

Do not forget they are trading nuclear weapons with Iran and Iraq. Do not forget the missile violations, the chemical war violations. Do not forget they are plundering Tibet. Do not forget they have arrested the men and women connected with the Dalai Lama. There are a lot of bad things that China has done, and we should recognize this.

Although this resolution is good, because it finally gets the Congress in a bipartisan way to come together, my last comment is this:

People talk about MFN. We would not have granted MFN to the Soviet Union. When Shcharansky was in Prime Camp 35, we would not have granted MFN to the Soviet Union, and both sides know it. When Sakharov was under house arrest in Gorky, we all stood together, Republicans, Democrats, Liberals, and Conservatives, because there was pressure to do it, and God bless Ronald Reagan, and where is he when we need him now? He stood firm and called them the Evil Empire. We would not have granted MFN to Czechoslovakia when Havel was under arrest. No way we would have done it. A Member would have been embarrassed to come down to the floor and say, "Havel is in jail, let's give him MFN."

And I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], who is not here. We would not have lifted sanctions and done anything for South Africa when Nelson Mandela was in.

So this is a good resolution. It puts the Congress on record. But let us not drip with sour grapes and say China is going to build all these airports, and they are going to do all these wonderful things.

How about what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] will tell us? We have lost millions of jobs, millions of jobs.

This is a trade issue. Their imbalance is almost \$40 billion, a trade imbalance. We have lost a million jobs. It is a slave labor issue. It is a persecution of religious faith, Catholic, Protestant, Buddhist. It is all these other issues. They sold weapons to Iraq that were used against American men and women to kill people in the gulf.

Having said that though, I just did not want the reports to go off that everything was wonderful. Having said that, the Bereuter resolution is a good resolution, and it is my prayer that we could come together and solve this problem. Every night I pray that China, in my prayers that China, will be free, and hopefully with the work that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has done and coming together, we put pressure on, there will be freedom, and 10 years from now there will be freedom in Tiananmen Square, freedom in China, and democracy, and I want to again thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER]. I will be eternally grateful to the Speaker for his help, the gentleman

from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for his faithfulness, and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her doggedness in staying with this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 15 seconds.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me just say this rule was negotiated with the minority, the Democratic and Republican leadership. It is a good rule, it is a fair rule, and I hope Members come over here and vote for it. As a matter of fact, I hope there is not even a recorded vote on it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHINA POLICY ACT OF 1995

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 193, I call up the bill (H.R. 2058) establishing United States policy toward China, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 2058 is as follows:

H.R. 2058

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "China Policy Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The People's Republic of China comprises one-fifth of the world's population, or 1,200,000,000 people, and its policies have a profound effect on the world economy and global security.

(2) The People's Republic of China is a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council and plays an important role in regional organizations such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum and the ASEAN Regional Forum.

(3) The People's Republic of China is a nuclear power with the largest standing army in the world, and has been rapidly modernizing and expanding its military capabilities.

(4) The People's Republic of China is currently undergoing a change of leadership which will have dramatic implications for the political and economic future of the Chinese people and for China's relations with the United States.

(5) China's estimated \$600,000,000,000 economy has enjoyed unparalleled growth in recent years.

(6) Despite increased economic linkages between the United States and China, bilateral relations have deteriorated significantly because of fundamental policy differences over a variety of important issues.

(7) The People's Republic of China has violated international standards regarding the nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

(8) The Government of the People's Republic of China, a member of the United Nations Security Council, is obligated to respect and uphold the United Nations Charter and Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(9) According to the State Department Country Report on Human Rights Practices

for 1994, there continue to be "widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in China, in violation of internationally accepted norms...(including) arbitrary and lengthy incommunicado detention, torture, and mistreatment of prisoners.... The regime continued severe restrictions on freedom of speech, press, assembly and association, and tightened control on the exercise of these rights during 1994. Serious human rights abuses persisted in Tibet and other areas populated by ethnic minorities."

(10) The Government of the People's Republic of China continues to detain political prisoners and continues to violate internationally recognized standards of human rights by arbitrary arrests and detention of persons for the nonviolent expression of their political and religious beliefs.

(11) The Government of the People's Republic of China does not ensure the humane treatment of prisoners and does not allow humanitarian and human rights organizations access to prisons.

(12) The Government of the People's Republic of China continues to harass and restrict the activities of accredited journalists and to restrict broadcasts by the Voice of America.

(13) In the weeks leading to the 6th anniversary of the June 1989 massacre, a series of petitions were sent to the Chinese Government calling for greater tolerance, democracy, rule of law, and an accounting for the 1989 victims and the Chinese Government responded by detaining dozens of prominent intellectuals and activists.

(14) The unjustified and arbitrary arrest, imprisonment, and initiation of criminal proceedings against Harry Wu, a citizen of the United States, has greatly exacerbated the deterioration in relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China, and all charges against him should be dismissed.

(15) China has failed to release political prisoners with serious medical problems, such as Bao Tong, and on June 25, 1995, revoked "medical parole" for Chen-Ziming reimprisoning him at Beijing No. 2 Prison, and Chinese authorities continue to hold Wei Jingsheng incommunicado at an unknown location since his arrest on April 1, 1994.

(16) The Government of the People's Republic of China continues to engage in discriminatory and unfair trade practices, including the exportation of products produced by prison labor, the use of import quotas and other quantitative restrictions on selected products, the unilateral increasing of tariff rates and the imposition of taxes as surcharges on tariffs, the barring of the importation of certain items, the use of licensing and testing requirements to limit imports, and the transshipment of textiles and other items through the falsification of country of origin documentation.

(17) The Government of the People's Republic of China continues to employ the policy and practice of controlling all trade unions and continues to suppress and harass members of the independent labor union movement.

(18) The United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 states that Congress wishes to see the provisions of the joint declaration implemented, and declares that "the human rights of the people of Hong Kong are of great importance to the U.S. Human Rights also serve as a basis for Hong Kong's continued prosperity." This together with the rule of law and a free press are essential for a successful transition in 1997.

(19) The United States currently has numerous sanctions on the People's Republic of China with respect to government-to-government assistance, arms sales, and other commercial transactions.

(20) It is in the interest of the United States to foster China's continued engagement in the broadest range of international fora and increased respect for human rights, democratic institutions, and the rule of law in China.

SEC. 3. UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC INITIATIVES.

(a) UNITED STATES OBJECTIVES.—The Congress calls upon the President to undertake intensified diplomatic initiatives to persuade the Government of the People's Republic of China to—

(1) immediately and unconditionally release Harry Wu from detention;

(2) adhere to prevailing international standards regarding the nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction by, among other things, immediately halting the export of ballistic missile technology and the provision of other weapons of mass destruction assistance, in violation of international standards, to Iran, Pakistan, and other countries of concern;

(3) respect the internationally-recognized human rights of its citizens by, among other things—

(A) permitting freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, freedom of association, and freedom of religion;

(B) ending arbitrary detention, torture, forced labor, and other mistreatment of prisoners;

(C) releasing all political prisoners, and dismantling the Chinese system of jailing political prisoners (the gulag) and the Chinese forced labor system (the Laogai);

(D) ending coercive birth control practices; and

(E) respecting the legitimate rights of the people of Tibet, ethnic minorities, and ending the crackdown on religious practices;

(4) curtail excessive modernization and expansion of China's military capabilities, and adopt defense transparency measures that will reassure China's neighbors;

(5) end provocative military actions in the South China Sea and elsewhere that threaten China's neighbors, and work with them to resolve disputes in a peaceful manner;

(6) adhere to a rules-based international trade regime in which existing trade agreements are fully implemented and enforced, and equivalent and reciprocal market access is provided for United States goods and services in China;

(7) comply with the prohibition on all forced labor exports to the United States; and

(8) reduce tensions with Taiwan by means of dialogue and other confidence building measures.

(b) VENUES FOR DIPLOMATIC INITIATIVES.—The diplomatic initiatives taken in accordance with subsection (a) should include actions by the United States—

(1) in the conduct of bilateral relations with China;

(2) in the United Nations and other international organizations;

(3) in the World Bank and other international financial institutions;

(4) in the World Trade Organization and other international trade fora; and

(5) in the conduct of bilateral relations with other countries in order to encourage them to support and join with the United States in taking the foregoing actions.

SEC. 4. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

The President shall report to the Congress within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and no less frequently than every 6 months thereafter, on—

(1) the actions taken by the United States in accordance with section 3 during the preceding 6-month period;

(2) the actions taken with respect to China during the preceding 6-month period by—

(A) the United Nations and other international organizations;

(B) the World Bank and other international financial institutions; and

(C) the World Trade Organization and other international trade fora; and

(3) the progress achieved with respect to each of the United States objectives identified in section 3(a).

Such reports may be submitted in classified and unclassified form.

SEC. 5. COMMENDATION OF DEMOCRACY MOVEMENT.

The Congress commends the brave men and women who have expressed their concerns to the Government of the People's Republic of China in the form of petitions and commends the democracy movement as a whole for its commitment to the promotion of political, economic, and religious freedom.

SEC. 6. RADIO FREE ASIA.

(a) PLAN FOR RADIO FREE ASIA.—Section 309(c) of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6208(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) SUBMISSION OF PLAN.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the China Policy Act of 1995, the Director of the United States Information Agency shall submit to the Congress a detailed plan for the establishment and operation of Radio Free Asia in accordance with this section. Such plan shall include the following:

“(1) A description of the manner in which Radio Free Asia would meet the funding limitations provided in subsection (d)(4).

“(2) A description of the numbers and qualifications of employees it proposes to hire.

“(3) How it proposes to meet the technical requirements for carrying out its responsibilities under this section.”.

(b) INITIATION OF BROADCASTING TO CHINA.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, Radio Free Asia shall commence broadcasting to China. Such broadcasting may be undertaken initially by means of contracts with or grants to existing broadcasting organizations and facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will each be recognized for 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7½ minutes.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, make no mistake about it. United States relations with the People's Republic of China have deteriorated to a very troubled level. Currently, United States-China relations are cool and formal, and are dominated by a series of disputes. In this environment, animosities and grievances—on both sides—could boil over and cause an irreparable breach. Indeed, a new cold war, this time with the PRC, is not entirely impossible—but it is avoidable. We must all approach this debate today with a deep sense of gravity and care regarding the long-term importance and fragility of Sino-American relations.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, a further, unnecessary deterioration in Chinese-American relations is not in the United

States national interest. It would not serve our security goals; nor would it serve our human rights objectives. It would not advance our trade and economic objectives. Simply put, I emphasize to my colleagues today that what we do here today should not aim to isolate or demonize China or foster the attitude in this country that China is an enemy. They are not an enemy. We should have the objective of improving the Chinese-American relationship while, at the same time, always acting in our national interest. These goals are not incompatible.

Having said that however, this Member steadfastly believes that the United States must remain engaged with China. This does not mean that we should ignore the many legitimate differences between our two nations. It is entirely proper that we make weapons proliferation, human rights, and the proper treatment of U.S. nationals, such as Harry Wu, our foreign policy objectives of the highest order. H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act of 1995, does precisely that. It fills a crucial gap by setting forth both clear policy objectives for the United States-China relationship and appropriate directions to the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, this Member has carefully and painstakingly worked to draft legislation that accurately and comprehensively describes the House of Representatives' objectives and our concerns with regard to the Government of the People's Republic of China. With significant contributions from the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and with the support of the House leadership as well as bipartisan staff assistance from the House International Relations Committee, we have crafted bipartisan legislation that nearly every Member, in good conscience, can support.

The China Policy Act of 1995 concisely states the United States' foreign policy grievances with the People's Republic of China. This legislation very specifically calls upon the President of the United States to undertake the following diplomatic initiatives, to report on their progress, and to use every available diplomatic means to cause China to accomplish the following reforms:

First, permit freedom of assembly, freedom of association, freedom of press, and freedom of religion.

Second, end arbitrary detention, torture, forced labor, and other mistreatment of prisoner.

Third, release all political prisoners, including Harry Wu, and dismantle the Chinese gulag and forced labor system.

Fourth, end coercive birth control practices.

Fifth, respect the legitimate rights of ethnic minorities and the people of Tibet.

Sixth, curtail excessive modernization and expansion of China's military capabilities.

Seventh, halt provocative military actions in the South China Sea.

Eighth, implement, and enforce international trade agreements.

Ninth, comply with prohibitions on all forced labor exports to the United States.

Tenth, reduce tensions with Taiwan.

Finally, this legislation commends the petition and democracy movement in China of brave men and women who are committed to the promotion of political, economic, and religious freedom. And, it also attempts to assist them and all Chinese in their endeavors by requiring the speedy implementation of the already authorized Radio Free Asia initiative.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is both an alternative to a damaging MFN denial for China and also a positive statement of congressional concerns. It is the beginning, hopefully, of a process of formulating a clearer and more comprehensive policy toward China. Since we don't have a clear statement of policy emanating from the executive branch, we will begin the U.S. effort here today.

Of course, this legislation and the criticisms of China that it outlines, will not be welcomed by Beijing's leaders, but it will give hope to millions of Chinese who suffer from a denial of fundamental rights. Moreover, it states U.S. concerns forthrightly. Unlike a denial of normal trade status, which is really what MFN treatment entails, this legislation is not as likely to fuel the recent downward cycle of action and reaction that has gravely endangered U.S. interests.

Mr. Speaker, China is in the midst of a prolonged succession struggle. This power struggle has enormous implications for China's future and its relations with the United States, and for global security and the world economy. Since the triumph of the Communists in 1949 China had been dominated by two leaders, Mao Tse-tung and Deng Xiaoping. What leader or what collective leadership will next succeed to that mantle of power in the PRC? What will be their ideology, values, and policies? We cannot discern or determine that, but we can and must make sure that we do not give advantage to those who would take China backward economically or make it more aggressive and assertive internationally.

By extending normal trade status while simultaneously stating and acting upon our serious concerns with the practices and policies of the People's Republic of China we are making several very important points.

First, we want to see a prosperous Chinese people.

The American system of free enterprise is the envy of the world, including China. In fact, many dissidents in China support extension of most favored nation or normal trade status to China because they know that economic freedom often precedes other freedoms as well. In Taiwan, for example many people will soon vote for a President for the first time. In other Asian countries, political freedoms fol-

lowing economic liberalization has been the norm rather than the exception.

Second, we support the development of a Chinese Government that can protect the civil and political rights of its own people with stable and accountable institutions.

Fragmentation or chaos of the Chinese Government is neither in the interest of the United States or the people of China. Human rights abuses occur in China not only because of failed official policies of the Chinese government but also because of the corruption and lack of respect for the rule of law. Stable institutions which abide by the rule of law are essential to provide the proper protection that the Chinese people necessarily demand and should enjoy.

Third, we respect a China that can defend itself, but we must demand a China that adheres to its international commitments to coexist peacefully, respect international legal norms, and refrain from aggressive military action.

As chairman of the Asia and Pacific Subcommittee of the House International Relations Committee, this Member would note that cooperation with China has been an important key to preventing an explosive, perhaps nuclear, confrontation with North Korea. And while we have very grave concerns about a number of China's transactions with countries like Iran and Pakistan, it is important to note that we have been actively engaged with the PRC on proliferation issues. We have succeeded in preventing a number of dangerous sales, and we continue to press on other matters of concerns. I would tell my colleagues—no, I warn my colleagues—that if we disengage from China, we will have absolutely no influence over what China exports, or to whom.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pause for a moment to consider the importance of our long-term interests with China. Let me remind everyone, in all candor, that China will be one of the two or three most important strategic relationships this Nation will have in the coming decades. China will be one of the two or three most important countries in the world early in the next century. Quite simply, China is too big, and too dynamic, and too strategically important to ignore or push to an enemy status.

I raise this point not to alarm this body, for we should never be intimidated from promoting human rights and market economies. At the same time, however, we must focus on building a positive relationship with the Chinese people and their Government. We must not let our very real and substantial current problems with the PRC damage the fundamentally friendly attitude of the Chinese people toward the United States. The people of China are favorably predisposed toward the United States, and they share a

general desire to embrace our freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to speak out forthrightly about our concerns, but to do it in a fashion that will ultimately bring us closer to the desired goals of freedom and human rights for all people, and a growing rapport and trust between our two governments. It must be clear that we speak with deep and serious conviction, but with friendship and constructive ends.

I urge adoption of H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act of 1995, and yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1145

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise here to support the Bereuter proposal. I think it is a sound, constructive proposal. I want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and every Member, Democrat and Republican, who cooperated in putting together this sound piece of public policy.

I love the stem winding, desk thumping speeches that some of our colleagues give, but when you ask yourself what is the solution, the solution really is the Bereuter proposal. We have a terrible condition in China, but let me let you in on a secret. It has been that way for 6,000 years.

When I first went to China shortly before we began any kind of relationship with them at all over a 40-year period, they were just finishing the cultural revolution, in which millions of Chinese had been displaced and rooted out of their families and their homes and transported around the country and hundreds of thousands of Chinese had been slaughtered. Fortunately, no Americans lost their lives in there because we did not have an American national in the whole country of China at that time.

China has never experienced the types of freedoms that we in the Western world have developed so tortuously over so many thousands of years. They have never had religious freedom or freedom of speech. They have never had the freedom of assembly or any of the freedoms we cherish. They need them, they want them, and they will eventually get them, but we have to lead the way, and we should never go to the same disastrous type of program that we carried out for about 40 years in which we threw ourselves out of China and isolated ourselves from China.

Our trade situation with China is not good, but it is better than the terrible situation that we had in the past. It is going to improve. I love all this discussion about slave labor, and I hope some of the people are listening to this. I do

not know of any State in the United States that does not have slave labor. All of us in our States produce goods that are sold in commerce that we Americans consume that were made by slave labor in our own prisons. It has been against the law so long as I can remember to import any of those kinds of goods in the United States.

So we have tried to keep them out. I am sorry some of them slip in, but it is against the law and anybody that is convicted of importing those kinds of goods is going to be penalized. We are doing our best to penalize Americans for knowingly doing that kind of thing.

But I doubt that there is a Member of Congress here that has not slept on a bed or sat at a desk or used a filing cabinet that was not made by prison labor in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that my time is up, but support the Bereuter amendment. It is a good, constructive proposal.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. MATT SALMON, a new member of the Committee on International Relations, who not only has lived in China for a substantial period of time, but speaks Chinese.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 2058. I believe it is a big bold step in the right direction. I am really pleased that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has taken this initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to talk a little bit about my experience. I served a mission for my church in Taiwan from 1977 to 1979. Most of the people that I became friends with over there were people that lived in mainland China and escaped the oppression of China under Mao Tse-tung. At that time they watched their families, many of them being killed, murdered before their very eyes. Many of them watched their parents be severely punished, sometimes beaten, sometimes even killed, for praying in public.

As China engaged the Western world, I was heartened, I was encouraged, by her desire to become more open politically, economically and socially. But as with many Americans, much of that optimism was extinguished by Tiananmen Square, and part of me died that day. Since that day China has steadily marched backward, stifling freedom, flouting human rights, and demonstrating disregard.

I do support doing business with China. I think it is a step in the right direction, but we need to make sure they understand we will be watching and the people that do business over there need to not be accepting, but step forward and do the right thing.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], who has been one of the prime movers on this matter of China.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate both the gentleman

from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the two cosponsors of this legislation, and certainly to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], who actually worked very closely with both cosponsors to put together this legislation in a way I believe that all of us will be able to support; second, what I believe is important, to send a signal to the Chinese that is unified that truly represents the true feelings of this Nation. So I would like to thank them for making this debate very comfortable for all of us in this House of 435 Members.

I would have to say, and I believe I will just reiterate what the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has said, that the United States-China relationship will probably be the most important relationship that the United States will have for the next 20 years. That is whether China is viewed by this country as our enemy, or whether this country views China as an ally, or perhaps something in between.

China has 22 percent of the world population, 1.2 billion people. Their economic growth rate is over 10 percent per year, and probably will grow much greater than that. Lloyd Bentsen, before he left as Secretary of the Treasury, said that for the next 15 years China will be building an equivalent to 18 Santa Monica freeways per day, and that means the Japanese, the Europeans, and all other countries are moving into China now, trying to influence China's behavior.

I have to say one of the experts that spoke on the rule perhaps has a little amnesia. President Clinton is basically following the policies of the Ford, Reagan, Bush, Carter, Nixon years in terms of our relations with the Chinese. That is because they all understood the permanence and importance of our relations with that country.

Now, there is no question that what the Chinese have been doing over the past decade, now coming to light, is something that we all in this country abhor, and certainly we understand that there were certain universal principles that all major great nations must comply with. But the way to really do it is not to isolate the Chinese, but to engage the Chinese.

That is what basically the Bereuter resolution does. It tells the Chinese that there are certain behaviors that we do not accept, but at the same time it attempts to normalize our relations with the Chinese. That is why this resolution, this bill, is so important for us, because ultimately it is the heirs of all of us in this room, the heirs of all of us in this country, that will benefit in terms of peace and understanding among nations and people of these nations, if in fact we can find some way with the United States, China, and other countries, to begin the normalization process with this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and ranking minority member of Asia and Pacific Subcommittee, Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. BERMAN, for bringing this important compromise resolution before us today. And I want to commend my colleague from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, and the gentlewoman from California, Ms. PELOSI, for their hard work and participation in this issue. Their struggle on behalf of human rights in China is exemplary.

It has been 6 years since the Tiananmen Square Massacre and a full 10 years since his holiness, the Dalai Lama, visited the Congress and told us about the repression in Tibet. During this time period, whenever the Congress attempted to bring about a change in Beijing's egregious behavior we were admonished, in so many words, by State Department experts that "now is not the time. There is a political transition period underway in China and if we took any substantive action we would be strengthening the hand of the hardliners in Beijing."

And so for the last decade whenever the Congress attempted to respond to China's use of slave labor, oppression of religious and political speech and thought, international property rights violations, unfair trade practices, arms proliferation, repression in occupied Tibet, threatening military exercises off the coast of Taiwan, a massive military buildup, the recent aggressive actions in the South China Sea and its obstruction to Taiwan's attempt to enter the United Nations, we were told to back off.

Accordingly, I wonder when the State Department will recognize that its China policy is fundamentally flawed? It is currently a failure on trade. It is a failure on human rights. And it is a failure on arms proliferation.

We all understand the necessity of constructively engaging China. But it is all too painfully obvious from the results that we are failing in our goals of encouraging pluralism, of respect for human rights, for trade, for regional security and for recognition of the wishes of the people of Taiwan.

