rights abuser, a country that is expanding its military power, an expansionist in its territory, is this the kind of country we want to give Normal Trade Relations to?

Mr. Speaker, I believe in free trade. I am a Republican free-trader. But I believe in free trade between free people. If we try to do it the other way around, we are doing nothing but bolstering the regime in power in these dictatorial countries around the world.

How long ago was it? Just a few short weeks ago that 24 military American personnel that were being held hostage by this very same Communist Chinese Government. They, in fact, forced an American surveillance aircraft that was in international waters out of the air in an attempt to murder those 24 American service personnel. Instead, the plane made its way to Hainan Island, luckily; and then they were held hostage for 11 days. That was not so long ago. And now, within a very short period of time, the elected Members of this body are going to vote by a majority to give Normal Trade Relations to that government. That does not make any sense.

Not only were they holding hostage our American military personnel, but we actually have several Americans who are being held right now as we speak, or at least legal residents of the United States, who are being held hostage or being held prisoner by the Chinese, and we are basically talking about giving Normal Trade Relations to a country that is holding Americans, or at least legal residents of our country, holding them illegally, committing torture.

There was a young lady and her daughter who came to our hearing of the Committee on International Relations. Her husband, who is a doctor, a Ph.D., is being held by the Communist Chinese, and her daughter and this lady were begging us: please, please, demand that they bring back my husband, and he is an academic. He is an academic.

The Communist Chinese today are doing what? They are murdering Falon Gong people. Falon Gong, by the way, is nothing more than a meditation group. Falon Gong people. Falon Gong, by the way, is nothing more than a meditation cult. I mean, they meditate and they have black costumes; and they are being imprisoned by the tens of thousands and hundreds of them are being murdered in jail, hundreds of them. Many of these women, they are being tortured, not to mention Christians, of course, who, if you do not register like the Jews did with the Nazis, if you do not register, you get thrown in a gulag. What happens in China? What happens in China when you get thrown into the gulag? Yes, right back to World War II. Guess what? Their prisoners are worked like animals.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we should not be granting Normal Trade Relations to a country like this. And when those prisoners are executed, and thousands of them are, China is the execution capital of the world, what does this ghoulish regime in China do? It sends doctors, their doctors out to harvest the organs from the bodies of the prisoners that they have just executed.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is time that we learn our lessons from history, not grant Normal Trade Relations with China, and to make sure we stand up for the rights of our own people and the freedom and dignity of our ex-POWs.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. Res. 130

Resolved, That the House of Representa-
tives be notified of the election of the Honor-
able Jeri Thomson as Secretary of the Sen-
ate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL 6 P.M., FRIDAY, JULY 13, 2001, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 7, COMMU-
NITY SOLUTIONS ACT OF 2001

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until 6 p.m. on Friday, July 13, 2001, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 7.

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

There was no objection.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-
man from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of this Chamber, and as one who has supported campaign finance reform and fought for campaign finance reform for close to 10 years, I would contend that the defeat of the rule and, thus, the disallowance of the bill coming up for a vote is a huge step backwards. What we have done is send the bill back to committee where it may never come out of floor and, thus, end the session; and under the best-case scenario under the rules of this House, it will at least be several months before we get another opportunity to bring it to the floor.

What was the alternative if we had supported the rule and brought it forward? Was it perfect? No. In fact, if I had my druthers, I would go one heck of a lot further than we were proposing to do in the underlying legislation and the amendments. But if we had allowed it to come forward, if we had approved the rule, we would have had the gentleman’s bill before this House, a very comprehensive campaign finance reform piece of legislation. We would have had 17 amendments before this House, 12 of which the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) was preparing to offer. We would have had the opportunity for two substitute campaign finance reform bills to be discussed, debated, and openly voted on in this House. What did we get? Nothing. Not one vote. We got a rule denial that sent it back to committee, and we have lost time to one ground.

The worst-case scenario that could have occurred if we had supported the rule, that we would move a piece of legislation forward either that was in
such good form and in such similar form as the Senate legislation, as the
McCain-Feingold legislation, that the
Senate would have concurred in it, and
we would have taken a huge step to
eliminating soft money, to reducing
the influence of money on the process.
Under the worst-case scenario, we
move forward and come out with a bill
that the Senate did not like, we go to
conference. So we are in conference
where we can hammer it out between
the Senate and the House. Instead, we
are still in a committee in the House,
a long way from getting to a final piece
of legislation.

