

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 226]

Abercrombie Cummings Hobson  
 Ackerman Cunningham Hoeffel  
 Aderholt Danner Hoekstra  
 Allen Davis (FL) Holden  
 Andrews Davis (IL) Holt  
 Arney Davis (VA) Hooley  
 Baca Deal Horn  
 Bachus DeFazio Hostettler  
 Baird DeGette Houghton  
 Baker Delahunt Hoyer  
 Baldacci DeLauro Hulshof  
 Baldwin DeLay Hunter  
 Ballenger DeMint Hutchinson  
 Barcia Deutsch Hyde  
 Barr Diaz-Balart Insee  
 Barrett (NE) Dickey Isakson  
 Barrett (WI) Dicks Jackson (IL)  
 Bartlett Dingell Jackson-Lee  
 Barton Dixon (TX)  
 Bass Doggett Jefferson  
 Bateman Dooley Jenkins  
 Becerra Doolittle John  
 Bentsen Doyle Johnson (CT)  
 Bereuter Dreier Johnson, E. B.  
 Berkley Duncan Johnson, Sam  
 Berry Dunn Jones (NC)  
 Biggert Edwards Jones (OH)  
 Bilbray Ehlers Kanjorski  
 Bilirakis Ehrlich Kaptur  
 Bishop Emerson Kelly  
 Blagojevich Engel Kennedy  
 Bliley English Kildee  
 Blumenauer Eshoo Kilpatrick  
 Boehlert Etheridge Kind (WI)  
 Boehner Evans King (NY)  
 Bonilla Everrett Kingston  
 Bonior Ewing Kleczka  
 Bono Farr Klink  
 Borski Fattah Knollenberg  
 Boswell Filner Kolbe  
 Boucher Fletcher Kucinich  
 Boyd Foley Kuykendall  
 Brady (PA) Forbes LaFalce  
 Brady (TX) Ford LaHood  
 Brown (FL) Fossella Lampson  
 Brown (OH) Franks (NJ) Lantos  
 Bryant Frelinghuysen Largent  
 Burr Gallegly Larson  
 Burton Ganske Latham  
 Buyer Gejdenson LaTourrette  
 Callahan Gephardt Lazio  
 Calvert Gibbons Leach  
 Camp Gilchrest Lee  
 Campbell Gillmor Levin  
 Canady Gilman Lewis (CA)  
 Cannon Gonzalez Lewis (GA)  
 Capps Goode Lewis (KY)  
 Capuano Goodlatte Linder  
 Cardin Goodling Lipinski  
 Carson Gordon LoBiondo  
 Castle Goss Lofgren  
 Chabot Graham Lowey  
 Chambliss Granger Lucas (KY)  
 Chenoweth-Hage Green (TX) Lucas (OK)  
 Clay Green (WI) Luther  
 Clayton Greenwood Maloney (CT)  
 Clement Gutierrez Maloney (NY)  
 Clyburn Gutknecht Manzullo  
 Coble Hall (OH) Markey  
 Coburn Hall (TX) Martinez  
 Collins Hansen Mascara  
 Combest Hastings (FL) Matsui  
 Condit Hastings (WA) McCarthy (MO)  
 Conyers Hayes McCarthy (NY)  
 Cook Hayworth McCollum  
 Cooksey Hefley McCrery  
 Costello Herger McDermott  
 Cox Hill (IN) McGovern  
 Coyne Hill (MT) McHugh  
 Cramer Hilleary McInnis  
 Crane Hilliard McIntyre  
 Crowley Hinchey McKeon  
 Cubin Hinojosa McKinney

McNulty Quinn  
 Meehan Radanovich  
 Meek (FL) Rahall  
 Meeks (NY) Ramstad  
 Menendez Rangel  
 Metcalf Regula  
 Mica Reyes  
 Millender- Reynolds  
 McDonald Riley  
 Miller (FL) Rivers  
 Miller, Gary Rodriguez  
 Miller, George Roemer  
 Minge Rogan  
 Mink Rogers  
 Moakley Rohrabacher  
 Mollohan Ros-Lehtinen  
 Moore Rothman  
 Moran (KS) Roukema  
 Moran (VA) Roybal-Allard  
 Morella Royce  
 Murtha Ryan (WI)  
 Myrick Ryun (KS)  
 Nadler Sabo  
 Napolitano Salmon  
 Neal Sanchez  
 Nethercutt Sanders  
 Ney Sandlin  
 Northup Sanford  
 Norwood Sawyer  
 Nussle Saxton  
 Oberstar Schaffer  
 Obey Schakowsky  
 Olver Scott  
 Ortiz Sensenbrenner  
 Ose Serrano  
 Owens Sessions  
 Oxley Shadegg  
 Packard Shaw  
 Pallone Shays  
 Pascrell Sherman  
 Pastor Sherwood  
 Paul Shimkus  
 Payne Shows  
 Pease Shuster  
 Pelosi Simpson  
 Peterson (MN) Sisisky  
 Peterson (PA) Skeen  
 Petri Skelton  
 Phelps Slaughter  
 Pickering Smith (MI)  
 Pickett Smith (NJ)  
 Pitts Smith (TX)  
 Pombo Smith (WA)  
 Pomeroy Snyder  
 Porter Souder  
 Portman Spence  
 Price (NC) Spratt  
 Pryce (OH) Stabenow

Stark  
 Stenholm  
 Strickland  
 Stump  
 Stupak  
 Sununu  
 Sweeney  
 Talent  
 Tancredo  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Tauzin  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Terry  
 Thomas  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thornberry  
 Thune  
 Thurman  
 Tiahrt  
 Toomey  
 Towns  
 Traficant  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton  
 Velazquez  
 Vento  
 Visclosky  
 Vitter  
 Walden  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Waters  
 Watkins  
 Watt (NC)  
 Watts (OK)  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 Wexler  
 Weygand  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson  
 Wise  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Young (FL)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). On this rollcall, four hundred nineteen Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAN TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) will yield 2 minutes to the Majority Leader, and then we will have closing statements from each of the managers beginning with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), who will have 4½ minutes; the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), who will have 4 minutes; the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who will have 4½ minutes; and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), who will have 4 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I support permanent normal trade relations with China because I profoundly believe that it will advance the cause of human rights for the Chinese people. Mr. Speaker, I believe free and open trade is not only the best way to make China a free and open nation, but it may be the only way.

A vote to open the China market and the world experience to the Chinese people is a vote to open markets. What is a market, Mr. Speaker? Market is simply an arena in which there is a sharing of information about market transactions, informations about desires, wants, hopes and dreams, and economic conditions.

But, Mr. Speaker, one cannot share that information about economics without also sharing information about culture, politics, religion, and values. Information, Mr. Speaker, is the life blood of a market. It is also poison to dictators, because dictators know that it is the truth that will set one free. They also know that, in a modern technology age, information is the basis by which one acquires truth.

When we open the China market, citizens from all over China will be carrying devices like this, a simple little pocket PC. With that PC, they can connect to the Internet every bit of information about culture, religion, markets, economics, and freedom and dignity available on this Earth. They cannot be stopped.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that the pen is mightier than the sword. I would argue that the PC is mightier than the shackles of tyranny.

When the people of China are free to transact in world markets, and when they share this information about freedom, they will learn the lessons of liberty, they will see liberty working out in the lives of the other citizens in the world, and they will demand it of their nation, and they will change their government.

The Communist hard-liners know this, Mr. Speaker, and that is why they do mischief to our efforts today. That is why they disrupt it, because they fear the freedom that comes from commerce and is contagious throughout all of human spirit.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what life will be for the Chinese people 5 or 10 or 15 years from now when we vote for freedom and commerce today. I cannot guarantee my colleagues that their life will be better. But I can tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, if we vote "no" today, if we deny them the chance, we will condemn them to a continued life of despair.

I for one choose to vote, instead, for my fondest hope, for the hope of freedom, dignity, commerce, and prosperity, for the beautiful people of China so that their children, like our children, in this wide open world can come home and say in that magical voice, Mom, dad, I got the job.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues vote "no" today, we have normal trading relations with China.

Jobs, American jobs, bombs, Bibles, in a nutshell, those are the three concerns that we have been talking about for the last 5 hours.

Every year, every year I have been here, we are asked to approve normal trade for China based on existing and potential progress with these three concerns in mind: jobs, bombs, and Bibles. We are told every year that, if we will just extend normal trade for one more year, that jobs in this country will not be adversely affected.

My district has lost manufacturing jobs to cheap Chinese labor every year I have been in Congress. There are others of my colleagues who fit in that category. This is not just cheap labor, Mr. Speaker, this is also slave labor.

We are told, if we just will extend normal trade for one more year, we will not have to worry so much about Red China dropping nuclear bombs on us because they are going to be much friendlier, our relationship is going to be greatly improved.

Yet, every single year that I have been in Congress, China has increased its nuclear arsenal with technology stolen from us and increased its threats to use them against American cities if we dare oppose their invasion of our allies.

We are told that, if we extend normal trade relations for just one more year, the human rights in China will surely get better, that Christians will not be jailed for having Bibles, and Muslims will not be jailed for having the Koran, the Tibetans will not be jailed for simply following their traditional religion.

Yet, every year that I have been in Congress, persecution of anyone in China who believes in a higher authority has gotten much worse. All of these things, all of them are worse after 5 years of what we have described as normal trade relations with China.

So what is our response we are considering to these violations? To grant them normal trade relations forever with no qualifications.

Here is what we must decide today. Do we allow China to profit from stealing our nuclear weapons secrets? Does China profit from violating our existing trade agreements and throwing hard-working Americans out of their manufacturing jobs? Does China profit from threatening an invasion of our friend and ally Taiwan? Does China profit from threatening nuclear attack on our cities?

Does China profit from forcing young Chinese mothers to endure forced abortions and sterilization and watch government doctors kill their child as it is being born? Does China profit from throwing Christians in jail for just having a Bible or crushing the people of Tibet when they wanted to worship as they saw fit?

There are many who support PNTR because they honestly believe that an

all-out global trade, with no restrictions and no oversight, has a chance of simply overwhelming China's corrupt political and economic system. I disagree, but I respect their position and do not doubt at all their honest motives.

But there is a seamier side of the China lobby that has successfully spread false information to America's business leaders, and many of our colleagues and have basically taken advantage of those honest emotions.

We have a choice in this House today, a big choice. Our collective voice, Mr. Speaker, will be heard by billions of people around the world. People yearning and struggling for freedom, hoping, fighting and praying for democracy and human rights and peace.

Our choice will determine whether our citizens and those masses of humanity locked in darkness continue to believe in America as the great beacon of human decency and divine providence, a Nation by whose light all mankind can see that liberty still shines brighter than gold.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I was tempted to recite Horatio at the Bridge for my colleagues, but I thought I might get more votes if I took this opportunity to recognize the distinguished minority whip to tell us why American workers should suffer ill no more.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) on a magnificent statement.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost sunrise in Gwong Dong Province in China. Soon 1,000 workers at the Chin She factory will be getting ready to go to work. Most of them are young people, some as young as 16 years of age. They work 14-hour shifts, 7 days a week. They are housed in cramped dormitories that resemble prisons. Their average pay is 3 cents an hour. They make handbags for export here to America.

1630

We are told we need this trade deal to open up the vast markets for American goods, but these Chinese workers cannot even afford to buy the products they make themselves. How are they going to buy our cars, our cell phones, our computers?

We can have free markets without free people, but it does not often come to a good end; Chile's Pinochet, Indonesia's Suharto.

We should have learned the lessons of NAFTA, jobs lost in food processing, in consumer products, in high-tech; 100,000 good auto worker jobs lost forever since NAFTA. And where are those men and women today? Oh, they are working. They are working in nursing homes, at gas stations, at convenience stores, and making a fraction of what they once earned. And the jobs they used to have are now performed by workers making pennies on the dol-

lar in Mexico's economic free-fire zone called the maquiladora.

But harsh as life can be in Mexico, China is far worse. It is a police state. And I say to the majority leader that their information is censored, including the Internet; a nation where injustice is law and brutality is order.

Alexis de Tocqueville once wrote that if people are to become or remain civilized, "the act of associating together must grow and improve in the same ratio in which equality of condition is increased."

That is what enabled America to become the most prosperous Nation in the world. It was not the forces of world commerce that enabled coal miners and steelworkers and auto workers and textile workers to take their place among America's middle class. No, it was leaders like Walter Reuther, and it was other Americans exercising their rights to form unions, to create political parties, to build women's organizations, to organize churches, civic organizations and groups. That is what the progressive movement at the turn of the century was all about.

Mr. Speaker, democracy is something that grows from the ground up. Theodore Roosevelt understood that a long time ago before any of us. It was not the global trade that created our national parks or the laws that protect our air and our water; it was the environmental movement. It was not free trade that won women the right to vote or beat Jim Crow; it was the commitment and the sacrifice of the suffragettes and civil rights leaders. It was the Elizabeth Cady Stanton and the A. Philip Randolphs, the Martin Luther Kings, and, yes, our own colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

The advocates of this trade deal tell us that prosperity is a precondition for democracy, and with all due respect, they are wrong. They have to grow together. While trade may make a handful of investors wealthy, it is democracy, democracy, that makes nations prosperous. Americans value trade, but we are not willing to trade in our values. We understand this approach to trade is really the past masquerading as the future. It is turning back the clock on 100 years of progress.

Some oppose this trade deal because of its impact on the environment, still others out of concern for our national security, and still others out of a deep commitment to religious liberty and human rights. But while we sometimes speak with different voices, we each share that same vision, and it is de Tocqueville's vision of a civilized society, and it is a vision of a new kind of a global economy, an economy where people matter as much as profits.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, by suggesting to my colleagues that it is almost sunrise in Gwong Dong Province, and soon the workers at the Chin She Handbag factory will begin another day. Today, we can send them a message of hope, a message that the global economy we want is not one where

working families in China and Mexico and America compete in a hopeless race to the bottom.

We have a better vision than that. It is a vision of the global economy where all have a seat at the table. It is a vision of a new global economy where none of us are on the outside looking in. At the beginning of the last century, the progressive movement began a struggle that made the promise of democracy and prosperity real for millions of Americans. Now, from this House of Representatives, we carry that struggle for human dignity into a new century. For families here in America and throughout the world, we have just begun.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman is recognized for 4½ minutes.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this has been, I think, one of my better days in this House; to be able to listen to the eloquent exchanges on such an important issue to our country and, indeed, the world; to be able to disagree and not be disagreeable; and for people from within and without to know that this will still be the House of Representatives and the true representatives of the people no matter how the vote turns out.

Let me say this. Some 50 years ago, November 30, 1950, to be exact, I found myself a member of the Second Infantry Division, having fought from Pusan, entering in July, straight through up to North Korea sitting on the Yalu River. I was 20 years old at the time, waiting to go home, because we thought the war was over. We had beaten back the North Koreans. While we were there and General McArthur was having his fight with President Truman, hoards of Chinese, not the lovely Chinese that the distinguished majority leader was talking about, but hoards of Communist Chinese destroyed the entire Eighth Army, and we suffered 90 percent casualties. I do not take Communists lightly.

But that was 50 years ago, and now the guy that was shot and was a high school dropout became a Member of this distinguished body, and now this United States is the most powerful country in the world, militarily and economically. And how did we get this way? It is because we do things better. We are better educated, we are better at producing. But in order for us to continue to prosper, we have to have economic growth. We have to find new marketplaces.

Yet, all of a sudden, to my shock and surprise, with the exception of Cuba, communism is not the barrier. It is exchange, engagement, and find those marketplaces. How can we afford to ignore over a billion people, knowing that if we ignore them that the Asians and the Europeans will not?

We come to the well here with an agreement where we are breaking down the barriers in China. Not in the United States. They have been down. This gives us an opportunity to go into those markets. And I have been throughout the United States. No one challenges me that farmers are begging to get into those markets. Silicon Valley in California, Silicon Alley in New York, farmers, pharmacists, manufacturers, the banking industry, the insurance industry are all asking us to allow them to get there and show how good Americans can really be.

We say we would like to do that, but we have deep-seated concerns about the way China treats its people. Well, we do not want to eliminate those concerns. That is why we have locked into place, with the help of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), a commission and oversight that if this fails, we will not have.

I ask those people that have this compassion and concern for their newfound Communist friends in China, what if these Chinese do everything that we hate for them to do, what do we do when it comes up next year if it is not permanent? Do my colleagues not understand that we would be the bad guys for putting in place an impediment to their getting into the World Trade Organization, but they will get in anyway? We will have no way, except barking at the Moon, to complain about the behavior that we dislike.

But I tell my colleagues this. We cannot forget as Americans that we have blemishes on this human rights issue. We have descendants of slaves that sit in this body. We have people here as Members of Congress that 50 years ago could not eat in certain restaurants. We have people living in the United States without educations, without hope, without running water.

Mr. Speaker, I have not leaned on one Member in asking them to vote for this bill. I would not think that I am more of an American than they are, but I want to share with my colleagues that when people in certain districts go to sleep dreaming about human rights, they are not thinking about Shanghai; they are thinking about an opportunity in this great country.

We are blessed. Let us break down these barriers. Let us be able to go there to China. Let us maintain an annual report, yes; but daily we will monitor the conduct and let us give America an opportunity to be all that she can be. We will show them.

Cutting off communication did not work with that Communist, Castro. He has outlived close to 10 Presidents. Do not let it happen in China.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), our distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, here we are, finally, on the floor of this great

House closing the debate on permanent normal trade relations with China.

Before we move into the finality of this, I want to thank those who helped make this legislation possible. I have to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). And I must say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), we have been talking a lot lately. They will be talking about us.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), and my partners, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY). I thank them all for their diligence in making this happen.

But while there is one bill being debated here today, there are actually two debates going on; two questions that have to be answered. One, is granting this status to China in the best interest of the United States and the American people? And, two, is granting this status good for the people of China?

1645

I believe the answer to both is "yes."

Among other things, this debate is about American economic security. American negotiators have reached a tough, but fair, agreement for China's entry into the World Trade Organization. It is in fact a one-sided agreement. China gets nothing from us they do not already have, and we get lower tariffs and easier access for our exports going to China. And who makes those exports? American workers do.

Regardless of whether we grant normal trade status to China, the Chinese market is opening. Someone is going to have the opportunity to sell to this vast new market. The question is who will be there when the door opens? Will it be the United States, or will it be Europe and Japan?

There will be new and larger markets for farm commodities and manufactured goods in China. Who will produce those products? American farmers and American workers or European farmers and European workers?

This vote today is about whether American firms set the ground rules and standards for business in China.

The potential for American economic growth is huge. If we pass this legislation, U.S. agricultural exports to China would increase by \$2 billion every year. That means American farmers will be selling more corn and more wheat and more citrus and more soybeans.

Last year, the wireless telephone market in China was \$20 billion. By 2003, that market will be up to \$45 billion. Our high-tech firms would thrive in the Chinese marketplace.

It is clear that passing this legislation is in the best interest of American economic security. That is why Alan

Greenspan supports it, and that is one reason why we should vote "yes."

But there is another reason. Gradual democratic reform is taking root in the hearts and the minds of the Chinese people. But for it to continue, we must clear the way for more Americans to work with the Chinese.

More trade will expose the Chinese people to powerful new ideas. Thanks to the American business presence in China, thousands of Chinese employees already have access to foreign newspapers and the Internet and to worldwide e-mail.

Today this House is doing a good thing. We are showing the people and the leaders of China what real democracy looks like.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) and I share a common goal, to help American workers and to encourage American reforms and human rights in China. But we differ on how to achieve that goal.

I believe my approach is better, and that is why I urge Members to support this bill. But I am proud that I live in a country where the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) can be here on this floor today passionately putting forth his point of view, because that is what true democracy is all about. And, ladies and gentlemen, that is what this great House of Representatives is all about.

In addition to the privilege of serving as the Speaker of this House, I am honored to be the representative of the people of the 14th District of Illinois. Like every State in this great Nation, Illinois has a lot to offer the people of China.

So, in closing, I say to the people of China that we want to send you our corn and our farm machinery and our telecommunications equipment. But as we do, we are going to send along something more, free of charge. We are going to send you a glimpse of freedom and the ideals of Illinois' favorite son, Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator. Because we want for you the prosperity and the blessings of the liberty that we enjoy.

This is a historic vote and a proud day for this body. I believe the vote we are casting today will help ensure our continued prosperity. Vote for the future. Vote "aye."

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with some reluctance that I support Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China. I believe in free trade and I believe this agreement will bring economic growth to the United States and China, but I am highly concerned about the skewed priorities of U.S. trade negotiations and the framework of the World Trade Organization.

I voted against the NAFTA because I thought we could make Mexico negotiate a better deal with more safeguards for the environment and worker rights.

I voted against the GATT, which created the World Trade Organization, because I disapproved of establishing a world trading system that ceded our sovereignty in a number of areas, and particularly our ability to uphold laws for public health and the environment.

I would have voted against Fast Track, if it had come to the floor, because of my concern that U.S. trade negotiators were not permitted to put worker protection issues as well as environment matters on the agenda.

But according to the WTO rules that Congress ratified, and I voted against, China will be able to become part of the WTO regardless of our vote today. All we can decide here is whether the U.S. will benefit from the terms of China's accession.

Although the symbolic message of rejecting PNTR would be potent, the substantive impact could be harmful for our economic and national security interests. On the economic side, there are some who believe that we can get every benefit by virtue of the bilateral agreement signed in 1979. I think that interpretation is incorrect. To press that issue, we could end up in a destructive trade war and at the same time lose major economic opportunities to America's global competitors.

In the national security arena, I fear that in rejecting PNTR we would treat China as an adversary and that it would in reaction to our vote certainly become one. Rejecting PNTR would embolden the hardline militarists and make China even less cooperative in arms control and regional affairs. On the other hand, supporting the entry of both China and Taiwan into the WTO is an unprecedented opportunity to work with both countries on equal footing within a major multilateral organization.

Furthermore, I think our current mechanism of annual review is not working and as a threat is not credible. I have voted against extending Normal Trade Relations status to China every year to protest their denial of human rights to their own citizens, but the possibility of cutting off trade relations has become an empty threat. That is why I strongly support my colleague SANDY LEVIN's proposal to establish a Congressional-Executive Commission to provide a continuous examination of human rights in China. It will create a strong network for Congress to communicate with NGO activists in China and maintain a constant focus on local Chinese elections, grass-roots environmental activities, and the situation in Tibet.

I hope that passing PNTR will also bring greater transparency to China, and promote the rule of law. The influx of American interest, telecommunications, and media companies will democratize the flow of information beyond government control and give us new tools to scrutinize China's record on human rights and religious freedom.

Although I'm supporting this bill, I continue to have serious concerns. For one thing, I am very troubled that Chinese tariffs on cigarettes will fall from 65% to 25% over the next four years. Lung cancer and other smoking-related diseases are already the most common cause of death in China, accounting for more than 700,000 deaths annually. This tariff reduction could open the door for tobacco companies to launch their aggressive marketing tactics against a highly vulnerable population where less than 4% know the dangers of smoking. Smoking patterns could eventually cause more than 3 millions deaths a year in China, and smoking rates could sky-rocket among women and children. We have a responsibility to make sure we don't spread the tobacco public health crisis to China.

I also believe that the existing need for WTO reform will become even more apparent

once China is a WTO member. I think there is a good change that China will try to get out of living up to its obligations under this accord and that even WTO judgments against China will be difficult to enforce. I also suspect that China may make efforts to use the WTO rules to challenge our own laws as trade barriers. When that happens, and maybe before, we in this country will have to face the dangers that the WTO represents and why it must be reformed.

The WTO's dispute settlement mechanism must be open to input by non-governmental entities that have an interest in the deliberation. The evaluating panels cannot be shrouded in secrecy if dispute settlement is going to evolve as a credible and effective tool to enforce transparency and compliance.

The U.S. should be leading the change to make trade rules include standards for human rights, labor rights, and the environment. We must work for a world economy that lives up to our standards instead of sinking to lower ones. Perhaps most importantly, we must make U.S. companies the ambassadors of these values when they operate abroad. I hope the advantages and consequences that unfold from PNTR will hasten our attention to moving forward on this agenda.

My support for PNTR was not an easy decision. The debate has convinced me that we must redouble our efforts to press for domestic change in China, a change in U.S. trade priorities and more progressive would trading norms. But it has also brought me to the realization that isolating China would not cause new problems without without solving old ones and bring about great dangers that we must work to prevent.

Today's vote could determine the course of U.S.-China relations for the next century. On voting for PNTR, I hope we will help make our most dynamic industries lead the way as they expand into China and the rest of the world. I also hope that it will allow us to working to bring down national barriers and promote the well-being of all our peoples.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4444 which would extend to the People's Republic of China permanent normal trade relations. More importantly, however, passage of this bill serves to ratify the bi-lateral trade agreement reached between the U.S. and China last fall as a condition for China's accession into the World Trade Organization. This will be the only vote Congress has on this momentous agreement.

On the one hand, China is a potential boom market for our industries, particularly agriculture which is critically important to my district. Bringing China into the WTO has the potential of making the Port of Hueneme, in my district, an even more important portal for Pacific Rim trade. With 20 percent of the world's population, China is an appealing market. It behooves us to work diligently and intelligently to open that market to U.S. sellers.

The other hand carries many pitfalls. China's track record in meeting its obligations under international agreements is not good. China is the only remaining Communist superpower. China has stolen our nuclear secrets and threatens stability in Asia with her belligerence towards Taiwan and others. We ignore that reality at our own peril.

Last year, I voted against a one-year extension of China's Most Favored Nation status based on two criteria: The United States maintains a multibillion-dollar trade deficit with

China and has for years, and China has repeatedly demonstrated an aggressive military stance that includes stealing our most important nuclear secrets. At the beginning of this debate, I was not automatically against China's entry into the World Trade Organization, but I did have some very serious concerns. WTO membership carries more protection for the United States than does Most Favored Nation status. MFN has been a one-way street. It was a unilateral decision on our part to allow China access to our markets with no reciprocal opening on China's behalf. WTO is more of a two-way street. China must meet and maintain certain open-door criteria to remain in the WTO.

Our trade with China historically has been a one-way street. In 1990, our trade deficit with China stood at \$10.4 billion. By 1998, that deficit had climbed to \$56.9 billion. It is estimated our trade deficit with China in 1999 will be \$66.4 billion. China's entry into WTO and the ratification of the U.S.-China trade agreement can ease that deficit, but only if the agreement has teeth. I believe the WTO process has those teeth.

In 1992, China and the U.S. signed a bilateral memorandum of understanding on trade access. China has violated it many times. In 1992, we also struck a deal with China to protect intellectual property, including copyrights on U.S. products. Today, U.S. copyrights for motion pictures and software in China are still being stolen by Chinese companies, a situation that results in the loss of billions of dollars and many thousands of American jobs. Chinese noncompliance has forced us to threaten trade sanctions several times.

On the national security front, China was continuing a systematic raid on the designs of our most sophisticated thermonuclear weapons at the same time that it was modernizing and pretending to normalize relations with the U.S. Among the stolen designs was information on the neutron bomb, which to date no nation has opted to deploy and hopefully no one will. Even though China has been caught red-handed, it continues to deny its espionage. Meanwhile, it continues to showcase its belligerency by transferring sensitive missile technology to North Korea and by repeatedly threatening to attack Taiwan.

The U.S.-China agreement can have positive consequences for the U.S., China and, indeed, the entire world. The agreement will force China to open its markets to U.S. goods and services, which will result in a lowering of the trade deficit. It could wean China from its passion for subsidies and government interference in its industries. It could educate the Chinese on the rule of law, as opposed to its current system of rule by the whim of its leaders. It could also hasten the spread of democracy within her borders. Each time a country has opened its economic markets, an open market of ideas has followed.

But we must step carefully. We must not let our desire to access China's markets to blind us to China's distaste for democracy, her threat to our national security and her history of violating international laws and agreements. For the WTO agreement to work, it must level the playing field for U.S. exporters and be fully enforceable. Anything less will not open China's markets or advance the historical trend toward truly free trade and the rule of law.

Since the U.S. signed a bilateral trade agreement with China last year, I have said

repeatedly that my vote for or against permanent trade relations with China would rely on specific factors: It must protect American jobs, ensure Chinese markets are open to American goods and services, protect America's strategic interests and—be enforceable.

I have made it clear that without those provisions, I would vote against Permanent Normal Trade Relations. Some of those protections were not in the bill until last night.

Those protections are in the bill only because I and other Members of Congress withheld our support until every "i" was dotted. By working behind the scenes, we were able to force concessions that make this agreement a better deal for American businesses, American workers and for those who support greater human rights for the Chinese people. Last night, a bipartisan provision was incorporated into the bill that makes it easier for us to monitor China's trade compliance, and act if need be. That provision builds on provisions in the World Trade Organization agreement that allows us to continue to treat China as a communist economy. That's important because our safeguards and anti-dumping countermeasures are more stringent for communist economies than it is for capitalist countries.

In addition, the revised bill continues Congress' all-important right to debate and vote on China's human rights practices and international behavior each year.

The European Union signed its WTO agreement with China on Friday, followed by an agreement with Australia on Monday. Both were negotiated with China's history of duplicity in mind. In particular, the EU agreement improves the deal signed by the U.S. by making China significantly more open to foreign investment and trade. Under WTO rules, those provisions are open to the U.S. as well.

We have given China Permanent Normal Trade Relations. But this is not the end, only the beginning. China has, at best, a mixed record of living up to international agreements, and I still have concerns about China's adherence to this one. But I am satisfied we have the mechanisms in place to force compliance, or take remedial action, if necessary. American businesses will not have a level playing field unless we continually insist on it, but now we have the tools to do that.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of this debate I have expressed my belief that any trade deal with China involves two questions. The first, which we are debating today, is whether the Chinese have negotiated an agreement that is fair for American workers and businesses. However, before we can address this question we must be able to answer the second question, whether the agreement that has been negotiated includes the necessary enforcement mechanisms to ensure compliance by China and fair treatment for American companies and workers. We have not yet answered this question, and consequently I cannot support this or any deal with China lacking the enforcement mechanisms necessary to guarantee fair trade.

Today's robust debate has highlighted the concerns of many of my colleagues, thousands of interest groups and millions of citizens. All the subjects being debated today—national security, human rights, religious freedom, democracy, labor at home and abroad, the environment and the development of our and the world's economy—are of considerable importance.

China is the most populous nation in the world. As such, its potential as a market for American goods and services is second to none. The concept of increased trade with China based on a good, enforceable agreement is sound and deserving of support. Trade is and will be extremely important to both American companies and workers. As a blueprint, the agreement negotiated by the Clinton Administration with China is good for America in many respects.

When it comes down to it, any agreement, like any contract, is only as good as its enforcement provisions. What we have from China, so far, is its promise, if you will, to allow U.S. and foreign firms to compete fairly and openly in the Chinese market. But negotiations must still be held to reach agreement on how those promises China has made are going to be enforced. It has been more than two years since the World Trade Organization (WTO) working party and Chinese negotiators first met to conduct serious negotiations on the enforcement provisions to be included in the protocol.

