

DICKEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4392) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. 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 the bill (H.R. 4392) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 396

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of House Resolution 396?

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

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 22, 2000

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### WHO IS TO BLAME

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the White House announced that it would work to compensate the victims of the Los Alamos wildfire. Well, Mr. Speaker, how generous of the administration to compensate the victims of a wildfire which its own agency, the National Park Service, is responsible for starting.

Of course, neither the administration or the Park Service accepts responsibility for the environmental disaster that has left hundreds of people stranded, over 400 homes destroyed, and has burned almost 50,000 acres. Instead, they have pledged compensation, which will ultimately cost the American taxpayers millions of dollars.

Meanwhile, the local superintendent who has acknowledged responsibility for igniting the blaze, in spite of adverse weather warnings, was given a paid vacation. They might as well have said congratulations. Mr. Speaker, the National Park Service and its personnel need to be held responsible for their actions, especially when those actions result in such extensive environmental devastation.

I yield back the administration's disgraceful inability to accept responsibility for its own negligence.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

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

#### MOST FAVORED NATION TRADE STATUS FOR PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for delaying the Chair, and I thank the Chair for its patience.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take to the floor this afternoon to continue our discussion on most favored nation trade status with the People's Republic of China.

As I have said before, the problem that we are faced with, the challenges and the choices that confront us here, are support for our basic cherished values; the right to practice one's religion; the right to assemble and organize and collectively bargain for a de-

cent wage and benefits and health care, and all the things that many of our citizens enjoy; the right to form political organizations so that ideas, such as good wages, decent working conditions, health care, good educational opportunities, can flow from political participation. All of these rights are kind of central to this debate on China, because in China today they do not enjoy what we enjoy here, and that is the ability to do these things.

China is a brutal, authoritarian police state. If the government is disagreed with, if one tries to form a political organization, if an individual tries to form a religious organization, if someone tries to form a trade union, they will end up in jail. And that is where, my colleagues, literally tens of thousands of Chinese dissidents, freedom fighters, people who care about democracy are languishing today in prison, because they dared to try to speak out to better their human condition in these areas.

Why is it so important for us to stand with them and not with the government of China and their partners in this trade deal, the multinational corporations, most of whom are American? Why is it important to stand with these heroes? It is important to stand with them because those values that we cherish, those first principles of our government, the right to be able to express ourselves in the God that we believe in, in the political organization that we want to affiliate with, in the worker organization that we want to band with in order to improve our economic lives, these are central tenets of what democracy is all about.

The State Department's Country Report on Human Rights, in their last report, said that China's poor human rights record deteriorated markedly throughout the year as the government intensified efforts to suppress dissent, particularly organized dissent; the government continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in violation of internationally accepted norms.

Permanent Favored Nation Trading Status supporters can claim that the Internet and technology will help unshackle the Chinese people, but the evidence shows the opposite is happening. According to the State Department, and I quote,

Authorities have blocked, at various times, politically sensitive Web sites, including those of dissident groups and some major foreign news organizations, such as Voice of America, The Washington Post, The New York Times, and the British Broadcasting system.

Just yesterday, outside these chambers on the lawn of the Capitol, we had approximately 100 dissidents from China who are now in exile, many of whom have spent 3, 4, 5, 10, 13 years in jail. They were here with us, and we formed a line with a linked chain

threading us as we marched around the Capitol grounds. And then we had them come and speak to people who were interested in hearing what they had to say, and they all spoke about the need not to reward China with this Most Favored Nation status by taking away an annual attempt to review their human rights record, their dismal record on human rights.

They asked us not to do it, because every time that we continue to have this debate, every time that we raise these issues, the Chinese are placed in a very hard, difficult position, a position they cannot defend, and we make progress each time we have this debate.

Wei Jingsheng, the great dissident and leader at Tiananmen Square and other activities in China, who is here now in exile in the United States, who spent years and years and years in prison, said do not grant permanent trade status to China right now. He said to continue to trade, continue to engage, continue to dialogue, but do not give them most favored trade status permanently; have the annual review. Because he knows how important it is for those who are still in the gulags, still in the prisons, still fighting for justice and freedom and liberty in China today.

So I would say to my colleagues, the news is always not good for workers in China. The government continued to tightly restrict workers' rights, and forced labor in prison facilities remains a very serious problem, according to the State Department, and they give us some examples in the State Department report.

For instance, there is the case of Guo Yunqiao. He led a protest march of 10,000 workers to local government offices following the 1989 massacre. He is currently serving a life term in prison for doing that on charges of hooliganism. Imagine that: Protesting on behalf of 10,000 workers of local government offices following the massacre at Tiananmen Square, and this man is facing a life in prison.

In the case of Guo Qiqing, who was detained in Shayang County on charges of disrupting public order, he has organized a sit-in to demand money owed to the workforce.

Or the case of Hu Shigen, an activist with the Federation Labor Union of China, in prison in Beijing No. 2 prison, and has 12 years remaining on his sentence. He is seriously ill. He has been charged with counterrevolutionary activities.

And the cases go on and on and on.

Despite the considerable leverage that we have, with 40 percent of China's exports coming to the United States, our negotiators did not lift a finger to help on human rights or labor rights or religious freedoms. We can do much better than what we have done.

□ 1345

I would say on the religious front, there is widespread religious persecu-

tion in China today against Buddhists, against Christians, against Muslims, against people who want to practice their faith.

If you do, if they indeed do, you cannot belong to the military, you cannot belong as a worker in the government, you cannot belong to the ruling party if you practice your religion in China; and to practice it in an organized way will often get you a long jail prison sentence.

Recently two Catholic bishops and archbishops have spent over 30 years in prison because of their leadership in our church.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on and on and the repression goes on and on and on.

The distinguished gentleman from Northern Virginia (Mr. WOLF), a friend and colleague of ours, was successful, very successful, in getting a commission established. It is called the U.S. Commission on Religious Freedoms. And it was established in order to look specifically at the issue of whether people can practice their faith in China.

Seven of the nine people who were appointed to that commission were appointed by people who share the view that we should have unfettered free trade, most favored nation trade status with the Chinese. So the people on the Commission, for the most part, came there with the blessing of these kinds of leaders, the President, the leaders of the respective bodies in the House and the Senate.

So it was a surprise when the last couple weeks ago the U.S. Commission on Religious Freedom issued its annual report. The Commission, as I said, is independent. Seven of its nine members were appointed by supporters of permanent MFN. The Commission opposes permanent most favored nation trade status for China without substantial human rights improvements. They came out opposed to this deal because they understand the political and religious repressions that are ongoing at this very minute in China today.

