future.

Despite our different approaches in addressing the problems faced by children and parents in the international adoption process, it is safe to say we all want the same thing—to help those who want nothing more than to provide a child with a loving home. It is my firm belief that the legislation we are considering today will do just that, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2909, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, notwithstanding the Chair's previous announcement, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays were ordered until later this afternoon.

#### DISAPPROVING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO 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. 103) disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to 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. 103 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 103

*Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That 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 Congress on June 2, 2000, with respect to the People's Republic of China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, July 17, 2000, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and a Member in support of the joint resolution each will control 1 hour.

Is there a Member in support of the joint resolution?

Mr. BROWN of OHIO. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) will control 1 hour of time.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 103.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, a little less than 2 months ago, the American people and this House spoke out overwhelmingly in favor of expanded trade with China. With broad bipartisan support, we passed a measure granting American workers, farmers, and businesses unprecedented access to China's once-forbidden markets.

Agriculture exports alone are expected to triple with this increased trade, and tariffs on American-made goods will be slashed or eliminated entirely in virtually every sector.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times before, this clearly is a win for the U.S. and her people. It is particularly important that we stay engaged with China so we can see the blessings of individual freedom, democracy, and move forward toward a free enterprise society.

Mr. Speaker, given that, it is disappointing that we must vote on this issue yet again. Nevertheless, support for continued normal trade with China is stronger than it has ever been, and I urge Members to keep this process on track by opposing H.J. Res. 103.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, here in Congress, we stand together in a commitment toward the spread of democratic ideals and the improvement of human rights. But as we have helped encourage the growth of democracy, many American corporations promote practices that work against all that Congress fosters throughout the world.

During the weeks approaching the vote for permanent NTR for the People's Republic of China, corporate CEOs flocked to the Hill to lobby for increased trade with China.

They talked about access to 1.2 billion consumers in China. What they did not say was that their real interest is in 1.2 billion Chinese workers, workers whom they pay wages on the level of slave labor.

These CEOs will tell us that increasing trade with China will allow human rights to improve. They will tell us that democracy will flourish with increased free trade. But as the CEOs speak, their companies systematically violate the most fundamental of human and worker rights.

Companies such as Huffy and Nike and WalMart are contracting Chinese sweatshops to export to the United States, often with the assistance of repressive and corporate Chinese local government authorities.

Mr. Speaker, 1,800 Huffy bicycle workers in the U.S. lost their jobs as Huffy in Ohio shut down its last three remaining plants in the U.S. In July of 1988, Huffy fired 800 workers from its Celina, Ohio, plant where workers earned \$17 an hour.

Huffy now outsources all of its production to developing nations, such as China, where laborers are forced to work up to 15 hours a day, 7 days a week and earn an average wage of 33 cents an hour. This is less than 2 percent of what bicycle workers made in Ohio.

The Qin Shi Handbag in China makes Kathie Lee Gifford-line handbags for

WalMart. There are about a thousand workers at the factory where they put in 14-hour shifts, 7 days a week, often 30 days a month. The average wage at the factory is 3 cents an hour.

Many workers live in a factory dormitory where they are housed 16 to a room. Their ID documents have been confiscated, and they are allowed to leave the factory for an hour and a half a day. For half of all factory workers, rent for the dormitory exceeds their wages.

The workers earn, in fact, nothing at all. In fact, they owe the company money. These people are indentured servants for WalMart or, most of us would say, slave labor.

Developing democratic nations such as India are losing out to more totalitarian nations such as China, where people are not free and the workers do as they are told. Developing democratic nations such as Taiwan lose out to authoritarian developing nations, such as Indonesia, because the workforce is stable and docile and does as their told.

In the post-Cold War decade, the share of developing countries' exports to the United States for democratic nations fell from 53 percent in 1989 to 35 percent last year.

Corporate America wants to do business with countries with docile workforces that earn below-poverty wages and are not allowed to organize to bargain collectively.

In manufacturing goods, developing democracies' share of developing country exports fell 20 percentage points. Corporations are relocating their manufacturing base from democratic developing nations to authoritarian regimes where the workers do not talk back for fear of being punished.

Western corporations want to invest in countries that have below-poverty wages; that have poor environmental standards; that have no worker benefits; that have no opportunities to bargain collectively. As developing nations make progress toward democracy, as they increase worker rights and create regulations to protect the environment, what we do in the developed democratic world, the American business community punishes those democratic developing countries by pulling their trade and their investment in favor of totalitarian countries.

They like China a lot more than they like democratic India. Corporate America likes Indonesia much more than they like Taiwan.

Decisions about the Chinese economy are made by three groups: the Chinese Communist Party, the People's Liberation Army, and wealthy Western investors. All of them control a significant amount of the business that exports to the U.S. and Western investors.

Mr. Speaker, which one of these three, the People's Liberation Army, the Chinese Communist Party, Western

investors, which one of these three want to empower workers? Does the Chinese Communist Party want the Chinese people to enjoy increased human rights? I do not think so. Does the People's Liberation Army want to close the slave labor camps? I do not think so. Do Western investors want Chinese workers to bargain collectively to get a little bigger piece of the pie? I do not think so.

None of these groups, Mr. Speaker, none of these groups, the People's Liberation Army, the Chinese Communist Party, and Western investors, none of these groups have any interests in changing the current situation in China. If they did, they would choose democratic India and democratic Taiwan.

None of these groups have any interest in changing the current situation in China. All three, Western investors, the Communist Party of China, the People's Liberation Army, all three profit too much from the status quo to want to see human rights and labor rights improve in China.

Congress should not tolerate the working conditions that exist in Chinese factories. Congress should care about how American corporations are behaving outside of our borders.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to reject MFN and vote for the Rohrabacher resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair announces that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) will be managing the time for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

There was no objection.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time, for purposes of control, to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), my distinguished colleague.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) will control 30 minutes of the time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of OHIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) and that he may then yield time as he sees fit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) will control 30 minutes of the time for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, we had a very thorough and informed debate in the House just a few months ago on these very issues. The spotlight is now on the Senate. There is a clear majority there for passage of permanent

NTR, and I express the hope of many of us that there can be full debate on the Senate side and action there expeditiously, which I think should mean within the next few weeks.

I want to dwell on the major challenges ahead, because clearly the U.S.-China economic relationships are at the beginning of a new phase; they are far from their final form. So I believe there is a need to focus on these challenges, and we cannot simply put our economic relationships and our broader relationships with China on automatic pilot.

As we know, there were major provisions in the legislation that passed the House that attempt to address these very critical challenges, and we need to focus on their effective implementation. The legislation set up a high-level executive congressional commission to be a continuing watchdog and a creative force in the area of human rights, including worker rights.

We need to be sure during this session that that legislation is adequately funded. We need to be sure that the appointees to this vital high-level commission have the interest and the determination to make that commission work, as the Helsinki Commission has worked, and, if I might express the hope, even more so.

□ 1315

We need to be sure that this commission gets off to a strong start. I hope whatever the point of view may be in terms of PNTR that all of us will join together on both sides of the aisle and within each caucus and conference to make sure that happens.

The legislation also calls for strong monitoring and enforcement of Chinese trade-related commitments and, as the chairman of the committee indicated, there are numerous, indeed essentially innumerable commitments. There also in the legislation is a strong anti-surge mechanism to make sure that there is a safeguard against major loss of American jobs in any specific sector. We need to be sure that the requests for adequate funding that have come on behalf of the Commerce Department and USTR to carry out these critical monitoring enforcement duties are fully funded in the appropriation processes.

Those processes are far from complete when it comes to these aspects.

We also need to be sure that the ongoing discussions in Geneva, in the working group on China, that in these discussions in Geneva the administration continues to press for a regular annual review within the WTO of these commitments by China.

I see that we have been joined by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREU-TER), with whom I have had the chance to work on these very provisions, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of

the full committee and the chairman of the full committee. I think all of us join in indicating the importance of the implementation process of these provisions.

In a word, we need now to focus on the future. We are far closer to the beginning than to the end of the challenges that we face in our economic relationships with China. China, as it grows, is already 1,200,000,000 people and is projected to become the second largest national economy within 20 years. We need to focus on these challenges as China emerges from 50 years as a state-controlled economy and with state abuses of human rights and individual freedoms. So today I urge my colleagues to vote no on this resolution and to join together to continue on this important and difficult road of confronting the challenges ahead.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The Chair would remind Members that it is not in order to urge certain Senate action, as recorded on page 181 of the House Rules Manual.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.J. Res. 103 to disapprove the President's annual certification of the so-called normal trade relations with China, and I have no allusions that this bill will overturn the House vote on permanent normal trade relations. But I have introduced this bill because we need to pay attention as to what has happened in China and throughout the world since we voted for permanent normal trade relations with China.

I believe the American public has the right to hear about events and the events in China that followed the mega million dollar propaganda campaign that was waged by U.S. corporations in order to acquire the approval of Congress for PNTR.

PNTR, let us remember, is a taxpayer subsidy for corporations; includes, and that is the most important provision for these companies, a taxpayer subsidy in the form of loan guarantees and actual interest guarantees and loan guarantees to companies that are closing their factories in the United States and opening them in China.

What we are talking about is American workers being taxed in order to support the transfer of thousands of jobs to low-paying labor mills in China. That is what PNTR was all about, and it was sold to us as something totally different. It told to us that there would be many benefits of PNTR.

Well, the day after the PNTR vote, the media began reporting what the real story behind the corporate lobbying campaign was all about, even though during the debate for PNTR we

heard that it was all about selling American products which, of course, is not the case. But after the vote, the truth began to emerge. A May 25 Wall Street Journal article put it very bluntly. Quote, "even before the first vote was cast by Congress and while the debate in Washington focused on U.S. exports, the multinationals had something very different in mind." Quote, "this is about investment in China, not about exports," said an economist for a major U.S. financial firm.

So I am including several articles for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 25, 2000]

OPENING DOORS: CONGRESS'S VOTE PRIMES U.S. FIRMS TO BOOST INVESTMENTS IN CHINA DEBATE FOCUSED ON EXPORTS, BUT FOR MANY COMPANIES, GOING LOCAL IS THE GOAL: "LOOKING FOR PREDICTABILITY"

(By Helene Cooper and Ian Johnson)

The China investment rush is on.

Even before the first vote was cast yesterday in Congress's decision to permanently normalize U.S. trade with China, Corporate America was making plans to revolutionize the way it does business on the mainland. And while the debate in Washington focused mainly on the probable lift for U.S. exports to China, many U.S. multinationals have something different in mind.

"This deal is about investment, not exports," says Joseph Quinlan, an economist with Morgan Stanley Dean Witter & Co., "U.S. foreign investment is about to overtake U.S. exports as the primary means by which U.S. companies deliver goods to China."

Michael T. Byrnes, chief representative of Rockwell International Corp.'s China division, seconds that: "In China, that's the direction we're going."

Yesterday, by a vote of 237-197, the U.S. House of Representatives gave its approval for the world's largest communist nation to become a card-carrying member of the ultimate capitalist club, the World Trade Organization.

The hotly contested House vote was portrayed by proponents as a historical watershed. It was "the most important vote we [have] cast in our congressional careers," said Rep. Bill Archer, House Ways and Means chairman.

The vote perfectly punctuates the end of the 20th-century struggle between communism and capitalism for dominance of the world economy. Capitalism won. With China's entry into the WTO, free markets and free trade have emerged as the unchallenged global standard for business.

The vote also cements a legacy for Bill Clinton. He will now be viewed by history as a president who firmly opposed protectionist forces within his own party, winning approval for the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1993, the WTO in 1994 and, finally, permanent normalization of trade with China. After yesterday's vote, Mr. Clinton said: "This is a good day for America. Ten years from now we'll look back on this day and be glad we did this."

For business, which spent millions of dollars on advertising and lobbied vigorously for this outcome, the consequences are more practical, but no less far-reaching. In the tense weeks leading up to last night's vote, business lobbyists emphasized the beneficial effect the agreement would have on U.S. exports to China. They played down its likely

impact on investment, leery of sounding supportive of labor union arguments that the deal would prompt companies to move U.S. production to China.

But many businessmen concede that investment in China is the prize. Consider Mr. Byrnes's company, Rockwell, a Milwaukee-based maker of automation and aviation equipment. In 1987, Rockwell invested in a small cable factory in the southern city of Xiamen that produces about \$3 million worth of equipment a year for the China market.

Like many foreign companies in the 1980s, Rockwell was allowed to invest only if it entered a joint venture, a messy arrangement that required Rockwell to cooperate with four local partners, all of them state-owned. The experience so frustrated Rockwell that it never invested in another factory in China, preferring instead to export as much as \$200 million worth of products each year to China from the U.S. and other countries.

Now, Rockwell says that's likely to change. The WTO agreement, Rockwell hopes, will encourage China to abide by international rules, such as publishing regulatory changes and making transparent the workings of its bureaucracy. "We're looking for predictability, reliability," Mr. Byrnes says. With that, Rockwell expects to set up more factories. "My advice back to the headquarters," Mr. Byrnes says, "is WTO makes things more predictable for investing."

Technically, yesterday's vote in the House has no direct bearing on China's entry into the World Trade Organization. That was all but assured last week when the European Union completed negotiation of a broad trade agreement with China, following a similar agreement with the U.S. last year. But under WTO rules, China still couldn't enter the group until Congress provided permanent normal trading relations with China—rescinding the law under which China's trade status came up for a vote each year.

If the measure hadn't passed, China would have had the right to deny U.S. companies the access to its markets that it is extending to other WTO members.

Now that that hurdle is cleared, the agreements to let China into the WTO will probably boost exports to the country by lowering its tariffs on a host of products. The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that American farm exports to China will rise by \$2 billion within five years. U.S. and foreign moviemakers also expect to do more business in China, where their combined annual quota will rise to 40 releases from 10.

Equipment manufacturer Caterpillar Inc., exports about \$200 million of tractors and other construction equipment to China a year, a figure that has roughly tripled in the past few years as China has pushed an ambitious infrastructure program, says Dick Kahler, president of Caterpillar China Co. WTO entry will cut tariffs to 10% from 20%, making Caterpillar's products even more affordable to Chinese customers. "We don't see why we can't continue to see that kind of growth," Mr. Kahler says.

Indeed, the fear among many in China is that local businesses will be swamped by foreign goods. A play that premiered in Beijing yesterday titled "Made in China" tells the story of a beleaguered Chinese cosmetics maker fighting a flood of foreign imports. "Chinese factory managers are terrified about the low tariffs," says the play's director, Wang Shaoying.

Still, if the strategic plans of American companies are anything to go by, U.S. exports aren't the big trade story here. "U.S.

exports will increase, over time," says Greg Mastel, director of global economic policy at the New America Foundation, a Washington think tank. "But not at the rate of investment, and the corporate community has been quiet about that. They've been able to avoid telling that story."

That story reflects a simple business fundamental: Companies need to be closer to their customers. And China has 1.2 billion potential customers.

Direct foreign investment in China already has burgeoned. It totaled \$45 billion in 1998, according to a January study by A.T. Kearney Inc., the Chicago management consulting firm. Last year, after the onset of the Asian financial crisis and a slowdown in the Chinese economy, the total shrank to \$40 billion. Now, many economists expect investment in China will resume rising, by as much as 15% to 20% a year.

With WTO membership, China agrees to allow foreign-owned dealership and distribution services, a big boost for auto makers and heavy-equipment manufacturers. U.S. banks, too, will get a crack at a market totaling 1.1 trillion yuan (\$132.88 billion), in terms of loans outstanding. U.S. lenders ultimately will have unlimited access for the first time to manage the deposits of Chinese citizens and to lend to individuals and corporations. And foreign asset managers will be allowed to establish joint-venture fund-management firms.

Consider Motorola Inc.'s China plans. Motorola has just developed a \$600 combination computer and wireless phone, called Accompli, which it makes entirely in China. "It has really clever Chinese features, all done based on market research in China," says Motorola Chairman Chris Galvin. Already, Motorola has China sales of about \$3 billion each year.

When it officially joins the WTO later this year, China will allow foreign companies 49% ownership of telecommunications carriers, and 50% two years later—compared with nothing today. Mr. Galvin believes that will be a huge opportunity for Motorola as its Chinese customer base expands. Motorola also plans to invest in Chinese Internet ventures, he says.

In Shanghai, General Motors Corp.'s Buick Regal is in the second year of production at a factory that cost more than \$1 billion to build. About 60% of the car is made locally, says Larry Zahner, president of GM China Group. Much of the rest, about \$250 million a year, is imported from North America, mostly from Michigan. But even with China in the WTO—which should eliminate Chinese rules requiring local content—the Detroit company expects to raise the local content of its cars manufactured in Shanghai to 80% or 90%, Mr. Zahner says.

Eastman Kodak Co. is well into plans to invest \$1 billion on manufacturing plants in China. Kodak expects China will leapfrog the U.S. as Kodak's biggest market by 2025. To that end, Kodak has been boosting its manufacturing capacity there, as well as encouraging smaller investors to open Kodak Express processing stores.

European and Japanese multinationals have been drawing up their plans as well. Germany's Volkswagen AG and Japan's Toyota Motor Corp. have big Chinese investment plans on the drawing board. In an era when new models are rolled out with increasing frequency, factories can't wait months for parts to be shipped around the world. As a rule of thumb, auto companies want their suppliers to locate within 250 miles of the final assembly plant.

Many of the biggest trade concessions China made in return for its acceptance into the WTO are in banking, insurance and other services. New York Life Insurance Co. is one insurer already planning to set up a joint-venture with a Chinese partner, though it hasn't made public the amount it wants to invest. Just after the vote yesterday, New York Life International's chief executive, Gary Benanav, was preparing to hop on a flight to China. "As quickly as possible, we are going to apply for a license to enter the life-insurance market," he said.

American International Group already has pumped hundreds of millions of dollars into China, mostly to set up offices, train Chinese insurance agents and to ingratiate itself with local regulators by plowing collected premiums back into Chinese infrastructure projects. It also is expected to be among the first to set up a fund-management joint venture.

Even agriculture companies are getting in on the act. Poultry giant Perdue Farms Inc. is ratcheting up its investment in China with a joint venture for a processing plant and hatchery near Shanghai.

Beijing is well aware that entry into the WTO will bring a rush of foreign investment. Indeed, that's a big reason why, after years of dragging its feet, China has in the past two years aggressively pursued WTO entry—to bring in the money needed to keep the economy growing and modernizing.

#### CHINA WARNS "NO MORE CONCESSIONS" TO GET INTO WTO

GENEVA (Reuters)—A senior Chinese official declared Friday that his country could make no more concessions on opening up markets for goods and services in its bid to join the World Trade Organization (WTO).

China's lead WTO negotiator, vice-minister for foreign trade Long Yongtu, issued his warning at a formal meeting of diplomats from most of the body's 137 member states who are working to wrap up the terms of Beijing's entry.

Some countries, said Long, "have raised some unreasonable requests, either requiring China to undertake obligations exceeding the WTO rules, or insisting that China cannot enjoy its rights under the rules . . ."

"We will never accept further requests that China should undertake obligations exceeding those for ordinary WTO members, and nor will we allow ourselves to have the rights that we should have to be impaired or even taken away," he added.

Long's trenchant statement came as Beijing's 14-year effort to become a formal part of the global trading community appeared moving into its final lap.

Diplomats said his remarks were largely aimed at developing countries—including India and several Latin American states—who are seeking to come fully under the umbrella of China's bilateral accords with the United States and the European Union.

Many of these countries are bidding to win the same right to impose so-called safeguard restrictions as were written into the U.S.-China pact on surges of Chinese imports of textile goods that might threaten the survival domestic producers.

#### SUBSIDIES ALSO AN ISSUE

But diplomats said there were other areas—like how subsidies were assessed and balance-of-payments measures treated—where the language of both U.S. and EU accords with China was drafted to be a specific to bilateral trading relations. Many emerging economies want the terms of these accords to be fully "multilateralized"—or

written into the final documents setting out the terms of China's entry and therefore applicable to all WTO members.

Speaking at a news conference, Long said his government was "determined and prepared" to honor all its agreements on WTO entry, but could not accept overall terms that went beyond the current rules of the organization.

Envoys said the row, which was unlikely to become a major obstacle to Chinese entry by the end of this year, was a reflection of the negotiations were now in the end-game.

"Many countries are upping the ante to try to win something extra at the last moment," said one negotiator. "Everyone realizes that Chinese entry will bring momentous changes for the organization."

#### ENTRY TALKS SEEN POSITIVE

Despite the controversy, both Long and Pierre-Louis Girard, Swiss chairman of the WTO Working Party on Chinese accession, said the atmosphere during the past week of formal and informal talks had been positive.

"Everybody seems pretty serious about getting this done so China can come in by the end of the year," a senior U.S. official who attended the session told reporters.

In a sign of advance, China Friday wrapped up a bilateral accord with Costa Rica—which had been seeking wider access for its tropical fruit and coffee exports—and appeared close to a final accord with Switzerland. Other agreements remain to be completed with Mexico, Guatemala and ?

Diplomats said the Working party would meet with Long and his team again in Geneva in the last two weeks of July and that the aim then would be to complete the major admission documents—a Protocol of Accession and a Working Party Report.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 5, 2000]

#### CHINA UNICOM SCRAPS PLAN LINKED TO QUALCOMM DEAL

(By Matt Forney)

BEIJING—China's No. 2 phone company has confirmed it won't use a mobile-phone technology designed by Qualcomm Corp., of the U.S. for at least three years—a decision that could reverberate from Silicon Valley to Washington.

