

complaint is before his committee, or that Mr. Bunning and Mrs. Johnson participated in GOPAC activities," Mr. Jost said.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that Members should not make references to members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct concerning pending investigations.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear any references made by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] as to pending matters. These are not matters before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; these are stories in the paper and not before the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is stating that as a general admonition from the Chair at this time.

SUPPORT THE ADOPTION PROMOTION AND STABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address an issue of great importance to everyone who cares about children. Today, there are hundreds of thousands of children who should be thriving in the love and care of adoptive parents. Tragically, they are not. Instead they are shuttling from foster family to foster family. In fact, this year a mere 10 percent of the 500,000 children in State foster care programs will move into permanent adoptive homes. This is not something out of Charles Dickens. It is happening today—in the United States of America.

We have come to this sorry state of affairs for many reasons, but two are paramount. First, the cost of adoption for many moderate-income families is prohibitive. Second, liberal social welfare policy has made interethnic adoption nearly impossible.

According to the National Council for Adoption, as many as 2 million families could be waiting for a child to adopt. But barriers like cost get in the way. Adoption expenses can total us to \$20,000. This financial burden is a major disincentive for moderate-income families wishing to adopt children.

A second barrier to adoption is the Federal law that permits States to use race in the placement of children in foster care and adoption. This law has clearly backfired. The use of race-matching has delayed the adoption of minority children, who remain in fos-

ter care at least twice as long as non-minority children. Today, 49 percent of children in foster care are minorities. A third of foster children are black.

I ask my colleagues: Is it fair to these innocent children to trap them in the foster care system simply because of the color of their skin? The love of a family knows no race. It is unconscionable that any child needing the love and care of a family he can call his own would be denied that love and care simply because the prospective adoptive family is of a different race. That is a grave injustice to the child who needs a home and to the family who waits with open arms.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress can help remove these barriers to adoption through swift passage of H.R. 3236, the Adoption Promotion and Stability Act. This bill makes two important reforms.

First, the bill revises the Tax Code to make adoption more affordable for families. H.R. 3236 provides a \$5,000 tax credit for adoption expenses. The bill also provides a \$5,000 per child tax exclusion for employer-paid adoption assistance. I believe this provision will encourage more moderate-income families to adopt children.

Second, the bill removes barriers to interracial adoption. Currently, the law allows placement agencies to use the racial background of the child as a criterion in making placement decisions. This bill prohibits the use of race to delay or deny placement of a child into a foster or adoptive home. I believe this provision will go a long way to end the intolerable delay associated with race-matching. It will ensure that placement agencies make the best interests of children their top priority.

In addition, I must note that many American Indian children are suffering in the current foster care and adoption system. Currently, tribes can delay the adoption of a child of American Indian descent because of the Indian Child Welfare Act. This law was intended to protect the integrity and heritage of American Indian tribes. Yet the law allows tribes to interfere with adoption decisions due to its ambiguity and broad application. As a result, litigations out of control, and Indian children are not being adopted. A provision of H.R. 3286, which was stripped from the bill in committee, would have established safeguards against the arbitrary, retroactive designation of children as members of a tribe. This would prevent a tribe from invoking the Indian Child Welfare Act to interfere with legitimate, voluntary adoptions. Should an amendment be offered to restore this provision of the bill, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Children must be afforded every opportunity to live in a happy, safe, secure, and—perhaps most important—permanent family environment. The provisions of this bill help to achieve this goal. I want to thank Ms. MOLINARI and Mr. ARCHER for their leadership on this issue. I also commend Mr. BUNNING, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr.

TIAHRT, and Mr. SHAW for their strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot take the hundreds of thousands of children languishing in foster care and match them with loving parents overnight. But with passage of the Adoption Promotion and Stability Act, we are taking an important step. I urge my colleagues to meet the needs of foster children across the country. I urge you to support this bill.

