

| | | |
|--------|------------|--------|
| Wicker | Wolf | Zeliff |
| Wilson | Young (AK) | Zimmer |
| Wise | Young (FL) | |

NAYS—147

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Hancock | Oberstar |
| Ackerman | Hastings (FL) | Obey |
| Andrews | Hilliard | Oliver |
| Baldacci | Hinchey | Owens |
| Barton | Hoyer | Pallone |
| Beilenson | Jackson (IL) | Pastor |
| Berman | Jackson-Lee | Payne (NJ) |
| Blumenauer | (TX) | Pelosi |
| Bonior | Jacobs | Petri |
| Borski | Jefferson | Pickett |
| Brown (CA) | Johnson, E. B. | Pomeroy |
| Brown (FL) | Johnston | Rangel |
| Bryant (TX) | Kaptur | Reed |
| Cardin | Kennedy (MA) | Roemer |
| Clay | Kennedy (RI) | Rose |
| Clayton | Kennelly | Rush |
| Clement | Kildee | Sabo |
| Clyburn | Klink | Sanders |
| Collins (IL) | LaFalce | Sanford |
| Collins (MI) | Lantos | Sawyer |
| Conyers | Levin | Schroeder |
| Costello | Lewis (GA) | Schumer |
| Coyne | Lipinski | Scott |
| Cummings | Lofgren | Sensenbrenner |
| DeFazio | Lowey | Serrano |
| DeLauro | Luther | Shays |
| Dellums | Maloney | Skaggs |
| Deutsch | Manton | Slaughter |
| Dicks | Markey | Stark |
| Dixon | Martinez | Studds |
| Doggett | Matsui | Stupak |
| Dooley | McCarthy | Tejeda |
| Duncan | McDermott | Thompson |
| Durbin | McHale | Thornton |
| Engel | McKinney | Thurman |
| Eshoo | McNulty | Torres |
| Evans | Meehan | Torricelli |
| Farr | Meek | Towns |
| Fattah | Menendez | Velazquez |
| Fields (LA) | Millender | Vento |
| Filner | McDonald | Visclosky |
| Foglietta | Miller (CA) | Volkmer |
| Ford | Minge | Ward |
| Franks (NJ) | Mink | Waters |
| Furse | Moakley | Watt (NC) |
| Gejdenson | Moran | Waxman |
| Gonzalez | Murtha | Williams |
| Green (TX) | Nadler | Woolsey |
| Gutierrez | Neal | Wynn |
| Hamilton | Neumann | |

NOT VOTING—17

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| Bachus | Fields (TX) | Lincoln |
| Becerra | Flake | McDade |
| Bevill | Gephardt | Peterson (FL) |
| Browder | Gibbons | Roybal-Allard |
| Christensen | Hall (OH) | Yates |
| Coleman | Hayes | |

□ 2342

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE AND SENATE FOR INDEPENDENCE DAY WORK PERIOD

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-640) on the resolution (H. Res. 465) providing for consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

POSSIBLE VOTE ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 463, DISAPPROVAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR CHINA

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my good friend, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, that we are about to take up the rule on the motion to disapprove most-favored-nation treatment for China. We do not expect to call for a vote over here even though all of our time will probably be used.

Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the gentleman if he expects anybody on his side of the aisle to call for a vote on this rule this evening.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, we have requests for time, we do not have any requests for votes, and I am not going to call for a vote.

Mr. SOLOMON. Therefore, we would not anticipate a vote on the rule although there is not any guarantee.

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman is exactly right.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is planning to meet on Tuesday, July 9, to grant a rule which may limit the amendments offered to the legislative branch appropriations bill.

Members who wish to offer amendments to the bill should submit 55 copies of their amendments, together with a brief explanation, to the Rules Committee office in H-312 of the Capitol, no later than noon on Monday, July 8.

Amendments should be drafted to the bill as ordered reported by the Appropriations Committee. Copies of the text will be available for examination by Members and staff in the offices of the Appropriations Committee in H-218 of the Capitol.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

Any off-set amendments should be scored by CBO to ensure compliance with clause 2(f) of rule 21, which requires that they not increase the overall levels of budget authority and outlays in the bill.

We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in submitting their amendments by the noon, July 8, deadline in properly drafted form.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 182, DISAPPROVING EXTENSIONS OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS TO PRODUCTS OF PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 461, REGARDING THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 463 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 463

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 182) disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The joint resolution shall be debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means (in opposition to the joint resolution) and a Member in support of the joint resolution. Pursuant to sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion. The provisions of sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974 shall not apply to any other joint resolution disapproving the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the People's Republic of China for the remainder of the One Hundred Fourth Congress.