China's promise to open its markets to Qualcomm's current generation of cell-phone technology was key to it earning U.S. support to join the World Trade Organization, the Geneva-based group that sets global trade rules.

Last year, Premier Zhu Rongji personally assured U.S. Commerce Secretary William Daley that China would open its markets to San Diego-based Qualcomm's code-division multiple access, or CDMA, technology, according to people in the room at the time, a decision that was supposed to result in millions of Chinese subscribers using Qualcomm technology by the end of this year.

But after China's entry into WTO was stalled by the U.S. last year—and the Chinese embassy in Yugoslavia was bombed—China's enthusiasm for Qualcomm's technology likewise faded. As China's WTO bid picked up steam last autumn and was endorsed by the U.S. last November, Qualcomm's fortunes in China rose, culminating in it signing a "framework" agreement with Unicom in February. But Qualcomm then ran into problems with China over the amount of its technology that would be produced locally.

The delays meant Qualcomm was starting to make little economic sense to China—analysts said it would be wasteful for China to

pour billions into a technology that would become dated in a few years when companies start rolling out next-generation mobile-phone technology.

"The company has planned to provide CDMA services this summer," said a representative for China United Telecommunications Corp., or Unicom, who was quoted in the state-run Xinhua news agency Sunday. Unicom canceled the project because "the timing of constructing a narrow-band CDMA system has become unfavorable," he said.

"Narrow band" refers to Qualcomm's currently available CDMA technology. The spokesman said he expected Unicom to use Qualcomm's next-generation, or "wide-band," CDMA technology in around 2003. But the spokesman also said that the February agreement, in which Unicom agreed to license some form of CDMA equipment from Qualcomm, "could be canceled."

Over the past week, Unicom sent mixed messages on whether it would use Qualcomm's technology, causing a sell-off of the company's stock, which had risen more than 20-fold last year but has sunk 60% from its January high.

#### CHINA WARY OF ITS PRIVATE SECTOR

(By Charles Hutzler)

BEIJING—President Jiang Zemin, worried about the Communist Party's slipping hold on a fast-changing China, has ordered the party to set up cells in the country's thriving private sector, state media reported yesterday.

Mr. Jiang's speech to party officials Sunday underscored the leadership's growing anxieties about the challenges global economic change is bringing to its monopoly rule. As more Chinese find work outside the government and decrepit state industries, free markets, not fiat from Beijing, hold sway.

Mr. Jiang, who heads the 61 million-member Communist Party, said the organization must improve its leadership and "strengthen its combat capabilities . . . so that the party can direct China's modernization drive and secure the country's power in the midst of fierce international competition."

He noted the private sector's importance in China's economy. Private companies need party organizations "to guarantee the healthy development of the sector," Mr. Jiang said in remarks carried by the official Xinhua News Agency.

Those cells "should work hard to unite and educate entrepreneurs to advocate various policies of the party, run businesses according to law and protect the employees' interests," Mr. Jiang said.

It was not clear how the party would put Mr. Jiang's order into effect. But if realized, the plan could bring a marked change to the freewheeling private sector. State firms have always had party representatives, and despite 20 years of free-market reforms, they often wield more power than enterprise managers.

Businesses outside state control now account for 60 percent of China's \$990 billion economy. That portion is projected to grow after China's expected entry into the World Trade Organization later this year opens many long-protected Chinese markets.

Foreign businesses are likely to increase investment in China.

#### CHINA POP DE-FIZZED

WHY THINGS GO BETTER FOR COKE WITHOUT AH-MEI ON ITS BILLBOARDS.

(By Charles Lane)

In a time of tension between China and Taiwan, Zhang Huimei brought people to-

gether. The diminutive Taiwanese pop singer, who goes by the stage name Ah-mei, sells millions of CD's on both sides of the Taiwan Strait. Last year 45,000 screaming fans caught her Madonna-like act in a government authorized Beijing concert.

American business, too, recognized her star power. Coca-Cola, seeking to harness her popularity to sell its products in the mainland Chinese market, spent millions on TV, radio and billboard ads for Sprite, featuring Ah-mei.

But Ah-mei's career in the People's Republic came to a screeching halt when she agreed to sing Taiwan's national anthem at the May 20 inauguration of Taiwan's newly elected president, Chen Shui-bian, whom Beijing considers excessively interested in independence for the island nation. Her videos and music were immediately banned on state-controlled media in China.

And Chinese authorities notified Coke that its Ah-mei ads would also henceforth be verboten. Beijing tried to portray this as a response to public outrage at Ah-mei's performance in Taipei. But there's been public outrage over the massacre at Tiananmen Square, and the Communist government hasn't deferred to that. The banning of Ah-mei was clearly linked to Beijing's broader attempt to enforce its increasingly hard line against Taiwan.

This blatant censorship was a frontal attack on Coca-Cola's freedom of expression, and Ah-mei's, and that of her fans, too. It was also an attack on Coke's bottom line. After the first six weeks of Ah-mei Sprite TV ads in 1999, Coke claimed that consumer awareness of the brand had doubled, and sales had grown substantially.

So how did this most American of multinationals fight back? A lawsuit? A plea for help from the U.S. government? Actually, Coke rolled over, without a peep of protest. The company was "unhappy" about the ban, says Robert Baskin, the company's director of media relations, but "as a local business, we will respect the authority of local regulators and we will abide by their decisions."

Trade and investment with the People's Republic has sometimes been sold as a kind of universal political solvent: The more U.S. firms get involved in the Chinese economy, the theory goes, the better the chances that American political values will, over time, penetrate the Communist-run society as well. We heard a lot of this during the recent debate over permanent normal trading status for China. The case of Coke's Ah-mei ads provides a rough test of how well this argument stands up in the here and now.

To be sure, you could argue that the fact that China felt constrained to justify its ban on the big U.S. firm's ads represents a kind of progress. Coke's presence in China is, of course, not hurting the Chinese people. Insofar as it provides jobs, income and tasty carbonated beverages, it makes life better and, in economic terms, freer. Coke runs a scholarship program that supports some 700 low-income Chinese university students.

Nor is Coke the first American firm to alter its advertising in China for political reasons. Two years ago Apple Computer actually censored itself, voluntarily removing images of the Dalai Lama—living symbol of Tibetan resistance to Chinese domination—from its "Think Different" ads in Hong Kong. A spokesperson for the company said at the time that "where there are political sensitivities, we did not want to offend anyone"—i.e., Apple didn't want to incur the wrath of Beijing by even seeming to urge Chinese citizens to think different about

Tibet. (Coke will continue to use its Ah-mei ads in Hong Kong and Taiwan.)

The point is that in the struggle over what values ultimately reign in China, the Chinese state is hardly helpless against the impact of American commerce. When pushed, firms such as Coke will be flexible about freedom of speech—and even, it seems, sacrifice some short-term profits—if they deem it necessary to preserve the long-term market access conferred by a prickly authoritarian government. And who can blame them? Coke and other multinationals are fundamentally economic, not political, institutions. They have to answer to their shareholders.

The Chinese regime's priorities are equally clear: it wants economic development; it wants foreign investment; it wants Sprite; it even tolerates entertainment imported from the renegade province across the Taiwan Strait. But what it really wants more than any of those things is ideological purity on such vital issues as Taiwan's political status. If your company won't accommodate itself to that hierarchy of values, Beijing will find a competitor who will. The Chinese Communist Party is a political institution. And it answers to no one.

Thus is a mighty Atlanta-based multinational with \$20 billion in annual global sales reduced to an obedient "local business."

#### PLA-FIRMS PLAN "COMPLETED"

XIAO YU

Beijing says it has completed its programme of removing thousands of firms from ownership by the military and judicial departments, in an effort to cut corruption.

Figures now made available, although incomplete, show that the PLA and departments of the judiciary used to own 37,670 businesses. By April 19, 459—52 percent—had been disbanded. Of these, 3,928 belonged to the PLA and 15,531 to judicial bodies.

In the past two years, local authorities have taken over 2,956 companies and firms from the PLA and 3,536 from judicial bodies. The PLA has kept 1,346 business enterprises under its wings and judicial bodies have retained 4,757 ventures. The PLA includes not just the military but also the armed police forces. Similarly, judicial bodies cover the police, prosecutors and courts.

President Jiang Zemin made the decision for the PLA and judiciary to spin off their business interests in 1998. It was seen as a major move to curb rampant corruption and smuggling.

First announcing completion of the programme in May, Vice President Hu Jintao reiterated Beijing's determination to stop the "serious harm" of military-backed business ventures.

"These companies take advantage of their special connection and enjoy all kinds of perks. Some even make use of the army, armed police and judicial organs to run monopolies, compete for profits against private business and threaten fair trade," he said.

Mr. Hu said army and judicial bodies must be run with government funding and he urged all levels of government to guarantee their budgets.

#### TRAVELERS INSURANCE, SAFECO LOSE CHINA OPERATING LICENSES

(12 June 2000) The Beijing representative offices of three foreign insurance companies in China have had their licenses revoked by the China Insurance Regulatory Commission (CIRC), Zhongguo Xinwen She (China News Service) reported on June 12.

These include two U.S.-based firms—Travelers Insurance (a member of Citigroup) and Safeco (US) Co.—and the Hong Kong-based Gui-Jiang Insurance Agency Co.

As stated in the article, the CIRC claims these firms "have violated the relevant insurance rules and regulations of China."

These regulations include: changing an operations' address without approval; failing to submit annual work reports to regulatory authorities regarding the work of the representative office; and failing to submit annual reports to regulatory authorities of the companies represented.

According to China News Service, CIRC officials believe the foreign rep offices "seriously violated the 'Administrative Rules Regarding Representative Offices of Foreign Insurance Companies in China.'"

The official also said that some representative offices of foreign insurance companies continue to violate relevant rules.

Last year, the CIRC designated the "Administrative Rules" as the primary guide to regulating foreign insurance companies.

By the end of last year, there were 113 foreign-invested insurance institutions from 17 economies working in China through nearly 200 representative offices in 14 cities.

China's \$70 billion annual trade surplus with the United States will continue to grow; and since the PNTR vote, Beijing is continuing its massive buildup in its military arena. There are new reports of the transfer of Chinese weapons of mass destruction and other types of deadly technologies to rogue nations. At the same time, this regime is attempting to galvanize international opposition to the United States in our efforts to build a missile defense system.

Since the vote on PNTR, the Chinese military has continued its missile buildup and has continued to call for the democratic government in Taiwan to surrender and become subject to Beijing. In addition, Beijing is now attempting to buy more naval destroyers from Russia, armed with the deadly Sunburn nuclear-capable anti-ship missiles that were developed in Russia for one reason, to destroy American aircraft carriers.

Since the PNTR vote, the Communist regime in Beijing has contracted for two more of these deadly naval weapons systems. Since the PNTR vote, there has been no move toward democratic reform or credible rule of law in China.

Now, these are all things we were told was going to happen, all the good things that would happen if Congress just showed our goodwill by voting for permanent normal trade relations. Instead, things have gone in the opposite direction. Jiang Zemin and his party have intensified the crackdowns on religion and on the media and within the academic community. The regime's quasi-Maoist anti-rightist campaign has spread throughout China since our vote on PNTR. Since our vote on PNTR, the State-run media has called the Dalai Lama a rapist and a cannibal, end of quote. This, of course, while the Communist regime in Beijing

continues to commit its genocide in Tibet.

Ominously, after our PNTR vote the regime issued a decree ordering Communist political cells to be formed in all private corporations.

Now we have been sold this bill of goods. We have been sold a bill of goods: Vote for permanent normal trade relations and things are going to go in the opposite direction. However, since our vote on PNTR, things have been going in the wrong direction. They continue to escalate going in precisely the opposite direction than we were told would happen if we simply would show a sign of good faith by giving permanent normal trade relations, which means subsidies to American corporations to invest and create factories in China; if we just do that, things will get better and there will be improvements along these other lines.

We have heard repeatedly that U.S. information technology in China is key to promoting democracy and free speech. However, since the PNTR vote, the Chinese Communist security services have stepped up their use of advanced western technology to do what? To crack down on Internet users. Sadly, during the past month, U.S. companies in China have ignored pleas for human rights and have ignored requests for them to speak out for people who were arrested or in some way under attack for some policy agreement with the Communist Chinese regime.

U.S. corporations have been compliant, thus, with Communist censorship. Who is having an effect on whom here? Is our engagement with them making them more democratic or are they corrupting our process and undermining America's commitment to freedom and democracy?

For example, after the PNTR vote, the music of one of the most popular female singers in China, who happens to be from Taiwan, was banned because she sang at the inauguration of Taiwan's democratically elected President. Subsequently, the Coca Cola Company was ordered by Beijing to destroy all advertising that featured her image at a cost of millions of dollars. Did Coca Cola put up resistance in the name of free trade or free expression? Was this the kind of engagement that would certainly point to Beijing and say, look, this is what we really believe in freedom and that is what they should not do if they believe in freedom?

No, they did not do that at all. What they did was comply with the demand of the Beijing dictatorship. Engagement is not helping them become more democratic. It is corrupting the United States of America and it is undermining America's commitment to democracy and freedom, as well as, I might add, adding subsidies to people who want to close factories here and

open factories there. All of these things are sinful and all of these things have been even worse since our vote for permanent normal trade relations.

Increasingly, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with an unreformed China what is happening is it is ending up with a betrayal of fundamental American values for which our children will some day pay a heavy price and the working men and women of America are paying the price today with their factories being shut and these companies going with tax subsidies to Mainland China to create jobs.

I ask for support of my resolution, H.J. Res. 103.

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), our distinguished colleague.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, first my congratulations to the chairman on a good discussion here today, and particularly the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) from the Democratic side who has taken a lot of extra efforts to make certain that this is a balanced approach to trade. He has taken some significant pressure back home from constituents. He understands some of the concerns raised by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and wants to make certain human rights are protected, religious expressions allowed.

I have visited China twice and can say from a personal observation that there is an emerging thought in China amongst the young people, amongst the average citizens, that suggests that they may in fact be able to change the way Mainland China thinks; they may be able to influence their leaders in the future. But the one thing became apparent to me, having visited there, is that we have to be there in order to facilitate that dialogue.

I think clearly the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has been very, very admirable in listening to all sides of the debate and taking into consideration the concerns the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has raised. I know he does not just make these characterizations without some background and some deep thought. I know he cares deeply about this debate and about the people of Taiwan and the Dalai Lama and others, and I do not criticize that strong voice that he brings to the floor today, but my various points of view that I have been able to study and look at suggest that there is progress on some of those fronts, maybe not as much as we would all like and, yes, there are some threats to average citizens, but I sense that if the American country, the people of our country, our corporate participants that provide jobs and provide opportunity, are not engaged in China, then we will not be able to impact or

change the dynamic of the Communist government; we will not be able to provide incentives for young people that recognize that entrepreneurial nationalism as it is in America is something to strive for; freedom of expression is something to be proud of.

It takes time to change people's ways of thinking. So I again urge a negative vote on the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) but urge that we continue to have this kind of spirited debate so we can resolve some of the underlying issues we bring to the floor today.

□ 1330

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been involved in fighting for worker rights in this country and around the world.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the resolution. Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would like to keep this debate low key, below the radar screen this afternoon. They would like for this issue to go away. In the land of freedom, this may be the last time we debate the issue on the floor of the Congress, the Congress of the people, the House of the people; this may be the last time we debate the issue of trade with China. Sadly, this could be the last debate. We will never have the ability to voice our concerns about an authoritarian government whose regime this House has recently voted to coddle, to patronize. Free trade with China is an oxymoron. Check the record. Check the record.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to use this time to talk about an even bigger picture. In his book, the Lexus in the Olive Tree, New York Times columnist Tom Friedman lays out what he calls globalization. We have addressed that issue not only with trade, but in foreign policy and a lot of other things, the subject of globalization. Friedman's contention is that no longer will there be Democrats and Republicans, one will either be a free trader, or not; one will be a globalizer, or not. Globalization means the spread of free market capitalism to virtually every country in the world. He talks about how these trade agreements we are talking about are the wave of the future. Get with it, I say to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER). Get with it, I say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), my friend. You are not with it.

The proponents of PNTR won their battle by arguing that we, the opponents, were against trade and globalization. It was clever. I cannot stress this point enough. We are not against trade, and we are not against a global economy. Mr. Speaker, I am

against deals that cause my State, the State of New Jersey, to lose 22,000 jobs. Yes, I am against that. I am against deals that see our textile industry exported overseas in the name of economic progress. Yes, I am against that.

While Mr. Friedman talks of globalization and the interconnection of economies, which is something that we cannot question, which will be good for big business, our constituents will see their technical and manufacturing jobs exported overseas. This sort of global economy will see jobs that were someone's career. Our grandparents who came here had these entry-level jobs, and we continue to export these manufacturing jobs against the very people who used them. Out of one side of our mouth we talk about the immigrants coming to America, but the very jobs that we work at will no longer be here.

Mr. Speaker, we have no longer a war on turf in America or in the world. We are not going to be fighting over boundaries, I say to my good friend from New York. I know that. But to think that the boundary lines are going to be the competitive forces playing out on Wall Street and on the Internet is to bury our heads in the sand. It is absolutely unforgivable what we have done in the last 3 months on the subject of trade with an enemy. Our enemy is not the Chinese people, it is the authoritarian government; and it goes long before 50 years that that government was authoritarian.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), my distinguished colleague and friend.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution of the gentleman from California and essentially do so for two reasons: the first is, we have, I think, an opportunity to provide an incentive for the Chinese to engage in fair international competition. I think we have an opportunity to provide an incentive for the Chinese to improve their labor standards, human rights standards. I think we have an opportunity to provide an incentive for the Chinese to improve their environmental standards.

However, I think if we continually on an analyzed basis and potentially on a permanent basis grant most favored nations status to the country of China, we have removed that last incentive to do these things. I think it is incumbent upon all of us that believe those changes are necessary is to say if you are going to do them, show us that you will.

Secondly, I do think that we have to change the focus of the debate and recognize that we have a choice to make today and every day, and that is

whether we are going to fight and negotiate to raise environmental standards, raise international labor standards; or are we simply going to engage in a race to the bottom because that is the way the world is today as we find it; that is the way we will accept the world as we find it, and we will accommodate ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, for 50 years we have spent the Treasury of the United States, and tens of thousands of young Americans have given their lives to secure our freedom, to win the Cold War, and to provide an opportunity for democracy to spread across the world. I think we have to make the same commitment to have our economic form of government also spread across the globe and not race to the bottom, but work every day to improve those international standards. We are not doing that if we do not support the gentleman's resolution.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, who knows full well that in this bill there are subsidies to American corporations to close their doors here and open up factories in the dictatorship in China to use their slave labor.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the legislation by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) that is before us today disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment to the People's Republic of China.

On May 24, when the House considered a measure providing permanent normal trade relations to China, I cited then a number of significant concerns in our relations with China regarding the enforcement of trade agreements, the documentation of human rights abuses, and the continued evidence of China's nuclear proliferation.

Over the past several months, additional evidence has emerged that China continues to play a key role in supplying sensitive nuclear missile and chemical weapons technology to a number of states of concern around the world. In particular, nonproliferation experts in and out of our government believe that China has provided critical assistance to the Pakistani nuclear weapons program.

To meet this growing threat to international peace and stability in Asia and around the world, I joined with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), my friend and colleague, in introducing on July 13 the China Nonproliferation Act, a companion measure to S. 2645 introduced by Senators THOMPSON and TORRICELLI.

In short, our concerns about irresponsible Chinese policies regarding the export of dangerous weapons of mass destruction are of even greater concern today than they were several

months ago during the debate on granting PNTR status for China. Approving this resolution, Mr. Speaker, of disapproval would send the right signal to Beijing that business as usual in Chinese weapons and technology exports is undermining our friends and allies throughout Asia and the Middle East.

China's continuing military buildup has only emboldened that nation to claim islands and territories belonging to the Philippines and its other neighbors in the region. Its illegal occupation of Tibet and its brutal repression of the Tibetan people continues unabated.

Under the current annual review arrangement, we in the Congress are able to fully examine and to debate the current human rights situation in China and its observance of religious freedoms. I ask my colleagues that if China is allowed to trample on the basic freedoms of its own citizens, how can we tell other nations in Asia and in Africa and elsewhere that they must not violate those freedoms?

I would also note that a recent report of our U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom was unanimous in its conclusions that China needs to take concrete steps to release all persons imprisoned for their religious beliefs and to take concrete measures to improve their respect for religious freedom.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support this resolution, disapproving the extension of the nondiscriminatory treatment of the People's Republic of China.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), our distinguished colleague.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations, this Member rises in opposition to House Joint Resolution 103. Despite the recent supercharged and misleading claims by opponents to NTR that this vote is about rewarding China, it is not that at all, but instead, a vote for our national interests, just as was the case with the successful passage on May 24 of legislation to provide permanent normal trade relations for China and the context of its accession to the World Trade Organization.

This Member strongly supports the continuation of normal trade relations, NTR, status for China because it is unmistakably in America's short-term and long-term national interests.