Their leader, Rabbi David Saperstein, a highly respected religious leader, is chairman of the Commission. Excerpts from the Commission's findings and recommendations read as follows: "The Chinese Government's violations of religious freedom increased markedly during the past year."

Another quote: "Roman Catholic and Protestant underground house churches suffered increased repression. The crackdown included the arrest of bishops, priests, and pastors, one of whom was found dead in the street soon afterward. Several Catholic bishops were ordained by the Government without the Vatican's participation or approval."

Another quote in the report: "The repression of the Tibetan Buddhists expanded. The Government authorities in

Tibet, in defiance of the Dalai Lama, Reting Lama, another important religious leader, Karmapa Lama, he had to flee to India." And it goes on and on and on. And it says at the end of the report, "While many of the commissioners support free trade, the Commission believes that the U.S. Congress should grant China permanent normal trade relation status only after China makes substantial improvements in respect for religious freedom."

Michael Young, Dean of the George Washington University Law School, who describes himself as a passionate believer in free trade, said, "The extraordinary deterioration of religious freedoms in China is close to unprecedented since the days of Mao." Mr. Young cited cases of women beaten to death by police for trying to practice their religion.

The conditions the Commission laid out are reasonable, and they include the following: Requiring China to provide unhindered access to religious leaders including those in prison detained or are under house arrest in China. Secondly, release from prison all religious prisoners in China. And third, requiring China to ratify the International Convention of Civil and Political Rights.

So you have the State Department's Country Report on Human Rights Practices, which I outlined, which is very, very critical of China. You have the Religious Commission which says, do not do what we will be voting on this next week, giving them permanent trade status, because they have not respected religious freedoms and liberties. And now because the votes are not there and this issue is in jeopardy, we perhaps will have grafted onto the China deal a concept or an idea to create another commission.

We do not need another commission, Mr. Speaker. We have enough commissions. We have enough reports. And the reports are the quite clear. This is a brutal, suppressive dictatorship that says to its people, you organize, you actively engage in religious freedom, political freedom, human rights issues, you challenge us on the environment and you can very easily expect that you will end up in prison.

You cannot maintain free markets, unfettered free markets, without free trade, without free people. You can have unfettered markets and you have can free trade. But unless you have free people, you will not be able to maintain that which you seek to do. Because at some point in your society things will come apart, as they did in Chile when they had so-called economic reforms under Pinochet, as they did in Nazi Germany under Hitler, as they did with Mussolini, as they did with Suharto in Indonesia recently.

Governments that are corrupt, that are repressive, and who just take advantage of their people in terms of

slave labor in the end have immense problems and difficulties and eventually fall.

My friend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) who has been most eloquent and passionate on these issues has joined us. I will yield to him for a remark. Then I want to talk about, if I could, we can share some thoughts on the economic piece of this and the sweatshops where the Chinese people work.

Because the other part of the freedom piece of this trade deal, as he well knows, is that there are people working in shoe factories, in textile mills, you name it, by the millions in China today who are making anywhere between 3 and 20 cents an hour, working 6 days, 7 days a week, 12 hours a day, putting together \$135 pairs of Nike shoes with toxic glue without wearing anything to cover their hands.

It is a repressive type of atmosphere outlined in this very well put together book "Made in China" by Charlie Kernigan of the National Labor Committee, which I encourage everyone to pick up and read. These people are really indentured servants in many ways. They work for a whole month for wages that are not adequate for them to even buy one of the pair of shoes that they make.

So it seems to me that when you have a situation economically internationally where corporations here in America can go over abroad, whether it is Mexico or China, to manufacture products that were made here, whether they are shoes or bicycles, Huffy is a good example that used to make bikes in the State of Ohio and now is in China and Mexico. When they move their facilities to these different countries, they do it for a reason. They do it because they do not have to deal with benefits, they do not have to deal with laws protecting workers, they do not have to pay decent wages.

And, of course, they cannot sell these products in China or in Mexico because the workers there, as I have just mentioned, do not make enough to purchase that which they make. So Mexico and China then become what are known as export platforms and these products are shipped right back here for sale. And, of course, we lose good-paying manufacturing jobs in this country and the multinationals make out and workers on both sides of the border do not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, before we talk about the "Made in China" report and the literally slave labor conditions under which literally millions of young women in China, almost all young and mostly women, I want to follow up on some things that the Democratic Whip talked about in terms of human rights.

We have, for 10 years, been engaging with China. We have traded with

China. We have opened our markets to China. During that entire 10-year period, the Bush administration, even the Reagan administration before the Bush administration, the Clinton administration have told us over and over that China would be freer, that engaging with China would really help.

You can look in these last 10 years and see how things are growing worse, they are continuing to go downhill. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) mentioned the State Department's Country Report outlining the conditions in China actually were worse this past year. As China has tried to woo us to get into the World Trade Organization, conditions were worse last year than the year before.

In fact, if we look at last year's Country Reports, the language that describes China's behavior towards Tibet and towards other outlying areas from the central government and towards minorities, in the language that the Country Reports describes Serbia's treatment of Kosovo, the language was almost identical. We bomb Kosovo, yet we give trade advantages to China.

The National Religious Commission that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) mentioned talked about religious persecution in China. The animosity and the hostility of the central government of China towards religion in China is worse than at any time since the cultural revolution in the mid 1960s. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights the Chinese continue to ignore.

So some in this body want to put faith in this congressional commission that has been suggested as some way to deal with problems of labor rights and human rights.

The Chinese do not pay attention to our official Department of State Country Reports. The Chinese has not paid any attention to the Religion Commission. The Chinese have not paid any attention to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Why would they pay any attention to a congressional task force that this body might pass in tandem with permanent most favored nation status trading privileges for China?

As William Safire, a generally conservative columnist in the New York Times, said in the paper yesterday after conversing, interestingly, with Richard Nixon, who told him that this engagement and trade and probably right before Nixon died had probably gone too far, Nixon said, I think we may have created a Frankenstein, talking about human rights abuses, talking about all the child labor and all of that in these countries. Safire said that we in this country have continued to feed the military machine in China.

That is really what we are doing with engagement. We are feeding the suppressive regime, not just their mili-

tary, but their police state, feeding of the police statement machine, too. And that is why the crackdown on religion, the crackdown on human rights, the oppression of workers, all of that have continued to get worse in China because the state apparatus is getting wealthier and wealthier, has better and better technology as they continue to get technology from American business and western business in China, as they continue to upgrade their oppressive regime and that regime is fed by all the investment and all the dollars that we send to China through our business investments.

