

Get this one: \$84,000 for gourmet popcorn. My mother and father have never done this. This is, again, a ripoff by the providers and the private sector of the public sector. Scrap the tax break plan and stop picking at our senior citizens.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: The Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. McNULTY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New York is correct. We have consulted with the ranking members of these committees, and we have no objection to the request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2058, CHINA POLICY ACT OF 1995, AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96, DISAPPROVING EXTENSION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO THE PRODUCTS OF CHINA

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 193 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 193

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2058) establishing United States policy toward China. The bill shall be debatable for ninety minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the minority leader or his designee.

SEC. 2. After disposition of H.R. 2058, it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 96) disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Wolf of Virginia and Representative Archer of Texas or their designees. Pursuant to sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to table, if offered by Representative Wolf or his designee. The provisions of sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974 shall not apply to any other joint resolution disapproving the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the People's Republic of China for the remainder of the first session of the One Hundred Fourth Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON]. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Rules, and I am proud to say that the arrangement worked out by this rule was unanimously agreed to on a bipartisan basis by the principal parties involved with the legislation.

What the rule does is to first make in order in the House the bill, H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act of 1995, as introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

The rule provides for 90 minutes of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. While we originally considered limiting this to 1 hour of debate, we expanded the debate time at the request of the bipartisan group that had negotiated a compromise with Mr. BEREUTER.

The rule further provides for one motion to recommit the bill, which, if containing instructions, may be offered by the minority leader or his designee. I would point out to my colleagues that this latter provision is in keeping with the new House rule adopted on January 4 of this year which guarantees to the minority the right to offer a motion to recommit with instructions, and I quote from rule XI, clause 4(b), "if offered by the minority leader or his designee." That is what is contained in the House rules.

This is a guarantee we Republicans were denied on numerous occasions when we were in the minority but which we promised to give the minority if we became the majority.

Mr. Speaker, the rule goes on to provide that after the disposition of H.R.

2058, the House may proceed to the consideration in the House of House Joint Resolution 96, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], disapproving the extension of most-favored-nation status to the products of the People's Republic of China.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, divided equally between the gentleman from Virginia and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Pursuant to the terms of the fast track procedures, the previous question is considered as ordered to final passage on the joint resolution, except that one motion to table the resolution is in order, if offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] or his designee.

Finally, the rule provides that the fast track procedures of the Trade Act shall not apply to any other disapproval resolution relating to MFN for China for the remainder of this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, before I turn to the policy aspects of the measures before us, I just want to comment on the cooperation we have received from the parties on all sides of the issue involved here in crafting this rule. As I mentioned earlier, this was reported from the Committee on Rules on a unanimous vote, thanks to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] who is managing for the minority. This was also due in no small part to the cooperation and compromise among all concerned that has taken place in crafting the legislative bill made in order by the rule.

I especially want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for his open-mindedness and willingness to listen to other Members. I also commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] who have labored for so long in these vineyards, for their accommodating attitudes in reaching agreement on a consensus bill.

I would be remiss if I did not single out the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], and the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], and the Committee on International Relations chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for all their work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule, a fair rule and a bipartisan rule that will enable us to debate the issues and vote on two distinct yet related propositions relating to the People's Republic of China. I hope that we will adopt this rule.

Turning now, Mr. Speaker, to the substance of the issue itself, I cannot avoid making the observation that two things have remained constant since the House began having this annual

China MFN debate 5 years ago. Those two constants are simply these: Our trade deficit with China keeps going up, and the conditions within China itself keep going down, keep getting worse.

Is there a single problem that troubles the United States-China relationship which has gotten better in the last 5 years? I ask all of my colleagues listening to this debate today to answer that question. Has anything gotten better since we debated this 1 year ago? The Chinese Communists' brutal disregard for human rights, how about that? The severe restrictions on freedom of speech, press and assembly and association, have they gotten better? Members know the answer. The continued denial of prison visits by international observers, has that improved? No. The continued jamming of Voice of America, still going on. The ongoing sales of missiles and weapons of mass destruction to terrorist regimes, still going on. The unrestrained use of prison labor in the manufacture of export products, in competition to the shirt that I am wearing, made by Americans in the United States of America, has that gotten better? No, it has gotten worse, and the proof is out there.

The massive military buildup, particularly in offensive weapons systems. I mention again, offensive weapons systems, which threaten the peace of the entire East Asian region.

Do my colleagues know that the People's Republic of China has more than doubled its defense budget in the last 5 years while other countries, like the United States of America and all of our NATO allies, all countries around the world have decreased their military spending?

□ 1040

There is China's continued reliance on predatory trade practices, and I could just go on and on. To top it all off, the Chinese regime has arrested a man named Harry Wu, an American

citizen, whose only crime was to tell the world the truth about China's gulag and the prison labor system. That is his only crime. Yet, he is being detained. God knows what is going to happen to him.

