CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the House for giving me the last hour before our adjournment for the Easter and Passover recess. I want to cover four issues, and hopefully I can do so in less than the 1 hour allotted: first, taxation and the energy crisis in California; and then two foreign policy issues, our airmen being held in China, and our sanctions policy and China, and our sanctions policy

Second, we could fix the funding formula, what is called the Annual Adjusted Per Capita Cost, that puts rural States at a disadvantage in attracting Medicare+ plans, because those Medicare+ plans offer a prescription drug benefit. My plan would increase the floor to $600 per beneficiary per month. That would be an entitlement for the Medicare+ Choice plans to actually go to States like Iowa. That way senior citizens and rural States would have the same opportunities to sign up for an HMO that offers a prescription drug benefit that those in New York, Miami, Los Angeles now can get.

Third, in response to my constituents who want to purchase their drugs in Canada, Mexico or Europe, we should stop the Food and Drug Administration from intimidating seniors and others with threats of confiscation of their purchases when they try to buy their drugs from overseas.

At the end of last year, we attempted to solve that problem; however, there were some loopholes in the bill that we passed last year, and we need to clarify current law to allow importers to use FDA-approved labeling without charge. Current law explicitly allows labeling to be used for “testing purposes” only and does not prevent drug companies from charging very, very high fees for using the label. FDA approval for labeling provides safety and efficacy. We can allow importers to obtain the best price available on the market. There are a number of things that we need to do to make sure that our retailers in this country are able to purchase from wholesalers overseas at lower rates so that they can pass on the savings to everyone.

FDA approval for labeling provides safety and efficacy. We can allow importers to obtain the best price available on the market. There are a number of things that we need to do to make sure that our retailers in this country are able to purchase from wholesalers overseas at lower rates so that they can pass on the savings to everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I think that would be a shame if this Congress does not address high prescription drug costs for the seniors that need it most and try to do something to lower the high cost for everyone. And that is where the reimportation issue comes into play.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have a solution. I encourage my colleagues to look at the bill that I introduced today, the Drug Availability and Health Care Access Improvement Act of 2001. We have bipartisan cosponsors all across the ideological spectrum on this bill.

It does three things. Here is a modest, three-step proposal for helping seniors and others with their drug costs.

Number one, we could allow those qualified Medicare beneficiaries, those select low-income Medicare beneficiaries and qualifying individuals, one and two, up to 175 percent of poverty to qualify for the State Medicaid drug programs. States could continue to use their current administrative structures. This could be implemented almost immediately. About a third of Medicare beneficiaries would be eligible, especially those most in need.

The drug benefit would encourage more seniors to sign up, and a key feature of this bill today, it is called the Drug Availability and Health Care Access Improvement Act of 2001. We have bipartisan cosponsors all across the ideological spectrum on this bill.

We could implement that benefit for them immediately. We could give them a Medicaid drug card. They could go to any pharmacy in their State, get their prescription drugs filled at no cost, and we would pay for that from the Federal side. We would not ask for a State match on that, so the Governors and State legislators do not need to worry that we will be adding additional costs to their budgets.

I think we can do that for a reasonable amount of money, and it would not require reinventing the wheel. Every State has this program now. It would be easy to administer. All of those State Medicaid programs are overseen to help prevent fraud and abuse. I think this is the commonsense answer if, Mr. Speaker, later this year or next year we find that we are not moving to a comprehensive Medicare reform bill and we are not moving to a bill that covers a prescription drug benefit for everyone.

I just think that it would be a shame if this Congress does not address high prescription drug costs for the seniors that need it most and try to do something to lower the high cost for everyone. And that is where the reimportation issue comes into play.

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the House for giving me the last hour before our adjournment for the Easter and Passover recess. I want to cover four issues, and hopefully I can do so in less than the 1 hour allotted: first, taxation and the energy crisis in California; and then two foreign policy issues, our airmen being held in China, and our sanctions policy and
our use of economic tools in order to achieve our national security purposes. If Mr. Speaker wants to make the President an enemy of the United States, then he can do quite well by holding the President and the Congress responsible for the war he has undertaken. He described this as an act of war. Only in the past, and he described the President as having crossed the face with the insult that they are not taxpayers and do not deserve any relief from the Republican plan.