Mr. Speaker, members should know in detail what the WTO will do to ensure full and fair implementation of China's commitments contained in the accession agreement before, not after, we vote on an issue as important as the issue on the floor today. Why is the protocol and working party report so important, some may ask. The simple answer is that the protocol and working party report identify what the WTO will do to make sure that China fully implements the commitments it has made in the agreements that have been reached with the United States and other WTO partners. Until the Congress sees not only the commitments China has made but also the WTO's enforcement commitments, there is, in reality, no agreement for Congress to consider and determine worthy of granting PNTR to China.

Once China enters the WTO, American firms and American workers must turn to the WTO for enforcement of their rights, and enforcement at the WTO is an area of considerable disappointment and concern. The WTO's "binding dispute resolution" system has proven to be a system rife with bias, incompetency, as well as totally unfamiliar with basic principles of due process and openness.

There are no judges, only ad hoc panelists, most of whom are not experienced or qualified in applying proper standards of review. These panelists are assisted, if not controlled, by WTO bureaucrats who have inherent biases based on their programmatic interests in the subjects under review. Proceedings are kept secret from the public and from the parties in interest. There is no ability to engage in meaningful fact-finding. Panel decisions have also created obligations for WTO members that they did not agree to in the process of negotiations. And even if a panel decides in your favor, as in the case brought by the United States against the European Union (EU) on beef hormones and bananas, there is no assurance at all that anything will change. Years have gone by since the U.S. "won" these cases, and U.S. firms still have no greater access to the EU market.

Mr. Chairman, PNTR is an extremely valuable trade benefit with China does not have but earnestly wants. It constitutes the only real leverage the U.S. has to bring about the kind of economic and trade reforms within China that will open that market to the products and

services American firms and American workers produce. Before we grant PNTR to China, we must make sure that China not only makes sufficient market opening commitments, but also that those commitments are enforceable.

I am not pleased to vote no today. It is unquestionably in our national interest to have a cooperative relationship with China, and I am well aware that rejecting this trade package could further strain U.S.-Chinese relations and diminish our influence in China with regard to democracy, human rights, labor, environmental protection and Taiwan.

But ultimately, my vote is about fairness and timing. Without enforcement mechanisms there can be no assurance of fairness for American business, American industry, and American jobs. By voting on a trade deal of such great importance before all the deals have been cut, especially on the enforcement mechanisms which will decide if this agreement is worth the paper it is written on, we needlessly jeopardize American jobs and business prospects in China. I guarantee you rules that can't be enforced will be broken. This vote should be postponed until accession agreements are concluded. Only then can we fully and responsibly assess the commitments China makes and determine whether the agreement ensures that China's commitment will be fully implemented and effectively enforced.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4444, extending Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status to China. In my career, I cannot recall a vote on which a final decision was more difficult to reach. Until today, I have been genuinely and sincerely undecided. In these past weeks and months, I have been listening intently to the forceful arguments for and against the legislation, especially those made by my constituents—who are as divided on this issue as I have been. I have great respect for the beliefs of those on both sides of this debate and for the passion of their convictions. In the final analysis, I believe that “aye” is the correct vote for a variety of reasons, including advancing the causes of human rights and democratization, for our national security, and for our economic self-interest.

Improving respect for human rights and fostering democracy clearly must be top policy priorities in our relationship with China. No one here today condones the political and religious repression in that nation. The disagreement is over which U.S. policy is more likely to contribute to an improvement in conditions in China. I stress the word “contribute,” because we need to be cognizant that nothing we do will dramatically change China in the short term.

Both sides of this debate have prominent human rights activists and former political prisoners supporting their position. We are presented with no easy formula that instructs us whether China plus or minus PNTR results in improved human rights. I have come to the conclusion that the increased outside contact, prosperity, and economic liberalization that comes with a strong U.S.-Sino trade relationship within the World Trade Organization (WTO) will be a greater force for change than the annual consideration and routine extension of NTR has offered. I am also comforted by the recent expressions of support for China's

entry into the WTO by the Dalai Lama—perhaps the most prominent symbol of the repressive nature of the Chinese regime.

We have heard much debate about the job losses which could result from passage of PNTR. While I am extremely sensitive to labor's concerns, on balance I believe that the economic interests of business and labor are enhanced by this normalization of trade with China. The U.S.-China Bilateral WTO Agreement provides for broad tariff reductions by China, for enhanced market access for American goods, and contains import surge protections for the U.S. The agreement requires no reduction in U.S. tariffs or any enhanced market access for Chinese products. As we have never revoked Most Favored Nation/Normal Trade Relations through the annual review process, China currently has defactor PNTR. I fail to see how reduced Chinese tariffs and other concessions in return for ending the formality of the annual review leads to increased job loss.

I believe that passing PNTR will not create any significant job loss that was not already occurring in certain sectors of the economy. While various estimates of the employment effects of PNTR have been proffered, they must be viewed in the context of an economy that is dynamic and in constant flux. The shape of the American economy is changing and will change whether or not we pass PNTR. In fact, I believe that Chinese WTO accession and passage of PNTR will be a net creator of good jobs in California and in my congressional district.

It is my fervent hope that over the long term, China's accession to the WTO will improve the human rights situation and encourage democratization in China. The inclusion in H.R. 4444 of a strong legislative package authored by Representatives SANDER LEVIN (D-MI) and DOUG BEREUTER (R-NE) has addressed my doubts about the effects of this bill on human rights in China, as well as the American jobs. The human rights monitoring commission created by the legislation is a good idea in its own right. I believe the merit of close scrutiny of China's human rights situation speaks for itself and I would support the proposal independent of this PNTR bill.

The import surge protections negotiated by the Clinton Administration and codified in this bill go a long way to addressing my concern about job losses resulting from this bill. This mechanism allows the President to utilize tariff increases, import restrictions, or other relief for domestic industries whose markets are disrupted by a surge in Chinese made goods. These powerful tools come in additional to the trade remedies already available under U.S. law and under the WTO.

Ultimately, passing PNTR is in our economic self interest. China will join the WTO whether or not we pass this legislation today. The rest of the world will enjoy significant tariff reduction on their exports to China regardless of the outcome of this vote. We are voting on our nation's ability to sell the products made by our workers and our companies on a competitive basis. We must continue to vigilantly monitor our relationship with China. We must continue to pursue improvements in respect for human rights in all appropriate venues, including the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. We will have to maintain our

steadfast support for Taiwan. We will have to closely monitor Chinese compliance with its obligations under the WTO and make full use of that organization's mechanisms to enforce those obligations. With the knowledge in mind, Mr. Speaker, I am left with the belief that passage of this legislation is in the interests of both the American and the Chinese people.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, today we are plotting a bold course that is in keeping with our history, our potential, and our ultimate goal of liberating the Chinese people.

In the international arena, America doesn't shrink from a challenge. We seize opportunity. We are fighters, visionaries, and pioneers. It's in our nature as Americans, to look past a challenge to victory.

Standing as we do, at the head of the world, in a position of unprecedented strength and prosperity, why would we now choose the timid path? We should not, and we will not. That's why we will pass Permanent Normal Trade Relations status with the People's Republic of China.

While PNTR will help our American economy, this is only one step toward our larger goal; ending communist rule in China by exposing the Chinese people to American values. Freedom is a contagious virtue.

Defeating a foe is a poor substitute for liberating a country from the weight of a repressive ideology. We should today ensure the triumph of liberty by planting the seeds of freedom in China. We should not accept a retrenchment driven by fear and insecurity.

There are serious issues we must address. Confronting these issues requires real American leadership and courage.

We should not for a moment imagine that PNTR will solve or even the address the many troubling questions concerning the future of the communist government in Beijing. Without a doubt, expanded trade must be matched with a revitalization of America's military and a strengthening of our friendships with our allies in Asia. Simply expanding trade without supplying these critical elements will not create a free China.

But we shouldn't let the strong steps we must take to resist aggression prevent us from communicating with the Chinese people.

The cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy has always been to make the case for freedom and democracy. We have never been afraid to place our values and our form of government up against any competitor. Give us half a chance, and we will win.

Expanding trade with China is just this sort of opportunity. Fundamental change in China will not happen simply through State Department dictates. It will only happen after we inspire the Chinese people to demand freedom.

We want to appeal to the Chinese people. To do that we have to be there, on the ground, spreading our values and the sure knowledge that there is a far better, nobler form of government than communism. Ignorance is the ally of repressive governments.

Expanded trade, because it spreads American values, is an essential tool in changing a closed society. And in the battle for China's future, one Chinese entrepreneur is worth a million government bureaucrats.

Over the last century, communist countries have run from this competition. They hid their people behind walls and fortified borders, because they knew that if their citizens were exposed to our values, then the battle would be lost. As a great power built on a foundation of timeless virtues, we fear no competing political systems because we trust the strength of our ideas.

We should ask ourselves: Why do so many of the hardliners, the old communist guard in China, resist opening their country to increased trade and interaction with America?

It's because they understand the power of democratic values. We need to support Chinese reformers by giving them more, not less, access to American ideals. This will raise the call for human rights and lead China to the rule of law.

We can't for a single minute ignore abuses by the Chinese government. Beijing's record on human rights, religious persecution, coercive abortion, and arms shipments to hostile states is shameful. The Chinese government does wicked things to its people.

The way to stop these evil deeds is to end communist rule and that means transforming China into a free-market democracy. This is much more likely to happen if American ideals eat away at the infrastructure of tyranny from the inside out.

We must also reject any notion that our support of expanded trade in China signals in any small way a slackening of our solemn commitment to defend Taiwan from aggression. We are sworn to defend Taiwan and we say again today that the United States will not allow any resolution of Taiwan's status that involves force or threats. We will not stand for it. Further, we must insist that Taiwan be admitted to the WTO as well.

Granting PNTR to China is a critical component of a strategy driven by our one, clear objective: destroying communism. So, I urge my fellow Members, to support PNTR and commit the United States to this contest between freedom and repression.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, extending permanent normal trade relations to China and supporting its accession to the World Trade Organization greatly benefits the United States. By encouraging participation in international organizations that facilitate the rule of law, I believe that this agreement is also in the best interest of the Chinese people.

By approving PNTR, we will be enabling the United States to take advantage of the across-the-board reductions in tariff barriers that we negotiated as terms for our approval of China's accession to the World Trade Organization. Agricultural tariffs will be substantially reduced on several priority products, including a 66 percent cut on the tariff for apples, that will obviously have a large impact on my State of Washington and other apple producing areas of our country. China also agreed to lift its longstanding ban on the import of wheat and to increase the quota by more than 400 percent. China agreed to participate in the Information Technology Agreement and to eliminate tariffs on products such as software, computers, and semiconductors. Also China agreed to slash tariffs on industrial goods by an average of 62 percent, enabling America's manufacturers to compete much more evenly in the Chinese marketplace. The WTO accession agreement also contains provisions that will help other industries in which the U.S. is

a world leader—telecommunications, insurance and banking just to name a few.

The approval last week of a market access agreement between China and the European Union further adds to the benefits we will enjoy with China's accession to the WTO, as the best terms of each agreement negotiated by the Chinese must be extended to all members of the WTO. More agricultural tariffs will be cut, including those on wheat gluten and Washington wines. Several more tariffs on industrial goods will also be reduced, liberalization of the telecommunications industry will be accelerated, and United States law firms will be authorized to offer legal services in China.

In return, we do not have to change anything—not one tariff, nor one regulation currently enforced by the United States. All we must do, according to WTO rules, is to extend permanent normal trade relations to China. Those of my colleagues that argue that our record trade deficit with China is a reason to oppose this bill must consider this point. There is nothing about this bill that will lead to an increase in the amount of goods we import from China; rather, this is all about slashing Chinese tariffs against United States goods which will lead to a substantial increase in United States exports to China. If you are truly concerned about addressing the United States trade deficit, you should vote for this bill.

Some are opposing this bill, claiming that China has rarely adhered to prior trade agreements in the past. In my judgment, opponents claiming this point should be eager to support this agreement. By entering the WTO, China will finally be participating in an organization whose sole purpose to enforce trade agreements. A few years ago, we had to beg, cajole, and plead with China in order to persuade them to provide any enforcement of the intellectual property agreement established between our two countries. With accession to the WTO, we will have an impartial adjudicator to hear the case and determine what redress is warranted. No longer will we have to rely on the honesty and effectiveness of the Chinese Government to ensure that they abide by trade agreements.

My good friends in the labor community have expressed grave concerns over the effects this bill will have on American and Chinese workers. I deeply respect their concerns, but I believe that they are best addressed by voting for this bill.

Currently, United States manufacturers and service providers struggle to enter the Chinese market because of high tariffs and often insurmountable red tape. By agreeing to cut their tariffs and reduce burdensome rules, China will be creating an incredible opportunity for American-made goods to finally penetrate their market. I firmly believe that this will be a real job creator in the United States, and ultimately of great benefit to U.S. workers. For this reason, the 27,000 member International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers Local 751 western Washington endorsed this legislation.

I cannot claim that the benefit to the Chinese worker will be as quick or as quantifiable as are the gains to American workers, but I do believe that accession to the WTO is in the best, long-term interest of the Chinese worker. This agreement will contribute to what we are already seeing in many parts of China—the growth of economic freedom and a vibrant middle class.

I also respect the convictions of those who consistently oppose any engagement with China because of China's disappointing record on human rights and religious freedoms. However, I side with many who, like the Dalai Lama and dissidents Bao tong and Dai Qing, recognize that engaging the Chinese and bringing them into international organizations that support the rule of law will be more effective in promoting freedom in China than will isolating China from the world community.

In my judgment, the most important reason to support this bill and Chinese accession into the WTO is for our own national security. By voting against this bill, we would be encouraging the isolation of China from the international community and hostility toward the United States. History shows that isolating a nation in this fashion often leads to mistrust, military buildup, and conflict. A belligerent China, possessing nuclear weapons and the largest land army in the world would be a grave prospect.

Conversely, I believe that maintaining our trade link with China will continue to provide us with a stable foundation.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4444, Extending Nondiscriminatory Treatment to the People's Republic of China. We stand here today at a cross roads in our relations with the Chinese. We can choose to engage China in a one sided agreement in which their tariffs on United States exports to China drop from the current average of 24.6 percent in 1997 to 9.4 percent in 2005. In return we will not have to lower our tariffs at all. Or we can choose to reject this agreement, allowing China to keep its tariffs high for United States goods and services while they reduce them for other countries. We must remember that in both of these choices, China joins the WTO.

The choice is clear. The policy of engagement is the better course and the path we must choose. However, engagement does not equal endorsement. There are three areas we must continue to push China on to improve their record: the environment, human rights, and transparency in their international dealings. The legislation before us moves us forward on each one.

As our efforts to address global climate change continue, China must be part of the solution. If we do not engage China in solutions to improve the global environment there is no way our solutions to clean up our planet can truly be effective. China is the world's largest energy consumer and emitter of greenhouse gases that contribute to global climate change. China is also the world's largest developing country chemical exporter and the world's largest producer of ozone-depleting substances. If China is left out of the fight for a cleaner environment, our efforts could be neutralized.

China's record on human rights has been abysmal. However, it is important to remember that the most repressive periods in recent Chinese history have occurred in times of isolation. Let us continue to encourage China to give their people greater freedoms. Under this policy of engagement, China has signed the U.N. Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the U.N. Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. Both await ratification in the National People's Congress. It is our hope the Congress will move quickly to ratify. These are steps in the right direction which we

should continue to encourage. The Dalai Lama has endorsed this agreement because he agrees that engagement is the fastest road to the realization of giving all Chinese democratic rights.

We need to recognize that China's growing regional integration has increased their willingness to settle long-standing disputes with its neighbors. Our allies in Asia support granting China permanent normal trading status, precisely because it would support regional security and cooperative efforts. This is especially true for Taiwan. That is why Taiwan's President Chen Shui-bain has endorsed this agreement and China's accession into the WTO.

However, we cannot solely rely on the benefits of trade to protect our interests. In February of this year we passed the Taiwan Security Act with the overwhelming support of the House. This legislation will ensure that Taiwan has the tools necessary to defend itself from a potentially aggressive China. Congress needs to pass legislation and ensure the President signs it into law this year.

Most importantly, this agreement is good for U.S. jobs and especially for jobs in New York's Hudson Valley. The agreement gives American workers unprecedented access to China's markets. For every additional billion in exports to China there are estimated to be created 20,000 new jobs in the United States. Last year New York exported nearly \$600 million in goods and services to China—this figure is expected to rapidly multiply under this agreement.

No one believes trade alone will bring freedom to China or peace to the world. When change does come it will be slow and will need our encouragement. This is the choice before us today. We can take a step move China in the right direction, and gain the benefits; or we can push China in the wrong direction, and pay the price. I believe this choice is clear. I encourage members on both sides of the aisle to make the right choice and join me in voting to approve permanent normal trade relations with China.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I do not represent companies. I do not represent unions. I represent people. As with any legislation, I ask what does this vote on Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) for China mean to the people I represent back home?

Workers and farmers throughout northern Illinois stand to benefit from the United States-China World Trade Organization (WTO) Accession Agreement because they will be making more product that eventually is exported to China, either directly or indirectly as suppliers.

If you work for Daimler Chrysler in Belvidere, this vote simply means the opportunity to build and sell more Neons and auto parts to China. As recently as 1995, Chrysler exported 600 Neons and purchased parts from six different suppliers in northern Illinois for their Jeep Cherokee plant in Beijing, China. The amount of Chrysler-related exports to China totaled \$7.8 million.

However, in 1999, no Neons and only \$30,000 in auto parts from two northern Illinois suppliers were sold to China. Why? China's protectionist auto policy now makes it virtually impossible to sell American cars and auto parts in China. This agreement forces China to cut tariffs by 75 percent on American cars

and drop local content requirements on American-made auto parts. This will allow more Neons and American auto parts made by companies like Modine Manufacturing of McHenry and Camcar of Rockford to be exported to China.

The workers at Honeywell's Microswitch plant in Freeport will benefit from PNTR for China because the company expects its exports to China to double by 2002. There are \$15,000 worth of Microswitch parts on each Boeing aircraft. China has plans to buy 1,600 new aircraft over the next 20 years.

The workers at Hamilton-Sundstrand in Rockford will benefit from this agreement because \$400,000 worth of parts are made in Rockford for each Boeing aircraft. This translates into hundreds of millions of dollars worth of work for the employees at Hamilton-Sundstrand.

The workers at Motorola in Harvard and Rockford will benefit because the agreement eliminates all tariffs on cell phones and pagers. Also, for the first time, Motorola will be permitted to sell its full range of products directly to the Chinese people.

The workers at Goodyear's Kely Springfield Tire plant in Freeport; the workers at Cherry Valley Tool & Machine of Belvidere; the workers at Kysor/Westram Corporation of Byron; and the workers at the Rockford Spring Company will all benefit from PNTR for China as suppliers to the agricultural equipment manufacturer, Case. As Case is able to sell more combine and tractors to China because the agreement lowers numerous tariff and non-tariff barriers to American agriculture equipment, the workers in their supplier chain will benefit, too.

Over half of Caterpillar's 1999 U.S. production was exported. These exports supported about 32,000 U.S. supplier jobs at small and medium-sized enterprises like the 400 employees at Bergstrom Manufacturing of Rockford, which makes the Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning units. The tariff cuts on construction equipment and the distribution rights in the agreement will help Caterpillar and thus Bergstrom Manufacturing become more competitive in China.

The workers at Seward Screw Products of Seward make 80 different parts for Harley-Davidson's large motorcycle factory in Milwaukee, WI. Today, Harley is prevented from selling any motorcycles in China because of import license restrictions, import quotas, excessive tariffs, and other significant trade barriers. This agreement substantially eliminates or reduces these trade barriers. In addition, granting PNTR to China will help Taiwan enter the WTO. The U.S.-Taiwan WTO Accession Agreement eliminates Taiwan's import ban on large motorcycle engines. Because both China and Taiwan represents the greatest long range market potential for motorcycles, the workers at Seward Screw Products will benefit by making more products for Harley.

But this agreement is not just for large companies. Few people know that 82 percent of all direct United States exporters to China are small-and medium-sized companies. These exporters generated 35 percent of the dollar volume of all United States exports to China in 1997. This figure is higher than the small busi-

ness exporter dollar volume share of overall U.S. exports, which was 30.6 percent.

China is the third largest growth market for small business exporters. In fact, the number of small businesses exporting to China grew by a remarkable 141 percent between 1992 and 1997. Plus, the value of small business exports to China more than doubled between 1992 and 1997.

Who are these exporters? I held a hearing on this topic last week before my Small Business Exports Subcommittee to find out. They are 135 employees who work for Aqua-Aerobic Systems in Rockford, IL. The agreement removes a variety of trade barriers against equipment used in sewage treatment plants because China needs the equipment to modernize its infrastructure.

Small companies like the 75 employee Coffee Masters of Spring Grove will benefit from this trade agreement. They have tried for years to break into the China market but with no success. They believe this agreement will knock down the numerous trade barriers to their specialized roasted coffee product.

E.D. Entyre of Oregon just announced earlier this month that they received a \$53,000 order for road construction equipment for a highway project in Hubei province in China. They believe the agreement will help their 350 employees deal directly with customers in China rather than going through various "middlemen."

Clinton Electronics of Loves Park exports high resolution display monitors for medical applications. The cuts in tariffs by over 50 percent on medical equipment, along with the elimination of quotas, will help further boost their 250 employee firm's exports to China.

And, we cannot forget the farmer. Illinois soybean, grain, and corn farmers like Bob Phelps of Rockton want to look to export markets like China—not the U.S. government—for their income security. Overall, American farmers will be able to sell about \$2 billion more of their products to China each year because the agreement will cut Chinese tariffs in half for farm products.

Soybean growers will see about a 20 percent increase in exports to China, according to the National Oilseed Processors Association. Hog farmers will receive about \$5 more per head, an Iowa State University study projects. That will mean an extra \$2.5 million for hog farmers in northern Illinois.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, this agreement is totally one-sided in favor of the people I represent who make products that are either directly or indirectly exported to China. We do not change any of our trade laws to make it easier for the Chinese to export to us. It is China that has granted concession after concession to the benefit of our workers and farmers! I urge my colleagues to support Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I support the opening of the mainland Chinese market to American exports. It is in the best interests of the American people and the Chinese people.

I feel strongly that the Communist government on mainland China is tyrannical, aggressive, and undesirable. I would like to see it go

the way of its Marxist comrade, the Soviet Union. I am alarmed by its threatening statements toward the United States and its belligerence toward our friends on Taiwan. I am disgusted by Communist China's record on human rights, on religious freedom, and its brutal one-child policy that forces women to abort their unborn babies.

If this were a vote on approval of the Communist regime in Beijing, I would strongly oppose it as would the vast majority of my colleagues. This is not such a vote.

My record has been highly critical of Communist China. On national security, I strongly supported Representative COX's investigation into Communist Chinese theft of American technologies. I cosponsored legislation to look into suspicious Chinese activity in the Panama Canal. On the question of Taiwan, I cosponsored the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act to strengthen the free nation's defense capability in case of attack from the mainland.

On forced abortion, I enthusiastically voted in favor of cutting off money to the U.N.'s population control agency so long as it cooperated with China's brutal one-child policy. On religious freedom, I recently wrote a letter to President Jiang Zemin urging release of Pastor Xu Guoxing.

My vote in favor of PNTR is not a departure. I remain solidly against anti-Communist China, which is why I support this agreement.

I want to end the despicable behavior of the Chinese Government against the United States, against Taiwan, and against the people it rules. The question is, how do we get there from here?

I think it is by exporting to China—not only American goods, but more importantly American ideas.

While this agreement is ostensibly about exporting American goods to mainland China, its ultimate virtue is the export of American ideas to mainland China. How else are things going to change in China? Our ideas have triumphed time and again in the past. We Americans have every reason to be confident that they will again. Since we are inspired by our ideas, is there any reason to think the Chinese, who themselves are oppressed by their government, will not be inspired by American ideas of liberty?

This agreement is part of the struggle against communism in China. It is war by other means.

Look at who supports this agreement and who opposes it. Taiwan, who has refused to bow to the bullying tactics of the much-larger mainland, supports the agreement. The spiritual leader of Tibet, the Dalai Lama, who was forced into exile by the Communist Chinese Government supports the agreement.

Within China's Communist establishment, the hard-liners are opposed to the PNTR agreement negotiated by the reformers. America's adoption of PNTR would be a victory for the reformers, and disapproval would be a victory for the hard-liners eager for confrontation with the United States. The Soviet Union was vanquished peacefully in a struggle between reformers and hardliners.

Adopting this agreement strengthens the reformers within the Chinese Government not only in the internal power struggle, but throughout society. Increased contacts with Americans will expose the average Chinese citizen to our universally appealing ideas on liberty. Increased prosperity and access to

communications technologies will increase the appetite of Chinese for American ways of life. And the expansion of a Chinese middle class that owes nothing to the communists is crucial. We are helping build the constituency for Chinese liberty.

While it may be emotionally satisfying to proclaim that one would never cooperate with the murderous regime in Beijing, it ultimately achieves little else. Not a single citizen of China is more free or better fed. Our own security is no more enhanced, nor is that of our friends. It is more important to be effective than to obtain simple self-satisfaction in one's hardened stance. I too, am revolted by communism, including the version practiced in China. I want to defeat it, and this is the way to do it.

The monstrosity of the crimes committed by Communist China have been so great that slaying the monster is more important than just calling it a monster.

Mainland China will gain membership into the WTO with or without American support. So why not gain benefits for our American companies in exchange? China is expanding trade with the rest of the world. Agreeing to this pact would allow American companies to compete on an equal footing with everyone else doing business on the mainland. By rejecting the agreement, we would punish our own companies unnecessarily.

Americans dominate the world in the agriculture and high-tech sectors. Lowering Chinese barriers to American goods will benefit Americans. High-tech pay the highest salaries, and increasing markets will produce more great jobs for Americans.

I have voted against the annual renewal of NTR for mainland China in the past. This year, the vote is different. In the past, NTR was about Chinese goods flowing into the United States. This time, it is about access to the mainland Chinese market for American goods. Free Americans will continue to buy Chinese-made goods whichever way Congress votes on this agreement. But passage will allow mainland Chinese to buy goods from Americans at lower prices—made lower by the reduction in tariffs.

Granting permanent NTR leaves many other levers at our disposal to deal with mainland China. We must continue to protect ourselves and to speak out against the tyrannical Chinese Government. But we cannot be content with just words; we must back that up with action.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4444, a bill to provide permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) to China. By passing this legislation, Congress will create substantial new export opportunities for American farmers and businesses, advance the cause of personal freedom for the Chinese people, and promote United States strategic interests in East Asia.

It is important to be clear about what the House is voting on. This is not a vote on whether China joins the World Trade Organization (WTO)—the WTO will admit China later this year. The question before us is whether to give China the same trade status that all WTO members are required to give each other—permanent normal trade relations. If we do, U.S. farmers and businesspeople will enjoy dramatically increased access to the world's most populous market. If we do not, the United States will be largely shut out of the

China market while our trade competitors will capitalize on China's market opening measures.

The United States routinely approves NTR on an annual basis. Even in the wake of Tiananmen Square, we did not revoke NTR because to do so would not only spark a trade war but would also risk even graver conflict between the United States and China. As a result, the annual NTR debate has never provided effective leverage to change the behavior of the Chinese Government because revoking NTR has never been a credible threat.

For American agriculture, opening the China market is a clear win, which is why nearly every farm and commodity organization in the country supports this bill. The USDA has conservatively estimated that China's market opening measures will increase American agriculture exports by \$2 billion annually. Under the terms of its agreement to join the WTO, Chinese tariffs on wheat will drop from 20 percent to just 1 percent; tariffs on beef will fall from 45 percent to 12 percent; poultry from 20 percent to 10 percent; and pork tariffs will decline from 20 percent to 12 percent. In addition, China has agreed to eliminate all export subsidies on agriculture commodities.

Opponents of PNTR have raised many valid concerns, including China's poor record on human rights, lack of religious and political freedom, threats against Taiwan, and a growing trade surplus with the United States. I share each of these concerns but disagree about the best way to address them. In my view, building commercial relationships with the Chinese people will lessen the control of the central government in Beijing; giving China a stake in the international economy will make it less likely to be aggressive toward its neighbors; and reducing China's trade barriers will help increase United States exports and reduce our trade deficit.

With respect to human rights, many of the most prominent Chinese political dissidents have urged Congress to approve PNTR. Wang Dan, the leader of the Tiananmen Square demonstration, has said that PNTR "will be beneficial for the long-term future of China." Martin Lee, the democratic leader of Hong Kong, Dai Qing, Bao Tong, and many other influential activists have all expressed their support for PNTR. Their shared opinion is that engagement with the United States advances the cause of personal freedom in China. In addition, no less authority than the Dalai Lama has said that Chinese participation in the international economy is good for religious freedom in China.

Approving PNTR for China also serves our national security interests. Secretary of Defense William Cohen, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell, and many other military experts have said that bringing China into the WTO and approving this legislation will enhance our security interests in East Asia. The recently and democratically elected President of Taiwan, Chen Shui-bian, also supports the normal trade relations between the United States and China.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, approving PNTR and opening the China market helps American farmers, workers, and small businesspeople, supports the cause of political and religious freedom in China, and strengthens United States security interests in Asia. I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, as we enter a new century and a new millennium, relations

among the nations of the Pacific Rim and Africa are becoming more significant. Trade with China represents a substantial component of our country's international commerce. As Congress has debated United States trading policies toward China and Africa during the past couple of weeks, I have carefully considered many fundamental issues.

I am a firm believer of self-determination for China. China is a Communist country, whether we agree with that system of government or not. Nevertheless, whatever political or economic system is in place, it is wrong to round up, to intimidate, to arrest people, and place them in slave labor camps with no due process. It is reprehensible for the United States to endorse this behavior by rewarding it with a favorable trade regime.

The time is now to send a strong message—an unyielding message that the United States will not condone mass suffering and oppression.

Trade must be open, it must be fair. Standards for human rights must be included in all trade agreements, environmental protections must be in place, women's rights should be advanced, workers' rights must be protected, religious freedom should be protected and American jobs should not become a casualty of trade policy.

Many argue that the best way to ensure China's respect for all these issues, is to admit China to the World Trade Organization and to grant it Permanent Normal Trading Relations status (PNTR). I disagree, and believe an annual review provides for this.

China's persistent gross violations against free exercise of religion, against women and reproductive freedom, and against political expression should prohibit the U.S. from relaxing its policies toward China and should cause us to ask why we want to relax our trade policies toward China and reward China for this repression.

Annual review, at least presents an effective mechanism for China's compliance with international worker, environmental, and human rights standards. Annual review, moreover, is the most viable insurance for the American worker.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, over 870,000 jobs will be lost over the decade. What will happen with these workers?

If this bill passes, the U.S. trade deficit will continue to escalate, leading to job losses in virtually every sector of the economy.

In my state of California 87,294 jobs will be lost. This is very scary.

I support free trade. But our trade policies should also include a fair ideal with American workers. Our trade policies should put an end to slave labor in China, rather than reward it.