One more point I would like to make. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) mentioned the "Made in China" report that really does outline the behavior of several U.S. businesses: The Kathie Lee, Wal-Mart, Alpine, Huffy, which permanently laid off 850 Ohio workers making \$17 an hour about a year ago, replacing them with Chinese workers, all young, almost all female, all under 25, many of them 16 and 17, making literally less than 2 percent of what they were making in China.

□ 1400

But this report underscores one other thing about why engagement with China is not working, and, that is, that investors from the West, investors from the United States and other western nations have begun to shift in the last 5 years, have massively shifted their investments in the developing world from democracies to authoritarian countries. They are less interested in India, a democracy, and more interested in China, an authoritarian government. They are less interested in Taiwan, a democracy, and more interested in Indonesia, a police state. Investor dollars from the West have been attracted to these kind of regimes because they can hire people at 20 and 30 and 40 cents an hour. Any time these workers have even complained about working conditions, they are fined or penalized or jailed in some cases and sometimes even worse. This workforce in China is young, it is female, it is inexperienced, it is docile, it does not talk back, and it does not fight back. That is the kind of workforce that investment dollars from the United States seems to be attracted to.

That is why passing permanent most-favored-nation status trading privileges for China will lock in that oppressive regime, will cost American jobs, will hurt the Chinese, will lock into this life-style, this slave labor life-style that too many Chinese workers already are subjected to and will make things worse.

Mr. Speaker, if I could add one more point. One other thing that seems to be happening is that the United States, Federal law from the 1931 Trade Act and from the 1992 agreement with China says that in this country we are

not allowed to accept into the country products produced by slave labor. When we have documented that workers are making between three and 35 cents an hour and in many cases those workers are charged for their room and their board and their clothing from that three to 35 cents an hour, it is pretty clear that an awful lot of these products, Kathy Lee handbags at Wal-Mart, shoes from Nike and Keds, all kinds of other products at Wal-Mart, bicycles from Huffy, that these products are made by slave labor when somebody is making only cents an hour and much of that is taken back from them by charging them for the clothes and the food they eat, the clothes they wear and the beds they sleep in. When that is happening, our government should say we are not going to accept those products made by slave labor. That has only happened once in the last 10 years, in 1991, did our government say you cannot let a product into the country that was made by slave labor. But we are aware as Harry Wu, a very courageous Chinese man that lives now in the United States who spent 20 years in prisons went back to China and documented case after case after case of products that were made under slave labor conditions and sold into the United States, our administration, the Republican leadership in this Congress and the administration should say, we are not going to vote on Chinese most-favored-nation status trading privileges until we investigate whether these slave labor products are being brought into the United States. It is illegal, and we ought to get to the bottom of it. We have no business voting on this until we really do find out if these are slave labor products.

Mr. BONIOR. I think the gentleman is right on target and absolutely correct in his assessment. I want to thank him for his eloquence and for his passion and for coming to the floor night after night to express his concerns on the questions of basic human rights and political and religious freedoms. They are very important parts of our international trade debate. They need to be a part of that debate. People tend to forget often in our country as the gentleman from Ohio well knows that the market by itself will not bring about these political, religious and labor reforms that are needed for workers and families. What brings that about is the ability of people to come together, to form civic organizations, and to fight these repressive laws and practices. It is what happened in the United States of America 100 years ago during the progressive era in our country. The free market did not provide the benefits that we often take for granted today. What provided the good wages, the health care, the pensions, the safe working conditions, the right to vote, the right to form political organizations, the right to freely practice

your religion, the right to speak out like I am speaking out now and you can speak out when you walk out of this building, what made all of that happen were courageous people like Wei Jingsheng and Harry Wu who are now trying to bring that about for the people of China. People in this country had to fight corporate conglomerates, trusts and power in order for workers to have the benefits we enjoy today. It did not just happen. People protested, they marched, they picketed, they were beaten, they went to jail and some, yes, even died in order that we could enjoy today many of the things that we have. Those same struggles are happening in China and other parts of the developing world.

A central question in this debate, certainly one of the central questions is whose side are we on? Are we on the side of those people who are trying to organize in China for a better life for the Chinese people? Are we on the side of the multinational corporations who promise us that this will help our economy and create jobs when the reality is it does just the opposite?

Let me demonstrate that point, if I could. This is a confusing looking chart, and I will try if I can to simplify it. The chart says U.S. goods trade balance with China, tariff cuts, agreements, 20 years of most favored trade status and accelerating collapse. What this chart shows is that our trade deficit, our trade account with China, has mushroomed, has exploded over the past 20 years. We now have a trade imbalance with China, they send us much more than we send them, of about \$70 billion. Just this morning, the March trade figures came out and showed that we were running a \$5.1 billion trade deficit. Last March we were running a \$4.1 billion trade deficit. That is just for 1 month. So it has increased by \$1 billion just over a year ago for the month of March. Much of that is with China. Not quite but almost 40 percent of the goods that are made in China are shipped to the United States of America. Two percent of our goods manufactured here go to China. So they are sending much more to us than we are sending to them. As a result, we have this trade deficit with the Chinese.

You might say, why is that? There are many reasons for that. One reason that we cannot get into the Chinese markets is because they do not live up to any of their trade agreements. On this chart, this is the deficit, swelling from almost zero out this far to \$70 billion. What is written in here are the agreements that were done over the last 20 years to try to get us into their market, allow us to sell textiles and space materials and all other types of agreements dealing with intellectual property and software, you name it, a whole series of agreements worked out with the Chinese. You would think after each agreement we would have

more access to their market and this number would diminish. Just the opposite. It has expanded. It has increased. The reason is they do not live up to their word. They have no compliance or no enforcement mechanisms in China to implement their agreements. And so we have this ballooning \$70 billion deficit.

The people who are promoting this trade deal say, "Well, this is another trade piece. This is one of many agreements. This one is really going to work because it is going to reduce our tariffs, so we will be able to send more into China and it will cost less and people will buy it there."