Mr. Speaker, never was this illustrated quite so clearly as today when we took up another piece of the President's tax plan, and that was a complete abolition of the estate tax. Mr. Speaker, most people of this country pay income tax, but the working poor generally pay only FICA tax. And there are some who are very wealthy who, because of the way that they have structured their investments, pay no income tax, but they pay estate tax. Three major taxes for the Federal Government: one, a burden on the poor; another a burden on most of us; and the third affects only those at the top 2 percent.

The President has decided if you do not pay income tax, you pay estate tax, you deserve tax relief because you are in the richest 2 percent, and he wants to help you. But if you pay no income tax, and you pay only FICA tax, you get not one penny, as I have said several times. So what is this estate tax package? It is a package passed today, which, if we made it immediately effective, would cost $963 billion over a 10-year period. With all of the rhetoric on this floor, you would think that we would have made it effective immediately. Speaker after speaker talked about how this tax is terrible, and yet the bill we adopted does almost nothing to reduce the tax on those with assets of 2-, 3- or $5 million, almost nothing for the next several years.

Why is that? Because, Mr. Speaker, in order to sneak this tax cut in, it is passed today, but does not become effective until the date that they acquired them or the date that the decedent's death, so higher depreciation deductions are available to someone who inherits an apartment building or inherits farm equipment. Lower capital gains tax is paid by those who inherit stocks and bonds, or those who sell off part of the land that they inherit.

 Added to the injury is the insult. The President has again and again before audiences across the country said that we are not taxpayers and do not deserve any relief from the plan. And if that waitresses has an income of $23,000, she gets not 1 penny, not even a 1-cent tip. If the waitresses, the exact waitresses here, she described with two kids and $25,000, spends anything for child care, then she gets no additional benefit at all, not 1 penny from the President's program. And if that waitresses has an income of $23,000, $25,000 or $26,000 and has 5 kids instead of 2 kids, not 1 penny.

So we were told to pass a tax program to help hard-working waitresses supporting kids, and virtually every waitresses in the restaurant goes home without even a 1-cent tip.

This House has added, this President's rhetoric has added an insult on top of that injury. There is injury to those waitresses from a tax program that this House adopted that the President adopted, because we are going to see higher interest rates, and every waitresses in that restaurant is going to be having a harder time buying an automobile, or if she is very fortunate and can almost afford a house, perhaps will not be able to do so. A worse economy and fewer patrons of that restaurant, all of this will injure those waitresses that get not one penny of tax relief from the plan.

Added to the injury is the insult. The President has again and again before audiences across the country said that his plan provides tax relief to every taxpayer, and his overwhelming implication is if you do not get anything from his plan, it is because you are not a taxpayer. If he does not give you anything, it is because you do not deserve anything. I ask the waitresses of this country to look at their paycheck stubs and see if there is a deduction for FICA. Then at that point, realize either your employer is lying to you when they take the money out of our paycheck for FICA, or the President is lying when he says that the waitresses of this country do not pay taxes because they do pay taxes to the Government, and they get in almost every case not one penny relief, but just a slap in the face with the insult that they are not taxpayers and do not deserve any relief from the Republican plan.

Mr. Speaker, never was this illustrated quite so clearly as today when we took up another piece of the President's tax plan, and that was a complete abolition of the estate tax. Mr. Speaker, most people of this country pay income tax, but the working poor generally pay only FICA tax. And there are some who are very wealthy who, because of the way that they have structured their investments, pay no income tax, but they pay estate tax. Three major taxes for the Federal Government: one, a burden on the poor; another a burden on most of us; and the third affects only those at the top 2 percent.

The President has decided if you do not pay income tax, you pay estate tax, you deserve tax relief because you are in the richest 2 percent, and he wants to help you. But if you pay no income tax, and you pay only FICA tax, you get not one penny, as I have said several times.

So what is this estate tax package? It is a package passed today, which, if we made it immediately effective, would cost $963 billion over a 10-year period. With all of the rhetoric on this floor, you would think that we would have made it effective immediately. Speaker after speaker talked about how this tax is terrible, and yet the bill we adopted does almost nothing to reduce the tax on those with assets of 2-, 3- or $5 million, almost nothing for the next several years.