First, the continuation of NTR directly benefits American economic prosperity, just as it has done for the past 20 consecutive years. Regardless of what this body does, China will join the WTO and be required to take major actions to open up its vast markets of 1.2 billion consumers. However, if this

body recklessly disrupts current trade by failing to continue China's current NTR status during this interim period, we certainly jeopardize our ability to take advantage of the benefits of China's WTO accession and give an unfair advantage to our international competitors.

Second, continued NTR supports the U.S. national security objective of maintaining peace and stability in East Asia. Expanding trade with China and supporting further economic liberalization, and eventual political reform in China provides a means of giving China a stake in the peaceful, stable economically dynamic Asia Pacific region. If China, on the other hand, concludes that we have concluded it as our adversary, resources China currently devotes to economic reform could easily be reallocated to military expansion and modernization with adverse consequences for Taiwan and for our allies in Korea and Japan, and a destabilized region. A rejection of NTR could well trigger such a reaction from Beijing. Confronting China in this scenario will require much more than the 100,000-person military force we presently have in the Pacific area.

Mr. Speaker, this particular annual debate, triggered again this year by H.J. Res. 103, has become highly counterproductive. It is very damaging to Sino-American relations, and importantly, with little or no positive results in China on human rights or freedom, or any positive impact on our relationship with that country and its people.

□ 1345

Given the strong support and 40-vote margin this body provided in passing PNTR on May 24, denying the continuation of NTR during this interim period is self-evidently neither in our short- nor long-term national interest, and therefore, this Member strongly urges his colleagues to join him opposing House Joint Resolution 103.

This Member, in contrast to what the gentleman from New Jersey says, does not intend that this have a low-key atmosphere. If Members are convinced of the rightness of their position in opposition to the resolution, let it have full public scrutiny.

The gentleman from Michigan and I have established, by our action, in the House, at least, and we expect that the other body will consider it soon, an opportunity for a full review of what China does in human rights by the creation of an executive-legislative branch Helsinki-type Commission. We in the Congress are going to have plenty of opportunity to scrutinize what they do with respect to their people. That is a better mechanism than we have now. It is a better mechanism than this annual debate.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Rohrabacher resolution.

Mr. Speaker, as this Member mentioned, this body passed H.R. 4444, legislation granting Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) to China in the context of China's accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO) by a strong margin of 40 votes: 237–197. As the other body has not yet acted on this important legislation and China is still negotiating its WTO accession protocols, the continuation of normal trade with China during this interim requires another annual Presidential waiver as contained in the Trade Act of 1974. Unfortunately, despite the support in the House for Normal Trade Relations with China, as reflected by the successful passage of PNTR, the introduction of H.J. Res. 103 requires the House to vote on extending Normal Trade Relations status for China yet again.

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, as we have in the past, 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 Member again points out that this particular annual debate has become highly counterproductive as 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 instead of the current average of 4 to 5 percent would severely 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.

Regardless of how this body votes on NTR, China will soon join the WTO and be required to take major actions to open up its vast market of 1.2 billion consumers. As part of China's WTO accession process, the U.S. negotiated an outstanding export-oriented, market access agreement which significantly lowers China's high import tariffs and allows for direct marketing and distributing in China. For example, the tariff on beef will fall from 45 percent to just 12 percent. Quantitative restrictions on oil

seeds and soybean imports are abolished. Indeed, it is projected that by 2003, China could account for 37 percent of future growth in U.S. agricultural exports. Prior to the agreement, China frequently required manufacturing offsets—most products sold in China had to be made in China. This export-oriented agreement abolishes that unfair offset and eliminates currently required industrial technology transfers allowing products made in America to be sold in China. This agreement makes it less likely that American companies need to open foreign factories and thereby export jobs. Given that America's markets are already open at WTO standards to Chinese exports, the U.S. has effectively given up nothing with the new agreement; all the concessions have been made by China.

However, during this interim period as China continues to take the steps necessary to join the WTO, it is necessary to provide continued, uninterrupted NTR status to China on an annual basis to help ensure that American commercial interests remain engaged in China in preparation for the opening of China required when China joins the WTO. For the past 20 years, the U.S. has provided China with NTR status on an annual basis. It appears to make no sense to this Member to revoke China's NTR status now and only for an interim period thereby significantly jeopardizing the ability of the U.S. to take advantage of the benefits of China's forthcoming accession to the WTO.

To elaborate on our own national security interests, the continuation of NTR for China, indeed, supports the U.S. national security objective of maintaining peace and stability in East Asia. Sino-American relations are increasingly problematic and uncertain. In the wake of our accidental bombing of China's embassy in Belgrade and China's confusion about U.S. continuing support for Taiwan, rejection of NTR, if only for an interim period, could result in a resurgence of resentful nationalism as hard-liners in Beijing characterize a negative NTR vote as an American attempt to weaken and contain China. Resources China currently devotes to economic reform could easily be reallocated to military expansion with adverse consequences for Taiwan and our allies in Korea and Japan, and a destabilized region. Confronting China in this scenario will require much more than the 100,000 strong force we presently have in the Pacific. China is not a strategic partner; it is increasingly as economic competitor that is growing as a regional power. However, it is not an adversary. If the United States is astute and firm—if America increases our engagement with China and helps integrate it into the international community—it is certainly still possible to encourage China along the path to a complementary relationship with America instead of an incredible level of conflict.

China is emerging from years of isolation and the future direction of China remains in flux—more than any major country. WTO accession and continued—and hopefully soon to be permanent—NTR are critical for the success of China's economic reform process and those Chinese leaders, like Premier Zhu Rongji, who support it. These reforms, being pursued over the formidable opposition of old-style Communist hardliners, will eventually provide the foundation for a more open econ-

omy there, a process that, in the long term, should facilitate political liberalization and improved human rights. In the near term, China will be required more and more to govern civil society on the basis of the rule of law, clearly a positive development we should be encouraging. Rejection of this standard annual renewal of NTR prior to providing China with PNTR would, indeed, jeopardize the pace and scope of these reforms in China.

Continuing to provide China with NTR and China's accession to the WTO does not guarantee that China will always take a responsible, constructive course. That is why the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] and this Member proposed an initiative which was attached to the recently-passed legislation providing PNTR that incorporates special import anti-surge protections for the U.S. and other trade enforcement resources for our government to ensure China's compliance with WTO rules. This initiative also proposes a new Congressional-Executive Commission on Chinese Human Rights that will report to the Congress annually on human rights concerns, including recommendations for timely legislative action.

Mr. Speaker, this Member believes that these additional provisions, particularly the Commission on Chinese Human Rights with the guaranteed review of its findings and recommendations by the appropriate standing committee in the House, do, indeed, address the multi-faceted concerns of our colleagues. The Levin-Bereuter initiative assures that China's compliance with their commitments and their human rights record will certainly not be ignored by the Congress or the Executive Branch. The Commission will be a far more effective way to address human rights issues than the noisy but ineffective annual debate on extending NTR.

Some have advocated the revocation of NTR status for China in order to punish Beijing for weapons proliferation and its espionage operations against the United States. As one of the nine members of the bipartisan 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.

Similarly, revoking NTR status during this interim period before China's accession to the WTO for proliferation reasons will have minimal, if any, impact in halting Chinese proliferation. On the contrary, China's likely reaction would be to refuse any cooperation on this issue to the detriment of U.S. national security interests around the globe.

The United States has convinced nearly every other country in the region that the best way to avoid conflict is to engage each other in trade and closer economic ties. Abandoning this basic tenet of our foreign policy with China—as H.J. Res. 103 would certainly do—would be a serious shock and would be an extraordinary setback from much of what our nation has been trying to achieve in the entire Asia-Pacific region. It would send many countries scrambling to choose between China or the United States.

We should first do no harm to our own nation and America's citizens. Rejecting annual NTR status for China is self-evidently neither in our short term nor our long term national interest. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this Member is strongly opposed to H.J. Res. 103 and again urgently urges its rejection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), who has opposed our government's policy of subsidizing industry's practice of shutting down U.S. plants and moving them to China.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the fact that today's vote on annual renewal of MFN with China occurs after the House's previous close vote granting China permanent MFN gives us a chance to re-evaluate the wisdom of our action.

Since that vote in May, we have learned that several of our assumptions about the meaning of the vote and of China's role in the world have proven false. Consider this. The Wall Street Journal ran an article that I want to quote from. The headline was, "House Vote Primes U.S. to Boost Investments in China."

The article says that the China deal with the U.S. on trade has less to do with U.S. workers making and exporting goods to the Chinese and more about Chinese workers working in U.S.-owned factories in China for import to the U.S.

The Journal quotes a Wall Street economist saying, "This deal is about investments, not exports." Indeed, the same article quotes a Washington-based analyst who said: "U.S. exports will increase, but not at the rate of investment, and the corporate community has been quiet about that. They've been able to avoid telling that story."

I want to read that quote again. This is a Washington-based analyst: "U.S.

exports will increase, but not at the rate of investment, and the corporate community has been quiet about that. They've been able to avoid telling that story."

We are going to tell the story here. Since the vote for permanent MFN with China, a company in the Cleveland area which provides jobs for my constituents said it will close in the U.S. in favor of a new factory in China.

Mr. Speaker, as a director of the UAW in the Cleveland region wrote to his Senators last week, "The first casualty of normal trade relations has occurred. . . . It is obvious that Rubbermaid's cancellation of the Nestaway contract is not about world competition, it is about naked greed. Nestaway's story is about only one of the thousands of small American companies which are confronted with an economic squeeze brought about by unfair trade laws. PNTR for China will be the death knell for many small companies."

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

Mr. Speaker, the center core argument of this debate today is never addressed. People always try to ignore it. I would just like to draw the attention of those people reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or listening to this debate to this, that over and over again we have stated that this is not about free trade. This is not a debate about free trade, or even engaging in China. People have a right to do business in China.

The reason why the American corporate community is insisting on normal trade relations status, which is a specific status, is so that those corporations can receive taxpayer subsidies and loan guarantees so they can close up their factories in the United States and open up factories in China to exploit a near slave labor, where people are not permitted to join unions, and do so at the taxpayers' risk, U.S. taxpayers' risk.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sin against the American people. It is not leading to more freedom. They are laughing at us because we are subsidizing their \$70 billion surplus which they are using to build weapons systems to kill the American military personnel that some day may have to confront their belligerency.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 103, 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 mirror retaliation on the part of the Chinese against \$14 billion in U.S. exports, this bill would effectively extinguish trade relations between our two countries.

House Joint Resolution 103 is an annual resolution of disapproval of the President's recommendation to extend normal trade relations status to China under the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974.

In light of our action earlier this year on H.R. 4444, rejecting House Joint Resolution 103 should be pro forma.

On May 24, after a vigorous debate which considered the opportunities that will be possible for the United States and the Chinese people when China accedes to the World Trade Organization, the House voted 237 to 197 to eliminate this annual review of China's NTR status upon China's accession to the WTO.

Unfortunately, H.R. 4444 is still pending in the other body, and I hope that H.R. 4444 will go as quickly as possible to the President without amendment. As the historic debate and the strong vote on H.R. 4444 documents, there is overwhelming support in this body for bringing China into the rules-based trading system of the WTO. It is the right thing to do for Americans and for the Chinese people.

Under the WTO deal, in exchange for applying tariffs on Chinese imports identical to those in effect now, United States exporters will have unprecedented access to 1.2 billion consumers in China. Tariffs on our exports to China will be steeply reduced, and the Chinese trade regime subject to the whole scale of reforms.

For example, under the agreement, average tariffs on agricultural goods would drop from 40 percent to 17 percent, Chinese tariffs on American-made automobiles would fall 75 percent, while quotas on U.S. auto exports to China would be eliminated entirely.

The opportunity we have to impose an enforceable system of fair trade rules on a nation of 1.2 billion people, as it emerges from the iron grip of communism and state planning, is one that cannot be lost. In my estimation, the revolutionary change WTO rules will bring to China dwarfs any other avenue of influence available to the United States.

Maintaining normal trade relations supports the continued presence of Americans throughout Chinese society, whether they be entrepreneurs, teachers, religious leaders, or missionaries. It is these individual contacts that are bringing our ideals of freedom to the Chinese people. These contacts would be lost if we revoked NTR.

The Reverend Pat Robertson 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."

Motorola, my corporate constituent, directly promotes the exchange of

ideas through its activities in China. For example, Motorola sends hundreds of Chinese employees to its United States facilities each year to attend technology, engineering, and management seminars. In a country where only 10 to 15 percent of the people have access to a college education, this is precious training that allows for eye-opening exposure to the American way of life.

H.R. 4444 has the active bipartisan support of more former presidents and cabinet officials, more distinguished Americans, more small businessmen and farmers, more Governors, more religious and human rights leaders, both here and in China, more of our allies, such as Taiwan and Great Britain, than any foreign policy or trade legislation in recent memory. H.R. 4444 even has the support of a past president of the United Auto Workers, Leonard Woodcock.

Denying normal trade relations with China means severing ties that would take years to repair. For the interests of all Americans and for the Chinese people, I urge a no vote on House Joint Resolution 103.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), who understands this debate is about China, not about its 1 billion consumers but about 1 billion workers, many of whom work as slave labor.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), has it right, and I am pleased to support his bill. It is the only moral position to take.

It is amazing how far backwards this Congress will bend for big business. This Congress should stand for small people, for human need, and not corporate greed. Why else would a young woman work 70 hours a week for pennies an hour and end up owing the company? Two hundred years ago they called that sharecropping, and it was black people, but they never called it freedom. Yet, Kathi Lee Gifford handbags and Huffy bicycles and Timberland shoes and of course Nike, operate factories where the standard is to do just that.

We will hear folks talk about China trade bringing democratic values to the people. I think the people of China already have democratic values, and these corporations work with the repressive Chinese government to deny the Chinese people the democracy that they want.

Besides, U.S. corporations are running away from developing democracies as if they have the plague, and are instead investing in the world's worst authoritarian regimes. They have a history of doing that. That is why the slave trade flourished; so, too, trade with the Nazis.

By definition, what is happening in China, especially to women, is slavery.

If it was bad for America and it is bad for Sudan, then it is bad for China. We should not be supporting it.

I know American corporations can do better than that. That is why I have introduced the Corporate Code of Conduct. I urge my colleagues to support the Corporate Code of Conduct and to support this bill.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of this body's greatest spokesmen for human rights, who knows that we should not be subsidizing American corporations to close factories here and open them up in China.

□ 1400

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for yielding me this time and for his kind remarks. I have the highest respect for Mr. ROHRABACHER,—a true champion of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, in 1994, President Clinton decided to conduct an experiment. He decided to delink most favored nation status for China with human rights on the theory that more trade and investment with the United States would be the quickest way to persuade the government of China to treat its own people as human beings. At the same time, the Clinton administration gave up its power to use even the threat of the loss of MFN as a lever against Beijing's military aggression against Taiwan and other neighboring countries, and its military threats against the United States as well.

Mr. Speaker, we are now 6 years into these two risky experiments with the lives of 1.2 billion people who are unfortunate enough to live under a cruel dictatorship and with the national security of the U.S. and the whole free world hanging in the balance. Nobody can seriously argue that either experiment has been a success. Instead, it has brought the people of China 6 more years of torture, forced labor, forced abortion, and sterilization, the crushing of the free trade unions, the denial of fundamental rights of freedom of religion, of expression of assembly, and of the press.

The Chinese Communist regime is not only threatening to invade Taiwan, its senior military leaders have also threatened to attack the United States of America. These are our great business partners.

Mr. Speaker, here is what Wei Jingsheng, the father of the Chinese democracy movement and long-time prisoner of conscience said in 1999 about the practical effects of MFN on the everyday lives of political and religious prisoners in China:

"The attitude of prison authorities toward political prisoners is directly

related to the amount of pressure being exerted by the international community. When international pressure was high, the number of dissidents sent to prison declined drastically and prison conditions for political prisoners somewhat improved. In 1998, condemnation of China's position was abandoned entirely. The direct consequence of this easing of pressure was that, not only did the government crack down on activists attempting to organize an opposition party, but they also cruelly suppressed nonviolent demonstrations by ordinary people."

Mr. Speaker, that is not me talking, that is Wei Jingsheng. When the U.S. turns up the economic pressure of Beijing, the beatings and the torture are less severe and are imposed on fewer people. When the pressure lets up, the repression gets worse.

But, Mr. Speaker, Members do not have to take Wei's word for the fact that Beijing responds to strength rather than weakness. All we have to do is watch what happens when Beijing does something that the Clinton administration and big business really hate, such as tolerating software piracy.

When that happens, Mr. Speaker, do the constructive engagers follow their own advice? Do they decide to just grin and bear it, go on trading and investing in China in the hope that eventually the Chinese Government will see the light? No, they do not. Instead, they threaten to impose trade sanctions, the very sanctions they say are inappropriate or ineffective when it comes to stopping torture and other human rights abuses. Talk about misplaced priorities.

Mr. Speaker, the threat to withhold trade privileges works to persuade Beijing to respect international copyrights because the Chinese dictatorship values the U.S. as a market for their expanding economy. So when we threaten their access to our market, they respond by respecting international copyrights. Why should that not also work when it comes to stopping or at least mitigating torture of religious prisoners and political prisoners?

Maybe there is a reason, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the Chinese Government is more attached to torture than they are to software piracy, but maybe not.

Let us try and do an experiment, a more promising one than the failed experiment of delinkage. Let us hold out the hand of friendship to Beijing, as Ronald Reagan did to Gorbachev, but make it clear that American friendship and American largesse are conditional on Beijing's observing certain minimum standards of human decency. Let us convince them that good things will flow to them from the United States if and only if they stop threatening to invade Taiwan and to shoot missiles at Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, the constructive engagers continually want us to give

up our power and try any strategy except their own 6-year-old experiment which is looking more and more like a miserable failure. Since our May vote on PNTR, the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom has reported that the Beijing regime has intensified its repression of Uighur Muslims, the Tibetan Buddhists. It has intensified its crackdown on Falun Gong as well as to Catholic and Protestant leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a yes vote on the measure offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade, for his very important leadership on this issue.

We all have gone through this discussion very vigorously over the past several months. We know that this, as many people have said, was the most important vote that we would face, some reported in a generation, in their entire careers, whether we would grant permanent normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China.

Because we have not seen the completion of China's accession in the World Trade Organization, we are here today dealing with this annual renewal question. As we look at this issue, I have to say that, having listened to my friends with whom I disagree on this issue, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), I just listened to the statements of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), no one is arguing about the problems that exist in China. We all know that they are there.

I think it is important for our colleagues who oppose us on this who support what really is a policy of trying to disengage, to end normal trade relations with China, we have to recognize that we do share the same goal of trying to ensure the recognition of human rights, to make sure that we maintain stability, the stability in the region, that we diminish the threat to Taiwan, that we do everything that we possibly can to recognize the rights of the people in Tibet. All of these questions, technology transfer, all of these are very high priorities for all of us.

The question is, how do we most effectively deal with them? Well, I argue that it is very clear that a policy of trying to encourage the spread of our Western values is the most effective way to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that we have an instance which has shown dramatic success, and that instance to which I am pleased to point to took place just 2 weeks ago. I am talking about the election in Mexico.

Now the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) suspected that I might want to hit him hard on this. I am not going to hit him, I am going to praise and congratulate him, because he stood in this well in 1993 when we, on a regular, on regular occasions would engage in debate with the gentlewoman from Toledo, Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) and I were on the same side going against the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) when we were arguing in behalf of the North American Free Trade Agreement. We realized as we were arguing for that that we were going to do everything that we could to enhance the economy of Mexico, to improve the standard of living.

At the time that we were debating the NAFTA, working hard with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) my friend in the back of the Chamber here, and others, we argued that economic reform which began under President Salinas in 1988 was a very positive force. We saw privatization, decentralization. We saw President Salinas close down the largest oil refinery in Mexico City. We saw very bold moves towards free markets in Mexico.

When we were debating the NAFTA, one of the criticisms leveled by opponents to the NAFTA was the critical corruption that existed in Mexico, the fact that they did not have free and fair elections. We did not argue with that. But we said that there is an interdependence between economic and political freedom. Maintaining strong economic ties is the best way to bring about the kind of political change and reform that we all want to see take place.

So what is it that took place? We saw the implementation of the NAFTA. We have seen great benefits, dramatic improvement in economic relations, a great increase in exports from the United States to Mexico, from Mexico into the United States, a dramatic improvement in the standard of living to the point where Mexico's middle-class population is today larger than the entire Canadian population.

Yes, we still have problems. We all recognize that. But we did see for the first time free and fair elections. In 71 years of one-party rule, we had so many problems developed. President Zedillo, to his credit, said that he wanted self-determination in Mexico. Having followed economic reform, they brought about free and fair elections.

I was pleased, along with the former Secretary of State James Baker and the Mayor of San Diego Susan Golding to have led a delegation of 44 members observing that election. It was terrific. To see the enthusiasm the people of Mexico had for participating in an election where their votes actually count was very reassuring.

Mr. Speaker, the same thing is going to happen in the People's Republic of

China, not tomorrow, not next week, not next year, maybe not for 5 years or 10 years, but clearly based on the evidence that we have seen in Mexico, in South Korea, in Taiwan, that clearly is the wave of the future.

So expanding our values into China is the best way that we can deal with repression. Rejecting this resolution of disapproval, realizing that Taiwan is very supportive of maintaining our ties with China, those sorts of things will benefit us, they will benefit the people of China and help maintain world peace.