While I support the State Department's efforts to constructively engage China, we have yet to see positive results from the process. The State Department must find a way to overcome the debilitating flaw in its China policy that sweeps aside responsive action with broad brush stroke generalizations about transition periods.

Until the State Department does that, the Congress must step in and respond to the many seriously unacceptable actions taken by the Communist Government in Beijing. Accordingly I urge my colleagues to support the Be-reuter resolution. It is a balanced, good first step toward building a more productive China policy. It sets forth some significant goal posts in our relationship with the People's Republic of China.

□ 1200

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I want to commend, first of all, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and all the Members who worked so very hard on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this debate today really comes down to one very simple question: What does America stand for as a nation?

Do we stand for democracy?

Do we stand for human rights?

Are those the values this Nation holds dear?

Or do we just stand up for those things when they're convenient?

Mr. Speaker, we all know that China is a nation that tortures, abuses, and imprisons its own people.

A nation where freedom of speech and freedom of religion do not exist.

A nation where people who speak out against the Government disappear without a trace.

And by extending most-favored-nation status to China, by giving them special treatment, we put our stamp of approval on all of it.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think America should be in the business of licensing torture.

But if we as a nation can't speak out against a Communist country that arrests and imprisons our own citizens, if we can't use our leverage to bring Harry Wu home, then we really have lost our way as a nation.

Harry Wu's only crime is that he told the truth about what's happening in China today.

He had the courage to tell the world about the torture and prison labor.

He had the courage to stand up for democracy and human rights.

And for that, he got arrested.

Now he's looking to us to speak out for him.

It's time we stand up for him.

By passing the Bereuter resolution today, we will send a crystal clear message to the dictators in Beijing: Let Harry Wu go.

But it's not enough for this Nation simply to stand up for human rights when our own people are threatened.

For 200 years, we have been the beacon for democracy around the world.

If we don't stand up for the rights of the Chinese people, if we don't stand up to the butchers of Beijing then nobody else will.

This isn't just in our moral interests. This is in our economic interest as well.

Today, China is running a \$30 billion trade surplus with the United States.

A good part of the reason is that China pays its people about 17 cents an hour.

They export products to America made with prison labor.

By extending most-favored-nation status to China, we are taking jobs away from our own people.

Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't be afraid to use trade to promote democracy and human rights.

MFN isn't a gift to be awarded. It's a privilege that must be earned.

China has not earned the right to receive special treatment from the United States.

I urge my colleagues: Support the Bereuter resolution.

And let the world know that America stands for democracy and human rights.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, which I chair, finally got the opportunity to hear the real-life stories in open hearing from some of the Chinese women who have had their baby killed by forced abortion in the People's Republic of China.

After having had to take the extraordinary step of issuing subpoenas to bring these women out of U.S. prisons where they have been held for 2 years by the Clinton administration, which is trying to deport these women back to their tormentors, yesterday we heard these women describe the horror, the humiliation, the suffering, the pain and the loss of being subjected to both forced abortion and forced sterilization.

Even though these and many other women like them have been found to be completely credible by the INS, these victims are poised to be forced back to their oppressors in China because the Clinton administration reversed a very human policy of the Bush administration, by providing asylum to women who have had a forced abortion or have a well-founded fear of force abortion or forced sterilization.

Bill Clinton, Mr. Speaker, has turned his back on these victims, and he is trying to force them back. Hu Shu Ye broke down in tears yesterday as she described the pain and suffering of being dragged by the family planning cadres in China to the abortion mill to

have her six-month-old unborn child destroyed. When she was able to regain her composure during the hearing, later in the hearing, she told us that she as bleeding so profusely that the Chinese officials were unable to involuntarily sterilize her. But 5 months later they were back at her door physically dragging her to be forcibly sterilized.

These women, their tears that they shed yesterday at the hearing and their profound suffering is the reality of tens of millions of women in the People's Republic of China, in that terrible dictatorship.

I have led two human rights missions to China, Mr. Speaker. Religious repression has intensified since the Clinton administration delinked MFN from human rights. Oppression of political dissidents has gotten worse. For every prominent dissident they have released, usually on the eve of some important decision in the United States, they have taken many, many others and many of those that we do not know about. And now they have taken a U.S. citizen, Harry Wu.

Not only do these human rights problems get worse every single month that we continue to truckle to China, but they keep discovering new horrors. The PRC dictatorship times the executions, for example, of prisoners for the convenience of rich foreigners who pay for the harvest of the prisoners' organs. Now we learn that states who supported abortion clinics sell human embryos, and there are even some credible reports that late-term unborn children are actually being consumed as a new health food. Mr. Speaker, ideas have consequences, and the central organizing idea behind the PRC dictatorship is the utter devaluation of the individual human being. They have consequences.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude. There is no moral or practical difference between trading with the PRC dictatorship and trading with the Nazis.

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

JULY 18, 1995.

[Primary Sources: The Pueblo Institute, Amnesty International, The Cardinal Kung Foundation]

ROMAN CATHOLICS IMPRISONED AND DETAINED IN CHINA

1. Father Fan Da-Duo. A priest of Beijing Diocese. Reportedly under house arrest and unable to administer sacraments.

2. Father Guo Qiushan: A priest of Fu'an, Fujian province. Arrested July 27, 1990. Released in August 1991 for health reasons. Currently under house arrest.

3. Father Guo Shichun: A priest of Fu'an, Fujian province. Arrested July 27, 1990. Released in August 1991 for health reasons. Currently under house arrest.

4. Bishop John Yang Shudao: Bishop of Fuzhou, Fujian province. Arrested February 28, 1988. Transferred to house detention in February 1991. Restricted to home village and under close policy surveillance.

5. Bishop Mathias Lu Zhensheng: Age: 76. Bishop of Tianshui, Gansu province. Arrested late December 1989. Released about April 26, 1990 for reasons of health. Restricted to home village.

6. Bishop Casimir Wang Milu: Age: 55. Bishop of Tianshui diocese, Gansu province. Arrested April 1984. Released April 14, 1993. Activity is strictly monitored and restricted.
7. Father John Baptist Wang Ruohan: A priest from Tianshui diocese, Gansu province. Arrested June 16, 1994. Currently detained in Tianshui jail.
8. Father John Wang Ruownag: A priest from Tianshui diocese, Gansu province. Disappeared December 8, 1991. Resurfaced after a period of detention but movement and activity are closely monitored and severely restricted.
9. Father An Shi'an: Age: 81. A priest of Daming diocese, Hebei province. Arrested late December 1990. Released December 21, 1992. Current whereabouts unknown. Believed to be under restrictions of movement.
10. Father Chen Yingkui: A priest of Yixian diocese, Hebei province. Arrested in 1991. Sentenced to three years' "reeducation through labor." Reported to be released.
11. Father Chi Huitain: Arrested April 17, 1995. Currently being held at an unknown location.
12. Father Peter Cui Xingang: Age: 30. A priest of Donglu village, Qingyuan county, Hebei province. Arrested July 28, 1991. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
13. Father Gao Fangzhan: Age: 27. A priest of Yizian diocese, Hebei province. Arrested May 1991. Currently being held without trial. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
14. Father Peter Hu Duoer: Age: 32. Arrested December 14, 1990. Severely tortured during his detention. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
15. Father Li Jian Jin: Age: 28. A priest of Han Dan, Hebei Province. Arrested March 4, 1994. Currently being held in Ma Pu Cun detention center.
16. Father Li Zhongpei: Arrested December 1990. Sentenced to three years' "reeducation through labor." Although Chinese authorities have reportedly released him, he has not been seen since his release.
17. Father Liu Heping: Age: 28. Arrested December 13, 1991. Reportedly transferred to house arrest; actions restricted and monitored.
18. Father Liu Jin Zhong: A priest of Yixian, Hebei province. Arrested February 24, 1994. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
19. Father Lu Dong Liang: A priest of Feng Shi, Dong Ging Liu, Hebei province. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
20. Father Lu Gen-You: Arrested in 1994. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
21. Father Ma Zhiyuan: Age: 28. Arrested December 13, 1991. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
22. Father Pei Guojun: A priest of Yixian diocese, Hebei province. Arrested between mid-December 1989 and mid-January 1990. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
23. Father Pei Xhenping: A priest of Youtong village, Hebei province. Arrested October 21, 1989. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
24. Father Shi Wande: A priest of Baoding diocese, Hebei province. Arrested December 9, 1989. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
25. Father Sun Hua Ping: Arrested June 30, 1994. Currently held in a detention center of Lin Ming Guan, Shi Zhuang Cun, Yong Nian Xian, Hebei province.
26. Father Wang Jiansheng: Age: 40. Arrested May 19, 1991 and sentenced to three years' "reeducation through labor." Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
27. Father Xiao Shixiang: Age: 58. A priest of Yixian diocese, Hebei province. Arrested December 12, 1991. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
28. Father Yan Chong-Zhao: A priest of Handan diocese, Hebei province. Arrested September 1993. Currently held in detention center in Guangping county, Hebei province.
29. Father Zhou Zhenkun: A priest of Dongdazhao village, Baoding, Hebei province. Arrested December 21, 1992. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
30. Bishop Guo Wenzhi: Age: 77. Bishop of Harbin, Heilongjiang province. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
31. Father Joseph Jin Dechen: Age: 72. A priest of Nanyang diocese, Henan province. Arrested December 18, 1981. Sentenced to 15 years in prison and five years deprivation of rights. Paroled May 21, 1992 but confined to his home village of Jinjiayang where he remains under restrictions of movement and association.
32. Father Li Hongye (or Hongyou): Age: 76. Bishop from Luoyang, Henan province. Arrested July 7, 1994. Conflicting reports make his current status unknown. Diagnosed with stomach cancer.
33. Bishop John Baptist Liang Xisheng: Age: 72. Bishop of Kaifeng diocese, Henan province. Disappeared and presumed rearrested March 18, 1994. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
34. Father Zhu Bayou: A priest of Nanyang diocese, Henan province. Released on parole but restricted to the village of Jingang, Henan.
35. Father Jiang Liren: Age: 80. Bishop of Hohhot, Inner Mongolia. Arrested December 1989. Transferred to house arrest in April 1990.
36. Bishop Mark Yuan Wenzai: Age: 69. Bishop of Nantong, Jiangsu province. Currently under the custody of the local Patriotic Church bishop and forced to live at the church in Longshan.
37. Father Liao Haiqing: Age: 64. A priest of Fuzhou, Jiangxi province. Arrested August 11, 1994. Released in mid-November. Currently under police surveillance.
38. Father Xia Shao-Wu: Arrested December 30, 1994. Currently held by Public Security Bureau officials Hebei.
39. Bishop Zeng Jingmu: Arrested September 17, 1994. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
40. Father Li Zhi-Xin: A priest in the city of Xining, Qinghai province. Arrested March 29, 1994. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
41. Father Vincent Qin Guoliang: Age: 60. A priest in the city of Xining, Qinghai province. Arrested November 3, 1994. Sentenced to two years' "reeducation through labor." Currently detained at Duoba labor camp.
42. Bishop Fan Yufel: Age: 60. Bishop Zhouzhi, Shaanxi province. Arrested in spring 1992. Transferred to house arrest in September 1992.
43. Bishop Lucas Li Jingfeng: Age: 68. Bishop of Fengxiang, Shaanxi province. Placed under house arrest April 1992. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
44. Bishop Huo Guoyang: Bishop of Chongqing, Sichuan province. Arrested early January 1990. Reportedly released in early 1991 and currently under police surveillance in Chongqing City, Sichuan.
45. Bishop Li Side: Bishop of Tianjin diocese. Arrested May 25, 1992. Exiled in July 1992 to a rural parish of Liang Zhuang, Ji country and is forbidden to leave. Currently held under house arrest.
46. Bishop Shi Hongzhen: Auxiliary bishop of Tianjin diocese. Activities severely restricted. One report states he is under house arrest.
47. Father Su De-Qien: A priest of Tianjin diocese. Must report to Public Security once a month. Unable to administer the sacraments since December 1993.
48. Father Gu Zheng: Age: 50. Arrested October 6, 1994. Released late November 1994 but remains under strict police surveillance.
49. Deacon Dong Linzhong: Deacon of Dongdazhao Village, Baoding, Hebei province. Arrested December 21, 1992. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
50. Deacon Wang Tongshang: Deacon of Baoding diocese, Hebei province. Arrested December 23, 1990. Sentenced to three years of "reeducation through labor." Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
51. Sister Wang Yuqin: Age: 23. Arrested April 25, 1995. Although most of the 30-40 people arrested with her have been released, she remains in detention. Also fined 900 Chinese Yen, the equivalent of 3 months income.
52. Wang (or Wong) Ruiying: Arrested June 1994. Currently being held in a detention center in Cheng An Xian, Hebei province.
53. Zhang Guoyan: Age: 45. Sentenced in 1991 to three years' "reeducation through labor." Reportedly released in March 1993.
54. Cui Maozai: Age: 42. Arrested April 26, 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.
55. Gao Jianxiu: Age: 46. Arrested April 26, 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.
56. Gao Shuyun: Age: 45. Arrested April 1995. Currently held at Chongren Sein detention center. Reportedly beaten so severely that she cannot feed herself. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.
57. Huang Guanghua: Age: 43. Arrested April 1995. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
58. Huang Meiyu: Age: 40. Arrested April 1995. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
59. Lu Huiying: Age: 51. Arrested April 1995. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.
60. Pan Kunming: Age: 30. Arrested April 1995. Sentenced to five years in prison.
61. Rao Yanping: Age: 18. Arrested April 1995. Sentenced to four years in prison.
62. Wu Jiehong: Age: 46. Arrested April 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.
63. Wu Yinghua: Age: 30. Arrested April 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.
64. You Xianyu: Age: 42. Arrested April 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.
65. Yu ChuiShen: Age: 50. Arrested April 26, 1995. Sentenced to three years in prison.
66. Zeng Yinzei: Age: 60. Arrested April 26, 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.
67. Zeng Zhong-Liang: Arrested December 30, 1994. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.
68. Zhang Wenlin: Age: 60. Arrested April 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.
69. Zhu Changshun: Age: 40. Arrested April 26, 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.
70. Zhu Lianrong: Age: 49. Arrested April 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.
71. Wang Dao-Xian: Arrested April 21, 1994. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.
72. Xu Funian: Age: 51. Arrested at the end of 1994 and sentenced to two years' "reeducation through labor."
73. Zhang Yousheng: Arrested in December 1990 or early 1991. Sentenced to three years'

imprisonment. Chinese authorities reported his release in June 1993. Activities are restricted and monitored.

74. Yu Qi Xiang: Age 19. Arrested April 26, 1995. Sentenced to two years in prison.

July 3, 1995.

[Primary Sources: Amnesty International, International Campaign for Tibet]

BUDDHIST MONKS AND NUNS IMPRISONED AND DETAINED IN TIBET

1. Apho: Age: 36. A monk of Bu Gon monastery. Arrested January 13, 1994. Currently held in Chamdo prison.

2. Bakdo: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

3. Buchung: Age 25. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested July 4, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

4. Champa Choekyi: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.

5. Champa Gyatso: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

6. Champa Tsondrue: Age: 17. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 19, 1994. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

7. Chigchen: Age 21. A monk of Palkhor monastery. Arrested July 3, 1992. Currently held in Gyantse jail.

8. Chime: Age 25. A monk Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

9. Chime Drolkar: Age 18. A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested October 1, 1990. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

10. Chimi: A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 16, 1993.

11. Choede: Age: 20. A monk of Yamure monastery. Arrested January 9, 1995.

12. Choekyi Gyaltzen: Age: 24. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 14, 1994. Currently held at Gutsa prison.

13. Choekyi Vangmo: Age: 20. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 14, 1994. Currently held at Gutsa prison.

14. Choekyi Tsomo: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 13, 1994.

15. Choenyi Drolma: A nun of Shugsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.

16. Choephel: A monk arrested October 20, 1993.

17. Chozom: A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested August 12, 1992.

18. Chung Tsering: Age: 30. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 13, 1994.

19. Dakar: Age: 20. A nun of Nagar monastery. Arrested August 17, 1993.

20. Damchoe Gyaltzen: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 15, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held at Drapchi prison.

21. Dawa: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Currently held at Gutsa prison.

22. Dawa: Age: 27. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Currently held at Gutsa prison.

23. Dawa: Age: 20. A monk of Phurchok monastery. Arrested May 24, 1994.

24. Dawa Gyaltzen: Age: 17. A monk of Tsepag monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993. Sentenced to five years in prison. Currently held at Drapchi prison.

25. Dawa Norbu: Age: 19. A monk of Palkhor monastery. Arrested July 3, 1992. Currently held in Gyantse jail.

26. Dawa Samdup: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested between October 16 and 21, 1993. Currently held at Gutsa prison.

27. Dawa Sonam: Age: 16. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

28. Dawa Tsering: Age: 22. A monk of Dralhaluphug monastery. Arrested September 30, 1989. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

29. Dekyi Nyima: A nun of Gura monastery. Arrested May 25, 1994.

30. Delo: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May, 1992. Current held in Gutsa prison.

31. Dhundup Gyalpo: Age: 17. monk. Arrested June 26, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Sangyvip prison.

32. Dondrup Gyatso: Age: 20. A monk of Dranang monastery. Arrested June 6, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

33. Dondrup: A monk of Rabkung monastery. Arrested September 30, 1990.

34. Dondup: Age: 17. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May, 1992. Current held in Gutsa prison.

35. Dorje: Age: 25. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested April 11, 1992. Sentenced to 6-8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

36. Dorje: Age: 15. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

37. Dorje Tsomo: Age: 18. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested August 12, 1992.

38. Dradul: Age: 23. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

39. Drakpa Tsultrim: Age: 41. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 7, 1988. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

40. Dunrup Yugyal: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 3, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

41. Gokyi: Age: 23. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 16, 1993. Sentenced to 3-5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

42. Gyaltzen Choedron: Age: 25. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested August 21, 1990. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

43. Gyaltzen Choezom: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested August 21, 1990. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

44. Gyaltzen Drolkar: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested August 21, 1990. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

45. Gyaltzen Drolma: Age 16. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 9, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

46. Gyaltzen Kalsang: Age 22. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested March 21, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

47. Gyaltzen Kunga: Age: 23. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1990. Sentenced to 2 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

48. Gyaltzen Kunsang: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 2 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

49. Gyaltzen Kunsang: Age: 25. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 5 and 22, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

50. Gyaltzen Lhagdrön: Age: 26. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested August 21, 1990. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

51. Gyaltzen Lhaksam: Age: 25. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested August 21, 1990. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

52. Gyaltzen Lhazom: Age: 25. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 9, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

53. Gyaltzen Lodroe: Age: 17. A monk of Tsepag monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

54. Gyaltzen Lungrig: Age: 24. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested August 12, 1990. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

55. Gyaltzen Nyinyi: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 5 and 22, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

56. Gyaltzen Pema: Age: 17. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 9, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa monastery.

57. Gyaltzen Sangmo: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 2-3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

58. Gyaltzen Sherab: Age: 25. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested between May 10 and 16, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

59. Gyaltzen Sherab: Age: 19. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 14, 1994. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

60. Gyaltzen Tengye: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 20 1994. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

61. Gyaltzen Tsultrim: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between May 4 and 14, 1993. Sentenced to 4-5 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

62. Gyaltzen Zoepa: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 21, 1994.

63. Jamchok: Age: 28. A monk of Lithang monastery. Arrested August 20, 1993.

64. Jampa: Age: 26. A monk of Rame monastery. Arrested July, 1992. Currently held in Tsethang jail.

65. Jampa: Age: 30. A monk of Pomda monastery. Arrested August, 1993.

66. Jampa Choejor: Age: 16. A monk of Chamdo monastery. Arrested February 8, 1994. Currently being held in Shritang prison.

67. Jampa Dedrol: Age: 15. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested February 13, 1993. Currently being held in Gutsa prison.

68. Jampa Drolkar: Age: 21. A nun of Nagar monastery. Arrested August 17, 1993.

69. Jampa Gelek: Age: 18. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993.

70. Jampa Legshe: Age: 27. A monk of Phenpo Naland monastery. Arrested July 3, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

71. Jampa Rangdrol: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested April 11, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

72. Jampa Tashi: Age: 26. A monk at Serwa monastery. Arrested March 29, 1994. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently held in Powo Tramo prison.

73. Jampa Tenzin: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 6, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

74. Jampa Tenzin: Age: 22. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 2 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

75. Jampa Tseten: Age: 22. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 6, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

76. Jampel Changchub Yugyal: Age: 32. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested March or April, 1989. Sentenced to 19 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

77. Jampel Dorje: Age: 15. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993. Sentenced to 2 years, 6 months in prison.

78. Jampel Gendun: Age: 31. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

79. Jampel Losel: Age: 27. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested April 27, 1989. Sentenced to 10 years in prison.