RENEWAL OF MFN FOR CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is about to enter its annual debate on the renewal of China's Most Favored Nation status. The need for renewal has existed since the United States first granted MFN to China back in 1980. It has been a difficult debate ever since 1989 and the events at Tiananmen Square. There is good reason to believe that the debate this year will be very difficult. This is because of two particularly large problems affecting the debate.

First, there are the policies of the Beijing Communist leadership. That government's disregard for international obligations on nonproliferation, intellectual property rights, trade, human rights, and on Taiwan mandate an effective response.

Second, there is a lack of leadership on the part of the administration. The policy has been ad hoc, dependent on domestic pressures, as Robert Zoellick testified before our committee last week when he said:

In an effort to please all constituencies, the administration has squandered our strength, failed to achieve its aims, and demonstrated weakness to both China and to others in the region.

Because of these problems, I fear that Congress will lose sight of the critical point, and that critical point is just this: Our policy on MFN for China should take these problems into account, but it must not be determined by them.

Rather, our decision on MFN must be determined by one thing and that one thing is, what is best for the United States? It is my view, though, that there are four basic reasons why extending MFN is in the best interests of our country.

First, revoking MFN would harm U.S. workers, U.S. businesses, and U.S. investment. Changes made in China's MFN status will curtail access to the Chinese market. Huge levels of trade and investment will still occur, but it will be other nations, not the United States, that will be making the investments, and we will lose all of our control and leverage. The effect will be losses of U.S. trade, U.S. investment and, quite frankly, many U.S. jobs.

The size of this potential hardship must be recognized by us in congress as

we debate this issue. This issue cannot be debated solely on emotion but must be based on reason.

United States companies have already committed to invest some \$26 billion in approximately 20,000 projects in China. United States trade with China already supports over 200,000 high-wage American jobs. But this is just a start. Over the next 25 years, China's economy is projected to expand to almost \$6 trillion. That is almost 10 times the size of China's economy in 1994.

Now, China's modernization plans call for imports of equipment and technology of approximately \$100 billion per year. Infrastructure expenditures amounting to as much as \$250 billion are projected through the remainder of the 1990's.

China's biggest import markets are in the areas of United States strength. Consider this: In both quality and price, the United States is in the lead for these markets: areas in aircraft, electric power systems, telecommunications equipment, computers, agricultural chemicals, and medical equipment.

Politics, unfortunately, could stop the United States from gaining tens of billions of dollars of new exports and hundreds of thousands of new jobs. This is already happening. Just the other day, Airbus took a \$2 billion contract from Boeing, based solely on politics. The president of China's aviation industries put it well when he said, and I quote:

We'd like to make our decisions based on technical and commercial factors, but governments and statesmen are involved. We can't control that.

Mr. Speaker, the second reason why revoking MFN would harm United States security interest in the region, let me say this, China is the emerging great power in that region, both economically and politically. There is no reason to think that its government can be deposed or ignored or strong-armed. It must be dealt with as a beligerent but as a great power.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the rest of my statement be entered into the RECORD.

This means engagement.

To go the other way, to adopt a policy of confrontation with China—which is what removing MFN does—would isolate the United States in Asia rather than isolate China.

As Henry Kissinger recently wrote:

In a confrontation with America, China would appeal to Asian nationalism and make the American military presence in Asia a bone of contention. And it would be able to enlist the economic cooperation of Japan as well as of the other industrial nations of Europe and the Western Hemisphere, all eager to seize the opportunities that we might abandon.

In addition, the futures of both Taiwan and Hong Kong are to be considered.

With Hong Kong to revert in a year, with Taiwan relying on China for \$20 billion a year in trade, and with the Taiwanese having invested \$25 billion in China, we need to treat these relationships carefully.

Reason 3: Revoking MFN will not improve human rights conditions or nonproliferation and trade policy in China.

As the Heritage Foundation recently wrote, history shows that China is far more oppressive against its people when isolated from the outside. This was clearly the case during the cultural revolution.

Human rights improvement is a long-term process that will require a long-term China policy.