We are not talking about cutting off our relationship with China. We want to make sure that our trade relations are such that people of China and the United States can benefit from a fair and free trade policy.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Very seldom do we have these defining moments; this vote defines who we are as a people and as a nation.

As an African-American whose ancestors were brought here in chains and forced to help build this great country as slaves I must oppose any measure that allows for the exploitation of people whether here in America, in Africa, China or anywhere in the world.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the legislation which would have implemented "permanent normal trade relations" with the People's Republic of China was three pages in length. Today, it is 66 pages in length. Close examination of this bill "gone bad" is demonstrative of how this Congress misdefines "free trade" and how, like most everything else is in Washington, this "free trade" bill is a misnomer of significant proportions.

For the past several years I have favored normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China. Because of certain misconceptions, I believe it is useful to begin with some detail as to what "normal trade relations" status is and what it is not. Previous "normal trade relations" votes meant only that U.S. tariffs imposed on Chinese goods will be no different than tariffs imposed on other countries for similar products—period. NTR status did not mean more U.S. taxpayers dollars sent to China. It did not signify more international family planning dollars sent overseas. NTR status does not mean automatic access to the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, OPIC, or any member of other "foreign aid" vehicles by which the U.S. Congress sends foreign aid to a large number of countries. Rather, NTR status was the lowering of a United States citizen's taxes paid on voluntary exchanges entered into by citizens who happen to reside in different countries.

Of course, many of the critics of NTR status for China do not address the free trade and the necessarily negative economic consequences of their position. No one should question that individual rights are vital to liberty and that the communist government of China has an abysmal record in that department. At the same time, basic human rights must necessarily include the right to enter into voluntary exchanges with others. To burden the U.S. citizens who enter into voluntary exchanges with exorbitant taxes (tariffs) in the name of "protecting" the human rights of citizens of other countries would be internally inconsistent. Trade barriers when lowered, after all, benefit consumers who can purchase goods more cheaply than previously available. Those individuals choosing not to trade with citizens of particular foreign jurisdictions are not threatened by lowering barriers for those who do. Oftentimes, these critics focus instead on human rights deprivation by government leaders in China and see trade barriers as a means to "reform" these sometimes tyrannical leaders. However, according to Father Robert Sirco, a Paulist priest who discussed this topic in the Wall Street Journal, American missionaries in China favor NTR status and see this as the policy most likely to bring about positive change in China.

But all of this said, this new 66 page "free trade" bill is not about free trade at all. It is about empowering and enriching international trade regulators and quasi-governmental entities on the backs of the U.S. taxpayer. Like NAFTA before us, this bill contains provisions which continue our country down the ugly path of internationally-engineered, "managed trade" rather than that of free trade. As explained by Ph.D. economist Murray N. Rothbard: "[G]enuine free trade doesn't require a treaty (or its deformed cousin, a 'trade agreement'; NAFTA was called an agreement so it can avoid the constitutional requirement of approval by two-thirds of the Senate). If the es-

tablishment truly wants free trade, all its has to do is to repeal our numerous tariffs, import quotas, anti-dumping laws, and other American-imposed restrictions of free trade. No foreign policy or foreign maneuvering is necessary."

In truth, the bipartisan establishment's fanfare of "free trade" fosters the opposite of genuine freedom of exchange. Whereas genuine free traders examine free markets from the perspective of the consumer (each individual), the mercantilist examines trade from the perspective of the power elite; in other words, from the perspective of the big business in concert with big government. Genuine free traders consider exports a means of paying for imports, in the same way that goods in general are produced in order to be sold to consumers. But the mercantilists want to privilege the government business elite at the expense of all consumers, be they domestic or foreign. This new PNTR bill, rather than lowering government imposed barriers to trade, has become a legislative vehicle under which the United States can more quickly integrate and cartelize government in order to entrench the interventionist mixed economy.

No Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, don't be fooled into thinking this bill is anything about free trade. In fact, those supporting it should be disgraced to learn that, among other misgivings, this bill, further undermines U.S. sovereignty by empowering the World Trade Organization on the backs of American taxpayers, sends federal employees to Beijing to become lobbyists to members of their communist government to become more WTO-friendly, funds the imposition of the questionable Universal Declaration of Human Rights upon foreign governments, and authorizes the spending of nearly \$100 million to expand the reach of Radio Free Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I say no to this taxpayer-financed fanfare of "free trade" which fosters the opposite of genuine freedom of exchange and urge by colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4444, which would permanently extend normal trade relations (PNTR) status to the People's Republic of China. If we enact this legislation today, we forever surrender our ability to review our trade relations with China on an annual basis.

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States states that "the Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations." Our founding fathers intentionally granted the "People's body" a separate, distinct voice on trade matters. This constitutional obligation makes our democracy unique: European parliamentary democracies grant no such powers to their legislatures. Under our Constitution, Congress does not simply rubberstamp the decisions of the Executive Branch. Congress is a separate, coequal partner in our system of checks and balances.

Every year in the House, we have exercised our Constitutional duty by reviewing our trade relationship with China. On an annual basis, the President has notified Congress that he will grant most-favored-nation (MFN) trading status to China, and we have had the opportunity to approve or reject MFN status by a vote on the floor of the House. This vote has been preceded by a full debate on whether China deserves to be treated as an equal trading partner. Members vote on the issue, and their constituents hold them accountable for their vote.

I have consistently voted against MFN for China because I believe it does not deserve to be treated as an equal trading partner. The Chinese dictatorship has one of the most deplorable human rights records on Earth, and, according to the State Department, things are only getting worse. The Chinese government uses executions and torture to maintain order, persecutes religious minorities and imprisons dissidents who dare to speak out for democracy. At a bare minimum, China's human rights record must improve if we are to treat it as an equal partner.

Equal trading partners extend the benefits of trade to those who produce its goods and services. In China, where workers make between 13 and 35 cents an hour, this relationship does not exist. The basic rights that we enjoy in the U.S.—the right to organize, the right to strike, decent wages and benefits, safe workplaces—simply do not exist in China.

Equally deplorable is the manner in which China has treated its neighbors. It continues its belligerence toward the free-market democracy of Taiwan. In fact, shortly after the ink was dry on the World Trade Organization (WTO) agreement, China threatened to use force against Taiwan. China continues to threaten our interests elsewhere by selling weapons of mass destruction to rogue terrorist nations and by trying to steal our nuclear weapons designs.

The WTO agreement is not the first trade deal we have reached with China. But trade agreements only work when countries abide by them. Regrettably, China has violated every trade deal with the U.S., and top Chinese officials have already indicated that they have no intention to abide by the WTO deal.

Despite China's worsening record on human rights, international trade, relations with its neighbors, and weapons proliferation, we are on the brink of throwing out our annual review forever. Like it or not, the annual MFN review process is the only means by which the U.S. can influence the Chinese government's behavior toward its own people and other nations. If Congress approves PNTR, we forever relinquish any leverage we have to improve Chinese behavior.

Mr. Speaker, many have argued that if we fail to approve PNTR we will lose precious business opportunities in China. I concede that point. Certainly, European and Japanese companies will be doing a great deal of business in China.

But I believe that America stands for something more than the almighty dollar. As the world's sole superpower and strongest democracy, we have a moral responsibility to stand up for those who struggle against tyranny. We are the only nation capable and willing to bring about democratic change in China. And we can use our economic power to exert that leverage.

During the Cold War, we put principles before dollars. We refused to grant MFN status to authoritarian communist regimes because of their deplorable records toward their citizens and their neighbors. When Lech Walesa and the other leaders of the Solidarity movement were imprisoned in Poland, the U.S. Congress stood with the Polish people and imposed sanctions on the communist government. Now, we enjoy a vibrant trading relationship with Poland and other former communist Central European nations, but those trade benefits were extended after these countries

opened their societies and embraced free markets and democracy. In fact, we are now doing business with the same dissidents who were imprisoned by their former communist regimes. These new leaders remember with gratitude that America stood with them—and not their oppressors—in the dark days of the countries.

Today's "Lech Walesas" are sitting in prisons in China because they dared to speak out for freedom and democracy. They, in my opinion, will become the future leaders of China. And when we seek to form a trading relationship with the future leaders of China, they will remember how we voted today.

Defeating PNTR would certainly send shockwaves throughout America's corporate boardrooms. But it would send a more powerful, purposeful message to the people of China that we stand with them in their quest to create a free-market, democratic society that cherishes a peaceful relationship with her neighbors and the United States. However, if Congress approves PNTR, we lose any leverage we have in helping the Chinese people realize their vision for a better society.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am astounded that today, this Congress is taking a vote on giving China permanent normal trade relations. I am amazed that this vote is about to take place because all of the evidence shows that China has done nothing to deserve America granting China permanent access to the U.S. market. In fact, the national security evidence and the human rights evidence shows that the Chinese government is a brutal regime that sees America not as a strategic partner, but as a global threat and competitor, economically and militarily.

There is much debate in this Congress and in America about China's future. Proponents of giving China PNTR claim that giving China permanent access to the U.S. market will change China's leadership, that giving China PNTR will promote democracy, promote religious freedom, promote peace, promote human rights.

While it is my fervent hope that these changes will occur in China, I have to ask the question, "what evidence is there to believe that China will change?" "What evidence is there that China has changed?"

After receiving several national security briefings from the CIA on China, having visited Tibet and China, and after looking at all of the continued and worsening human rights abuses committed by the Chinese government, I have to conclude that reality says, that giving China PNTR right now is dangerous to America's national security and that giving China PNTR will only strengthen the Chinese communists hold on power—allowing China to continue with its already horrible human rights record.

Let's look at the evidence.

China continues to destabilize Asia. In the past 50 years, China has clashed with nearly all of its neighbors. They invaded the Soviet Union, they invaded parts of India, they invaded Vietnam, they fought and killed thousands of U.S. troops in the Korean War. Thousands of American GI's who were captured or killed by the Chinese during the Korean War are still unaccounted for. We have never found out what happened to these GI's at Chinese hands.

China continues to threaten to use force against Taiwan. China has done this repeatedly and forcefully while we in Congress have

been debating whether or not to give China PNTR. China is right now reportedly conducting war games mimicking an invasion of Taiwan that includes battle against U.S. troops. China has threatened Taiwan with a "blood soaked battle."

In 1999, China's Defense Minister declared that war with the U.S. "is inevitable." It is estimated that China has over a dozen nuclear ballistic missiles aimed at major U.S. cities and is reportedly building three new types of long-range missiles capable of striking the U.S.

Less than one year ago the Cox Committee found that China has "stolen" classified information regarding the most advanced U.S. thermonuclear weapons, giving them design information "on par with our own." The information included classified information on every currently deployed warhead in the U.S. ballistic missile arsenal.

China's official military newspaper threatened the U.S. saying if the U.S. were to defend Taiwan, China would resort to "long range" missiles to inflict damage on America.

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

China is forging an alliance with Russia against the U.S. and China is purchasing as many weapons from Russia as it can. Reports indicate that China has purchased advanced naval vessels and top of the line anti-ship missiles from the Russians that specifically are meant to be used against U.S. aircraft carriers.

Reports indicate that China is seeking to disrupt or end U.S. alliances in the Pacific. Reports indicate that China is seeking to be the primary power in Asia and to nudge the U.S. out of Asia.

China has increased its military budget by close to 13 percent this year.

We hear the argument that PNTR will lead to economic and political growth in China, but who in China will benefit the most from increased foreign investment? Since the Clinton administration reduced technology trade restrictions in 1993, incidences of technology transfers from the U.S. to China have been numerous. Much of the capital and revenue the Chinese would gain from PNTR will go to help increase China's military build-up and to help stabilize a repressive, authoritarian regime.

I'd suggest the money is going to go toward building more jails and more prison labor camps, toward more weapons purchases and toward funding more intelligence operations against the U.S.

For all of these reasons and more, all of the major American veterans organizations, including the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart all oppose giving China PNTR. This Congress needs to heed the voices of our veterans. These are the people who have fought, who have been wounded, and who have put their lives on the line to

preserve and protect freedom. These veterans know a national security threat when they see one. They unanimously oppose giving China PNTR because they know that it is very likely that American troops will be in harm's way because of China's military threats against the U.S. and because of China's military threats in the Asia region. Letters from these groups are included for the record.

Three former Commandants of the Marine Corps, seven retired four star generals, a former Commander in Chief of the U.S. Army in Europe, and numerous other national security experts signed a letter opposing giving China PNTR because of national security concerns. These national security leaders argue that if the U.S. gives China PNTR:

The nation ignores at its peril threatening Chinese rhetoric and behavior. \* \* \* Being is using some of the hard currency it is garnering from trade and financial dealings with the United States to acquire ominous weaponry \* \* \* specifically designed to attack American carrier battle groups \* \* \* We believe that the annual debate on our China policy mandated by current law should not be eliminated at present.

A recent report issued by the CPA and the FBI stated that China has stepped up military spying against the United States while using political influence programs to manipulate U.S. policy. This FBI/CPA report says that the U.S. military and U.S. private corporations are the primary targets of Chinese intelligence. This report also says that Chinese companies play a significant role in China's pursuit and acquisition of secret U.S. technology.

I am concerned that Members of Congress and the American public do not know enough about the national security threat China poses to the U.S. I have been urging our colleagues to obtain a briefing by the CIA on China and just over 40 Members have had this briefing. I have written President Clinton urging him to declassify information that shows the national security threat China poses to the U.S. before this vote takes place and he has done nothing.

Members and the American public need to know the answers to questions about the national security regarding and PNTR before this vote takes place.

Right smack in the middle of this debate on PNTR, the Chinese government has stepped up its already heinous human rights violations.

That's not just me saying that. The 1999 State Department Human Rights report on China is 68 pages long on descriptions of China's human rights abuses—abuses ranging from its policy of forced abortion and forced sterilization, to imprisonment and eradication of any democratic dissent, to imprisonment of people for having religious beliefs, to forced labor in China's vast prison labor system. The report says, "The Government's poor human rights record deteriorated markedly throughout the year, as the Government intensified efforts to suppress dissent."

The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, a bi-partisan commission established by Congress whose members were appointed by Congress and the Administration, opposes giving China PNTR because of China's continued religious persecution, saying: " \* \* \* Congress should not approve PNTR for China until China makes substantial improvements in respect for religious freedom."

We know that 8 Catholic bishops are in prison—and I think there are probably more—and

some have been in custody for over 30 years. In the past week, more Protestant House church leaders have been arrested. Muslims in northwest China are in prison because of their faith.

China continues to pillage and occupy Tibet. Tibet is a peace-loving country that is not a threat to China. Yet, the Chinese government has brutally occupied Tibet for decades and has no plans to leave Tibet. I visited Tibet and met with Buddhist monks and nuns. Each temple has a Chinese communist official that controls and monitors everything that is done in the temple. The Chinese have cameras strewn throughout the capital of Lhasa, so they can watch and monitor the people. Hundreds of Tibetan monks and nuns are in prison because of their faith.

The Chinese military is responsible for trafficking in human organs. A blood type match is made between a prospective organ recipient and a Chinese prisoner. Once the match is made, prisoners are taken to a remote location, where the necessary medical personnel have been assembled, and summarily executed. Their organs are then removed and sold.

The State Department Human Rights report says that over 500 women in China of child bearing age commit suicide each day. Could it be that China's policy of forced abortion and forced sterilization are a significant cause of these suicides? Could it be that the fines for violating the government's birth quotas, that are three times a couple's annual salary, are causing these suicides?

A country that abuses its own citizens on a massive scale cannot be trusted in its dealings with the U.S. Do Members actually think that the same Chinese government that flattens its own citizens with tanks—that kills frail 80-year-old Catholic bishops—can be trusted?

The decision on whether to give China PNTR must be based on facts and truth, not on wishful thinking or ill-placed hopes. Our challenge as a country and as lawmakers is to examine the facts, to seek the truth and to make informed and wise decisions based on the facts and truth. All of what I have said about China's worsening human rights record and the national security concerns are incontestably true. Yet, a large number of Members here are seriously considering giving away to China the only leverage the U.S. has—aside from military coercion—our annual review of whether to extend to China normal trading privileges.

I am concerned that we in the U.S. have become so enamored with China's prospective market, that we are on the verge of ignoring facts and truth. We may be ignoring history, ignoring China's abysmal human rights record, and ignoring the threats China poses to U.S. national security and to our men and women in uniform.

Today, in the year 2000, America is at a similar crossroads as Europe and America were leading up to World War II. Europe and America in the 1930's were tired of conflict, having just fought a bloody World War I, and chose to ignore the threat emanating from Germany and Japan. Neville Chamberlain forced through the sale of Germany of the Merlin high-performance engine—the same engine that was used by the British during the Battle of Britain in the famous Spitfire fighter plane. France was so caught up in enjoying the peace that it depleted its artillery stock

through artillery sales to Romania, Yugoslavia and Turkey. France sold so many of its artillery pieces that when Germany invaded France, France only had 90 artillery pieces on its line with Germany. America was selling oil to Japan during Japan's invasion of Chinese Manchuria and kept selling oil to Japan within a year or so of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

We are at a similar crossroads today. Many in America feel victorious as the Cold War with the former Soviet Union no longer exists. Some see the recent facts and developments regarding China in a positive and hopeful light because they are tired of standing down a potential adversary and they are tired of facing a global rival. Events that many did not expect to happen in their lifetimes have occurred. The Berlin Wall has fallen, Germany is reunited, the Soviet Union has dissolved, Western Europe no longer faces a phalanx of hostile tanks, soldiers and missiles to its east. The battle against the former Soviet Union continued for 40 years and many simply want to wish away a future rival and a future conflict.

Those of us in Congress and in America who are very concerned with the national security threat that China poses to the U.S. are frequently criticized as having a Cold War mentality toward China and of being China bashers. We are accused of being overly critical of China and of China's human rights abuses, that we are looking for a rival simply to replace the enemy that once was the Soviet Union. Because of our concerns with China and opposition to giving China PNTR, we are accused of not giving China a chance to change and grow into a democracy and into a reliable and trusted ally.

Yet, in reality, China is still an authoritarian, communist country of over a billion people.

Yet, in reality, China wants the U.S. out of Asia and seeks to be the unrivaled power in Asia.

The massive human rights abuses and massive religious persecution in China are undisputed facts.

It is fact that China plundered Tibet.

It is fact that communist China has engaged militarily virtually every country on its border as well as the U.S. in the past 50 years.

It is fact that this present Chinese leadership rolled over its own people with tanks in Tiananmen Square.

It is fact that China commits untold atrocities against its own people.

It is fact that China has been publicly threatening to shoot nuclear missiles at the U.S.

Fits of wishful thinking and outright ignoring these and countless other facts do not change the reality of the regime in China or the plausible threat that China poses to the U.S.

We need to learn what history teaches us about leadership.

The lessons from our past are clear. Leadership is not about seeing what we wish to see. Leadership is not about closing our eyes to the threats before us. Leadership is about clearly, lucidly, and forcefully addressing facts and truth and taking appropriate action.

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

We must have a way to continue our annual review of trade with China. If we sign off on permanent trade, we hand over any influence we could have in promoting a China that respects its citizens and that is a non-threatening, peaceful member of the community of nations.

Annual review of China's trade status is an appropriate foreign policy tool, it is an opportunity for Congress to influence the behavior of China on matters of national security and human rights, and it is the right thing to do in maintaining our vigilance in preserving freedom.

[From the American Legion]

CHINA TRADE OPPOSED BY THE AMERICAN LEGION

INDIANAPOLIS (Wednesday, May 20, 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 preconditions 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 OF THE UNITED STATES

Washington, DC, May 17, 2000.

To: All Members of the United States House of Representatives, 106th U.S. Congress.

From: John W. Smart, Commander-in-Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States oppose Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China. China's policies and actions over the past several years have not demonstrated that it is ready to become a permanent-trading partner of the United States.

Passage of the China Trade Bill would end annual congressional review of China's access to U.S. markets and give it permanent trade relations with the United States. While this bill might provide certain economic benefits and advantages to some American companies, it could hurt other American industries and may cost many Americans their jobs. Permanent Normal Trade relations with the United States should be earned by China, not given away. Essentially this bill 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.

Now is not the proper time to grant China Permanent Normal Trade Relations. 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.

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.

Respectfully,

JOHN W. SMART,  
Commander-in-Chief.

AMVETS,  
Lanham, MD, May 16, 2000.

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

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOLF: AMVETS, the nation's fourth largest veterans 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 can not 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 Normal Trade Relations for China.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. TAYLOR,  
National Commander, 1999-2000.

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

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,  
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 the 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.

FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION,  
Alexandria, VA, April 21, 2000.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH,  
M.C., House of Representatives, 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 door 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.

NAVAL RESERVE ASSOCIATION,  
Alexandria, VA, May 9, 2000.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOLF: The Naval Reserve Association and the Naval Enlisted Reserve Association work together as affiliates to represent 37,000 officers and enlisted members from the Naval Reserve services. They are representative of the 89,000 Selected Reservists, the 4,500 non-pay Drilling Reservists (VTU), and the 91,000 Individual Ready Reservists (IRR), as well as the Retired Reserve community.

As a resource to the U.S. Military, our membership is concerned with our relationship with China. Decisions made today will be affecting the political-military balance in the Pacific for the next 50 years. The Peoples Republic of China may well be a rival.

Building its economy on the backs of its people, China is also willing to risk world stability. To generate hard currency, the PRC is selling weapons systems to Third World nations, including many considered rogue states in nature.

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.

The process of reviewing trade relations with China each year is an opportunity for Congress to influence the behavior of China on matters of national security and human rights.

China is the largest of four surviving Communist governments in the world today. Human rights of its citizens continue to be violated. Evidence exists of Chinese espionage within the U.S. Government and industry. The PCR has effected political influence to manipulate U.S. policy. An annual trade review provides an element of counter balance.

Trade between nations helps maintain diplomatic dialogue and exposes a country's citizenry to outside ideas as well as products. Commerce with China is growing in importance for a number of U.S. Corporations. As a nation, we should continue to expand the marketplace, but not *carte blanche*. Now is not the time to offer Permanent Normal Trade Relationships (PNTR) for China.

MARSHALL HANSON,  
*Director of Legislation, Naval Reserve Association.*

DENNIS F. PIERMAN,  
*Executive Director, Naval Enlisted Reserve Association.*

WARRANT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,  
*Herndon, VA, May 9, 2000.*

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,  
*Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOLF: On behalf of the members 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 possible, 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.

Respectfully,

RAYMOND A. BELL,  
*Executive Director.*

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
*Washington, DC, April 27, 2000.*

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,  
*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.*

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.*

Hon. TRENT LOTT,  
*Majority Leader, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT AND SENATOR LOTT: In recent days, proponents of granting China Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status have asserted that the failure by Congress to do so would harm U.S. national security. As individuals who have devoted much of our professional lives to providing for and safeguarding America's security and vital interests, we believe this assertion to be incorrect—possibly dangerously so.

In our judgment, the Nation ignores at its peril threatening Chinese rhetoric and behavior. For example, PRC leaders and official publications routinely refer to the United States as "the main enemy." They have threatened "long-distance missile strikes" against American cities if the U.S.

interferes with China's coercion of Taiwan. Beijing is using some of the hard currency it is garnering from trade and financial dealings with the United States to acquire ominous weaponry, such as Russian-built Sovremenny-class destroyers—ships whose nuclear-capable SS-N-22 "Sunburn" missiles were specifically designed to attack American carrier battle groups.

In December, China's Defense Minister General Chi Haotian told a meeting of senior officers of the People's Liberation Army that China needs to prepare for an "inevitable" war of several years duration to break American "hegemony" in East Asia. A few months earlier, the Central Military Commission of the Communist Party circulated to all PLA bases and garrisons a document in which it declared, "The strategic superiority which can be claimed by the U.S. is close to zero. It does not even enjoy a sure advantage in terms of the foreseeable scale of war and the high-tech content which can be applied to combat . . . After the first strategic strike, the U.S. forces will be faced with weaponry and logistic problems, providing us with opportunities for major offensives and to win large battles."

Such statements and actions suggest that the Chinese today, like the Japanese sixty years ago, put great faith in the ability of a materially weaker challenger to defeat a major power which looks stronger, but which they believe has become decadent and irresolute in the use of power. If Beijing is poised to make the same mistake that Tokyo made in 1941, it would cost this country dearly to prove them wrong should it come to a war the Chinese apparently expect and for which they are preparing. A firm American stand now would likely avoid miscalculation later, boost deterrence and, therefore, promote peace in the Western Pacific and East Asia.

Toward that end, we believe that the annual debate on our China policy mandated by current law should not be eliminated at present. It should, instead, be expanded to place international economic ties in the larger context of American national security policy and interests in Asia.

The PRC clearly does not want this yearly debate to occur, which is why granting PNTR at this time, in the face of myriad threats from China, is likely to be interpreted by Beijing as an act of appeasement. If so, far from enhancing U.S. security, a vote for PNTR under present circumstances would only intensify the threat Communist China will pose.

We believe that, under present and foreseeable circumstances, China's trade status and behavior should continue to be subjected to a formal annual review. In addition, the United States must retain the ability to take whatever measures are deemed necessary to prevent the transfer of technology, capital and other resources to Beijing that could ultimately help threaten U.S. security and American lives. We strongly urge Congress to reject any China NTR or WTO-related legislation that does not contain such safeguards.

General Robert H. Barrow, USMC (Ret.), former Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps.

General J.B. Davis, USAF (Ret.), former Chief of Staff, Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe.

Diana Denman, former Co-Chair, U.S. Peace Corps Advisory Council.

Adm. Leon A. 'Bud' Edney, USN (Ret.), former Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic.

Major Gen. Vincent E. Falter, USA (Ret.), former Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy.

Frank J. Gaffney, Jr., President, Center for Security Policy and former Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Hon. William R. Graham, former Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy and Science Advisor to President Reagan.

James T. Hackett, former Acting Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Adm. Kinnaid McKee, USN (Ret.), former Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion.

Lieutenant General Thomas H. Miller, USMC (Ret.), former Deputy Chief of Staff for Aviation, Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps.

Gen. Carl Mundy, USMC (Ret.), former Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps.

Major Gen. J. Milnor Roberts, USA (Ret.), former Chief of Army Reserve.

General Glenn K. Otis, USA (Ret.), former Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Army, Europe.

General John L. Piotrowski, USAF (Ret.), former Commander, U.S. Space Command and Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

Hon. Roger W. Robinson, Jr., former Senior Director, International Economic Policy, National Security Council.

Major Gen. John K. Singlaub, USA (Ret.), former Chief of Staff, U.S. Forces Korea.

Hon. Gerald B.H. Solomon, former Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Gen. Donn A. Starry, USA (Ret.), former Commander, U.S. Army Readiness Command.

Hon. James H. Webb, Jr., former Secretary of the Navy.

General Joseph J. Went, USMC (Ret.), former Assistant Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps.

General Louis H. Wilson, USMC (Ret.), former Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps.

[From the Center for Security Policy]

TWENTY-ONE NATIONAL SECURITY LEADERS  
URGE REJECTION OF PNTR

WASHINGTON, D.C.—On the eve the House of Representatives vote on granting the People's Republic of China Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status the Center for Security Policy released an Open Letter to Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott and Speaker of the House Dennis Hastert (see the attached). This letter, which was signed by over twenty of the Nation's most eminent security policy practitioners and retired military officers, argues forcefully that the granting China PNTR would harm U.S. national security.

This letter comes on the heels of numerous appeals by the Nation's largest veterans and military service organizations who have expressed their opposition to rewarding China's threatening rhetoric and behavior by removing the yearly review of China's trading status. These groups, including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, the Warrant Officers Association, the Fleet Reserve Association, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, AMVETS, the Naval Reserve Association and the Naval Enlisted Reserve Association and the signatories of today's letter should be commended for their defense of America's security and principles.

The Open Letter's signatories include: three former Commandants of the U.S. Marine Corps (General Robert H. Barrow, General Carl Mundy and General Louis H. Wilson); seven retired four-staff general officers (former Chief of Staff, Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe, General J.B. Davis, USAF; former Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic, Admiral Leon 'Bud' Edney, USN; former Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion, Admiral Kinnaid McKee, USN (Ret.); former Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Army, Europe, General Glenn K. Otis, USA (Ret.); former Commander, U.S. Space Com-

mand and Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, General John L. Piotrowski USAF (Ret.); former Commander, U.S. Army Readiness Command, General Donn A. Starry, USA (Ret.); and former Assistant Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps, General Joseph J. Went, USMC (Ret.); former Secretary of the Navy, James H. Webb, Jr.; former Science Advisor to President Reagan, William R. Graham; and former Chairman of the House Rules Committee, Gerald B.H. Solomon.

The Open Letter reads in part:  
"The Chinese today, like the Japanese sixty years ago, put great faith in the ability of a materially weaker challenger to defeat a major power which looks stronger, but which they believe has become decadent and irresolute in the use of power. If Beijing is poised to make the same mistake that Tokyo made in 1941, it would cost this country dearly to prove them wrong should it come to a war the Chinese apparently expect and for which they are preparing. A firm American stand now would likely avoid miscalculation later, boost deterrence and, therefore, promote peace in the Western Pacific and East Asia. Toward that end, we believe that the annual debate on our China policy mandated by current law should not be eliminated at present. It should, instead, be expanded to place international economic ties in the larger context of American national security policy and interests in Asia."

The Center urges Congress to weigh carefully the arguments of these highly respected and accomplished authorities and, in so doing, to discount dubious appeals for granting China PNTR on national security grounds.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of granting permanent normal trade relations to the People's Republic of China. I do not presume that my comments will change any of my colleagues minds but please allow me to tell you why I am in support of this measure.

During the 19th Century, European powers, more or less, forced their own way into China by militarily demanding exclusive trade concessions. More often than not, these trade concessions benefitted the European merchants almost unilaterally. In this age of imperialism, little concern was given to the "economic benefit" received by the Chinese people in general. To be sure, there were many Chinese feudal lords and merchants who grew very wealthy from trading with the Europeans, but as a matter of course, widespread economic prosperity would not reach the average Chinese peasant or urban laborer until well into the late 20th Century.

The United States during this age of imperialism was steadfast in promoting the "Open Door Policy" whereby no nation was excluded from trade with China. Of course, this privilege was limited to only but a few great maritime powers. Nevertheless the concept of free trade and open access to markets was there.

The point of recalling this history is to understand China's present frame of political reference. China was, in many ways, abused by the Western foreign powers for much of the 19th and early 20th Centuries. In the turmoil that followed the Second World War, the Chinese Communists seized power in a revolution of the peasantry. In establishing a paranoid one-party authoritarian state, the west's colonial legacy has remained a rather contemporary influence in the body politic of China's leaders. In the years since the Cultural Revolution, China has made tremendous inroads to opening up and embracing many market

concepts. True, they still are ruled by an intolerant regime that has an abhorrent human rights, labor rights, women's rights, civil liberties, and environmental record. True, they are also modernizing their military and repeatedly engage in political "saber rattling."