80. Jamyang: Age: 28. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Currently being held in Gutsa prison.

81. Jamyang Dhondup: Age: 29. A monk of Lithang monastery. Arrested August 20, 1993.

82. Jamyang Dolma: Age: 23. A nun of Shar monastery. Arrested June 15, 1994.
83. Jamyang Kunga: Age: 22. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested November 7, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
84. Jigme Dorje: Age: 27. A monk of Serwa monastery. Arrested March 29, 1994. Sentenced to 15 years in prison. Currently being held in Powo Tramo prison.
85. Jigme Yandron: Age: 24. A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested August 28, 1990. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
86. Jigme Yangchen: Age: 23. A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested October 1, 1990. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
87. Kagye: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
88. Kelsang: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May, 1992.
89. Kelsang: Age: 16. A monk of Tsepak monastery. Arrested June 3, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
90. Kelsang Chodak: Age: 20. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested December 15, 1990. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
91. Kelsang Dawa: Age: 21. A monk of Tsome monastery. Arrested May 15, 1992. Sentenced to 3-5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
92. Kelsang Gyaltzen: Age: 25. A monk of Dingka monastery. Arrested March 17, 1991. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
93. Kelsang Phuntsog: Age: 21. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested August 4, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
94. Kelsang Thutob: Age: 46. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested April 16, 1989. Sentenced to 18 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
95. Kelsang Tsering: A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested January, 1992. Currently held in Medro jail.
96. Khyentse Legrup: Age: 21. A monk of Chideshol monastery. Arrested November 7, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
97. Kunchok Tsomo: Age: 15. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 17, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
98. Kunsang Jampa: Age: 20. A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested March 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
99. Legshe Phuntsog: Age: 23. A monk of Phenpo monastery. Arrested July 3, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
100. Lhagyal: Age: 23. A monk of Samey monastery. Arrested between June and September, 1991. Sentenced to 3-4 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
101. Lhaga: Age: 23. A monk of Chideshol monastery. Arrested August 27, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
102. Lhakpa: Age: 22. A monk of Draglhaluphug monastery. Arrested between October 6 and 25, 1989. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
103. Lhakpa Tsering: Age: 20. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.
104. Lhundrup Monlam: Age: 26. A monk of Palkhor monastery. Arrested March 15 or 16, 1990. Sentenced to 4-5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
105. Lhundrup Togden: Age: 24. A monk of Palkhor monastery. Arrested December 1989. Sentenced to 14 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
106. Lhundrup Zangmo: Age: 23. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested between August 12 and 21, 1990. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
107. Li-Ze: A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested January 1992. Currently being held in Medro jail.
108. Lobsang: Age: 28. A monk of Lithang monastery. Arrested August 20, 1993.
109. Lobsang: Age: 22. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.
110. Lobsang Choedrak: Age: 19. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested February 23, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
111. Lobsang Choedrag: Age: 18. A monk of Nyemo Gyache monastery. Arrested February 3, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
112. Lobsang Choedrag: Age: 18. A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested March 11, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
113. Lobsang Choedrak: Age: 22. A monk of Drak Yerpa monastery. Arrested September 15, 1993.
114. Lobsang Choedron: Age: 17. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested February 3, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
115. Lobsang Choedron: Age: 23. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested August 22, 1990. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
116. Lobsang Choedron: Age: 22. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested August 22, 1990. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
117. Lobsang Choedron: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 13, 1994.
118. Lobsang Choejor: Age: 32. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 7, 1988. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
119. Lobsang Choekyi: Age: 21. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 5 and 22, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
120. Lobsang Choezin: Age: 17. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 20, 1994. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
121. Lobsang Dadak: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested September 1989. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
122. Lobsang Dargye: Age: 27. A monk of Ragya monastery. Arrested November 16, 1992.
123. Lobsang Dargye: Age: 27. A monk of Serwa monastery. Arrested March 29, 1994. Sentenced to 15 years in prison.
124. Lobsang Dargye: Age: 23. A monk of Sangyag monastery. Arrested between May 11 and 16, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
125. Lobsang Dargye: A monk of Sangyag monastery. Arrested December 7, 1994.
125. Lobsang Dolma: Age: 24. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 1994.
126. Lobsang Donyo: Age: 19. A monk of Drak Yerpa monastery. Arrested August 28, 1993. Currently held in Taktse jail.
127. Lobsang Dorje: Age: 20. A monk of Phurchok monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
128. Lobsang Dradul: Age: 18. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 10, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
129. Lobsang Drolma: Age: 22. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested February 3, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
130. Lobsang Drolma: Age: 18. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 5 and 22 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
131. Lobsang Gelek: Age: 22. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested in November or December 1989. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
132. Lobsang Gelek: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 6, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
133. Lobsang Gendun: A monk of Sang-ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1993.
134. Lobsang Gyaltzen: Age: 22. A monk of Nechung monastery. Arrested May 19, 1993.
135. Lobsang Gyaltzen: Age: 22. A monk of Shelkar monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993.
136. Lobsang Gyaltzen: Age: 23. A monk of Nechung monastery. Arrested May 19, 1993.
137. Lobsang Gyaltzen: Age: 19. A monk of Tsepak monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
138. Lobsang Jampa: Age: 23. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 1994.
139. Lobsang Jampa: Age: 29. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
140. Lobsang Jampa: Age: 44. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested July 6, 1991. Currently held in Seitru prison.
141. Lobsang Kalden: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 13, 1994.
142. Lobsang Khedrup: Age: 16. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
143. Lobsang Legshe: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
144. Lobsang Lodrup: Age: 21. A monk of Phurchok monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
145. Lobsang Lungtok: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
146. Lobsang Ngawang: Age: 22. A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested between March and May 1992. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
147. Lobsang Palden: Age: 21. A monk of Phurbu Chog monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
148. Lobsang Palden: Age: 22. A monk of Shelkar monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993.
149. Lobsang Palden: Age: 32. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 7, 1988. Sentenced to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
150. Lobsang Phuntsog: Age: 22. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested August 1991. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
151. Lobsang Samten: Age: 18. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 3, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
152. Lobsang Sherab: Age: 18. A monk of Phurchok retreat. Arrested May 16, 1992. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
153. Lobsang Tashi: Age: 41. A monk of Zitho monastery. Arrested March 4, 1990. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in PoZungma prison.
154. Lobsang Tengue: A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested in 1983. Currently being held in Gutsa prison.
155. Lobsang Tenzin: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
156. Lobsang Tenzin: Age: 18. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested August 14, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
157. Lobsang Tenzin: A monk of Sang-ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994. Currently held in Taktse prison.
158. Lobsang Thargye: A monk of Sand Nak Kha monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992.

159. Lobsang Thupten: Age: 16. A monk of Purchok monastery. Arrested August 5, 1992.
160. Lobsang Thupten: Age: 32. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested July 6, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa monastery.
161. Lobsang Trinley: A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested January 6, 1992. Currently held in Medro jail.
162. Lobsang Tsegye: Age: 27. A monk of Serwa monastery. Arrested March 29, 1994. Sentenced to 15 years in prison. Currently held in Powo Tramo prison.
163. Lobsang Tsondu: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested 1990. Sentenced to 6-7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
164. Lobsang Yangzom: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 13, 1994.
165. Lobsang Yarphel: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested between June 10 and 13, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
166. Lobsang Yeshe: Age: 18. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 1994.
167. Lobsang Yeshe: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
168. Lobsang Zoepa: Age: 19. A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested August 22, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
169. Loden: Age: 51. A monk of Gyu-me monastery. Arrested March 1993.
170. Lodro Pema: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.
171. Migmar: Age: 17. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.
172. Migmar: Age: 27. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.
173. Migmar Tsering: Age: 20. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.
174. Namdrol Lhamo: Age: 28. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 12, 1992. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
175. Namgyal Ghoedron: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.
176. Ngawang Bumchok: Age: 22. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested June 15, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi Prison.
177. Ngawang Chendrol: Age: 18. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
178. Ngawang Chenma: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 5, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
179. Ngawang Chime: Age: 19. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
180. Ngawang Choedrak: A monk and Chant master. Arrested April 1993.
181. Ngawang Choedron: A nun of Choebup monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993.
182. Ngawang Choekyi: Age: 23. A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 14, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
183. Ngawang Choekyi: Age: 21. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
184. Ngawang Choenyi: Age: 20. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested May 8, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
185. Ngawang Choekyong: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested between December 2 and 7, 1994. Currently held in Taktse prison.
186. Ngawang Choephel: Age: 29. A monk of Lithang monastery. Arrested August 20, 1993.
187. Ngawang Choesh: Age: 24. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
188. Ngawang Choezom: Age: 22. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested March 21, 1993. Sentenced to 11 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
189. Ngawang Choglang: Age: 25. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
190. Ngawang Dadrol: Age: 17. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 15 and 22, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
191. Ngawang Dawa: Age: 16. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 9, 1991. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
192. Ngawang Debam: Age: 24. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested August 8, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
193. Ngawang Dedrol: Age: 23. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
194. Ngawang Dedrol: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
195. Ngawang Dipsel: A monk of Drepung monastery. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
196. Ngawang Dorje: Age: 21. A monk of Shedrupling monastery. Arrested August 12, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
197. Ngawang Drolma: Age: 18. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested March 13, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
198. Ngawang Gomchen: Age: 20. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested August 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
199. Ngawang Gyaltzen: Age: 21. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested May 3, 1991. A monk of Gutsa prison.
200. Ngawang Gyaltzen: Age: 36. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested April 4, 1989. Sentenced to 17 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
201. Ngawang Gyatso: A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
202. Ngawang Jamchen: Age: 24. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 27, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
203. Ngawang Jigme: Age: 17. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested in September or October 1991. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
204. Ngawang Jigme: Age: 20. A monk of Medro monastery. Arrested June 6, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
205. Ngawang Jinpa: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested between December 2 and 7, 1994.
206. Ngawang Keldron: Age: between 19 and 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison.
207. Ngawang Kelsang: A nun of Nyemo Gyaltse monastery. Arrested June 1993.
208. Ngawang Kelzom: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 2-5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
209. Ngawang Kelzom: Age: 24. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 2 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
210. Ngawang Khedup: Age: 24. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested June 15, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
211. Ngawang Kunsang: Age: 26. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested in January or February 1990. Sentenced to 14 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
212. Ngawang Kunsel: Age: 20. A nun of a Garu monastery. Arrested May 25, 1994.
213. Ngawang Kyema: Age: 23. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 22, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
214. Ngawang Lamchen: Age: 23. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993.
215. Ngawang Lamchung: Age: 22. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested December 12, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
216. Ngawang Lamdrol: Age: 19. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested May 25, 1994.
217. Ngawang Ledoe: A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested 1983. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
218. Ngawang Legsang: Age: 22. A monk of Kyormolung monastery. Arrested 28, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
219. Ngawang Legshe: Age: 22. A monk of Kingka monastery. Arrested March 17, 1991. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
220. Ngawang Legyon: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994.
221. Ngawang Lhaksam: Age: 24. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
222. Ngawang Lhundrup: Age: 22. A monk of Kingka monastery. Arrested April 1991. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
223. Ngawang Lhundrup: Age: 33. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 16, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
224. Ngawang Lhundrup: Age: 19. A monk of Shedrupling monastery. Arrested August 12, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
225. Ngawang Lobsang: Age: 23. A nun of Phenpo Namkar monastery. Arrested July 16, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
226. Ngawang Lochoe: Age: 23. A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Sentenced to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
227. Ngawang Losel: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested between December 2 and 7, 1994. Currently held in Taktse prison.
228. Ngawang Losel: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993.
229. Ngawang Lungtok: Age: 19. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
230. Ngawang Namdrol: Age: 23. A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
231. Ngawang Namling: Age: 28. A monk of Drugyal monastery. Arrested June 27, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
232. Ngawang Ngondron: A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
233. Ngawang Ngon-Kyen: Age: 19. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested between May 7 and 31, 1994.
234. Ngawang Nordrol: Age: 23. A nun of Samdrup Drolma monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
235. Ngawang Nyidrol: Age: 23. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested July 6, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
236. Ngawang Nyima: Age: 23. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 5 and 22, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.
237. Ngawang Nyima: Age: 22. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
238. Ngawang Oeser: Age: 22. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested April 16, 1989.

Sentenced to 17 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

239. Ngawang Palden: Age: 28. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested August 28, 1992. Sentenced to up to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

240. Ngawang Palgon: Age: 33. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested June 15, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

241. Ngawang Palmo: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

242. Ngawang Palsang: Age: 20. A monk of Medro monastery. Arrested June 6, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

243. Ngawang Pekar: Age: 29. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested March 1989. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

244. Ngawang Pelkyi: Age: 18. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 22, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Trisam prison.

245. Ngawang Pema: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 13, 1994.

246. Ngawang Pemo: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

247. Ngawang Phulchung: Age: 34. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested April 16, 1989. Sentenced to 16 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

248. Ngawang: Age: 21. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 15, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

249. Ngawang Phuntsog: Age: 22. A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

250. Ngawang Phurdron: A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

251. Ngawnag Rabjor: Age: 20. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 27, 1991. Sentenced to six years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

252. Ngawang Rigdrol: Age: 21. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 5 and 22, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

253. Ngawang Rigdrol: Age: 22. A nun of Phenpo Namkar monastery. Arrested July 17, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

254. Ngawang Rigzin: Age: 29. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested April 1989. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

255. Ngawang Samdrup: Age: 18. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 17, 1992. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

256. Ngawang Samten: Age: 20. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 5, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

257. Ngawang Samten: Age: 22. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested between March 9 and 11, 1991. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

258. Ngawang Sangden: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 13, 1994.

259. Ngawang Sangdrol: Age: 18. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 17, 1992. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

260. Ngawang Sangye: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

261. Ngawang Shenyen: Age: 25. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested March 18, 1989. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

262. Ngawang Sherab: Age: 23. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested June 16,

1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

263. Ngawang Sherab: Age: 24. A monk of Jamchen monastery. Arrested March 11, 1992. Sentenced to up to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

264. Ngawang Sonam: Age: 21. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

265. Ngawang Songtsen: Age: 24. A monk of Jokhang monastery. Arrested March 1989. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

266. Ngawang Sothar: Age: 23. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

267. Ngawang Sungrab: Age: 20. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 27, 1991. Sentenced to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

268. Ngawang Tendrol: Age: 18. A nun of Toelung Ngengon monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

269. Ngawang Tengye: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

270. Ngawang Tenrab: Age: 37. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested March 16, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

271. Ngawang Tensang: Age: 21. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 14, 1991. Sentenced to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

272. Ngawang Tenzin: Age: 23. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

273. Ngawang Tenzin: Age: 18. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested February 19, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

274. Ngawang Tenzin: Age: 21. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested March 18, 1989. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

275. Ngawang Thoglam: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994. Currently held in Taktse prison.

276. Ngawang Thupten: Age: 18. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested May 29, 1993.

277. Ngawang Thupten: Age: 19. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 10, 1991. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

278. Ngawang Trinley: Age: 27. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

279. Ngawang Tsamdrol: Age: 21. A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Sentenced to a total of 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

280. Ngawang Tsangpa: Age: 21. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested between May 27 and 31, 1994.

281. Ngawang Tsedrol: Age: 22. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

282. Ngawang Tsondru: Age: 23. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested June 1, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

283. Ngawang Tsondru: Age: 26. A monk of Dingka monastery. Arrested March 17, 1991. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

284. Ngawang Tsultrim: Age: 24. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested March 18, 1989. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

285. Ngawang Tsultrim: A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested May 1993.

286. Ngawang Wangmo: A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

287. Ngawang Wooser: Age: 28. A monk of Dingka monastery. Arrested March 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

288. Ngawang Yangchen: Age: 22. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested August 12, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

289. Ngawang Yangdrol: Age: 23. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

290. Ngawang Yangkyi: A nun of Tsangkhung monastery. Arrested August 21, 1990. Currently held at Drapchi hospital.

291. Ngawang Yangkyi: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

292. Ngawang Yeshe: Age: 22. A monk of Serkhang monastery. Arrested February 11, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

293. Ngawang Zangpo: Age: 20. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested August 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

294. Ngawang Zoepa: Age: 25. A monk of Rong Jamchen monastery. Arrested between September 11 and 19, 1992. Sentenced to up to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

295. Ngawang Zoepa: Age: 28. A monk of Dingka monastery. Arrested March 17, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

296. Norbu: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

297. Norbu: Age: 20. A monk of Yamure monastery. Arrested January 11, 1995.

298. Norgye: Age: 23. A monk of Rong Jamchen monastery. Arrested September 19, 1992. Sentenced to 4-5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

299. Norzang: Age: 15. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

300. Norzin: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.

301. Nyidrol: A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

302. Nyima: Age: 28. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested April 2, 1994.

303. Nyima: Age: 18. A monk of Phurchok monastery. Arrested May 24, 1994.

304. Nyima Gyaltzen: Age: 23. A monk of Tsepak monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

305. Nyima Tenzin: Age: 27. A monk of Pangpa monastery. Arrested December 29, 1993.

306. Nyima Tsamchoe: Age: 25. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 22, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

307. Palden Choedron: Age: 19. A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested October 1, 1990. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

308. Pasang: Age: 24. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

309. Pasang: A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested January 1992. Currently held in Medro jail.

310. Pasang: Age: 15. A monk of Tsepak monastery. Arrested June 3, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

311. Passang: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested June 1993.

312. Pema Drolkar: Age: 18. A nun of Michungr monastery. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

313. Pema Oeser: Age: 16. A nun of Nagar monastery. Arrested August 17, 1993.

314. Pema Tsering: Age: 23. A monk of Serwa monastery. Arrested March 29, 1994.

Sentenced to 15 years in prison. Currently held in Powo Tramo prison.

315. Pendron: A nun of Shungsen. Arrested December 12, 1993.

316. Penpa: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

317. Penpa: Age: 19. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

318. Penpa: Age: 21. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested July 4, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

319. Penpa: Age: 22. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested July 4, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

320. Penpa Wangmo: Age: 20. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested February 13, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

321. Pepar: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

322. Phetho: Age: 21. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested August 18, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

323. Phuntsog: Age: 21. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

324. Phuntsog Changsem: Age: 18. A monk of Drepung Monastery. Arrested September 14, 1991. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

325. Phuntsog Chenga: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

326. Phutsog Choedrag: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994.

327. Phutsog Choejor: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994.

328. Phutsog Choekyi: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 6-7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

329. Phuntsog Dadak: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

330. Phuntsog Demei: Age: 22. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

331. Phuntsog Dondrup: Age: 17. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 10, 1991. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

332. Phuntsog Gonpo: Age: 19. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 14, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

333. Phuntsog Gyaltsen: Age: 26. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 7, 1988. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

334. Phuntsog Jigdral: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994. Currently held in Taktse prison.

335. Phuntsog Jorchu: Age: 26. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested August 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

336. Phuntsog Legsang: Age: 21. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

337. Phuntsog Lochoe: Age: 24. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested March 21, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

338. Phuntsog Lhundrup: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994.

339. Phuntsog Namgyal: Age: 23. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992.

Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

340. Phuntsog Nyidron: Age: 23. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested between October and December 1990. Sentenced to a total of 17 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

341. Phuntsog Nyimgbu: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested October 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

342. Phuntsog Pema: Age: 23. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested between October and December 1990. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

343. Phuntsog Peyang: Age: 27. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested May 25, 1994.

344. Phuntsog Rigchog: Age: 28. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested May 31, 1994.

345. Phuntsog Samten: Age: 24. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested September 4, 1991. Sentenced to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

346. Phuntsog Samten: Age: 23. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

347. Phuntsog Segyi: Age: 22. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

348. Phuntsog Seldrag: Age: 17. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested May 31, 1994.

349. Phuntsog Tendon: Age: 14. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested May 31, 1994.

350. Phuntsog Thoesam: Age: 23. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested June 1, 1993. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

351. Phuntsog Thrinden: Age: 19. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested May 31, 1994.

352. Phuntsog Thubten: Age: 30. A monk of Rame monastery. Arrested June 12, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

353. Thuntog Thutop: Age: 20. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 14, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

354. Phuntsog Tsamchoe: Age: 22. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested March 3, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

355. Phuntsog Tsering: Age: 20. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested September 4, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

356. Phuntsog Tsomo: Age: 19. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested May 25, 1994.

357. Phuntsog Tsungme: Age: 21. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested May 26, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

358. Phuntsog Wangden: Age: 23. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested September 4, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

359. Phuntsog Wangdu: Age: 25. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 18, 1993.

360. Phuntsog Wangmo: Age: 21. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested May 25, 1994.

361. Phuntsog Zoepa: Age: 19. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested May 31, 1994.

362. Phurbu: Age: 19. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested October 10, 1989. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

363. Phurbu: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested September 30, 1989. Sentenced to a total of 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

364. Phurbu: Age: 16. A monk of Tsepak monastery. Arrested June 3, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

365. Phurbu Tashi: Age: 15. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993. Sentenced to 2 years, 6 months in prison.

366. Phurbu Tashi: Age: 20. A monk of Pangpa monastery. Arrested December 29, 1993.

367. Phurbu Tsamchoe: A nun of Tsangkhung monastery. Arrested June 10, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

368. Phurbu Tsering: A monk of Tashi Lhunpo monastery. Arrested June 15, 1993.

369. Rigzin Choekyi: Age: 24. A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested August 1990. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

370. Rigzin Tsondrü: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.

371. Rinchen Drolma: Age: 23. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 2-4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

372. Rinchen Sangmo: Age: 20. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 22, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

373. Samten Choesang: Age: 20. A nun of Phenpo Namkar monastery. Arrested July 16, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison.

374. Samten Sangmo: Age: 20. A nun of Phenpo Namkar. Arrested July 16, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

375. Seldroen: Age: 17. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 14, 1994. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

376. Shenyen Logsang: A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested June 16, 1993.

377. Sherabl Drolma: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.

378. Sherab Ngawang: Age: 12. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested February 3, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Trisam prison.

379. Shilok: Age: 33. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested March 30, 1992. Currently held in Tsethang prison.

380. Sodor: Age: 20. A monk of Lhoka monastery. Arrested August 16, 1989. Sentenced to a total of 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

381. Sonam: A monk of Drak Yerpa monastery. Arrested August 1994. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

382. Sonam Bagdro: Age: 24. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to Gutsa prison.

383. Sonam Choephel: Age: 12. A monk of Cunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison.

384. Sonam Drolkar: A nun of Dechen Khul monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

385. Sonam Gyalpo: A monk of Tashilhunpo monastery. Arrested July 1, 1993.

386. Sonam Tenzin: A monk of Dakpo. Arrested January 1992. Currently held in Medro jail.

387. Sonam Tsering: Age: 20. A monk of Yamure monastery. Arrested January 11, 1995.

388. Sotop: Age: 23. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested March 1989. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

389. Tapsang: Age: 22. A nun of Sungsep monastery. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

390. Tashi Dawa: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

391. Tendar Phuntsog: Age: 62. A monk of Potala monastery. Arrested March 8, 1989. Sentenced to up to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

392. Tenpa Wangdrag: Age: 49. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 7, 1988. Sentenced to 14 years in prison. Currently held in Powo Tramo prison.