Mr. Speaker, the list of abuses goes on and on and on. Every one of these problems has gotten worse during a period of time in which China's exports to the United States have gone up, listen to this, have gone up 233 percent. And our trade deficit against China has gone up by a staggering 377 percent since 1989, and we sit here and allow this to continue to happen, putting Americans out of work.

That is what is wrong with giving an outlaw regime MFN status. The trade becomes a one-way street. In 1989, the year of Tiananmen Square, about 23 percent of China's total exports came to the United States, 23 percent. By last year, that figure had risen to nearly 37 percent, and yet the Chinese Communist regime continues to thumb its nose at everything our country stands for. America, the leader of democracy throughout the world, they thumb their nose at us.

I would just ask the proponents of MFN, when do the benefits start? When can we expect to see a change in Chinese behavior? The hometown newspaper of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] said it best.

A recent editorial in the San Francisco Examiner said that our current approach to China proves that "Once you get rolled, it's easier to get rolled again. The Chinese have little reason to think the United States will make good on any threat," because we never follow through.

Continuing to read from the Examiner editorial: "Instead of calling the shots, the United States is treated by the Chinese as a bothersome supplicant." Is that not something, this great Nation?

Continuing to read: "Such back-of-the-hand treatment should not come as

a surprise. For years now the United States has seen how China treats its own citizens."

Mr. Speaker, I would simply close this portion of my remarks by noting that no Member of this body should be surprised by the current state of United States-China relations. If Members do not think about anything else today, I hope that they will at least ponder this: A China which is not at peace with its own people will not be at peace with the United States or any other country in the world. That is why human rights have to be at the center of the United States-China relationship, because American interests are ultimately inseparable from our American values. Anything and everything we do should be to promote those American values.

Mr. Speaker, we will be conducting the MFN debate this year under a different format from what we have used in previous years. The whole point of what this House will be doing today is to send a united and unmistakable message to China that the freely-elected representatives of the American people are putting human rights and American values back into the central focus of the United States-China relationship.

Reasonable men and women can have an honest disagreement over the relative merits of MFN, and there are good people on both sides of this argument, Republicans and Democrats alike. However, let there be no mistake about it, Members of this Congress are unanimous in our determination to see an end to the abuses that China's Communist regime is perpetrating on its own people and on the world at large.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of the Members to think about this point as we debate this issue over the next 3 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following material:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 19, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	36	72
Modified Closed ³	49	47	12	24
Closed ⁴	9	9	2	4
Totals:	104	100	50	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of July 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	O	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PQ: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235-193; D: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230-194; A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242-185; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-192; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O=open rule; MO=modified open rule; MC=modified closed rule; C=closed rule; A=adoption vote; D=defeated; PQ=previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we support the rule. As my colleague on the other side of the aisle has indicated, this rule will provide for the debate on two measures, H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act of 1995, and House Joint Resolution 96, the resolution disapproving the extension of most favored nation treatment to the People's Republic of China. The rule allows 90 minutes of debate on the China Policy Act and also provides for 1 hour of debate on the resolution disapproving MFN to China.

This is not an unusual rule for this legislation, which has critical implications for United States policy toward China. In the past, the Committee on Rules has brought two measures to the floor under one rule. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle are in total agreement with the rules resolution, and many of my colleagues, including the distinguished author of the disapproval resolution, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, as well as the gentlewoman from California, Ms. PELOSI, and the gentleman from Nebraska, DOUG BEREUTER, have worked many hours to reach agreement on the proper legislative approach. They have done an excellent job. They deserve, as the gentleman from New York already has, they deserve to be commended. I am glad we will have a chance to debate this issue.

The Chinese have one of the worst human rights records in the world. Individual rights of people are routinely

repressed. Scholars and intellectuals are imprisoned, and women are often forced to have abortions if they try to have more than one child.

In 1989 the world was horrified when the Chinese killed their own students at Tiananmen Square. Now, 6 years later, not much has changed. China continues to violate basic human rights of its own people, and those living in Tibet as well. It also routinely contributes to nuclear weapon and missile proliferation among terrorist states.

Many of us in the Congress believe that tough economic sanctions by the United States is the only way to convince China to stop its human rights violations. By denying MFN status and reversing China's \$30 billion trade surplus, we may get some concessions. If the Chinese Government refuses to hear the protests of those who respect basic human dignity, perhaps it will listen if money is at stake.

We are glad Mr. Speaker, that we will have a chance to debate this issue and to bring the bill of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] to the floor, the so-called China Policy Act, which addresses some of the serious flaws in our current policy toward China. Again we reiterate; we support this rule, and we urge our colleagues to join us in voting for it. It is a fair and a good rule.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], the vice chairman of the Committee on Rules. Even though he and I disagree on this matter, he is

an expert, and I will be interested in hearing what he has to say.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for his very kind remarks. As I look in the Chamber here, it was, believe it or not, exactly 1 year old today, July 20, 1994, that my colleague, the gentlewoman from California, Ms. PELOSI, my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, my colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. HOYER, the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. KOLBE, and the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. Kopetski, our former colleague, joined in the first bipartisan, bicameral debate on a very important question that came forward. That question was, should U.S. trade policy be used to enforce human rights?