If you look at this chart, you can see that we had two tariff reduction agreements with the Chinese. China lowers its average import tariffs from 42 percent to 23 percent. What happened? The deficit continued to grow, even after they lowered the tariff. Then they lowered it to 17 percent from 23, and it continued to grow even more. The reason is, they just do not let our stuff into their country. They find a way to keep it out. In this latest agreement, Ms. Barshefsky, our trade representative, went there and did a deal on wheat. Now, the first thing people should understand is China is awash in food. They have a lot of food, a lot of food goods. They have a lot of food in storage. Keep that in the back of your mind when you are told that you will be able to ship fruits and vegetables and grains and meats and all these other agricultural products. Right after she did the wheat deal, one of the top Chinese people in the government who deals with agriculture and wheat said the deal that would allow X amount of imported grain, wheat in this case into China, is a deal "in theory only." Those were his words. In theory only. So already they are backing away from that opportunity.

In the area of intellectual property, and by that I mean software, digitalware, tapes and those kinds of things, 95 percent of all intellectual property sold in China today is pirated material, in other words, copied and pirated. We get very little benefit as a result of that. In fact, it is so egregious that the ministries that are supposed to write the laws against pirating materials use pirated software. I could go on and on and on. It is quite tragic and it is quite sad.

The other part of this trade agreement that I think people need to be cognizant of is the proponents of it will say, yes, but it will open up their markets, it will allow us to sell more goods to China. What it will do is require our multinational corporations to establish their facilities in China. It will take our jobs and export them to China. Those facilities will be built, people will be hired for three cents to 35 cents an hour, slave wages, indentured servitude, products will be put together

and they will be shipped back here to the tune of about 40 percent of all of China's exports and sold here to the best market in the world, certainly China's best market, the United States of America. So what we get out of this is compliance, and compliance is not the right word but working together with the Chinese to undermine these basic fundamental human rights, what we get out of this as well is our manufacturing capabilities moving offshore to China, China becomes an export platform because people making three to 35 cents an hour cannot buy the Nike shoes that they are making or the Motorola cell phones that they are making or the television sets that they are making because they do not make enough money, so they are put together and they are shipped right back here and sold to our people.

Yes, our people get other jobs. They lose their good manufacturing jobs here, and they get other jobs, but they get jobs that pay a half to two-thirds of the amount that they were making before. As a result of that, people end up often working two jobs, sometimes three jobs, and you have got America on this treadmill. We are doing very well economically but people's lives have changed radically. They do not have enough time for their families or for themselves. I saw this figure recently, and I am loath to quote it because I am not quite sure, but over the last generation or maybe generation and a half, Americans are working I think something like 31 days longer a year, something like that, if you add up all the extra hours.

□ 1415

So there is no time or no adequate time for family often, and then what happens when that occurs is the parents are not home for their children when they get home from school, and then you have all the maladies that flow from that, with alcohol, teen pregnancy and drugs, and we get ourselves into a vicious cycle and a breakdown in the whole social structure of our country.

I have come a long way in winding this down to our own problems, but it is all related, and it all comes back to treating people decently and with some sense of civility, and paying them a good wage, allowing them to organize, allowing them to worship freely, allowing them to express themselves politically.

When you do not do that, you shut people out from the really basic first principles of democratization. As I said earlier, you can have free trade and free markets, but they are not going to work very well unless you have free people. Without free people, they will explode, they will implode, and your society will come apart at the seams, as it did in Chile, as it did in Europe, as it did in Indonesia, as it undoubtedly will in China at some point.

You cannot repress and hold in the basic instincts of mankind, which is a yearning to be free, a yearning to be able to express yourself at those various fundamental levels of religion, politics and the worksite.

So I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a terribly, terribly important debate that we are engaged in, and I want to congratulate all of the courageous people in China and the dissidents who have been exiled for standing with us. I want to congratulate the working men and women of this country. Seventy-nine percent of the American people think Congress should not give China more access to our products until it improves its human rights; 79 percent. Yet we are on the precipice, we are right there, of going ahead next week with a vote on this most critical issue, without addressing in a fundamentally strong way the issues of human rights and labor rights and civil rights and political rights.

These are universal rights we are talking about. We are not talking about American rights, we are talking about rights that have been adopted not only in the United States of America, but since our crusade in this area, in Latin America, our brothers and sisters in Europe, and the revolution on human rights and civil rights and political rights is spreading abroad and around the world in other areas as well.

This is a very important issue for this country. It is a very important issue in terms of the choices we make as a society. Is the market piece of this so overwhelming? Is the promise of gold at the end of the rainbow of this market of 1.2 billion people in China so enticing, so captivating, so tempting that it will blind us to the real nature of who we are as a people, what we stand for as a people, what we have been the beacon of light for people around the world? Will we just give that up in order to provide a few multinationals the opportunity to set up shop and export back to this country, and abuse, as they have constantly abused, the workers in China?

I do not think anything could be more fundamental. That is why these debates, whether they were on NAFTA or fast track or now China, are so vigorously fought, so heartfelt, so passionate and so encompassing.

Seattle was not an aberration. Seattle happened because the rules of the game in a global world are now changing. What the proponents of China most-favored-nation trade status are about, it seems to me, is masquerading the past as the future. They have not been able to make the transition to the realization that we live in a global society, and, as a result of that, we affect each other more fundamentally, more immediately, and, as a result of that, the rules have to change.

Let me, for example, take the environmental issue. You could say well,

why does the environment have anything to do with trade? It has to do with trade because it is a lever on conducting trade in a clean, green way.

China is one of the most, if not the most, polluted places on the face of the Earth. Five of the ten most polluted cities in the world are in China. Two million people die in China each year from air and water diseases. Eighty percent of the rivers in China have no fish because of pollutants and toxics.

China produces more fluorocarbons than any other nation on Earth, which eats away at the ozone layer and causes the problems that we are all familiar with, including skin cancer. So that is important, because the ozone layer does not just affect the spot above China, the rivers that are polluted do not only run through China. The waters and lakes and oceans that are polluted affect people in other countries, so we are all interconnected here in a way we have never been before.

So that is why we argue that we need to discuss these issues in the context of our broader international agreements.

I am joined today by really one of the great champions of human rights and worker rights and trade, my friend and dear colleague, the gentlewoman from Toledo, Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who has just been magnificent in her effort to wage an understanding of this issue for the American people. I yield to her now for any comments she might want to share with us.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), our great leader from the State of Michigan, our Wolverine State, a few moments to talk about our proposal for permanent normal trade relations for China. One certainly could not say anything about our trade relations with China being "normal." In fact, they are very abnormal, with more exports coming into our market from China for over 12 years now than our exports being able to get in there, even when tariffs have been lowered.

I wanted to say to the gentleman that I think that his fortitude on this as the days go on is magnificent. I just wish every American could see the hours and hours that the gentleman has put into this personally and all the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle enjoy working with the gentleman so very much.