393. Tenzin: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 1, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

394. Tenzin: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 7, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
395. Tenzin: Age: 24. A monk of Bu Gon monastery. Arrested January 13, 1994.
396. Tenzin Choekyi: Age: 19. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested March 11, 1993.
397. Tenzin Choekyi: A nun of Choebup monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993.
398. Tenzin Choephel: Age: 16. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
399. Tenzin Dekyong: Age: 15. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested March 13, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
400. Tenzin Dradul: Age: 18. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
401. Tenzin Drakpa: Age: 23. A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested December 6, 1991. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
402. Tenzin Dragpa: Age: 24. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 10, 1992. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
403. Tenzin Kunsang: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 12, 1994.
404. Tenzin Namdrak: Age: 23. A monk of Phakmo monastery. Arrested August 13, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
405. Tenzin Ngawang: Age: 21. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested between August 12 and 21, 1990. Sentenced up to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
406. Tenzin Phuntsog: Age: 24. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
407. Tenzin Rabten: Age: 21. A monk of Shelkar monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993.
408. Tenzin Thupten: Age: 20. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested between August 12 and 21, 1990. Sentenced up to 14 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
409. Tenzin Trinley: Age: 23. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested November 7, 1992. Sentenced to 3-4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
410. Tenzin Wangdu: Age: 19. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested between June 10 and 13, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
411. Thapke: Age: 17. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.
412. Tharpa: Age: 17. A monk of Phurchok monastery. Arrested May 24, 1994.
413. Thupten Geleg: Age: 16. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested May 31, 1994.
414. Thupten Kelsang: Age: 18. A monk of Phurchok monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
415. Thupten Kelsang: Age: 19. A monk of Lo monastery. Arrested May 4, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
416. Thupten Kunga: Age: 70. A monk of Rong Jamchen monastery. Arrested April 10, 1992.
417. Thupten Kunkhyen: Age: 17. A monk of Chideshol monastery. Arrested November 7, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
418. Thupten Kunphel: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
419. Thupten Monlam: Age: 20. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested August 8, 1992. Sentenced to up to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
420. Thupten Phuntsog: Age: 26. A monk of Rame monastery. Arrested June 22, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison.
421. Thupten Tsering: Age: 25. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested May 19, 1993. Currently held in Seitru prison.
422. Thupten Tsondu: Age: 23. A monk of Chideshol monastery. Arrested April 6, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
423. Topgyal: Age: 21. A monk of Bu Gon monastery. Arrested February 1994.
424. Trinley Choedron: Age: 18. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1995. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
425. Trinley Choezom: Age: 18. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested February 3, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
426. Trinley Gyaltzen: Age: 16. A monk of Tsepa monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
427. Trinley Gyamtso: Age: 24. A monk of Labrang monastery. Arrested September 1994.
428. Trinley Tenzin: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested either May 12 or 13, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
429. Tsamchoe: A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 1, 1992.
430. Tsamchoe: Age: 19. A nun of Nagar monastery. Arrested August 17, 1993.
431. Tsering: Age: 20. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested between September and November 1992.
432. Tsering: A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested March 11, 1993.
433. Tsering: Age: 23. A monk of Lhodrak monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993.
434. Tsering Choedron: A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
435. Tsering Choedron: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 11, 1992.
436. Tsering Choekyi: A nun of Sungsep monastery. Arrested December 12, 1992.
437. Tsering Donden: Age: 26. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.
438. Tsering Dondrup: Age: 25. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested September 4, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
439. Tsering Phuntsog: Age: 26. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
440. Tsering Phuntsog: Age: 24. A monk of Palkhor monastery. Arrested in July or August 1990. Sentenced to 13 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
441. Tsering Samdrup: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 19, 1994. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
442. Tsering Tashi: Age: 20. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested May 26, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
443. Tseten: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested January 1990. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
444. Tseten Ngodrup: Age: 19. A monk of Phagmo monastery. Arrested August 13, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
445. Tseten Nyima: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992.
446. Tseten Samdup: Age: 17. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992.
447. Tsetob: Age: 28. A monk of Bu Gon monastery. Arrested January 13, 1994.
448. Tsetse: Age: 47. A monk of Bu Gon monastery. Arrested January 13, 1994. Currently held in Chamdo prison.
449. Tsultrim Donden: Age: 23. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 12, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
450. Tsultrim Gyaltzen: Age: 23. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested July 5, 1993.
451. Tsultrim Nyima: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992. Currently held in Gutsa monastery.
452. Tsultrim Sherab: Age: 19. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested July 5, 1993.
453. Tsultrim Tharchin: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 11, 1993.
454. Tsultrim Topgyal: Age: 20. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993.
455. Tsultrim Zangmo: Age: 23. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 14, 1994.
456. Tsultrim Zoepa: Age: 23. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested July 5, 1993.
456. Walgon Tsering: A monk of Qinghai monastery. Arrested September 1994. Currently held in Hainan County prison.
457. Wangdu: Age: 22. A monk of Jokhang monastery. Arrested March 8, 1989. Sentenced to a total of 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
458. Yangdron: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 11, 1993.
459. Yangzom: Age: 23. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested March 21, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.
460. Yeshe Choezang: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 11, 1993.
461. Yeshe Dolma: Age: 28. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 15, 1994.
462. Yeshe Drolma: Age: 24. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested August 12, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
463. Yeshe Dradul: Age: 24. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested March 13, 1989. Sentenced to 5-6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
464. Yeshe Jamyang: Age: 19. A monk of Serkhang monastery. Arrested February 11, 1992. Sentenced to 3-4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
465. Yeshe Jinpa: Age: 20. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993.
466. Yeshe Kalsang: Age: 20. A monk of Gyaldoe monastery. Arrested June 6, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
467. Yeshe Khedrup: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 6, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
468. Yeshe Kunsang: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 11, 1993.
469. Yeshe Ngawang: Age: 22. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested March 13, 1989. Sentenced to a total of 14 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
470. Yeshe Samten: Age: 22. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested June 19, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.
471. Yeshe Tsondu: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 12, 1993.

July 3, 1995

[Primary Source: The Puebla Institute]
PROTESTANTS IMPRISONED AND DETAINED IN
CHINA

1. Dai Gullang: Age: 45. Arrested August 25, 1993. Sentenced without trial to three years' "reform through labor." Currently held in Xuancheng Labor Camp, Anhui province.
2. Dai Lanmei: Age: 27. Arrested August 25, 1993. Sentenced without trial to two years' "reform through labor." Currently held in Xuancheng Labor Camp, Anhui province.
3. Fan Zhi: Arrested after August 1991.
4. Ge Xinliang: Age: 27. Arrested August 25, 1993. Sentenced without trial to two years' "reform through labor."
5. Guo Mengshan: Age: 41. Arrested July 20, 1993. Sentenced without trial to three years' "reform through labor." Reportedly held at Xuancheng Labor Camp, Anhui province.
6. Jiang Huaifeng: Age: 61. Arrested late September 1994. Sentenced to two years' "re-education through labor." Currently detained at Xuancheng Coal Mine Labor Reform Camp in southern Anhui.

7. Leng Zhaoqing: Arrested after August 1991.

8. Li Haochen: Arrested September 1993. Reportedly sentenced to three years' "reform through labor." Originally held in Mengcheng county prison, but current whereabouts are unknown.

9. Liu Wenjie: Arrested July 20, 1993. Length of sentence unknown. Reportedly detained in Xuancheng Labor Camp, Anhui province.

10. Wang Yao Hua: Age: early 30s. Arrested 1993. Sentenced to three years' "reeducation through labor."

11. Wang Dabao: Arrested after August 1991.

12. Xu Hanrong: Arrested after August 1991.

13. Yang Mingfen: Arrested after August 1991.

14. Xu Fanian: Age: 51. Arrested late September 1994. Sentenced to two years' "reeducation through labor." Currently detained in Xuancheng Coal Mine Labor Reform Camp, southern Anhui.

15. Zheng Shaoying: Arrested after August 1991.

16. Zhang Guanchun: Arrested after August 1991.

17. Zhang Jiuzhong: Arrested in 1993. Sentenced to two years' "reform through labor."

18. Zheng Lanyun: Arrested July 20, 1993. Reportedly detained in Xuancheng Labor Camp, Anhui province.

19. Gou Qinghui: Arrested June 3, 1994. Detained in Beijing.

20. Wang Huamin: Arrested June 3, 1994. Detained in Beijing.

21. Wu Rengang: Arrested June 3, 1994. Detained in Beijing.

22. Xu Honghai: Arrested June 3, 1994. Detained in Beijing.

23. Chen Zhuman: Age: 50. Arrested December 14, 1991. Sentenced without trial to three years' "reeducation through labor." Reported detained in a prison in Quanzhou, Fujian.

24. Han Kangrui: Age: 48. Reportedly detained in Longtian town detention center.

25. He Xianzing: Age: 53. Arrested December 23, 1993. Reportedly detained in Jiangjing town detention center.

26. Lin Zilong: Age: 81. Arrested December 23, 1993. Reportedly held in administrative detention in Fuqing police station jail.

27. Yang Xinfei: Age: 67. Under police surveillance.

28. Bai Shuqian: Arrested 1983. Sentenced to 12 years' imprisonment. Reportedly detained in Kaifeng, Henan.

29. Du Zhangji: Arrested 1985. Sentenced to eight years in prison. Not known to have been released.

30. Geng Menzuan: Age: 65. Arrested July 9, 1983. Sentenced to 11 years in prison and five years deprivation of political rights.

31. He Suolie: Arrested 1985. Sentenced to five years in prison. Not known to have been released.

32. Kang Manshuang: Arrested 1985. Sentenced to four years in prison. Not known to have been released.

33. Pan Yiyuan: Age: 58. Arrested February 2, 1994. Reportedly detained in Zhangzhou Detention Center.

34. Qin Zhenjun: Age: 49. Arrested July 9, 1983. Sentenced to nine years' in prison. Reportedly released but movement is restricted and remains under police surveillance.

35. Song Yude: Age: 40. Arrested July 16, 1984. Sentenced to eight years' imprisonment. Released April 1992 but still deprived of political rights.

36. Wang Baoquan: Age: 67. Arrested July 9, 1983. Sentenced to six years' imprisonment. Reportedly released but still denied political rights.

37. Wang Xincan: Age: 31. Arrested July 9, 1983. Sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment.

Currently held at Henan Provincial Prison No. 3, Yuzian.

38. Xu Yongze: Age: 52. Arrested April 16, 1988. Sentenced to three years' imprisonment. Released May 20, 1991. Remains under strict police surveillance and is reportedly forced to report periodically to the local Public Security Bureau.

39. Xue Guiwen: Age: 38. Arrested July 9, 1983. Sentenced to six years' imprisonment and deprived of political rights for 5 years. Released, but still deprived of political rights.

40. Zhao Donghai: Sentenced in 1982 or 1983 to 13 years' imprisonment.

41. Xu Fang: Age: 21. Arrested September 1993.

42. Chen Xurong: Arrested in May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' "reeducation through labor." Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong province.

43. Fan Zueying: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to two years' "reeducation through labor." Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong. Should have been released in 1994 but no release has been reported or confirmed.

44. Li Qihua: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' "reeducation through labor." Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

45. Li Culing: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' "reeducation through labor." Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

46. Liu Limin: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to two years' "reeducation through labor." Should have been released in 1994 but no release has been reported or confirmed.

47. Liu Ping: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' "reeducation through labor." Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

48. Qin Zingcai: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' "reeducation through labor." Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

49. Sun Faxia: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to two years' "reeducation through labor." Should have been released in 1994 but no release has been reported or confirmed.

50. Sun Fuqin: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to two years' "reeducation through labor." Should have been released in 1994 but no release has been reported or confirmed.

51. Sun Jingxiu: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to two years' "reeducation through labor." Should have been released in 1994 but no release has been reported or confirmed.

52. Wang Guiqin: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' "reeducation through labor." Currently detained in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

53. Wu Xiuling: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' "reeducation through labor." Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

54. Yang Zhuanyuan: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' "reeducation through labor." Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

55. Zheng Jikuo: Arrested June 1992. Sentenced to 9 years' imprisonment. Held in an unknown location.

56. Zheng Yunsu: Arrested June 1992. Sentenced to 12 years' imprisonment. Reported held at the Shengjian Motorcycle Factory labor camp near Jinan city.

57. Zheng (given name unknown): Son of Zheng Yunsu (No. 56). Arrested June 1992. Sentenced to five years' imprisonment. Held in an unknown location.

58. Zheng (given name unknown): Son of Zheng Yunsu (No. 56). Arrested June 1992.

Sentenced to five years' imprisonment. Held in an unknown location.

59. Zhou Wenxia: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to two years' "reeducation through labor." Should have been released in 1994 but no release has been reported or confirmed.

60. Pei Zhongxun: (Korean name: Chun Chul) Age: 76. Ethnic Korean. Arrested August 1983. Sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment. Currently held in Shanghai Prison No. 2.

61. Xie Moshan: (Moses Xie) Age: early 70s. Arrested April 24, 1992. Released July 23, 1992 but movements are severely restricted and he is required to report periodically to the local Public Security Bureau. Mail is regularly intercepted and read by local authorities.

62. He Chengzhou: Reportedly had a bounty for his capture (dead or alive) placed on his head in early 1992.

63. Lalling (given name unknown): Reportedly being held in the Yunan State Prison near the Burmese border.

64. Nawlkung (given name unknown): Reportedly being held in the Yunan State Prison near the Burmese border.

65. Wang Jiashui: Reportedly had a bounty for his capture (dead or alive) placed on his head in early 1992.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution. What the resolution does is, it enables us to voice our very serious concerns about various Chinese policies and actions, while at the same time underscoring our desire for a good Chinese-American relationship.

I want to try to put this United States-China relationship into context. That relationship is of enormous importance to the United States and to international peace and security. It is a very complex relationship, and it is extremely difficult to manage. We have very tough disagreements and issues with the Chinese on human rights and nonproliferation and trade. It seems to me what we in the Congress ought to be doing is helping the President manage that difficult relationship. We should not make that relationship more difficult.

Let me be very blunt about it. Good Chinese-American relations are very much in the interest of the United States for several reasons.

China, already the largest country in the world, now possesses one of the world's largest economies as well. As a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, China is not only a key country in Asia but has a significant impact on United States efforts to resolve an array of problems far removed from Asia. China is one of the world's five acknowledged nuclear weapons states. United States efforts to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction can succeed only if China cooperates with us and the rest of the international community.

China has the world's largest standing army whose capabilities have been significantly enhanced in recent years. Stability throughout East Asia depends in large measure on Chinese intentions and objectives which are themselves in part a function of Beijing's ties with Washington.

On the economic front, American exports and American jobs are dependent upon good relations with China. Last year we sold \$9 billion worth of goods to China. These exports supported 180,000 high-wage American jobs. We ignore the affairs of Asia and China at our peril. Three times in the past half century, young American men and women have laid down their lives in Asian wars. It is impossible to envision a coherent Asian policy for the United States without a policy of continual engagement with China. The United States will be greatly handicapped in promoting its interests in Asia unless we enjoy at least a decent relationship with the Chinese.

That is what this resolution is all about. It is supported by both those who support MFN for China and those who oppose MFN. But for the first time in 6 years, this House is able to speak on China with a single voice, and that is a highly welcome development.

When we frequently hear in this country conflicting signals about our views on China, there can be no misunderstanding how this House feels about China and the resolution puts it forward very clearly.

We believe China is a terribly important country with a bright future. We hope to have cordial relations with the people of China and with their government. Nonetheless, there are a lot of actions by the Chinese Government that cause us grave concern. We must balance multiple interests when we deal with China: Promoting human rights and democracy, securing China's strategic cooperation in Asia and the United Nations, controlling proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, expanding United States economic ties. An engagement with China, rather than isolation, is most likely to promote those varied United States interests. That is the message this resolution conveys.

I suspect none of us are pleased with every single clause in the resolution. But on balance, I believe this resolution does an admirable job reconciling the various points of view of Members.

There are many in this Chamber who deserve high praise for their work on this: The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and many others. I commend them for their work.

This resolution is good for America. It is good for American interests. It places the House of Representatives clearly on the side of economic and political reform in China, while recognizing that the best way to encourage that reform is through a policy of engagement.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Bereuter resolution.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman

from Indiana for his excellent statement and for his help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], one of the great experts in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, by now it is apparent that the United States-China bilateral relationship is in the worst shape it has been in at least a decade and continues in a downward spiral. The Chinese—in the throes of a prolonged leadership transition—have done little to stem the deterioration. The prolonged detention of Harry Wu, an American citizen, is unwarranted and all of us condemn it. With our vote on this bill today, we have an opportunity to send a strong message to the Chinese that such actions are repugnant to the American commitment to human rights and our sense of justice. Thus, I enthusiastically urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2058.

This bill, the China Policy of 1995, condemns the actions of the Chinese Government on issues such as its continued violation of internationally-recognized standards of human rights and nuclear nonproliferation as well as its discriminatory and unfair trade practices. It directs the administration to pursue intensified diplomatic initiatives to persuade China to alter its policies.

Just as important, and unlike the annual efforts to revoke China's most-favored-nation trade status, this bill does not jeopardize our political and economic relationship in a way that could well prove counterproductive for both nations and undermine our ability to cooperate with China on critical national security issues, such as nuclear proliferation issues in North Korea.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation. It is important that we let Beijing know its abhorrent human rights, nuclear proliferation, and trade actions will not go unnoticed. However, at the same time, we must also help those within China intensify the pressure now building for political and social change.

I believe that we can accomplish this and promote human rights in China by engaging them increasingly in trade and economic relations. This policy requires extension of MFN. That is not a contradiction of terms or of policy. The best foreign policy tools available to us to encourage political reform abroad are policies that promote capitalism and economic opportunity. Such policies are powerful levers for political change precisely because they are powerful levers for economic change. That is a policy that has worked successfully in such diverse countries as South Africa, Korea, Taiwan, and Chile.

Our foreign policy toward China should embrace tools of reform and change—not condition them. These are precisely the tools we can use to promote the evolution of Chinese society so that its people can press for political reform from within. They are the tools to stimulate Chinese society to adopt a

more pluralistic and democratic political process. That, in turn, will inevitably lead to a greater respect for human rights and personal liberty. There are examples previously mentioned that support this proposition. One concrete result of economic liberalization in China is the way that it has spawned a parallel civil justice system based on the rule of law, rather than rule by law. While some may question whether increasing the number of lawyers in China is true reform, I would argue that it is if the contract law that develops and other legal reforms lead to parallel development of law that protects human rights. Will it? None of us can say with certainty, but history suggests that it will.

Revocation of trade with China would almost certainly retard—not promote—the cause of human rights in China. United States economic sanctions would harm the emerging Chinese private sector and the dynamic market-oriented provinces in southern China, which depend on trade. This would weaken the very forces in Chinese society pressing hardest for reforms. We must not undermine the brave efforts of reform-minded Chinese who have come to depend on economic opportunity as a means of ultimately achieving political freedom in China. Lasting reform in China can only be driven from within. We must continue to work toward that end.

The United States-China relationship is very complex. There is no country on this globe that has brought more fascination or caused greater aggravation to Americans than China, but none of us doubt the potential for good in this world that will flow from improved political and economic relations. Today, we agonize over how we can promote human rights in China, advance peace in Asia, and protect our own national security interests in that region. But, in this debate, let us not lose sight of the common goals which should unite all of us.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2058.

□ 1215

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to my neighbor, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], a subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the alternative bill offered by Mr. BEREUTER and in opposition to House Joint Resolution 96.

I think everyone agrees that improving human rights in China is a priority, and I know people on both sides of this issue are eager to see the end of human rights violations in China. But, while this is an important issue for the United States to pursue, it is not the only issue at stake and I firmly believe we will not and cannot improve human rights by revoking MFN.

As you know, on May 26, 1994, President Clinton announced his decision to

delink human rights issues in China from the extension of MFN. By Executive order, later endorsed by Congress, the President proposed a policy of broad, comprehensive engagement with China.

The President's decision, which I fully support and applaud, recognizes the fact that denying China MFN status will not prompt Chinese leaders to improve human rights conditions. In the short term, it will only harm the economies of both the United States and China. In the long term it would give European and Japanese businesses a competitive advantage, allowing them greater access to the China's huge market of 1.2 billion people.

Mr. BEREUTER's bill offers a constructive alternative for all of us who have serious concerns about human rights, weapons proliferation, abuse of American citizens in China, and other critical issues between the United States and China. I am pleased to support this bill, and urge the administration to act quickly and earnestly to fulfill its requirements. If we treat China as an enemy, it will react as an enemy. Keeping our eye on the big picture is key to a successful relationship. A little tough love never hurt anyone.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a policy of frank and constructive engagement with China and its 1.2 billion citizens. I believe this policy can best be carried out both by renewing China's most favored nation trading status and by approving the legislation before us expressing strong disapproval of China's human rights abuses. I commend the Members involved in this debate for coming together for a policy which is good for the Chinese people and America.

Like many of my colleagues, I am frustrated by the Chinese Government's lack of progress toward democracy and respect for the rights of its own people. I am angry about the detention of Harry Wu, and I join the administration and my colleagues in condemning the detention of this American citizen in the strongest possible terms, and demanding his immediate release.

But I believe it would be a mistake to isolate China from the world community through actions such as denial of MFN. China is experiencing tremendous turmoil. Its government is in transition. Its market economy continues to expand, which I believe will lead to an inevitable clash between the freedom of the market and the lack of freedom in China's political system. We must do everything we can to ensure that when that clash occurs, freedom wins—freedom in the marketplace and freedom at the ballot box.

I believe that constructive economic engagement with the people of China will encourage such freedom.

But I also believe that we must be frank and forceful when we disagree with the policies of the Chinese Government. The bill put forth by Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. HAMILTON accomplishes both goals, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2058, the Bereuter-Wolf bill which sets forth a clear policy on China by the Congress, and requires the President to report back to Congress every 6 months on the progress China is making toward achieving democracy as we reward them with MFN status.

It sets forth international standards of conduct on nuclear proliferation, international standards on human rights, and the lack of access to their markets.

Last year Members of Congress were told that the provision of most favored nation [MFN] for China would give an incentive to Chinese leaders to be responsible with respect to how they treat their citizens and address the trade deficit.

Since then, thousands of Chinese have been wrongfully imprisoned and persecuted and the Chinese leadership has continued to prevent freedom of association, speech, and religion.

Although China is going through political and social changes, its leaders must know that the United States stands firm in our defense of the basic principles upon which our democracy was founded—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of affiliation. The detention of Harry Wu, an American citizen and a Hoover Institute scholar from Stanford University, which I am privileged to represent, and a globally recognized human rights leader is the most recent example of how oppressive the Chinese Government is.

This resolution addresses the significant economic inequities which exist between our two countries. In 1989 the trade deficit was \$6 billion; today it is closer to \$40 billion. Our trade deficit with China will exceed our trade deficit with Japan in the next few years if we do not forge a clear policy to deal with it.

But the most valuable export our great Nation has is democracy and the best lesson in democracy we can give the world are the standards upon which our democracy rests and celebrates.

I urge my colleagues to support the Bereuter-Wolf bill, which will send a strong and clear message to the Chinese leadership that the Congress of the United States insists on these values in return for granting most-favored-nation status.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], who has been very active on trade issues.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bereuter-Wolf bill, which sends a strong, and appropriate, message to China without jeopardizing United States national interests or United States workers.