Why is that? Because, Mr. Speaker, in order to sneak this tax cut in, it is passed today, but does not become effective until the date that they acquired them or the date that the decedent's death, so higher depreciation deductions are available to someone who inherits an apartment building or inherits farm equipment. Lower capital gains tax is paid by those who inherit stocks and bonds, or those who sell off part of the land that they inherit.

Mr. Speaker, never was this illustrated quite so clearly as today when we took up another piece of the President's tax plan, and that was a complete abolition of the estate tax. Mr. Speaker, most people of this country pay income tax, but the working poor generally pay only FICA tax. And there are some who are very wealthy who, because of the way that they have structured their investments, pay no income tax, but they pay estate tax. Three major taxes for the Federal Government: one, a burden on the poor; another a burden on most of us; and the third affects only those at the top 2 percent.

The President has decided if you do not pay income tax, you pay estate tax, you deserve tax relief because you are in the richest 2 percent, and he wants to help you. But if you pay no income tax, and you pay only FICA tax, you get not one penny, as I have said several times. So what is this estate tax package? It is a package passed today, which, if we made it immediately effective, would cost $963 billion over a 10-year period. With all of the rhetoric on this floor, you would think that we would have made it effective immediately. Speaker after speaker talked about how this tax is terrible, and yet the bill we adopted does almost nothing to reduce the tax on those with assets of 2-, 3- or $5 million, almost nothing for the next several years.

Why is that? Because, Mr. Speaker, in order to sneak this tax cut in, it is passed today, but does not become effective until the date that they acquired them or the date that the decedent's death, so higher depreciation deductions are available to someone who inherits an apartment building or inherits farm equipment. Lower capital gains tax is paid by those who inherit stocks and bonds, or those who sell off part of the land that they inherit.

Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago the President asked us to adopt, because we are responsible that no one will speak in favor of its immediate adoption will serve any relief from the Republican plan. And he was compassionate in that description; unfortunately, not compassionate to that waitresses or the other waitresses that work with her. You see, under the President's tax program, that waitresses with two kids does get a little bit of tax relief, perhaps 2 percent of her income, perhaps a cheap 25-cent tip left under the table or under the plate. But he carefully selected the one waitresses in the entire restaurant that gets anything at all.

You see, under the President's plan as passed by this House, if that waitresses had had an income of $23,000, she gets not 1 penny, not even a 1-cent in-suit tip. If the waitresses, the exact waitresses here, she described with two kids and $25,000, spends anything for child care, then she gets no additional benefit at all, not 1 penny from the President's program. And if that waitresses has an income of $23,000, $25,000 or $26,000 and has 5 kids instead of 2 kids, not 1 penny.

So we were told to pass a tax program to help hard-working waitresses supporting kids, and virtually every waitresses in the restaurant goes home without even a 1-cent tip.

This House has added, this President's rhetoric has added an insult on top of that injury. There is injury to those waitresses from a tax program that this House adopted that the President adopted, because we are going to see higher interest rates, and every waitresses in that restaurant is going to be having a harder time buying an automobile, or if she is very fortunate and can almost afford a house, perhaps will not be able to do so. A worse economy and fewer patrons of that restaurant, all of this will injure those waitresses that get not one penny of tax relief from the plan.

Added to the injury is the insult. The President has again and again before audiences across the country said that his plan provides tax relief to every taxpayer, and his overwhelming implication is if you do not get anything from his plan, it is because you are not a taxpayer. If he does not give you anything, it is because you do not deserve anything. I ask the waitresses of this country to look at their paycheck stubs and see if there is a deduction for FICA. Then at that point, realize either your employer is lying to you when they take the money out of our paycheck for FICA, or the President is lying when he says that the waitresses of this country do not pay taxes because they do pay taxes to the Federal Government, and they get in almost every case not one penny relief, but just a slap in the face with the insult that they are not taxpayers and do not deserve any relief from the Republican plan.