I would say to my colleagues who participated in that, they remember very well that we had a difficult time determining exactly what the exact question was going to be. We all agreed, we all agreed that U.S. trade policy should be used to promote human rights, but we decided to take the negative position, that U.S. trade policy should not be used to enforce human rights. That is for a very simple and basic reason. I remain convinced that trade promotes private enterprise, which creates wealth, which improves

living standards, which undermines political repression.

If we look at the very serious challenges that lie ahead for the most populous Nation on the face of the Earth, a country which has five times the population of the world's only complete superpower, the United States of America, we clearly have an obligation to remain engaged.

Right here in the United States, we know full well that there are thousands and thousands of jobs that depend on our exports to the People's Republic of China. In fact, 360,000 jobs hinge on our exports, so clearly, cutting off trade with China would jeopardize economic growth right here in the United States.

Quite frankly, I believe that it is extraordinarily important for us to look at the gains which have been made in China over the past several years, since we worked to deal with this issue of engagement. As my friends here on the House floor know full well, I take a back seat to no one when it comes to demonstrating outrage at the issue of human rights violation.

The gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and I joined with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and others in marching, following the Tiananmen Square massacre from right here in the Capitol up to the Chinese Embassy to protest the Tiananmen Square massacre. The fact of the matter is we have to realize that if we are going to continue to deal with the improvement of human rights, there is nothing, nothing that we could do to jeopardize it in a greater way than to bring to an end, bring to an end the engagement policies that we have had over the past several years.

Mr. Speaker, last year I went with my father and traveled throughout China, and had fascinating experiences there. As I talked to people who worked, peasants and others, clearly they carried the strong message that as the old leaders of China fade from the scene, they do not want to see us leave their country economically devastated. It is for that reason that they encouraged us to maintain MFN with China.

As we also look at the situation which exists there, it is very clear that there are many things that we as a country can continue to do to improve the quality of life of the people of China. Just this week we received a letter from Jack Valenti, our friend with the Motion Picture Association of America, in which he talked about that to near record crowds; the movie "Forrest Gump" is playing in China. Let us think about the movie "Forrest Gump," that great American drama, set with the backdrop of 20th century American history. What an amazing message to have moving throughout the country of 1.2 billion people living today under political repression.

My hometown newspaper, the Los Angeles Times, just this week had a very important article talking about individuals within China from all

across the economic spectrum who are benefiting from the kind of engagement that we have going on today. The benefits have been very, very great: black and white TV's are even appearing in caves in China. When one thinks about that kind of exposure to the West, we are clearly, clearly on a path toward improving the situation there.

I hope very much that we will be able to now move ahead in a bipartisan way. This is a new day, because there is recognition that while we can never tolerate the reprehensible human rights violations, the violation of Harry Wu's rights and others' rights, we need to do everything that we possibly can to move ahead with this very important policy of engagement. I thank my friends for working in a very close bipartisan way with the gentleman from California [Mr. BEREUTER], and others to bring this about.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, that is music to my ears. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] from the Committee on Rules for being so generous in yielding, and also the chairman of the Committee on Rules, my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for bringing this rule to the floor, and for his championing the cause of freedom throughout the world, and his relentless advocacy for human rights in China.

It is with a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I rise in support of the Bereuter legislation, H.R. 2058, which is designed to move United States-China policy in the right direction by sending a strong message to the Chinese Government that the United States Congress is concerned about human rights in China and Tibet.

I have been pleased to work in this endeavor with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF]. With all due respect to the previous speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], we should all take a back seat to the gentleman from Virginia as an advocate for human rights throughout the world, in his advocacy for human rights. Mr. WOLF is an inspiration to this Congress, and it is a privilege to work with him.

I was particularly pleased that the leadership of this Congress, the office of the Speaker, and of the Democratic leader worked to help us merge our bills, forge a compromise under the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. BEREUTER], and I am grateful to him for his leadership and his receptiveness to our ideas.

As many Members know, and I address the mechanics of this because we are on the rule, as many know, we had three options out there. We had the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] for total revocation; we had the legislation of the gentleman from California [Mr. BEREUTER];

and we had the Wolf-Pelosi legislation, which we believed was the strongest possible message on human rights for this Congress. We have, I think happily, been able to merge the Bereuter bill and the Wolf-Pelosi bill into the product we have here.

Indeed, we were very pleased to have many of the provisions in the bill of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the bill of the gentleman from California [Mr. BEREUTER], but I commend the gentleman from California for having initiatives that were even stronger than some of ours and with which we were very pleased to associate ourselves.