China's continued human rights abuses are an unavoidable issue in United States-China relations. We Americans care deeply about certain inalienable rights. However, linking trade policy to these concerns by new threats to withdraw MFN for China's shortcomings would be highly counterproductive to our long-term national interests and to the release of Mr. Harry Wu.

Our Nation's trading practices and policies have been the subject of lively debate in America since the birth of our Nation. And on this particular question—MFN for China—we have wrestled for years.

The China MFN issue has been hung up on two competing policy goals: Is our goal to maximize our own United States jobs? Or is it to make the cause of human rights primary as a means to achieving our best long-term interests?

The answer, I believe, is both. The goals are not mutually exclusive.

For instance, I believe all of us can agree that compassion for the suffering in China is useless if our policy has no effect other than to put our own people out of work. We have made no difference in the life of those suffering overseas while only increasing the numbers of those suffering here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, these criteria must become our compass. We should extend MFN to a nation if: They allow U.S. investors and advisors in, the rule of law is advancing in that country, a multilateral action is unattainable or unsustainable, or we have that nation's assistance on a critical geopolitical issue.

Conversely, we should deny MFN status to governments abusing their people only if an effective multilateral action is doable and the U.S. can expect no help from that government on other critical geopolitical issues, if they do not allow U.S. employers or advisors into their country, and if they do not respect the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, the genius of the Bereuter-Wolf bill is that we give full voice to our American concerns for human rights without self-defeating linkage to trade policy. That is the appropriate response, and I want to thank both Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. WOLF for crafting this solution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bereuter-Wolf-Pelosi bill. I commend these sponsors for their commitment to this issue and willingness to reach compromise language. H.R. 2058 sends a strong signal

that this Chamber is deeply concerned about certain and specific activities currently occurring in the People's Republic of China. In addition to human rights issues, this bill addresses our diplomatic relationship and other pressing issues such as weapons proliferation, prison labor and unfair trade practices.

All of us on this floor today share deep concerns about the continuing problems related to the rights and treatment of Chinese citizens. I recently signed a letter with over 70 of my colleagues—from both sides of the aisle—calling on China's Premier to immediately release Mr. Harry Wu.

Each year we debate the issue of China and more specifically the extension of most-favored-nation status to China [MFN]. At this juncture, I have never believed that disapproving extension of MFN would improve conditions in China.

For many years, it has been my fear that failure to extend MFN would significantly weaken our political and economic position with the central government in China. China's economic growth is booming. Its economy is expected to double by the year 2000 and will be the biggest economy into the next century. Recent growth has been driven by private- and foreign-owned enterprise surpassing state-run enterprises plagued by performance and financial problems. Economic reforms aided by foreign investment and expertise have rerouted economic power from state-run industry. Change is occurring everywhere. One can see clearly the successes of United States investment particularly in southern China and its spreading. Due to its high rate of growth, China will need to replace its aging infrastructure. The potential market for high technology and services, for example, is enormous. China will need to purchase power generating equipment, aerospace and telecommunications equipment to name a few. And we should be there.

Already we have seen shifts in the dynamics of China's Government structure. Central government control over the daily lives of Chinese citizens is weakening as economic liberalization has led to greater autonomy, expansion of basic freedoms, and improved standards of living for Chinese citizens.

China is currently undergoing domestic change both politically and economically. Furthermore, the United States-China relationship is clearly in transition. But that should not preclude us from pursuing engagement with the Chinese at all levels.

Clearly, advancing human rights must remain a priority of U.S. foreign policy. The United States-China trade relationship has increased the exposure of the Chinese people to Western cultural influences and business principles. Trade and investment are part of a greater effort to promote long-term progress toward political pluralism and democracy in China. To revoke MFN would sever our economic rela-

tionship and would remove one of our most successful means of influence in China to date.

Again, I commend my colleagues for reaching agreement and putting forth this language. I urge my colleagues to support this measure and maintain MFN for China.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK], a member of the Committee on International Relations and a former Ambassador.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, I may have to be the only person in the House to have to say this and do this, but having lived 6 years in a harsh Communist dictatorship, I cannot silently stand by and do nothing. When you have witnessed pastors and priests being killed, churches being bulldozed, and Bibles being turned into toilet paper, you learn how not to deal with Communist dictators.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us is just what Beijing ordered. Here we have legislation filled with tough-sounding but meaningless threats. This has a laundry list of demands from the Beijing Communists, ranging from asking the President to undertake new initiatives to persuade the Chinese to treat their people humanely to asking them to stop their accelerating military expansion.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, when has any Communist regime responded to friendly requests to change its behavior? Pass the Bereuter bill and all Members will hear from the Communist will be the laughs of doddering old rulers who will once again have put one over on Uncle Sam. This bill will not free one dissident, it will not close one slave camp, it will not stop the purchase of one new Soviet-made submarine. As the philosopher said, this is nonsense on stilts.

□ 1230

The deal worked out, with the possible exception of Radio Free Asia is meaningless. We ask, we request, we hope, we dream. Let's get real.

Where is the enforcement mechanism? There is none. MFN aid goes to Communist elites who line their pockets. It never goes to the people. MFN perpetuates the Communist dictatorship in power. An engagement policy did not bring about the fall of communism. Engagement via MFN keeps the Communist elites in power and perpetuates persecution, murder, and gulags.

It was building up U.S. defense and U.S. determination, peace through strength, SDI that won the cold war, not appeasement, not engagement, not stability, rhetoric. You do not stop dictatorships by preemptively caving in to their demands.

Unfortunately, they do not talk or act tough at Foggy Bottom. As Senator Richard Russell said, we need an American desk at the State Department and in the U.S. Government.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is once again the time of year we discuss the renewal of MFN for China. In the past, we have attempted to link human rights to the renewal of MFN. Last Congress, we made the decision to renew MFN and to pursue other courses of action to improve human rights in China.

At this point in time, it would be counterproductive to revoke MFN status for China. Economic liberalization is a key element for improving human rights. The opening of the markets in China will provide higher wages and a better way of life for Chinese citizens. Usually, improved economic conditions help improve human rights.

American businesses conducting business in China should set an example. We need to be leaders on the issue of human rights. Our businesses need to be a model of excellence on human rights.

Human rights is an extremely important issue. Basically, it is the dignity of an individual. I commend Congressmen BEREUTER and HAMILTON for introducing H.R. 2058. This legislation reminds China that we have not forgotten about their current human rights situation.

This measure demands the immediate release of Harry Wu. In addition, the legislation recognizes various areas in which China has made human rights violations. This legislation requires the President to take action to improve the situation. The President will be required to report his progress within 30 days of enactment.

I urge you to support this legislation. This legislation states that human rights is still a priority.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WHITE], who has already become very active on trade issues in the Congress.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, my district overlooks both sides of the shipping lanes of Puget Sound. It is one of the biggest trading districts in the United States. China is our biggest trading partner. Every year there are billions of dollars coming into my district because of trade with China.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not a good enough reason for me to vote for most-favored-nation status for China. We should not sell the Chinese people into slavery just to bring trading profits into our district.

Mr. Speaker, the reason to vote for this bill is because it is the only way to bring the Chinese people out of slavery. We have seen plenty of examples of that in recent history. In Eastern Europe, in Tiananmen Square, it is only after expanded contacts with the West that we see the people themselves rising up and demanding human rights from their own governments.

Mr. Speaker, it is the fax machine, not the trade sanction, that freed Eastern Europe, and it is the fax machine, not the trade sanction, that will free China.

I ask my colleagues, do not vote for this bill because it is going to bring trading profits to the United States. Vote for this bill because it is the best way, really the only way, to bring freedom, human rights, and prosperity to the Chinese people.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, it is said that the definition of a successful life is helping one person breathe easier. In those terms, I think Harry Wu is a hero because he has breathed life into a nation, into China, with his courage to fight against the human rights abuses over there.

As a strong supporter of MFN, I strongly condemn the Chinese Government for incarcerating Mr. Wu. I call on the Chinese to unconditionally and immediately release Mr. Wu from prison. This is important to strong supporters of MFN, to opponents of MFN, and to the American people. I hope the Chinese people and government are listening.

We will continue to work on this for hours and days and weeks after this resolution. With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, it is important to note from Madison to Kissinger and Nixon, our foreign policy is not based upon one person but on 3 pillars: on human rights, on economic interests, and on national security interests.

When we combine all three of those, I think we have a compelling case that we must continue to engage the Chinese, to push them and leverage them toward human rights improvements, toward opening their markets, because it is in our interests, our human rights interests, our economic interests and our middle-class job interests. Who is going to sell the next semiconductor computer chip to the Chinese? Are we just going to tell the Japanese they can have that market? Who is going to sell the next high-definition television? It is going to be an American high-definition television produced in America, and we are going to get the benefit by that.

I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]. My respect goes out to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], a distinguished and active member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as a cosponsor, and in strong support of H.R.

2058, the China Policy Act introduced by our colleague from Nebraska and the chairman of the East Asian Subcommittee, Mr. BEREUTER.

With the end of the cold war in Europe and the transformation of Russia into a democratic government with an open market economy we must now turn our attention to China with the intent of achieving the same results.

The emergence of China as a great political and economic force and a nuclear super-power poses an enormous challenge to this nation both strategically and economically. The need for the United States to develop an open, aggressive, cohesive, and consistent policy toward Beijing is of paramount importance.

This is not to say we should close our eyes or turn a deaf ear to the unacceptable behavior of the regime in Beijing. Clearly, their poor human rights record, their recent military actions with respect to the Spratly Islands, their sale of M-9 missiles to Pakistan and perhaps Iran, their unwillingness to renounce the use of force against the Republic of Taiwan, and the recent jailing of American citizen, Harry Wu, defies every international norm and standard governing missile proliferation, the use of military force, and human rights.

However, denying most-favored-nation status at this time is not the way to actively engage the Chinese and to encourage reform, openness and respect for international standards of behavior.

The expression of our concern is what H.R. 2058 attempts to do. It says that we in this Congress do not accept China's current behavior and that we call on the President to intensify diplomatic efforts to encourage China to moderate its intolerable internal human rights policies and to respect external international norms.

I believe open dialog and continued diplomatic and economic contact is the best way to provide the United States the opportunity to promote internal economic reform, political liberalization, and respect for human rights in China. Without this constructive engagement, China is less likely to move toward the role of the responsible world power we would like China to become.

I urge the Members to vote for H.R. 2058 and against the resolution of MFN disapproval.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Nebraska for yielding me the time. I want to congratulate the gentleman in the chair for the great job he is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill. This is a good bill. It is not a perfect bill, but I think it is the right approach. The question we hear often here in Congress is, just how long do

we have to put up with the misguided conduct of the Chinese? How long? Well, just as long as we put up with it. We have all the leverage in our hands.

We have a \$29 billion trade deficit with China, the second largest trade deficit with any country in the world. This year we are having a huge trade deficit, the largest in American history. We buy most of their exports. In fact, half of the Chinese exports come right here to the United States, to the detriment, I may say, many times of our workers and to the detriment of our trade deficit.

We have all the leverage. We have all the chips. The question is, do we have the will? Maybe if we had a little reciprocity before, a little tit-for-tat before, we would not have to pass this bill today. Mr. Wu would be here; an American citizen would be here in the United States where he belongs.

This bill sets forth what we expect from China. The President will report, as I interpret this bill, every 6 months on the initiative in 8 areas. We must be faithful to the goals and the commitments that we have as a Nation. I think this bill helps focus on that.

I hear others tell us that China is a giant but that we are unwilling to confront a China today. I do not think that is the case. I think we are willing to stand up for what we believe in. I think this bill helps us do that.

After all, we have to have the courage of our convictions. A great writer wrote, "Hope is lost, much is lost. Courage is lost, all is lost." That is why I think this bill is the right approach. It is a measured approach.

This bill sets forth, I think, the right temper, the right approach, and I would hope that other people would endorse it and vote for this bill because I think it is the best approach, the right direction for America to take in these times.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my friend and colleague the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this House is united in wanting to have good relations with China. This House is united in recognizing how important China is. But this House is divided in deciding how we can see to it that China's abominable human rights policy, China's continued sale of weapons of mass destruction to highly questionable countries, and China's one-sided trade policy with the United States come to an end.

There is no dispute that China has one of the worst human rights records on the face of this planet. Since human rights were "de-linked" from the issue of giving them most-favored-nation treatment 1 year ago, human rights conditions in China have significantly deteriorated.

Thousands of Chinese citizens are imprisoned in forced labor camps for non-violent opposition to the regime. The

repression of Tibet continues unabated. The Chinese Government enforces sickening and draconian birth control policies of forced sterilization and forced abortions.

This bill has some redeeming features. It condemns these human rights violations, but unfortunately it does not have teeth. It does not do anything but admonish the Chinese.

To give meaning to our condemnation, we have to give our action real teeth. The only way to make this condemnation meaningful is to deny MFN to the Chinese. If you vote for this bill, as I will, you should also vote for legislation to deny MFN to China.

Only by taking strong and effective action do totalitarian governments change their policies. Economic sanctions against South Africa were the key element in bringing about the end of apartheid. We were urged by the previous administration not to enact sanctions, to engage the South Africans in constructive dialog.

□ 1245

But it was only after we put sanctions on South Africa that the sickening practice of apartheid ended. We got the attention of the Chinese when this House voted for my resolution calling for the Olympic games not be held in Beijing. We got the attention of the Chinese when this House voted for my resolution calling for our Government to issue a visa to President Li of Taiwan.

China is now illegally holding an American citizen, Harry Wu, who was entrapped by the Chinese in going there. They gave him the visa, and when he arrived they arrested him. China is selling missile technology. China has a trade surplus of over \$30 billion with the United States.

There are plenty of other sources of textiles and Barbie dolls and Christmas tree lights. India and lots of other developing countries would like to sell those things to us, but the Chinese have a \$30 billion-plus trade surplus with us.

I commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and all of my colleagues with whom I had the pleasure of working for improving human rights in China for this legislation. But we must not approve this legislation believing that this is China policy. This is a part of China policy. It lays out the problems with China. It provides no effective mechanism of enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, just as the apartheid Government of South Africa laughed at us until we provided economic sanctions, so the rulers in Beijing are capable of taking rhetoric from this body. What they are unwilling to take, and what we should force them to take, is economic sanctions. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, but I also urge my colleagues to vote for House Joint Resolution 96 to deny most-favored-nation treatment to China.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the

distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2058, the Bereuter amendment, which is legislation to symbolically stand for democracy and to make a statement about human rights. Unfortunately, statements and symbolism are not enough.

We need to make tangible policy decisions, as well. And without tangible policy decisions, statements and symbolism, as are encompassed in H.R. 2058, lack meaning. So I will be supporting H.R. 2058, but we must insist, if we are sincere in this effort, on having some tangible action as well.

In fact, tyrants assume that we do not even mean what we are saying when we make statements and there is no change in policy that follows. We are confronting today a regime that controls China, a dictatorial regime that now holds one of our own citizens, Harry Wu, as prisoner, but also smashes the human rights of its own people and is more and more becoming belligerent to its own neighbors.

We are not talking about what we will do and what relations we will have with the people of China. All of us want to have good relations with the people of China. We reach out to them. We want good relations with all people of the world. The question is what will we do about this tyrannical regime, this monstrous oppressor that controls these people? Will we be on the side of the people of China, or will we be on the side of the oppressor?

We will have to do more than symbolism and statements. We must follow this measure with an elimination of most-favored-nation status with this regime, because we should believe in free trade between free people, not free trade with tyrannies and dictatorships; a trade relationship that only bolsters those in power and does nothing to further the cause of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen that in this debate over and over again where we have heard the argument that trade will improve democracy. That does not work. Let us put pressure on these people in Beijing to improve their democracy and to improve the respect for human rights and to release Harry Wu.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged at this time to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], who has coauthored the pending legislation and has continued to bring clarity to this issue.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and his kind remarks. I am only taking 1 minute now, because I had the opportunity to speak much longer earlier on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I want to once again commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], for his leadership and working with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], and with me and with others, to bring together this compromise.

The previous speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], is a gentleman whose courage and relentless advocacy for human rights is well-known to this body and I respect him enormously. I would not be supporting this legislation, though, if I thought it was just a statement.

Mr. Speaker, I think that even before we merged our two bills, Mr. BEREUTER had strong language in his legislation addressing United States concerns with China and teeth in saying that there is a reporting requirement that the President must report to this body on issues regarding trade, human rights and proliferation.

This is all very important. It is a step forward to us. I am pleased with the legislation and it comes at a time, a very critical time in China with the succession that might be likely soon, and also at a time when Harry Wu, an American citizen, a distinguished scholar, is being held by the Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that our colleagues will support this legislation and I hope that the Chinese will release Harry Wu soon.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to work with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and she is correct in reminding about the reporting requirements and I could say Radio Free Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the other gentleman that I worked with who has been invaluable in working with me.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], as I did before, and thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI]. Both were very good. The gentleman from Nebraska was very balanced and Ms. PELOSI was like Margaret Thatcher working for something in London; she never gave up.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support. I would hope that there would be a strong, large vote; that any Members who have any reservations on each side, I would hope that they would put those reservations aside so we can send a strong bipartisan message.

Third, it puts the Congress on record for the first time in a united way. There are clear objectives. It calls for action by the administration. It calls that Radio Free Asia will be established within 3 months, whereby the people in China can hopefully hear what is happening in places like in the U.S. Congress.

It calls for a Presidential report for the first time. If anyone is listening in China, it puts the Congress on record in support of the democracy movement in China. And is that not a great day for those who gave their life in Tiananmen Square and other places to know that the Congress now has given

its official imprimatur on the democracy movement? And, as a gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] says, it makes a strong statement on Harry Wu.

Mr. Speaker, it is our hope and prayer that the Chinese see that we have come together; that the one thing they can do to give a sign of reconciliation would be the release of Harry Wu.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act of 1995 sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 2058 is a compromise reached after several hours of discussions between the gentlewoman from California, Representative PELOSI, the gentleman from Nebraska, Representative BEREUTER, and myself. It is a good bill because it garners support from both sides of the MFN issue and both sides of the aisle. I hope it will pass with an overwhelming majority. Passing H.R. 2058 with a unanimous vote will send a powerful message of concern to the Communist government in Beijing and a powerful message of support for the burgeoning Chinese democracy movement.

I will say that the U.S. Congress is united in its deep concern about China's treatment of Harry Wu; its continuing human rights violations; its violation of international nonproliferation standards and its unfair trading practices. This is the toughest language on China to come out of Congress in a while and it will plow new ground.

Personally, I think that the United States has no business giving nondiscriminatory trade status to the world's largest Communist government. I think revoking MFN is our strongest hook. However, I think it is more important for our ultimate goal of promoting democracy in China to speak with a united voice. That's why those of us on both sides of the issue have come together around this legislation.

The Communist government in China maintains the world's largest system of slave labor camps—the laogai—which are used as the central cog of repression to harshly stifle dissent and break the human spirit. Harry Wu, who sits in a Chinese prison right now because of his commitment to exposing China's laogai system, has documented over 1,000 forced labor camps in China.

China's strict one-child-per-family policy has resulted in gross violations of human rights, including forced abortion and sterilization. In my office, I have a 40-minute video filmed by a crew from Channel 4 in Great Britain showing the dying rooms in China's state-run orphanages where baby girls who become ill are left to die of starvation and neglect. The video also shows the abhorrent conditions in China's orphanages where children, mostly girls, are forced to grow up almost totally devoid of nurture and attention because of China's one-child-per-family policy.

We know that the Communist government in Beijing has sold nuclear weapons and technology to Iraq and Iran and M-11 missiles to Pakistan.

We know almost conclusively that the Chinese Government takes the internal organs of executed prisoners without consent, young men around 20 years old are the preferred donors, and sells them to foreign buyers for around \$30,000 each. Harry Wu has docu-

mented it, the BBC has documented it, Human Rights Watch/Asia has documented it, Amnesty International has documented it, and a Hong Kong newspaper has documented it. I would be happy to share the BBC tape with any Member interested in viewing it. Even a Chinese Government official admitted it at a U.N. meeting several years ago. When asked now if this kind of despicable behavior occurs, the Chinese Government, of course, denies it. That is not surprising but it does not mean it doesn't happen.

We know that Catholics and Protestants who dare to worship independently of government control are continually thrown in jail, harassed, and in some cases beaten by Chinese security officials. Estimates indicate that there are 20–50 million Christians in China who refuse to worship in China's Government-sanctioned churches. The official Protestant and Catholic churches in China, which combined, claim a membership of only 10 million, must use the Government-sanctioned doctrine. As the Chinese Government becomes more wary of dissent and unrest in this uncertain period of transition, surveillance on Chinese Christians has been stepped up.

In Tibet, conditions have worsened since we looked at the MFN issue last year. As of April 26 of this year, there had already been more political arrests in Tibet in 1995 than there were in all of 1994. Prisoners have died in the past year as a result of mistreatment while in prison including a 24-year-old nun. Tibetan monks continue to be thrown in jail or forced into exile. The Chinese Government has placed restrictive guidelines on Tibetan monasteries and refused repeated requests by the Dalai Lama for talks to work out a peaceful settlement.

Now the Chinese Government is holding Harry Wu, a brave American citizen and human rights activist. He was detained just weeks after President Clinton renewed China's MFN status. He is being investigated for the simple crime of speaking the truth about China's laogai camps. This arrest is a clear indication that China thinks the U.S. Government is weak and more interested in appeasing business interests than speaking up for what is right.

These kinds of abuses are not new in China. They have gone on for years while the U.S. Government pursues a weak policy, or perhaps no policy. President Clinton has been unwilling to speak out boldly and forcefully and instead has promised to promote our interests through engagement. So far, it's been an empty promise. Nothing has happened and I'm not convinced—and that's saying it nicely—the administration is doing anything to promote human rights in China.

Congress as a whole has not spoken out boldly and forcefully—but that is about to change.

H.R. 2058 sets a new standard for progress. It sets out clear objectives for U.S. policy.

It demands the release of Harry Wu immediately and unconditionally.

It requires the adherence to international nonproliferation standards and requires China to immediately halt the export of ballistic missile technology and weapons of mass destruction.

It clearly and unequivocally calls on the Clinton administration to intensify diplomatic efforts to persuade the Chinese Government to respect the internationally recognized rights

of its citizens and says specifically what Congress considers progress in this area.

It also commends the Chinese people's internal democracy movement—one of the most important provisions in the bill.