Vote no on this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MASCARA) who recognizes that countries like Mexico and Taiwan are democracies and do not have slave labor camps like the People's Republic of China.

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of workers who do not have to toil in sweatshop conditions, workers who are not denied the right to organize, workers who are not confined to slave labor factories.

I rise in support of American workers, workers at Wheeling Pittsburgh Steel in my district, workers at Weirton Steel, in the textile mills of North Carolina and the auto factories of Michigan.

These are the people who have seen first hand the effects of unbalanced trade with China. These are real people who have seen their jobs moved overseas and their communities decimated.

I should mention from the start that I am a strong supporter of free trade. Our country has profited greatly from exports, and we are poised to take great strides as global leaders of the high-tech industry.

But free trade must be fair trade. We have suffered through many trade disputes with China without satisfactory resolution. Illegal dumping and subsidies have hurt scores of American companies and cost many workers their jobs.

We have been told that we must pass normal trade relations so that China can be admitted into the WTO. We are told that China's entry into the WTO will hold them accountable to international standards and lead them to respect the rule of law.

But the People's Republic of China have had a dismal record in previous trade agreements with our country. Moreover, the WTO itself has proven inconsistent in resolving trade disputes. Our country recently won two prominent WTO cases against the European Union, which has subsequently failed to honor both of these rulings.

If Europe can ignore WTO, what message does that send to China? What assurances should we have that our accession agreements are meaningful?

If we look for trade to change China, we are looking in the wrong direction. If we expect increased commerce to bring more freedom to the Chinese, we are being misled. The only thing we can be sure of is that our country's workers will be asked to risk their jobs in the hope that social and political conditions in China will improve.

I am unwilling to ask my constituents to make this sacrifice. I am not about to risk my neighbors' well-being for anybody, including China. I support the resolution to deny China most-favored-nation's status.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for yielding me this time, and I thank him once again for his hard work on permanent normal trade relations and his successful legislative efforts to help us in a bipartisan way establish, not just a yearly way of monitoring human rights, not just a monthly way of monitoring human rights, but a daily way of us trying to monitor and improve the human rights condition in China, something we are all very concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson, the third President of the United States said that he sought "an empire for liberty". He was not content merely to say that the 13 original colonies were what we should improve our great Republic's emphasis on human rights and expanding liberties. He sought in 1803 to purchase the Louisiana territories or the Louisiana Purchase, as it was later called, and expand the United States. He also sought with the Lewis and Clark Expeditions in 1803 through 1806 to also look for a greater expansion of the United States.

As we debated permanent normal trade for China, many of us came to the conclusion that the status quo between the United States and China simply was not good enough for human rights, for the environment, and for trade, and that we wanted to change that. We wanted to penetrate the Chinese markets with products, not exporting our jobs. We wanted to see the Chinese improve on their human rights condition. It was not good enough.

□ 1415

Therefore, we sought an engagement strategy of confrontation, an engagement strategy of challenging the Chinese Government, an engagement strategy of penetrating their markets and opening up their markets to American products.

We are having a similar debate today. None of us are happy with the status quo. None of us think the Chinese have made enough progress on human rights. None of us feel that they have gone far enough in terms of emphasizing freedom and liberty, as Jef-

erson talked about. None of us feel like our workers are being fairly treated, at this point, with fair trade opportunities. So we came to a 13-year agreement to try to find ways to cut their barriers to trade, to cut their surplus on our trade, and try to find new ways for workers and farmers to get into their markets.

I would hope that we would continue, in the tradition of the permanent normal trade debate that we had, to find new ways to engage the Chinese to try to insist that the United States make trade policy national security policy, because our workers and our jobs depend upon it. So we have to get better fair trade policies. We have to get agreements that allow the Chinese to take down their barriers and quotas and tariffs to trade, and that is what we are trying to do with the permanent normal trade agreement.

So I would hope in a bipartisan way, Members of the Democratic and Republican parties would continue to try to come together and not only support, as we have, permanent normal trade, but fair trade policies. Not free trade but fair trade policies that penetrate the Chinese market, penetrate new markets; that do not sell our jobs overseas, but get our products into new markets.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has 12½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 13 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 18½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and let me say to all my colleagues who have been engaged in this debate that I think it has been a high-level debate.

I think the theme that my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), just made was a central theme that has been advanced by the side in favor of most favored nation trading status for China. It is a theme that has resonated throughout this debate. The theme is essentially that when the United States moves trade dollars abroad and we engage in liberal trade practices with a nation, good things happen; and,

therefore, we can expect good things to happen with China.

I am reminded that in 1941, Carl Anderson, one of our former colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota, warned his colleagues, and this was about 6 months before Pearl Harbor, that there was a chance that the American fleet might at some point be engaged with the Japanese fleet in combat. And he said at that time that when that engagement occurred we would be fighting a Japanese fleet that was built with American steel and fueled with American petroleum. Six months later, at Pearl Harbor, a lot of ships were sunk, a lot of planes destroyed, and 5,000 Americans killed and wounded by a Japanese fleet that was built with American steel and fueled with American petroleum.

That attempt at engagement with Japan's coprosperity sphere for Southeast Asia did not work. In fact, the fruits of American trade came back to kill Americans on the battlefields in the South Pacific. Similarly, the United States was one of the biggest investors in Nazi Germany, and I think we can all conclude that that massive transfer of funds did not work. It did not bring about good things.

Now, let us examine what China is doing with the trade dollars we are sending them. The second of the Sovremenny-class missile destroyers has now been delivered to China. This is the missile destroyer type built by the Russians for the sole purpose of killing American aircraft carriers. It is armed with the high speed Sunburn anti-ship missiles, which are very difficult to defend against. And that transfer is accompanied by the transfer of SU27 fighter aircraft, very high performance aircraft, also air-to-air refueling capability, which is now being purchased by the Chinese with American trade dollars. American trade dollars are also going to help construct the components of weapons of mass destruction and rocketry that is also being diffused around the world to such nations as Iraq and Syria.

So we are helping to build with American trade dollars a military machine, a war machine, in China. And I think it is a tragedy. Because in the century we have just left, where 619,000 Americans were killed in the bloodiest century in the history of the world, we left the century in a position of dominance, of absolute military dominance, having disassembled the Soviet empire.

Now, with our own hand, with \$70 billion a year in this trade imbalance with China, \$70 billion in American cash, we are helping to raise up with our own hand another superpower, which one day, either in proxy or by direct conflict, may engage American forces on battlefields and may kill American soldiers and sailors with technology and equipment that has been purchased with American trade

dollars. That is the tragedy of this MFN for China.

I realize it is a fait accompli, but I hope my colleagues will reflect on the military machine that we are constructing in this new century.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong opposition to what I regard to be a shortsighted and, I believe, a very misguided attempt to undermine continued progress in the U.S.-Chinese relationship.

Just a few months ago, a bipartisan majority of the House voted to extend permanent normal trade relations to China. Now, this is not a vote that occurred in a vacuum. It followed 10 years of annual review of China's human rights policies under the Jackson-Vanik procedures that is now the law pertaining to trade with China. Under these procedures, we spent the last decade in committee hearings and in debates here on the floor. We spent the last decade analyzing and reanalyzing virtually every aspect of the relationship that we have with China.

During that time I think two central tenets emerged. First, none of us are satisfied with the current political environment that exists in China. Second, all of us would like to see greater and more profound changes occur in China. On that we all agree. But then we diverge. We diverge on how we are going to bring that about.

There is a group in the House, a minority in the House, that believes the best way to effectuate change in China is by isolating them. I respect that point of view; I disagree with it. They would have us cut off economic and political ties to the most populous nation on earth by voting first against permanent normal trade relations and now, today, against the annual renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver.

A majority of the House, and the administration, rejects this view. They believe, as I do, that change in China is going to occur only if the United States continues to help nurture those elements within Chinese society that promote change; namely, the expanding free market system, a new civil society that is emerging, and reform of the political party system. And we can only nurture these elements if we are engaged.

This year, after a long national debate that preceded it, the House was faced with a stark choice between these competing views. The majority rejected isolationism in favor of engagement. We rejected the flawed annual Jackson-Vanik procedures in favor of a more thoughtful, long-term approach to U.S.-China relations. We believe the Senate will follow shortly and that a new and more productive era in U.S.-China relations will begin.

There are some in the U.S. Congress who want us to change course with today's vote. They urge that we return to unproductive policies of the past by voting against renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver this year. That would be a mistake, Mr. Speaker. This historic opportunity awaits us as we venture into the 21st century, an opportunity to help redefine our relationships with China, an opportunity to help bring greater security to Asia, and an opportunity to bring forth real change in China through the magic of the free enterprise.

A "yes" vote today would be a vote for the past. I urge my colleagues to vote against the failed policies of the past and for a more enlightened future. I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Toledo, Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who fights for justice so workers can share in the wealth that they create.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for yielding me this time and for his leadership on this issue, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER); and I rise to express my strong support for this resolution to disapprove most favored nation status for China.

Why? Due to China's growing arrogance and record of transgressions, even in the wake of this body's unfortunate vote to grant unconditional permanent normal trade relations with China just a few weeks ago, by only a handful of votes I might add. So, what has happened? Three days after that vote, the Jiang regime clenched its fists even tighter on religious freedom in China when a Chinese court sentenced a Catholic priest to jail for 6 years. Why? For printing Bibles.

And then 10 days after the vote here in the House, Communist China repressed free speech again when Chinese officials arrested Huang Qi, a Chinese Web site operator, for posting articles about government corruption and human rights violations in China, including the 1989 massacre of pro-democracy students in Tiananmen Square. At 5:15 on June 3, with the Chinese police at his door, Huang posted his last message on his Web site. It said, "Thanks to all who make an effort on behalf of democracy in China." He wrote, "They have come. Goodbye."

Huang now faces a prison sentence of 10 years or more because the State says he is trying to subvert state power.

And then 2 weeks after the vote here in this House, Communist China proved its unworthiness again when China broke its promise to open its markets to California-based Qualcomm Corporation's cellular phone technology, a deal that was key to China's earning U.S. support to join the World Trade Organization. And that was after the premier of China had personally assured

Secretary Daley over at the Commerce Department that China would open its markets to Qualcomm, and they even signed a deal to that effect.

Based on this abysmal continuing record of oppression and human rights abuses, no one should support permanent extension. Today, we have a chance to cast a vote; and it should be for disapproving most favored nation relations with China.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

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

My colleagues, I would like to ask how many people here believe that governments in general will do purposely, decisively things that are not in their national interest? Do we really believe that governments in the world, especially the Chinese Government, are so stupid, so unclear about who they are and what they want that they are going to do something that they believe would lead to their own demise?

Everything we have heard here today, and everything we heard during the debate on PNTR, suggests that we all have one goal, and that is to make sure that China changes itself from the totalitarian system that now exists, from the system that we have just heard described that takes away freedom from their own people, that enslaves people, that acts as an aggressor nation, that threatens its neighbors. We all want to change that; right? Everybody here has said that is their goal.

□ 1430

Well, do my colleagues really believe that the Chinese Government thinks that PNTR will in fact create that same metamorphosis inside of them? Of course not. Do my colleagues think it is at all odd that the Chinese Government wants PNTR? If they agreed with any Member on the floor here about the ramifications of PNTR, do my colleagues think they would be saying, yes, please let us have more trade so that we can become a gentler nation and a nicer, kinder, gentler nation so that we can actually dissolve ourselves into some sort of Jeffersonian democracy? Of course not.

What the Chinese Government knows and understands perfectly well is that what this trade does is in fact embolden them. It supports the regime. The Chinese people and the Chinese Government have a social compact they have entered into, and it is this. This is the agreement they have reached that the Government says, we will do more for you in terms of your economic welfare; and you, in turn, will keep us in power. That is the agreement.

What PNTR does and what normal trade relations does with China is to

stabilize an aggressive regime. They know it. That is why they support it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), who has fought for workers' rights all over the globe and especially in the United States and Latin America and China.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comments and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, all of us know this House has debated and resolved the question of China's trade status. But the concerns raised during that debate, the abuse of human rights, the destruction of the environment, the denial of religious freedom, China's failure to live up to trade agreements, we have not begun to even respond to those.

And the situation has only grown worse, as we just heard from the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who has by example illustrated to us what was promised and what was not fulfilled and what was broken soon after a vote we had.

In just the time since we voted on the permanent trade deal, China has only continued to back away from its commitments it made to the WTO. Of course, we may never know the extent to which China is violating its agreement since not all the funds that were promised to monitor that made it into the budget. Meanwhile, China remains an autocratic police state.

Did voting for permanent trade help Wang Changhuai? Wang was an auto worker at the Changsha engine factory. After the crackdown in 1989, Wang was tried and he was convicted of subversion. And what was his act of subversion? He helped organize a free trade union. For that crime he was sentenced to 13 years in prison.

Mr. Speaker, Bernard Malamud once wrote "the purpose of freedom is to create it for others." While trade with China may generate wealth for a few investors, it will not free brave men like Wang. Nor will it provide economic security to workers and their families right here at home.

We can undo today the mistakes of the past. I urge my colleagues to think about this issue more fully, and I hope we will not repeat the mistakes that we have made in the past in the future.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, can the Chair be kind enough to tell us the time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) has 8½ minutes remaining.

The order of closing is the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), and

the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

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

Mr. Speaker, we have a vigorous debate on the House floor. There are not a lot of Members here, but it is important. Again, China's Government seems to me making things more difficult for itself. It admits recent reports of missile technology aid to Pakistan and using the Commerce Department's less-than-secure measure of granting defense and computer companies permission to hire Chinese technicians to work on sensitive export control technologies.

Again, earlier this month, The New York Times reported that the U.S. intelligence agencies have told the Clinton administration and Congress that China has continued to aid Pakistan in its efforts to build long-range missiles that could carry nuclear weapons. And just yesterday, The Washington Times reported that the Clinton administration has allowed the hiring of hundreds of Chinese technicians to work on military-related or dual use technologies.

China is stepping up its espionage presence in the U.S. through all means possible and continues to expand its military complex with U.S. trade dollars.

As said before, some see China as a strategic partner. My colleagues, I see China as a potential adversary.

So I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this resolution.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close briefly and then I will let others refute if they want to.

Mr. Speaker, this is not going to be the last time that we debate our economic and trade relations with China. I hope not at all.

Indeed, China PNTR as it passed the House has been molded so that we will be assured of continuing surveillance, continuing oversight, continuing pressure, and continuing debate.

The whole purpose of that effort as we shaped and reshaped it was to make sure that we both engaged China and confronted it in terms of our economic and trade relations. As a result, as we have discussed, and I do not want to go into this in detail, we set up a commission that has major responsibilities, that is created at the highest level and that has jurisdiction in terms of human rights, including worker rights.

That commission is going to report back to this Congress with provisions written in to assure that we will be discussing and debating it. Indeed, I see these mechanisms, these instrumentalities as ways to assure our greater involvement, not our lessened involvement, our deeper engagement on a regular basis rather than the once-a-year consideration.

We also have provided that there shall be major enhanced oversight in monitoring responsibilities by the executive, including Commerce and USTR and, as I expressed earlier, the hope that there will be full appropriations for these purposes.

Also, we created within the legislation the strongest anti-surge provision that has ever been introduced and eventually, I trust, enacted into American law, a safeguard provision to make sure that if there is a major deleterious effect of this growing, complex relationship on American jobs in any particular sector there will be a prompt answer from the United States of America.

It is an effort to both expand trade but to do so shaping it. It is an effort that globalization will continue, in my judgment, there is no way to slam the door on it, but to shape it, to wrestle with these issues.

So I do think it is now important that we look to the future, that all of us join together in realizing that the challenges are mainly the challenges of the future and not of the past.

This is going to be a changing and difficult relationship. It is going to have a lot of edges to it, including rough edges. We are going to smooth them in an effective and constructive way, not by insulating ourselves or isolating China. Neither is going to work.

What will work is an activist, internationalist kind of approach to these problems that looks after the needs of American workers and businesses in a world that is indeed changing.

So I urge strongly that we vote no on this resolution. I take it that a no vote is indeed a yes vote to an activist effort to make sure that as China and the U.S. evolves into a fuller relationship that it will be one with our eyes open and one with our hands strong to make sure that American workers land on their feet and that American businesses as they work overseas conduct themselves in a way that we will be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I went to Nicaragua with the National Labor Committee and visited workers in a neighborhood called Tipitapa. These workers work in a Taiwanese-owned company, Chentex. They sew blue jeans. They make 21 cents for every pair of blue jeans that is sold for \$24 in Wal-Mart, in Kohl's, in K-Mart in the United States.

These workers asked for a 13-cents-per-pair-of-jeans raise. Summarily, the union leaders and the workers were fired by this company. These workers work about 60 or 70 hours a week and are paid about \$30 or \$40 a week for their work. They do not share in the

wealth they create for their employer. They cannot buy the clothes, the products that they make.

General Motors workers in Mexico cannot buy the automobiles they make because they are not paid enough. Disney workers in Haiti cannot buy the toys they make because they are not paid enough. Nike workers in Indonesia cannot buy the shoes they make because they are not paid enough. The textile workers in Nicaragua cannot buy the jeans they make because they are not paid enough. And Nike workers in China cannot buy any of the Nikes that they make, they cannot buy the shoes, because they are not paid enough.

When I was in Nicaragua, I met a young woman named Kristina. She and her husband live in a very run-down shack papered with boxes. Her house, basically, is made out of shipping material, shipping crates that she got from the factory where she works. Kristina leaves every day at 6 o'clock in the morning, rides two city buses to get to work, takes her 2-year-old to her mother's house, arrives at work at 7 o'clock, works until 7 o'clock at night, goes and picks her 2-year-old daughter up, comes home, gets home about 9 o'clock. She leaves home at 6 she gets home at about 9 o'clock at night.

□ 1445

Her husband has an even longer schedule. She does that 6 days a week. She lives in substandard housing. Her daughter is suffering from malnutrition. You can look at the ends of her hair and see the protein deficiency that shows up in the discolored hair. She has no opportunities in life. They are not sharing in the wealth they create. They cannot buy the products they make.

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of the global economy, the tragedy of how we have let the global economy develop, is that in democratic developing countries, investments leaving democratic developing countries like India and go to authoritarian developing countries like China. American business would prefer the workers in Indonesia because they cannot form unions, they do not talk back, they do not pay them any kind of real wages, they do not have worker safety laws, they do not have environmental laws. American companies would rather invest in Indonesia than democratic Taiwan. They would rather invest in China where they can pay slave labor. Kathie Lee/Walmart pays as little as 3 and 5 and 10 cents an hour. They would rather invest in China where they can pay slave labor wages instead of investing in democratic India.

Mr. Speaker, if we believe in this country, as we say we do, we believe in free enterprise, we do, it creates dynamism, it creates a dynamic, wealthy economy, we also believe in rules. We

believe in environmental laws, in food safety laws, in worker protection laws, in minimum-wage laws. We believe in free enterprise. We believe in rules.

Mr. Speaker, in the global economy, we believe in trade, we believe in openness, we believe in capitalism, but we need the same kind of rules.

Vote "yes" on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) who has been such a leader in this movement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his great leadership on this issue.

I listened intently to the debate as we have had this debate over and over again; and I come to the floor in a little bit of a different approach and, that is, the Congress has spoken, the House has spoken on this issue. The House has placed the ball in China's court to comply with our bilateral agreement. The House has spoken to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Nebraska's (Mr. BEREUTER) commission as the way to go to sort of calibrate the relationship between trade and human rights. So I think what choice do I have but to see this as an opportunity.

For 10 years many of us, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), for some of that and others, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), have fought this fight about how do we improve trade, improve human rights and stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction by China. Again, the PNTR vote has been taken and a choice has been made. So in my optimistic spirit, I think that maybe putting that aside now, we can really focus on the human rights, proliferation and some of the trade issues in a way that does not menace, for some, the passage of PNTR. So with the air cleared and that decision made, hopefully we will all join together when we hear of some of the things that are happening in China that are not in furtherance of our national security, that is, promoting democratic values, stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, growing our economy by promoting exports abroad.

The reason, Mr. Speaker, we are having this vote today is because when we took the PNTR vote, and I am sure this was explained earlier, but I think it bears repeating, when we took the PNTR vote earlier in the year, it was to be effective when China became a member of the WTO. China has not met all of the requirements, and indeed today there is a wire story that says that China's bid for admission to WTO still faces major hurdles and more time is needed before it gets the green light.

They said compilation of key documents essential to the process were running into problems, with the United States and the European Union sensing that China was trying to water down parts of the agreement it has made with them.

At the same time, some developing countries, including India, were insisting despite China's objections that their domestic interests should have the same protection against floods of China's imports, especially textiles, as the big powers had won. It is far from over yet, said one key official. There is a lot more work still to do and a lot of problems to resolve.

Let us hope they do resolve them. Then they would get PNTR, but only then would they get PNTR. And some of the concerns that many of us had on the vote, we were not saying they should not get it, we were saying if and when they meet the criteria that is established, the standards in our bilateral, then we should give them PNTR. Let us give them a chance to take the initial steps. Well, they have not yet, but again the Congress has spoken.

I just want to make a couple of points. Since our vote, China, in terms of human rights, the day after the congressional vote on PNTR, China continued to persecute individuals for their religious beliefs. Reuters reported that a Chinese court sentenced a Roman Catholic priest to 6 years in jail only for printing Bibles. The arrests are part of a nationwide repression campaign on authorized religious activities.