I wanted to make sure to come down here during this time as we attempt to inform the American people and our colleagues about this upcoming vote next week on extending permanent trade relations with China, that every major veterans organization in this country has come out in opposition to granting permanent normal trade relations with China.

I wanted to say a word about that, because I know many of our Post Commanders, our State Commanders, our

Auxiliary Leaders across this Nation, are phoning their Members of Congress. They have been doing it this week, they are going to continue over the weekend and into next week, and I thought I would read into the RECORD and provide for the RECORD some of what these organizations have said, starting with the Veterans of Foreign Wars, an organization of 1.9 million Members.

I have been on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of this Congress for my entire tenure here, and I was just so elated to see their letter this week, which said that we should not approve permanent relations with China. They asked that the current situation where we have an annual review here in this Congress be maintained until such time as China changes its policies and demonstrates that it is ready to treat its own people according to basic human rights standards of other modern industrialized nations.

They oppose China's proliferation of missile technology and weapons of mass destruction. They oppose their threats against this country and other countries in the Pacific, including the democratic Nation of Taiwan. The VFW basically says passage of the China trade bill essentially rewards China for mistreating its citizens.

I want to thank all of the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, all the Post Commanders, all the Ladies Auxiliary Presidents and members, for engaging in this issue and letting their voices be heard from coast to coast, especially where it matters most, and that is back at home, in the home district with the home Member of Congress.

Also the American Legion, 2.8 million members strong, this week came out against permanent trade relations with China. In its formal letter they say that they want to force China to meet four preconditions before any permanent trade relations with China are extended or for any entry into the WTO by China. Those four conditions are recognition of the Taiwanese right to self-determination; full cooperation on the accounting of American servicemen missing from the Korean War and the Cold War; abandonment of policies aimed at military dominance in Asia; and encouragement and promotion of human rights and religious freedom among the Chinese people themselves.

The National Commander of the American Legion Al Lance said in his letter, "China should embrace Democratic values before it benefits from unfettered American investment."

The Military Order of the Purple Heart, again, calling their Members of Congress around the country, I wish to extend the appreciation of this Member of Congress for their activism on this. Over 30,000 members of the Military Order of the Purple Heart and 600,000 living recipients of the Purple Heart.

In their letter they say "China as an international actor continues to behave in a manner that is threatening to international stability and U.S. security interests." They say this Congress should delay the granting of permanent normal trade status to China at this time because it would remove China from the review and the openness that occurs here on this floor of Congress, which does not even happen inside China itself. They are very worried about the proliferation of weapons from China to other places, and certainly their dismal human rights record.

Then the Military Order of Purple Heart goes on to say, "Today China represents the most dangerous of the emerging threats to U.S. national security. Her designs on Western Pacific dominance, her extreme belligerence toward Taiwan and her persistent espionage and theft of U.S. advanced technologies are behaviors that must be checked before any reasonable consideration of permanent normal trade status can be undertaken."

It says, "Many of America's combat wounded veterans sacrificed life and blood to repel Chinese aggression during the Korean conflict, and now, 50 years after that war, China remains an unabashedly communistic regime. It is time for China to change if she wishes to be a truly welcome participant on the world stage."

Mr. Leader, I know that I want to yield back most of the remaining time, but I would want to place on the record the official letter from the Fleet Reserve Association, representing 151,000 members, all career and retired Sailors, Marines and Coast Guardsmen of the United States opposing permanent normal trade relations with China.

In addition to that, the Warrant Officers Association, representing nearly 20,000 warrant officers of active Army, Army Guard and the Army Reserve, in their letter saying "China shows few of the peaceful democratic traits evidenced by our Nation's other major trading partners." "In this instance," they say, "trade and economic considerations cannot take precedence over the safety of our Nation and that of our allies and friends."

A letter from the Reserve Officers Association, which we will place on the record, representing over 80,000 officers in all uniformed services, indicating opposition to permanent normal trade relations with China. They want the annual review here. They are very concerned about China's military threats against Taiwan, and threatened military action against the United States if we defend Taiwan.

Finally, from AMVETS, 200,000 veterans opposed in this organization to permanent normal trade relations with China, saying the security issues take precedence over trade relations with foreign nations.

I would just say, finally, and again to thank all the veterans Commanders, the Ladies Auxiliaries, the Post leaders, the membership in all these organizations across the country that are weighing in, phoning their Members of Congress, I know we have gotten many calls in our community and that is happening across the country, to thank them for their activism, to encourage them this weekend and the coming week.

I want to place in the RECORD finally the request made by one of our valued colleagues from the State of California (Mr. BERMAN), who tried to get a provision as we voted on this agreement that would provide that in the event that this permanent normal trade status would be granted, that in the event that China would attack, invade, or blockade Taiwan, that permanent normal trade relations would be revoked.

□ 1430

The administration was not willing to include that in the measure that they have sent up to this Congress.

AMVETS,

Lanham, MD, May 16, 2000.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,

Member of Congress, House of Representatives,  
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOLF: AMVETS, the nation's fourth largest organization, represents more than 200,000 veterans who honorably served in the Armed Forces of the United States, and opposes Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) for China.

While the U.S. relationship with China is important, AMVETS believes that national security issues take precedence over the trade relations with foreign countries. We concur in your belief that our nation cannot afford to give leverage to the Republic of China—which exports weapons of mass destruction and missiles, maintains spy presence in the U.S. and continues to threaten Taiwan with military force.

When Congress votes in the House during the week of May 22, let it be known that AMVETS says "no" to the Permanent Trade Relations with China.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. TAYLOR,

National Commander, 1999-2000, AMVETS.

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF  
THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, April 27, 2000.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,

U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: The Reserve Officers Association ("ROA"), representing 80,000 officers in all seven Uniformed Services, is concerned about the proposal to grant Permanent Normal Trade Relations ("PNTR") to China.

ROA acknowledges the importance of our relationship with China, including our growing economic ties to China. Nevertheless, ROA believes that it would be a mistake to grant PNTR to China at this time. The annual process of reviewing trade relations with China provides Congress with leverage over Chinese behavior on national security and human rights matters. Granting PNTR would deprive Congress of the opportunity to influence China to improve its human rights record and behave as a more responsible actor on the national security stage.

Just within the past few weeks, China has made military threats against Taiwan and threatened military action against the United States if we defend Taiwan. Just four years ago, China fired several live missiles in the Taiwan Strait, necessitating a deployment of two American carrier battle groups to the area.