H.R. 2058 has teeth. It requires Radio Free Asia to be on the air in China within 3 months of enactment. Radio Free Asia will promote democracy in China and will give democracy reformers and other interested listeners news and information they will not hear from the Government-controlled media. Radio Free Europe was a powerful force in the democratization of Eastern Europe and I am convinced it will have the same effect in China. Radio Free Asia has been authorized by this body force, but so far, the U.S. Information Agency has been slow in getting it on the air. This bill steps up the pace.

Finally, the bill requires the administration to report to Congress every 6 months on the actions taken and the progress made in achieving the human rights and proliferation objectives outlined in the bill.

Again, this is tough language that requires action. We will be able to look at this issue every 6 months and see exactly what has been tried and achieved. We will also see what has not been done.

I support H.R. 2058 because it is a building block. It has the support of the major Chinese dissident groups and human rights organizations. If we pass H.R. 2058, next year we will be able to ask these questions:

Has the Chinese Government taken concrete steps to dismantle the forced labor camps?

Has the Chinese Government ended coercive birth control practices?

Has the Chinese Government ended crackdowns on Catholics and Protestants?

Has the Chinese Government begun to respect the rights of the people of Tibet?

Does the Chinese Government allow totally free worship, free press, and freedom of associations?

Have political prisoners been set free?

Does China adhere to the provisions of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and the missile technology control regime?

If the answer to any of these is no, Congress will be obligated to act. We will know where to look for progress.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Bereuter bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I think everyone here on this floor should be proud that we are debating this issue of human rights in China. Indeed, if all the other democracies in this world were having this kind of a debate, I think this situation might be different.

A major problem with the use of MFN in this instance is, and has been, that we have been alone and other nations have not followed suit. Indeed, they have simply stepped into the vacuum. And so, then the issue is this, I think: If we are not going to use MFN, how are we going to be sure that we do

not leave a vacuum in several key areas; human rights, and the critical trade issue?

In the human rights area, I think this country, the administration, has been taking steps in the right direction. For example, it forced a vote at the United Nations recently to condemn China's human rights record. That failed by 1 vote, as I understand it. And I think today we are calling on the administration to continue these efforts in the United Nations; indeed to intensify them.

In the critical area of trade, as our trade deficit with Japan continues to grow, I understand the President is going to announce soon the appointment of a commission to look into Asian Pacific trade and investment policies. We need to confront, with China, trade issues as we did intellectual property. If not MFN, we have to find another method, other instrument, to make sure that there is free and fair trade with China.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we join together to support this resolution, let us be sure that it is followed up by steps both on human rights and on trade policies.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], a member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for the hard work that he and Members on both sides of the aisle have been putting in; hours and hours of burning the midnight oil trying to remove us from the horns of a dilemma.

Last night I watched "Nightline." I saw Harry Wu, videotaped just weeks before he left on this last courageous journey where he has disappeared somewhere to the world's most populous nation, and I thought, if we pull away most favored nation, is it an execution order? Or even worse than execution, a disappearance, to slowly die as a missing person for 10, 15, 20 years in some Chinese gulag?

This is as hard an issue as were sanctions over South Africa. I changed regularly on that issue, always toward the same goal as those who were liberals that wanted the most severe sanctions. But trying to listen to Buthelezi on one side, and listening to the self-serving voices of the white tribe on South Africa, I may have come down on the wrong side several times.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be on the right side on this one and that is why during the vote I will be reading every word of Mr. BEREUTER's well-crafted work product.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put a statement in the RECORD about how the Republican Party was born. It was founded over one main issue, the terrible and horrific abomination of slavery. It was a travesty and gross belittlement of one class of people. It was a national disgrace, a dark sin upon our collective conscience, and it was removable only, as Lincoln pre-

dicted, through the subsequent shedding of precious American blood.

This time, the people we must want to serve are locked up in China, a slave state. May we pray that what we do in this body serves the one goal we all want; liberty and freedom for the people in a slave state.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMON].

(Ms. HARMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act, and in opposition to House Joint Resolution 96, the MFN disapproval resolution.

I have often said that the next century will be the Asian century as China, the world's largest underdeveloped economy, takes off. American companies need to gain footholds in this market early. Our competition is already poised if we retreat.

China is already an important market for America, and for California, which has exports valued at over \$1.5 billion to China last year. In my congressional district, dozens of companies and thousands of jobs in a wide range of industries depend on the Chinese market. Small companies like Rainbow Sports, which produces golf equipment, and Contact Enterprises of Torrance, which manufactures industrial parts, depend on sales to China. A Hughes satellite project for China provides over 1,000 jobs in my district. As the Chinese economy grows, more opportunities to create American jobs will grow as well.

But United States interests in maintaining engagement and dialogue with China are not limited to jobs and trade. We have a strong interest in seeing China treat its people according to international human rights standards. China's trade links with the United States have resulted in economic liberalization, and a nation whose economy is increasingly free and open must afford its people rights and freedoms as well. Without such changes political upheaval is inevitable, regardless of the state of the economy.

China's military might and weapons-export policies also present the United States with urgent security concerns. As a member of the National Security Committee, I am particularly concerned about nuclear and missile proliferation. It is my firm belief that maintaining strong economic and diplomatic links with China—links which the removal of MFN would threaten—is the key to bringing China's arms export policy in line with international goals and standards.

Two consecutive administrations, with strong bipartisan support from Congress, have pursued a policy of engagement with China which has shown

considerable success. China signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1992 and agreed to join the Missile Technology Control Regime. It has also agreed to further discussions with the United States on all aspects of nuclear proliferation, including China's trade with Iran and Pakistan. We must assure China meets its international obligations. By contrast, cutting off MFN will merely isolate that country, ending a constructive dialogue and imperiling the progress that must be made. The China Policy Act strikes the right balance by letting China know how immensely important this issue is to United States-China relations, without ending MFN, the basis for those relations.

Mr. Speaker, China has a long way to go toward recognizing the rights of its citizens. Harry Wu must be freed. But revoking MFN would not be a helpful step in achieving these goals. The China Policy Act, developed with bipartisan consultation, sends a strong and constructive message to China. I strongly urge its passage.

□ 1300

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] for the generous grant of time.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is broad agreement here on the problem: the egregious violations of human rights in China, the use of prison labor, the imprisonment of Harry Wu, a United States citizen, the unfair trade practices of China, those that make the Japanese look like proponents of Adam Smith and free trade, unfair trade practices that resulted last year in a \$29 billion surplus with the United States, headed towards \$40 billion trade surplus with the United States this year according to the Commerce Department. That means we are going to export 8 million United States jobs to China because of their unfair trade practices. We disagree over the solution.

What does this resolution say? Intensify diplomatic initiatives. Well, we have been doing that every year now for about a decade. A report from the President. Well, we have been having reports from the President since the Reagan administration on the abuses in China. We know what they are, and it has not changed a bit, but there is one new, very serious, initiative. We are going to broadcast Radio Free Asia into China within 90 days. The geriatric oligarchy of China is quaking in their boots. Yes, they are quaking in their boots.

We will not be allowed to vote on the resolution of disapproval. A quick sleight of hand is going to move to table it. Why is that happening? Because last night, for the first time, we saw a crack in the free-trade dogma that has dictated policy under both Democrats and Republicans in this institution in the vote on the bailout of

Mexico, and suddenly, after the leaders, the Republican leaders and the Democratic administration, lost a vote on the bailout of Mexico which came to the floor, they do not want to allow a vote on the resolution of disapproval of MFN for China because they are afraid there might be an honest vote in this House where people would say we have been gumming this issue for years. The Chinese will take \$40 billion in unfair trade practices and laugh all the way to the bank. They will only understand real action.

Repeat MFN.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], my good friend and colleague.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] for yielding this time to me and rise with a heavy heart as we discuss this entire situation involving China, and I see—as the American birthright—the ideal that this Nation and others around the world are conceived in liberty and should be dedicated to the proposition that all people are created equal with certain inalienable rights. I think that is what our Nation is here for, as a beacon to the rest of the world, but what we see so often is that our foreign policy has been directed to certain financial interests, and in fact our foreign policy, rather than being a representation of the best ideals in us, has really become a kind of deal-making exercise.

Mr. Speaker, we should probably call China MFN the Boeing MFN because supporters of MFN for China and keeping that special trade status protected say that exports to China will create jobs here. However Boeing, one of the chief beneficiaries of nearly \$2 billion worth of airplane sales to China, recently announced over 5,000 people in our country are being laid off because they are going to replace that production with production in China, and I think what is so troubling is that China has done nothing to promote democracy. It has done nothing to stop China from selling missile technology to rogue nations like Pakistan. China has done nothing to end labor abuses in its own country affecting both men and women who are voiceless as we debate there today. They have done nothing to end human rights abuses like the detention and arrest of American citizen Harry Wu.

But in fact our China policy not only does not stand up for democracy, but from an economic standpoint has led to a flood of cheap imports into our country—expected to reach over \$32 billion this year alone—representing an increase over last year, and in fact since China's crackdown on democracy in 1989, our country has suffered a net loss of over \$100 billion in China.

Mr. Speaker, when we debated the crime bill, we talked about three strikes and you're out. It seems to me here we have got five strikes and you're out, and we ought to go back to

the negotiating table and figure out what we stand for fundamentally as citizens of the freest nation on Earth.

China MFN is just another smoke-screen for the rights of capital surmounting the rights of people and the ideals of democratic freedom. Free trade can only exist among free people. When is the United States of America going to recall its own birthright?

I am very upset that the Wolf amendment will not be offered here for a vote up or down in this Congress today. I stand here with a very heavy heart. I ask, "Why don't we stand up for what our Constitution says we are here for?"

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the China Policy Act.

I support the China Policy Act, because I believe that the time has come to quit coddling the tyrants in Beijing.

It is time to say to the Chinese Government that "Human rights abuses; forced abortions; and acts, such as imprisonment of an American citizen, Harry Wu, is not tolerable."

Mr. Speaker, we are Americans. We stand for freedom. We fight for democracy, and we have not forgotten Tiananmen Square.

To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I want to remind you, this is not a partisan issue. This is an opportunity to do what is right. If you support democracy and human rights, vote for the China Policy Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, China has millions more dissidents than those who openly brave the hard suppression of human rights. The one thing that unites the people in China with a narrow leadership clique, however, is the memory of the destruction of China's sovereignty during the last two centuries and the imposition of unequal treaties and other indignities on the part of first the Western powers and then Japan.

I tell my colleagues a certainty, that as nothing else the denial of normal trade status will unite China's people behind their Government and identify the United States as hostile to their interests. On the other hand, the legislation before us today recognizes the importance of China while specifying the deep concerns of the American people about the PRC and then requiring diplomatic conduct from the Presidency, and reports and Radio Free Asia.

A number of well-known China dissidents, for example, including Chi Ling and Won Won To have warned that the denial of MFN status will endanger China's current economic opening and close off current widening exposure of Chinese to the outside world. The dissident movement exists in

China precisely because growing foreign investment and China's expanding foreign trade have created a fast burgeoning middle class with the same expectations as middle classes throughout the world. It thrives on a freer flow of information brought about by the introduction of Western telecommunications technology and access to the international media.

Mr. Speaker, the denial of MFN will set back the democracy movement in China even more than it sets back the Chinese economy and chokes off the prosperity of Hong Kong.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a true consensus bill and in the nature of foreign policy. It has support of a broad range of individuals who have done extraordinary work in bringing the China Policy Act to this floor. Led by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. PELOSI], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and others, we now come to the position of being able to at least speak very clearly with reference to a consensus that has developed in this House that will not be as exacerbating as perhaps some would like for us to put forward. It does not link China policy to trade. It incorporates key additional human rights language which is and was a continuing concern of many Members of this body. It sends a clear message regarding troubling China activities such as, as has been so often mentioned and justifiably so, the unjustified detention of Harry Wu, the violation of basic human rights that we all are concerned about, the sale of missile components in violation of non-proliferation commitment, and I personally yesterday had a visit from State Department officials because I shared immense concern with reference to the potential for sale of missile components to Pakistan and to Iran. I was assured that there are sanctions in the event these allegations come to fruition that will cover these matters. It also deals with the unfair trade practices that have been mentioned by so many Members here. In short, it establishes the United States policy objectives, will expedite the startup of Radio Free Asia, and we do, for the efforts that have been ongoing, commend China in spite of the fact that we recognize that there is much more that they should do in their movement toward democracy.

It is very difficult for us to speak as clearly as we have in this measure, and I commend all of our colleagues for the extraordinary work that they have done in bringing to us a true consensus bill which, in my judgment, is how foreign policy should be made in this body.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN].

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe in open markets and in a vibrant international marketplace in which the United States is an active trading partner with all nations.

But, I have some real problems with extending most favored nation trading status to a country like China where the people who produce the goods that China exports to us are not free.

It is not much of an exaggeration to say that while we prohibit the import from China of goods made using prison labor, the harsh fact is that all the goods produced there are the products of prison labor.

The country is so unfree that it claims that the Government of China owns all the labor of all Chinese people.

When you want to hire a Chinese person to work for an American company, you pay the Chinese Government a lot of money, but the person who does the work never sees the money. The government pockets maybe \$20 a day for a factory worker, while the worker gets less than a dollar of that.

This is not free trade. This is slavery.

The Chinese exported this system to Cuba, where the same thing happens. The Castro dictatorship is more than happy to sell the services of Cuban workers to unscrupulous foreign investors, and to keep all the money for itself while tossing a few pennies a day to the person who actually has to do the work.

Both in Cuba and in China, the system is a moral outrage and reeks of the slave trade of the 19th century.

Unfree labor is not the only problem with doing business with China.

It is a country where there is no respect whatsoever for the human rights of its citizens—nor for the human rights of American citizens.

The arrest of Harry Wu, an American citizen, is only one example of this. It is just one small element in an abysmal Chinese human rights situation.

Forced abortion. We all know this issue. We know it happens and it happens a lot.

And we know that there are many killings of born and unborn little girls.

And, we know that these practices violate every known standard of human rights since God made Man.

There are reports that aborted fetuses are sold and eaten.

The trafficking in human organs that is practiced in China is another outrage. One hears rumors of condemned prisoners being executed according to the marketing needs of those who have sold their organs to wealthy foreigners needing a heart, liver, kidney or other transplant.

I could go on and on and on with one outrage after another that is taking place in China.

I thank the gentleman for highlighting these outrages.

□ 1315

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the gentlewoman was making a point. She outlined some serious allegations and some serious charges. In 1930 we heard serious charges before, and we said we are not sure, and we did nothing. Now, 50 years later, we hear the same allegations, and, again, America is doing nothing. There is something wrong.

What lessons have we learned from history? None, apparently. We should not trade with a barbarous nation such as China, and we should vote to cut their MFN.

This is more than just a symbol. We cannot even purchase anything without the label "China" on it. I was offended July 4 when I took out of my pocket an American flag, and on it it said "Made in China." That is an outrage. We need to stop trading with these guys. It is wrong, and America needs to stand up and say so.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], the distinguished gentleman who has worked very hard on Sino-American relations and trade issues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman from California is recognized for 4½ minutes.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from Nebraska, and rise in very strong support of the Bereuter resolution. The gentleman has worked long and hard on this issue, along with many of our colleagues, and I believe that this is a very important day in the history of the United States Congress and in world history.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of history, when I look back on one of the most interesting years in the last quarter of a century, 1989 has to stand out. We observed that year the crumbling of the Berlin Wall. We saw the tremendous changes take place as we saw the first transition of one democratically elected government to another in El Salvador. We saw political pluralism emerge in Nicaragua. We saw great speeches made right here in this Chamber by Vaclav Havel from then Czechoslovakia, from Lech Walesa, the leader of Poland, an electrician from the Gdansk Shipyard. To me, one of the most moving speeches came from the first democratically elected President in the history of South Korea.

Now, one of the arguments that I have made time and time again, and many of our colleagues have joined in this, is if we look over the past several years at countries where tremendous political repression has existed, we chose as a nation not to impose trade sanctions, countries like Taiwan, coun-

tries like Argentina, countries like Chile, and nations like South Korea.

Well, on October 18, 1989, just a few months after the tragic Tiananmen Square massacre, President Roh Tae Woo stood right behind me here. He does not speak English at all, but he, out of respect to this body, delivered his speech in broken English. He phonetically delivered his statement to us. And there was an item in that which to me really demonstrates where we stand today and what it is that we are trying to do.

He said:

The forces of freedom and liberty are eroding the foundations of closed societies. The efficiency of the market economy and the benefits of an open society have become undeniable. Now these universal ideals, symbolized by the United States of America, have begun to undermine the fortresses of repression.

Mr. Speaker, that statement was made in 1989, right here in this Chamber, and we have seen tremendous changes take place in the ensuing 6 years. We proceeded during that 6-year period with engagement with China with most favored nation trading status. And my colleagues are right in talking about the fact that things have not necessarily gotten better. They have in many ways gotten worse. But it is important for us to look at some areas of improvement.

Remember, we are talking about a nation that has a history that spans four millennia. Now, we cannot expect a change to take place overnight, but we do realize that exposure to western values has gone a long way towards improving things.

We have seen the establishment of a stock market in Shanghai. The reports to come from that have been incredible. Obviously any economic visitor in Shanghai would love to have the opportunity to see how their stocks are doing. Well, how do they find those reports? It has to be printed in the newspaper.

One of the things that the government of China is having a very difficult time doing is keeping any kind of political reporting out of that information that is disseminated through the free flow of economic activity in Shanghai. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we must realize that trade promotes private enterprise, which creates wealth, which improves living standards, which undermines political repression, and that is exactly what is happening here.

We are not going to change things overnight. We have a long way to go. But if we believe for one moment that shutting the door with China will all of a sudden get Harry Wu released, that is preposterous. If we believe that closing the door will improve the plight of those many people in China who are seeking economic opportunity, we are crazy to believe that. The two southern provinces of Guangdong and Fujian see Chinese people literally clawing their way to get in there. Why? Because that

is the place that they can find economic opportunity.

So I believe that this is a very balanced approach that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is taking, and I again congratulate him for all that he has done, the work of the Committee on International Relations, working closely with members of the Committee on Ways and Means. I believe that we have a positive solution to a very, very tough problem. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day. This is a historic day as we look towards the most important relationship between two countries on the face of the Earth.

I support the Bereuter resolution.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2058, which condemns China's violations of human rights and calls for China to grant access to American exports. H.R. 2058 crafts a reasonable compromise between those who would want to extend most-favored-nation status to China unconditionally, and those who agree with me that denial of most-favored-nation status is the best means of influencing China.

We must not forget the Tiananmen Square massacre or the Chinese Government's brutal suppression of student protestors. Rather, we must answer the Chinese peoples cry for freedom and democracy by continuing to press for adherence to international human rights standards.

Under H.R. 2058, the Congress calls for the immediate release of United States citizen Harry Wu who was recently arrested by the Chinese Government; calls on the President to pressure China to adhere to international weapons nonproliferation agreements; calls on China to release political prisoners, respect the rights of Tibetans, and end the practice of coercive abortions. It is important to note that this legislation does not in any way disturb the President's decision to extend most-favored-nation status to China for the coming year.

In addition to these human rights abuses, H.R. 2058 includes additional conditions that call on China to permit greater access by United States exporters to China's markets by ending that nations unfair trade practices. American working men and women deserve to have the support of the United States Government in the attempt to force China to adopt a fair trade policy.

All of the objectives embodied in H.R. 2058 are reasonable standards which we should expect any nation wishing to acquire most-favored-nation trading status to satisfy. Certainly no one could argue that the language of H.R. 2058 would impose too heavy a burden on the Chinese Government, or that the conditions are unduly harsh.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2058 is a fair and just bill which allows China the opportunity to reform their conduct, and make progress toward internationally recognized standards of human rights, without being punished. If there is no progress toward the goals established in this bill in China, then the denial of further favorable trade status will be necessary to convey the message to the Chinese Government that their conduct will not be tolerated by the international community. I strongly urge all my colleagues to take a stand for human rights, and vote for passage of H.R. 2058.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the H.J. Res. 96, a bill to

disapprove most-favored-nation (MFN) treatment for China. H.J. Res. 96 is carefully targeted to send a strong message to the Chinese Government that continued suppression of human rights, flaunting of international agreements on nuclear non-proliferation, and engaging in unfair trade practices cannot be tolerated, ignored, or rewarded.

Denying most-favored-nation status for China is a reasonable response to the continuing controversy over trade and human rights policy in regards to China. It is absolutely imperative that this House insist that the United States Government not reward the Chinese regime which brutally massacred pro-democracy demonstrators in Tiananmen Square just 6 years ago, and continues to hold prisoner an American citizen with carte blanche on the importation of their goods into our market. Granting most-favored-nation status for all Chinese products rewards the Chinese regime for its intransigence on human rights, and its refusal to engage in fair trade.

Mr. Speaker, despite the arguments of those who support totally unfettered trade with China, the fact remains that trade and human rights are inextricably linked. A nation that suppresses its peoples' human rights also suppresses their wages. This, in turn, leads to an unnatural advantage in trade, which adversely impacts American businesses and workers, and causes the loss of American jobs.

In fact, the United States trade deficit with China is now over \$30 billion a year, second only to our trade deficit with Japan. Yet, despite the freedom we grant to Chinese imports to the United States, China does not grant most-favored-nation status to United States goods, and continues to bar certain United States goods from the Chinese market. For those who advocate free trade, it seems rather illogical and inconsistent to grant free access to our market to a country which denies free access to their market for our goods.

Nearly 30 percent of China's total exports are to the United States, which means that most-favored-nation status for their goods is vital to the Chinese economy. Therefore, most-favored-nation status is logically the most effective tool for influencing the Chinese Government to improve their record on human rights. If the United States continues to grant most-favored-nation status to Chinese goods, without requiring improvements in human rights, there is no incentive for the Chinese regime to alter their policies. I ask my colleagues who support unrestricted most-favored-nation status for China to identify what other means we have available to influence the Chinese Government? They cannot give me an answer, because they have no answer.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all my colleagues to insist that the United States stand up for the principles of human rights, and for the freedom of the Chinese people. Vote for H.J. Res. 96 and send a clear, unmistakable message to the dictators in Beijing, and your constituents, that you believe in freedom and democracy for people all over the world.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress former Congresswoman Helen Bentley of Maryland and I combined to pass into law Radio Free Asia, a new surrogate radio to be aimed at repressive regimes in China, in North Korea, in Laos, in Vietnam, in Burma, and other Asian nations. Today, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has focused

his policy alternative to the withdrawal of Most Favored Nation tariff status from China on starting surrogate broadcasting to China. His is the proper way to go.