Mr. Speaker, never was this illustrated quite so clearly as today when we took up another piece of the President's tax plan, and that was a complete abolition of the estate tax. Mr. Speaker, most people of this country pay income tax, but the working poor generally pay only FICA tax. And there are some who are very wealthy who, because of the way that they have structured their investments, pay no income tax, but they pay estate tax. Three major taxes for the Federal Government: one, a burden on the poor; another a burden on most of us; and the third affects only those at the top 2 percent.

The President has decided if you do not pay income tax, you pay estate tax, you deserve tax relief because you are in the richest 2 percent, and he wants to help you. But if you pay no income tax, and you pay only FICA tax, you get not one penny, as I have said several times. So what is this estate tax package? It is a package passed today, which, if we made it immediately effective, would cost $963 billion over a 10-year period. With all of the rhetoric on this floor, you would think that we would have made it effective immediately. Speaker after speaker talked about how this tax is terrible, and yet the bill we adopted does almost nothing to reduce the tax on those with assets of 2-, 3- or $5 million, almost nothing for the next several years.

Why is that? Because, Mr. Speaker, in order to sneak this tax cut in, it is passed today, but does not become effective until the date that they acquired them or the date that the decedent's death, so higher depreciation deductions are available to someone who inherits an apartment building or inherits farm equipment. Lower capital gains tax is paid by those who inherit stocks and bonds, or those who sell off part of the land that they inherit.
die in the next few years and their heirs. They have decided to ignore those who need the reduced income taxes and reaped the benefits. Their running business is worth $2 or $3 million and need the higher tax deductions, income tax deductions, all to embrace the needs of those with assets of over $10 million, over $20 million. What is amazing is that they were able to sell some of the small business groups on it. They have talked the talk of tax relief for those with a few million dollars. They have walked the walk of the huge fortunes.

We are well on our way to a series of tax bills that we cannot afford, that will probably add up to $3 trillion in tax cuts over the next 10 years, and much of the cost of those bills is going to be hidden by the fact that many of their provisions for the elderly, for defense, and for education are, in fact, temporary increases that will expire in 10 years from now. Keeping in mind that under the tax law to look for 2001, here is what we want it to look like for 2002, pass that, and then wait a year and see where the economy is, they could probably get almost total support in the House. It is their insistence on locking this country in to an economic plan that it cannot afford, an economic plan that guarantees slow growth or recession, that virtually guarantees higher interest rates. It is that insistence that is causing dissension both here in the House and fortunately greater dissension in the Senate. Keep in mind that under the tax plan the Republicans have put before us, 79 percent of the package does not come until more than 5 years from now. Instead of providing the tax relief we can afford and the stimulus that some say we need, it simply locks in the greatest cuts for the wealthiest people many, many years from now.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to focus on what some regard as a regional problem, perhaps just the problem of one State, but it is actually the problem of the entire country, and, that is the electric energy crisis and related natural gas crisis in my home State of California. First, let me dispel the idea that it was all the fault of the extreme environmentalists, tree huggers in California, who would not allow any plants to be built and now we are reaping what we have sown. Nothing could be more clearly disproven in so many different ways.

First, no Federal agency was issuing a loud warning 2 or 3 years ago. No experts from the utility sector were saying that we were headed for a particular problem. There are geniuses on Wall Street that could have quintupled and requintupled and made tenfold and twentyfold on their money by selling short the stock of California utilities. Now, we are told that no plants were sited in California. Keep in mind, many have been approved in the last 2 years. But during the 8 years in which Republican Pete Wilson was governor of our State, not a single plant was sited.

But let us say that you come here with an extreme prejudice against California and you think both Republicans and Democrats in California have somehow brought this upon our State. Electricity can be transported for a few hundred miles. If you want to serve the California market, you cannot do so from a plant in Pennsylvania. But you can do so from a plant in Nevada or Arizona. If anybody foresaw an extreme shortage of electricity and even a modest increase in the price of electricity in California and the other western States, they did not have to build a plant in California. They could have built one in Arizona, Nevada, Oregon or Washington. So you would have to believe that the environmental extremists are in control not only of California but of Nevada and Arizona, Oregon and Washington, Nevada and Arizona being two of the most pro-business States, two of the most Republican-voting States in this country.