As with any compromise, some people may not be happy with it, but as I say on this China issue, if it is good enough for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] it should be good enough for the rest of us.

Why is it that we need to come here again to discuss this issue and to present a policy for China in the Congress of the United States? Our colleagues who have spoken before me, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] taking the lead, have spoken of some of the concerns that this Congress has with China. They fall into three categories, by and large: human rights, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and, obviously, unfair trade practices; and MFN is related to trade. It is appropriate that we are here.

The reason this debate comes up annually, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] said we were 1 year talking about this, 1 year to the day, is because the President must request a special waiver to grant MFN to China; hence, the proposed motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] to deny the President's request.

In those three areas of human rights, trade, and proliferation, in this past year there has been no progress. Indeed, the Chinese continue to violate international standards and norms, and the missile technology control regime, in transferring technology to Pakistan, to Iran, and making the Middle East a very dangerous neighborhood, as well as the world a less safe place.

If there were no other consideration, the issue of the proliferation of nuclear technology to unsafeguarded countries would be enough reason for us to deal with this MFN issue on this floor. What is dismaying about all of this is that instead of addressing this issue, the Clinton administration on June 30—this notice was in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 30: "Notice of termination of the suspensions of licenses for the export of cryptographic items to the People's Republic of China—Message from the President." It is in the June 22, 1995, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have it available for our colleagues.

This is all to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a double standard with this administration when it comes to China.

We have defined Iran as a rogue country. We have made a strong point of saying we will not trade with them. We have chastised, and more, Russia for their trade with Iran.

We have looked the other way when China has done the same, and indeed, and indeed, in the same time frame, we have lifted—the President has gotten a blanket waiver against the prohibition of sale of encryption technologies to China. This is, I think, a big mistake. The human rights violations continue, highlighted, of course, by the arrest of Harry Wu, a champion of democracy, a scholar at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, a distinguished American, an internationally recognized champion of human rights, and his release must be immediate, as the bill calls for.

However, I would also like to say that Harry's plight is not only that of an individual, but representative of the thousands and thousands and thousands of people who are in prison labor camps in China who Harry's advocacy was for. He had been arrested for 19 years for criticizing the Soviet invasion of Hungary. He knew of what he spoke in terms of brutality in slave labor camps. It continues. His telling the truth about that has landed him in a Chinese jail. As an American citizen he deserves our fullest support. I urge our colleagues to avail themselves of our yellow ribbons on his behalf.

He is not the only one, obviously, in prison that we are concerned about. There are thousands who are; in particular, Wei Jing Cheng, Bao Pong, Chen Zeming, some of the champions of Chinese democracy. Indeed, in the last few months, many leaders and intellectuals in China have been arrested for merely signing petitions asking for an end of corruption and more democratic reforms in China. Obviously, my colleagues know I could go on all day about the violations of human rights in China.

On the subject of trade, when we first started this debate in 1989, for that year, for 1989, China had a \$6 billion trade surplus with the United States. That means, as Members know, within our trade relationship they profited by \$6 billion. This past year, it was \$30 billion. It went \$6, \$9, \$12, \$18, \$24, \$30. This year it will be closer to a \$40 billion trade surplus, inching closer year by year to the same kind of deficit that we have with Japan, but absent the same kind of allowing of products into their markets that even Japan does. Then Members know what our complaint is with Japan.

I do not want to bring up the issue of Taiwan in terms of recognition, but just in terms of this one figure. In China there are 1.2 billion people. In Taiwan there are approximately 19 million people, and Taiwan imports from the United States twice as much as mainland China imports from the United States, so the trade issue must be addressed, not only in terms of slave labor and violations of trade agree-

ments, but in addition to the lack of market access for American products into China, which is also a trade violation.

□ 1100

What does the administration do? The administration not only gave them MFN but this past January gave the Chinese the same trade privileges, reductions in tariffs, that World Trade Organization members have, even though China is not a member of the World Trade Organization and living up to any of the standards or requirements of the WTO.

Again, our concern is with China. The disappointment is with the administration in the way they respond to human rights, trade and proliferation violations.

This China Policy Act that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has authored establishes a framework for diplomatic relationships between the United States and China. It calls upon the President to undertake intensified diplomatic initiatives to persuade the Chinese Government to unconditionally and immediately release Harry Wu.

The provisions of the legislation are available to our colleagues, but since it is new I will just touch on a few:

Adhere to prevailing international standards regarding proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including halting the export of ballistic missile technology and the provision of other weapons of mass destruction to Iran, Pakistan, and other countries of concern; respect internationally-recognized human rights—we know what they are—press, freedom of religion, assembly, et cetera; releasing all political prisoners and dismantling the Chinese gulag and forced labor system; ending coercive birth control practices; respecting the rights of the people of Tibet and ethnic minorities; curtailing excessive modernization and expansion of its military capabilities. It goes on to more on that.