Withdrawing MFN may seem an effective means of moving the Beijing Government away from repression and toward the norms of international human rights. But it only seems so. On further examination one can see that the results of such withdrawal would likely rather be retaliation against American companies doing business in China and no progress on the rule of law. Moreover, MFN is a one-shot gun. Once fired there is no further bullet. Once withdrawn, the tariffs rise, Chinese retaliation follows, and markets change.

No, Mr. Speaker, this is not the approach that the United States should follow. Mr. BEREUTER has it right. Beam a message of truth to China—tell them the truth about what is happening in their own society to their own people—and create the pressure for change from within. Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, the surrogate radios of the cold war, gave not only truth, but hope to millions in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union that ultimately helped to undermine and bring down their totalitarian, communist regimes. Radio Free Asia would play the same role.

I am a great supporter and believer in the effectiveness of the Voice of America which beams to China and to societies across the world the message of our country to their people. It is among the most cost effective means of promoting American values to people everywhere. Surrogate radio is not the same. Surrogate radio is radio that broadcasts the messages of their own people to those societies. That relates to them not only in their own language but by their own people and in their own cultures. It reports the truth about what is happening not only around the world but, more importantly, within that society and not within the American idiom but within theirs. Surrogate radios are not to supplant the Voice of America—our voice to the world. Surrogate radios are not to provide an alternative to the VOA. Surrogate radios have always operated right along side VOA and complemented its good work. Both are extremely effective in their different missions, both spend the relatively small sums required to sustain them effectively as well, and both are necessary to advance the purposes of our foreign policy.

Now VOA has, unfortunately, been sending a message that our radios are a zero sum game, that money put toward RFA is money taken away from VOA. I don't favor that and I don't know anyone that does. And yet it has been extremely difficult to get RFA up and running and this administration has spoken a good commitment to it without following its good words with action. It is my hope that the Bereuter amendment will receive an overwhelming vote and send a message to the White House that this is our policy of choice and that the President had better get aboard and start acting as the engineer of this train.

Last year the question of funding and starting up RFA was faced in the appropriation for Commerce, State, Justice where the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], then the chairman, failed to fund RFA. I offered an amendment to ensure that the commitment to RFA was known to the then chairman and it passed overwhelmingly. I hope Congress will again today go on record to

send the message strongly that RFA's time has indeed come.

We should, in approving the policy choice in Bereuter, also make the commitment to provide sufficient funds to make FRA a reality. These funds should not come from VOA. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, if we continue to see from VOA the kind of effort to slow and side-track RFA start-up that has been all too evident, then, perhaps, we should, indeed, consider using VOA funds for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Wu, is my friend, the friend of all of us, the friend of every person who loves human freedom. He returned to China, the nation of his birth, and put himself at great risk to make the truth known about China's egregious labor prison camps and its heinous market in human organs. His is just the latest example of the oppressive practices of the Beijing regime. Since last year's vote not to withdraw MFN, which I supported, human rights violations by the Chinese Government have worsened not improved. The Chinese communist regime makes it easy to generate support in Congress for RFA. They are clearly their own worst enemy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they will argue, as they always do, that these are matters only of internal concern, that the United States is yet again intruding itself in Chinese matters, that what they do to their own people is none of our affair. Yet we need only remind them that they are signatory to the Universal Declaration, that they made a commitment—which has since rung hollow—to observe the tenets of basic rights for every human being. And I would say one thing further: that we are our brothers keeper; that the denial of Harry Wu's rights is the denial of my rights and yours and of every person in this chamber and on this Earth. That once we can convince China and the rest of the world that every person deserves respect, that every person has the right to worship and speak and write in the way he or she chooses, that governments must rule only through law created democratically by the people—then may China and other nations which deny these basic rights take their place among the nations of the world who will live in peace and harmony and work together toward a better life for all peoples. We all look forward with all the Harry Wu's—and there are hundreds of millions of them in China—to that day.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I support the China Policy Act, sponsored by my colleague from Nebraska, the distinguished chair of the Asia and Pacific subcommittee.

I agree with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that Congress must be concerned with the illegal and unjust arrest and current incarceration of American Harry Wu by Chinese officials. We must use all available diplomatic means to resolve this situation and see that Mr. Wu is returned to freedom.

However, we must not be so short-tempered and short-sighted as to vent our frustration by revoking Most Favored Nation status for China. Revoking MFN status is not something the United States should do lightly in any situation.

The recent deterioration of relations with China is indeed a cause for great concern. In today's Post Cold War world, the United States has many vital security concerns in Southeast Asia. In this region of the world where great strides are being made toward

democratization, America must remain vigilant in our support of international human rights.

Perhaps the time has come for the United States to be more circumspect with regard to Beijing's policies and reputation. Yet, one thing is sure—the time has not come to end MFN for China and ostracize this emerging nation, which may hold the ultimate key to peace and stability in Asia. We will never succeed in fostering real democratization for millions of Chinese tomorrow if we decide to impose an economic quarantine China today.

It is possible to support MFN status for China and still fight for Harry Wu's return home—and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do just that. I urge them to support H.R. 2058 to support the safe return of Harry Wu.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 96 that would deny Most-Favored-Nation [MFN] trade status to China.

I can understand the reasons why the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] proposed an MFN disapproval resolution. But, I'm not convinced that an embargo—the effect of withdrawing MFN status—would punish China's use of prison labor, human rights abuses, and possible violations of arms control agreements.

Taking away MFN will actually strip us of a powerful tool that we can use to push for change, while having a negligible effect on China. Denying MFN to China forces us to turn our backs on Chinese human rights abuses. But MFN gives us the leverage and access needed to encourage improvements in China's treatment of its citizens.

Let's keep the lines of free ideas open through trade. Discussion between two friendly trading partners is more effective than criticism between nations involved in an embargo or trade war. Change is generated by communication and cooperation, not alienation.

I encourage my colleagues to support the committee's position in opposing this measure and support the continuation of MFN status to China. I believe we can do what's best for trade while engaging the Chinese to produce change.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to add to the RECORD an article from Business Week magazine that highlights how increased economic activity and Western contacts have improved overall human rights, especially in the southeastern provinces in China. Change sometimes comes too slowly for Americans but I am confident that the inevitable triumph of democracy and respect for human rights will happen one day soon in China just as it has in other parts of the world.

[From Business Week, June 6, 1994]

CHINA—IS PROSPERITY CREATING A FREER SOCIETY?

The contrast is stark. Chinese authorities continue their crackdown on dissenting voices and put security forces on alert in Tiananmen Square. At the same time, in the grimy central city of Wuhan, a professor is bringing a new concept to China's heartland: the rule of law. Armed with a Yale Law School degree and a team of young associates, Wan Xiang runs China's first public-interest legal center. From his bustling offices, Wan takes on government officials—including members of the much-feared national police, the Public Security Bureau (PSB)—who have long ridden roughshod over individual rights.

Increasingly, Wan is winning. In one recent case, his Center for the Protection of the Rights of Disadvantaged Citizens came to the defense of an entrepreneur from Hangzhou who left his job as a technician at a state-backed company to start his own business. Accusing the man of taking company patents, police put him in detention, ransacked his home, and confiscated all his belongings. After a plea from the man's wife, Wan dispatched two lawyers to represent him. They won—and got the PSB to pay damages of 500 yuan—the equivalent of six weeks' salary. Altogether, the center, which is funded in part by the Ford Foundation, has received 1,600 requests for help.

As the June 4 anniversary of the 1989 Tiananmen massacre approaches, President Clinton is poised to make the politically costly decision to renew China's most-favored-nation trading status (page 102). He is doing so even though China has been cracking down hard on its most vocal dissidents. It has re-arrested Wei Jingsheng, a leader of the "Democracy Wall" movement of the late 1970s. Beijing has imprisoned many other political activists and has rounded up religious and labor leaders.

But no matter what an increasingly jittery leadership does to repress and control, a quiet revolution is taking place. Across the Middle Kingdom, the glimmerings of a freer society can be seen in the actions of Chinese such as Professor Wan. China's contact with the U.S. and the rest of the world is helping make that happen. Although Clinton's decision was in part based on pure commercial reasons, it does reflect a growing view among experts that the annual debate about human rights in China has been overtaken by deeper, grassroots change in the world's most populous nation.

An explosion of information technology, for example, has allowed the Chinese to link up to the world with fax machines, telephone lines, satellite dishes, and personal computers. Thanks to market-oriented reforms, millions of Chinese can now decide where to work and live instead of being told. A growing local media, aligning with regional power brokers, is spotlighting tension between provincial authorities and Beijing. And workers and peasants are becoming more vocal about protesting corruption, layoffs, and taxes.

Two or three years ago, signs of people circumventing or undermining totalitarian rule could be dismissed as anomalies. But no longer. Just as China's economic boom has brought increased prosperity to millions, so too is life for ordinary Chinese becoming easier and freer. "There has been a substantial evolution—economic, social, and political—that makes the state less intrusive in people's lives," says Kenneth G. Lieberthal, a China expert at the University of Michigan.

Indeed, the central judgment that Deng Xiaoping made 15 years ago now appears to be proving faulty. Deng reckoned that by opening the door to the outside world, China could absorb foreign investment, trade, and technology while spurning the cultural and political influences, or "bourgeois liberalization," that would challenge Communist Party rule.

But years of double-digit economic growth are transforming Chinese society itself, loosening Beijing's control over 1.2 billion people. In Guangdong, workers angered by dangerous factory conditions have formed more than 800 illegal trade unions. In Beijing, live talk shows allow radio listeners to discuss once-taboo subjects, from urban pollution to extramarital affairs. In a Shanghai factory, the subject at mandatory Communist Party meetings is bonuses, not politics. And in

coastal cities and interior villages, attendance at underground churches is soaring. Virtually no one accepts the ideology called communism anymore.

SHIFTING SANDS

Many of these grassroots changes have frightened the Communist Party leadership, which is already rattled by Deng's deteriorating health and an inevitable power struggle. Yet the earth continues to shift under the leadership's feet. Beijing must encourage growth to stay in power, but that only increase the potential for greater individual freedom. Only a few years ago, the government could dictate where citizens lived and worked, when they married, and when they could have a child. But today, a rising middle class is quietly challenging centralized control. "Change is happening from the bottom up, regardless of what happens with the Communist Party," says David S. Goodman, a fellow at Murdoch University's Asia Research Center in Perth, Australia.

That doesn't mean China's transition to the post-Deng era will be smooth. The party still maintains its monopoly on power. Moreover, the state controls the media and arrests whomever it wants. In Tibet and Xinjiang, ethnic minorities face severe repression. Meanwhile, the tumultuous move to a market economy has created a political and social powder keg. The economy grew 12.7% in the first quarter, barely cooling off from its 13% pace in each of the past two years. Inflation is 24.6% in the big cities, and corruption among officials is widespread. In 1989, that combination led to large antigovernment demonstrations. If similar unrest breaks out after the death of 89-year-old Deng, the leadership may once again call in the troops.

As the years after Tiananmen have shown, however, the People's Liberation Army isn't interested in turning back the clock. It's making too much money in its lucrative businesses, ranging from toys to tourism. Likewise, the party can be counted on to beat back outright challenges to its rule, but its members are also making money in China's rush to get rich.

NEW SUITS

Where once the party and central government could dictate just about anything, now they must compete for power with provinces, cities, giant quasipublic corporations, and even workers and peasants. As a result, China continues to evolve away from the totalitarian model of the Maoist era and the authoritarian regime of the Deng era. "The system is losing its central control," says M. Scot Tanner, an expert on Chinese politics at Western Michigan University. He argues that China is gradually becoming a "soft authoritarian" regime like Taiwan or South Korea in the early 1980s.

An unlikely arena for this clash of interests is the nation's rudimentary legal system. As in Wuhan, a new set of laws and property rights is evolving throughout China. In a country where the rule of law has long been subordinate to *guanxi*, or personal connections, the Chinese have started to turn to the judicial system to resolve business and personal disputes.

Chinese citizens are suing almost everyone—from local enterprises to the police. For instance, Zheng Chengsi, a slender, bespectacled professor in Beijing, brought suit against two of his former students last year after discovering they had plagiarized more than 60,000 words from his work—of all things—intellectual-property rights. Zheng's lawyers filed the case in Beijing's East District court last year. The defendants tried, in vain, to persuade Zheng to settle. But he insisted he didn't want damages. "My rights were violated," he says. "I wanted these

things to be published." In August, Zheng got his wish: The judge ordered the defendants to publish details of the case in nationally circulated newspapers.

Like Zheng, most Chinese plaintiffs are involved in disputes with other civilians. But some citizens are challenging government officials in court. In 1992, Liu Benyuan, an entrepreneur in Sichuan province, sued local cadres who tried to take away his mineral-water bottling plant. They were upset because Liu refused to pay them off. Besides his bottling plant, they also closed his chemical and printing factories. Liu fought back. Last February, a court ruled in his favor, giving him back his businesses.

China's legal system is ill prepared to handle the growing clamor for justice. As claims multiply, the number of lawyers is expected to quadruple, to about 200,000, by the year 2000. Many citizens continue to distrust the system's impartiality, since local officials often treat courts as arms of their governments. And when the courts do act independently, they often have great difficulty enforcing their judgments. That led editors of the official *Legal Daily* newspaper on May 23 to issue a daring call for an independent judiciary. "The idea of economic rights is spilling over into other areas such as individual rights," says Helena Kolenda, a Beijing-based lawyer with the New York law firm Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison. "It has sparked a consciousness."

The demand for more rights is moving beyond individual lawsuits and sparking organized, large-scale protests. Two groups recently staged sit-down strikes in front of the Shanghai municipal building, protesting government secrecy and consumer ripoffs. The unrest has also spread to the countryside, where 75% of China's population lives. Last year, about 4,000 Guangdong villagers conducted a demonstration on a main thoroughfare. They were upset that local cadres had sold off prime farmland to Hong Kong real estate developers.

More worrisome to Beijing, unrest is spreading in factories, where workers increasingly are organizing. That has spooked the government, adding to worries that dissidents and intellectuals are reaching out to disgruntled workers. But as state-owned enterprises lay off employees, workers throughout China are going on strike. In March, there were 270 strikes in Liaoning, Shaanxi, and Sichuan provinces, several lasting as long as 40 days and involving 10,000 workers. In Tianjin last fall, laid-off workers marched on a state-run factory, carrying signs asking: "How can we feed our children?" Says Trini Leung, Chinese labor expert at the University of Hong Kong: "Labor unrest is bubbling very hot, and the authorities are worried."

Like peasants in the countryside, urban Chinese workers are furious about the rampant corruption and lawlessness among some well placed officials. One day last fall, a Shanghai bus driver found his way blocked by parked limousines in front of a karaoke bar frequented by government and Communist Party officials. When the bus driver told the chauffeurs to move, a group of men fatally beat him. Shanghai's bus drivers responded with a wildcat strike, refusing for several days to drive on the busy route.

The state hopes to prevent an explosion of labor unrest by encouraging laid-off workers to find jobs in the growing private and quasipublic sectors. But the unrest is not limited to the public sector. Workers at foreign joint ventures run by Taiwanese, Hong Kong, and other foreign investors have struck to protest abysmal working conditions. In Fujian province, where Taiwanese companies employ more than 400,000 people, workers often spend 16 hours a day on the job without over-

time pay. Migrant workers in Guangdong joint ventures typically make \$35 a month, less than half of what local residents make for the same work. Last fall, 49 workers died in fires at two factories run by investors from Hong Kong and Taiwan.

Even with its many problems, the private sector's growth has made it much harder for Big Brother to keep tabs on each citizen. Economic reform has vastly increased mobility for ordinary Chinese. That has undercut the *dang an*, or personal dossier, system. The *DANG AN*, which includes an employee's family background, political leanings, and class status, once was used by officials to retain workers, limit promotions, and even ruin careers. But now, Chinese are going into business for themselves, while foreign corporations don't care about such dossiers.

With the declining importance of the dossier, the party's stifling presence in the workplace has been drastically reduced. Party bosses are no longer the decision-makers. And the political meetings that were once mandatory are no longer held at wholly owned foreign ventures or at many joint ventures. Even at state enterprises, less time is spent mouthing Marxist mantras. At China Textile Machine Co. in Shanghai, political meetings have been pared from an hour a week to 20 minutes. "The empty talk is gone," says Zheng Bohua, the company's deputy general manager. "Now we discuss production."

U.S. companies, although anxious to defend their commercial interests in China, argue that they, too, are changing the thought processes of Chinese workers. Learning how to make individual decisions does leave a deep imprint. And working for a Western company almost automatically means a higher standard of living, with better pay and benefits. "If I were asked to go back to a state enterprise, that would be hard to deal with," says Ren Shouqin, 54, vice-president at China Hewlett-Packard Co. in Beijing. HP sent him to the Monterey Institute of International Studies for an MBA.

SOAPS AND CNN

At HP's headquarters in Beijing, well-heeled young women and men work at computer terminals, watch educational videos, send electronic mail, and read foreign magazines. In the Beijing area, 100,000 to 200,000 Chinese citizens work for foreign companies in offices that increasingly resemble the home office. Cai Ping, a 23-year-old manager in HP's personnel department, regularly communicates with HP staffers in Hong Kong and Palo Alto, Calif. "It's as if we're in the same building," she says. "Right now, I'm in touch with the trends of the world."

It's not just elite workers at foreign multinational corporations who are in touch with the rest of the world. In Guangdong, millions of people get their news from two Hong Kong television stations. With a satellite dish, moreover, they can get up to 18 other stations. Despite a ban on such dishes, they are common fixtures in the Guangdong urban landscape. Millions of Chinese who understand English will soon be able to watch Cable News Network.

Of course, the state-controlled media remain on a tight leash, and authorities still strike out at individual journalists who hit too-sensitive nerves. In April, Xi Yang, a reporter for a Hong Kong newspaper who had written about plans for an interest-rate increase, was sentenced to 12 years in prison for allegedly "stealing state financial secrets."

But commercial imperatives are creating the potential for more reliable news. TV stations in wealthy coastal cities have stepped up coverage of social and economic news. A recent protest in Shanghai was covered by

one government station, despite efforts by city officials to black it out. Most of the time, stations stick to more popular fare to lure a broader audience—and advertisers. Taiwanese soap operas are now common, as are news stories about prostitution and corruption.

TALK RADIO

At the same time that local governments are opening commercial TV stations and newspapers, party organs are on the decline. The circulation of *People's Daily* dropped from 2.3 million in 1992 to 1.65 million last year. With the government cutting back on press subsidies, the fight is on for advertising dollars and for circulation gains. Some papers have responded by printing fewer political screeds and more alluring tales of sex and violence.

Economic change has emboldened the business press. As millions of Chinese have become stockholders for the first time, the business press has become more aggressive in shaking up China's corporations and shining a light on corruption. An increasingly influential business paper is the *Shanghai Securities News*. The paper warns of stock market shenanigans and covers civil lawsuits involving companies. A few weeks ago, the paper ran the first word of a lawsuit by a widow who sued a securities firm after her husband committed suicide. She claims the firm forced him to engage in illegal insider trading. "This paper really tells us the truth," says one investor.

Radio is also slowly moving away from the party line. Talk radio abounds in the large cities, where people's frustrations and desires anonymously spill out over the airwaves. On Guangdong radio, callers regularly criticize the government, sounding off on everything from police brutality to trade policy. On one recent evening, crime is the big concern, as listeners complain about robberies on buses, highways, and city streets.

American talk radio it's not. But this profusion of media outlets has created a forum for the country's various power groups to fight their battles. In the past, the powerful Propaganda Ministry could homogenize the country's newspapers. Now, as the decentralized economy has given more power to regional chieftains, various factions are vying for control. With conservatives and reformers wielding control of media outlets, China has not one official press but several. *People's Daily*, controlled by the conservatives, therefore reports on strikes and rural unrest to demonstrate the dangers of policies advocated by reformers such as Vice-Premier Zhu Rongji, while *Shanghai papers* report on successful reforms.

Even though China's media can hardly be called free, the emergence of divergent voices means the center's ability to control people's minds has vanished. The very values upon which communism was founded are shifting. Since so few Chinese believe in its ideology, the Communist Party's leaders have no option but to press ahead with economic modernization—even as it unleashes social changes. To justify its existence, the party has to deliver prosperity, not class struggle. These pressures can only mount as more Chinese accumulate wealth.

THE DOOR IS OPEN

To contain the damage, Beijing's leaders have adopted a strategy of strategic retreats. By pulling back in certain areas, the leaders hope they can limit popular unrest and triumph in the end. But it's unlikely that 1.2 billion Chinese will be content with just the beginnings of a legal system, a freer press, and a trade-union movement. Having won those gains in the past few years, they are pressing for more.

Faced with these demands, the Communist Party will be confronted with tough choices.

It can lash out, as it did in 1989. Or it can begin to transform itself, as did autocratic parties in Taiwan and South Korea. A violent crackdown would be a huge step backward and would be unlikely to work in the long term. As the years after 1989 have demonstrated, hard-liners cannot repress an entire society and still preserve economic reform.

No one is arguing that China is about to blossom into a multiparty democracy. The government's strategy is to co-opt potential pressure groups before they become independent political forces. The technocratic leaders who are gradually taking over the reins of power from the old-time revolutionaries are more willing to allow interest groups to express their viewpoints—but only as long as they remain within the confines of a single party.

For now, many Chinese say they are too busy making money to think about politics. Young Chinese, in particular, are learning that wealth means the freedom to travel, to buy foreign newspapers, to win a court case against a corrupt government official. "If you have money," says a taxi driver in Fuzhou, "then you can buy human rights." By this reckoning, the best thing Washington can do to nurture greater rights in China is to make sure its doors remain as open as possible to investment and ideas. "We have confidence about the future," says Aven Yang, senior manager for materials at Northern Telecom Ltd.'s joint venture manager for materials at Northern Telecom Ltd.'s joint venture in Shekou. "There is bread, and the door is open. We don't want the door to close." The rest of the world should make sure it doesn't.

By Joyce Barnathan in Shanghai, with Pete Engardio in Guangzhou, Lynne Curry in Beijing, Dave Lindorff in Hong Kong, and Bruce Einhorn in New York.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 96, legislation that would disapprove the President's decision to renew most-favored-nation [MFN] status for the People's Republic of China [PRC]. My reason for doing so is simple: While I share my colleagues concerns about the Chinese Government's actions regarding human rights, missile proliferation, and other bilateral matter, I do not believe that these issues should be linked to the basic foundation of trade between the United States and the PRC. I believe that there are more appropriate and effective means to address these important non-economic concerns.