Yet anyone who has bothered to study Chinese history will instantly recognize that it is China who fears the western world's economic, political, and military power. It is China who fears being isolated and contained. Beijing recognizes that as a developing nation they need to be a part of the global economy in order to survive and become more prosperous. Since China increasingly depends on the connections to the global economy, they indeed have more to lose if they are cut out. Part of the motivation behind the trade accord, as brokered by President Clinton, is to "normalize" the trade and economic links of China with the global economy and thereby cement China's dependence upon this community, which is subject to the rule of law.

So, let us now turn briefly to the agreement as drafted in this bill. To address some of the rhetoric let us turn to the facts. All this agreement does is remove the annual Congressional review process, as required by the 1974 Trade Act, before granting normal trade relations to China for the year. In granting this "permanent" status, China will then be able to work towards joining the World Trade Organization (WTO). In this agreement, the granting of PNTR by the United States only goes into effect upon China's admittance to the WTO. This process could take years. In the meantime this body loses nothing; the annual NTR review would still apply. In addition, there are many legal and market oriented hoops that the Chinese government must comply with in order to become a member of the WTO. Once China is a member of the WTO, the United States still can impose sanctions on China but they have to be "WTO consistent." This means that if for national security reasons or other qualifying reasons, the President feels it is necessary to impose economic sanctions, it would be within our rights to do so.

One concern is that in passing this bill, Congress abdicates its ability to have economic leverage over China. There are many other processes to affect this "leverage" over China. For example, the U.S. could use the power of the Export-Import Bank, TDA and OPIC to apply pressure on China. Finally, the Levin-Bereuter language that establishes a Congressional Executive Commission on Human Rights and Labor Abuses in China, will annually grant this body the opportunity to investigate and criticize China's abuse in these areas. This language preserves our commitment and ability to annually address Human Rights and Labor Abuses in China.

Mr. Speaker the strengths of granting PNTR clearly outweigh the weaknesses. It will undoubtedly benefit American businesses and open China's markets in U.S. goods. Plain and simple, this agreement is about trade. My colleagues, China has along way to go towards reforming its civil society but you cannot genuinely compare the current regime in China to the government of Nazi Germany in the 1930s. Unlike the Nazi's, China is not bent on world domination. The Chinese have no military plans to occupy parts of California or New York.

Mr. Speaker, trade inevitably liberalizes a society. Look at South Korea, Taiwan, Indonesia, Spain, Portugal, Chile and Argentina.

The former authoritarian regimes in these nations were undoubtedly weakened by the permeating influence of open markets and the free flow of goods, capital, and ideas. As we stand here on the precipice of change, we have an opportunity to take a first step towards exposing China towards the benefits and responsibilities of trade and the rule of law. Granting PNTR and China's membership in the WTO is not a panacea. It may change China in profound ways that were not anticipated by most Americans. But in the end, the long road ahead for our national security and economic security begins with this first step. We should grant PNTR and continue to engage China.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, the decision on whether or not we should grant normal trade status to China is always a difficult one. In 1995 and 1996, I supported renewing trade with China because there were indications that the Chinese were moving in the right direction toward a more open free society. However, abiding concerns about human rights, religious persecution, proliferation of advanced missile technology, and saber rattling toward Taiwan and China's other neighbors led me to vote against granting normal trade status to China during the last three years.

This year, however, the debate over granting normal trade relations with China is different. We face a momentous decision about the future of jobs in the United States and specifically greater employment prospects for men and women living in Georgia's Eighth Congressional district. The administration negotiated a one way agreement with China that mandates significant reductions in tariffs as a part of China's entry into the World Trade Organization as well as includes import safeguards for sensitive industries like textiles. In 1998, Georgia exported over \$338 million worth of goods and services to China. China has an estimated \$750 billion in infrastructure needs over the next ten years. Companies and industries located here in middle and south Georgia are well positioned to take advantage of this auspicious opportunity. Thousands of Georgia's workers at companies such as Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corporation in Macon, Rayonier in Baxley, Barnesville, and Lumber City, Hudson Pecan Company in Ocilla, International Paper in Folkston, BP Amoco in Hazlehurst and Nashville, Blue Bird Body Corporation in Fort Valley, and CSX Corporation in Waycross all support increased trade with China.

I continue to be concerned with a number of issues related to China. But today we must decide whether or not we will close the door to expanded markets for products made in Georgia, alienate the most populous nation in the world, and lose a genuine opportunity to build a dialogue with China and spread American values of freedom, democracy, and market economics consequently improving the lives of 1.6 billion people. We should condemn China's brutal repression against its citizens and continue to vigilantly monitor human rights abuses. We will ensure that our military and intelligence capabilities are strong and robust enough to meet the challenges of any Chinese aggression. We must pry open the Chinese market and tear down pernicious trade barriers that block American goods and services and restrain prosperity.

We cannot change Chinese civilization overnight. But turning our back on China now and

limiting our opportunities for improving our relationship with the Chinese is not the answer either. Rejecting trade with China only frustrates efforts by American businesses to expand their worldwide sales and create jobs here at home.

We must continue to be concerned about human rights and labor issues in China. We will now have a forum like we have never had to dialogue on these issues.

For the agricultural community, the benefits of trade with China are enormous. Chinese tariffs on pecans will be reduced 35 percent, tobacco 40 percent, and textiles 13.7 percent. For the manufacturing community, the job security and job creation potential are great. Tariffs on wood products will be slashed 64 percent, agriculture equipment 50 percent, and aluminum 33 percent. In fact, most every agricultural and manufacturing group or company in the state of Georgia supports expanding trade relations with China.

Granting China normal trade relations will be beneficial to our district and the state. But more importantly, building better friendships with the Chinese people, teaching them about the value of open, democratic, and free societies, and bringing China into the legal, cultural, and economic community of nations will create a better world for the next generation.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will vote against this bill. Deciding how to vote on this has not been easy, and I want to explain how I've arrived at my decision.

I began by reviewing the developments that led to the decision we are asked to make today.

In November 1999, after nearly 14 years of negotiations, the U.S. and China reached a bilateral agreement covering market access issues with China, taking the first step to China's admission to the World Trade Organization (WTO).

For the U.S. to benefit from China's accession to the WTO, Congress must first grant unconditional and permanent NTR to China. This means we would no longer have the annual opportunity to review China's record on human and worker rights, which Congress has done since the passage of the Trade Act in 1974. The Trade Act includes an amendment that denies NTR for China, which congress has voted to waive since 1980. I think this has been an important exercise that has enabled Congress to regularly review China's progress in human and worker rights. Some argue that this "sword of Damocles" that we hang annually over the heads of the Chinese isn't putting a stop to human rights violations. But we should ask what might have happened if we hadn't exercised this leverage. Human rights organizations and dissidents tell me that as the vote approaches every year in Congress, the situation in China becomes a little less grim. To me, that indicates that the annual review of Congress continues to be important.

The agreement negotiated last November would require China to open its markets widely and deeply, and would provide new trade and investment opportunities for U.S. businesses. But there remain unanswered questions about the economic consequences of the agreement and whether the immediate benefits to U.S. producers will be as great as some have claimed. For instance, it is unclear whether the agreement will improve our increasing trade imbalance with China, a deficit valued annually at \$69 billion. It is unclear

whether most of the benefits of the agreement will be realized by U.S. companies that invest directly in China and use China primarily as an export platform, or whether there will be an increase in imports of U.S.-made goods to China. It also remains unclear on what terms the U.S. and China would trade in the absence of the WTO agreement—some analysts maintain that the 1979 U.S.-bilateral treaty would allow the U.S. to benefit from some, if not all, of the provisions in the WTO agreement, even if the agreement itself doesn't go into effect.

So, I have questions about the details and effects of the trade agreement.

But my misgivings about granting permanent NTR status to China don't revolve around questions of the benefits of trade as much as about the question of who will benefit. We hear from free trade advocates that permanent NTR will be good for the people of China. There's an underlying assumption here that free trade invariably leads to development and democracy. Markets do produce change, but not necessarily "development" in a positive sense. Markets without law produce the kind of capitalism we see in Russia, and markets without democracy produce an Indonesian-style economic disaster. I agree that open markets and more porous borders have helped lift up the lives of people in many countries of the world. But I am also alarmed about the growing economic inequality within and between countries. Unless free trade is also fair trade, we risk lifting up the few to the detriment of the many. Economic openness accompanied by tighter restrictions on basic freedoms. Even now, China claims its action in arresting and imprisoning pro-democracy activists and Falun Gong followers are done in the name of the "rule of law."

Fortunately, the vote on permanent NTR is not a vote on whether to isolate China from the rest of the world. The forces of globalization have already changed China and connected it to the world in ways even China's leadership can't control. Even now, China receives far more foreign direct investment than any other developing country. Trade, investment, and reform will continue whether or not the U.S. grants China permanent NTR. And this doesn't mean that the U.S. would necessarily be left out of the mix. Despite threats to impose stiff tariffs on U.S. firms doing business in China if permanent NTR does not pass, China's paramount concern right now is its economy and finding ways to bring it into the 21st century. If China is determined to find this path, it is doubtful that it would choose to neglect the very country that consumes 40 percent of its exports.

After careful consideration, I have decided I cannot support permanent NTR for China at this time. There are five main reasons why.

First, if there is any constant in China's behavior, it is that China does not do what it says it will do, especially as regards trade. In my view, a WTO agreement can advance economic reform in China only if it is enforced. The WTO was founded on the assumption that its members respect international laws. But China has violated all four bilateral trade agreements that it has entered with the U.S. since 1992. Already, some of China's ministries have moved to protect themselves against the effect of WTO membership. It seems to me that if we can expect massive violations from China based on its record of

noncompliance with existing trade agreements, we should be concerned that the WTO multilateral dispute mechanisms—already cumbersome—are not constructed to handle this kind of load.

Second is the concern I touched on earlier about the importance of the leverage provided by the annual NTR review. China's record of violating its citizens' fundamental human rights of freedom of speech, religion and association will be harder, not easier, to challenge if Congress grants PNTR.

Third, I have many concerns about labor the environmental standards that the November 1999 agreement does not take into account. If we don't insist now—before we grant permanent NTR—that China commit to making progress in these areas, what could be our best chance for these reforms will be closed off.

Fourth, there is important symbolism to consider. Granting China permanent NTR would send a powerful message to Asia's genuine fledgling democracies—Thailand, the Philippines, Korea, and Indonesia, where workers have the right to organize—that they no longer have to abide by internationally recognized human and labor rights. Granting China permanent NTR would also send a troubling message that although we hold other countries accountable through sanctions for arms sales, threats to neighboring democracies, or human rights abuses, we are not willing to do the same for China. While I am not advocating sanctions for China, neither do I believe we should turn a blind eye to China's human rights abuses by granting permanent NTR.

This leads me to my fifth reason, which to me is the most important. China has racked up a dismal human rights record year after year, despite signing two UN covenants on human rights prior to President Clinton's trip to Beijing in 1998. In fact, according to recent reports by the State Department, Human Rights Watch, and other organizations, the situation has deteriorated markedly since late 1998. Even now at the current meeting of the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva, China is fighting a U.S. effort to censure Beijing for its worsening human rights record. In the name of "social stability," China has effectively banned opposition political parties, further constrained free association and religious expression, sped up the pace of arrests and executions of activists, and interfered with the free flow of information through restrictions on the Internet. This is all in addition to extrajudicial killings, torture and mistreatment of prisoners, forced confessions, arbitrary arrest and detention, and denial of due process. Just recently, a constituent of mine in Westminster asked for help in getting his Chinese parents released from a jail in Hubei Province, where they are being detained for their Falun Gong practice. We've done what we can, but as far as I know, they're still there.

Before we grant PNTR, we should insist that China ratify and live up to the two UN human rights treaties it has already signed. We should ask that it take steps to begin dismantling its "reeducation through labor" system, which allows officials to sentence citizens to labor camps for up to three years without judicial review. We should insist that China change its repressive policies regarding the Tibetan people and open Tibet to regular access by UN human rights and humanitarian agencies and foreign journalists. If we don't insist

now—before we grant permanent NTR—that China live up to agreements it has signed and that it adhere to international standards of human rights, China will have no incentive to move in this direction.

Some have suggested that the "brave" position to take is to vote to grant normal trade relations to China. I disagree. For me it is far more difficult to cast a vote that some might say would close the door on a developing country and its billion citizens, all of whom deserve the benefits that truly free trade can bring. On the contrary, I'll be the first to welcome China if—as it opens its markets—it also will open its prisons; lift restrictions on speech, association, and religious expression; protect the rights of its workers; and respect its environment.

I don't believe we can or should ignore China. To do so would risk ignoring important economic opportunities and strategic and security considerations. I believe we should encourage China's economic modernization, but we should also encourage China to take the leap into the 21st century in more than just economic ways.

The question is not whether to engage China, it is how and on whose terms. I was encouraged by the efforts of Representative LEVIN and Representative BEREUTER to seek a way in which to maintain pressure on China to improve its record on human rights, compliance with core labor standards, and development of the rule of law. That is why I voted for the rule, which added the Levin-Bereuter provisions to the bill. These provisions still don't go far enough—given that they have no power of enforcement—to allow me to change my position. But I believe they reflect the right spirit, a spirit that is about trying actively to shape globalization, not passively closing our doors. Although I cannot support permanent NTR today, I remain committed to this activist course.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, granting China Permanent Normal Trade Relations status is unwise, unprincipled, and counterproductive.

American multi-national corporations are realistic enough to understand that most of them will never sell anything in China. They will create production platforms taking advantage of cheap labor and non-existent health, safety, and environmental regulations to replace American men and women who work for a living wage in the United States.

In our economic relations with China, it is we who have the leverage, not the Chinese. They have a \$70 billion trade surplus with the United States—and this surplus is vital for their military armament plans and their economic progress. We have all the cards but pretend to be impotent.

Mr. Speaker, fig leaves have a noble function in Greek sculpture—they conceal valuable and at times indispensable parts. The "Commission" proposed in this legislation gives a bad name to fig leaves. We have governmental and private studies overflowing our desks, all proving the outrageous human rights abuses, violations of religious freedom, and the denial of political discourse that permeate China. No one in his or her right mind believes for a moment that yet another commission will have any impact on the dictatorial regime in Beijing.

China's victory in this struggle today, however, will be carefully studied and imitated by the new KGB-trained President of Russia. Our

ability to advocate pluralism, religious freedom, and political liberties in Russia will be profoundly crippled by the hypocrisy of this debate today. President Putin will have no trouble learning the lesson that what we really care about is stability and investment opportunities. All the rhetoric about liberty, freedom of the press, and religious freedom is just that—sheer rhetoric with no substance.

Mr. Speaker, China already has Normal Trade Relations with the United States. This measure on which we are voting today merely protects this repulsive regime from an annual debate in the Congress, which over the past decade has pointed out China's serious shortcomings. Now the government in Beijing will have a free ride.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, after considering the arguments for and against PNTR, I have concluded that rejecting it would be a serious mistake and passing it would benefit Georgia's and our area's economy.

China will soon enter the World Trade Organization (WTO), which oversees the rules of international commerce. The United States is already a member. WTO rules say that members must grant one another "unconditional" low-tariff access to their markets. The current process of annual votes by Congress on China trade amounts to a "condition." Hence, the U.S. would be out of compliance with WTO rules if PNTR was not passed.

To gain entry into the WTO, China has agreed to open markets that have long been closed, such as agriculture, services, technology, telecommunications, and manufactured goods, and will drop or greatly reduce tariffs. The U.S. has already opened our markets. U.S. exports to China have tripled over the past decade. But China's exports to the U.S. are seven times greater. That deficit should drop with an expansion of U.S. goods and services under PNTR and WTO.

Unfortunately, China will only give these market-opening benefits to countries that give Chinese products "unconditional" access. So, if we fail to give China PNTR, they will shut U.S. companies out of huge business opportunities in a fast-growing economy of 1.2 billion people. That would impact jobs in our area greatly, according to Governor Roy Barnes, Agriculture Commissioner Tommy Irvin, the 342,000-members of the Georgia Farm Bureau, Proctor and Gamble, Merck Pharmaceutical, Miller Brewing, Phillip Morris, Kraft Foods, Georgia Pacific, Weyerhaeuer, Ayres Aircraft, Carter Manufacturing, Griffin Chemical, Coca-Cola, Bell South, Georgia Power, AT&T, Cargill, Tyson Foods, Gold Kist, American Cotton Shippers, Synovus Financial, AFLAC, UPS, Tobacco Association of the United States, Brown and Williamson, and countless others.

Too many people associated with these area businesses would lose. We just can't afford NOT to grant PNTR.

Some, including myself, have expressed deeply-felt and well-reasoned concerns about PNTR. Some, including veterans groups, have questioned whether it might compromise our national security. Some farmers and business entrepreneurs feel China's proclivity for cheating might put the U.S. at an export disadvantage. Others express concern about rewarding a country like China with a horrible record of political suppression, religious persecution, and unfair and inhumane labor practices. I share all of these concerns.

Upon close analysis, however, I believe that failure to pass PNTR would have even worse consequences. Our national security would be endangered because rejection of PNTR would send a clear message that we view China as an adversary. The Chinese are modernizing a military that has more manpower than any country on earth, and only because of our current engagement policy have they agreed to stop transferring anti-ship cruise missiles to Iran and other rogue nations for cash. If they view us as an adversary, rather than a trading partner, they will continue to transfer weapons of mass destruction and endanger our national security.

Moreover, if we are seen as an adversary to China, our bilateral relations with other Asian countries such as Singapore, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Taiwan, and even Japan would be affected. These countries would have to align themselves with China, their strong neighbor, or the U.S. on the other side of the world. Taiwan President-elect Chen shui-Bian supports PNTR because he says it would promote greater cooperation between mainland China and the free world as well as contribute to peace and stability.

As for human rights, labor and environmental issues, it is clear the U.S. cannot exert influence if it is disengaged. Although the effectiveness of the oversight measures in the PNTR package is disputed, the measures do, in fact, make workable mechanisms available to the U.S. to take retaliatory action against any breakdown in our expectations of China. With the passage of PNTR, China will have the opportunity to prove to the world its ability to greatly improve its record. In turn, the U.S. and other WTO nations, will have the opportunity to hold China more accountable.

My vote for PNTR is a vote to open markets in China's in order to promote jobs in Georgia, and for a safer world.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, China has a continuing legacy of human rights violations and oppression which cannot be ignored. Year after year we have been told, "Give most-favored-nation status to China and their government will be forced to reform." We heard that during the Bush years. We hear it during the Clinton years.

Let us look at the score card a little bit.

We gave most-favored-nation status and they continue their policy of population planning with forced abortion.

We gave most-favored-nation status and they continue not to tolerate any dissent of any kind; the imprisonments, the torture, and the killings go on.

It was reported in the beginning of May that Chinese police cut off a villager's tongue after he was detained for writing anti-corruption slogans on a communist party office building.

We gave most-favored-nation status and they continue to try to stamp out any religion that is not state-supported religion.

"In February, the family of 60-year-old Chen Zixiu, a Falun Gong follower, were asked to collect her body from a police station in Shandong province where she had been detained for four days. Her body was covered with bruises, her teeth were broken and there was blood coming out of her ears. She was arrested on suspicion of planning to go to Beijing to petition the authorities against the banning of the Falun Gong."

We gave most-favored-nation status and their policy of cultural genocide in Tibet continues.

"The International Campaign for Tibet reports that more than 1,000 monks and nuns were expelled from their monasteries and nunneries in 1999, bringing to more than 11,000 the number of monks and nuns turned out of their monasteries since the beginning of the 'Strike Hard' campaign in 1996."

We gave most-favored-nation status and they sell nuclear and missile technology to some of our worst enemies.

"In addition, Beijing is aggressively developing strategic ties with Burma, North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Pakistan."

We gave most-favored-nation status and they make plans to invade Taiwan.

"An internal document prepared by China's Central Military Commission and published in the Western press states that the United States will 'pay a high price' if it intervenes in any China-Taiwan military conflict."

We gave most-favored-nation status to them, and they have the biggest buildup of nuclear missile development of any country on the face of the earth.

PNTR supporters say access to China's huge market will increase U.S. businesses exports and create extra jobs in America. As it is, we have a 70 billion dollar trade deficit with China and most proponents of the agreement admit our deficit will continue to grow.

"In all likelihood there will be no great improvement in the trade balance. . . . And there will be no net extra jobs."—National Journal.

The United States should not sell out for the promise of an extra buck. . . . a promise that will not be kept even if PNTR is passed.

If you have a rabid dog in your backyard, you don't welcome him into your home.

Vote "no" on PNTR with China.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of normal trading relations with China.

Trying to determine what course will be the best for the United States and for the people of China in the long run is not easy. No one has a crystal ball. However, I believe that is in the best interests of the United States and of the people of China to have more contact with and interaction rather than less.

First of all, trade with China directly affects hard-working Americans in my district. For example, more than one-third of our agricultural production is exported, and China is the largest potential overseas market for our cotton, beef, and other products.

Secondly, we cannot afford to forget that China has more people than any other country in the world; it has the world's largest economy after ours; and it has a strong military with missiles and nuclear warheads which can reach the United States. While Chinese leaders have done a number of things with which we do not agree, we should not ignore or cut off contact with a country that will inevitably play an increasingly important role in world affairs.

Finally, I believe that continuing trade with China is in the best interests of the people of China. They have more freedom today, than they ever had since the Communists took control in 1949. The areas where people have the greatest freedom are those areas with the most contact with the outside world. We should not hesitate to speak out strongly for the values we hold dear, such as freedom of religion. But we will not help the people of China to obtain that freedom by cutting back on our trade, contacts, and influence there.

For these reasons I will vote for normal trade relations with China and continue to work for the national security interests and values of the United States.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Congress takes an historic step today in considering legislation to grant normal trade relations to China. We do this to position our workers, firms, and farmers to take maximum advantage of the vast opportunities offered as a result of China's decision to join the WTO.

Just as importantly, we do this to reinforce the reformers in China who look in our direction and at our success, as they attempt to move the Chinese economy out from under the iron grip of Communism and stranglehold of state control. China's decision to adopt the WTO system of fair trade rules is a choice to impose the discipline of market-based principles throughout a vast country of 1.2 billion people. In my estimation, the revolutionary change WTO rules will bring to the Chinese economy dwarfs any other avenue of influence available to the U.S.

The trade agreement with China and this vote to normalize trade relations between our two countries have been hard fought and long awaited. For fourteen years, through Democrat and Republican Administrations, this body insisted that we would not take an empty trade deal with China. At last we have succeeded in obtaining a great win for Americans. In addition to the commercial benefits, this bill turns our relationship with China in a positive direction. By reinforcing the efforts of Chinese citizens fighting for change, we magnify our chances of maintaining peace, stability and security in Asia.

In bringing China into the WTO, we will obtain access to the WTO dispute settlement mechanism to systematically tear down barriers, if China chooses to be recalcitrant in any area. With a WTO finding on our side, and the collective judgment of 135 countries against China, we multiply ten-fold our leverage to bring China into compliance with the rules of fair trade. In the event China chooses to flaunt a WTO finding against it, we would have the ready option of imposing WTO-legal trade sanctions.

I expect this new approach to solving trade disputes with China to be many times more effective than our current method of threatening unilateral trade sanctions under Section 301.

Over the past 21 years, China has sought to reform its economy, encouraging the growth of the private sector. Since 1979, China's government policy toward the private sector has evolved from prohibition, to toleration, to active encouragement. The number of private sector employees (i.e. those working for a privately owned Chinese company or self-employed) rose from 4.5 million in 1985 to an estimated 81.3 million in 1999. Accounting for over half of China's economic output, the private sector in China has become a major force in the country's economic development.

China's membership in the WTO will require it to privatize a substantial portion of its economy, not only to conform to the WTO, but also to be able to compete internationally. Reduced government control over the economy will enhance living standards and economic freedom for the average Chinese citizen.

The growth of the private sector in China, which WTO membership will further encourage, has allowed many more Chinese citizens

to choose their employment, education, housing and recreation free from state control. According to CRS, privatization "has reduced the pervasiveness of the work unit as a means of social control".

We know that U.S. foreign investment exposes Chinese workers and managers to such principles as merit-based pay and promotion, individual rights and privacy, ethical business practices, transparency of business and payroll transactions, and free access to more information. Internet usages and the consequent flow of information into China are surging. Motorola, my own corporate constituent, provides wireless communications equipment that enables Chinese citizens to gain access to, and utilize affordable communications services.

Motorola directly promotes the exchange of ideas by sending hundreds of Chinese employees to its U.S. facilities each year to attend technology, engineering, and management seminars. In a country where only 10–15% of the people have access to a college education, this is precious training that allows for eye-opening exposure to the American way of life.

In 1998, Motorola established the Center for Enterprise Excellence (CEE) to provide training for management of China's ailing state-owned enterprises. As of June 1999, 500 executives and engineers of 75 state-owned enterprises from 15 provinces had received training. Motorola also provides scholarships to 8 universities in China—with money disbursed to approximately 1,000 students and 100 teachers every year.

Caterpillar has also worked with Illinois State University (ISU) to establish a learning center in Beijing.

Motorola pioneered a company-subsidized Employee Home Ownership Program in China. The program provides for an additional 20% of each employee's salary to be paid into a special housing fund. The money can be withdrawn and used to buy or rent a house or apartment, or to renovate an existing home.

U.S. companies export U.S. concepts of volunteerism, charitable giving, and community activism. For example, Motorola has contributed approximately \$1.5 million to China's Project Hope—which focuses on providing funds and mobilizing non-governmental resources to support elementary school education in the poorest rural districts in China. Through these donations, Project Hope has built 24 primary schools and financed education for more than 6,700 children.

In short, a vote for normal trade relations, which will allow these types of exchanges to continue, is a vote for bringing American values and ideals much closer to average Chinese citizens.

I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 4444.

[From the Daily Herald, May 23, 2000]

#### THE CASE FOR CHINA TRADE

Like it or not, China is a growing economic and military force with whom Washington must deal over time.

U.S. business interest are urging Congress to permanently normalize trade relations with China in a vote this week. That would drive China's tariffs down and further open the vast Asian nation to a wide range of American products.

American labor, by contrast, is lobbying hard for Congress to reject Permanent Normal Trade Relations. Unions argue that jobs would flow away from Americans and to poorly paid and highly exploited Chinese workers.

That many Chinese workers toil under miserable conditions is beyond dispute. But the hard reality is that their lives will not improve by Congress rejecting normalized trade with China.

China is going to be admitted to the World Trade Organization whether Congress OKs permanent normal trade relations or not. European nations have already built their own trade bridges while China. Congressional rejection of permanent trade status for China would merely guarantee that European and Pacific Rim nations would benefit from China's reduced tariffs and do so without competition from U.S. business. Illinois farmers and suburban companies such as Motorola would miss an opportunity that would carry direct and ripple benefits for thousands of workers here.

That's the economic side of the story. The political side is that Congress, by turning down permanent trade status, would introduce new tensions into U.S.-Chinese relations that would serve no positive purpose for the United States or China's citizens.

Like it or not, China is a growing economic and military force with whom Washington must deal over time. Those dealings are often frustrated, given China's oppression of its citizens, aggressive stance toward Taiwan, ambitious weapons acquisition and resistance to granting political liberty even as it experiments with limited economic freedom.

But to nurture a long-term relationship with Cuba is nonetheless in the best interests of the United States, and such a relationship can be better built and sustained between two countries that are cooperating—not battling—over commerce.

China's leaders make it difficult for Washington to work with Beijing even when doing so is in America's better interests. That was true when Richard Nixon traveled to China and when the U.S. agreed to China's admission to the United Nations. It remains true today, when a vote for permanent trade status is a tough vote but the correct vote nonetheless.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, we are making a critical decision today on whether to grant permanent normal trade relations to China. This is not an easy decision. Before casting my vote, I considered the advice and counsel of my constituents and experts in the field. And, after weighing the complexity of the PNTR issue and the long-term implications of this vote, I have decided to vote against granting permanent normal trade relations to China.

While this bill would have an important economic impact, it fails to honor American values regarding human rights, labor protections and the environment.

Free and fair trade makes sense for America. If given a level playing field, American companies and workers can compete with any other in the international marketplace. Indeed, to a great degree, globalization and free trade have helped to sustain this country's record prosperity and economic expansion over the past decade.

Yet, free trade alone, without consideration for human rights, basic labor standards, and environmental protection will only encourage a race to the bottom.

For over a decade, I have been troubled by the message our China policy has sent to the Chinese people, to our citizens and to the rest of the world. Despite egregious human rights violations, China's export of weapons of mass destruction around the world, repeated crackdowns on religious freedom and its continued occupation of Tibet, we have refused to estab-

lish a bottom line in our relationship with China.

Regardless of the policies pursued by the Chinese regime, we continue to send a message that economic interests override our concerns regarding abuses of human rights, labor standards and the environment.

Just as our trade policy with Japan and Europe has evolved throughout the years to give priority to issues such as market access and intellectual property rights, we need to ensure that basic labor and environmental standards and respect for human rights be given similar weight at the negotiating table.

There are some who have argued that increased contact with China will improve the country's dismal record on these issues, especially through the use of information technology and the Internet.

While I agree that the Internet has promoted the spread of information, our recent history with China has shown that increased economic engagement will not necessarily lead the country down a path to democratic reform.

Indeed, we have stood by and watched a systematic deterioration in China's respect for labor, the environment and human rights, including most recently, a series of violent crackdowns on members of the Falun Gong movement.

It is crucial that we continue to engage China out of concern for our own national security interests as well as the interests of China's democratic development. For that reason, I'm pleased that the legislation before the House today contains a bill I introduced authorizing commercial and labor rule of law assistance to China.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is not just about granting permanent normal trade relations to the People's Republic of China—it's about sending a message to the world that is consistent with the values that have made our nation great. Until such an agreement is before us, I am left with no choice but to vote no.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to granting permanent normal trade relations to China and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Our nation continues to experience unprecedented economic growth. A major factor in that growth is the expansion of international trade and the increased global competitiveness of U.S. businesses.

Expanding export opportunities is especially important in the Northeast where the economy is still transitioning into a high-tech economy. The economic base of the manufacturing, jewelry, and textile industries has been slow to adapt to the global economy. Increasing export opportunities for these sectors is critical to foster our continued economic growth.

It is possible to enter into trade agreements that will result in higher wages, cleaner air, and greater consumer safeguards. However, because we cannot look into a crystal ball to find out how a trade agreement will turn out, we must address environmental and consumer safeguards and worker rights at the outset. Additionally, in today's high-tech world, agreements should also contain provisions that protect intellectual property and allow equitable market access for all trading partners. Unfortunately, there are many countries that do not provide adequate market access, protect intellectual property, take steps to preserve the environment, respect internationally accepted worker rights, or have adequate measures in place to ensure consumer safety.

In an effort to expand opportunities, I strongly support export assistance programs such as the Export-Import Bank (EX-IM) and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC). Together these two institutions provide critical financial assistance to American businesses seeking to expand their business into foreign countries. By providing insurance, loans, and loan guarantees, EX-IM and OPIC ensure that U.S. businesses are able to compete in markets that are often unstable and where foreign companies are subsidized by governments.