Then on June 8, Chinese authorities arrested an operator of an Internet Web site because it posted news about dissidents and the government's 1989 crackdown on pro-democracy protest in Tiananmen Square. The Web site is a U.S.-based Internet service provider. In response to this, many people in the Internet world, which I come from, have said, well, wait until the Internet democratizes China. When this happened, they said, what can we say? If we say something, we will only endanger these people further.

The gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. LEVIN) commission is going to be very important in addressing some of these issues. Then on June 13, the Chinese police arrested members of the China Democracy Party which they have outlawed who were sentenced to 3 years in a labor camp for only asking for the release of a fellow dissident. Imagine that. Sentenced to 3 years for requesting the release of a fellow dissident. Many members of the China Democracy Party already serving long terms in labor camps throughout China. Yesterday China's middle school teachers were beaten and seriously injured by police for protesting a plan to force them to resign and take tests to get their jobs back.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has spoken but our work is not done. Hopefully we

can work together to improve human rights, trade and to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, there will be no real human rights monitoring in China. The Russians were signatories of the Helsinki Final Accords and Helsinki worked. The Chinese will never sign or participate in the monitoring.

If every Member would go back and search your files, how many letters have you all sent to China on behalf of the Catholic bishops, the 14 Catholic bishops that are in jail? How many of you have sent a letter since we have passed PNTR?

I do not know why we are having a debate, but we are having it, and I think the gentlewoman from California made the case, your side won. But now have you done anything about the human rights concerns raised? Have you done anything about the fact that the Dalai Lama cannot return to Tibet and Tibet is still being plundered? Search your files. Have you done anything with regard to Tibet? Or have you done anything, as the gentlewoman talked about, to help house church leaders who have been arrested since we passed PNTR? Have you done anything with regard to them? Do you think Boeing has done anything with regard to the Catholic priests? Do you think Boeing, the head of Boeing, has done anything with regard to the evangelical house church leaders that have been arrested? Do you think Boeing has done anything with regard to the Catholic priest who went to jail for publishing the Bible? You all probably know that Boeing has not done anything.

Secondly, I think we are in the same mood as we were during the 1930s with regard to Winston Churchill and Nazi Germany. I think when I watch what is taking place in the other body, Senator THOMPSON is trying to do something and Members are urging him not to do anything because he may upset this. In closing, your side won. I wish their commission works. But in the meantime, not only those of us who have been against PNTR but those of you who have been for PNTR have an obligation, have a burden that every time you get a Dear Colleague letter from a Member asking that something be done to help a Catholic priest in China, you sign the letter. When there is something to be done with regard to a Catholic bishop, you sign the letter. When there is something to do with regard to Tibet and the Dalai Lama, you sign the letter. When there is something to be done to stop the persecution of the Moslems in the northwest portion of the country, you sign the letter. When we raise concerns with regard to nuclear proliferation in China, you sign the letter. If we can come to-

gether with regard to these issues of human rights and religious persecution, perhaps we can make some changes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution disapproving the extension of normal trade relations with China for another year.

Just two months ago we were on this floor debating the issue of granting permanent normal trade relations with China. At that time I and many of our colleagues provided evidence which showed that China has done nothing to deserve permanent access to U.S. markets. The evidence was strong in the areas of national security and human rights showing that the Chinese government is a brutal regime which poses a serious national security threat to the United States and which continues to commit human rights abuses and persecutes its own people for their religious beliefs.

In the past two months since the PNTR debate, the fears which many expressed about China's behavior have become reality and have been reported on by some of the major newspapers and leading news sources on China.

Immediately after the PNTR vote, the Washington Post published a lengthy article on the core planning document for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This document reportedly says that there should be a new focus on Asia, in part because of the risk of a hostile relationship with China.

The article, stated: "Cautiously but steadily, the Pentagon is looking at Asia as the most likely arena for future military conflict . . ." The article reports that a Pentagon official estimates that ". . . about two-thirds of the forward looking games staged by the Pentagon over the last eight years have taken place partly or wholly in Asia." Aaron L. Friedberg, political scientist at Princeton University is quoted on this subject, saying ". . . however reluctantly, we are beginning to face up to the fact that we are likely over the next few years to be engaged in an ongoing military competition with China . . . Indeed in certain respects, we already are." I submit this article for the record.

China has exported weapons of mass destruction and missiles in violation of treaty commitments. The director of the CIA has said that China remains a "key supplier" of these weapons to Pakistan, Iran, and North Korea. Other reports indicate China has passed on similar weapons and technology to Libya and Syria. If one of these countries is involved in a conflict, it is very possible that our men and women in uniform could be called into harm's way. These weapons of mass destruction could then be targeted against American troops.

I am concerned about the alliance that seems to be forming between China and Russia against the U.S. China is purchasing as many weapons from Russia as it can. I am concerned with recent reports in the Taiwan press that Russia will dispatch its Pacific Fleet to check the route of the U.S. Seventh Fleet if the U.S. makes any movement toward Taiwan during a China-Taiwan conflict. I also submit this article for the record. Also, reports indicate that China has purchased advanced naval vessels and top of the line anti-ship mis-

siles from the Russians that specifically are meant to be used against U.S. aircraft carriers.

The Chinese government has continued to persecute people because of their faith. Compass Direct, a news service that covers global religious freedom, reports that the government has cracked down on the House Church in Anhui province with new restrictions entailing all new house churches that are unregistered with the government are outlawed; all unregistered meetings and Bible training classes are labeled as illegal activities; and well over one hundred House church believers have been arrested in the past few months.

Compass Direct also reports that:

Ten house church leaders were arrested in May in Guangdong province.

Two Beijing House church leaders have reportedly received 1½ year sentences in prison labor camps for organizing "illegal religious meetings".

An underground Catholic priest near Wenzhou Province, Father Jiang Sunian, was reportedly given a six-year jail sentence on May 25 for printing Bibles and other religious literature without official permission.

The head of China's Religious Affairs Bureau, recently said that the Communist Party will increase the Party's control of religious affairs and "redirect the religions toward the adaptation of the socialist society."

The U.S. Committee on International Religious Freedom has recently stated that the Chinese government has increased its persecution of the Muslim Uighurs in Northwest China. I submit the Commission's statement for the record.

Tibetan Buddhists continue to be persecuted and imprisoned by the Chinese communist government.

In the PNTR debate, we said China's military engages in organ trafficking. On June 15 the International Herald Tribune published an article on the Chinese government's role in the organ trafficking of prisoners. I submit this article for the record. The article says:

"The day before convicts are executed—usually in batches—a group of patients in the hospital are told to expect the operation the next day . . . The night before their execution, 18 convicts were shown on a Chinese television program, their crimes announced to the public. Wilson Yeo saw the broadcast from his hospital bed in China and knew that one of the men scheduled to die would provide him with the kidney he so badly needed."

"China's preferred method of capital punishment, a bullet to the back of the head, is conducive to transplants because it does not contaminate the prisoner's organs with poisonous chemicals, as lethal injections do, or directly effect the circulatory system, as would a bullet through the heart.

". . . kidneys are essentially handed out to the highest bidders . . ."

A Chinese official from the Health Ministry was quoted saying that the trafficking of executed prisoner's organs ". . . is put under stringent state control and must go through standard procedures."

In closing, since PNTR has passed, there is even more evidence about China's gross human rights violations, religious persecution, and information regarding the national security threat that China poses to the U.S.

As I said in my statement for the record during the PNTR debate, the U.S. is at a crossroads in its relationship with China. Wishful thinking and ignoring all of the evidence about China's human rights violations, religious persecution, and national security threat do not change the reality of the regime in China.

We need to learn what history teaches us about leadership. Leadership is not about seeing what we wish to see. Leadership is not about closing our eyes to the threats before us. Leadership is about clearly, lucidly, and forcefully addressing facts and truth and taking appropriate action.

The American way of life, our freedom can only be preserved by vigilance. Vigilance requires us to look at the situation in China today and conclude that the Chinese regime should not have received permanent trade relations with the U.S. until the questions of national security were adequately addressed and until there was a significant improvement in China's human rights record.

The same applies to this debate on extending approval of normal trade relations with China. Giving China PNTR was the wrong thing to do and for the same reasons, which are buttressed by even more evidence today, the U.S. should disapprove extension of China normal trade relations.

[From the Washington Post, May 26, 2000]

FOR PENTAGON, ASIA MOVING TO FOREFRONT

(By Thomas E. Ricks)

When Pentagon officials first sat down last year to update the core planning document of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, they listed China as a potential future adversary, a momentous change from the last decade of the Cold War.

But when the final version of the document, titled "Joint Vision 2020," is released next week, it will be far more discreet. Rather than explicitly pointing at China, it simply will warn of the possible rise of an unidentified "peer competitor."

The Joint Chiefs' wrestling with how to think about China—and how open to be about that effort—captures in a nutshell the U.S. military's quiet shift away from its traditional focus on Europe. Cautiously but steadily, the Pentagon is looking at Asia as the most likely arena for future military conflict, or at least competition.

This new orientation is reflected in many small but significant changes: more attack submarines assigned to the Pacific, more war games and strategic studies centered on Asia, more diplomacy aimed at reconfiguring the U.S. military presence in the area.

It is a trend that carries huge implications for the shape of the armed services. It also carries huge stakes for U.S. foreign policy. Some specialists warn that as the United States thinks about a rising China, it ought to remember the mistakes Britain made in dealing with Germany in the years before World War I.

The new U.S. military interest in Asia also reverses a Cold War trend under which the Pentagon once planned by the year 2000 to have just "a minimal military presence" in Japan, recalls retired Army Gen. Robert W. RisCassi, a former U.S. commander in South Korea.

Two possibilities are driving this new focus. The first is a chance of peace in Korea; the second is the risk of a hostile relationship with China.

Although much of the current discussion in Washington is about a possible military

threat from North Korea, for military planners the real question lies further ahead: What to do after a Korean rapprochement? In this view, South Korea already has won its economic and ideological struggle with North Korea, and all that really remains is to negotiate terms for peace.

According to one Defense Department official, William S. Cohen's first question to policy officials when he became defense secretary in 1997 was: How can we change the assumption that U.S. troops will be withdrawn after peace comes to the Korean peninsula? Next month's first-ever summit between the leaders of North and South Korea puts a sharper edge on this issue.

In the longer run, many American policymakers expect China to emerge sooner or later as a great power with significant influence over the rest of Asia. That, along with a spate of belligerent statements about Taiwan from Chinese officials this spring, has helped focus the attention of top policymakers on China's possible military ambitions. "The Chinese saber-rattling has gotten people's attention, there's no question of that," said Abram Shulsky, a China expert at the Rand Corp.

#### THE BUZZWORD IS CHINA

Between tensions over Taiwan and this week's House vote to normalize trade relations with China, "China is the new Beltway buzzword," observed Dov S. Zakheim, a former Pentagon official who is an adviser on defense policy to Republican presidential candidate George W. Bush.

To be sure, large parts of the U.S. military remain "Eurocentric," especially much of the Army. The shift is being felt most among policymakers and military planners—that is, officials charged with thinking about the future—and least among front-line units. Nor is it a change that the Pentagon is proclaiming from the rooftops. Defense Department officials see little value in being explicit about the shift in U.S. attention, which could worry old allies in Europe and antagonize China.

Even so, military experts point to changes on a variety of fronts. For example, over the last several years, there has been an unannounced shift in the Navy's deployment of attack submarines, which in the post-Cold War world have been used as intelligence assets—to intercept communications, monitor ship movements and clandestinely insert commandos—and also as front-line platforms for launching Tomahawk cruise missiles against Iraq, Serbia and other targets. Just a few years ago, the Navy kept 60 percent of its attack boats in the Atlantic. Now, says a senior Navy submariner, it has shifted to a 5-50 split between the Atlantic and Pacific fleets, and before long the Pacific may get the majority.

But so far the focus on Asia is mostly conceptual, not physical. It is now a common assumption among national security thinkers that the area from Baghdad to Tokyo will be the main location of U.S. military competition for the next several decades. "The focus of great power competition is likely to shift from Europe to Asia," said Andrew Krepinovich, director of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, a small but influential Washington think tank. James Bodner, the principal deputy undersecretary of defense for policy, added that, "The center of gravity of the world economy has shifted to Asia, and U.S. interests flow with that."

When Marine Gen. Anthony Zinni, one of the most thoughtful senior officers in the military, met with the Army Science Board

earlier this spring, he commented offhandedly that America's "long-standing Europe-centric focus" probably would shift in coming decades as policymakers "pay more attention to the Pacific Rim, and especially to China." This is partly because of trade and economics, he indicated, and partly because of the changing ethnic makeup of the U.S. population. (California is enormously important in U.S. domestic politics, explains one Asia expert at the Pentagon, and Asian Americans are increasingly influential in that state's elections, which can make or break presidential candidates.)

Just 10 years ago, said Maj. Gen. Robert H. Scales, Jr., commandant of the Army War College, roughly 90 percent of U.S. military thinking about future warfare centered on head-on clashes of armies in Europe. "Today," he said, "it's probably 50-50, or even more" tilted toward warfare using characteristic Asian tactics, such as deception and indirection.

#### WAR GAMING

The U.S. military's favorite way of testing its assumptions and ideas is to run a war game. Increasingly, the major games played by the Pentagon—except for the Army—take place in Asia, on an arc from Teheran to Tokyo. The games are used to ask how the U.S. military might respond to some of the biggest questions it faces: Will Iran go nuclear—or become more aggressive with an array of hard-to-stop cruise missiles? Will Pakistan and India engage in nuclear war—or, perhaps even worse, will Pakistan break up, with its nuclear weapons falling into the hands of Afghan mujaheddin? Will Indonesia fall apart? Will North Korea collapse peacefully? And what may be the biggest question of all: Will the United States and China avoid military confrontation? All in all, estimates one Pentagon official, about two-thirds of the forward-looking games staged by the Pentagon over the last eight years have taken place partly or wholly in Asia.

Last year, the Air Force's biggest annual war game looked at the Mideast and Korea. This summer's game, "Global Engagement 5," to be played over more than a week at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama, will posit "a rising large East Asian nation" that is attempting to wrest control of Siberia, with all its oil and other natural resources, from a weak Russia. At one point, the United States winds up basing warplanes in Siberia to defend Russian interests.

Because of the sensitivity of talking about fighting China, "What everybody's trying to do is come up with games that are kind of China, but not china by name," said an Air Force strategist.

"I think that, however reluctantly, we are beginning to face up to the fact that we are likely over the next few years to be engaged in an ongoing military competition with China," noted Princeton political scientist Aaron L. Friedberg. "Indeed, in certain respects, we already are."

#### TWIN EFFORTS

The new attention to Asia also is reflected in two long-running, military-diplomatic efforts.

The first is a drive to renegotiate the U.S. military presence in northeast Asia. This is aimed mainly at ensuring that American forces still will be welcome in South Korea and Japan if the North Korean threat disappears. To that end, the U.S. military will be instructed to act less like post-World War II occupation forces and more like guests or partners.

Pentagon experts on Japan and Korea say they expect that "status of forces agreements" gradually will be diluted, so that

local authorities will gain more jurisdiction over U.S. military personnel in criminal cases. In addition, they predict that U.S. bases in Japan and South Korea will be jointly operated in the future by American and local forces, perhaps even with a local officer in command.

At Kadena Air Force Base on the southern Japanese island of Okinawa, for example, the U.S. military has started a program, called "Base Without Fences," under which the governor has been invited to speak on the post, local residents are taken on bus tours of the base that include a stop at a memorial to Japan's World War II military, and local reporters have been given far more access to U.S. military officials.

"We don't have to stay in our foxhole," said Air Force Brig. Gen. James B. Smith, who devised the more open approach. "To guarantee a lasting presence, there needs to be a private and public acknowledgment of the mutual benefit of our presence."

Behind all this lies a quiet recognition that Japan may no longer unquestioningly follow the U.S. lead in the region. A recent classified national intelligence estimate concluded that Japan has several strategic options available, among them seeking a separate accommodation with China, Pentagon officials disclosed. "Japan isn't Richard Gere in 'An Officer and a Gentleman,'" one official said. "That is, unlike him, it does have somewhere else to go."

In the long term, this official added, a key goal of U.S. politico-military policy is to ensure that when Japan reemerges as a great power, it behaves itself in Asia, unlike the last time around, in the 1930s, when it launched a campaign of vicious military conquest.

#### SOUTHEAST ASIA REDUX

The second major diplomatic move is the negotiation of the U.S. military's reentry in Southeast Asia, 25 years after the end of the Vietnam War and almost 10 years after the United States withdrew from its bases in the Philippines. After settling on a Visiting Forces Agreement last year, the United States and the Philippines recently staged their first joint military exercise in years, "Balikatan 2000."

The revamped U.S. military relationship with the Philippines, argues one general, may be a model for the region. Instead of building "Little America" bases with bowling alleys and Burger Kings that are off-limits to the locals, U.S. forces will conduct frequent joint exercises to train Americans and Filipinos to operate together in everything from disaster relief to full-scale combat. The key, he said, isn't permanent bases but occasional access to facilities and the ability to work with local troops.

Likewise, the United States has broadened its military contacts with Australia, putting 10,000 troops into the Queensland region a year ago for joint exercises. And this year, for the first time, Singapore's military is participating in "Cobra Gold," the annual U.S.-Thai exercise. Singapore also is building a new pier specifically to meet the docking requirements of a nuclear-powered U.S. aircraft carrier. The U.S. military even has dipped a cautious toe back into Vietnam, with Cohen this spring becoming the first defense secretary since Melvin R. Laird to visit that nation.

The implications of this change already are stirring concern in Europe. In the March issue of *Proceedings*, the professional journal of the U.S. Navy, Cmdr. Michele Consentino, an Italian navy officer, fretted about the American focus on the Far East and about

"dangerous gaps" emerging in the U.S. military presence in the Mediterranean.

#### WHERE THE GENERALS ARE

If the U.S. military firmly concludes that its major missions are likely to take place in Asia, it may have to overhaul the way it is organized, equipped and even led. "Most U.S. military assets are in Europe, where there are no foreseeable conflicts threatening vital U.S. interests," said "Asia 2025," a Pentagon study conducted last summer. "The threats are in Asia," it warned.

This study, recently read by Cohen, pointedly noted that U.S. military planning remains "heavily focused on Europe," that there are four times as many generals and admirals assigned to Europe as to Asia, and that about 85 percent of military officers studying foreign languages are still learning European tongues.

"Since I've been here, we've tried to put more emphasis on our position in the Pacific," Cohen said in an interview as he flew home from his most recent trip to Asia. This isn't, he added, "a zero-sum game, to ignore Europe, but recognizing that the [economic] potential in Asia is enormous"—especially, he said, if the United States is willing to help maintain stability in the region.

#### TYRANNY OF DISTANCE

Talk to a U.S. military planner about the Pacific theater, and invariably the phrase "the tyranny of distance" pops up. Hawaii may seem to many Americans to be well out in the Pacific, but it is another 5,000 miles from there to Shanghai. All told, it is about twice as far from San Diego to China as it is from New York to Europe. Cohen noted that the military's new focus on Asia means, "We're going to want more C-17s" (military cargo planes) as well as "more strategic airlift" and "more strategic sealift."

Other experts say that barely scratches the surface of the revamping that Asian operations might require. The Air Force, they say, would need more long-range bombers and refuelers—and probably fewer short-range fighters such as the hot new F-22, designed during the Cold War for dogfights in the relatively narrow confines of Central Europe. "We are still thinking about aircraft design as if it were for the border of Germany," argues James G. Roche, head of Northrop Grumman Corp.'s electronic sensors unit and a participant in last year's Pentagon study of Asia's future. "Asia is a much bigger area than Europe, so planes need longer legs."

Similarly, the Navy would need more ships that could operate at long distances. It might even need different types of warships. For example, the Pentagon study noted, today's ships aren't "stealthy"—built to evade radar—and may become increasingly vulnerable as more nations acquire precision-guided missiles.

Also, the Navy may be called on to execute missions in places where it has not operated for half a century. If the multi-island nation of Indonesia falls apart, the Pentagon study suggested, then the Navy may be called upon to keep open the crucial Strait of Malacca, through which passes much of the oil and gas from the Persian Gulf to Japan and the rest of East Asia.

The big loser among the armed forces likely would be the Army, whose strategic relevancy already is being questioned as it struggles to deploy its forces more quickly. "At its most basic level, the rise of Asia means a rise of emphasis on naval, air and space power at the expense of ground forces," said Eliot Cohen, a professor of strategic studies at Johns Hopkins University.

In a few years, Pentagon insiders predict, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be from the Navy or Air Force, following 12 years in which Army officers—Generals Colin L. Powell, John Shalikashvili and Henry H. Shelton—have been the top officers in the military. Perhaps even more significantly, they foresee the Air Force taking away from the Navy at least temporarily the position of "CINCPAC," the commander in chief of U.S. forces in the Pacific. There already is talk within the Air Force of basing parts of an "Air Expeditionary Force" in Guam, where B-2 stealth bombers have been sent in the past in response to tensions with North Korea.