The fact is no one wanted to build a plant in California, and no one wanted to build a plant in those other western States I mentioned. No one foresaw this problem until quite recently, with the exception of perhaps a few academics whose voice was not loud enough for anyone to hear. So it is obvious that this is not a problem we brought upon ourselves, but rather this is a problem which by the way is about the only way we can solve it, that is the only way we can solve the problem by regulating the wholesale price of electricity, which by the way is the only way to solve it in the short term.

Take off the Federal handcuffs or stop the Federal bureau from doing anything and we are fully capable of generating just about all of the electricity we need in most or all of the months of the year and California has been told, “It’s your problem. Solve the problem. Oh, by the way here is a Federal law that says you can’t solve the problem by regulating the wholesale price of electricity,” why by the way is the only way to solve it in the short term.

The next focus has got to be on the cost of generating electricity. In the spot market, the wholesale price has gone up ten and twentyfold. We are told that this is somehow California’s fault. It could be that the Federal Government puts the handcuffs on California and then says, “It’s your problem. Go solve it.”

Federal law must reregulate the price of moving natural gas from New Mexico to California. And if the Federal Government does not want to do it, then perhaps it could be granted to the State of California. I realize the pipelines that I am talking about do not run through the State, but a Federal grant of that power to California would probably be constitutional. The Federal Government does not to totally deregulate the wholesale price of electricity generated by plants in California. Fine. Let California do it. Let Oregon do it for its plants. Let Washington do it for plants in the...
State of Washington. Take off the handcuffs. Better yet, lend a hand. FERC should regulate the price of pipeline fuel and thus at least at the wholesale level of electricity.

I do want to comment a little bit about the shortage of electricity in California in one respect and, that is, the term "closed for maintenance." I thought closed for maintenance meant, "We got to fix the plant. We got guys working on it." I have come to learn closed for maintenance means closed to maintain an incredibly high price for each kilowatt.

Last summer, without any shortages that came to anyone's notice, or with the notice of very many, California demanded and needed and got from its existing plants 45,000 megawatts of electricity. This last winter and spring when we needed 33,000 megawatts, the plants are closed for maintenance. The electricity cannot be generated. What changed was not the plants. The plants were adequate to give us 45,000 megawatts of electricity last summer. What changed was the law, the incentives. The incentives went to closed for maintenance, the lights went out, the prices went up.

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to phrase it this way, but this administration is waging war on California. Maybe it is because we did not vote for them. Maybe it is because they see our governor as a challenger in 2004. I think it is a war being waged for the same reason the ancients waged war and that was to get war booty. In this case incredibly high profits for certain companies based in Texas, both the pipeline companies that own the natural gas pipelines and the companies that own the generation facilities that sell that electricity to the utilities in California.

The question, though, is not why is the Bush administration waging war on California but why does this Congress allow for that war to be waged? All Americans are going to suffer from this war. If we do not regulate natural gas pipelines, the wholesale value of electricity, and allow California to adjust its clocks, then it will not just be my district or my State that suffers. This entire economy is wired together. The markets drop in Tokyo and all of a sudden the lights went out, the notice of very many, California demanded and needed and got from its existing plants 45,000 megawatts of electricity. This last winter and spring when we needed 33,000 megawatts, the plants are closed for maintenance. The electricity cannot be generated. What changed was not the plants. The plants were adequate to give us 45,000 megawatts of electricity last summer. What changed was the law, the incentives. The incentives went to closed for maintenance, the lights went out, the prices went up.

I include myself among those who usually want to go with free enterprise and free markets, but those who are so kind as to instruct their pilots to engage in this game, or whether they were so instructed at all. Was it teenage hormones? Was it an attempt to intimidate an American plane over international waters? Or was it some effort to try to cause a collision but one that would kill Americans instead of Chinese airmen?

I do not know why the Chinese instructed their pilots to engage in this game, or whether they were so instructed. Was it teenage hormones? Was it an attempt to intimidate an American plane over international waters? Or was it some effort to try to cause a collision but one that would kill Americans instead of Chinese airmen?

I do not know, but there is no moral reason for this intentionally dangerous flying, even after repeat warnings. Yet, the Chinese are asking us for an apology.