Adhere to rules of international trade regime; comply with the prohibition on all forced labor products coming into the United States; and reduce tension with Taiwan through dialog and confidence-building.

The bill specifies the administration should undertake diplomatic initiatives bilaterally with China and multilaterally in the United Nations, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization and in our bilateral relations with other countries.

In order to hold the President accountable for undertaking these initiatives, the bill requires a report to Congress within 30 days of enactment and at least every 6 months thereafter.

H.R. 2058 also places Congress firmly on the record in support of the pro-democracy movement in China. For the first time we commend the men and women working in the democracy movement, particularly those people who so bravely petitioned the Chinese

government for the promotion of political, economic and religious freedom.

Finally, the Bereuter bill requires the administration to get Radio Free Asia up and running. This important initiative has been stalled for too long. The bill mandates that within 90 days of enactment, Radio Free Asia shall commence broadcasting to China.

I urge my colleagues to give a strong vote on the Bereuter bill, on the China Policy Act, because it will allow the United States Congress to send a unified message to the Chinese government that its continuing violations of internationally recognized human rights are not acceptable.

The reason that I am pleased with this bill and one of the reasons I support the bill is because it does hold the President accountable. Last year when the President did not abide by the Executive order he had issued the year before, he instead proposed some initiatives, a code of conduct for businesses, funding for Radio Free Asia. The list goes on and on. The fact is that the adherence to it was zero.

It is important, I think, for us to hold the administration accountable. A vote for the China Policy Act will do that. I think it is very important for this Congress. We have been engaged in advocacy for a long time. We will always be engaged in advocacy for the causes of concern to us. But absent a coherent China policy that maybe the State Department proposes, the Commerce Department appears to dispose, I think it then behooves the Congress to set forth a framework that will have a positive impact on our relationship with China.

I think the message should be very clear that a prosperous, strong and democratic China is in the best interest of the United States. We look forward to a great future with the Chinese people, but in doing so we want to do it on the basis of recognition of international norms and indeed norms that the Chinese government has signed on to but has not abided by.

By supporting the Bereuter bill, we can speak with one voice on behalf of those fighting for freedom in China. I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

In closing, I wish once again to commend my colleagues on that side, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], and particularly in this case the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. I once again thank the leadership of the House for accommodating our concerns.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am not here today to talk about Harry Wu or Tiananmen Square or human rights. Those issues should be addressed. But I

think commerce and trade should be looked at in a little bit of a different vein here, folks.

Let me say this: America does not need to go bankrupt trying to effect some social reforms in China.

Let us look at the record. China has been convicted of dumping in American markets, placing phony "made in America" labels on cheap Chinese imports, violating international prison labor law, violating United States copyright law, closing Chinese markets, and that is only the tip of the iceberg. Their average wage is 17 cents an hour. They still employ slave labor.

Let us look at some facts. Right now China enjoys a one-way street, a \$37 billion trade surplus with America, second only to Japan. At least Japan makes us some promises. China makes us threats. China says if you mess with MFN, they will crack down on soybeans, corn, aircraft, grain. They will not tolerate it. Unbelievable, ladies and gentlemen.

I believe that a Congress that will allow China to dictate trade terms is the same Congress that has destroyed many American jobs.

Let us talk some business. How do you compete with foreign imports with a wage factor so limited and low? Then they rip off our markets illegally and we extend the red carpet treatment, talking about all the great business we are going to attain.

This is a dream world. The Constitution is very clear on this: Congress shall regulate commerce with foreign nations. One of the main problems financially in America is the Congress of the United States talking about balanced budgets and all of these other sideline issues and missing the whole boat. You cannot balance the budget of the United States buying much more than you sell. That is what we are doing, and it is our trade problem, folks.

I am going to oppose any more most-favored-nation trade status for China for one reason: They do not deserve it. It is time to regulate trade with China.

One last thing, ladies and gentleman. We are either going to take on the trade issue in America or we will continue to have huge budget deficits and tremendous loss of jobs. You cannot separate them.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], another outstanding member of the Committee on Rules who formerly served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and is certainly very knowledgeable on this issue.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our distinguished colleagues who have worked so diligently and so exhaustively on this issue: The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER]; of course the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. WOLF],

the tireless champion for human rights throughout the world; the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] who has distinguished herself in her career for her advocacy on behalf of democracy and human rights in China; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], my chairman and dear friend; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] who is here and who has worked so tirelessly on this issue as has the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and others.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule. I rise in support of it. I would prefer today to see a vote on the denial of the extension of MFN to China. But I will support the Bereuter legislation. I think it is a fair, well-thought-out piece of legislation.