#### PARALLEL WITH PAST

If the implications for the U.S. military of a new focus on Asia are huge, so too are the risks. Some academics and Pentagon intellectuals see a parallel between the U.S. effort to manage the rise of China as a great power and the British failure to accommodate or divert the ambitions of a newly unified Germany in the late 19th century. That effort ended in World War I, which slaughtered a generation of British youth and marked the beginning of British imperial decline.

If Sino-American antagonism grows, some strategists warn, national missile defense may play the role that Britain's development of the battleship Dreadnought played a century ago—a superweapon that upset the balance by making Germany's arsenal strategically irrelevant. Chinese officials have said they believe the U.S. plan for missile defense is aimed at negating their relatively small force of about 20 intercontinental ballistic missiles.

If the United States actually builds a workable antimissile system, former national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski predicts, "the effect of that would be immediately felt by the Chinese nuclear forces and [would] presumably precipitate a buildup." That in turn could provoke India to beef up its own nuclear forces, a move that would threaten Pakistan. A Chinese buildup also could make Japan feel that it needed to build up its own military.

Indian officials already are quietly telling Pentagon officials that the rise of China will make the United States and India natural allies. India also is feeling its oats militarily. The *Hindustan Times* recently reported that the Indian navy plans to reach far eastward this year to hold submarine and aircraft exercises in the South China Sea, a move sure to tweak Beijing.

Some analysts believe that the hidden agenda of the U.S. military is to use the rise of Asia as a way to shore up the Pentagon budget, which now consumes about 3 percent of the gross domestic product, compared to 5.6 percent at the end of the Cold War in 1989. "If the military grabs onto this in order to get more money, that's scary," said retired Air Force Col. Sam Gardiner, who frequently conducts war games for the military.

Indeed, Cohen is already making the point that operating in Asia is expensive. He said it is clear that America will have to maintain "forward" forces in Asia. And that, he argued, will require a bigger defense budget. "There's a price to pay for what we're doing," Cohen concluded. "The question we're going to have to face in the coming years is, are we willing to pay up?"

#### AN EYE ON ASIA

U.S. forces dedicated to the Pacific region: U.S. Army Pacific 60,000 soldiers and civilians (two divisions and one brigade); U.S. Pacific Fleet 130,000 sailors and civilians (170

ships); Pacific Air Forces 40,000 airmen and civilians (380 aircraft in nine wings); Marine Forces Pacific 70,000 Marines and civilians (two expeditionary forces).

#### ON FOREIGN SHORES

Major U.S. deployments in Asia include:  
U.S. Forces Japan: 47,000 personnel ashore and 12,000 afloat at 90 locations.  
U.S. Forces Korea: 37,500 personnel at 85 installations.

#### TRAINING GROUNDS

The Pacific Command participates in dozens of joint exercises with allied countries each year, including:

1. Cobra Gold: The U.S.-Thai exercise is expanding to include Singapore.
2. Foal Eagle: Brings together U.S. and South Korean troops on the Korean peninsula.
3. Crocodile: A training exercise with Australia at Shoalwater Bay.
4. Rim of the Pacific: Participants include the U.S., Australia, Japan and South Korea (pictured above).

[From Hong Kong Sing Tao Jih Pao, July 8, 2000]

#### RUSSIAN NAVY REPORTEDLY INSTRUCTED TO STOP US INVOLVEMENT IN TAIWAN STRAIT

(By Reporter Li Nien-ting)

Taiwan's media have reported that after the Sino-Russian summit a few days ago, Russian President Vladimir Putin gave a special instruction to the Russian military that in case the Taiwan situation deteriorates and the US military attempts to become involved in the situation, Russia will dispatch its Pacific Fleet to check the route of the Seventh Fleet of the US Navy, to keep the latter far away from the Taiwan Strait. This will be the embryonic form of Sino-Russian military cooperation in defense.

Jiang Zemin and Putin, the heads of state of China and Russia, had an in-depth exchange of views before the five-nation summit a few days ago. The two countries reached a consensus on jointly opposing the US global missile defense system (TMD) [as published; acronym given in English] and made commitments on Sino-Russian military cooperation in defense.

Relevant analysis held that military cooperation and antagonism seems to have become the hottest topic for discussion in the post-Cold-War period. Following the US attempt to develop the national missile defense system and TMD, China has found the US move to join hands with the weak to deal with the strong a knotty problem. Having failed to obtain any result through severe denunciation the Beijing authorities have decided to work with Russia to contend with the United States. Since Putin was elected Russian president, the cooperation between the two countries has tended to be further strengthened. Their military cooperation has caused the two countries to be on the same front against the United States.

#### A MILITARY COOPERATION PLAN INVOLVING \$20 BILLION

Taiwan media have quoted information from a mainland official source as saying: In order to strengthen Russia's strategic cooperative partnership with China, Russian President Putin gave a special instruction to the high-level officers of the Russian military a few days ago that in case the US military involves itself in the Taiwan Strait situation, Russia will dispatch its Pacific Fleet to cut off the route of the US fleet in order to keep the latter far away from the Taiwan Strait.

Regarding the military alliance between China and Russia, the media of the West have commented that the strategic cooperative partnership between China and Russia has entirely been established on the basis of the fundamental interests of the national security of the two countries. Therefore, on the issues of Chechnya and Taiwan, China and Russia not only should fully support each other's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and unity, but also should join hands in solving the other side's conflicts over sovereignty and territorial integrity.

It has been disclosed that there is a 2000-2004 military cooperation plan between China and Russia that involves as much as \$20 billion. China will purchase from Russia high-tech equipment for the navy and the air force, or cooperate with Russia to develop and produce such equipment. It is believed that the plan is being implemented.

[From Hong Kong Ta Kung Pao, July 6, 00]  
[SPECIAL ARTICLE ON COOPERATION AMONG PRC, RUSSIA, KAZAKHSTAN, KYRGYZSTAN, TAJIKISTAN]

(By Mao Chieh)

"That historical issues left over in the past several hundred years have been mostly solved over the past five years represents a great achievement of the "Shanghai Five" meeting. Taking a step back and assuming crisis in the Taiwan Strait will further escalate, the mainland will be able to concentrate all its efforts to handle the cross-strait issue since its worries about its backyard have been greatly reduced."

The heads of state of China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Hyrgystan, and Tajikistan gather today (6 July) in Dushanbe, capital of Tajikistan, to attend the fifth meeting of the "Shanghai Five." Due to the presence of the new Russian President Putin and to the first attendance of Uzbekistan as an observer, the Dushanbe summit meeting has attracted particular attention.

"Of the 20-point Dushanbe Statement signed today by the five countries' heads of state, the main points of the meeting can be summed up in four," remarked Pan Guang, director of Shanghai Research Center on international issues, when interviewed by this paper's reporter.

#### CHINESE PERSECUTION OF UIGHUR MUSLIMS MAY BE INCREASING, COMMISSION SAYS

The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom today issued a statement deploring what appears to be increasing persecution of Uighur Muslims in China's Xinjiang region and called for the U.S. government to raise the issue directly with China and in international organizations. Following is the text of the statement:

"In the Commission's May 1 Annual Report to the Administration and Congress, and in testimony before Congress, since that date, we have called attention to the serious deterioration of religious freedom in China during the past year.

"Since last summer, the authorities have launched a nationwide crackdown on the Falun Gong spiritual movement, sentencing leaders to long prison terms and detaining more than 35,000 practitioners, a few of whom have been sent to mental institutions, have been beaten to death, or have died suddenly while in police custody. Catholic and Protestant underground "house churches" are suffering increased repression, including the arrests of priests and pastors, one of whom was found dead in the street soon afterwards. The repression of Tibetan Bud-

dhists has expanded, with a top religious leader, the Karmapa Lama, recently fleeing to India in January.

"The increase in religious persecution has touched another group, less known in the West—the 8 million Muslim Uighurs, a Turkic people living in western China's Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region. In the face of Han Chinese mass migration into traditionally Uighur areas, Islamic institutions have become an important medium through which Uighurs attempt to preserve their history and culture.

"Verifiable information from the region is hard to come by, largely because foreign diplomats, journalists, and human rights monitors are generally barred from traveling there. But in recent years tensions in Xinjiang and reports of sporadic violence against the government have increased. While the government blames "small numbers" of "separatists" for the violence, Islamic institutions and prominent individuals in the Muslim community have become the target of repressive, often brutal measures by Chinese authorities unwilling or unable to differentiate between religious exercise or ethnic identity and "separatist" aspirations. Thousands have been detained, including many religious leaders. Convictions and executions of so-called "splittists" are common, often reportedly on little evidence and with no regard for due process of law. Indeed, residents of Xinjiang region are the only Chinese citizens who are subject to capital punishment for political crimes.

"Last August, the Chinese authorities stepped up their crackdown with the arrest of a prominent Uighur businesswoman, Rebiya Kadeer. Ms. Kadeer was arrested last Aug. 11 as she was on her way to a private dinner in Urumqi with two staff members from the U.S. Congressional Research Service. She was last convicted in a show trial for "harming national security" and sentenced to 8 years in prison. The evidence consisted of a number of Chinese newspaper articles she had passed on to her husband in the U.S., who commented on them over Radio Free Asia. Kadeer is reported to be in poor health and in need of medical help as a result of brutal treatment meted out to her in prison.

"In recent days a major Xinjiang newspaper announced the July 6 execution of three accused Uighur separatists by firing squad immediately after their public sentencing on charges of "splitting the country." This follows upon similar executions of five Uighurs immediately after sentencing in a June trial, with two others sentenced to life in prison and the others receiving jail terms ranging from 17 to 20 years.

"Several weeks ago, the House voted to grant China Permanent Normal Trade Relations status (PNTR). During the debate, PNTR supporters argued that the fruits of engagement with China would be increased respect for the rule of law and international norms of behavior with regard to human rights. As Beijing's violations of religious freedom continue unabated, if not at a stepped up pace, PNTR supporters have a moral obligation to speak out and let the Chinese government know that these abuses are unacceptable. "No one expected improvement overnight, but certainly things shouldn't have deteriorated overnight," said Commission Chairman Elliott Abrams.

"The Commission reiterates its recommendation of May 1 that the U.S. government raise the profile of conditions in Xinjiang by addressing religious-freedom and human rights concerns in bilateral talks, by

increasing the number of education exchange opportunities available to Uighurs, and by increasing radio broadcasts in the Uighur language into Xinjiang. The Commission further recommends that the U.S. move immediately to take up the issue in all appropriate international organizations. The State Department should demand both the humanitarian release of Rebiya Kadeer from prison, an immediate end to summary executions of Uighur "separatists," and free access to Xinjiang for foreign journalist and human rights monitors. Finally, the Commission urges the U.S. Senate to consider the plight of the Uighurs and the state of religious freedom in China as it considers whether to grant Beijing PNTR status."

[From the International Herald Tribune,  
June 15, 2000]

AN EXECUTION FOR A KIDNEY  
CHINA SUPPLIES CONVICTS' ORGANS TO  
MALAYSIANS

(By Thomas Fuller)

MALACCA, MALAYSIA.—The night before their execution, 18 convicts were shown on a Chinese television program, their crimes announced to the public. Wilson Yeo saw the broadcast from his hospital bed in China and knew that one of the men scheduled to die would provide him with the kidney he so badly needed.

Mr. Yeo, 40, a Malaysian who manages the local branch of a lottery company here, says he never learned the name of the prisoner whose kidney is now implanted on his right side. He knows only what the surgeon told him: The executed man was 19 years old and sentenced to die for drug trafficking.

"I knew that I would be getting a young kidney," Mr. Yeo says now, one year after his successful transplant. "That was very important for me."

Over the past few years at least a dozen residents of this small Malaysian city have traveled to a provincial hospital in Chongqing, China, where they paid for what they could not get in Malaysia: functioning kidneys to prolong their lives.

They went to China, a place most of them barely knew, with at least \$10,000 in cash. They encountered a medical culture where kidneys were given to those with money and a doctor could stop treatment if a patient didn't pay up. Surgeons advised them to wait until a major holiday, when authorities traditionally execute the most prisoners.

China's preferred method of capital punishment, a bullet to the back of the head, is conducive to transplants because it does not contaminate the prisoners' organs with poisonous chemicals, as lethal injections do, or directly affect the circulatory system, as would a bullet through the heart.

More than 1,000 Malaysians have had kidney transplants in China, according to an estimate by Dr. S.Y. Tan, one of Malaysia's leading kidney specialists. Many patients go after giving up hope of finding an organ donor in Malaysia, where the average waiting period for a transplant is 16 years.

Interviews with patients who underwent the operation in China reveal how the market for Chinese kidneys has blossomed here—to the point where patients from Malacca negotiated a special price with Chinese doctors.

In 1998, two doctors from the Third Affiliated Hospital, a military-run complex in Chongqing, came to Malacca and spoke at the local chapter of the Lions Club about their procedures. Kidney patients worked out a deal with the doctors: Residents of Malacca would be charged \$10,000 for the procedure

instead of the \$12,000 paid by other foreigners.

It goes without saying that the kidney transplants these doctors perform are highly controversial. The Transportation Society, a leading international medical forum based in Montreal, has banned the use of organs from convicted criminals. Human rights groups call the practice barbaric.

But patients here who have undergone the operation in China say they were too desperate at the time to consider the ethical consequences.

Today they are simply happy to be alive. The trip to Chongqing offered them an escape from the dialysis machines, blood transfusions, dizziness and frequent bouts of vomiting. And why, they ask, should healthy organs be put to waste if they can save lives?

"Ethics are only a game for those people who are not sick," says Tan Dau Chin, a paramedic who has spent his career working with dialysis patients in Malacca. "Let me put it this way: What if this happened to you?"

Simon Leong, 35, a Malaccan who underwent a successful operation two years ago in Chongqing, says the principle of buying an organ is "wrong."

"But I was thinking, I have two sons. Who's going to provide for them?"

Corrine Yong, 54, who returned from Chongqing two months ago after a successful operation, was told that if she did not receive a transplant she would probably not live much longer.

"I didn't have a choice," she says of her decision to go to China.

For kidney patients in Malaysia the chances of obtaining a transplant from a local donor are slim. Despite an extremely high death rate on Malaysian roads—in a country of 22 million people, an average of 16 people are killed every day in traffic accidents—the organ donation system is woefully undeveloped.

Kidneys were transplanted from just eight donors last year. Thousands of people are on the official waiting list.

Dr. Tan, the Malaysian kidney specialist, says the small number of donors in Malaysia is partly due to religious and cultural taboos.

Malaysian Muslim families in particular are reluctant to allow organs to be removed before burial, although this is not the case in some other Muslim countries, such as Saudi Arabia, which has a relatively high number of donors.

Organ donation has always been an uncomfortable issue. The terminology is euphemistic and macabre: Doctors speak of "harvesting" organs from patients who are brain-dead, but whose hearts are still beating.

And when the issue of executed prisoners comes into play, transplants become politically explosive.

"It is well known that the death penalty is often meted out in China for things that most people in Western countries would not regard as capital crimes," said Roy Calne, a professor of surgery at both Cambridge University and the National University of Singapore.

Using organs from executed prisoners is not only ethically wrong, he says, but discourages potential donors to step forward in China: "If the perception of the public in China is that there's no shortage of organs you're not likely to get any enthusiasm for a donation program."

It is impossible to know exactly how many Asians travel to China for organ transplants. But data informally collected from doctors

in at least three countries suggest the numbers are in the hundreds every year.

Also impossible to confirm is whether all parties in China receive organs from executed prisoners and not other donors.

But patients interviewed for this article say doctors in China make no secret of where the organ comes from. The day before convicts are executed—usually in batches—a group of patients in the hospital are told to expect the operation the next day.

Melvin Teh, 40, a Malacca businessman who received a kidney transplant from a hospital in Guangzhou two years ago, says doctors did not offer the names of the prisoners. "They just tell you it was a convict," he said. "They don't tell you what he did."

Mrs. Yong says doctors told her that the donors were all "young men" who had committed "serious, violent" crimes.

Chinese officials have admitted that organs are occasionally taken from convicts, but deny that the practice is widespread.

"It is rare in China to use the bodies of executed convicts or organs from an executed convict," an official from the Health Ministry was quoted as saying in the China Daily in 1998. "If it is done, it is put under stringent state control and must go through standard procedures."

That view does not jibe with the stories that patients from Malacca tell, where kidneys are essentially handed out to the highest bidders, often foreigners.

Mr. Leong, the Chongqing patient, and his wife, Karen Soh, who accompanied him to China, say money was paramount for the surgeons involved in the operation. They recounted how another Malaysian kidney transplant patient who suffered complications while in Chongqing had run out of cash.

"They stopped the medication for one day," Mrs. Soh said, referring to the anti-rejection drugs. The patient was already very sick and eventually died of infection upon her return to Malaysia, according to Mrs. Soh.

Patients say they are advised by friends who have already undergone a transplant to bring the surgeons gifts. Mrs. Young brought a pewter teapot and picture frame. Ms. Soh and her husband brought a bottle of Martell cognac, a carton of 555 brand cigarettes and a bottle of perfume for the chief surgeon's wife.

"They call it 'starting off on the right foot,'" Mrs. Soh said.

After the operation was complete, the couple gave two of the doctors "red packets" filled with cash: 3,000 yuan (\$360) for the chief surgeon, and 2,000 yuan for his assistant. Other patients also "tipped," although the amounts varied.

It might be tempting to see the market for Chinese organs as part of the more general links that overseas Chinese have with the mainland.

Many of the patients are indeed ethnically Chinese and come from countries—Malaysia, Taiwan, Thailand—with either links to the mainland or large ethnic Chinese populations.

Yet if the experience of Malaysian patients in any indication, the trip to China provides a severe culture shock. Patients recalled unsanitary conditions, and for those who did not speak Mandarin the experience was harrowing.

Mr. Leong, who speaks little Mandarin, was helped by his wife who wrote out a list of phrases for her husband to memorize. The list included: "I'm feeling pain!" "I'm thirsty." "Can you turn me over?" Mr. Leong would simply say the number that

corresponded to his complaint and the nurse would check the list.

But more difficult than communicating is paying for the transplant. For the Leongs it involved pooling savings from family members and appealing for funds through Chinese-language newspapers. The cost of an operation amounts to several years' salary for many Malaysians.

Yet despite financial problems and cultural shock, all four patients interviewed for this article said they had no regrets.

Mr. Yeo enjoys a life of relative normalcy, maintaining a regular work schedule and jogging almost every day.

He says he was so weak before his transplant that he had trouble crossing the street and climbing stairs. Four-hour sessions three times a week on dialysis machines were "living hell."

Does it disturb him that an executed man's kidney is in his abdomen?

"I pray for the guy and say, 'Hopefully your afterlife is better,'" Mr. Yeo said.

And has he ever wondered whether the prisoner might have been innocent?

Mr. Yeo pauses and stares straight ahead. "I haven't gone through that part—the moral part," he said.

"I don't know. I can't question it too much. I have to live."

[From *The New Republic*, July 24, 2000]

SIERRA LEONE, THE LAST CLINTON  
BETRAYAL—WHERE ANGELS FEAR TO TREAD  
(By Ryan Lizza)

Even for the Clinton administration, it was an extraordinary lie. "The United States did not pressure anybody to sign this agreement," State Department spokesman Philip Reeker proclaimed at a press briefing in early June. "We neither brokered the Lomé peace agreement nor leaned on [Sierra Leonean] President Kabbah to open talks with the insurgents. . . . It was not an agreement of ours." Observers were stunned. The dishonesty, said one Capitol Hill Africa specialist, was "positively Orwellian."

Orwellian because the peace agreement signed in Lomé, Togo—an agreement that forced the democratic president of Sierra Leone to hand over much of his government and most of his country's wealth to one of the greatest monsters of the late twentieth century—was conceived and implemented by the United States. It was Jesse Jackson, Bill Clinton's special envoy to Africa, who in late 1998 pressed President Ahmad Tejan Kabbah to "reach out" to Foday Sankoh—a man who built his Revolutionary United Front (RUF) by systematically kidnapping children and forcing them to murder their parents. In May 1999, the United States, led by Jackson, brokered and signed a cease-fire agreement between the government and the RUF. In June, U.S. officials drafted entire sections of the accord that gave Sankoh Sierra Leone's vice presidency and control over its diamond mines, the country's major source of wealth. U.S. Ambassador to Sierra Leone Joseph Melrose even shuttled back and forth between Lomé and Sierra Leone's capital, Freetown, to cajole the reluctant Kabbah. In March 2000, after the accord was signed, American officials hosted repeated meetings at the U.S. embassy to carry it out.

Barely any of this made the American press. And then this May, when the RUF took hostage 500 of the U.N. peace-keepers meant to supervise Lomé's implementation—simultaneously detonating the agreement and catapulting it onto the front page—the United States washed its hands of the whole thing. Said Reeker on June 5, "We were not part of that agreement."

The Clinton administration's Africa policy will probably go down as the strangest of the postcolonial age; it may also go down as the most grotesque. In dealing with Africa, previous U.S. administrations were largely unsentimental. Africa was too poor to affect the U.S. economy, too alien to command a powerful domestic lobby, too weak to threaten American security. As a result, past presidents spoke about Africa modestly and not very often.