The same is true on nonproliferation and trade. China needs to understand that it must meet its international responsibilities if it wants to attain international respectability.

The United States will have to use effective levers to achieve this.

A strong, clear, and coherent China policy is needed. Our goals will not be achieved in these areas otherwise.

MFN is simply the wrong lever. It was not designed for these goals, and it will fail miserably if used this way.

Reason 4: MFN is normal treatment that all our partners grant, and will continue to grant, to China without condition.

MFN is a misnomer. In reality it means that a country is treated in a nondiscriminatory manner on tariffs. It is the norm that rules.

In this respect, all our OECD partners grant such treatment to China. They do so without condition.

No official in any of those countries, to my knowledge, has suggested that this situation even be reviewed, much less altered.

The United States currently grants MFN to every country in the world except seven countries. These are Afghanistan, Cambodia, Cuba, Laos, North Korea, Vietnam, and the former Yugoslavia.

There are 17 others, including China, that currently receive MFN conditionally.

These 17 do not include Iran, Libya, Iraq, Syria, or Sudan. All these rogue states get MFN. Why is this?

This is because our MFN law is built on the cold war. The Jackson/Vanik amendment, enacted in 1974, was intended to pressure the former Soviet Union into allowing Jews to emigrate.

It was not designed to today's issues with China.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my colleagues will find these reasons for extending MFN convincing. In conclusion, though, I urge that we consider two other needs during the coming debate.

First, that China is too important for today's United States policy.

This administration keeps drawing lines in the sand, and then backing off. They are running out of credibility, and pretty soon they will run out of beach.

We need a coherent, long-term, and bipartisan China policy.

Second, the world has changed dramatically since 1974. The law on MFN has not. We may need to reform this law.

Let's look at how it can be used for today's issues.

Why should rogue regimes supporting international terrorists be treated better than countries like the Ukraine, Armenia, Bulgaria, and Romania? Mr. Speaker, I think this needs review.

OIL COMPANY MISMANAGEMENT AND GASOLINE PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the political party that once suggested that catsup should be counted as a vegetable in school lunch programs has given us a new plan to slash funding for public schools across America.

Over the weekend the Republican majority leader suggested that repealing the 4-cent tax on gasoline be paid for by cutting education for the children in the United States. He said if there is a place where we are getting a declining value for an increasing dollar it is in education.

That is right, the majority leader of the Republican Party wants to cut the education budget of our country. And to do what? Well, the Colombo-like, Dick Tracy-like investigations of the Republican Party have found that the 4-cent increase in gasoline tax in 1993 is somehow related to oil company executive speculation in the oil market in 1996, which has led to a 20-cent increase in the price of gasoline for consumers across this country.

Now, you are never going to hear a word from the Republican Party about the oil companies increasing gasoline by 20 cents a gallon in the last 3 months. Not a word. They are going to keep pointing back to a 4-cent gasoline tax in 1993 that actually led to a reduction in the price of oil over the next 2 years.

Why? Well, because they want to avoid some very simple facts. Fact No. 1: The central reason that oil prices are rising in America is that the oil company executives across the board, every one of them in 1995, decided that they were going to lower the inventories that they kept to hand in order to ensure against excessive cold weather or something else going on well below their average for the preceding 20 years.

Now, that is fine if it had not also been tied to a bet which they had, which was that Saddam Hussein would accept safeguards placed upon how he would use the profits from the sale of oil if the United Nations and the world community allowed has back into the marketplace for the sale of oil.

Surprisingly, Saddam Hussein refuses to accept the safeguards, which would ensure that the money, the profits which he would obtain would be used for humanitarian purposes within his country and not for a massive military buildup.

The oil company executives ran on empty. If we rode around in our automobile with the needle on the gas gauge down on empty and then ran into a traffic jam, we would blame ourselves. The oil companies ran on empty. There was plenty of oil in the world. The world was awash in oil all of last year and the beginning of this