Mr. Speaker, my people have a word for that. It is called chutzpah. Chutzpah is when a young man commits a war crime, but when that suffering began it is time to adopt revised Federal policies.

The second myth I want to dispel is the idea put forward by those who worship, do not just understand and usually practice but worship, the free market system. The free market system works rather well for most things, but if one had to pick something it was not going to work for, well think of a good idea that cannot be stored, cannot be transported but a few hundred miles, has no substitutes, is a necessity, to put it in the equation everything would be of roughly point one, which is to say it is a necessity where you need the amount you need and if they sell it for less you are not going to use more, and if they charge you more it is incredibly difficult to use less. It is a necessity. It cannot be stored.

It is not subject to the regular market forces. If there was ever a good that did not fit the absolute worshiping of a free market, this is it.

We are told that the free market must be allowed to run unfettered and that California's problem is that we regulated the wholesale price of electricity but we maintained regulation on the retail price. So the amount SoCal Edison has to pay the generator companies, most of them based in Texas coincidentally, the plants may be in California but they are owned by some particular business interests, that the amount that SoCal Edison has to pay the generator companies has been deregulated but the amount that they sell it to the consumer for has been regulated and that is the problem; that if only we deregulated both sides of the equation everything would be fine.

I ask people to look at San Diego. In San Diego County, we did exactly what the worshippers of the free market, and I include myself among those who usually want to go with free enterprise and free markets, but those who are so kind as to instruct their pilots to engage in this game, or whether they were so instructed at all. Was it teenage hormones? Was it an attempt to intimidate an American plane over international waters? Or was it some effort to try to cause a collision but one that would kill Americans instead of Chinese airmen?

I do not know why the Chinese instructed their pilots to engage in this game, or whether they were so instructed. Was it teenage hormones? Was it an attempt to intimidate an American plane over international waters? Or was it some effort to try to cause a collision but one that would kill Americans instead of Chinese airmen?

I do not know, but there is no moral reason for this intentionally dangerous flying, even after repeat warnings. Yet, the Chinese are asking us for an apology.

Mr. Speaker, my people have a word for that. It is called chutzpah. Chutzpah is when a young man convicted of brutally killing both of his parents goes before the judge and asks for mercy on the basis that he is an orphan and the request for this apology fits in that same category of chutzpah. International law is clear. That plane cannot be touched. News reports are clear. The Chinese side is all over that many of them would say, well, thank God, we did what those who are so extreme that they worship the free market suggested, thank God we went for the most pristine possible deregulation.

How many of them would be thrilled to get that $400 electric bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to shift to a discussion of forlorn policy, starting with the Americans being held on the Chinese island of Hainan; America held hostage, day four.

Let us go through a few of the facts that have been uncontroversial. Our plane was in international air space. The Chinese have admitted that. Our plane was flying slow, clumsy, large, Turboprop, not looking for any trouble; not trying to approach any Chinese planes. Chinese fighter planes that are fast and maneuverable deliberately came close as possible, some teenager trying to get just as close as possible to an old driver and then there is a collision, who do we blame?

This was the first time, Mr. Speaker. Again and again and again, through formal and informal channels, the United States has, for a period of many months, told the Chinese side that their repeated unsafe and reckless flying, their interception of our planes and coming not just as close as safe but closer than safe, buzzing those planes, reckless disregard for the safety of both aircraft, gross negligence, would some day lead to an accident; and then it did.

I ask us to think about this in our own lives. If one car is just proceeding about its business and another one, a hot rod, tries to squirm as close as possible, some teenager trying to get just as close as possible to an old driver and then there is a collision, who do we blame?

This is not the first time, Mr. Speaker. Again and again and again, through formal and informal channels, the United States has, for a period of many months, told the Chinese side that their repeated unsafe and reckless flying, their interception of our planes and coming not just as close as safe but closer than safe, buzzing those planes, reckless disregard for the safety of both aircraft, gross negligence, would some day lead to an accident; and then it did.

I do not know why the Chinese instructed their pilots to engage in this game, or whether they were so instructed at all. Was it teenage hormones? Was it an attempt to intimidate an American plane over international waters? Or was it some effort to try to cause a collision but one that would kill Americans instead of Chinese airmen?