Additionally, as a member of the House Banking and Financial Services Committee, I am addressing the impact of trade on international financial markets. In particular, we have had to consider several financial crises in the last two years. Financial problems in Asia, South America, and Russia have led to other trade problems, most notably the dumping of foreign products into the U.S. marketplace. In an effort to mitigate the impact of the financial crisis, I have supported an increase in U.S. payments to the International Monetary Fund (IMF). This funding helped to replenish the IMF's resources depleted by the financial crises in Asia, Mexico and Russia and to prevent the meltdown in the world economy from striking the United States.

There continues to be substantial debate about the progress that China has made on worker and human rights, market accesses, and protecting intellectual property. In fact, the U.S. government continues to express its concerns regarding these issues, as indicated in the 1998 Annual Report on Human Rights and the 1999 Trade Policy Agenda and 1998 Annual Report of the President of the United States on the Trade Agreements Program.

Exports from the United States to China are far outweighed by goods imported to consumers in our country by China. According to the Library of Congress, our trade deficit with the Chinese was nearly \$57 billion in 1998 and, as our country's fourth largest trading partner, China is poised to exceed our trade deficit with Japan within a few years. High tariffs, in some cases in excess of 100%, restrictions on distribution, restrictions on investment, and non-tariff barriers including quotas remain substantial impediments to market access for U.S. companies. In my opinion, this trade imbalance is troublesome and we must signal our intention to China that the playing field for American businesses must be leveled.

By opposing this bill we send a message to China that improvements regarding human and worker rights, our growing trade deficit, intellectual property protections, and child labor must be made before permanent normal trade relations, and child labor must be made before permanent normal trade relations is granted.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose PNTR for China.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill to provide for normal trade relations with China on a permanent basis, otherwise known as PNTR. I will focus my remarks on the potential benefits of this market opening agreement for U.S. farmers and ranchers. I believe those benefits will be significant, and I am in good company in that belief. Nine Secretaries of Agriculture who have served since John F. Kennedy support PNTR for China. But like my colleagues, my decision is much more broadly based. I believe that United States engagement with China will help persuade the

Chinese to play by the rules in agricultural trade, and cause China to improve its record on human rights, labor, and environmental issues. And I am in good company in this belief as well—Billy Graham; former President Jimmy Carter; Martin Lee (champion of Democracy in Hong Kong); Dai-Ching (Chinese investigative journalist and environmentalist); all agree that the best way to improve China's performance on human rights and the environment is to engage China.

BENEFITS FOR AGRICULTURE  
CHINA'S NEED

I have heard the argument that China, with 21 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of the world's arable land, doesn't need U.S. agricultural products. Some have stated that between 1992–1998, China exported about \$4 billion more in agricultural products than it imported in each of those years. But this does not reflect the significant agricultural imports that enter China “off the books” through Hong Kong. If we look at agricultural trade for China and Hong Kong for the 1992–1998 period, we get a clearer picture of the full potential of the Chinese market. According to the U.N. Trade Database, China and Hong Kong annually imported about \$5.5 billion more in agricultural products than they exported. If you include fish and forestry, China and Hong Kong's net annual deficit in agricultural imports was even larger—\$6.9 billion. And these numbers do not reflect the predicted growth of China's middle class, and its increased demand for meat and other agricultural products. USDA's Economic Research Service [ERS] and private United States agricultural commodity groups believe that China will continue to be a major market for United States agricultural products, and that China's accession to the WTO will expand that market.

SUMMARY OF CHINA'S WTO AGREEMENT

With regard to the agricultural products that U.S. producer groups identified as priority items, the average tariff will fall from 31 percent to 14 percent. This means that these United States agricultural products will face less than half the tariff they currently face in the Chinese market. China has agreed to end import bans and its discriminatory licensing system for bulk commodities, including wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and soybean oil. China has also agreed to establish a WTO consistent tariff-rate quota [TRQ] system with in-quota tariffs of 1–3 percent. Specific rules for the administration of these TRQs, and a percentage of trade reserved for non-state trade, will help to ensure the quotas get filled, and will increase demand for U.S. agricultural products. All of this ensures an initial minimum level of access for wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and soybean products—that will increase as the agreement is fully implemented.

China's commitment on export subsidies means that United States exports of corn, cotton, and rice will not compete with subsidies from the Chinese government in third country markets, such as South Korea, Malaysia, and Indonesia. China's commitment to cap and reduce domestic subsidies will reduce incentives to overproduce. China's commitment to provide greater transparency with regard to its domestic subsidies will increase predictability with regard to China's agricultural production. China has also agreed to abide by the WTO agreement on Sanitary and Phyto-sanitary regulation, and has already implemented rule

changes that have allowed imports of United States citrus, wheat, and meat. China has also agreed that the United States may continue to use its anti-dumping methodology for 15 years, and has agreed to an additional “product-specific” 12-year safeguard provision. Together, these provisions give U.S. producers a level of protection above and beyond that provided for under normal WTO rules.

Finally, China has agreed to allow any entity to import most products into any part of the country within 3 years of accession, and to liberalize distribution services for agricultural products. This means United States companies will be allowed to market their products in China. Let's look at the potential of this agreement for some specific commodities. For cotton, China committed to a tariff-rate quota of 743,000 tons for cotton in 2000, increasing to 894,000 in 2004. The within-quota duty would be 4 percent and the over-quota duty would decline from 69 percent in 2000 to 40 percent by 2004. Nonstate trade companies get  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the quota, which means we help avoid the problem we have sometimes had in the past with quotas going unfilled. USDA's Economic Research Service [ERS] projects that if China did not join the WTO, it would import cotton worth \$565 million in 2005.

If China does join, ERS projects that its cotton imports would increase to \$924 million by 2005. That's why National Cotton Council President Ronald Rayner congratulated U.S. negotiators on the agricultural agreement, stating that it will “benefit the U.S. cotton industry with greater access to the Chinese market and a promise of less subsidization by the Chinese”. For corn, China committed to establish a 4.5 million ton tariff rate quota in 2000, rising to 7.2 million by 2004. Within quota imports would be subject to a 1 percent duty, and over-quota duties would be 77 percent in 2000, dropping to 65 percent by 2004. Nonstate trade companies get  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the quota in 2000 rising to 40 percent by 2004. ERS projects that China's net imports of corn in 2005 will increase by \$587 million, if it joins the WTO. United States exports to China have averaged about 47 million bushels over the past 5 years. The National Corn Growers Association states that “we have an opportunity to triple that average if, when China joins the WTO, the United States is prepared to grant China permanent normal trade relations.” The Corn Growers add: “China's impressive growth in national income is projected to lead to increased consumption of food and fiber. At the same time, growing resource constraints on agricultural production are making China increasingly reliant on trade.”

For wheat, China committed to a tariff-rate quota of 7.3 million tons in 2000, rising to 9.64 million in 2004. In quota duty would be 1 percent and out of quota duty would be 77 percent in 2000, falling to 65 percent by 2004. Nonstate trade companies get 10 percent. ERS projects that China's net imports of wheat in 2005 will increase from \$231 million to \$773 million, if it joins the WTO. What does the National Association of Wheat Growers say?: “The United States market is currently open to China; this agreement serves to open the Chinese market to American products and services. This agreement will give United States wheat producers a far greater sales opportunity to a country with 1.2 billion consumers, with a potential 10 percent increase in total annual United States wheat exports.”

For soybean products, China has agreed to a tariff rate quota of 1.72 million tons of soy oil in 2000, rising to 3.26 million in 2005. The in-quota duty is 9 percent and over-quota duty is 74 percent in 2000, falling to 9 percent in 2006. Nonstate traders get half the quota in 2000 and 90 percent by 2005.

ERS projects that China's net imports of soybean products in 2005 will increase by \$180 million, if it joins the WTO. Here's what the American Soybean Association has to say: "ASA strongly supports WTO membership for China, and urges Congress to extend permanent NTR status to China."

#### CONCLUSION

Overall, the Economic Research Service concludes that China's implementation of its WTO obligations between 2000 and 2004 will add \$2 billion to the bottom line for United States farmers and ranchers in 2005. And ERS is not alone in its view. According to Worldwatch's Lester Brown, China's water supplies in its grain-producing areas are falling at a high rate. Brown sees massive grain imports and growing dependence on U.S. grain. A report dated May 23, 2000 from Kyodo News International confirms Brown's story, stating "A severe drought in northern and eastern China threatens millions of hectares of crops and is causing widespread drinking water shortages." The total area affected is about 31 million acres. The Farm Bureau also expects great benefits from China's accession to the WTO: "U.S. exports to the Asian region as a whole are expected to increase in the next few years as a result of China's accession into the WTO. This is likely to occur as Chinese consumption levels increase, domestic production patterns skew more to global prices, China ceases to employ export subsidies, and there is a commensurate decline in Chinese agricultural exports to the Asian region. While this agreement may be with China, it will have impacts far beyond Chinese borders." To put ERS numbers on China into context, I will mention another number, and that is the amount farmers and ranchers lost in 1996 due to various U.S. economic sanctions placed on countries around the world.

According to the ERS, we lost half a billion dollars in 1996 due to those sanctions. But that is less than a fourth of the \$2 billion ERS says we will lose in 2005 if we do not grant China permanent normal trade relations. All six of the countries currently under sanctions (Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Sudan, and North Korea) together import only \$7.7 billion in agricultural products each year. That's about half of the \$14 billion worth of agricultural products China imports annually. Fortunately, we are moving in the right direction in our policy on sanctions, and the administration's changes last year have allowed sales of corn to Iran and wheat to Libya. Let's move forward on China too, and stop giving away agricultural markets to our competitors. And let's do so just because this is a good deal for farmers and ranchers. Let's think about what the Billy Graham Center has to say about permanent normal trade relations with China. And, by the way, they are the ones who coordinate services for more than a hundred Christian organizations involved in service in China. They say that denial of PNTR will "seriously hamper the efforts of Christians from outside China who have spent years seeking to establish an effective Christian witness among the Chinese people". I urge your support for permanent normal trade relations with China.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, today, we will make a crucial decision about our place in the global economy. The question of voting for permanent normal trade relations with China is easily answered in economic, social and political terms. Formalizing a freer trading relationship with China will help American employees and employers alike. For China, PNTR will promote democracy, a better standard of living, and ultimately improve human rights. The vote on PNTR is a necessary step toward China's full membership into the World Trade Organization [WTO]. Members of the WTO agree to be governed by a set of rules allowing for a relatively open trading relationship among them.

For China to complete its accession to the WTO, it will have to change many of its laws, institutions and policies to make them conform with international trade rules. China must complete negotiations with the WTO, and separately with its various trading partners within the WTO, including the United States. China is the world's third largest economy after the United States and Japan, and the largest not a member of the WTO. It has the world's 10th largest trade economy. If we fail to pass PNTR, our economic competitors in Europe and Japan will have greater access to this huge and still-growing Chinese market—while our own access will still be blocked. American business can compete anywhere in the world and win—if it is given a relatively level playing field. The bilateral agreement signed in November 1999 forces China to remove protectionist barriers to its markets, while protecting import-sensitive American industry from a flood of new Chinese imports.

The United States has made no significant concessions to China, because we already have few barriers to our market. The agreement gives our business equal access to the Chinese market. The American export sector—which already accounts for 11 million jobs—will be strengthened further. According to most experts, China is on the verge of huge infrastructure expenditures over the next few years as it attempts to catch up with Europe, Japan, and the United States. Most of these projects will be contracted to Western firms. This could be a boon to southwestern Connecticut. In 1998, the Stamford-Norwalk area alone exported \$86 million worth of goods to China.

There are some in Congress and throughout our country who want to deny PNTR to China to punish it for its terrible human rights record. But closing off China will not bring any improvement in the way it treats its citizens. An isolated China will continue to repress its population and forestall the onset of democracy and freedom. A nation cannot engage in free trade without educating its citizens. The more educated a country's citizens become, the more they want and are empowered to demand an open society and freedom. In truth, the most subversive action we can take towards the oppressive Chinese regime is to encourage free trade. Communist hardliners argue the defeat of PNTR will make it easier for them to thwart the movement toward democracy and capitalism. In the absence of interaction with the United States, these hardliners will be able to restrict communication, stop foreign travel, and pull the plug on the Internet. Reform will wither on the vine.

Taking a look at recent history, Communist dictatorships that had interaction with the

West—the Soviet Union, Poland, Romania and Hungary—are dead. Those shut off from the rest of the world—Fidel Castro's Cuba and Kim Jong Il's North Korea—are still brutalizing their citizenry. For me, the issue is clear. PNTR is essential to our full participation in the emerging economy of the future. We win access to Chinese markets. China becomes exposed to the type of information and prosperity that builds democracy and freedom. Candles give way to electric lights. The horse and carriage gave way to the automobile. Typewriters gave way to word processors and computers. We cannot repeal the law of gravity. We are in a world economy, and China is a large and vital part of that economy. Permanent normal trade relations with China should be approved by Congress and welcome by all Americans.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, this is an historic day for the workers, business leaders, and reformers in China and the United States. Today Congress has the opportunity to push our relations forward by breaking down the walls surrounding China and supporting its entrance into the World Trade Organization. As we cast our votes today, I ask my colleagues to carefully consider the incredible potential this opportunity offers for the Chinese and American people. Passing PNTR supports freedom in China.

As long as China's barriers to the United States remain, our relationship with the Chinese people will be restricted. By breaking down Chinese barriers to trade, while enhancing our own protections, we are creating new opportunities for American and Chinese people to work together and develop new ways to agree. Bringing China into the WTO will increase the exchange of cultures and ideas, which will in turn foster new areas of cooperation and progress. This is the most effective way to provide support for the reform-minded Chinese people who need our help the most. On their behalf, Congress should extend PNTR to China. Passing PNTR also supports the United States.

Some Members may come to the floor today to claim the United States workforce and economy will suffer from greater competition with China. However, these Members are misinformed. To the contrary, the United States Trade Representative should be congratulated for her effective negotiations. This is a one-way deal. The United States will continue our current tariff levels on all Chinese imports, with new protections, and in return China will drop its average tariff level by 62 per cent. By voting yes, only China will have to change its laws.

This vote is about the power of economic freedom and prosperity, as displayed in the United States. It is true that as China expands into the world markets of goods and services, the United States will face new competition. It is also true that for the first time, the domestic Chinese economy will face direct competition from the United States. The American economy is leading the world—primarily as a result of the strength of the American workforce. I have faith in the productivity and entrepreneurial spirit of the American economy to continue this leadership and find new opportunities for success in China. Congress should embrace trade with China, and the competition it brings, because this will lead to a higher standard of living for the people of the United States as well as the people of China. That is how we make progress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the incredible opportunity this vote offers. On behalf of American and Chinese workers, businesses, and reformers, I urge my colleagues to support progress with China and vote for PNTR.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4444, to authorize extension of permanent normal trade relations [PNTR] to the People's Republic of China [PRC]. I do so because, fundamentally, I believe that extending PNTR to the PRC is in the United States' short-term and long-term national interest. Our economic interests and our democratic values necessitate extending PNTR to the PRC.

Extending PNTR to the PRC is in our national interest because extending PNTR is a necessary precondition for United States companies to enjoy the full advantages of China's entry into the World Trade Organization [WTO] and the fruits of thirteen years of difficult bilateral negotiations between the PRC and the United States. For my State of Delaware, this bilateral agreement opens perhaps the most important emerging market to our exports, benefitting key industries and creating export and employment opportunities. Extending PNTR to the PRC would significantly benefit Delaware's key export sectors, including agriculture, poultry, insurance, financial, and chemical products.

According to the United States Department of Commerce, Delaware's merchandise export sales to China in 1998 totaled \$69 million, up 17 percent from \$59 million in 1993, and China ranked as Delaware's 16th largest export destination in 1998. Delaware's exports to China are becoming more diversified, with 1998 exports encompassing 17 different product categories, up from 12 product sectors in 1993. In twelve of these product sectors, exports from Delaware to China more than doubled from 1993 to 1998.

I believe those who claim that the PRC will benefit more from receiving PNTR with the United States are mistaken. The United States will greatly benefit from PNTR with China, because currently the United States market is already open to Chinese exports. To join the WTO and receive PNTR, China must make all the concessions—opening its markets, eliminating barriers, and implementing comprehensive trade and investment reforms. As a result, the terms for Chinese WTO membership represent an extraordinary breakthrough for Delaware workers, farmers, and consumers. Delaware clearly will have expanded opportunities to extend its exports to Chinese markets, and ensuring that China adhere to global trade rules is in Delaware's strong interests.

Because China has received Normal Trade Relations under United States law annually since 1980, United States tariffs would remain exactly the same if PNTR is approved. In contrast, failure by Congress to extend PNTR would squander 14 years of negotiations, invite the unraveling of China's extensive WTO commitments and shut American companies and farmers out of the world's biggest emergency market for years to come.

The stakes involved are high. Trade is much more than the sale of U.S. goods and services. It is also an exchange of ideas, beliefs, and values that changes and enriches all who participate. When we trade with China and bring it into the integrated global trading arena, we are in a strong sense exporting our American democratic values, beliefs and prac-

tices. To be sure, there are real hurdles that China faces with our relationship with it, but engaging and enveloping and integrating China into "the world of trade" is tremendously important. We realize that implementing the agreements associated with PNTR will be slow and difficult, but Chinese government leaders and economists hope the process of normalizing trade with the United States will help close inefficient state enterprises that employ a great number of Chinese, and help reduce government censorship.

Like most Americans, I continue to be concerned that despite the positive influence trade with the United States has had on China's development toward more open, liberalized trade policies, serious human rights, trade, security, and weapons proliferation issues remain. Though sometimes it seems difficult to see how these things have improved, I would observe the following: the number of international religious missions operating openly in China has grown rapidly in recent years. Today, these groups provide educational, humanitarian, medical, and development assistance in communities across China. Despite continued, documented acts of government oppression, people in China nonetheless can worship, participate in communities of faith, and move about the country much more freely today than was even imaginable twenty years ago. Today, people can communicate with each other and the outside world much more easily and with much less government interference through the tools of business and trade: telephones, cell phones, faxes and e-mail. On balance, foreign investment has introduced positive new labor practices into the Chinese workplace, stimulating growing aspirations for labor and human rights among Chinese workers.

Nevertheless, we must continue to work to improve human rights and expand freedom in China. I have voted for legislation which overwhelmingly passed the House that voiced my strong disapproval of China's actions and policies. We can and must continue to place pressure on China without punishing American businesses and farmers. I have voted to direct House committees to hold hearings and report appropriate legislation to the House addressing U.S. concerns with China's trade practices, human rights record, military policy, and promotion of weapons proliferation. I do not believe that the annual congressional debate, linking justifiable concern for human rights and religious freedom in China to the threat of unilateral United States trade sanctions has been productive. Some will say, the debate on the problems we have with China will end if we extend PNTR to China. To those I say, the debate will never end, and the pressure will never cease until China demonstrates a commitment to a freer and democratic nation. Indeed, by extending PNTR to China, the pressure on China to address our concerns may prove to be even greater and more consistent.

Clearly, the Chinese Government has a long way to go, and the positive developments we seek will no doubt come about gradually. The issue now before the House of Representatives is how to best encourage China to respect international norms of behavior in all areas, and what can the United States government do that will best advance human rights and religious freedom for the people of China. Are conditions more likely to improve through isolation and containment, or through opening

trade, investment, and exchange between peoples? The answer is clear to me.

I believe the best way to encourage the type of behavior we desire is through policies that promote the rule of law, free trade, economic reform, and democratization in China, for these are the seeds from which democracy can grow. Therefore, I believe the U.S. should continue to pursue our historic and longstanding policy of "engagement," rather than containment, with China, based on the premise that the United States will be best able to influence the growth of democracy and market-oriented policies in China through enhanced diplomatic and trade ties, which over time will hopefully bring improvements in human rights and economic conditions. The Chinese government in much more likely to develop the rule of law and observe international norms of behavior if it is recognized by the U.S. government as an equal, responsible partner within the globalized trading community of nations.

History has shown that when people are empowered economically, they also become empowered politically. Economic freedom precipitates political freedom. China's citizens will come to have greater choice about their lifestyles and employment and to enjoy enhanced access to communication and information from the United States.

The longer China's trade is governed by the rule of law and is transparent, the quicker they will assimilate into the global system of trade, and raise their standard of living. U.S. private enterprises trading with Chinese private enterprises will help change the status quo between our nations better than any diplomatic agreements we may enter into. As noted earlier, although I am dissatisfied with some of China's recent actions, I am convinced we still need to maintain mechanisms for engagement, and a functioning, bilateral trade relationship provides a framework for helping to restore our long-term interests in China. Human rights must not be violated, and the U.S. will not trade with people who do not provide their own citizens basic human rights and decencies. However, I believe that entering into PNTR is in our national interest, and that not going forward with it would undermine any competitiveness we have with China, while it itself enjoys all the advantages that PNTR provides with every other of the 133 WTO member-nations. China must adopt free and fair trade practices, and we should help facilitate that as much as we can, without sacrificing our values.

This legislation includes important authority to allow the Congress to monitor China's compliance with this agreement. This includes a process which would begin with an annual report from the U.S. Trade Representative, followed by hearings on Chinese trade practices. Congressional panels could then instruct our trade representative to investigate any trade violation and pursue a resolution through the WTO, the 135-member body that sets the rules for international trade. Also included in this legislation is the establishment of a congressional-executive commission that would pressure China to improve its record on human rights, labor, and rule of law, providing for enhanced monitoring of China's conduct in areas from trade to human rights, as well as efforts to make labor rights a higher priority in U.S. trade policy.

China is at a turning point in its history. A yes vote on normal trade can help propel it

forward to greater liberalization and engagement with the West. A no vote will encourage Chinese hard-liners to resist change, and even be perceived in China as a vote for confrontation. It will weaken those who work for change, and strengthen those who oppose it at any cost. Our choice is clear. We can try to push China in the right direction, and gain the benefits, or, we can force them in the wrong direction, and pay a price. But standing for freedom, democracy, human rights, security and peace, we must extend Permanent Normal Trade Relations to the People's Republic of China today.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4444, legislation which would grant Permanent Normal Trade Relations [PNTR] status to China.

To be honest, the idea of permanently altering our relationship with China troubles me. We have been wooed into complacency with the trade agreements hammered out last fall in the WTO accession negotiations. But the million dollar question that no one seems to be asking is: If China plans to abide by their promises, why are they—and why are we—afraid of a yearly review? The fact is that China has repeatedly violated trade agreements and has all but acknowledged that this time will be no different. Why do we think that a permanent extension will be the magic tool to make China suddenly change their ways? It defies logic. In fact, PNTR commends the existing track record of violations and noncompliance. A yearly review of our trade relationship with China may not be the ideal way to promote change. It is, at best, a blunt instrument. But it is one of the only mechanisms we have today to highlight this regime's lack of compliance with internationally accepted norms. The PNTR advocates have conjured up a crisis in which only approval will save the day and U.S. face. This is a farce and a mistake that will overshadow any prospect for real progress on key human rights and economic justice issues that affect China/U.S. relations.

Repeatedly, China's government has proven itself to be one of the most oppressive in the entire world. Many of my colleagues are willing to turn a blind eye toward these injustices—clamoring to capitalize on a promise of economic gain, with indifference to the human indignities upon which it may be built. But even this "expanded market" rationale is flawed. If China were indeed a market for "Made in the USA" goods, expanding trade could have the potential of boosting our economy and helping working Chinese families. And conversely, if we were importing goods from Chinese owned businesses, we might have a small opportunity to promote free enterprise with China. However, neither one of these scenarios reflect reality. American companies merely use China as a production platform—a manufacturing site for goods, which are then sold in the United States for inflated profit! Jobs that have traditionally provided American workers with living wage employment within the USA and a real chance to join the middle class are being—and will continue to be—exported to China, where companies can exploit the labor conditions and people. The notion that somehow this trade policy will

turn China around on a dime is wishful thinking; it is time to face reality and get our heads out of the clouds.

Why would we lower the standards and protections that provide the foundation of our economy and prosperity? Trade pacts have too often been the Trojan Horse that undermines progress in emerging areas not only in the host of human rights issues, but also environmental policy, health, and safety standards.

Don't vote for the PNTR proposition that says; "Heads we win, tails you lose." This, simply put, is a false syllogism, a created crisis that will lead to higher trade deficits with little prospect for a sound economic or social order in U.S./China policy. Amendments and study commissions aren't the answer. Congress doesn't have to reinvent itself and set up special groups, in essence trying ourselves and our deliberation process in knots to justify oversight and some phony "monitoring" scheme. If Members of Congress can't vote now on the reality of the situation before us, what would lead the PNTR advocates to believe we would be more willing once this policy is actually in place?

I will not vote to relinquish ability to annually review China's record, to advocate for my constituents' interests, and to promote the core values that have sustained our nation as the world's most successful economy and the promise for individual human rights around the globe. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4444, a bill that will grant permanent normal trade relations to China. This agreement is a tool U.S. farmers and ranchers can use to their great benefit.

China represents an agriculture market that is vital to the long-term success of American farmers and ranchers. Agriculture trade with China can strengthen development of private enterprise in that country and bring China more fully into world trade membership.

The economic benefits of this agreement for U.S. agriculture are clear. China's participation in the WTO will result in a least \$2 billion per year in additional U.S. agricultural exports by 2005.

More than 80 U.S. agricultural groups support extending permanent normal trade relations to China. This is what a few of them have to say about the benefits of the U.S.-China agreement.

The U.S. wheat growers say that PNTR with China represents a potential 10% increase in U.S. wheat exports.

U.S. pork producers believe that China PNTR could pave the way for an increase in the value of hogs by \$5 per head.

Poultry producers say that because China is already the largest U.S. export market for poultry (\$350 million in 1999), under PNTR, it could become a \$1 billion market in a few years.

Cattle producers believe that a vote against China PNTR is a vote against them. They expect to almost triple beef exports to China by 2005.

U.S. corn growers believe they have the opportunity to immediately triple their 5-year av-

erage of corn exports to China with acceptance of permanent normal trade relations.

Some who oppose normal trade relations with China will say that China has an agricultural glut and will never buy U.S. agricultural products. That is not true according to USDA's Economic Research Service. They say that China's accession to the WTO means that U.S. farmers and ranchers can sell an additional \$1.6 billion worth of staple commodities by 2005. On top of that, \$400 million of U.S. fruits, vegetables, and animal products can be sold by 2005 with China's entry to the WTO. That's \$2 billion more of agricultural exports by 2005.

Still others argue that China is self-sufficient in agricultural production, that it produces enough to feed its own people and it does not need U.S. commodities. The trade numbers do not reflect that at all.

According to the United Nations statistics, during the 6-year period ending in 1998, China was a net importer of agriculture products every year. During this period, China's average trade deficit was \$5.5 billion for agricultural products. If fish and forestry are included with other agricultural products, the deficit goes up to \$6.9 billion.

The Worldwatch Institute Chairman Lester Brown says that China's water supplies in its grain-producing areas are falling at a high rate. He sees massive grain imports and growing dependence on U.S. grain. China imports large amounts of U.S. agriculture commodities right now, some through Hong Kong (\$2.5 billion in 1999 of agricultural, fish and forestry products). As the diets of the Chinese improve, there will be more demand for high quality agriculture products and valued added food products. This is what U.S. farmers and the food industry can provide to Chinese consumers.

China has access to the U.S. market right now. China will become a member of the WTO and after its accession will still have access to the U.S. market. The vote on normal trade relations with China will decide whether U.S. agriculture will have improved access to the Chinese market or will cede that market to the competitors of U.S. agriculture.

Without approval of H.R. 4444, or agricultural competitors around the world will gain the benefit of the agreement negotiated by the United States with China and our farmers and ranchers will not. We cannot allow that to happen.

Without approval of H.R. 4444, no enforcement mechanisms will be available and the U.S. will not be able to use WTO dispute settlement provisions, a critical weapon to ensure U.S. trading rights. The ability to enforce tariff rate quotas will be undermined. The U.S. could not challenge Chinese export or domestic subsidies that hurt U.S. exports in other markets. We could not enforce the benefits of the sanitary and phytosanitary agreement that was negotiated with the Chinese and is important to U.S. citrus, wheat and meat producers. Additionally, the special safeguard provisions, to protect against import surges, negotiated by the U.S. would not be available.

The economic case for supporting permanent normal trade relations with China has been made, especially for U.S. agriculture. It is crystal clear; we have nothing to lose and everything to gain.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4444. A vote for this bill is a vote of support for United States farmers and ranchers.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, as we enter into debate today on normalizing trade with China, there are certain realities which must be acknowledged. Reality one, the human rights abuses in Chinese today are abominable. China continues to deny its citizens the most basic of human rights: freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and freedom of worship. Reality two, China will enter into the World Trade Organization whether Congress passes PNTR or not. Reality three, isolating China from the United States and the rest of world, will not improve human rights for the Chinese.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for including an essential human rights provision in the Levin-Bereuter package—increasing authorization funding for international broadcasting operations in China and neighboring countries.

A fundamental prerequisite to political and economic freedom is an informed citizenry. One of the best and most cost-effective ways to help enhance the respect for human rights abroad is to disseminate reliable information that serves to foster the spirit of democracy in closed societies. Arming citizens with reliable, accurate information will eventually enable them the power to create change. By doing so, not only is the U.S. interest served by helping to spread democracy, but democratic activists are also empowered to challenge the status quo.

Successful in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty provided this accurate information to help bring down the Iron Curtain. Radio Free Asia as a surrogate for a free press in the People's Republic of China, along with Voice of America, provide an invaluable source of uncensored information to the Chinese people. RFA currently broadcasts 24-hours a day in three languages in China (plus Tibetan in Tibet), and VOA broadcasts 126 hours a week in three languages with five hours a week of television.

Unfortunately, however, many of these signals do not reach the intended audience because of the jamming practices of the Chinese government. Stronger signals are needed to counteract this jamming. Internet is a medium increasingly used by the Chinese, however the government jams these sites as well.

The number of Chinese who risk their lives by listening to RFA and VOA is staggering. More staggering is the number of Chinese who put their lives in jeopardy by calling into RFA's "call in" shows. In the first three months of this year alone, RFA reported an average of 27,200 calls per month. Unfortunately, due to the limited resources of RFA less than 2% of these callers were able to speak with RFA broadcasters. The United States is the wealthiest country in the world. Surely, during this time of unparalleled economic boom we can find a few more dollars in our budget to provide resources so these callers, callers who risk their lives by simply picking up a telephone, may be allowed to have their voices heard.

As China struggles with democracy, human rights and freedom, the importance of independent media sources cannot be underestimated. The Chinese government will be less likely to commit abuses (if RFA and VOA are shining light on their injustices while promoting democracy and an understanding of our country. If we hope to bring stability and democracy to Asia, we must not isolate the largest country in the world. We must not turn our backs on the those fighting for freedom and the rule of law. I support extending permanent normal trade relations with China and do not oppose China's entry in the World Trade Organization. I strongly believe that membership in the WTO can be used as a catalyst for reform in China. Through greater involvement in the world community and economic liberalization, China will become a more responsible nation, with one day a reality of respecting human rights and the rule of law.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share my support for H.R. 4444, legislation to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to grant normal trade relations to China. I support H.R. 4444 because I believe this legislation will not only open Chinese markets to United States products, but will also serve as the next best step we can take in our relationship with China.