What we are dealing with, Mr. Speaker, here today on this issue really I think is related to the following question: What is the goal, or what should be the goal of our public policy? The maximization of profit for our businesses at all costs, even at the cost of ignoring, of not even mentioning the Orwellian nature of the Chinese regime?

I know, Mr. Speaker, the geopolitics involved when we analyze China. I know that China is the historical adversary of Russia, and I know the size of China and the great number of human beings that reside there.

May I recommend to our colleagues the book by our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK], written with regard to his experience when he was United States Ambassador to Romania under Ceausescu, his brilliant synthesis of how those rogue regimes look to most-favored-nation status as legitimization of their conduct. They know who they are, but they want to be told by the leader of the free world, the United States in effect, and we do that with MFN, "You're normal. We are ignoring your rogue status. We are ignoring the nature of your brutality."

That is what MFN is. When we deny MFN, there are no tariffs involved. It is simply a political statement which tells rogue regimes, in this case the Chinese regime, that they are not what they really are. That, in effect, is what MFN is.

I think that we have to realize and ask this question about ourselves: Are we willing to go through the trouble of at least mentioning, of at least telling the tyrants in China, "We know who you are" or "We know your genuine nature."

"We know that you murder prisoners and that you sell their organs. We know that you use slave labor. We know that you force women to have abortions."

By not extending MFN, we would simply be telling the Chinese tyrants, "We know who you are and we're telling the world who you are. Recognizing the geopolitics, which we are not ignoring, we're telling you who you are."

I wish that we would have that vote today. If not, I think we are making at

least some progress with the well-thought-through and negotiated legislation presented by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER]. But this is an issue that will not go away until China truly is normal. Then we can tell the world community they are not a rogue regime. They are normal.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, we should not be timid in using trade with the United States to stand up for human rights. This Nation has stood tall, sometimes alone, for the rights of people around the world against some very strong governments.

Some of the proudest moments in the history of this Nation were when we watched Soviet emigres settle in new homes around the world. We saw the destruction of the Berlin Wall, the historic elections in South Africa, knowing full well the role that we played in the United States to bring about these historic moments.

Trade was a critical tool in those changes. MFN and denying it to the Soviet Union played a critical role in the actions of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe. Trade sanctions against South Africa was a critical tool in bringing about the changes in South Africa.

The current conditions in China, as it relates to respect for human rights, is outrageous. We should not be timid in taking economic action as it relates to China. It will work. China, as the Soviet Union of the pre-1990's before it, should not be granted unrestricted MFN. We should stand tall for human rights against these nations. It will work.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule. I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for all their good work. We must send a very strong message to China.

Mr. Speaker, we must send a strong message to China. We must let China know that if they want to join the community of nations, they must treat their people with respect and dignity. We must tell them that selling arms to Iran, a terrorist nation, is unacceptable.

Harry Wu's arrest is only the most recent reminder of China's longstanding human rights abuses. We cannot forget the day the tanks rolled into Tiananmen Square. Terrible human rights abuses continue to this day.

Political prisoners in China and Tibet are brutally tortured. Religious leaders are imprisoned. Democratic reformers are jailed. There is no freedom

of speech, no freedom of press, no freedom at all.

We have a moral obligation and a mandate to tell China to change its ways. As a Congress and as a nation, we cherish freedom, and we must speak out.

We cannot stand by while China stifles dissent and disagreement. We cannot stand by while the Chinese Government tortures its prisoners. We cannot stand by while China exports goods made in slave labor camps. We cannot stand by while China detains an American citizen, Harry Wu, and threatens him with the death penalty.

I truly believe that if you do not stand for something, you will fall for anything. We cannot have trade at any cost. We must not let the democracy movements in China and Tibet fall. We must stand with the people who are fighting for freedom. I urge my colleagues to support this Rule.

□ 1115

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] who has been one of the leaders for human rights throughout this world for many, many years in this body, and we just admire and respect him so much.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, let me say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], especially on the issues related to China, has been a stalwart and it is so good to be working with him and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and many others.

China is one of the worst, most egregious abusers of human rights in the world today. In report after report issued by our own State Department, and numerous human rights organizations, examples of wide-ranging abuses of human rights indicate that no aspect of human life is free from the repressive and the insidious control of the butchers of Beijing.

Mr. Speaker, last year, a year and a half ago, I thought the President had it right. He issued an Executive order. He laid down very clear, nonambiguous markers. Significant progress in human rights had to be achieved or MFN was a goner. He stated this and made very, very much about it. As a matter of fact, during his race for the Presidency, he accused Mr. Bush of coddling dictators.

But I am very sorry to say that as we saw a deterioration of the human rights situation in China and a significant regression, this President, Bill Clinton, blinked. He did a complete flip-flop, backed off a very principled stand, and then coddled the dictators, the very butchers of Beijing that he was so rightfully critical of during the campaign and during the early months of his Presidency.

