

Davis (FL)	Kildee	Pelosi
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)
DeFazio	Kind (WI)	Phelps
DeGette	Kleczka	Pomeroy
DeLahunt	Kucinich	Price (NC)
DeLauro	LaFalce	Rahall
Deutsch	Lampson	Rangel
Dicks	Langevin	Reyes
Dingell	Lantos	Rivers
Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Rodriguez
Dooley	Larson (CT)	Ross
Doyle	Lee	Rothman
Dreier	Levin	Rush
Edwards	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Engel	Lipinski	Sanders
Eshoo	Lofgren	Sawyer
Evans	Lowe	Schakowsky
Farr	Luther	Schiff
Fattah	Maloney (NY)	Scott
Filner	Markey	Serrano
Ford	Mascara	Shaw
Frank	Matheson	Slaughter
Frost	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Gephardt	McCarthy (MO)	Snyder
Gillmor	McCollum	Solis
Gonzalez	McDermott	Spratt
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Stark
Hill	McKinney	Stenholm
Hilliard	McNulty	Strickland
Hinche	Meehan	Stupak
Hinojosa	Meek (FL)	Tanner
Hoefel	Meeks (NY)	Tauscher
Holden	Menendez	Thomas
Holt	Millender-	Thompson (CA)
Honda	McDonald	Thompson (MS)
Hooley	Miller, George	Thurman
Hostettler	Mink	Tierney
Houghton	Mollohan	Towns
Hoyer	Moore	Turner
Hyde	Morella	Udall (CO)
Inslee	Murtha	Udall (NM)
Israel	Nadler	Velázquez
Jackson (IL)	Napolitano	Visclosky
Jackson-Lee	Neal	Waters
(TX)	Oberstar	Watt (NC)
Jefferson	Obey	Waxman
Johnson (CT)	Oliver	Weiner
Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz	Wexler
Jones (OH)	Owens	Woolsey
Kanjorski	Pascrell	Wu
Kaptur	Pastor	Wynn
Kennedy (RI)	Payne	

NOT VOTING—11

Capps	McHugh	Smith (TX)
Cooksey	Moakley	Vitter
Gutierrez	Moran (VA)	Watts (OK)
Hall (OH)	Roybal-Allard	

□ 1322

Messrs. FORD of Tennessee, CUMMINGS, TURNER, ACKERMAN, and THOMAS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PORTMAN, BARTLETT of Maryland, and McKEON changed their vote from "nay" to yea."

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote on final passage of H.J. Res. 41, the Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment (recorded vote No. 87). If I had not been detained, I would have voted "aye" on this important bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

A NEW CHINA POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, President Bush deserves much credit for the handling of the spy plane crisis. However, he has received significant criticism from some of his own political supporters for saying he was very sorry for the incident. This seems a very small price to pay for the safe return of 24 American military personnel.

Trade with China, though, should be credited with helping to resolve this crisis. President Bush in the diplomatic handling of this event avoided overly strong language and military threats which would have done nothing to save the lives of these 24 Americans.

This confrontation, however, provides an excellent opportunity for us to reevaluate our policy toward China and other nations. Although trade with China for economic reasons encourages both America and China to work for a resolution of the spy plane crisis, our trading status with China should be reconsidered.

Mr. Speaker, what today is called "free trade" is not exactly that. Although we engage in trade with China, it is subsidized to the tune of many billions of dollars through the Export-Import Bank, the most of any country in the world.

We also have been careless over the last several years in allowing our military secrets to find their way into the hands of the Chinese government. At the same time we subsidize trade with China, including sensitive military technology, we also build up the Taiwanese military, while continuing to patrol the Chinese border with our spy planes. It is a risky, inconsistent policy.

The question we must ask ourselves is how would we react if we had Chinese airplanes flying up and down our coast and occupying the air space of the Gulf of Mexico? We must realize that China is a long way from the U.S. and is not capable nor is showing any signs of launching an attack on any sovereign territory of the United States. Throughout all of China's history, she has never pursued military adventurism far from her own borders. That is something that we cannot say about our own policy. China traditionally has only fought for secure borders, predominantly with India, Russia, Japan, and in Korea against the United States, and that was only when our troops approached the Yalu River.

It should not go unnoticed that there was no vocal support from any of our allies for our spy missions along the Chinese coast. None of our allies bothered to condemn the action of the Chinese military aircraft, although it technically was cause of the accident.

Do not forget that when a Russian aircraft landed in Japan in 1976, it was

only after many months we returned the plane to Russia, in crates.

Although there is no doubt that we technically have legal grounds for making these flights, the question really is whether or not it is wise to do so or necessary for our national security. Actually, a strong case can be made that our national security is more threatened by our patrolling the Chinese coast than if we avoided such flights altogether.

After a half century, it is time to reassess the need for such flights. Satellite technology today gives us the ability to watch and to listen to almost everyone on Earth. If there is a precise need for this type of surveillance for the benefit of Taiwan, then the Taiwanese ought to be involved in this activity, not American military personnel.

□ 1330

We should not feel so insecure that we need to threaten and intimidate other countries in order to achieve some vague psychological reassurance that we are still the top military power in the world. This is unnecessary and may well represent a weakness rather than a strength.

The Taiwanese Relations Act essentially promises that we will defend Taiwan at all costs and should be reevaluated. Morally and constitutionally a treaty cannot be used to commit us to war at some future date. One generation cannot declare war for another. Making an open-ended commitment to go to war, promising troops, money and weapons is not permitted by the Constitution.

It is clear that war can be declared only by a Congress currently in office. Declaring war cannot be circumvented by a treaty or agreement committing us towards some future date. If a previous treaty can commit future generations to war, the House of Representatives, the body closest to the people, would never have a say in the most important issue of declaring war.

We must continue to believe and be confident that trading with China is beneficial to America. Trade between Taiwan and China already exists and should be encouraged. It is a fact that trade did help to resolve this current conflict without a military confrontation.

Concern about our negative trade balance with the Chinese is irrelevant. Balance of payments are always in balance. For every dollar we spend in China, those dollars must come back to America. Maybe not buying American goods as some would like, but they do come back as they serve to finance our current account deficit.

Free trade, it should be argued, is beneficial even when done unilaterally, providing a benefit to our consumers. But we should take this opportunity to point out clearly and forcefully the