A report issued last month by the CIA and FBI indicates that Beijing has increased its military spying against the United States. Less than a year ago the Cox Committee reported that China stole classified information regarding advanced American thermo-nuclear weapons.

Additionally, Beijing has exported weapons of mass destruction to Iran and north Korea, in violation of treaty commitments. Finally, China's record of human rights abuses is well documented.

A recent Harris Poll revealed that fully 79% of the American people oppose giving China permanent access to U.S. markets until China meets human rights and labor standards. On this issue, Congress should respect the wisdom of the American people. Now is not the time to grant Permanent Normal Trade Relations to China.

Sincerely,

JAYSON L. SPIEGEL,  
*Executive Director.*

UNITED STATES ARMY  
WARRANT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,  
*Hemdon, VA, May 9, 2000.*

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,  
*Member of Congress, U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOLF: On behalf of the membership of this Association I write to express support and appreciation of your actions, and that of several of your colleagues, in opposing Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China.

The USAWOA represents nearly 20,000 warrant officers of the Active Army, the Army Guard, and the Army Reserve. These highly-skilled men and women serve as helicopter pilots, special forces team leaders, intelligence analysts, command and control computer and communications managers, armament and equipment repair technicians, and in other technical fields critical to success of the modern battlefield. Daily, many of them are in harm's way.

From our perspective, it appears that China has done little to deserve such consideration. Of more concern is the fact that China shows few of the peaceful, democratic traits evidenced by our Nation's other major trading partners. Indeed, China appears to striving to achieve not only economic dominance of the Pacific Rim but also a significant military advantage over her neighbors, and quite possibly, the United States.

In this instance, trade and economic considerations cannot take precedence over the safety of our Nation and that of our allies and friends. Until fundamental, lasting changes take place in China, normalization of trade relations should not take place.

Respectively,

RAYMOND A BELL,  
*Executive Director.*

FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION,  
*Alexandria, VA, April 21, 2000.*  
Hon. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH,  
*House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Please be advised that the Fleet Reserve Association (FRA), representing its 151,000 members, all

career and retired Sailors, Marines, and Coast Guardsmen of the United States Armed Forces, joins you and your colleagues in opposing Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) for China.

FRA shares your concern that weapons of mass destruction exported by that country can be used against U.S. military personnel, and also our Nation's citizens. Further, China already has obtained considerable knowledge of our Nation's weapons technology without normal trade relations. Should the United States open its doors to normal trade relations, it is worrisome that China will discover even more of that sensitive information.

One of the most important goals of this Association is to protect its members as well as every active duty and reserve uniformed member of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. To fulfill that commitment, FRA must do all that it can to oppose any move that could possibly send those brave men and women into harms way without 'rhyme or reason.' With the possibility that the future will hang dark shadows over open trading with a yet unproven China, FRA is sensitive to the harm that country may inflict upon our Nation.

Loyalty, Protection, and Service,  
CHARLES L. CALKINS,  
*National Executive Secretary.*

MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART,  
*May 15, 2000.*

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,  
*U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: The Military Order of the Purple Heart (MOPH), representing the patriotic interests of its 30,000 members and the 600,000 living recipients of the Purple Heart, is seriously concerned with the Administration's proposal to grant Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status to the Peoples Republic of China.

The MOPH is familiar with the current series of U.S. Government reports concerning China to include: the Cox Committee Report, the Rumsfeld Commission Report, the 1999 Intelligence Community Report on Arms Proliferation, and Chairman Spence's May 2000 HASC National Security Report on China. These and other similar security assessments clearly indicate that China, as an international actor, continues to behave in a manner that is threatening to international stability and U.S. national security interests.

Given the broad consensus that has formed about this issue, to include the recent Harris Poll indicating 79% of all Americans are against granting PNTR status to China, the MOPH believes it both prudent and reasonable to delay the granting of PNTR status to China at this time. Speaking as patriots and combat wounded veterans, we believe that granting PNTR status to China would relieve them from the current pressure caused by annual Congressional review of their trade status. Clearly, Congressional review has caused China to improve its dismal human rights record and to modify to some extent its proliferation of dangerous arms on the world market. Yet these modifications must be seen as the beginning not the end.

Today, China represents the most dangerous of the emerging threats to U.S. national security. Her designs on Western Pacific dominance, her extreme belligerence towards Taiwan, and her persistent espionage and theft of U.S. advanced technologies are behaviors that must be checked before any reasonable consideration of PNTR status can be undertaken.

Many of America's combat wounded veterans sacrificed life and blood to repel Chinese aggression during the Korean Conflict. Fifty years after that war China remains an unabashedly communistic regime. It is time for China to change if she wishes to be a truly welcomed participant on the world's stage. It is also time for Congress and the Administration to reflect upon the sacrifices of its combat wounded veterans and ensure that China will not once again become our enemy. In the view of the MOPH this objective must be reached before PNTR status should be granted to China.

Yours in Patriotism,  
FRANK G. WICKERSHAM III,  
*National Legislative Director.*

THE AMERICAN LEGION,  
*Washington, DC.*

For immediate release

CHINA TRADE OPPOSED BY THE AMERICAN  
LEGION

INDIANAPOLIS (WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 2000).—Taking into account nuclear espionage charges, human rights abuses, saber rattling against Taiwan, and influence-peddling indictments, the 2.8-million member American Legion today demanded the U.S. government withhold Permanent Normalized Trade Relations with the People's Republic of China and oppose its entry into the World Trade Organization.

The American Legion's board of directors, during its annual spring meeting here recommended Congress and the Clinton administration force China to meet four pre-conditions both for entry into the WTO and for ending the annual congressional review of its trade status:

Recognition of the Taiwan's right to self-determination;

Full cooperation on the accounting of American servicemen missing from the Korean War and the Cold War;

Abandonment of policies aimed at military dominance in Asia; and

Encouragement and promotion of human rights and religious freedom among the Chinese people.

"China should embrace democratic values before it benefits from unfettered American investment," American Legion National Commander Al Lance said. "The American Legion sets forth the prerequisites for peace and stability, without which Communist China will become economically and militarily more formidable even as it embarks on policies pursuant to regional instability. A something-for-nothing trade arrangement with China—one that severs trade from national security and human rights—threatens stability, rewards antagonism, and strengthens a potential foe of American sons and daughters in the U.S. armed forces."

Founded in 1919, The American Legion is the nation's largest veterans organization.