It is shameful. The situation in China on religious freedom has gotten

significantly worse. Li Peng issued two sweeping decrees, 144 and 145, to crack down on the house church movement and on the fledgling Catholic church in the People's Republic of China. One could be part of the officially government-sanctioned, government-run church, but if they dared to worship God and read their Bible in their home, or assemble to praise God, they are going to have their door broken down and the public security police are going to yank them off to prison for interrogation and for beatings.

The situation of Harry Wu, I think, crystallizes what is going on in China today. Here is a man who spent 19 years in the Laogai, was in the gulag system, faced unbelievable repression, the use of hunger as a means of torture.

He spoke at a subcommittee hearing. I am the chairman of the International Operations and Human Rights Subcommittee, and Harry and other survivors of the Laogai system came forward and talked about their terrible experiences in that gulag system. Many of those products which end up in our stores. They are being sold in our supermarkets and in our stores across the country.

We have what we call a memorandum of understanding with the People's Republic of China, to check out the use of gulag labor for export, and it is a farce. They do not allow us access to those. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I went to Beijing Prison No. 1 and saw socks and jelly shoes being made, but it was one of those rare instances when we were actually able to see what was being made with prisoners and other people who were held in incarceration.

Harry Wu, Mr. Speaker, should tell us all what can happen when an American citizen traveling on a duly issued visa and passport, is held incommunicado and denied access by our own Embassy, against all the rules, and now continues to languish in China against his will. It tells us that the human rights situation is abysmal.

He has been a tremendous witness to the sorriest state of human rights in China and, thankfully, we are today beginning to bring some focus on what is actually occurring there.

On the issue of forced abortion, Mr. Speaker, which I know Members have heard me talk about since 1979 when it was first initiated in that country, just the other day I received a letter from a woman in China who heard me talking about it on Voice of America and she wrote me this letter: "I've been hesitating to write you until today. At the end of May I heard a report on V.O.A. about your concern over China's cruel policy of forced abortion."

"As a Chinese woman who has just been forced to have an abortion at that time, I really agree with you. What is a real woman without the personal right to have one more child, especially when she is expecting a baby and obliged by the state to kill that baby."

Mr. Speaker, she went on to say, "Considering human rights in China, we suffer more than any other countries, if we don't have the right even to get birth to a baby. What's the use of any other rights? Please don't mention my name in public since I could be severely punished." And she went on in her letter to talk about what some of her friends have gone through.

Mr. Speaker, on gulag labor, on religious repression, on forced abortion, all of these human rights abuses, the Tiananmen Square and other dissidents who continue to be rounded up. Wei Jing Cheng, who met with Assistant Secretary John Shattuck and 2 weeks later was dragged into prison. Here is the hero to the Democracy Wall movement who had the audacity to meet with the Assistant Secretary for Human Rights. He met with me 2 weeks earlier in Beijing and because he met, he was dragged off and we have not heard from him since.

This is a very cruel regime, Mr. Speaker. To be dealing with the Chinese today, and to act as if there is nothing going on human rights wise, is like dealing with the Nazis back in the 1930's. This is a cruel dictatorship. Let us not forget that. Their people do not have rights.

And when we talk about empowerment, empowerment has not worked. Yes, trains may run on time and we may be having this robust trading relationship, but they have had regression in human rights. They have gone in the opposite direction. Rather than liberalization, they have become more repressive.

There is a compromise piece of legislation that will be offered. I think it is a good start. I would have hoped that we would have revoked MFN. The President shamelessly delinked it, after making all the right noises for months. He delinked it when human rights got worse in China. For years to come, that will be seen as one of the worst decisions this President has ever made and another indication of the vacillation of the Clinton Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote for the Bereuter legislation. I do think it makes a strong statement. Radio Free Asia is needed now more than ever and language in this legislation admonishes the President to do that. It is a good bill. We could have had better, but I urge support for it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut. [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, we have today an opportunity to take a small step forward on behalf of human rights for the people of China. In is a very small step. It takes very little courage on our part, for we risk nothing, either economically or our own personal freedom.

There is must more that has to be done. For people listening to this debate, it must often be difficult to reconcile a country of a billion people with a focused discussion on only one

or two individuals: Harry Wu, an American citizen who had all the proper documents to enter China, sitting in prison; a handful of others that are occasionally mentioned.

What we do here today, and focusing on Harry or one or two others, it to try to get across to people what is going on today in China. I first met Harry Wu 3 or 4 years ago. He came to testify about slave labor and prison labor. He had with him a hidden camera as he met with Chinese officials.

Posing as an American businessman, Harry asked how could he be guaranteed the quality that he wanted in his products being made in a prison. In a free market, in a factory where workers come voluntarily, their pay and benefits have an impact on the product. But he asked, how could he be guaranteed the product made by people who were enslaved by the Chinese government could have that quality? And the Chinese official, on camera, took her hands and said, "We beat them. We beat them."