Not Bill Clinton. He has proclaimed frequently and passionately that Africa matters. He has insisted that black suffering has as great a claim on the American conscience as white suffering. He has vowed that the United States will no longer be indifferent. These words have borne no relation whatsoever to the reality of his administration's policy. Indeed, confronted with several stark moral challenges, the Clinton administration has abandoned Africa every time: it fled from Somalia, it watched American stepchild Liberia descend into chaos, it blocked intervention in Rwanda. But Clinton's soaring rhetoric has posed a problem that his predecessors did not face—the problem of rank hypocrisy. And so, time and again, the imperative guiding his administration's Africa policy has been the imperative to appear to care. Unwilling to commit American blood and treasure to save African lives, and unwilling to admit that they refuse to do so, the Clintonites have developed a policy of coercive dishonesty. In Rwanda, afraid that evidence of the unfolding genocide would expose their inaction, they systematically suppressed it. And in Sierra Leone, unwilling to take on a rebel group that was maiming and slaughtering civilians by the thousands, the Clintonites insisted that all the rebels truly wanted was peace and a seat at the negotiating table.

Abandoning Africans is nothing new. But the Clinton administration has gone further. It has tried to deny them the reality of their own experience, to bludgeon them into pretending that the horrors around them do not truly exist—so that they won't embarrass the American officials who proclaim so eloquently that their fates are inextricably linked to our own.

Sierra Leone, a former British colony whose capital was founded in the late eighteenth century by freed slaves, was a pretty nasty place even before the birth of the Revolutionary United Front. After an initial bout with democracy upon gaining independence in 1961, it slid into dictatorship and kleptocracy and stayed there through the 1970s and '80s—consistently near the bottom in world rankings of infant mortality, per capita income, and life expectancy.

So the outside world barely noticed when, in 1991, a group of about 100 guerrillas launched a campaign to take over the country. But the RUF—backed by Charles Taylor, a warlord in neighboring Liberia—quickly established itself as a rather unusual rebel group. For one thing, it had no discernible political philosophy or agenda. For another, it was almost unimaginably brutal. Typically, RUF troops would enter a village and round up its children. Girls as young as ten would be raped. Boys would be forced to execute village elders and sometimes even their own parents, thus cutting themselves off from their past lives and beginning their absorption into their new rebel "family." Once children were conscripted, their loyalty was maintained through drugs—they were injected with speed, which numbed their sensitivity to violence and rendered them dependent on their adult suppliers—and violence.

When conscripts tried to escape, RUF leaders amputated their limbs. Refugees even accused the RUF of cannibalism.

For several years after its initial invasion, the group terrorized the Sierra Leonean countryside, periodically closing in on Freetown and being pushed back by a succession of military dictators. And then in 1996, something remarkable happened—a burgeoning civil-society movement, backed by the United States and led largely by women's groups, rose up against Sierra Leone's military overlords and cleared the way for the country's first presidential elections since 1967. The RUF did its best to keep people from the polls—chopping off the hands of would-be voters—but almost two-thirds of the electorate cast ballots nonetheless, electing as president Ahmad Tejan Kabbah, a longtime U.N. official. After the election, hundreds of Sierra Leoneans danced outside the U.S. embassy in Freetown in gratitude for America's support.

The euphoria did not last long. In May 1997, 14 months after Kabbah's election, disgruntled government soldiers—known as "sobels" because of their collaboration with the rebels—staged a coup, forcing Kabbah into exile in Guinea. The coup leaders invited the RUF into their junta, suspended Sierra Leone's constitution, emptied Freetown's prison of its worst criminals, and literally held the city's residents hostage, placing artillery in the hills around the capital and threatening to bombard the civilians below if removed from power.

No one expected the United States to send troops to restore democracy; this was, after all, Africa. But it didn't need to. Nigeria, a country that long fancied itself the region's hegemon, already had its own intervention force in Sierra Leone under the auspices of an organization called ECOMOG, the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group.

While Nigeria, a country in perpetual economic crisis, spent some \$1 million per day battling the criminal regime in Freetown, several mid-level State Department Africa hands began lobbying their superiors to request funds from Congress to bolster ECOMOG's work. But the administration refused, saying such a request was pointless because Congress would say no. And, while the Clintonites were right that the Republican Congress wasn't usually enamored of foreign aid, the struggle for Sierra Leone might have offered the administration an opportunity to put its vaunted commitment to Africa into action. Indeed, several sympathetic members of Congress—Republicans and Democrats—even urged the State Department to challenge Congress to rise to the occasion. But the challenge never came. "It was totally bizarre," says one person with knowledge of the internal squabbling. "A decision was made that the State Department was just not going to ask for it."

In fact, not only did the Bureau of African Affairs not request additional money from Congress, it didn't even spend the money Congress had already given it. For months, \$3.9 million sat unspent in the bureau's budget for voluntary peacekeeping operations. In February 1998, ECOMOG liberated Freetown and restored Kabbah to power—proving that the RUF's child soldiers were no match for a bona fide adult military. As the rebels streamed back into the countryside, The Nigerians saw an opportunity to finish them off for good. But ECOMOG lacked the resources to take the war into the Sierra Leonean hinterland, and still no money came from the Clinton administration. "The only

way they [ECOMOG soldiers] could eat is because the people of Sierra Leone gave them food and places to sleep," says one U.S. official. By spring, the window of opportunity had closed. The RUF, freshly resupplied by Liberia, was back on the offensive with a campaign of systematic killing, mutilating, and raping called Operation No Living Thing. In late May, long after it could have made a real difference, the administration finally allocated the \$3.9 million to ECOMOG.

Nigeria, visibly tiring of its proxy war, began to look for a way out, and the United States faced an even starker version of the same dilemma it had confronted all along. It could make a major financial and political commitment, in conjunction with the Nigerians or others, to save a fledgling democratic government too weak to save itself. Or it could abandon that government, leaving Sierra Leone to Sankoh and his child butchers—because, after all, Sierra Leone did not remotely affect America's vital national interest. The Clintonites, typically, did neither. Against all the evidence that Sierra Leone could be saved from the RUF only through war, the Clinton administration set out to make peace. In early spring 1998, a group of U.S. policymakers gathered on the sixth floor of the State Department to plot strategy. One senior official summarized their goal: "We need to appear to be doing something."

To make peace with Foday Sankoh and the RUF, the Clintonites had to go through Sankoh's political godfather, Liberian dictator Charles Taylor. Taylor and Sankoh attended the same school—a Libyan secret-service camp known as al-Mathabh al-Thauriya al-Alamiya (World Revolutionary Headquarters), a sort of university for revolutionary guerrillas from all over Africa. When they met, Taylor had recently returned from the United States, where he had escaped from a prison in Plymouth, Massachusetts, while awaiting extradition back to Liberia on charges of embezzlement. Sankoh, imprisoned in the '70s for his role in plotting a coup, had been working as an itinerant photographer in the Sierra Leonean countryside. Each man dreamed of overthrowing his native government, and they pledged to help each other do so.

Taylor got his chance first, on Christmas Eve 1989, when he launched a civil war that would become a model for Sankoh's a year and a half later. One of Taylor's first military innovations was his creation of the Small Boys Unit, a battalion of intensely loyal child soldiers who were fed crack cocaine and referred to Taylor as "our father." Soon, refugees from the Liberian countryside began recounting stories of horrific cruelty. Taylor's soldiers were seeking out pregnant women and placing bets on the sex of their unborn children. Then they would rip open the woman's wombs and tear out the babies to see who was right. Evidence of cannibalism also began to trickle out. One soldier told Reuters, "We rip the hearts from their living bodies and put them on the fire, then eat them." A Liberian human rights organization claimed cannibalism in Taylor-controlled territory was so widespread that "there is fear of persecution based on one's fitness for consumption." Taylor's own defense minister accused him of taking part in the practice himself.

By 1991, Liberia looked a lot like Sierra Leone would look seven years later. Troops from ECOMOG defended a weak government in the capital, Monrovia, while Taylor controlled the other 90 percent of the country. Taylor developed a vast warlord economy,

selling off Liberia's minerals and raw materials, trafficking in hashish, and reportedly reaping an annual income of about \$250 million. But he wanted to expand his lucrative empire even further—to include the diamond mines just across the border in Sierra Leone. What's more, he wanted revenge against Sierra Leone, which had served as a base for the ECOMOG troops that were preventing his total victory in Liberia.

So he kept his deal with Sankoh. In March 1991, a number of Taylor's fiercest fighters accompanied Sankoh and the fledgling RUF into Sierra Leone, where they headed straight for the diamond mines. Taylor appointed Sankoh "governor of Sierra Leone," and his soldiers jokingly referred to Sierra Leone as their Kuwait. Sankoh frequently visited Taylor at his headquarters in the Liberian town of Gbarnga.

And then in 1996, with Liberia in ashes and 13 failed peace agreements—"[Taylor] reneged on all of them," says a former senior State Department official—Taylor offered his Sierra Leonean protégé the ultimate lesson in the politics of terror: he took power. Taylor agreed to stand for election. He had the largest army and the most money, and he made it clear that if he did not win, he would resume the killing. A country exhausted by war elected him president. During the run-up to the vote, Taylor's child soldiers took to the streets, chanting what became his unofficial campaign slogan: "He killed my pa. He killed my ma. I'll vote for him."

To bring "peace" to Sierra Leone, the Clinton administration first had to show that Sankoh and Taylor were men with whom one could legitimately do business. "Their whole policy was to 'mainstream' them—that was the word used by someone at State," explains an aide to the House International Relations Committee. "If you treat Sankoh like a statesman, he'll be one." . . . [A State Department official] used the term to explain what they had done with Taylor and what they were trying to do with Foday Sankoh." In Jesse Jackson, appointed, "Special Envoy for the President and Secretary of State for the Promotion of Democracy in Africa" in October 1997, Washington had the ideal man for the job.

Jackson first met the Liberian dictator on an official trip to West Africa in February 1998. Taylor, worried that Jackson, like prior American diplomats, would hector him about human rights, invited an old Liberian friend of Jackson's named Romeo Horton to brief him on America's new envoy. Horton says Jackson and Taylor's meeting went extremely well. "Instead of meeting an adversary," says Horton, Taylor "met a friend." The following month, when Clinton toured Africa, Jackson arranged a 30-minute phone call between the two leaders from Air Force One. Upon returning home, Jackson organized a conference on "reconciliation" for Liberians at his PUSH headquarters in Chicago. According to Harry Greaves Jr., co-founder of a Liberian opposition party, who attended the Chicago conference, "The message was, '[Taylor's] been elected, and let's give him a chance.' It's all about p.r., and Jackson is part of that campaign." As Leslie Cole, an old friend of Taylor's, wrote to the new president soon after Jackson's conference, "Getting Jesse on the bandwagon was a good and smart idea."

So it's not surprising that by the time Jackson began the diplomatic push that would lead to Lomé, he and Taylor were giving the same advice to the democratic government of Sierra Leone: Cut a deal with the

RUF. In November 1998, Jackson traveled to West Africa again, meeting with Taylor and Kabbah in Guinea and then, in Freetown, with Kabbah alone. During his five-hour stop in Sierra Leone, Jackson, who arrived just days after fresh reports that the RUF was beheading children and disemboweling pregnant women, urged Kabbah to make concessions to the rebels. "The government must reach out to these RUF in the bush battlefield," Jackson told Sierra Leonean leaders. Much of Freetown believed otherwise. "Think again, Jackson, the RUF is not a civilized body to be trusted," implored one prominent newspaper. A local journalist asked Jackson why he was telling Sierra Leoneans to negotiate with the RUF when the public was against it. "I remember very clearly what he said," says Zainab Bangura, a prominent member of Freetown's democracy movement. "That is what leadership is about: to mold public opinion, not to follow public opinion." Sierra Leone's current ambassador to the United States, John Leigh, remembers Jackson's trip well. "When he went to Sierra Leone in 1998," Leigh says, "what he was doing was pushing Charles Taylor's position."

Seven weeks after Jackson departed, as Bangura put it recently, "All hell broke loose." The "hell" was the January 1999 RUF assault on Freetown, which, hard as it is to believe, set a new standard for rebel atrocities. Capitalizing on ECOMOG's weariness, the RUF marched into the capital surrounded by a human shield of civilians that prevented the Nigerians from launching an effective counterattack. Divided into squads with names like "Burn House Unit," "Cut Hands Commandos," and "Kill Man No Blood Unit" (the last group specialized in beating people to death without spilling blood), the RUF burned down houses with their occupants still inside, hacked off limbs, gouged out eyes with knives, raped children, and gunned down scores of people in the streets. In three weeks, the RUF killed some 6,000 people, mostly civilians. When the rebels were finally forced from the city by an ECOMOG counterattack, they burned down while blocks as they left and abducted thousands of children, boys and girls who would become either soldiers or sex slaves.

Incredibly, the Clintonites didn't abandon their efforts to "mainstream" the RUF in the weeks following the attack; they intensified them. In February, just weeks after the assault, the State Department hosted the RUF's "legal representative," Omrie Golley, for talks in Washington. While Golley was at the State Department, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Howard Jeter organized a phone call between him and Kabbah, establishing the first formal contact between the government and the rebels. Golley remembers the experience fondly. In contrast to the British, who he says treated his group with disdain, Golley gushes that he "was always very impressed with the American approach to the whole conflict."

Golley also met with New Jersey Representative Donald Payne, probably the most important member of Congress on Africa policy. Within the Congressional Black Caucus, it is common knowledge that members take their cues on Africa from Payne. And, given the overriding importance of domestic politics—particularly domestic racial politics—on the Clinton administration's Africa policy, Payne wields substantial influence.

Among Capitol Hill Africa specialists, Payne's sympathy for Taylor and Sankoh is the stuff of legend. In February 1999, for instance, after his meeting with Golley, Payne

wrote to Kabbah imploring him to pursue negotiations with Sankoh, who had been temporarily captured by the government and was actually awaiting execution for treason, even while the RUF continued the war. "[S]uccessful negotiations must be without precondition and include the permanent release of Mr. Foday Sankoh," Payne wrote. "That letter is exactly what Charles Taylor was saying at the same time in Liberia. He was saying Sankoh should be freed," says Ambassador Leigh. "That letter that Payne wrote to President Kabbah is exactly the type of agreement that the State Department pressed Kabbah to accept." And, indeed, Sankoh was released as part of the run-up to Lomé.

On the House Africa Subcommittee, where Payne is the ranking Democrat, both Republican and Democratic staff members say he has bashed ecomog and questioned whether Taylor was really aiding the RUF. In May of last year, Payne fought to remove from a resolution language accusing Liberia and other countries of supporting the rebels, even after the State Department formally acknowledged that Taylor "continues to actively support the rebels in Sierra Leone, including the provision of arms and ammunition." Says one Democratic aide, "Whenever there is talk of sanctioning Taylor or of threatening Liberia . . . Mr. Payne is always the first one to jump to their defense." Former Liberian Ambassador to the United States Rachel Diggs says Taylor "had free access to Don Payne and Jesse Jackson . . . whenever there was a problem, these were the people whose ear Taylor had in the U.S. and who had his ear in Liberia."

Indeed, Payne's relationship with Taylor goes back to the early '80s, when Taylor was in jail in Massachusetts and Payne, then a member of the Newark municipal council, spoke out against his extradition to Liberia. Payne says he was simply helping Taylor at the behest of a friend and didn't actually meet the Liberian until 1997, when he attended Taylor's presidential inauguration in Monrovia. But since then the two men have clearly become friends. One visitor to Payne's office tells of watching the congressman hang up the phone with Taylor and remark that the Liberian president had just told him he was tired of dealing with Jeter, the U.S. envoy for Liberia. (Taylor is known to dislike Jeter, once referring to him as a "burnt-out" diplomat.) Taylor suggested that Payne become the U.S. envoy instead. "What surprised me was that Payne didn't say anything," says the visitor. "He seemed flattered." Payne says he does not remember any such conversation. At one point, according to an associate of Payne's, the New Jersey congressman jokingly complained that he was getting so many calls from Taylor that he was tired of talking to him. Payne insists he has talked on the phone to Taylor no more than half a dozen times.

Within three months of Golley's February 1999 visit to the State Department and the congressional offices of Donald Payne, the phone call initiated by Howard Jeter had led to a government/RUF cease-fire. With striking unanimity, Sierra Leonean intellectuals believe that Kabbah, a rather weak president, agreed to the cease-fire under pressure from Jackson and against the advice of some of his ministers and prominent members of civil society. Days before the ceasefire, Jackson and Kabbah met up in Ghana, where both were attending a conference. From Ghana, Jackson abruptly flew Kabbah to the talks in Lomé, Togo, where the cease-fire agreement was signed. One Freetown news-

paper even reported that Kabbah was "kidnapped" by Jackson. "The story was," explains Zainab Bangura, "that he was kidnapped, because [Kabbah] went [to the conference in Ghana] with his finance minister and information minister"—at the time both men were thought to be against signing the agreement—"and they all went to the airport to go to fly to Lomé, and Jesse Jackson said there were no seats for them. So they didn't go."

The cease-fire paved the way for the Lomé peace talks themselves. And, once again, the United States took the lead. U.S. Ambassador to Sierra Leone Joseph Melrose was a constant presence at the negotiating table. "They oversaw the whole peace talks," says Abu Brima, who attended as the leader of a delegation representing Sierra Leonean civil society. "Melrose was very, very active and literally kind of led it, I would say." Bangura adds: "Every time the talks were about to fall apart, Melrose would fly over to Freetown to pressure the president." According to Leigh, Melrose's "job was to soften the Sierra Leonean delegation to accept the agreement." The Clinton administration even sent a technical team, led by a USAID official named Sylvia Fletcher, that actually drafted parts of the accord.

The final agreement at Lomé, signed on July 7, 1999, awarded the RUF four ministerial posts, made Sankoh vice president, placed him in charge of a new commission to oversee Sierra Leone's diamonds, and granted the RUF blanket amnesty for all crimes. After the agreement was signed, Fletcher and Melrose held meetings establishing the diamond commission—which included Sankoh, members of Kabbah's government, and representatives from De Beers and other diamond companies—at the U.S. embassy. As one U.S. government official put it, "The message we sent with Lomé is that you can terrorize your way to power."

For close to a year, the Lomé agreement did what the Clinton administration hoped it would do. With articles on pages A17 and A6, respectively, *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* announced the accord and ushered Sierra Leone off their pages—another peace process successfully brokered by an administration committed to the well-being of Africa. As Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Susan Rice bragged last September, "the U.S. role in Sierra Leone . . . has been instrumental. With hands-on efforts by the president's special envoy Jesse Jackson, Ambassador Joe Melrose, and many others, the United States brokered the cease-fire and helped steer Sierra Leone's rebels, the Kabbah government, and regional leaders to the negotiating table."

It probably wouldn't even have mattered that Sankoh refused to disarm—of the estimated 10,000 children fighting for the RUF, only about 1,700 were turned over to demobilization camps, as required—or that he continued the illicit diamond-trading that Lomé was meant to stop. If Lomé had simply unraveled quietly—even if Sankoh had followed his mentor in Liberia and grabbed complete power himself—it is unlikely that Sierra Leone would have made the American front pages. The Clinton administration would still have accomplished much of what it set out to do at that meeting on the sixth floor of the State Department in spring 1998.

But this May, in an ironic twist of fate, Sierra Leone leapt from the shadows into the world spotlight. Lomé had achieved one of the RUF's central goals—the exit of the stubborn Nigerians. The U.N. peacekeepers

who took their place—sent from countries like India, Jordan, Kenya, and Ghana—were ill-equipped and bound by the timid U.N. rules of engagement. And, as soon as they ventured into the RUF's diamond heartland, the rebels stole their weapons and vehicles and held them hostage for several weeks. The humiliating standoff brought Lomé crashing down in full public view. And U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan's desperate appeals for Western countries to send troops to reinforce his peacekeepers called global attention to the very point the Clinton administration had worked so hard to conceal: Its unwillingness to sacrifice anything real on behalf of the people of Sierra Leone. Instead of soldiers, the United States once again sent Jesse Jackson. But, by this time, Jackson was so bitterly despised in Freetown that the Sierra Leonean government told him it could not guarantee his safety. One group of prominent Sierra Leonean democracy activists warned Jackson, "Our people will greet your presence in the country with contempt, and we'll encourage them to mount massive demonstrations in protest." During a conference call with Freetown leaders in which he tried to explain himself, Jackson was openly attacked as a RUF "collaborator." His trip to Sierra Leone was canceled.

Today, a year after Lomé, the U.N. hostages have finally been freed. Foday Sankoh has even been captured and will likely be tried as a war criminal. President Kabbah's government is defended by a shaky coalition of citizen militias, government soldiers, former RUF collaborators, U.N. troops, and, most importantly, military advisers from Great Britain—the only Western power to heed Annan's call. Sankoh's apparent replacement has been given sanctuary in Liberia by Taylor, who continues to arm the RUF. The rebels still control much of the Sierra Leonean countryside, and there are widespread rumors of an imminent RUF attack on Freetown. If the British leave, an attack is all but certain.

At the National Summit on Africa in February, President Clinton said, "We can no longer choose not to know. We can only choose not to act, or to act. In this world, we can be indifferent, or we can make a difference. America must choose, when it comes to Africa, to make a difference." Sophisticated people understand what this kind of talk, coming from this administration, means. And the people of Sierra Leone, who now count prostheses as one of their country's chief imports, have become sophisticated. In fact, in recent months Sierra Leonean exiles in Washington have increasingly allied themselves with Republicans like New Hampshire Senator Judd Gregg. It's a remarkable turn of events, given that Gregg and his ilk are isolationists—men who say forthrightly that America has no important interests in Africa, can't successfully export its method of government there, and shouldn't waste blood or money trying. After eight years of the Clinton administration, it seems, the people of Sierra Leone no longer expect very much from the United States. They're willing to settle for truth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) has 2 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has the right to close.