[Veterans of Foreign Wars News Release]

VFW URGES CONGRESS TO REJECT PERMANENT  
TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 17.—The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States today urged Congress not to grant Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China.

Citing the need for a change in China's human rights standards, the 1.9-million member VFW said. "The United States should maintain its current annual congressional review of China's trade status until such time as China changes its policy and demonstrates that it is ready to treat its people according to the basic human rights

standards of other modern industrial nations."

In a letter to all members of Congress, VFW Commander in Chief John W. Smart said, "A vote against Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China will send a clear message that the United States does not tolerate China's persistent human rights violations, and will not agree with its proliferation of missile technology and weapons of mass destruction, its military threats against the United States and other countries in the Pacific region including repeated threats made against Taiwan.

"Passage of the China Trade Bill, essentially rewards China for mistreating its citizens, violating its current trade agreements, threatening its neighbors and the United States with military action, proliferating weapons of mass destruction, stealing nuclear, military and industrial secrets from the United States, increasing espionage against the U.S., and practicing religious oppression. We believe this bill sends the wrong message to China and the rest of the world," Smart said.

The VFW was founded in 1899. As an organization of former servicemen and women, the VFW remains committed to a strong national security and the well being of those serving on active duty, in the National Guard and the Reserves.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 17, 2000.

VFW, AMVETS, AND PURPLE HEART VETERANS JOIN THE RANKS OF VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS IN OPPOSITION TO PNTR FOR CHINA

DEAR COLLEAGUE: VFW, the second largest veterans' organization, AMVETS, the fourth largest veterans organization, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart, have added their forceful voices in opposition to Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China. Veterans groups representing over 5.1 million members have now voiced their objection to this critical trade legislation.

VFW, representing 1.9 million members, states: "Passage of the China Trade Bill, essentially rewards China for mistreating its citizens, violating current trade agreements, threatening its neighbors and the United States with military action, proliferating weapons of mass destruction, stealing nuclear, military and industrial secrets from the United States, increasing espionage against the U.S., and practicing religious oppression. We believe this bill sends the wrong message to China and the rest of the world."

AMVETS, representing more than 200,000 veterans, states: "We concur in your belief that our nation cannot afford to give leverage to the Republic of China—which exports weapons of mass destruction and missiles, maintains spy presence in the U.S. and continues to threaten Taiwan with military force. When Congress votes in the House during the week of May 22, let it be known that AMVETS say 'no' to the Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China."

Military Order of the Purple Heart, chartered by Congress, and representing 30,000 members and the 600,000 living recipients of the Purple Heart, states: "Today, China represents the most dangerous of the emerging threats to U.S. national security . . . Many of America's combat wounded veterans sacrificed life and blood to repel Chinese aggression during the Korea Conflict. Fifty years after that war China remains an unabashedly communist regime. It is time for China to change if she wishes to be a truly welcomed

participant on the world's stage. It is also time for Congress and the Administration to reflect upon the sacrifices of its combat wounded veterans and ensure that China will not once again become our enemy."

National Commander Al Lance of the American Legion, representing 2.8 million, states: "China should embrace democratic values before it benefits from unfettered American investment. The American Legion sets forth the prerequisites for peace and stability, without which Communist China will become economically and militarily more formidable even as it embarks on policies pursuant to regional instability. A something-for-nothing trade arrangement with China—one that severs trade from national security and human rights—threatens stability, rewards antagonism, and strengthens a potential foe of American sons and daughters in the U.S. armed forces."

The Fleet Reserve Officers Association, representing 151,000 members, career and retired Sailors, Marines, and Coast Guardsmen, states: "One of the most important goals of this Association is to protect its members as well as every active duty and reserve uniformed member of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. The Fleet Reserve opposes Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China."

The Naval Reserve Association, representing 37,000 officers and enlisted members from the Naval Reserve Services, states: "China is aggressively building its military. The PRC's ambitions include reunification by force with Taiwan, and territorial claim over the energy resources in the international waters of the South China Sea." They conclude by stressing, "Now is not the time to offer Permanent Normal Trade Relationships (PNTR) for China."

The Warrant Officers Association, representing nearly 20,000 warrant officers of the Active Army, the Army Guard, and the Army Reserve, states: "In this instance, trade and economic considerations cannot take precedence over the safety of our Nation and that of our allies and friends. Until fundamental, lasting changes take place in China, normalization of trade relations should not take place."

The Reserve Officers Association, representing 80,000 officers in all seven uniformed services, states, "Just within the past few weeks, China has made military threats against Taiwan and threatened military action against the U.S. if we defend Taiwan. Now is not the time to grant Permanent Normal Trade Relations to China."

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,  
Member of Congress.  
CHRIS SMITH,  
Member of Congress.  
DAVID BONIOR,  
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
House of Representatives, May 17, 2000.

VOTE WITH AMERICA'S VETERANS ON MEMORIAL DAY—VOTE NO ON PNTR FOR CHINA

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This week the VFW, the Military Order of the Purple Hearts and AMVETS, joined the American Legion and several other veterans organizations in opposition to PNTR for China.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, United States Army Warrant Officers Association, Reserve Officers Association, The American Legion, Naval Reserve, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Fleet Reserve.

This vote is scheduled just a few days before Memorial Day, a day which honors our

armed forces personnel who have given their lives for our freedom. We should heed the voices of our men and women in uniform and America's veterans who are asking us to vote no on PNTR for China.

Sincerely,

FRANK WOLF,  
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 18, 2000.

IF CONGRESS PASSES PNTR, CHINA CAN EXPORT CHEAP, SEMI-AUTOMATIC WEAPONS TO THE U.S.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Upon approving the annual Most Favored Nation status for China in 1994, President Clinton issued an embargo on the imports of assault weapons from China. This complete prohibition was issued because Chinese gun manufacturers had exported almost one million Chinese rifles to the United States—more than made by all U.S. manufacturers combined in 1992 according to the BATF.

The most popular import was the SKS semi-automatic rifle, once a standard weapon among East Bloc forces and used against U.S. troops in Vietnam. The SKS was the fourth most frequently traced firearm in America—surprising since handguns, not rifles, tend to be the guns that criminals use most. They were particularly popular among neo-nazi's, white supremacists and street gangs. What made them attractive was their power and inexpensive price, only \$55.95.

If Congress approves permanent NTR, World Trade Organization regulations will apply to the U.S. ban of gun imports from China. Under WTO regulations, the U.S. is required to treat foreign and domestic goods identically. Since these weapons are legal in the U.S., China will be able to challenge our embargo on these dangerous firearms. The U.S. would have to lift the import ban on China or prohibit the manufacture of those assault weapons domestically.