I believe I join all of my colleagues in saying that I have serious concerns about the Chinese government, most specifically the current trade deficit, national security concerns, and human rights violations. In 1980, we first granted China annual Most Favored Nation (MFN) status, now known more accurately as Normal Trade Relations (NTR). The nature of the annual review was supposed to give the U.S. leverage in negotiations with China. However, since then, annual renewal has become just another exercise, and I believe H.R. 4444 will put us back on the path towards results. We need to be engaged with China, and to be an influence in China in order to have an effect on how that nation governs.

China is going to join the World Trade Organization regardless of what this Congress does today. The question is whether the United States is going to take advantage of China being a member of the WTO and allow our farmers and manufacturers access to this market. We know other countries will.

One critical aspect of China's ascension to the WTO is that it will change the leverage. The U.S. doesn't have to stand alone anymore in our disputes with China, but rather, we will stand along with the entire 169 nations of the WTO. Everyone in this room knows that the WTO is not a perfect organization with perfect policies, but every meeting of WTO member countries brings new ideas and suggestions for improving the organization. The U.S. will sit at the table while the WTO evolves its policies and lives up to the name World Trade Organization. The only alternative, two nations battling it out, is much less effective, as history has also demonstrated.

History has taught us some valuable lessons about dealing with foreign nations. We have learned from experience that isolation does not work. We don't even have to travel one hundred miles from Florida to see a perfect example of trade sanctions gone awry. The 1970s embargo against the then Soviet Union is another prime example of failed isolationism. The Soviets laughed at the U.S., while our farmers suffered. History has taught us that engagement is the key to results. En-

agement allows us to address our concerns about a foreign nation's policies, all while expanding opportunities to our own farmers and manufacturers.

World trade is critically important for agriculture, and 23 percent of Iowa's entire workforce is in some way tied to agriculture. Everything is connected—almost 40 percent of our entire economy relies on trade with other countries. Today's vote has been described in terms of "granting" something to China, but it really means jobs for Iowans and new customers for Iowa businesses.

To me, the most important aspect of China's ascension is that it will even the decks on trade tariffs. For too long, the tariffs on U.S. goods going into China have proven insurmountable for farmers and manufacturers in my district who wish to export to China. The deal struck by Ambassador Barshefsky will open doors that have been closed for too long.

Opponents of this deal like to claim that it opens the U.S. to China. Apparently, they haven't looked at the trade agreement, and I would also guess that they haven't been out shopping since 1980. Everytime I walk in a store, I pick up products with a "Made in China" label on them. The agreement we are voting on today is one-way; our way. It opens the doors for America, not the doors of America.

A farmer from my district, Dave Kronlage of Delaware County, traveled out to Washington on February 16, 2000, to testify before the Ways and Means Committee about China. Dave has done everything he can to profit from his business, including minimizing his risks and by joining with area farmers to create their own meat company, Delaware County Meats. Dave and other farmers, however, are running out of options for increasing their profitability. He told the Committee that China's ascension to the WTO will provide an estimated 7.7 percent increase to his income. In Dave's view, the next move belongs to Congress, and the next move will be made today.

In 1996, we made farmers three promises, to reduce taxation, to reduce regulations, and improve access to foreign markets. We can stand here and argue about how successful Congress has been at the first two, but I don't think there is anyone in this body that will claim that Congress or the President has helped open new markets to farmers. Now is our chance to rectify this shortfall.

My state is the nation's largest pork, corn, and soybean-producing state. Last year, China's increase in pork consumption was roughly equal to the pork produced in Iowa. Yet, we sold not one pork chop to China last year. While pork producers like Dave Kronlage saw their equity evaporate through \$8 per hundred-weight prices last year, trade with China was not an option.

Normal trade relations with China will put Iowa pork chops, Iowa corn, and Iowa manufactured goods on the shopping lists of 1.3 billion Chinese people. Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman estimates agriculture exports will triple, putting another \$5 per head in the pockets of Iowa pork producers, and increasing demand for Iowa corn by 360 million bushels. That's the total annual corn production by every one of the 21 counties in Iowa's Second District.

The U.S. produces far more food and manufactured goods than Americans can possibly consume. That means we have to find customers outside the boundaries of the United States. We cannot ignore 1.3 billion customers in China, watch them shop elsewhere, and expect this country to continue as a leader in the world economy.

With one vote, we can hand a market of 1.3 billion people to our farmers, and simply say "Better late than never." Now is the time. This is the best move to make for farmers and manufacturers in the U.S. This is the best move to make for advancing relations with China that could lead to meaningful changes in China's style of governing. And this is the best move for this Congress to make for the future of our economy. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 4444.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I, like many of my colleagues, have spent a great deal of time talking and listening to my constituents on the issue of granting Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China.

I have heard from a wide range of voices. These voices represent America's broadly based interests, reflecting our democratic values, like free speech, freedom of religion, the right to privacy, and the right to organize. I have heard from workers in my district who fear they would lose their jobs to China. I have heard from environmental activists who are angry that China has made no attempt to adhere to environmental standards.

And I have heard from many constituencies who are deeply troubled by the religious, political, and human rights oppression China has continued to engage in. Veterans have approached me with their concerns about the well-documented violations of human rights. Religious groups and individuals have called and written about China's lack of true religious freedom. Women activists are outraged by the forced abortions that continue in China. Students at the University of Wisconsin oppose the forced labor and inhumane working conditions that continue to plague Chinese workers.

After listening to the broad range of my constituents's concerns, I cannot in good conscience vote to grant China Permanent Normal Trade Relations and put profit over labor, environmental and human rights.

China has violated every trade agreement over the past twenty years and Chinese officials are already backing away from commitments they made only months ago. I believe we must broaden our policy of engagement with China and restore the link between human rights and trade.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, the House gathers today to consider an issue of seminal importance for the national interests of the United States: the case for Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) with China and China's prospective membership in the World Trade Organization (WTO).

There can be little doubt that this is the most consequential foreign policy legislation upon which this Congress has been asked to address in the new millennium. Impressively, the vast majority of Members appear united on the principle that it is in the interests of the United States to develop a credible strategy for integrating China into the world economy as a responsible power that accepts international political and trading norms. What is at issue is means, not ends; that is, whether granting PNTR advances U.S. interests and values in modern China.

In my judgment, approving PNTR for China is in the enlightened self-interest of the people of the United States and of China. It promotes our economic well-being by opening Chinese markets to American goods and services. It advances our interest in a rules-based international trading system by helping to "lock-in" Chinese reforms, economic restructuring, and a commitment to orderly globalization. China's accession to the WTO, in turn, also paves the way for a long-overdue entry by a democratic Taiwan into the global trading body.

China's entry into the WTO, coupled with permanent normal trade relations, opens up substantial commercial advantages to the United States. With market-opening commitments in agriculture, banking and financial services, telecommunications and a panoply of other industries, Americans and other exporters will have much greater access to a market that reflects fully one-fifth of the world's population. Credible estimates suggest that the market-opening concessions that would accompany PNTR would boost U.S. exports to China by around \$3 billion or close to a 15% increase in current U.S. exports to China.

Indeed, the math is on our side. While we frequently have 3 to 5 percent tariffs on Chinese goods coming into our country, they just as frequently have 30 to 50 percent tariffs on American goods shipped to China. This agreement negligibly effects America's tariff structure, but dramatically reduces Chinese levies, down in most instances to the single digit level.

The Committee on Banking and Financial Services has jurisdiction over certain macro-economic issues as well as the financial services industry in particular. With regard to commercial products, China maintains unfairly high tariffs, which this PNTR approach is designed to reduce. With regard to financial services, China maintains arbitrary non-tariff barriers, which this PNTR approach is designed to dismantle. Reduction in Chinese tariffs and non-tariff barriers is self-apparently in the U.S. national interest. Not insignificantly, commerce follows finance. If we fail to pass PNTR, China will simply import fewer manufactured goods and farm products from the United States. It will be German, French and Japanese banks which will enter China and, by so doing, facilitate exports from the companies they serve in their own countries. America will remain an import haven, but opportunities for building export jobs here at home will be denied to American workers.

Here, I would emphasize a fatal flaw of failing to approve PNTR—it would leave the U.S. unable to apply WTO rules and obligations on the Chinese government, including standards of openness and reciprocity as well as mechanisms for dispute resolution. In other words, American farmers, workers and consumers would be denied the market-opening and rules-based trade benefits that China would otherwise be obligated to embrace, and our European and Japanese competitors would be given extraordinary market advantages in China.

In this regard, it must be stressed that although our economic ties to China have grown rapidly in recent years, so too has the size of our trade deficit. It is time American leaders make the fundamental point that normal trade relations are all about reciprocity. A billion dollar a week trade deficit is politically and economically unsustainable, particularly if China's

market is closed to American products or biased in favor of products and services from other countries.

The best way for countries to have good sustainable political relations is to have reciprocal open markets, and the best way to achieve reciprocity in trade is to get politics out of economics and competition into the market.

Balanced and mutually beneficial trade is a cornerstone of good Sino-American relations. Likewise, unbalanced trade contains the smoldering prospect of social rupture. Hence, little is more in the U.S. interest than to promote reform and liberalization of China's economic, trade, and investment regimes and to bind China to the rules of international commerce.

For some, the PNTR issue has come to symbolize concerns about globalization and the increased integration of the world economy through trade flows, capital flows, and high-speed information technology. While angst exists in some segments of the American public, as in all publics, about competition and globalization, the historical record affirms that market systems based on free trade and the rule of law lead to higher standards of living than systems based on political isolation or economic autarky.

Protectionism is particularly harmful in the credit, securities, and savings industries because the general economy is dependent on each. In the U.S. today approximately one-fourth of banking assets and one-third of commercial loans are made by foreign entities.

While some may be startled by these statistics, in general, Americans consider foreign financial competition good for the nation's economy and believe it would be even more so in developing countries such as China, which need to build a financial system that can allocate capital on a market basis. Hence, one of the most beneficial and far-reaching aspects of our bilateral WTO accession agreement is China's commitment to undertake the progressive dismantling of barriers to foreign investment in its financial services industry.

More broadly, Beijing's commitment to the rules and obligations of a WTO-based framework should help support China's transition to a modern market economy based on the rule of law. As the world's most populous nation, China's successful management of economic and social reform is very much in the interest of the U.S. and the broader global economy. Joining the WTO binds China to a set of rules, which limits the ability of government officials to capriciously change market rules to advance personal or vested interests. This will help Chinese reformers lay the basis for a rule-based economy that is the best hope for controlling pervasive official corruption. In this context, it deserves stressing that government centered, managed trade provides fertile ground for corrupt practices. On the other hand, free trade under the rule of law is an economic framework where social corruption has a more difficult time flourishing.

Many Americans, including Members of Congress, are vexed by the human rights record of China and are concerned by the pace of economic and political change in China. On the other hand, experience teaches that the political system that best fits economic free enterprise is reflected in democratic political institutions of, by, and for the people. Advancing freely associated economic ties with the West under the rubric of internationally accepted trade rules has one principal political

side effect: it builds bridges to democracy. Quixotic attempts to isolate China economically run the great risk of exacerbating human rights abuses, stunting prospects of establishing democratic institutions, and causing in-temperate international actions.

Chinese society is changing far more rapidly than most Americans realize. The late Deng Xiaoping underscored the new Chinese pragmatism with his cat and mice metaphor, and by promoting "socialism with Chinese characteristics." Twenty years of ad hoc, pragmatic economic reforms have moved China from the chaos of the Cultural Revolution to unprecedented economic development and largely peaceful social change, quadrupling the standard of living and laying the foundation for systemic reforms. Indeed, despite indefensible examples of continued political repression, against groups like the Falun Gong and liberal intellectuals, China may be changing as rapidly as any other country in the world. While a communist style political apparatus remains ensconced at the top of Chinese society, at local government levels, experiments with democratic elections are occurring and at the individual and family levels, free speech has become increasingly the norm. In sharp contrast with the period of Mao's Cultural Revolution there is little question that China has become a far more open society than it was just a generation ago when Deng inaugurated his period of "opening and reform."

Nonetheless, China's economic and social system cannot develop to its fullest unless the rule of law and its associated rights—including freedom of speech and of the press, due process for disputes over contractual obligations, and a judiciary that efficiently and fairly adjudicates disputes—are made central tenets of Chinese life. As the development of a modern market economy impacts on politics, Beijing's leaders can be expected to recognize the incompatibility of free enterprise and an authoritarian political system. Instability is simply too easily unleashed in society when governments fail to provide safeguards for individual rights and fail to erect political institutions adaptable to change and accountable to the people.

Lastly, establishing permanent normal trade will help foster a stable, mutually beneficial Sino-American relationship, a bilateral relationship that is of profound importance to the future of peace and prosperity not just in Asia, but for the world. Here, a note about Taiwan is important. It is no accident that people in Taiwan as well as Hong Kong strongly favor America normalizing trade relations with Beijing. The opposite—nonnormal trade—presents too many opportunities for friction in an area desperate for normalcy and stability.

From a historical perspective free trade is a natural extension of the open door policy that hallmarked American involvement in China at the end of the 19th century. Rejecting PNTR would effectively drive a stake through the heart of our economic ties with China and place in grave jeopardy the future of our relationship with one-fifth of the world's population.

Whether the 21st century is peaceful and whether it is prosperous will most of all depend on whether the world's most populous country can live with itself and become open to the world in a fair and respectful manner. How the United States, its allies, and the international system responds to the complexities and challenges of modern China is also one of

the central foreign policy challenges of our time.

Failure to approve PNTR would not be responsive to that challenge. It would not effectively address our legitimate concerns on human rights, nonproliferation, relations across the Taiwan straits, or trade. On the contrary, rejection of PNTR would go back on our open door tradition and suggest that China and the United States can not maintain cooperative relations. It would be a vote with destabilizing consequences for the region and beyond.

Ironically, in this seminal foreign policy vote, the president's political opposition is willing to share the obligations of governance despite electoral advantage that would accrue in refusing to adopt a bipartisan approach. Republicans are generally prepared to be supportive of the president's initiative because the majority consider PNTR to be key to peace, stability, and prosperity in the 21st century. It would be tragic, and I might say unprecedented in the post World War II era in any Western democracy, if the majority of the administration's own party fails to support its President on what is almost certainly the Executive Branch's most important foreign policy initiative.

The irony that should not go unnoticed is that after all the discord between the Executive and Legislative branches over the past several years the President's own party may produce a vote of no-confidence in the President while the Republicans in this instance support his foreign policy judgment.

In the strongest possible terms, I urge my colleagues to cast a vote with majority support in both parties in favor of this crucial economic and foreign policy measure. Absent a Democratic as well as Republican stamp of approval, foreign economic policy will be seen at home and abroad as subject to capricious change in Congress if there is a shift in party control.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4444, which grants the president authority to extend permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) with the People's Republic of China, and I urge our colleagues to adopt the measure.

Mr. Speaker, as we all recognize, the decision before us is of historic dimension and is one of the most important actions taken by this Congress. The arguments for and against granting PNTR to China are exceedingly broad and complex. The stakes, too, are tremendous, as it involves the destiny of the most populous nation with one-quarter of planet's inhabitants, the future of America's economic strength and vitality, and perhaps the very stability of the world.

I commend my colleagues and deeply respect their commitment regardless of their position on the issue before us, for there are valid and compelling arguments to be made on both sides.

On this matter, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few observations. After examining the November 1999 trade agreement negotiated by the United States with China, it is abundantly clear that granting PNTR to China to facilitate its entry into the World Trading Organization (WTO) will bring innumerable trade benefits to America.

Under the trade agreement, China must dramatically reduce tariffs, phase out quotas, and open up closed market sectors, while the U.S. simply maintains the status quo with no further

trade concessions to China. It is truly a one-way deal in our favor. Ensuring that China and the U.S. trade on a level playing field, with WTO enforcement, should go a long way toward rectifying our present trade imbalance.

On the other hand, if we fail to grant PNTR to China, Mr. Speaker, China will still enter the WTO but will not be obligated to extend WTO trade benefits to the U.S. This will significantly reduce U.S. trade and investment with China. I believe our economic competitors in Europe, Japan and Asia will welcome our absence in China, Mr. Speaker, and through the WTO take advantage of China's market-openings to our detriment.

Although the trade incentives for extending China PNTR are obvious and apparent, Mr. Speaker, the most important consideration for me concerns what will best promote democratization and continued political, social and human rights progress in China.

On that point, Mr. Speaker, I find most persuasive and enlightening the voices of those Chinese who have been persecuted and are among China's most ardent and vocal critics—individuals who would be expected to take a hard line stance against the Beijing government.

For example, look at prominent dissident Bao Tong, who has urged the U.S. Congress to pass PNTR as it would hasten China's entry into the WTO, forcing adherence to international standards of conduct and respect for the rule of law. Bao has noted that the annual Congressional trade reviews have not been effective to improve human rights in China and other tools must be sought.

Xie Wanjuan, an exiled leader of Tiananmen Square democracy protests and organizer of the China Democracy Party, supports PNTR and the China trade deal. Xie states, "The closer and economic relationships between the United States and China, the more chances for the United States to monitor human rights in China and the more effective for the United States to push China to launch political reforms."

Longtime dissident, Ren Wanding, who has been jailed for 11 out of the last 21 years, states, "If you really want China to change, then you should approve PNTR. If you want to isolate China and see it get worse, then it will get worse and worse."

Mr. Speaker, these Chinese democracy activists, along with Wang Dan, Dai Qing, Zhou Litai and other prominent dissidents, urge that the U.S. extend PNTR to China. Joining their voices are other Chinese leaders who have opposed Beijing's communist control, including Hong Kong's Democratic Party Chairman Martin Lee and Taiwan's new President Chen Shui-bian. Both Lee and Chen have called for normalization of trade relations between the U.S. and China and WTO accession by China.

Mr. Speaker, we should listen to the wisdom of these courageous Chinese, whose credentials are impeccable and who clearly have the interests of all of the Chinese people at heart. They know that it is absolutely crucial and vital for continued political, social and human rights progress in China that the U.S. maintain and expand its presence there through trade.

The Chinese people thirst for U.S. engagement because America, and everything it represents, is the only nation with the power, the conscience, and the fortitude to push for true reforms and democracy in China.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to hear the pleas of the Chinese people for a brighter

future. It is in their best interests, as well as ours, that we extend permanent trade relations to China by adoption of the legislation before us.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of establishing Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China.

Mr. Speaker, China is a rogue nation. Totalitarians and Communists rule it. These leaders oppress their people and deny the basic freedoms and religious liberties that we hold so dear here in America. China regularly fails to abide by standards of good citizenship in the community of nations. China's officials have been tied with attempts to influence the 1996 elections in the United States through contributions to the Democratic National Committee. This nation's spies have stolen our nuclear technology. It sells missile technology to Iran and North Korea and regularly threatens war against Taiwan.

It is in this environment that Congress must decide whether we should continue our annual renewal of normal trade relations (NTR) for China, and forego the benefits of lower tariffs and increased access to China's markets, or grant permanent normal trade relations, (PNTR) for China. I believe firmly that this vote affects the advancement of America's national interests, including national security, human rights, religious liberty, and commerce and American jobs.

With very few measures have I so deeply struggled with determining the best course of action, and with identifying what is right or wrong for America. After carefully considering all the facts, and reviewing the notes and letters and calls from my constituents, I believe that our best hope for advancing American national interests in China is fulfilled by granting PNTR to China. Moreover, failing to do so today would damage America's interests, in national security, human rights and religious freedoms, and American commerce and jobs.

Let me first address the matter of American national security. I can assure you that since nearly losing my life fighting communism in Vietnam, the matter of what action best represents America's national security interests is a matter which I take very seriously. Beijing has exhibited poor citizenship in the world. It tested missiles in the Taiwan Straits on the eve of free elections in Taiwan. It has sold missiles and weapons materials to rogue terrorist nations. It smuggled AK-47 rifles into the United States, bound for Los Angeles street gangs. It increased its defense budget 40 percent over the past several years.

However, in light of this current and emerging national security concern, I believe it is only through American engagement, through the extension of PNTR to China, that provides the best hope to advance America's national security interests in China and East Asia. I am under no illusion that by extending PNTR to China will work miracles in the advancement of our national security. It will not. Yet, the penalty for sacrificing our engagement in China by not granting PNTR is much worse. Denying PNTR to China will not keep China out of the WTO. Denying PNTR to China will not protect Taiwan, which is why the government leaders of Taiwan support granting PNTR to China. Rather, denying PNTR to China would bring instability to this critically important area of the world. Denying PNTR to China would force the Beijing regime away from the United States, undermine advocates

for democracy in China, and drive China away from the community of law-abiding countries, into the arms of the world's terrorist nations.

Thus, I conclude that it is in America's national security interest to encourage American engagement in China and support PNTR for China.

Secondarily, Mr. Speaker, let me address the issue of religious liberty and freedom for the people of China. Again, Beijing's record in this field is repugnant to the cause of freedom. Its list of crimes against freedom goes on and on. Beijing oppresses the Buddhist people of Tibet, and the Muslims of Xinjiang. It strictly limits the rights of Christians from meeting or owning religious materials. It practices a population policy that includes forced abortion and sterilization. It has detained, jailed, and killed its dissidents. It severely restricts the activities of people of faith, and imprisons priests and ministers, and closes house churches that attempt to teach religion free from the reach of the Beijing regime.

Given this challenge, what action advances America's national interest in this area? I conclude that our national interest for religious liberty and freedom is best advanced by extending PNTR to China. Through American engagement we advance American values, through the export of commerce and culture, directly into the lives of Chinese citizens. While I respect the views of my friends at the Family Research Council and other family organizations who strongly oppose extending PNTR to China, it is also true that several U.S.-based organizations that support Christian missionaries in China support PNTR for China. The case for greater commerce with China can, therefore, be cast favorably not just in commercial terms, but in moral terms, as an engine of liberty and freedom in an oppressed nation. This is why many of our nation's most respected religious leaders, from Billy Graham to Pat Robertson, have called for keeping the door to China open.

I agree that PNTR for China will not work miracles for the people of China. It will not directly free a single person wrongly imprisoned by the communist government of China. However, Wang Juntao, the leader of the protests at Tiananmen Square several years back, has said this: "I prefer to choose 'yes' . . . Both fundamental change in the human rights situation and democratization in China will come from efforts by Chinese within China. The more the relationship between the two countries expands, the more space there will be for independent forces to grow in China. Such independent forces will eventually push China toward democracy."

American commerce with China will give the Chinese people a taste of economic freedom, and economic freedom will pave a path toward more political and religious freedom.

Lastly, I would like to address the matter of commerce and American jobs with the world's most populous nation. Companies in San Diego engage in significant exports in China. Among these are Solar Turbines, Cubic, Qualcomm, Jet Products, and several other firms large and small, which engage in manufacturing, telecommunications, television, computers, biotechnology, pharmaceuticals, and many other industries, employing thousands of San Diegans in good high tech, high skill, high wage jobs. Furthermore, many Americans jobs are dependent on imports from China. These include high-tech jobs in the computer hard-

ware and electronic device industries, and hundreds of thousands of lower-tech jobs, including retailers with shops all across America. In addition, American consumers rely on the ability to purchase goods made in China.

The vote before us today is about granting American companies access to China. This vote and WTO membership for China only lowers China's tariffs and China's barriers to trade. This action will allow American companies to increase distribution in China, allowing more goods to be made in America and exported. This bill will allow American financial service companies and insurance companies unprecedented access to China's markets. Our action today will benefit all Americans through greater exports, investment, and opportunity in China.

I want to remind my colleagues that this vote is not a goal line. This is not the end of our duty to the American people on this issue, nor is this the last time that we must face the burden of addressing the shortcomings of China. To use a football analogy, this is another first down in our relationship with China. Since President Nixon returned to China, our relationship has been growing and China has changed. Since I was there 20 years ago, China is a better place.

If we are to continue moving China in the right direction during the next 10-20 years, we must assure that certain conditions are in place to foster that development.

We need a President who will not sell secrets to China for campaign contributions;

A Vice-President that will show leadership and distinguish right from wrong;

A State Department and Commerce Department that will fight for America's interests and not devalue national security concerns for business expediency;

A Department of Defense that has a strong leadership and the support and funding necessary to defend America and protect our servicemen and women;

And intelligence organizations with the assets and direction to protect our strategic and economic interests here and abroad.

Right now we have none of these things. And because of the repeated failures of the Clinton-Gore administration on China policy, Congress must exercise leadership in the United States-China relationship. Here in the People's House, we must remember that America is the world's leader in human rights, religious freedoms and peace and prosperity.

I want to close by sharing a recent experience I had in Vietnam. Several years ago, my good friend Rep. HAL ROGERS asked me to accompany him to Vietnam to raise the flag and reopen our embassy there. My first response to him was no. I did not want to return to Vietnam. I had lost too many friends and had too many memories of my time there to return. Then Pete Peterson, now our Ambassador to Vietnam, who was then our colleague, called me. Pete said, "Duke, I was a POW. It is tough for me to return to Vietnam, I need you to help me return there and raise America's flag." To Pete I said "yes." So I returned to Vietnam.

While I was there I toured old target sites and met with people who had led the Vietnamese Army we fought against. One of those was the head of the Vietnamese security forces. He is now the Mayor of Hanoi. He shared with us many of his thoughts and views on the United States relationship with Vietnam and his views on Communism.

When our conversation turned to questions, I asked him why Vietnam was not moving to open trade with the United States. And I will always remember what he said.

He said, "Congressman, we are communists. If we allow trade with America, our people will have things. They will have property and be able to own things without our control. That, Congressman, will hurt us and weaken our control over the people."

When he finished, I thought to myself—"trade is good."

Mr. Speaker, expanding trade with China advances America's national interests. Expanded trade will help us weaken the hold of the dictators in Beijing, bring economic prosperity and greater stability to the entire Far East region, and carry American values of freedom and liberty into China.

Mr. Speaker, trade is good.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4444. Establishing permanent trade relations with the largest market on the face of the planet is the right thing for the American people and it is the right direction to support the United States economy.

I have traveled in China and several other Pacific Rim countries. I understand the wealth of opportunity that is available to the countries who take the step of moving aggressively into the markets of Asia without barriers, beginning in the largest market in the world, China. Establishing normal trade relations with this market so our businesses have a level playing field has enormous positive economic consequences for this country that will last throughout the course of this century. Not so long ago, China was a poor country. Now their coastal cities are the new, churning economies of the Pacific Rim. The enormous changes that are occurring on the coast are spreading rapidly to the interior of China, and touching the lives of people there.

The economic advantages of supporting trade with China may well be enough reason to support this resolution, but that is only the beginning. Possibly the most important reason the U.S. needs a permanent trading relationship with China is the national security implications it provides to us. I have seen first hand the relationship China has with the other nations of the Pacific Rim. These nations have hundreds of centuries of history between themselves and China. When China stands closer to the United States, it is possible for the other countries of the Pacific Rim to work with the United States on trade and make the world safer and more democratic.

While we have an utterly different philosophy of government than does China, during the course of our history it has been the inherent responsibility of the American people, especially entrepreneurs, to spread the spirit of democracy and freedom throughout the world. This may be our most unique opportunity to reach the largest number of people yet with the message that the principles of work and responsibility are the foundation of freedom and self-determination. There is no better way to spread the message of democracy than to engage the world's largest nation in a trade agreement that will benefit the United States and China for decades and probably centuries to come. When we engage a country of 1.3 billion people, we take a positive step in demonstrating how freedom works.

This vote will soon take its place alongside the pivotal votes of the past decade which

have played a large role in redefining economic success and budgetary policy: the 1993 Budget Deficit Reduction Act; the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). We have been enjoying tremendous economic opportunities for the past few years and I hope it continues for a very long time. Remember, we can best provide for people and communities in the United States when our economy is strong, and PNTR will go a long way towards keeping our economy strong.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important decisions I have to make as a Member of Congress each year, is how to vote on our nation's trading relationship with China. This year, many of my constituents have been engaged in this debate as they have called, written, or stopped by my office to urge me to vote in favor of, or in opposition to, normalizing trade relations with China.

I have spent months and indeed years weighing the advantages and disadvantages of approving Permanent Normal Trading Relations (PNTR) with China. We have debated this measure ever since I began my service in 1994. As I reviewed the arguments on whether or not to extend Normal Trade Relations to China on a permanent basis, I have decided against PNTR for China.

I plan to vote no for several reasons:

1. The worsening of labor and human rights situation in China;
2. The continued aggressive military statements and actions against a Democratic Taiwan;
3. The transfer of sensitive military technology by China to rouge nations; and
4. The failure of the current Administration to effectively monitor and enforce the trade agreements they have already signed with China, including launch quota agreements, which of course, are very important for our district.

First, this is a vote of conscience. My staff and I have thoroughly reviewed the 1999 U.S. State Department Report on Human Rights Practices in China, which was released in February. The Report told the story of egregious civil and human rights abuses by the Chinese government against its own people.

The Administration's Report said, "The security apparatus is made up of the Ministries of State Security and Public Security, the People's Armed Police, the People's Liberation Army, and the state judicial, procuratorial, and penal systems. Security policy and personnel were responsible for numerous human rights abuses."

The Report goes on to say, "The [Chinese] Government's poor human rights record deteriorated markedly throughout the year, as the Government intensified efforts to suppress dissent, particularly organized dissent . . . The Government tightened restrictions on freedom of speech and of the press, and increased controls on the Internet; self-censorship by journalists also increased . . . The government continues to restrict freedom of religion, and intensified controls on some unregistered churches."

In addition, violence against Chinese women is on the rise as the government continues to, as the Report states, "induce coercive family planning—which sometimes includes forced abortion and sterilization; pros-

titution; discrimination against women; [Government] trafficking in women and children; [Government] abuse of children; and discrimination against the disabled and minorities are all problems.

I believe that by voting in favor of PNTR, I would be giving my implicit support for these violations of basic human rights. There are some of my colleagues who believe that through engagement we can effect changes in China. There may be some merit to that argument and I do not fault them for that belief. I cannot, however, in good conscience, vote to extend this privilege to China at this time. They have shown an unwillingness to embrace basic freedoms.

I am also deeply troubled by Communist China's aggressive militaristic threats toward a Democratic Taiwan. The Chinese government has threatened the democratically elected Taiwanese government. The Chinese have said in no uncertain terms that the recently elected democratic leaders of Taiwan have no role as China usurps Taiwan's independence under the Chinese umbrella of Communism and totalitarianism.

Even before threatening Taiwan, China was engaged in a massive spying effort on the United States. In fact, the Congressional "Cox Commission," produced a three-volume report outlining and detailing the military and commercial abuses and concerns the United States has with the Chinese government. Among the key findings of the bipartisan Cox China Espionage Report were:

1. That Communist China stole billions of dollars worth of American nuclear secrets that took our scientists decades of hard work to develop;
2. The Peoples Republic of China has stolen classified information on every warhead used for our ICBM and our submarine launched ballistic missiles; and
3. According to the unanimous judgment of the Committee, The People's Republic of China will exploit elements of stolen U.S. thermonuclear weapons designs on its new ICBMs as 2002.