What was the grounds for defeating
the rule, those who voted against the
rule. Why? What did they not like
about the rule? It came down to this.
This is important for the citizens of
this Nation to understand. It came
down to procedure over substance. It
was not a question of whether each and
every one of the gentleman’s amend-
ments was going to get a vote. All 12 of
them under the rule would get a vote.
It is that he and others wanted them
to be voted as one, in one lump sum,
they had to take it or leave it, one lump sum. Do I not think that was a
good approach? I think the 12 amend-
ments was fair, was reasonable. Each
and every amendment would have got-
ten a vote on the floor; it would have
been openly discussed and debated.
Instead, none of them came to the floor
and the underlying bill did not.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day, I think.
As one who has fought for this reform,
and we got so close to getting a sub-
stantive vote, and instead, we are back
in committee. All 228 members who
voted against the rule, if they so
strongly believe the rule was flawed,
I would encourage each and every one
of them and I would hope that each and
every one of them will bring forward a
discharge resolution with what they
think we should do and that all 228 are
on that discharge resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we as a
House do campaign finance reform
once and for all and do it right.

STATUS REPORT ON THE CURRENT
LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING
AND REVENUES FOR FY 2002 AND
THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2002
THROUGH FY 2006

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate the
application of sections 302 and 311 of the
Congressional Budget Act and section 201 of
the conference report accompanying H. Con.
Res. 83, I am transmitting a status report on
the current levels of on-budget spending and
revenue, H. Con. Res. 83, for the five-
year period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006.
This status report is current through July 11,

The term “current level” refers to the
amounts of spending and revenues estimated
for each fiscal year based on laws enacted
or awaiting the President’s signature.

The first table in the report compares
the current levels of total budget authority,
outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set
forth by H. Con. Res. 83. This comparison
is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budg-
et Act, which creates a point of order against
measures that would breach the budget reso-
lution’s aggregate levels. The table does not
show budget authority and outlays for years
after fiscal year 2002 because appropriations
for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current lev-
els of budget authority and outlays for discre-
tionary action by each authorizing committee
with the “section 302(a)” allocations made
under H. Con. Res. 83 for fiscal year 2002
and fiscal years 2003 through 2006. “Discre-
tionary action” refers to legislation enacted
after the adoption of the budget resolution.
This comparison is needed to enforce section
302(b)(1) of the Budget Act, which creates a point
of order against measures that would breach the
section 302(a) discretionary action alloca-
tion of new budget authority for the committee
that reported the measure. It is also needed to
implement section 311(b), which exempts
committees that comply with their allocations
from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels
of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year
2002 with the “section 302(b)” suballocations
of discretionary budget authority and outlays
among Appropriations subcommittees. The
comparison is also needed to enforce section
302(f) of the Budget Act because the point
of order under that section equally applies to
measures that would breach the applicable
section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for
2003 of accounts identified for advance appro-
priations in the statement of managers accompa-
nying H. Con. Res. 83. This list is needed to
enforce section 201 of the budget resolu-
tion, which creates a point of order against
appropriation bills that contain advance appro-
priations that are: (i) not identified in the state-
ment of managers or (ii) would cause the ag-
gregate amount of such appropriations to ex-
ceed the level specified in the resolution.

The fifth table compares discretionary allo-
cations to the levels provided by section
251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emer-
gency Deficit Control Act of 1985. If at the end
of a session discretionary spending in any cat-
egory exceeds the limits set forth in section
251(c) (as adjusted pursuant to section
251(b)), a sequestration of amounts within that
category is automatically triggered to bring
spending within the established limits. As the
determination of the need for a sequestration
is based on the report of the President re-
quired by section 254, this table is provided
for informational purposes only.

The sixth and final table gives this same comparison relative
to the revised section 251(c) limits envisioned
by the budget resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE
BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2002 CON-
GRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 83

(Reflecting action completed as of July 11, 2001—On-budget amounts,
in millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriable Level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Authority</td>
<td>1,626,488</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>1,590,674</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Authority</td>
<td>1,618,202</td>
<td>8,878,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>1,590,674</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>2,027,528</td>
<td>12,766,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level over (+) or under (—) Appropriable Level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Authority</td>
<td>—648,389</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>196,719</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>33,950</td>
<td>18,843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2002
through 2006 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new
budget authority for FY 2002 in excess of
$68,589,000,000 (if not already included in the
current level estimate) would cause FY 2002
budget authority to exceed the appropriate
level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new out-
lays for FY 2002 in excess of $396,239,000,000 (if
not already included in the current level esti-
mate) would cause FY 2002 outlays to ex-
ceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res.
83.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would result in
revenue loss for FY 2002 in excess of
$35,950,000,000 (if not already included in the
current level estimate) would cause revenues
to fall below the appropriate level set by H.
Con. Res. 83.

Enactment of measures resulting in rev-
ue loss for the period FY 2002 through 2006
in excess of $18,943,000,000 (if not already in-
cluded in the current level estimate) would cause
revenues to fall below the appropriate levels
set by H. Con. Res. 83.