Is the U.S. prepared to lift the import ban on assault weapons from China?

Or is the U.S. prepared to ban the manufacture of those weapons in the U.S.?

Don't give China the power to decide gun policy in the United States.

Don't allow China to sell these cheap, dangerous assault weapons on the streets of America.

Oppose PNTR for China.

Sincerely,

PETE STARK,  
Member of Congress.  
CAROLYN MCCARTHY,  
Member of Congress.  
NANCY PELOSI,  
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 18, 2000.

CHINA THREATENS WAR OVER TAIWAN

DEAR COLLEAGUE: BEIJING (AP).—An official Chinese newspaper threatened war today if Taiwan's president-elect refuses to recognize that the island is part of China.

Stepping up pressure ahead of this week-end's inauguration, Beijing wants Chen Shuibian, who was elected March 18, to recognize the "one China principle" to allay its fears over his previous pro-independence stance.

China's government and entirely state-run media have for weeks demanded that Taiwan accept that it is part of China as a precondition for talks. But the China Business Times went further, threatening war if Chen

fails during his inauguration Saturday to heed Beijing's demands.

"If Taiwan's new leader refuses in his inaugural speech to recognize the one China principle and even makes a speech that inclines toward Taiwan independence, then relations between the two sides will certainly take a turn. War in the Taiwan Strait will be difficult to avoid," the newspaper said in a front-page article alongside photos of a tank, a warplane and military exercises.

#### SEC. 2. WITHDRAWAL OF NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS.

Pursuant to Article XXI of the GATT 1994, nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) shall be withdrawn from the products of the People's Republic of China if that country attacks, invades, or imposes a blockade on Taiwan.

Sincerely,

HOWARD L. BERMAN,  
Member of Congress.

#### A BILL

Providing for the revocation of normal trade relations treatment from the products of the People's Republic of China if that country attacks, invades, or imposes a blockade on Taiwan.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. FINDINGS

The Congress finds that—

(1) Article XXI of the GATT 1994 (as defined in section 2(1)(B) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501 (1)(B))) allows a member of the World Trade Organization to take "any action which it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests," particularly "in time of war or other emergency in international relations"; and

(2) an attack on, invasion of, or blockade of Taiwan by the People's Republic of China would constitute a threat to the essential security interests of the United States and an emergency in international relations.

#### SEC. 2. WITHDRAWAL OF NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS.

Pursuant to Article XXI of the GATT 1994, non-discriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) shall be withdrawn from the products of the People's Republic of China if that country attacks, invades, or imposes a blockade on Taiwan.

#### SEC. 3. APPLICABILITY TO EXISTING CONTRACTS.

The President shall have the authority to determine the extent to which the withdrawal under section 2 of normal trade relations treatment applies to products imported pursuant to contracts entered into before the date on which the withdrawal of such treatment is announced. The President shall issue regulations to carry out such determination.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for raising these issues and I commend her and I commend the Veterans Administration, the Legion, the VFW and the others that she mentioned for stepping out and standing up, and we appreciate her leadership on this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who has been a great leader on this issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say two things. I think the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) stated it very well when she pointed out how the VFW and the

other veterans groups are very much opposed to PNTR. I think what came across in our press conference, I would say to my good friend from Michigan, and he chaired that, was the intensity factor on the part of the veterans. They were very, very strong and bold about the security implications of conveying, without the annual review, permanent normal trading relations and the human rights issues.

I have had 18 hearings in my Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights. I have been there three times. It does not make me an expert but I think I have some insights and they are shared by so many who have done likewise. Torture is commonplace in the PRC. If one is arrested as a religious believer or a democracy promoter, they get tortured and we are doing business with their torturers.

I think when we look at every area in human rights they have gone from bad to worse over the last 10 years, and I think we need to say enough is enough, and I thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), for having this special order.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my friend for his leadership and his passion and his courage to take on these human rights issues in his committee as the Chair. We enjoy working with him and we look forward to continuing to work on these issues that we share common values and beliefs in.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to my friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished Democratic whip, for yielding and for his extraordinary leadership on this important issue.

I am pleased to join my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), and commend her for her leadership as well.

This next week this House of Representatives will have a vote and decide how we will honor the pillars of our own foreign policy, promoting democratic values, stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and growing our own economy by promoting our exports abroad. A vote for permanent NTR does not advance any of those goals, and I wish to associate myself with the remarks that have been made in that regard.

I wanted to emphasize a point made by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) earlier. This weekend in Taiwan, the second democratically-elected President will be inaugurated. It is cause for celebration in the heart of every person in the world who cares about freedom and democracy. At a time when we should all in this body be celebrating that great triumph of democracy, we are instead rejecting a very simple amendment, and that is the Berman amendment that

the majority has refused to put in the bill, and that the administration has refused to accept.

That simple amendment would say that PNTR would be lifted for China if China invades Taiwan. What could be simpler than associating one's self with the idea that if a country invades another place then they would not get special privileges in the United States? Not only have we ignored China's activity to proliferate weapons of mass destruction such as chemical, biological and nuclear technology to rogue states, not only have we ignored that, we have certified that they are not doing it when we know full well that they are.

If the President wants to make this a national security issue, let us do that. In terms of national security, instead of appeasing the Chinese Government every step of the way on their misbehavior internationally we are missing an opportunity to say to them do not even think about invading Taiwan. If they do not think China is going to invade, there is no problem here. Right? Clearly, they do not trust the Chinese, or else they would let this amendment pass.

Again, instead of saluting the democracy in Taiwan, we are rewarding the unsafe behavior of the Chinese. So I urge all of my colleagues to sign on to a letter to the Committee on Rules to make this amendment in order that if China invades Taiwan, we lift PNTR.

Our relationship with every country should make the world safer, the trade fairer and people freer. Permanent NTR at this time does not do that. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) for his leadership.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for raising that very important security issue and freedom issue and as my friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), did, I want to thank the veterans of this country for coming out in opposition based on basic security grounds and human rights grounds and encourage them to continue to call their Members of Congress as we enter this vote at the end of the week, the American Legion and the VFW and the AMVETS and the many organizations that we talked about. I thank my colleagues for joining me today.

#### RECOGNIZING THE FIELD MUSEUM OF CHICAGO'S PUBLIC UNVEILING OF SUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARY MILLER of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to observe and listen to a profound discussion lead by the distinguished minority whip and I happen to agree with the views expressed by all of those speakers, and I