The Report goes on and on, like background for a Tom Clancy novel, threatening the very fiber of our cultural heritage.

China has taken the technology they have stolen and shared it with rogue nations. They have encouraged the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile technology by sharing these sensitive technologies with rogue nations.

No longer are the American people safe from terrorists and the aggressions of our enemies. As many of these rouge nations have access to our top level military secrets. What is most disturbing is that the Administration knew about these security breaches as early as 1995, but failed to act because they were fearful of the repercussions and potential the political fallout.

My first experience with our government's effectiveness or unwillingness to challenge the Chinese in their failure to live up to their agreements came in 1997, and was in relation to the launch agreements, known as the Bilateral Space Launch Services Trade Agreement. The Administration significantly expanded agreements with the Chinese and Russians which permitted U.S. satellite manufacturers to ship satellites to Russia and China for launch. These agreements permitted larger numbers of U.S. satellites to be shipped to

China and Russia for launch in these countries. The Chinese signed an agreement stating that they, a non-market economy (NME), would not sell launch services at below market costs, in other words "no market dumping."

In probing this issue, I discovered that the Chinese were indeed allowed to "dump" launch services on the international market at below market costs. This was in violation of the agreement that they signed and it also was taking launches away from U.S. launch facilities at the Cape. Furthermore, our U.S. Trade Representative failed to respond to my inquiries over whether or not they were addressing this issue of dumping. It was not until I personally went down to their offices and went through their files that I discovered the fact that they were taking no steps whatsoever to curtail this problem. Furthermore, they never took any action to even discuss this problem with the Chinese.

This is a very disturbing trend which I cannot envision will improve until we as a nation decide to look at China differently. We must always keep our national security, our economic security, and the security of basic human rights in mind in all our dealings with China. Thus far, we have not.

Today I have outlined for you numerous abuses by the Chinese government. And, I understand that at some point there may be the tremendous economic potential to open our trading relations with the people of China. However, today I cannot support the Chinese government's repression of human and civil rights of the Chinese people; I cannot support their continued threats against Taiwan; and I cannot support their theft of American technology and military secrets. Until China can demonstrate a better track record in these key areas; I will not support Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 4444. Why is granting Permanent Normalized Trade Relations (PNTR) to China so important? There are several answers to this question. Granting PNTR to China transcends political, economic, and social boundaries and should foster better relations between the United States and China. Markets will be opened, diplomatic communication will be enhanced, and democratic values will spread in a Communist arena.

There is no question that the South Bay and the state of California will see the benefits. China's entry in the World Trade Organization (WTO) would mean dramatically expanded access to one of the largest and fastest growing markets in the world. China is currently our 12th largest trading partner. According to some experts, with China's entry into the WTO, that trade could double. Trade in and out of the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach would dramatically rise.

To be admitted into the WTO, China will have to make significant concessions to the other members. The U.S. reached an agreement with China on bilateral trade terms last November. This agreement dramatically cuts tariffs on American products, eliminates most domestic ownership requirements and provides greater transparency regarding Chinese business practices.

Let's take two industries important to my district to illustrate the benefits of this agreement. Mattel currently makes toys in China. To sell these toys in China, they must first be ex-

ported out of China and then imported back into the country. On import, Mattel must pay a tariff equal to 35%. After importation, Mattel must rely on Chinese companies to distribute the product in the country. PNTR will eliminate this requirement and effectively reduce the tariff rates to zero by 2005. The result? Increased sales and improved productivity for a U.S. company.

The benefits are the same for cars and auto parts. Currently, for TRW to sell auto parts in China, it must import the parts, which are subject to tariffs that range between 23.4% and 70%. To sell cars in China, Honda and Ford are subject to import tariffs as high as 100%. These companies are also subject to limits on the number of vehicles they can sell. The Chinese also require that cars sold in China must be substantially composed of Chinese parts, further hampering TRW's ability to sell American-made parts in China. With PNTR, tariffs are substantially reduced and the Chinese component requirement is eliminated. The result? Increased production and more jobs in the United States.

Granting PNTR for China is not all about dollar signs. There are also the social implications that increased trade promotes. There has been much debate, often times heated and emotional, over whether to enter into this agreement with China.

Many of the negative feelings associated with China stem from the oppressive 1989 crackdown of the student protesters in Tiananmen Square. Communist China reminds us of our Cold War opponents of yesterday. However, our greatest opportunity to implement change is to open the avenues of trade. Expanded trade relations means a greater flow of democratic ideals to a population unfamiliar with the freedoms we enjoy. The economic freedoms that China is pursuing will not work without some levels of political and personal freedom as well.

Companies like Mattel also implement strict codes of conduct for production facilities and contract manufacturers. This focus upon working conditions and employee treatment means better treatment for Chinese workers following adoption of PNTR.

Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, recently wrote, "The addition of the Chinese economy to the global marketplace will result in a more efficient worldwide allocation of resources and will raise standards of living in China and its trading partners. . . Further development of China's trading relationships with the United States and other industrial countries will work to strengthen the rule of law within China and to firm its commitment to economic reform."

Diplomatic ties will also be strengthened with improved trade relations with China. The worst possible scenario occurs if Congress denies granting China PNTR. In this case, diplomatic communication between the United States and China will be severely limited. It would be dangerous if we, as leaders of the free world, do not have open lines of communication with the most populated country in the world. I do not believe that this is a risk worth taking.

There is no doubt that California will make great gains through increased trade. The 36th congressional district also stands to benefit. But considering the big picture, increased trade and increased communication with China will allow an opportunity to lessen ten-

sions between our two countries. The fall of the Iron Curtain took the Berlin Wall with it. Progress can be made with China. Support PNTR.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support Permanent Normal Trade Relations status for China. This measure is an important step in promoting free and fair trade between the United States and the People's Republic of China, and in promoting freedom within China.

I remain concerned about the behavior of the Chinese leadership in a number of important areas, including weapons proliferation, human rights, and relations with Taiwan. In the past, I have voted against extending NTR for these reasons.

But the vote before us today is different. Extending Permanent NTR to China and supporting its accession to the World Trade Organization is the strongest catalyst for change in that country. It will promote the free market there. It will promote the rule of law there. And I strongly believe that it will ultimately promote the rise of democracy there.

We have seen capitalism rip through the "Iron Curtain," and now we have a tremendous opportunity to see it tear through Communist China.

We cannot do this by allowing the remnants of an antiquated economic system to remain isolated. Those in China who want to see this measure fail are the hard-line Communists who seek to maintain control and oppress the new generation that yearns for a better life. The greatest threat to the future of these Communist tyrants is the passage of PNTR and the freedom it unleashes.

Today we have an unprecedented opportunity to gain substantially greater access to China's market of well over one billion people. If we pass this measure, China will have to change its protectionist laws and policies, and reduce tariff rates on U.S. products. But if we do not extend PNTR, we will lose these benefits, while our trade competitors gain them.

Mr. Speaker the best way to name the communist bear is not to poke it in its eye, but to endear yourself to its cubs. The new generation of Chinese knows America and has a strong desire to emulate our values and culture. This is our country's chance to engage China and have a truly profound effect on that nation's future.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4444, legislation to grant Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China.

The United States Trade Representative's agreement with China gives us a unique and historic opportunity to challenge old assumptions and establish new goals with respect to China. The Administration, in November, laid its bet on improving economic relations with China as the best way to ensure that this huge and growing power will become a constructive member of the world community. Today, it is up to Congress to affirm this deal to make these opportunities a reality.

Despite our disappointments with China's internal policies, this is not a time to withdraw and abandon all dealings with China, particularly those that are clearly in our own interest to pursue. The deal the U.S. Trade Representative made with China represents a series of major concessions by the Chinese to accomplish a goal—Chinese membership in the

WTO—that is also clearly in our national interests. This deal is a classic “win-win” proposition for the United States.

While China will benefit from expanded trade and investment, this deal is composed of a series of unilateral concessions by China that reduce most of its tariffs, open the markets most attractive to U.S. goods and services, and commit China to international rules of commercial behavior and extensive monitoring of its compliance. Granting China PNTR would result in an opening of markets for American farmers, bankers, insurers, and manufacturers of microchips, chemicals, cars, computers, and software, who will reap benefits from a whole new level of access to what is potentially the world's largest consumer market.

To fully realize the benefits of trade, however, requires more than agreements to reduce barriers. Sustaining support for the trading system also requires that the rules under which countries engage in trade are credible and equitable. The rules should ensure that governments play fair—that they not seek advantage for favored interests by subsidizing their producers or passing regulations that unnecessarily distort international trade. Fairness also requires that the gains from trade are shared widely and do not come at the expense of core labor and human rights standards.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before Congress today's bill will make these larger goals possible. Beyond the market-opening provisions in H.R. 4444, this bill also contains thoughtful provisions developed by Representatives LEVIN and BEREUTER that will establish mechanisms to monitor human rights in China, to report on labor market issues, and to encourage the development of rule of law and democracy-building in China. Granting China permanent PNTR would also mean the beginning of a long-term transition from a state-controlled economy toward a free market that will make these larger goals possible. Indeed, China is not only agreeing to import more American products, they are agreeing to import one of democracy's most cherished values—economic and social freedom.

The only thing the United States would do in return is grant China the same permanent “normal trade relations” status afforded to all WTO members, which has been granted on an annual basis for the past 19 years. Granting PNTR to China is not a “blessing” of their past and current behavior. Rather, it is a commitment by China to change its behavior to become a responsible global citizen.

This deal would impose on China a clear set of rules for business whereby the United States will benefit from China's verifiable and enforceable commitment to play by the world's rules. This deal will allow the United States to engage this emerging power in well-defined and civilized manner, rather than isolating it and strengthening the claims of its militarists that the America is an enemy. And this deal will open Chinese markets to U.S. products and services, which I hope will make the global economic pie bigger, so everyone gets a bigger piece.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in order for farmers, ranchers, and food processors to succeed in a global market, the US

needs fair trade and fair access to growing global markets. Nebraska is one of the nation's leading producers and exporters of agricultural products. Market access is absolutely crucial to the well being of our producers—as it is to producers of all commodities nationwide.

Agriculture will benefit most from the pending trade agreement with China. China's economy is already among the world's largest, and it has expanded at annual rates of nearly 10 percent. By supporting PNTR, we are giving our agricultural producers the access needed to compete in the global market. Passing up the opportunity to increase trade with a country that has nearly 26 percent of the world's population would be a grave error.

Under it's World Trade Organization accession agreement, China will lower its tariffs from 45 to 12 percent on frozen beef, and 45 to 25 percent on chilled beef by 2004. also, China will accept all beef from the United States that is accompanied by a USDA certificate of wholesomeness.

Nebraska's 1998 exports to China totaled \$33 million, which represents a 1,200 percent increase from 1993. China is Nebraska's 14th largest export destination, up from 31st in 1993. By building on this trend, the U.S. has taken a step in the right direction. Approval of PNTR is simply the continuation of this process.

Opponents of PNTR legislation argue that China will no longer need to respect our positions on human rights and other issues.

However, by joining the WTO, China is agreeing to a rules-based trading system, and by working closely with China, the U.S. will be able to influence positive change on human, religious, and political rights.

Not only must we support PNTR for China for agriculture, but for the continued growth of our nation as a whole. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 4444.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in urging my colleagues to vote No on granting PNTR for the People's Republic of China.

Since relations between the U.S. and China were normalized, Congress has had the opportunity, every year, whether or not to grant China the same trading status we give to other “friendly” nations. Although the China trade deal has won out every year, at least we had an annual review in place. If this bill passes, I am sure the dictators in Beijing will take our concerns even less seriously than they have in the past.

It is well known that China has a terrible record on human and worker rights, environmental protection, fair trade and weapons proliferation. China has repeatedly violated almost all of their prior agreements. The United States consumes 40 percent of China's exports, so common sense dictates that we can influence China's actions by threatening to cut off market access. By essentially granting China permanent guaranteed access to our markets we would surrender our only political and economic leverage.

Big business claims that granting China PNTR will allow for more American products to be sold to the 1.2 billion consumers in China. But even if China opens their doors to

our products, which I don't believe they intend on doing, how many cars or designer jeans will American workers sell to Chinese workers making 13 cents per hour.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this “Blank Check for China.”

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of continued Normal Trade Relations between the United States and China.

Trade with China has been a significant factor in the economic expansion we've been able to enjoy during the 1990s. In my own district, Greater Cincinnati companies exports to China have almost doubled in this decade alone. That means more jobs for my constituents, more prosperity for the families and businesses in Southwest Ohio, and a healthier economy for the area I represent, for the state of Ohio as a whole and, indeed, for the entire nation.

For those of my colleagues who are undecided on this subject, I'd urge you to take a close look at this PNTR agreement, because it makes so much sense. This is a totally one-sided agreement. Because we already have an essentially open market, we've given away nothing to get this deal, but we've received unprecedented concessions from the Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, China has a long way to go on improving labor standards, human rights and environmental protection. That's why I believe our most important export to China won't be our products and services. Our most important export is our ideas and our beliefs about freedom and democracy.

As the United States and China develop closer ties—as individuals from both countries begin to interact more often with each other—it's going to be impossible for the Chinese government to prevent our values and ideas from spreading. You can already see it happening with the spread of the internet in China, despite the best efforts of their government to slow it down.

Mr. Speaker, we can choose to get rid of normal trade relations with China, and stand on the sidelines when our European and Asian competitors take our place. Or we can build a strong bilateral relationship through engagement—opening their country to our products and ideas.

I urge my colleagues to support the rational approach—and to support normal trade relations with China.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support permanent normal trade relations for China. I will vote in favor of PNTR, not only because of the benefits that American farmers and businesses stand to gain in terms of increased trade, which are substantial, but also because of the impact approval of PNTR will have for U.S. national security and stability in Asia.

A solid trade relationship with China, with its huge potential markets, is important to Missouri. In 1998, China was Missouri's sixth most important export market and the United States' fourth largest trading partner. From 1991 to 1998, U.S. exports to China more than doubled. The agreement that the administration reached with China last November

concerning China's accession to the World Trade Organization commits China to eliminate export subsidies and lower tariffs dramatically, reduce its farm supports, and play by the same trade rules as we do. Further concessions recently gained by the European Union would increase the benefits, as the agreement would apply to all parties to the WTO.

During the first 6 years of the agreement, USDA estimates U.S. agriculture exports to China will increase a total of \$7.5 billion. In the first ten years of the agreement, USDA projects one-third of U.S. export growth will be in U.S. agricultural products destined for China.

China is the last major untapped market for American agriculture. As China moves from an agrarian economy to a modern economy, someone must fill the gap. As the standard of living increases in China, the Chinese people will be able to buy more U.S. products. To gain these advantages, Congress must approve PNTR status for China. If Congress does not do so, the only winners will be our international competitors who would welcome the chance to gain market share that would otherwise go to U.S. farmers and benefit the entire agriculture community. Congressional approval of PNTR also have implications for U.S. national security. Early this year, I led a small House Armed Services Committee delegation on a trip to the Asia-Pacific region. Although we did not visit China, we did find in our meetings will officials how much other nations in Asia value America's presence and engagement in the region to promote stability.

The state of U.S.-China relations is critical to the future stability, prosperity, and peace of Asia. Encouraging China to participate in global economic institutions is in our interest because it will bring China under a system of global trade rules and draw it into the world community. It is in our long term interest to develop a relationship with China that is stable and predictable. China will enter the WTO based upon the votes of all 135 WTO members. Denial of PNTR by the U.S. will not affect China's entry into the WTO, but rejecting PNTR after last year's negotiated agreement will diminish our credibility and our ability to make a difference in China.

WTO memberships will bring China into the system of trading rules and standards that apply to all other major trading partners in the world. Congress should approve PNTR so that American farmers, workers, businesses will be able to take advantage of opening markets in China and so that our continued involvement in China can help in working toward other reforms. For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support PNTR.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of granting normal trade relations to China. This measure is good policy for our Nation as a whole, and good policy for the people of the 18th district of Illinois. The choice we have before us today is whether we want to trade with China with our hand open in friendship, or with our hand closed in opposition. China is expected to join the WTO later this year, and today's vote will set the stage on how we will trade with China in the years to come.

By passing NTR today, we will establish a first in U.S. trade policy. We will lock ourselves into a one-sided trade deal, which favors the United States. Last year, Ambassador

Charlene Barshefsky and our trade representatives negotiated a bilateral agreement with China, which not only significantly lowers many of China's tariffs, but also provides for anti-surge guarantees to protect American manufacturers from Chinese dumping of goods into our markets. Failure to pass NTR will not prevent China from joining the WTO. It will, however, prevent us from benefiting from the bilateral agreement we negotiated, while at the same time concede the benefits of this agreement to our Asian, European, and Latin American competitors.

As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I recently joined with my colleagues in a series of field hearings throughout the country to get a sense of how agriculture is doing in America. The consensus is that unlike the rest of the country, our agriculture community is in trouble.

Granting NTR to China will not cure the ills that face our agricultural economy, but it will help. The facts are that China has 20 percent of the world's population and approximately 7 percent of the world's arable land. It is shifting from an agrarian economy to an industrialized/manufacturing economy. China currently has a population of over 1.3 billion, with a steady rate of population growth. These facts indicate that over the long term, China represents a huge potential market for American agriculture products. In the near term, China is currently the sixth largest market for U.S. farm products. In 1999, the U.S. exported over \$2 billion dollars worth of agricultural commodities to Mainland China and Hong Kong, in spite of high tariff rates and restrictive trade practices, designed to specifically prohibit importation of American agricultural products.

Once China joins the WTO and accedes to the bilateral agreement, many of these high tariff rates and restrictive trade practices will be reduced, or phased out, by 2005. This agreement, as well as WTO rules, also contain provisions which allow the United States to act unilaterally if China violates the terms of the agreement. Granting NTR is not only good for agriculture—it is good for American business as well. As President Clinton stated in the State of the Union address, "Our markets are already open to China. This agreement will open their markets to us." The Commerce Department recently announced that our trade deficit widened in March to an all time high of \$30.2 billion. Granting NTR to China will help reverse our trade gap by leveling the playing field, and allowing American business to crack into this highly protected market.

As I have indicated before, I believe that granting NTR is good for the country and good for the people of Illinois. In 1998, direct exports to China from the State of Illinois totaled over \$505 million. If we pass the NTR legislation, I would expect this figure to grow significantly. In addition to the agricultural interests in my district, I am also proud to represent America's manufacturing industry. Caterpillar, Inc., one of nations' leading manufacturers of earth moving and construction equipment, is based in my hometown of Peoria, Illinois. Caterpillar employees over 67,000 workers worldwide, many of whom live in my district, and in 1999, exported \$5.2 billion worth of equipment. For Caterpillar, and other heavy machinery manufacturers, China has always been a very difficult market in which to work. The bilateral agreement we negotiated would ease market restrictions, lower tariffs on heavy ma-

chinery, and, in general, make it easier for American companies to operate in China.

Aside from the obvious economic benefits, I believe that granting NTR to China will lead to positive societal changes within China. It is my hope that improved economic conditions in China will result in a higher quality of life for Chinese workers. I also hope that greater interaction with Western culture, and its focus on human rights, will pressure the Chinese Government to continue with the liberalization of its economic and social structure. We need to approach China with an open hand, not with a closed fist. I urge my colleagues to support granting normal trade relations to China.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4444 to grant permanent normal trade relations for China. The United States has engaged in normal trade relations with China for the past two decades. Since then, trade has grown and flourished between our two countries, with an ever-increasing U.S. corporate presence in China. In 1999, China was the 4th largest U.S. trading partner. Since I joined Congress, I have voted three times in favor of normal trade relations with China. Today, however, I will vote to reject H.R. 4444 for three reasons.

First, before today, an annual review of China's performance in the areas of human rights and nuclear non-proliferation has been concretely tied to a vote in Congress on its trade status. This has provided the U.S. with leverage to raise critical issues with China regarding human rights, workers rights, freedom of religion and association, the autonomy of Tibet, the transfer of nuclear technology, the security of Taiwan, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. At least once a year, China had to respond seriously to these concerns in order to gain the two things it most desires: access to U.S. technology and access to the U.S. consumer market. I don't mean to imply that China's performance always improved in these areas, but the annual review, directly tied to a vote on trade, ensured that the dialogue between our two nations was a serious one.

The vote today strips the Congress, and I believe the Administration, of any leverage on these issues. We can establish commissions and release reports to monitor human rights in China, but we already do that regularly anyway. More pieces of paper will have little impact on China. What leverage we had was due to the fact that the review was tied directly to a vote on trade.

Second, I am interested in not only who benefits from the U.S.-China bilateral trade agreement, but also who suffers. I believe many of the claims made on both sides of this debate will prove, over time, to be exaggerated—especially in light of China's record of non-compliance with other trade agreements. I believe many businesses in Massachusetts, including in my own district, will benefit from increased commerce with China, particularly in the areas of high-tech, computers and financial services. I believe trade in these areas between our two countries will increase even if permanent NTR is rejected today.

I also know, however, that in negotiating this agreement the U.S. Trade Representative conceded whole areas of trade and commerce to China. Nowhere is this more true than in the textile and clothing industry. Prior to the conclusion of negotiations on the bilateral trade agreement, I wrote and phoned the

USTR about this issue, pleading for support. My letters and calls went unanswered. I would like to point out to my colleagues that this is the very first trade agreement opposed both by the textile manufacturers and the clothing and textile workers. As this House knows, that was not the case with NAFTA, the Caribbean Basin Initiative/CBI or the recently approved Africa trade bill. This alone should give all my colleagues an idea about exactly how bad this agreement is for clothing and textiles, and for communities like those I represent in southeastern Massachusetts. By opposing H.R. 4444, I stand with the families and towns whose lives and livelihoods have been so callously disregarded by the USTR.

Third, I believe the very framework around which we currently pursue trade agreements is flawed. Worse, I believe it runs counter to our ability to achieve our goals in promoting freedom and democracy worldwide. Let me be clear, I support normal trade relations with all nations. I believe it is good for America, good for the exchange of goods and services, and good for the exchange of ideas. I am not and never will be an isolationist. I believe strongly, however, that commerce and trade must not operate separate from, let alone contrary to, other national priorities; to promote democracy, nuclear non-proliferation, respect for human rights, and protection of the environment. Internationally, the U.S. is a leader on these issues and a party to international agreements, standards and law. Yet in the areas of trade and commerce, we often negotiate agreements that undermine these other standards and agreements. I believe we must integrate these priorities, not separate them. We have a global economy because the world is now, more than ever before, a global, interdependent community.

The bilateral trade agreement negotiated between the U.S. and China, which goes far beyond "normal" trade relations, and H.R. 4444 to grant permanent NTR to China have aggressively sought to "de-link" trade from any other U.S. priority or consideration. I believe this takes us down the wrong path. It says to all the other countries of the world that human rights, arms control, and the environment are not important to the U.S. if a buck is to be made. Last minute sugarcoating to establish commissions to monitor human rights will not change this basic message. And it's the wrong message.

For these reasons, and many others, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4444.

I submit the following materials from the textile industry.

AMERICAN TEXTILE  
MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE,  
Washington, DC, May 10, 2000.

RE: China Permanent NTR—Textile and  
Appeal Markets

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute (ATMI), I would like to reiterate our opposition to legislation granting permanent normal trade relations to China (NTR) and to again urge you to vote against this proposal. We have written you previously outlining concerns, and this letter is to elaborate more fully on the issue of market access. ATMI is the national trade association for the domestic textile industry, with member company facilities in more than 30 states.

Contrary to claims that the United States gave up nothing in the agreement to support China's accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO), we must emphatically point

out that the U.S. has actually given China greater access to our textile and apparel market than that given any other WTO member. Incredibly, the U.S. did this while at the same time doing nothing to guarantee that we will receive reciprocal access the China's markets.

While current WTO members are seeing U.S. textile and apparel quotas phased out over a ten-year period, China will be allowed to benefit from a phaseout period of five years or less (depending on when they actually join the WTO). This is the equivalent of, in a baseball game, allowing one team (China) to start an inning with a runner leading off second base while making every other team play by the normal rules and start each inning in the batters' box. China is being given an enormous headstart toward home plate, which in this case is the elimination of all U.S. quotas and thus unrestricted access to the U.S. market.

At the same time, the U.S. has received nothing but the same old tired assurance from China that they will allow our textile and apparel exports to enter their country. We have heard this song and dance before. But as the following chart shows, China has effectively used its elaborate system of tariff and non-tariff barriers to keep its market closed to our products.

Based on this poor track record, we sincerely doubt that China's most recent assurance of access will pan out.

So as far as textile trade goes, this is a one-sided trade deal that only benefits China. Accordingly, we urge you to reject permanent NTR and allow Congress the chance to use annual renewal of NTR as leverage to force China to honor the promises it has already made to allow U.S. textile and apparel exports access to the vast but heretofore virtually closed Chinese market.

Sincerely,

ROGER CHASTAIN,  
President.

AMERICAN TEXTILE  
MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE,  
Washington, DC, May 18, 2000.

Re: China Permanent NTR—Ineffective  
Textile and General Product Safeguards

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We understand that the House Ways and Means Committee leadership has reached a deal under which the product safeguard provisions of last November's China WTO accession agreement will be incorporated into the permanent normal trade relations (NTR) bill, H.R. 4444. On behalf of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute (ATMI), I would like to point out that this "breakthrough" will not do anything to alleviate our concerns. We are still strongly opposed to this legislation and urge your opposition as well.

Enclosed is a copy of our April 21 letter to Ambassador Barshefsky, which points out serious flaws in the China WTO accession agreement's textile product safeguard and 12-year general product safeguard. As you will note from our letter and accompanying questions, we believe the safeguard provisions in the accession agreement will not be effective in preventing serious harm to the U.S. textile industry as a result of import surges. Therefore, inclusion of these provisions in H.R. 444 or any parallel legislation does not address our concerns.

Also, as we stated in this letter (and as you probably know from our previous letters, congressional testimony, news releases and communications from our members and workers in your district), China's entry into the WTO under the accelerated quota phase-out schedule is projected to cost over 150,000 jobs in the U.S. textile and related industries. Thus, we again dispute the claim by

supporters of the bill that the United States "gave away nothing" in this agreement—in fact, the U.S. is proposing to give China faster access to our market than any other WTO member, and at the cost of 150,000 U.S. jobs.

Therefore, we urge you to vote "NO" on H.R. 4444 when it comes before the House.

Sincerely,

ROGER W. CHASTAIN,  
President.

AMERICAN TEXTILE  
MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE,  
Washington, DC, April 21, 2000.

Ambassador CHARLENE BARSHEFSKY,  
United States Trade Representative,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR AMBASSADOR BARSHEFSKY: We would appreciate your review of several important matters concerning the textile product safeguard and the twelve-year general product specific safeguard in the China WTO Accession agreement.

An effective safeguard is of paramount importance to the livelihoods of more than 1.2 million textile and apparel workers. The study by the International Trade Commission on China's accession concluded that China's share of the U.S. apparel market would triple as a result of the agreement. Another study by Nathan Associates came up with the same conclusion and examined the impact on U.S. textile and apparel employment. The Nathan study determined that over 150,000 U.S. jobs in the textile and apparel sector would be lost as a result of the agreement.

The information we have received thus far as to the details regarding the use of either the textile specific or the general product specific safeguard has created serious concerns regarding the potential effectiveness of either instrument.

We would appreciate hearing from you at your earliest convenience about how these safeguard mechanisms will operate.

Sincerely,

CARIOS MOORE,  
Executive Vice President.

ATMI QUESTIONS ON THE TEXTILE PRODUCT  
SAFEGUARD AND THE 12 YEAR PRODUCT  
SPECIFIC SAFEGUARD IN THE CHINA WTO  
ACCESSION AGREEMENT

(1) Textile Product Safeguard

(a) Administration: Will the Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA) will be the administrator of the textile product safeguard in the China WTO accession agreement?

(i) Will CITA be the final decision-making authority on the imposition of this safeguard?

(ii) Will CITA have authority to direct U.S. Customs to carry-out safeguard actions?

(b) Timing: Will textile products that have already been integrated be subject to the textile product safeguard immediately upon china's entry into the WTO and will those products that will be integrated in 2002 be eligible for a safeguard action, if appropriate, in 2002?

(c) Original finding of market disruption: China has by far the world's largest textile and apparel complex and by far the largest quota coverage (over 100 quotas) imposed on its textile and apparel exports. These quotas were imposed because of findings of market disruption over the past 15 years. Can the original finding of market disruption automatically be re-applied when these quotas are removed?

(i) If not, if China's imports do surge across most, if not all, product categories (as the ITC study appears to imply they will), would separate market disruption findings be needed on each category, or, if an overall condition of disruption could be found, could this serve in place of separate statements?

(d) New findings of market disruption: If the original market disruption finding cannot be reapplied, the U.S. has historically made a determination of market disruption in textile and apparel cases where imports of a given textile product were increasing from a particular country (as well as from the world overall) while domestic U.S. production of that same product was declining. Could the U.S. use these same three criteria alone—increasing Chinese imports, increasing world imports and decreasing U.S. production—to make a similar finding under the textile product safeguard in this agreement?

If not, what other or different criteria would be required under a WTO-based system?

(ii) In other cases, the ITC study predicts that China will take market share from other countries. Some of these countries—Mexico and the Caribbean nations—are primary export markets for U.S. textile products. Please confirm that the U.S. could take action on the basis of increasing Chinese imports and declining U.S. production with overall imports remaining stable.

(e) Use of textile inputs to take an apparel safeguard action: As mentioned above, a large percentage of U.S. textile output is now exported to the CBI and Mexico for assembly into garments for re-export back to the United States. Displacement of these regional apparel imports into the United States by Chinese imports would hurt the U.S. textile industry in the same way that the loss of U.S. apparel production does. In fact, for many products, including knit shirts, underwear and woven trousers, a substantial amount of the production originally sourced in the United States has now shifted to the CBI and Mexico. It is extremely important that ATMI be able to ensure that both safeguards in the agreement can be used to protect its workers if these re-export markets are threatened by Chinese imports.

(i) Will the government consider declines in complementary U.S. textile products as a basis for imposing safeguard measures against increasing Chinese apparel imports?

(ii) How would the administration ensure that no WTO difficulties would result from such a result. (see "e" below)?

(f) Definition of U.S. apparel production: The United States currently defines a cut piece of fabric which is being exported as a completed garment—as a result government reports sometimes show that U.S. apparel production for a given product is increasing when in fact it is exports of the cut pieces of cloth that are increasing (note: these pieces constitute the bulk of the trade between the U.S. and Mexico and the CBI). If these cut pieces exports were removed, actual U.S. apparel production would almost certainly be in decline.

(i) When considering the use of either safeguard will the government commit to removing exported cut pieces of U.S. fabric from its U.S. apparel production calculations?

(ii) Are there any WTO rules or regulations which this would violate?