I do not know, but there is no moral reason for this intentionally dangerous flying, even after repeat warnings. Yet, the Chinese are asking us for an apology.

Mr. Speaker, my people have a word for that. It is called chutzpah. Chutzpah is when a young man convicted of brutally killing both of his parents goes before the judge and asks for mercy on the basis that he is an orphan and the request for this apology fits in that same category of chutzpah. International law is clear. That plane cannot be touched. News reports are clear. The Chinese side is all over that
plane looking for every secret, dismantling equipment, in violation of international law.

International law is clear. Our people are to be back here. They retain their sovereign immunity when they land in desperation and emergency, which I might add in this case was caused by the incredible gross negligence of Chinese pilots. Yet, we are being asked for an apology. Reckless flying, ignoring international law as to our plane when it is on the ground, holding our Naval airmen hostage, and they are asking us for an apology.

Perhaps the only thing that is more outrageous than all that is that, as I speak here, imports from China are being unloaded at American harbors in part of the most lopsided pro-Chinese trade arrangement that any economist could ever imagine. They are allowed access to our markets where they sell over $80 billion of goods and we are lucky if we can sell $12 billion of goods into China.

What ought to happen is that we ought to make it clear, we ought to today stop the importation of Chinese goods until our Naval airmen are back on their ships or in American hands. Oh, but that would mean perhaps a few hours or a day of delay in bringing in tennis shoes or plastic toys, and the commercial interests that flex their muscle so strongly when we dealt with providing China with permanent Most Favored Nation status will be back here, or are already back here flexing their muscles, and their message is clear. Do not interrupt a single package, a single container of tennis shoes, no matter how lopsided the trade arrangement is, no matter how abnormally dependent China is, and they are utterly dependent on the American market, roughly half, very roughly half their exports go to the United States. We are the only country that lets them run a huge trade surplus with us and we are the only country willing to run a huge trade deficit with them.

Yet in spite of the fact that we are strong and they are weak, they are unified and we are looking only at the commercial interests of a few companies. So, Mr. Speaker, what I fear is that corporate interests, and just a few corporate interests, engaged in this importation frenzy will demand that we apologize, demand that we pay the Chinese money. They will demand that we be weak because sniveling preserves profits.

I hope that this administration and this Congress reject that kind of thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go into my fourth topic but I see it is getting late. So I will come back to this floor to deliver a speech dealing with the fourth topic I wanted to cover, and that was our use of economic sanctions, economic carrots and sticks, in order to achieve our international objectives.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED
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Mr. EHRlich, for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WILSON, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HYDE, for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes.

Ms. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington, for 5 minutes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 385. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 620 Jacaranda Street in Lanai City, Hawaii, as the “Goro Hokama Post Office Building”.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 93 of the 107th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE). Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 93 of the 107th Congress, the Speaker requests that Section 301 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 which authorized the Services to expend appropriated funds for recruiting functions be continued beyond the September 30, 2001, deadline as a permanent authorization, pursuant to Public Law 104–201, section 301(a) (110 Stat. 2991); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1454. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter requesting that Section 301 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 which authorized the Services to expend appropriated funds for recruiting functions be continued beyond the September 30, 2001, deadline as a permanent authorization, pursuant to Public Law 104–201, section 301(a) (110 Stat. 2991); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1455. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board’s final rule—Electronic Fund Transfers (Regulation E; Docket No. R-1041) received March 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1456. A letter from the Acting Chair, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting an Annual Report for FY 2000, entered “Entering the 21st Century”; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1457. A letter from the Acting Chair, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting an Annual Report for FY 2000 entitled, “Entering the 21st Century”; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1458. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Medicaid Program; Use of Restraint and Seclusion in Residential Treatment Facilities Providing Inpatient Psychiatric Services to Individuals Under Age 21; Delay of Effective Date (HCFA-2065–F) (RIN: 0938–AJ96) received March 28, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1459. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a letter requesting that Section 301 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 which authorized the Services to expend appropriated funds for recruiting functions be continued beyond the September 30, 2001, deadline as a permanent authorization, pursuant to Public Law 104–201, section 301(a) (110 Stat. 2991); to the Committee on Armed Services.