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

Let me say to my colleagues before the vote here, this is a motion to disapprove of the President's waiver of

the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the U.S. Trade Relations Act. Right now, all of us can trade with China. There is no problem there. You or I could go out to trade with them. All corporations can trade with them. But under this motion, we are saying yes to disapprove of the President's waiver. What he wants to do is continue this waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment so that basically when businesses go into China, they are subsidized by U.S. taxpayers, agricultural subsidies, Ex-Import Bank subsidies and a myriad of these subsidies that helps businesses when they go in. But when the taxpayer goes into business for himself, does he get support and subsidies from the government? No.

So all we are saying today, vote yes on this motion to prohibit this waiver by the President of the Jackson-Vanik amendment and let these businesses continue to go in and continue to do business but not at the taxpayers' expense. I think we have heard plenty of arguments to show during this vigorous debate that there are human rights issues, that there are espionage issues, that there is the hiring of these Chinese technicians in this country to work on related military dual use technologies issues. Our relationship is moving along and in some ways it is bad and in some ways it is good, but I do not think the American taxpayers should be forced to subsidize businesses that go in. I ask for a "yes" on the motion to disapprove of the President's waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard expressions here on the floor today as we have heard in the past during our debates on this issue of persecution of Christians, Muslims and other groups in China which is a legitimate and serious concern. However, the U.S. can be most effective in advancing religious freedom by expanding our engagement with the Chinese people and by continuing to press Beijing to respect the rights of Chinese believers.

World religious leaders, including the Reverend Billy Graham, the Reverend Pat Robertson, the Dalai Lama, the American Friends Committee, Father Robert Drinan, the National Council of Churches, Rabbi Arthur Schneier and Reverend Don Argue with the National Association of Evangelicals see continued U.S. engagement with China as key to promoting religious freedom. Two years ago, the Chinese Service Coordinating Committee, an umbrella group for U.S. religious agencies working in China, said "a public Christian stance

against MFN status for China is not in the interest of the church in China, and will seriously hamper the efforts of Christians from outside China who have spent years seeking to establish an effective Christian witness among the Chinese people."

Religious activity of all types is flourishing as ordinary Chinese reach out for new forms of belief. Unofficially, it is estimated that there are now 30 to 60 million Chinese Protestants, 6 million Catholics, 17 million Muslims, and 100 million Buddhists.

The present situation stands in stark contrast to the post-Communist revolution China of the 1950s when religious activity was harshly suppressed. The situation worsened even further during the Cultural Revolution when many churches were closed and church properties were seized.

Engagement with China has made it possible to disseminate Bibles and religious literature to Chinese citizens. World Pulse, a publication of the Billy Graham Center, has 250,000 readers in China. East Gates International, a Christian organization, publishes and distributes religious materials in China and reports that "expanding U.S. economic ties with China and especially China's admittance to the World Trade Organization will continue to benefit religious organizations working in China."

□ 1500

While some, indeed, believe the annual Normal Trade Relation votes can be used as leverage, U.S. religious groups who are actively engaged in evangelical work in China believe such threats are highly counterproductive.

Threatening U.S. economic sanctions in the name of religion creates an impression that religion is being used as a tool of U.S. foreign policy and undermines their work in China. Recently pastors of key house churches in China, many of whom have served time in prison for their beliefs, urged Congress to approve Permanent Normal Trade Relations.

We in the House have already taken that action as everyone knows, and it is the absence of completion of that work still that causes us to go through this annual renewal procedure, but the annual renewal procedure is consistent with what we did recently when the House overwhelmingly supported granting mainland China Permanent Normal Trade Relations, and we should.

In this instance, on today's resolution, all vote no to reject it overwhelmingly and be insistent with what we have done thus far.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution to disapprove annual normal trade relations (NTR) with China. Unfortunately, we should have debated the one year extension in May, instead of the harmful bill that will give permanent normal trade rela-

tions (PNTR) trade status to China's barbaric regime, and will ensure that multinational corporations have the investment protection they need to exploit China's cheap labor. China doesn't deserve annual normal trade relations status and it definitely doesn't deserve the permanent normal trade relations status the House approved in May. Regardless of how the House voted on PNTR, I will take this opportunity to tell my colleagues and the American people why the People's Republic of China (PRC) does not deserve normal trade privileges with the United States—for the next year or permanently.

Just one month after the House voted to give China PNTR, the New York Times reported that China continues to aid Pakistan in its efforts to build long-range missiles that could carry nuclear weapons. China plays by its own rules and doesn't adhere to the rules of the international community. The United States wouldn't need to monitor the regional tension between India and Pakistan if China worked toward a mutual goal of nonproliferation. Instead, China provokes Pakistan with transfers of nuclear technology and exacerbates tensions between the two countries.

Senator THOMPSON is trying to force a vote on his bill to monitor China's nuclear proliferation activities with greater scrutiny and applies sanctions if China is found proliferating weapons of mass destruction. Unfortunately, Senator THOMPSON is finding resistance from his own party that does not link PNTR with a non-proliferation bill.

We saw what happened when the Administration decided to de-link trade and human rights for China. Human rights abuses in China worsened yet China has been allowed to export their cheap sneakers to the United States.

Tens of thousands of Falun Gong practitioners have been detained, tortured and now are being committed to Chinese mental institutions for the mere expression of their faith. The Chinese government claims that Falun Gong is a religious cult not approved by the state. The state does not approve peaceful meditation, but it does approve torture and forced abortions. The Chinese government does not approve Roman Catholicism, but the sale of executed prisoner's kidneys is perfectly acceptable to the PRC. The United States cannot allow this barbaric government to harm its own people without facing some sort of punishment. Withholding annual normal trade relations should be that punishment.

China is the biggest producer of ozone layer-destroying chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and will soon surpass the United States as the leading emitter of greenhouse gases. The United States suffers from China's earth-destroying practices. The United States spends \$3 billion annually on cataract operations and billions more on treating skin cancer cases due to the destruction of the earth's protective ozone layer. China's irreverence for environmental standards is reflective of its irreverence for human life. This is unacceptable in the 21st Century. China must be held accountable for its actions—human rights violations, labor rights violations, trade violations, weapons proliferation and environmental violations must be scrutinized and the annual NTR debate is the forum for scrutiny.

Withholding annual NTR will send a clear signal to Beijing that the United States does not condone its inhumane actions. Opposing the annual NTR extensions will tell China that the United States is willing to hold the PRC accountable. China must pay a price for its actions, and that price should be United States trade. I urge my colleagues to support disapproval of extending NTR status to China yet again.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, again I come to the floor to debate the issue of trade with China. In no way should the United States' continued engagement with China be seen as a reward for its horrendous human rights violations. As co-chairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, I am all too familiar with the human rights violations which the government of China practices everyday against so many of its own citizens. From the Falun Gong to the Catholic Bishops, to the Tibetan Buddhist and the Uighur Muslims, this past year has seen China's continued persecution of its minorities.

I strongly believe that for change to come about and for democracy to take hold in China, the citizens of China must be exposed to democratic ideals and other Western values. Today, these very ideals are taking root throughout China. They are taking place because of our current policy of engagement, one on one, business to business, client to customer. Information is also being spread by important U.S. programs, such as Radio Free Asia and the Voice of America. Slowly, attitudes and actions are changing. The Chinese people want freedoms: freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly. We know these ideals are slowly taking hold. This is evident though radio Free Asia's call-in listen program which is overburdened every day with thousands of citizens risking their lives to express their views, which is currently prohibited by the Chinese government. If the United States wants to see true change in China, see freedoms enjoyed by all throughout the country, programs such as Radio Free Asia must continue to exist and must be expanded so they can reach a greater audience.

If we hope to bring stability and democracy to Asia, we must not turn our backs on the largest country in the world. We must continue to work with the Administration in pressuring the Chinese government to release all political prisoners including Rebiya Kadeer, a Uighur businesswomen jailed earlier this year, and to allow the Dali Lama to return to Tibet. We must also continue to support worthwhile, effective endeavors current in place, including Radio Fred Asia. I hold out hope that greater involvement in the world community will one day bring out respect for human rights and the rule of law in China.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the passage of H.J. Res. 103 and deny the extension of Normal Trade Relations with China.

I believe that we are all shaped by our life experiences. We are all influenced by the lessons from our youth.

For me, post-World War II Chicago was a unique place and time to grow up. At home, in school, in church, and in the ballfields, we learned the difference between right and wrong, good and bad, friends and enemies.

Our parents taught us the value of hard work and discipline. When we played 16-inch softball, we knew the rules, and we played by them. It was wrong to cheat, and cheaters were punished. In school, we learned about our nation's history. In the schoolyards, we learned who were our friends and who weren't. In church, we learned about God, morality, and right and wrong. When I grew up, we learned to love and honor this nation and all that it stands for.

I value those simple lessons from my youth that remain with me to this day, which is why I opposed NTR for China.

The Communist leaders in Beijing do not play by our rules. They do not act as friends. They do not act in the interest of peace and prosperity for all.

Instead, they point missiles at the democratic island of Taiwan and U.S. military bases on Japan, break trade agreements with the U.S., sell nuclear and other dangerous weapon technologies to the highest bidder, practice forced abortions, throw democratic activists into jail, ignore human rights, and set up concentration camps.

We do not trade with other totalitarian regimes.

Do we have NTR with North Korea?

Do we have NTR with Serbia?

Do we have NTR with Cuba?

No, no, and no.

Then why should China get it?

That is the question I pose to my colleagues today. Think about the lessons from our youth. Think about the logic of trading with China. Think about what it means for this nation and our ideals.

Mr. Speaker, I am not someone who seeks out confrontation and conflict with anyone. I do not believe that the U.S. should carelessly start needless fights in this world. But we must protect our interests. We must protect our ideals. We must protect our principles.

I can see a day in the future where we can freely and fairly trade with a friendly and democratic China. I can see a day in the future where China acts as our friend in promoting peace and prosperity.

I want to see such a day happen, but until the day that China becomes a democracy that is for the people and by the people, until China stops pointing missiles at the U.S. and Taiwan, until China honors its trade agreements, until China starts to respect basic human rights, I will continue to fight against giving a blank NTR check to China.

Vote for this resolution and against NTR for China.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, July 17, 2000, the joint resolution is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and the 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 noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BASS. 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 147, nays 281, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

YEAS—147

Abercrombie	Graham	Quinn
Aderholt	Gutierrez	Rahall
Baca	Hall (OH)	Riley
Baldacci	Hastings (FL)	Rivers
Baldwin	Hayes	Rogers
Barcia	Hayworth	Rohrabacher
Barr	Hefley	Ros-Lehtinen
Bartlett	Hilleary	Rothman
Barton	Hilliard	Rush
Bonior	Horn	Sabo
Borski	Hostettler	Sanchez
Brady (PA)	Hunter	Sanders
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Sanford
Brown (OH)	Jones (NC)	Saxton
Burr	Jones (OH)	Scarborough
Burton	Kaptur	Schaffer
Capuano	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clay	Kildee	Sensenbrenner
Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Sisisky
Coble	King (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Coburn	Kingston	Souder
Collins	Klink	Spence
Condit	Kucinich	Spratt
Conyers	Lantos	Stark
Cook	Lee	Stearns
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Strickland
Cox	Lipinski	Stupak
Coyne	LoBiondo	Tancredo
Cummings	Mascara	Taylor (MS)
Danner	McIntyre	Taylor (NC)
Davis (IL)	McKinney	Thompson (MS)
Deal	Meek (FL)	Tierney
DeFazio	Menendez	Towns
Delahunt	Metcalfe	Traficant
DeLauro	Miller, George	Udall (CO)
Diaz-Balart	Mink	Udall (NM)
Doyle	Mollohan	Velazquez
Duncan	Nadler	Visclosky
Ehrlich	Ney	Wamp
Engel	Norwood	Waters
Evans	Obey	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Oliver	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Owens	Weygand
Gejdenson	Pallone	Wise
Gephardt	Pascarell	Wolf
Gibbons	Payne	Woolsey
Gilman	Pelosi	Wu
Goode	Phelps	Wynn
Goodling	Pombo	Young (AK)

NAYS—281

Ackerman	Blagojevich	Chambliss
Allen	Bliley	Chenoweth-Hage
Andrews	Blumenauer	Clayton
Archer	Blunt	Clement
Armey	Boehrlert	Combest
Bachus	Boehner	Cooksey
Baird	Bonilla	Cramer
Baker	Bono	Crane
Ballenger	Boucher	Crowley
Barrett (NE)	Boyd	Cubin
Barrett (WI)	Brady (TX)	Cunningham
Bass	Bryant	Davis (FL)
Bateman	Buyer	Davis (VA)
Becerra	Callahan	DeGette
Bentsen	Calvert	DeLay
Bereuter	Camp	DeMint
Berkley	Canady	Deutsch
Berman	Cannon	Dickey
Berry	Capps	Dicks
Biggert	Cardin	Dingell
Bilbray	Carson	Dixon
Bilirakis	Castle	Doggett
Bishop	Chabot	Dooley

Doolittle	Kolbe	Price (NC)
Dreier	Kuykendall	Pryce (OH)
Dunn	LaFalce	Radanovich
Edwards	LaHood	Ramstad
Ehlers	Lampson	Rangel
Emerson	Largent	Regula
English	Larson	Reyes
Eshoo	Latham	Reynolds
Etheridge	LaTourette	Rodriguez
Everett	Lazio	Roemer
Ewing	Leach	Rogan
Farr	Levin	Roukema
Fattah	Lewis (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Filner	Lewis (KY)	Royce
Fletcher	Linder	Ryan (WI)
Foley	Lofgren	Ryun (KS)
Ford	Lowey	Salmon
Fossella	Lucas (KY)	Sandlin
Fowler	Lucas (OK)	Sawyer
Franks (NJ)	Luther	Scott
Frelinghuysen	Maloney (CT)	Serrano
Frost	Maloney (NY)	Sessions
Gallegly	Manzullo	Shadegg
Ganske	Markey	Shaw
Gekas	Martinez	Shays
Gilchrest	Matsui	Sherman
Gillmor	McCarthy (MO)	Sherwood
Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus
Goodlatte	McCrery	Shows
Gordon	McDermott	Shuster
Goss	McGovern	Simpson
Granger	McHugh	Skeen
Green (TX)	McInnis	Skelton
Green (WI)	McKeon	Slaughter
Greenwood	McNulty	Smith (MI)
Gutknecht	Meehan	Smith (TX)
Hall (TX)	Meeke (NY)	Snyder
Hansen	Mica	Stabenow
Hastings (WA)	Millender-	Stenholm
Herger	McDonald	Stump
Hill (IN)	Miller (FL)	Sununu
Hill (MT)	Miller, Gary	Sweeney
Hinche	Minge	Talent
Hinojosa	Moakley	Tanner
Hobson	Moore	Tauscher
Hoefel	Moran (KS)	Tauzin
Hoekstra	Moran (VA)	Terry
Holden	Morella	Thomas
Holt	Murtha	Thomas (CA)
Hooley	Myrick	Thompsonberry
Houghton	Napolitano	Thune
Hoyer	Neal	Thurman
Hulshof	Nethercutt	Tiahrt
Hutchinson	Northup	Toomey
Hyde	Nussle	Turner
Inslee	Oberstar	Upton
Isakson	Ortiz	Vitter
Istook	Ose	Walden
Jackson-Lee	Oxley	Walsh
(TX)	Packard	Watkins
Jefferson	Pastor	Watt (NC)
Jenkins	Paul	Watts (OK)
John	Pease	Waxman
Johnson (CT)	Peterson (MN)	Weiner
Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (PA)
Johnson, Sam	Petri	Weller
Kanjorski	Pickering	Whitfield
Kasich	Pickett	Wicker
Kelly	Pitts	Wilson
Kind (WI)	Pomeroy	Young (FL)
Kleczka	Porter	
Knollenberg	Portman	

NOT VOTING—6

Boswell	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Campbell	McIntosh	Vento

□ 1525

Messrs. NUSSLE, ARMEY, DELAY, CUNNINGHAM, MALONEY of Connecticut, GONZALEZ, GARY MILLER of California, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. CAPUANO, FRANK of Massachusetts, LIPINSKI, GUTIERREZ, BARTON of Texas, QUINN, Ms. LEE and Mrs. MEEK of Florida changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on two motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3113, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 4517, by the yeas and nays.

Further proceedings on H.R. 2634, on which the yeas and nays were ordered, will resume tomorrow.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote in this series.

UNSOLICITED COMMERCIAL ELECTRONIC MAIL ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3113, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3113, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 427, nays 1, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

YEAS—427

Abercrombie	Berman	Callahan
Ackerman	Berry	Calvert
Aderholt	Biggert	Camp
Allen	Bilbray	Canady
Andrews	Billirakis	Cannon
Archer	Bishop	Capps
Armey	Blagojevich	Capuano
Baca	Bliley	Cardin
Bachus	Blumenauer	Carson
Baird	Blunt	Castle
Baker	Boehlert	Chabot
Baldacci	Boehner	Chambliss
Baldwin	Bonior	Chenoweth-Hage
Ballenger	Bonior	Clay
Barcia	Bono	Clayton
Barr	Borski	Clement
Barrett (NE)	Boucher	Clyburn
Barrett (WI)	Boyd	Coble
Bartlett	Brady (PA)	Coburn
Barton	Brady (TX)	Collins
Bass	Brown (FL)	Combest
Bateman	Brown (OH)	Condit
Becerra	Bryant	Conyers
Bentsen	Burr	Cook
Bereuter	Burton	Cooksey
Berkley	Buyer	Costello
Cox		
Coyne		
Cramer		
Crane		
Crowley		
Cubin		
Cummings		
Cunningham		
Danner		
Davis (FL)		
Davis (IL)		
Davis (VA)		
Deal		
DeFazio		
DeGette		
Delahunt		
DeLauro		
DeLay		
DeMint		
Deutsch		
Diaz-Balart		
Dickey		
Dicks		
Dingell		
Dixon		
Doggett		
Dooley		
Doolittle		
Doyle		
Dreier		
Duncan		
Dunn		
Edwards		
Ehlers		
Ehrlich		
Emerson		
Engel		
English		
Eshoo		
Etheridge		
Evans		
Everett		
Ewing		
Farr		
Fattah		
Filner		
Fletcher		
Foley		
Forbes		
Ford		
Fossella		
Fowler		
Frank (MA)		
Franks (NJ)		
Frelinghuysen		
Frost		
Gallegly		
Ganske		
Gejdenson		
Gekas		
Gephardt		
Gibbons		
Gilchrest		
Gillmor		
Gilman		
Gonzalez		
Goode		
Goodlatte		
Goodling		
Gordon		
Goss		
Graham		
Granger		
Green (TX)		
Green (WI)		
Greenwood		
Gutierrez		
Gutknecht		
Hall (OH)		
Hall (TX)		
Hansen		
Hastings (FL)		
Hastings (WA)		
Hayes		
Hayworth		
Hefley		
Herger		
Hill (IN)		
Hill (MT)		
Hilleary		
Hilliard		
Hinche		
Hinojosa		
Hobson		
Hoefel		
Hoekstra		
Holden		
Holt		
Hooley		
Horn		
Hostettler		
Houghton		
Hoyer		
Hulshof		
Hunter		
Hutchinson		
Hyde		
Inslee		
Isakson		
Istook		
Jackson (IL)		
Jackson-Lee		
(TX)		
Jefferson		
Jenkins		
John		
Johnson (CT)		
Johnson, E. B.		
Johnson, Sam		
Kanjorski		
Kasich		
Kelly		
Kind (WI)		
Kleczka		
Knollenberg		
Mollohan		
Moore		
Moran (KS)		
Moran (VA)		
Morella		
Murtha		
Myrick		
Nadler		
Napolitano		
Neal		
Nethercutt		
Ney		
Northup		
Norwood		
Nussle		
Oberstar		
Obey		
Olver		
Ortiz		
Ose		
Owens		
Oxley		
Packard		
Pallone		
Pascarell		
Pastor		
Payne		
Pease		
Pelosi		
Peterson (MN)		
Peterson (PA)		
Petri		
Phelps		
Pickering		
Pickett		
Pitts		
Pombo		
Pomeroy		
Porter		
Portman		
Pryce (NC)		
Pryce (OH)		
Quinn		
Radanovich		
Rahall		
Ramstad		
Rangel		
Regula		
Reyes		
Reynolds		
Riley		
Rivers		
Rodriguez		
Roemer		
Rogan		
Rogers		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Rothman		
Roukema		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rush		
Ryan (WI)		
Ryun (KS)		
Sabo		
Salmon		
Sanchez		
Sanders		
Sandlin		
Sanford		
Sawyer		
Saxton		
Scarborough		
Schaffer		
Schakowsky		
Scott		
Sensenbrenner		
Serrano		
Sessions		
Shadegg		
Shaw		
Shays		
Sherman		
Sherwood		
Shimkus		
Shows		
Shuster		
Simpson		
Sisisky		
Skeen		
Skelton		
Slaughter		
Smith (MI)		
Smith (NJ)		
Smith (TX)		