American consumers are out here today purchasing products made by men and women who are in prison and beaten to keep up the quality that international corporations demand of the products they sell across the globe.

We are going to take a small step here today, but there is an opportunity for American citizens to take a much larger step in the message to the Chinese tyrants.

When you buy something, take a look at where it is made. If you have an opportunity to buy something made in the United States or a country that respects human rights, make the purchase from that country. There are products at the same price. New Balance sneakers made in the United States cost the same as those sneakers made by people enslaved in China. Buy the American product.

If the Chinese officials see their percentage of sales in the United States drop, we will not have to wait for a Congress or an administration to take sufficient steps to get that message across to the Chinese Government.

We, as citizens in this country, together have the ability to have an impact on the policies within China. The tens of billions of dollars worth of products that are sold in this country each and every year provide the financing to sustain their system of government.

Together, we can make that difference. Every time you go out to the store, take a look at where the product is made. If the product is made in a country that oppresses human rights, as China does, try not to buy that product. Maybe you cannot make it 100 percent of the time. If you do it once in a while, if you do it twice, whatever time you can do that, you will help people like Harry Wu who have risked their lives to take this action.

When I grew up as a young man, I was told of an old Polish lady who saved my father's life. My father, a

Lithuanian Jew at the time, was hiding from the Nazis. The borders have moved so often, it is hard to tell. It was Poland at that time; today it is Lithuania.

She took this man in at risk of losing their eight children. When I think of courage, I think of this woman. To save an individual's life, not a family member, she risked not only her own life, but she risked the lives of her eight children.

That courage that is asked of us here on this floor as American citizens does not come to the same chart even. We are protected by civil rights and civil liberties. We live in the greatest democracy in the world. But together we can help, without risk, the lives of those today imprisoned in China.

Join us in boycotting Chinese-made products. Write to legislators and senators who oppose the Chinese Government's continued oppression, and we will make a small difference in the lives of Chinese citizens. A billion people in China have a right to expect that they can live with some dignity and without oppression from their own government.

Today we in the Congress will make a small step in sending a message to the Chinese Government. The American citizenry together can send a much larger message. Let us not forget Harry Wu and the millions like him in China. Let us stand together for freedom and individual rights. Let us not forget the heroes of Tiananmen Square. Let us do our small part in fighting for freedom.

□ 1130

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, the Bereuter resolution moves this country in the direction of putting additional pressure on China in terms of human rights violations. We can do that, and we can also have MFN status with China.

This country exports more than \$9 billion a year of goods to China. That is close to 200,000 jobs in this country. If we do not have MFN status with China, that will be only one of eight countries with which we have no MFN status with in the entire world.

Last year, I spent an entire day with Counsel General Wang Li from China in the 16th district in Illinois, which has 1,500 factories. He told me there are 300 cities in China that have in excess of 1 million people. Seventy-five percent of those cities do not have an airport, and he said that China is in the process of building over 200 airports. This is the time to expand our trade with China.

Look what happened this past week. China signed a \$1 billion agreement with Mercedes-Benz in a joint partnership to build the minivan in China. That could have been signed with

Chrysler, and I hope one day eventually that will happen. What we have to do is to keep open the channels of communication.

To deny MFN status would be to close that avenue.

President Nixon said in a letter to President Bush in 1989, that "in the current emotion of the moment our nations seem to be forgetting an important point: A modernized, unified, and effectively governed China that has good relations with us is by far the preferred solution for advancing American security interests in East Asia." It was true in 1989; it is true in 1995. Let us move forward and recognize that 60 percent of all world trade is occurring in the Pacific rim.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, as I yield to the next speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL]. He has taken over on his side of the aisle as the manager of this rule. He is truly one of the outstanding Members of this body, who has stood up for the oppressed people around this entire world. And we admire him and respect him as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3¼ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentleman who has led the fight for human rights all over this world.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to personally thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for his faithfulness over the years; also the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her faithfulness on this. She was like Margaret Thatcher on this, and I also want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for his willingness to kind of work this out, and I want to thank the Speaker personally because his involvement made a difference.

So much I want to say. I tell the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] that, if we had traded with Hitler, I do not think it would have made any difference, and I went to the Holocaust Museum and saw the documents where they said it would just have more business with Hitler, he will change, and he did not change.

There is a lot bad going on in China. This is a good resolution, it is a good bill, and I support it, but keep in mind, I will tell the gentleman when he talks about business, there are Catholic priests in jail that we now have in jail in China. How much business is it worth for our Catholic priest to be in jail? There are Protestants who have been arrested in church. How much money in trade and factories is it worth for that American? Harry Wu, an American prisoner, is in jail. They have more gulags and slave labor camps.

The gentleman met with a Chinese counselor. How about going into slave labor camps? That is the problem. When our people go to China and meet, they have dinner with Li Peng. They do not go into the house churches and into the slave labor camps.