(g) Lack of recent U.S. textile and apparel production data: During the last five years, the Commerce Department has stopped issuing quarterly textile and apparel production figures and, as a result, U.S. apparel production figures are often a year or more out of date. The government has also sometimes delayed safeguard actions until more recent production data was available. The imposition of a safeguard measure requires immediate action if it is to be effective—particularly when a dominant supplier such as China is involved.

(i) Will the government agree that it will either re-institute quarterly reporting or that it will use the most recent available production data that it has available as a

basis for any safeguard measure and that it will not delay imposition of a safeguard measure because of production information?

(h) Definition of "reapplication": The textile safeguard says that after a measure has been in place a year, the safeguard must be "reapplied" in order to be extended. What does "reapplied" mean?

(i) Does it mean that a new market disruption statement would need to be created?

(1) If so, does this mean that the government would have to wait until imports started increasing again in large numbers before a new safeguard could be imposed?

(a) Would this mean that the industry could conceivably be forced to wait up to a year—in order for a pattern of increasing imports to be established—before a second safeguard action could be applied?

(i) Concerns over potential number of cases and speed of response: Under the category system, China currently has over 100 quotas applied to it. Under the WTO accession package, almost all of these quotas will disappear on Jan. 1, 2005. How can the U.S. government ensure that safeguard actions will quickly be forthcoming if a large number of categories qualify for action at the same time? (see b) and I) above for details).

(j) Can China appeal a safeguard action to the DSB?: If China disagreed with the imposition of a safeguard by the U.S., would it have recourse under the WTO to request dispute settlement?

(i) If so, could a dispute settlement panel or some other WTO entity overturn the imposition of a quota under this safeguard or authorize Chinese retaliation?

(1) The creation of a textile safeguard action against a WTO country in Agreement on Textiles and Clothing has steadily become more complex, difficult and time-consuming—at least 12 different areas have to be investigated thoroughly and reported upon. Safeguard actions have come to require enormous amount of work and even then outcomes, which require consensus, are often unsatisfactory. As a result, textile safeguard actions for WTO countries are now exceedingly rare.

(a) If a U.S. safeguard action is appealable within the WTO, how can the U.S. government ensure that safeguard actions against China do not get bogged down in this cumbersome process?

(k) Use of the category system in safeguard actions: Under the MFA and ATC, the U.S. has used a category system in order to impose specific quotas. Textile Monitoring body (TMB) reports in the WTO have implied that they no longer consider the category system a relevant vehicle for safeguard actions. Would the U.S. use the category system or would it consider using alternative systems for imposing a safeguard?

(l) WTO criteria: what are the WTO criteria for "market disruption" and what would the U.S. have to do meet to sustain a textile product specific safeguard action under WTO review?

(2) The 12 Year Product Specific Safeguard (a) CITA to administer? Who will be the administrator of the overall product specific safeguard in textile cases? Will CITA administer this safeguard as it has other safeguards under the GATT and the WTO?

(b) Will a Presidential finding be required? Will a judgment of material injury by the administrator require the imposition of a safeguard or will presidential action be also required? (In 301 cases, we note that Presidential action is NOT required.) The ability of a Presidential to potentially ignore a finding of material injury concerns us.

(c) Do textile inputs have standing in a case of increased apparel imports? As stated in regards to the textile safeguard (see 1d) a large percentage of U.S. textile output is

now exported to the CBI and Mexico for assembly into garments for re-export back to the United States.

(i) Will declines in complementary U.S. textile products be accepted as a basis for imposing safeguard measures against increasing Chinese apparel imports.

(ii) Are there any WTO rulings or regulations which could be used to prevent such a basis?

(d) A second safeguard action? Can a second safeguard action be re-instituted after a three-year or two-year safeguard has been imposed if a new investigation determines that it is warranted?

(i) Would such a safeguard still be open to retaliation (eg, China's suspension of concessions)?

(e) Section 406—how does it compare?

(i) Can the safeguard under section 406 be applied rather than the general product specific safeguard in this agreement?

(ii) Will section 406 remain in effect in the event that China gets PNTR and the 406, as a part of Jackson Vanik, no longer operable?

(iii) The administration claims that the injury threshold for the product specific safeguard is lower than section 201, stating that it will be easier for industries to get relief under this provision from growing Chinese imports. However, the injury standard for section 406 appears to be the same as the product specific safeguard and the duration of relief is actually longer under section 406. Yet, section 406 is almost never used, while section 201 is more frequently employed.

(1) What is the basis for the administration's belief that utilization of this product specific safeguard will be greater and easier to use?

(2) In your opinion, why are section 406 actions so rarely brought and why should product specific safeguard actions—which appear to be virtually identical—be any easier?

(3) Dumping

(a) Textile dumping cases: Can language be inserted into the agreement making it easier to bring dumping cases against Chinese imports (right now, effective textile dumping cases are difficult to bring because minor product specific changes can result in the evasion of dumping margins.)

(4) Countervailing Duty Cases

(a) Are CVD cases now possible? The USTR Fact Sheet published in *Inside US Trade* implies that countervailing duty suits will be allowed against China. However, Commerce maintains a prohibition on any CVD petitions against non-market economies and the dumping provisions in the United States/China agreement refer to China as a non-market economy. China, therefore, appears to be immune from United States CVD law.

(i) Will the Administration change the Commerce position?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4444, permanent normal trade relations for China. While I must first say that I am essentially a "free trader" I am opposed to the extension of permanent normal trade relations with China because of China's dismal record on human rights and its dismal record on worker rights, labor standards and environmental protections. The United States has formerly criticized China's human rights record before the United Nations Human Rights Commission for measures against political activists that have created what officials called a "sharply deteriorated [human] rights situation . . ." Pursuant to a May 1, 2000 Report on International Religious Freedom, "Chinese government violations of religious freedom increased markedly during the past year."

China has received normal trade relations (NTR) status annually since 1980. However,

gross human rights abuses in China still prevail. Since the Tiananmen Square tragedy of 1989, the annual process of renewal has been a meaningful way to impact human rights considerations into the U.S.-China trade debate. The annual debate in the Congress on normal trade relations is the only substantive economic leverage the Congress can choose to exert against China. If Congress grants China permanent normal trade status, the United States will lose the best leverage it has to meaningfully influence China to enact internationally recognized rights and protections. While there is no doubt that the globalization of the world's markets is inevitable, Congress should continue to have an opportunity to review China's human rights performance on an annual basis before granting China permanent normal trade relations.

Mr. Speaker, in the past, I have voted in support of most favored nation [MFN] status for China. Last year, I opposed the year long MFN for China. However, today, I oppose PNTR for China because of its potential negative impact on the American worker.

While this bill might provide certain economic benefits and advantages to some American companies, it could hurt other American industries and may cost many Americans their jobs. Pursuant to a report by the Economic Policy Institute, American workers in every state will lose jobs if this bill is passed. Over the next decade, U.S. job losses would total 872,091 with every industry suffering.

In the State of Florida alone, an estimated 22,277 jobs will be lost. If we do not protect the interest of the American worker, then who will? We must not allow "big business" to sell out the American worker, nor can I allow small business in my district to be severely impacted by this trade pact.

Most Americans recognize the importance of trade. Most Americans also recognize the importance of decent wages and decent work standards. In the United States, our manufacturing industry served as the lifeblood of millions of Americans for generations. The manufacturing industry and other similar industries served as a vehicle for millions of Americans to lift themselves out of poverty and achieve the American dream. However, in the last 20 years, millions of manufacturing jobs have been lost to low-wage foreign nations producing cheap imports. We can not continue to lose American jobs to cheap labor abroad without substantive protections for the American worker.

Free trade without enforceable labor and environmental protections will promote the growth of child labor, forced labor, poverty-level wages and environmental abuses. Increasingly, American companies are moving their operations abroad in order to take advantage of cheap labor and near non-existent environmental standards. Unfortunately, for many businesses, this is the great attraction of China. PNTR will perpetuate the increasing exploitation of Chinese workers and add to the suffering of thousands of children who toil in filthy hazardous sweatshops. We must not aid in this human tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, human rights is a fundamental principal of American democracy; the ability of the American worker to gain meaningful employment is critical to the prosperity of America; labor standards and worker rights are fundamental rights which should be extended to every worker—across the globe; and exploi-

tation of innocent children is unacceptable. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 510, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. BONIOR

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BONIOR. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BONIOR moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4444, to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on International Relations with instructions that those committees report the bill back to the House promptly with the following amendment:

Add at the end of title I the following new section:

**SEC. 105. WITHDRAWAL OF NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS.**

(a) 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.

(b) 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.

(c) APPLICABILITY TO EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The President shall have the authority to determine the extent to which the withdrawal under subsection (b) 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is recognized for 5 minutes on his motion to recommit.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit is the exact same language as an amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and I offered in the Committee on Rules we sought to have incorporated in the base bill or to be offered as an amendment, but we were not allowed to do so. It is very simple. It

simply says that PNTR is automatically revoked if China attacks, invades, or blockades Taiwan.

Now, when we talk to people in the administration or even outside in the academic world, people who are China experts, they all say, but if China invades, attacks, or blockades Taiwan, of course we would revoke PNTR and much more.

But, over and over again in history, we know that when nations do not tell the consequences for conduct for aggressive actions, other countries misread those consequences.

Having studied what happened prior to the Gulf War for a very long time, I believe if we had made more clear to Saddam Hussein what would have happened should he invade Kuwait, that particular bloody battle could have been avoided.

If all we are going to do is agree to revoke PNTR should this very real threat be implemented, then let us tell the Chinese beforehand.

I agree with the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTER), reach out to the future. But as we do so, remember the past, give the specific announcement of the consequence for the threat to our national security interests for which we spend billions of dollars in forward deployment in the Western Pacific.

And, by the way, this is GATT pursuant to article 21. Arguments being spread around this Chamber that this somehow is GATT violative are inaccurate, wrong, and improper legal analysis.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bipartisan motion. Surely we should use our economic leverage with China to deter any Chinese aggression against Taiwan. It is a very simple motion that will do exactly what we need to do to protect our ally.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who has been so marvelous on this issue.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, there are good people on both sides. I know as a Member that sometimes we want to be with our party and sometimes we want to be with our President.

For me, I want to be with my conscience. My conscience tells me, and I think the American people would agree, that if China attacks, invades, or blockades Taiwan, they should lose PNTR.

Support the motion to recommit. That is where the American people would be.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I think the bottom line question we all need to ask, Mr. Speaker, is, is there anything that the dictatorship in Beijing can do that would lead to a loss of support for PNTR that Beijing so desperately wants? They need

to know, as my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), said, up front what the consequences will be.

If pervasive torture, religious persecution, Laogai labor, a lack of press freedom, and worker rights and other human rights abuses are not enough, I sincerely hope that war with Taiwan is sufficiently egregious to trigger a loss of support for PNTR.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I asked only three questions of the CIA when I went in for the briefing. I said, will PNTR, if we pass it, stabilize or destabilize the regime? They said, stabilize. I said, what will it do to buildup of forces on the shoreline and the aggressive forces that are being amassed against Taiwan? They said, it will improve it.

I tell my colleagues now, as I left that meeting, I walked away thinking about the oath of office I took with all of my colleagues here, the oath that said I swear to protect and defend this country.

Think about that oath. Vote for this motion to recommit.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say, if we supplied the American dollars for the missile destroyers, we supplied American dollars for the AWACS and air refueling equipment and for the kilo submarines that China is acquiring, we at least owe the commitment to Taiwan to condition those supplies of American cache with a commitment to have a benign relationship with Taiwan on the part of mainland China.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if this motion to recommit passes, it does not instruct the committee to report back forthwith with instructions. Does that mean that if this motion to recommit passes that the bill will have to go back to committee?

1700

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Texas is correct.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, what that means is that it will be reported back to committee, and there will be no vote on final passage?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is correct, the bill would be recommitted to two committees.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, is it not also true that if indeed this motion passed, this bill could be reported back to the two respective committees to which it is designated and that bill could be reported back to the House tomorrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At some subsequent time, the committees could meet and report the bill back to the House.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations for 22 years and a former member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I rise to oppose the motion to recommit. First of all, the Bonior motion to recommit violates GATT provision article 1, because you cannot condition most favored nation status, MFN, or NTR, so this is a killer amendment.

The President, by the way, already has the authority to withdraw at any time MFN or NTR status for the People's Republic of China. Also, under article 21 of GATT, the United States has unilateral authority to exert its national security exception for any reason. Clearly reacting to an attack on Taiwan would meet the security exception.

The U.S. can withdraw MFN or NTR clearly under those circumstances without having to in any way compensate China. And WTO members have wide discretion to invoke its GATT 21 rights. This authority has gone back for many years. We have exerted it against Cuba, we have exerted it against Nicaragua, and it has been sustained in every instance. So this amendment is not necessary, it is a killer amendment, and I hope that the House will reject the motion to recommit.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this motion to recommit. If Members are for the bill, vote for it. If they are against the bill, vote against it, but do not do it this way. This is a very clear poison pill by opponents of free trade to kill this historic legislation, make no mistake about it. This amendment is a procedural vote that is cleverly drafted to appeal to those of us who support Taiwan. But let us be clear. This is a blatant political move to bring down this bill both on substance and on procedure.

Mr. Speaker, there is no bigger supporter and defender of Taiwan than myself. I have worked with Members on both sides of this aisle and on both sides of this debate on legislation to protect Taiwan and give it the resources it needs to defend itself from Beijing. Most Members voted for the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act. I have been and will continue to be an outspoken opponent against China's Communist leaders.

I share the concerns of my friend the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) about Beijing's constant refusal to renounce the use of force against Taiwan, and I will continue to work with anyone in this Congress who wants to address these issues. But, Mr. Speaker, this amendment does not help Taiwan. It puts them square in the middle of a vicious political fight. Taiwan supporters need to understand this. Taiwan does not support this language. We have spoken to I-jen Chiou, the Deputy Secretary-General of the Taiwan Security Council, and he made it clear that this amendment is not helpful to Taiwan. They support PNTR. They support China getting into the WTO. This amendment puts all of that in jeopardy.

Let me say to my friends on both sides of the aisle, if China attacks Taiwan, I will be the first to come down on this floor to force any administration, whether it be Democrat or Republican, to take action against China. But let us be clear. This language will do nothing to address our concerns with Beijing, it will have no impact on their actions but will permit the Chinese to refuse WTO benefits to American companies.

The USTR has already made it clear that this language will subject us to punishing tariffs once China enters the WTO. And at the same time, it does not give us any new authority. We already have the authority under the WTO to remove PNTR for China for national security reasons. However, singling out China preemptively is a violation of our commitments under the WTO. So, Mr. Speaker, I understand why this language looks appealing, but I urge my colleagues not to use our friends in Taiwan as a political tool.

After all the discussions, after all the commitments that have been made on this issue, Members will not even get to vote on final passage today if this motion to recommit passes. Now, they say it will come back from committee. I have got to tell Members, they do not come back from committee. When motions to recommit like this go back to committee, they are subject to oblivion.

This is it. If you are against it, vote against the bill. If you are for it, vote for the bill but do not play this kind of game. Vote "no" on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 258, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]

AYES—176

Abercrombie Hefley Pombo  
 Aderholt Hilliard Rahall  
 Andrews Hinchey Riley  
 Baca Hoeffel Rivers  
 Baldacci Hoekstra Rodriguez  
 Baldwin Holden Rogan  
 Barcia Holt Rogers  
 Barr Horn Rohrabacher  
 Barrett (WI) Hostettler Rothman  
 Bartlett Hunter Roybal-Allard  
 Barton Jackson (IL) Rush  
 Berkley Jackson-Lee Sabo  
 Berman (TX) Sanchez  
 Blagojevich Jones (NC) Sanders  
 Bonior Jones (OH) Sandlin  
 Borski Kanjorski Saxton  
 Boucher Kaptur Schaffer  
 Brady (PA) Kasich Schakowsky  
 Brown (FL) Kennedy Sensenbrenner  
 Brown (OH) Kildee Shadegg  
 Burton Kilpatrick Sherman  
 Buyer Kingston Shows  
 Capuano Kleczka Sisisky  
 Chabot Klink Slaughter  
 Chenoweth-Hage Kucinich Smith (MI)  
 Clay Lampton Smith (NJ)  
 Clement Lantos Souder  
 Clyburn Lee Spence  
 Coburn Lewis (GA) Spratt  
 Condit Lipinski Stabenow  
 Conyers LoBiondo Stark  
 Cook Luther Stearns  
 Costello Markey Strickland  
 Coyne Mascara Stupak  
 Crowley McCarthy (NY) Tancredo  
 Cummings McGovern Taylor (MS)  
 Danner McIntyre Taylor (NC)  
 Davis (IL) McKinney Thompson (MS)  
 DeFazio McNulty Thurman  
 Delahunt Menendez Tierney  
 DeLauro Millender-Towns  
 Deutsch McDonald Traficant  
 Dingell Miller, George Udall (CO)  
 Doyle Mink Udall (NM)  
 Duncan Moakley Velazquez  
 Engel Mollohan Vento  
 Evans Murtha Visclosky  
 Farr Nadler Wamp  
 Forbes Ney Waters  
 Frank (MA) Norwood Waxman  
 Gejdenson Oberstar Weldon (FL)  
 Gephardt Obey Wexler  
 Gibbons Olver Weygand  
 Gilman Owens Wise  
 Goode Pallone Wolf  
 Gordon Pascrell Woolsey  
 Graham Payne Wu  
 Green (TX) Pelosi Wynn  
 Gutierrez Peterson (MN)  
 Hall (OH) Phelps

NOES—258

Ackerman Campbell Ehlers  
 Allen Canady Ehrlich  
 Archer Cannon Emerson  
 Army Capps English  
 Bachus Cardin Eshoo  
 Baird Carson Etheridge  
 Baker Castle Everett  
 Ballenger Chambliss Ewing  
 Barrett (NE) Clayton Fattah  
 Bass Coble Filner  
 Bateman Collins Fletcher  
 Becerra Combest Foley  
 Bentsen Cooksey Ford  
 Bereuter Cox Fossella  
 Berry Cramer Fowler  
 Biggert Crane Franks (NJ)  
 Bilbray Cubin Frelinghuysen  
 Bilirakis Cunningham Frost  
 Bishop Davis (FL) Gallegly  
 Bliley Davis (VA) Ganske  
 Blumenauer Deal Gekas  
 Blunt DeGette Gilchrest  
 Boehlert DeLay Gillmor  
 Boehner DeMint Gonzalez  
 Bonilla Diaz-Balart Goodlatte  
 Bono Dickey Goodling  
 Boswell Dicks Goss  
 Boyd Dixon Granger  
 Brady (TX) Doggett Green (WI)  
 Bryant Dooley Greenwood  
 Burr Doolittle Gutknecht  
 Callahan Hall (TX) Hall (TX)  
 Calvert Dunn Hansen  
 Camp Edwards Hastert

Hastings (FL) McCarthy (MO) Roukema  
 Hastings (WA) McCollum Royce  
 Hayes McCrery Ryan (WI)  
 Hayworth McDermott Ryun (KS)  
 Herger McHugh Salmon  
 Hill (IN) McClniss Sanford  
 Hill (MT) McIntosh Sawyer  
 Hilleary McKeon Scott  
 Hinojosa Meehan Serrano  
 Hobson Meek (FL) Sessions  
 Hooley Meeks (NY) Shaw  
 Houghton Metcalf Shays  
 Hoyer Mica Sherwood  
 Hulshof Miller (FL) Shimkus  
 Hutchinson Miller, Gary Shuster  
 Hyde Minge Simpson  
 Insee Moore Skeen  
 Isakson Moran (KS) Skelton  
 Istook Moran (VA) Smith (TX)  
 Jefferson Morella Smith (WA)  
 Jenkins Myrick Snyder  
 John Napolitano Stenholm  
 Johnson (CT) Neal Stump  
 Johnson, E. B. Nethercutt Sununu  
 Johnson, Sam Northup Sweeney  
 Kelly Nussle Talent  
 Kind (WI) Ortiz Tanner  
 King (NY) King (NY) Ose  
 Knollenberg Oxley Tauscher  
 Kolbe Packard Terry  
 Kuykendall Pastor Thomas  
 LaFalce Paul Thompson (CA)  
 LaHood Pease Thornberry  
 Largent Peterson (PA) Thune  
 Larson Petri Tiahrt  
 Latham Pickering Toomey  
 LaTourette Pickett Turner  
 Lazio Pitts Upton  
 Leach Pomeroy Vitter  
 Levin Porter Walden  
 Lewis (CA) Portman Walsh  
 Lewis (KY) Price (NC) Watkins  
 Linder Pryce (OH) Watt (NC)  
 Quinn Quinn Watts (OK)  
 Radanovich Weiner  
 Lucas (KY) Ramstad Weldon (PA)  
 Lucas (OK) Rangel Weller  
 Maloney (CT) Regula Whitfield  
 Maloney (NY) Reyes Wicker  
 Manzullo Reynolds Wilson  
 Martinez Roemer Young (AK)  
 Matsui Ros-Lehtinen Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—1

Scarborough

1724

Mr. RUSH and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 197, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

AYES—237

Ackerman Biggert Calvert  
 Allen Bilbray Camp  
 Archer Bishop Campbell  
 Army Bliley Canady  
 Bachus Blumenauer Cannon  
 Baird Blunt Capps  
 Baker Boehlert Cardin  
 Ballenger Boehner Carson  
 Barrett (NE) Bonilla Castle  
 Bass Bono Chabot  
 Bateman Boswell Chambliss  
 Becerra Boyd Combest  
 Bentsen Brady (TX) Cooksey  
 Bereuter Bryant Cox  
 Berry Callahan Cramer

Crane Jefferson Pryce (OH)  
 Cubin Jenkins Radanovich  
 Cunningham John Ramstad  
 Davis (FL) Johnson (CT) Rangel  
 Davis (VA) Johnson, E. B. Regula  
 DeGette Johnson, Sam Reyes  
 DeLay Kasich Reynolds  
 DeMint Kelly Roemer  
 Dickey Kind (WI) Rogan  
 Dicks Knollenberg Roukema  
 Dixon Kolbe Royce  
 Doggett Ryan (WI)  
 Dooley LaFalce Ryun (KS)  
 Doolittle LaHood Salmon  
 Dreier Largent Sandlin  
 Dunn Latham Sawyer  
 Edwards Lazio Schaffer  
 Ehlers Leach Serrano  
 Emerson Levin Sessions  
 English Lewis (CA) Shadegg  
 Eshoo Lewis (KY) Shaw  
 Etheridge Linder Shays  
 Everett Lofgren Sherwood  
 Ewing Lowey Shimkus  
 Fletcher Lucas (KY) Shuster  
 Foley Lucas (OK) Simpson  
 Ford Maloney (NY) Skeen  
 Fossella Manzullo Skelton  
 Fowler Martinez Smith (MI)  
 Franks (NJ) Matsui Smith (TX)  
 Frelinghuysen McCollum Smith (WA)  
 Frost McCrery Snyder  
 Gallegly McDermott Stenholm  
 Ganske McHugh Stump  
 Gekas McClniss Sununu  
 Gilchrest McIntosh Sweeney  
 Gillmor McKeon Talent  
 Gonzalez Meehan Tanner  
 Goodlatte Meeks (NY) Tauscher  
 Goss Miller (FL) Tauzin  
 Granger Miller, Gary Terry  
 Green (WI) Minge Thomas  
 Greenwood Moore Thompson (CA)  
 Gutknecht Moran (KS) Thornberry  
 Hall (TX) Moran (VA) Thune  
 Hansen Morella Thurman  
 Hastert Myrick Tiahrt  
 Hastings (WA) Neal Toomey  
 Herger Nethercutt Turner  
 Hill (IN) Northup Upton  
 Hill (MT) Nussle Vitter  
 Hilleary Walsh Walden  
 Hinojosa Hobson Weldon (PA)  
 Hooley Houghton Weller  
 Hoyer Hulshof Whitfield  
 Hulshof Hutchinson Wicker  
 Hyde Hyde Weldon (PA)  
 Inslee Isakson Wilson  
 Istook Isakson Young (AK)  
 Jackson-Lee Jackson-Lee Young (FL)  
 (TX)

NOES—197

Abercrombie Collins Goodling  
 Aderholt Condit Gordon  
 Andrews Conyers Graham  
 Baca Cook Green (TX)  
 Baldacci Costello Gutierrez  
 Baldwin Coyne Hall (OH)  
 Barcia Crowley Hastings (FL)  
 Barr Cummings Hayes  
 Barrett (WI) Danner Hayworth  
 Bartlett Davis (IL) Hefley  
 Barton Deal Hilliard  
 Berkley DeFazio Hinchey  
 Berman Delahunt Hoefel  
 Bilirakis DeLauro Hoekstra  
 Blagojevich Deutscher Holden  
 Bonior Diaz-Balart Holt  
 Bonior Dingell Horn  
 Boucher Doyle Hostettler  
 Brady (PA) Duncan Hunter  
 Brown (FL) Ehrlich Jackson (IL)  
 Brown (OH) Engel Jones (NC)  
 Burr Evans Jones (OH)  
 Burton Farr Kanjorski  
 Buyer Fattah Kaptur  
 Capuano Filner Kennedy  
 Chenoweth-Hage Forbes Kildee  
 Clay Frank (MA) Kilpatrick  
 Clayton Gejdenson King (NY)  
 Clement Gephardt Kingston  
 Clyburn Gibbons Kleczka  
 Coble Gilman Klink  
 Coburn Goode Kucinich

Lampson	Obey	Slaughter
Lantos	Olver	Smith (NJ)
Larson	Owens	Souder
LaTourette	Pallone	Spence
Lee	Pascrell	Spratt
Lewis (GA)	Pastor	Stabenow
Lipinski	Paul	Stark
LoBiondo	Payne	Stearns
Luther	Pelosi	Strickland
Maloney (CT)	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Markey	Phelps	Tancredo
Mascara	Pombo	Taylor (MS)
McCarthy (MO)	Quinn	Taylor (NC)
McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
McGovern	Riley	Tierney
McIntyre	Rivers	Towns
McKinney	Rodriguez	Traficant
McNulty	Rogers	Udall (CO)
Meek (FL)	Rohrabacher	Udall (NM)
Menendez	Ros-Lehtinen	Velazquez
Metcalf	Rothman	Vento
Mica	Roybal-Allard	Viscosky
Millender-	Rush	Wamp
McDonald	Sabo	Waters
Miller, George	Sanchez	Watt (NC)
Mink	Sanders	Weldon (FL)
Moakley	Sanford	Wexler
Mollohan	Saxton	Weygand
Murtha	Schakowsky	Wise
Nadler	Scott	Wolf
Napolitano	Sensenbrenner	Woolsey
Ney	Sherman	Wu
Norwood	Shows	Wynn
Oberstar	Sisisky	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—  
Scarborough

1741

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize extension of non-discriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People's Republic of China, and to establish a framework for relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3688

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3688.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

1745

COMMENDING ISRAEL'S REDEPLOYMENT FROM SOUTHERN LEBANON

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 331) commending Israel's redeployment from southern Lebanon, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.  
The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 331

Whereas Israel has been actively seeking a comprehensive peace with all of her neighbors to bring about an end to the Arab-Israeli conflict;

Whereas southern Lebanon has for decades been the staging area for attacks against Israeli cities and towns by Hezbollah and by Palestinian terrorists, resulting in the death or wounding of hundreds of Israeli civilians;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 425 (March 19, 1978) calls upon Israel to withdraw its forces from all Lebanese territory;

Whereas the Government of Israel unanimously agreed to implement Security Council Resolution 425 and has stated its intention of redeploying its forces to the international border by July 7, 2000;

Whereas Security Council Resolution 425 also calls for "strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries" and establishes a United Nations interim force to help restore Lebanese sovereignty; and

Whereas the Government of Syria currently deploys 30,000 Syrian troops in Lebanon: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—*

(1) commends Israel for its decision to withdraw its forces from southern Lebanon and for taking risks for peace in the Middle East;

(2) calls upon the United Nations Security Council—

(A) to recognize Israel's fulfillment of its obligations under Security Council Resolution 425 and to provide the necessary resources for the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) to implement its mandate under that resolution; and

(B) insist upon the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanese territory so that Lebanon may exercise sovereignty throughout its territory;

(3) urges UNIFIL, in cooperation with the Lebanese Armed Forces, to gain full control over southern Lebanon, including taking actions to ensure the disarmament of Hezbollah and all other such groups, in order to eliminate all terrorist activity originating from that area;

(4) appeals to the Government of Lebanon to grant clemency and assure the safety and rehabilitation into Lebanese society of all members of the South Lebanon Army and their families;

(5) calls upon the international community to ensure that southern Lebanon does not once again become a staging ground for attacks against Israel and to cooperate in bringing about the reconstruction and reintegration of southern Lebanon;

(6) recognizes Israel's right, enshrined in Chapter 7, Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, to defend itself and its people from attack and reasserts United States support for maintaining Israel's qualitative military edge in order to ensure Israel's long-term security; and

(7) urges all parties to reenter the peace process with the Government of Israel in order to bring peace and stability to all the Middle East.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the ranking minority member of our committee,

for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 331, introduced by our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), which commends Israel's decision to withdraw its forces from southern Lebanon.

The events of the past few days have indeed been historic. I was pleased to be an original sponsor of this resolution, which calls on the U.N. Security Council to recognize Israel's fulfillment of U.N. Security Council Resolution 425 by withdrawing from Lebanon and to insist that all foreign forces be withdrawn from that country.

The measure we are considering today is a major foreign policy statement of the Congress. It is pro-Israel and pro-Lebanon, sends a strong bipartisan message of peace and stability to the region. As a result of this latest major development, a high priority of the United States must also be to affirm Israel's right as noted in the U.N. charter to defend itself and its civilians from attack.

H. Con. Res. 331, Mr. Speaker, also reasserts U.S. support for maintaining Israel's qualitative military edge in order to ensure Israel's long-term security.

Mr. Speaker, Israel's courageous decision to pull out of Lebanon demonstrates its strong commitment to a peaceful resolution to the conflicts that troubled that region. I hope that Israel's courage is reciprocated by both Syria and Iran in their dealings with Lebanon. This means that the 30,000 Syrian forces now occupying Lebanon should also be removed as required by the Taif Accord. Moreover, Iran must understand that it cannot continue to equip and train Hezbollah and other terrorist groups without bearing the consequences of international public opinion.

As our colleagues know, Israel has been actively seeking a comprehensive peace with all of her neighbors since its miraculous creation in 1948, yet southern Lebanon has for decades been the staging area for attacks against Israeli citizens and towns by Hezbollah and Palestinian terrorists, resulting in the death or wounding of hundreds of Israeli civilians.

H. Con. Res. 331 recognizes the courageous risks for Israel that Israel is taking, as well as confirming the strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon. It also appeals to the government of Lebanon to grant clemency and ensure the safety and rehabilitation into Lebanese society of all members of the south Lebanon Army and their families.

This measure underscores the congressional desire for the U.N. Security Council to swiftly recognize Israel's