The People's Republic of China [PRC] has been denied permanent MFN trading status since 1951, when Congress revoked MFN status for all Communist countries. However, under the provisions of the Trade Act of 1974, the United States can grant temporary MFN status to China if the President issues a so-called "Jackson-Vanik" waiver.

In June of this year, President Clinton exercised this option—as he has in each of the previous years of his administration—and extended the Jackson-Vanik waiver for China for an additional year. In considering House Joint Resolution 96, we must now decide whether to exercise our congressional prerogative to disapprove this waiver—and deny MFN status for China. Following this debate, I hope Congress can move forward on the consideration of granting permanent MFN status for China and putting an end to this annual source of Sino-American tension.

In making this important decision, there are two questions that we must answer: First, is it in our national economic interest to continue

MFN for China? Second, how does extending MFN for China influence our efforts to effectively address human rights and other bilateral problems between the United States and China?

The answer to the first question is unequivocally yes. Extending MFN to China would clearly yield substantial economic benefits to the United States.

China is our Nation's fastest growing major export market. America exported \$9.8 billion worth of goods to China in 1994, an increase of 5.9 percent over 1993. These exports supported approximately 187,000 American jobs, many of which are in high-wage, high-technology fields.

But these benefits are only the tip of the iceberg. With a population of more than a billion people—and a GNP that has grown at an average rate of 9 percent since 1988—and 12 percent last year—the future export potential of the Chinese market is enormous. In industries such as power generation equipment, commercial jets, telecommunications, oil field machinery and computers, China represents a virtual gold mine of economic opportunity for American businesses.

The important of such a market is hard to understate: In a world where most existing major markets are saturated or are quickly maturing, it is critical that we find new and expanding markets for American products. China is just such a market. In fact, it represents one of the last reservoirs of raw economic potential left for American businesses to tap.

In short, if cultivated properly, a vigorous trading relationship with China could be a badly-needed cornerstone of American export growth—and overall economic growth—over the next few decades.

Denying MFN for China, however, would put that relationship at risk. I want to point out that MFN is a misnomer. MFN is not preferential treatment—it is equal treatment. By denying MFN for China, we would be denying China the same trading status that all but six of our trading partners have been granted.

Even worse, we would actually be punishing China by placing exorbitant "Smoot-Hawley" tariff rates, established earlier this century on the Chinese goods. For example, with MFN, waterbed mattresses exported to the United States from any MFN country—including China—would face a tariff of 2.4 percent. Without MFN, the tariff on this product would be 80 percent—an increase of 3,300 percent. This kind of punitive tariff would, for all intents and purposes, close the American market to Chinese products.

In other words, continuing MFN does not constitute special treatment for China—but rescinding MFN would deny China the trade status that we grant to virtually every other nation in the world.

How would China be expected to respond to such a punitive action? There's no way to know for sure * * * but I suspect that the Chinese would retaliate by quickly closing their market to American goods and would take their business elsewhere—an event that our international competitors, especially the Japanese and the EC, would note with glee.

And, even if a full-fledged trade war with China is avoided, there is still the risk of destroying all of the progress made so far on other United States-China trade issues.

For example, the United States has recently reached an historic accord with the People's

Republic of China on protection of intellectual property rights and market access. The accord contains a commitment on the part of the Chinese to crack down on piracy and to enforce intellectual property laws. It would also require China to finally open its markets to United States audio-visual products. Rescinding MFN for China would undermine this progress, and would eliminate any possibility of future progress on other trade related issues—such as full enforcement of the 1992 bilateral agreement prohibiting prison-made goods.

And there remain other serious trade problems between the U.S. and the PRC that need to be addressed.

For example, despite signing the 1958 New York Convention on Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards, China refuses to enforce any claims awarded against Chinese firms under this agreement. As a result, American businesses such as Revpower, which was granted a \$6.6 million arbitral award for contracts that were violated and property that was unjustly expropriated, have never been able to collect what they are due. Such incidents raise questions about China's sincerity in enforcing such agreements and whether United States investments are safe in the PRC.

There are also many trade disagreements associated with the PRC's accession to the World Trade Organization [WTO] that need resolution, including the issue of permanent MFN status—which I support.

The fact is MFN provides the basic foundation to negotiate with China on these kind of trade issues. Without MFN, there is no trading relationship—and no reason for China to listen to us on trade related issues.

Finally, American consumers—especially those with limited incomes—are also penalized by denying MFN for China.

Many of the low-cost goods that American consumers have become so used to buying come from China. If we deny MFN, we will raise prices dramatically on those goods and undermine competition that lowers the price on goods from elsewhere. The result is an implicit tax increase on average American consumers, especially low-income families. For example, an extra \$5–\$10 dollars on a shirt may not be much for a Member of Congress, but for an average working family, this cost increase directly affects their standard of living.

In short, denying MFN for China can only have negative consequences for the United States. At a minimum, rescinding MFN would destroy the progress we have already made and would jeopardize future progress towards establishing an equitable trading relationship with the PRC. At maximum, denying MFN would cause a full-fledged trade war in which the Chinese market would be closed to American products.

Either way, the end result would be that American companies would effectively be shut out of one of the most rapidly expanding export markets in the world—sending hundreds of billions of dollars of future American exports down the drain. And in addition to these lost jobs, the standard of living of average working families will be lowered due to increased prices of consumer goods.

This scenario is easily avoidable. By continuing MFN status for China, we can take the next step toward promoting a strong economic relationship with this important trading partner—and put ourselves in position to reap the

economic benefits that the Chinese market offers.

It is clear then, that extending MFN for China is in our national economic interest. However, the United States should not make foreign policy decisions based solely on raw economic benefits. In this case, we must also consider the effect that today's decision will have on our efforts to promote human rights and regional security.

I can understand the motivation of some of my colleagues who want to link MFN trade status to other issues like human rights, missile proliferation, the arrest of Harry Wu, population control activities and regional security. They are trying to fill the void on these important issues resulting from the Clinton administration's lack of a coherent, long-term China policy. I agree with them completely that this void must be filled—I disagree with the method. MFN linkage is not the way to promote progress on these other issues.

First, I believe that continuation of MFN for China will help promote further economic development and reform in the PRC. In the long term, I believe this economic reform will result in political reform. That is the exact trend that happened in Taiwan and South Korea and is currently happening in Indonesia and Malaysia.

Second, while perhaps having a short-term punitive effect on China, the denial of MFN makes it more difficult to address our long list of important non-trade concerns.

What incentives is there for China to adhere to human rights standards, comply with agreements it voluntarily made regarding missile exports and the proliferation of other weapons of mass destruction, halt nuclear testing, release Harry Wu, ensure a smooth transition in Hong Kong, and engage in responsible negotiations on regional security issues if the United States denies MFN? MFN denial is considered a hostile action by Beijing.

The struggle to succeed aged paramount leader Deng Xiaoping has already begun. Denying MFN would only exacerbate relations and play directly into the hands of the hardliners who are using tensions in Sino-American relations to bolster their position. The reformers—many of whom are dependent on further economic growth so sustain their popularity and reform program—would be undercut by the denial of MFN. And, it is these very reformers who will more likely address the human rights and proliferation concerns we have. So why give their opponents ammunition?

Mr. Speaker, if the Clinton administration had a coherent China policy which could effectively and forcefully address these serious concerns, then Congress would not feel compelled to have to step-in and fill the void. Unfortunately, we must.

However, in doing so, I urge my colleagues to do what is best for long-term American interests and not become sidetracked by short-term political expediency. I urge a “no” vote on the Resolution of disapproval.

Therefore, it is my hope that we will look at MFN for China, not as a point of contention between our two nations, but rather as the beginning of change that will bring new understanding within China. Economic gains result in further progress on human rights which can only promote a new era of security cooperation between the United States and China.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the China question has vexed American policymakers for over a century as we struggle to define our relationship.

China is the most populous nation on Earth and offers an enormous market for United States products. In 1994 United States companies had \$9.3 billion in sales to China. Last year, companies in my home State of New York sold China nearly \$600 million in goods, and New York ranks fourth in the Nation in total export sales to that country. Importantly, exports to China support some 180,000 United States jobs.

China remains the key to the balance of power in Asia, and is well on its way to being the leading player in the Asia-Pacific region. Many experts believe that the Chinese economy will someday be the largest in the world, larger than even our own.

The United States Government cannot ignore such a geopolitical giant, and for us to deny China MFN status would be foolish and an unwise policy. China's cooperation is essential in dealing with global challenges of nonproliferation, the environment, refugees, and controlling narcotics traffic. Moreover, a unilateral trade embargo by the United States will have little effect since Japanese and European corporations will quickly move to fill the void. Importantly, we will lose the only leverage we have over China to bring about Democratic reforms and persuade them to conform with acceptable standards of international behavior. Without a strong economic presence in China, the United States will have little, if any, capacity to influence the evolution of the Democratic process in China.

Of course, we have numerous problems with the Chinese Government. We are deeply troubled by: consistent human rights abuses; the unfair imprisonment of American citizen, Harry Wu; an unwillingness to adhere to international standards of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; a refusal to recognize the legitimate rights of ethnic minorities; and provocative military measures in the South China Sea. These are issues which must be addressed.

The Chinese Government should not feel that renewing MFN is a reward for its behavior, and we must keep the pressure on all fronts to push for Democratic reform. The pathway to democracy is through free and open markets, and renewing China's MFN status makes sense. It is good for our commercial and strategic interests, and it lays the groundwork for sustainable long-term progress in human rights as well as promoting many other important issues. Mr. BEREUTER's China Policy Act, which I support, does this. It also sends an important signal to the Chinese Government that its continued violations of internationally recognized human rights are clearly unacceptable. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support Mr. BEREUTER's China Policy Act.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Mr. BEREUTER's resolution.

It is fully within our rights to criticize the Chinese Government's highly inappropriate behavior, underscored recently by the case of Harry Wu. There is no doubt in my mind that we cannot stand idly by while an American citizen is treated with such disregard. The imprisonment of Mr. Wu is an insult to every American.

I also applaud Mr. WOLF's and Ms. PELOSI's support for the China Policy Act. Their efforts

were instrumental in forming the final language of this bill. With that said, I must add that House Joint Resolution 96, revoking MFN for China, must be rejected. It is the wrong message to send, and if we insist on sending it, it will hurt us. It is legislation that will accomplish nothing politically.

In that respect, what we are doing here is not symbolic. It is not kowtowing to China. It is not standing on the sidelines of the issue.

In fact, we are sending a very strongly worded message to China's leaders that we are very unhappy with their conduct. In answer to those who question a lack of action, this bill would require regular reports from the administration to Congress detailing China's progress in those areas of concern to us—particularly human rights violations, nuclear proliferation, and unfair trade practices.

We are not simply sending them a hint of our displeasure. We are actively pursuing a change in their policy. And we will be doing so without harming our own interests.

Critics of extending MFN to China counter that revocation of this status is the only way that we can affect change in China. They claim that we can only make ourselves heard, and persuade the Chinese to adhere to international norms, by disengaging ourselves economically—even at the expense of American industry. That is totally incorrect.

It has been said before, and I will reiterate it. We do need to express our displeasure with the Government and ensure that our concerns are heard and understood. For that reason, we need to remain engaged in China—economically and politically. Without those avenues, we will not have the leverage to accomplish what all of us in Congress, and in the United States, deem to be of the utmost importance—securing the full observance of human rights, democratic reforms, economic liberalization, and preventing the proliferation of China's weapons of mass destruction.

There is no argument here that we have many problems and concerns with China's internal policies and trade practices. We need to make it clear to the Chinese Government that their intolerable policies will not go unanswered. And in answering we will use all of the means necessary within our relationship to convey our views to them. However, we need to act within the construct of our established relationship, thereby working toward our goal of a free and democratic China. I commend Mr. BEREUTER on his well-written and well-directed bill, and I urge its swift passage.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the Chinese Government, and the defense industrial companies through which it operates, has established itself as the arms supplier of choice for many of the world's rogue states. We have granted China most-favored-nation status, and Beijing has responded by becoming the most eager vendor in the international nuclear marketplace. While we, in Congress, have been appropriating billions of dollars to encourage peace and security around the world, Beijing has been selling weapons of mass destruction to the highest bidders, regardless of the consequences. Over the past several years, the Chinese Government has: Delivered missile guidance systems to Iran; sent M-11 ballistic missile technology to Pakistan and aided Pakistan's efforts to develop a covert nuclear weapons program; sold Silkworm missiles to Iraq; and provided nuclear technology to Algeria.

In addition to sending sensitive technologies to outlaw nations, China continues to increase its military muscle at home by: Pursuing a secret program to develop biological weapons; continuing its underground nuclear test explosion program despite an international testing moratorium in effect since 1992; and conducting military exercises in the East China Sea just north of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, Beijing has a rapsheet that would make any thug proud. But instead of getting 10 to 20, the Chinese Government keeps getting billions of dollars worth of tax breaks which have helped it run up a massive trade surplus with the United States.

Over the years, I have stood in the well of the House to speak out against a Chinese regime which ignores international security rules, systemically oppresses it own people, and demands preferential trade status while refusing to provide equal access to its own market. Since last year, the Chinese Government record has deteriorated even further: American citizen Harry Wu has been detained, political prisoners are still being held in a Chinese "Gulag Archipelego" stretching across the country, and China's trade and proliferation policies remain dismal.

I stand here today in support of H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act of 1995, which I believe will send a message to Beijing's ruling clique: We're watching you. We'll be checking your progress in the nonproliferation, trade, and human rights. And it's time to clean up your act.

I still however, support a complete cut-off of MFN status for China because I don't believe we should label as "most favored" the regime operating in Beijing. I hope that this bipartisan bill serves as a wake-up call for China's dictators.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the view that China's MFN trade status should be preserved. As the previous Bereuter bill makes clear, the Chinese Government is, in many ways, a brutal and anachronistic regime, intolerant of dissent and responsible for grave human rights abuses. Yet under this repression flourishes one of the world's largest and most rapidly growing economies.

Free-market reforms taken in the name of "Leninist Capitalism" have dramatically increase in the well-being of Chinese citizens to the degree that per capita income in China now doubles every 6 to 7 years, United States commercial involvement in China has been an integral part of this dramatic change, contributing significantly to the improvement of living conditions in China.

There are currently over 2,000 United States companies with \$6 billion invested in mainland China. A close look at these operations reveals countless separate contributions to Chinese well-being above and beyond basic employment. United States businesses offer management development programs, scholarships, on site medical clinics, and gifts to charitable causes in China. Operating under the strictest standards of safety, hygiene, and environmental protection, these firms, by their presence and example, spread United States values and ideals throughout the communities in China where they are located.

As employees of United States companies, Chinese citizens are able to interact with their government on a more independent basis than would be possible absent United States support and employment. Pluralism and personal

liberty also are enhanced through government to government contacts, scientific exchanges, personal travel, and increased international awareness of Chinese Government activities.

While beneficial to the average Chinese citizen, United States commercial involvement in China also is critical to United States economic and strategic objectives. Since 1980, when MFN was first granted to China, United States exports have increased 438 percent compared to an overall increase in United States exports of 156 percent during the same time period. As other speakers will lay out, a policy that preserves United States interaction with Chinese society puts us in the best position to leverage the Chinese Government in the sensitive areas of weapons proliferation, North Korea, and market access for United States exports.

House Joint Resolution 96, would set back all progress the United States is making with China. Such a policy of unilateral confrontation must be rejected in favor of a strategy that preserves United States leadership in Asia, and maintains our commitment to the people of China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, denying most-favored-nation status to China is not in the best interest of the United States.

Because of its size and location China will be a pivotal nation in the Pacific rim well into the 21st century. The damage inflicted by revoking MFN to China will have serious consequences for our economy.

China has one of the fastest growing economies and is one of the largest markets in the world. United States businesses have made significant inroads into the Chinese market. In 1993, Tennessee companies exported \$58 million in goods to China. In 1994, Tennessee companies exported \$384 million to China, a 567-percent increase. Just last December, Nashville hosted the first economic summit to help Tennessee businesses learn how to capitalize on the Chinese market.

Denying MFN to China would surely result in retaliatory action against American goods, and the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs across America which are dependent upon our future trade with China. In fact, a Chinese delegation will be visiting Tennessee to pursue joint venture projects with 30 Tennessee businesses. If we vote to deny MFN today we are voting to kill jobs, and we are robbing States such as Tennessee of millions of dollars in potential revenue.

China is an extremely fertile market with tremendous possibilities. American businesses and the American economy need China. If U.S. companies are forced to pull out, you can be sure there are plenty of other nations that will be all too happy to fill that void. Most importantly, China needs America. The presence of businesses from the West have contributed greatly to the transition of the Chinese market from that of state-run to privately owned and operated establishments.

I certainly understand my colleagues concerns about China's human rights record, and I join them in condemning these practices. I believe we should continue to push for human rights improvements in China. Trade has been the avenue which has allowed the West to make tremendous strides in bringing about a more open and free society in China.

The United States is committed to being a leader in the international community. We have been very successful because we have

led by example. It would be impossible for the United States to lead by example if we did not have a presence in China.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of this resolution.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 96 that would deny most-favored-nation [MFN] trade status to China.

I can understand the reasons why the gentleman from Virginia proposed an MFN disapproval resolution. But, I'm not convinced that an embargo, the effect of withdrawing MFN status, would punish China's use of prison labor, human rights abuses, and possible violations of arms control agreements.

Taking away MFN will actually strip us of a powerful tool that we can use to push for change, while having a negligible effect on China. Denying MFN to China forces us to turn our backs on Chinese human rights abuses. But MFN gives us the leverage and access needed, to encourage improvements in China's treatment of its citizens.

Let's keep the lines of free ideas open through trade. Discussion between two friendly trading partners is more effective than criticism between two nations involved in an embargo or trade war. Change is generated by communication and cooperation, not alienation.

I encourage my colleagues to support the committee's position, in opposing this measure, and support the continuation of MFN status to China. I believe we can do what's best for trade while engaging the Chinese to produce change.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we debate China's most-favored nation status, we must view American policy toward China with consideration of many issues.

Those issues include human rights, trade, the peaceful transition of Hong Kong and weapons proliferation.

Human rights must continue to be a vital consideration as America formulates its policy toward China, as well as policy toward other areas of the world.

Obviously, we are all concerned about China's recent behavior, and the detention of American Harry Wu. Regardless of our action here tonight, Mr. Wu must be released, and we should continue to pursue that result.

However, the United States must pursue policies which are specific to each of the issues which affect our relationship to China in order to achieve positive results.

The continuation of China's most-favored-nation status is a necessary part of America's policy toward China.

To be effective, to spread the word of freedom around the world, America must continue to be engaged in world events.

Through American influence, positive changes can be made in other societies, including China. The transfer of information, which our trade relationship provides, is crucial to achieving change in China, without MFN, this change will not occur.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that the China Policy Act contains no teeth, and I urge support of the resolution disapproving MFN for China.

How long are we going to appease the murderous, nuclear proliferating, United States-citizen-arresting regime in Peking?

Most of us have seen the movie, "Schindler's List." What is going on in China

is similar: factories churn out goods made with slave labor. By giving MFN to China, we give China a \$37 billion trade surplus with us—and a lot of that is blood money. The world community failed to do the right thing 50 years ago. We are failing to do the right thing now. We should be ashamed.

Yesterday, I nominated my constituent, Mr. Harry Wu, for the 1996 Nobel Peace Prize for his determined efforts on behalf of human rights. I am saddened and disappointed that the Congress will not act with the same courage as demonstrated by Mr. Wu.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the previous question is ordered.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 10, answered "present" 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]
YEAS—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Arney
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Biley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)

Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner

Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbine
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta

Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchee
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)

Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers

Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—10

Burton	Kaptur	Souder
Chenoweth	Pickett	Stockman
Funderburk	Scarborough	
Jones	Seastrand	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

DeFazio

NOT VOTING—7

Bachus	Moakley	Reynolds
Collins (MI)	Nadler	
Jefferson	Owens	

□ 1346

Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. JONES, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mrs. SEASTRAND changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall No. 536 on the Bereuter amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

□ 1345

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Chair to say the bill is passed? Was there not a further pending vote on the resolution of disapproval?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman that the bill has passed. There is an addition measure to be considered.

Mr. DEFAZIO. A separate resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Separate under the rule.

Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 193, it is now in order to consider House Joint Resolution 96.

DISAPPROVAL OF EXTENSION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO THE PRODUCTS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. ARCHER. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 96 is as follows:

H.R. RES. 96

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress does not approve the extension of the authority

contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 recommended by the President to the Congress on June 2, 1995, with respect to the People's Republic of China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such times as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to an agreement between the minority, the majority, and the interested parties, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], will each control 10 minutes to debate the motion to table, after which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will be recognized to move to table the motion of disapproval.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the procedure, and I will be happy to handle our time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the majority leader, he said on a nondebatable motion, there was some agreement to debate it, 10 minutes being allocated to two Members. I am wondering if that requires unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No, the allocation of debate time is in order under the rule.

Mr. DEFAZIO. The rule made specifically in order that a nondebatable motion to table be debatable, but not the resolution itself?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct that debate will precede the motion to table.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LANTOS. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANTOS. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, are both sides in control of the time in favor of tabling this motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would note that the rule, House Resolution 193, allocates debate time for consideration of the joint resolution and does not require that the time be divided between proponents and opponents.

Mr. LANTOS. If I may continue my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, I

believe House rules do. We have had precedent for that when there was both on the majority and minority side the determination to grant Most Favored Nation treatment to Romania. I objected on parliamentary grounds, and the Speaker at that time granted me part of the time to express the views of those who are opposed to the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the rule was adopted pursuant to the rules of the House, and the rule that was adopted by the House is the rule that is in effect for the consideration of this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. May I continue my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may continue.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, is there any rule of the House which mandates that a portion of the time be allocated to opponents of a proposed legislation if both the majority and the minority are on one side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the case of a specific rule, the specific rule controls, and a specific rule has been adopted.

Mr. LANTOS. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those of us who are opposed to tabling this motion be allocated half the time.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do feel constrained to object, because there has been agreement between the majority and the minority as to how this issue will be debated, so I am constrained to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Chair would state that the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] could ask anyone possessing time to yield to him.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me begin my comments by commending Members on both sides of the aisle for the professional manner in which they have worked together to write the resolution just passed by the House. Specifically, I would like to commend the minority leader, the chairman and ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], all of whom made great efforts to ensure passage of this important resolution that sends a strong signal to the Chinese Government about the need for human rights reforms, while encouraging them to become a responsible actor in the world economy.

I believe that continuing a trade relationship with China, including encouraging the Chinese to enter the World Trade Organization on a commercial basis, where they accept all the obligations as well as the benefits of membership, combined with other