SEC. 2. After disposition of House Joint Resolution 182 pursuant to the first section of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 461) regarding human rights abuses, nuclear and chemical weapons proliferation, illegal weapons trading, military intimidation of Taiwan, and trade violations by the People's Republic of China and the People's Liberation Army, and directing the committees of jurisdiction to commence hearings and report appropriate legislation. The resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Cox of California or his designee and a Member opposed to the resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 463 is a rule providing for the consideration of two measures. The first measure is House Joint Resolution 182, a resolution disapproving the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China. It was introduced by

the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] on June 13, and it was ordered reported adversely by the Committee on Ways and Means on June 18 by a vote of 31 to 6.

Although the Trade Act of 1974 already provides procedures for considering such disapproval resolutions without a special rule, there are two principal reasons why this rule is necessary.

First, the Trade Act provides for 20 hours of debate on such disapproval resolutions. This special rule narrows that down to 2 hours, equally divided between a proponent and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. ARCHER, in opposition. The rule also provides for consideration in the House instead of the Committee of the Whole as it ordinarily would be.

Second, the Trade Act does not waive points of order against his disapproval resolutions. This rule waives all points of order against House Joint Resolution 182 and its consideration. We are aware of only one need for a waiver, and that is the 3-day availability requirement for the committee report.

Since the bill and report were only filed yesterday, Tuesday, by the Committee on Ways and Means, and today is only the first rather than the third day of its availability, this rule and waiver are necessary.

Under the Trade Act procedures, disapproval resolutions are not subject to amendment or to a motion to recommend. This rule does not alter either of those provisions of the statute. Neither does the rule alter the statutory division of debate time between proponents and opponents.

After the 2 hours of debate provided by the rule, the previous question is ordered to final passage without intervening motion, meaning there will be no amendments and no motion to recommit, consistent with the statutory provisions of the 1974 Trade Act. We live by the law.

In addition to the two reasons I have cited for why this rule is necessary, the rule provides for the consideration of a tandem piece of legislation following the disposition of the disapproval resolution. That measure is House Resolution 461, introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] just yesterday.

Under the terms of this rule, the Cox resolution will be debated in the House for 1 hour, equally divided between Mr. COX or his designee, and a Member opposed to the resolution.

As with the disapproval resolution, the rule orders the previous question on the Cox resolution to final adoption without intervening motion, meaning no amendments and no motion to recommit. In other words, on both resolutions this House will be given a straight up-or-down vote, and that is the fair way to do it.

The Cox resolution is a simple House resolution, meaning that it does not require Senate approval or Presidential signature for it to be effective. The res-

olution contains a number of findings in the preamble regarding human rights abuses, nuclear and chemical weapon proliferation, illegal weapons trading, military intimidation of Taiwan, and trade violations by the People's Republic of China and the People's Liberation Army.

It then concludes with a single resolving clause that directs the various committees of jurisdiction, including the Committees on Ways and Means, International Relations, and Banking and Financial Services, to hold hearings on the matters and concerns addressed in the preamble and, if appropriate, to report legislation addressing these matters to the House not later than September 30 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, those are the provisions of this rule. I think they will provide the House with ample opportunity over the next 4 hours to fully debate the critical problem of Communist China.

The Committee on Rules had a rather extensive debate on these issues last night before we reported this rule by a unanimous voice vote. I hope this rule will receive the same measure of bipartisan support we had in the Rules Committee.

On the resolutions themselves, I would urge support for both of them, for one simple reason, and let me say this loud and clear: The policy of engagement with Communist China has failed, failed, failed.

Despite what some proponents of business as usual will say today, all one needs to do is read the papers every single day to know that Communist China is a rogue dictatorship that is running amok and is absolutely contemptuous of our weak-kneed policy of appeasement. The examples of abhorrent and dangerous behaviors by this dictatorship are too numerous to even list. Here are just a few.

First, as we speak there is a vicious crackdown on dissent taking place in Tibet, and we all ought to keep this in mind as we deliberate this issue. It is pathetic, Mr. Speaker, it is so sad.

We must remember that we are talking about a Communist dictatorship that commits crimes against its own people every single day.

Mr. Speaker, we also must remember that Communist China represents a growing threat to the national security interests of this country, and that will be brought out during the next 4 hours of debate. Backed by its rapidly growing military power, Communist China has begun to throw its weight around in East Asia, bullying our democratic friends in Taiwan and acting very aggressively in the Spratly Islands.

Most of all, we should be very concerned about recent attempts by China to acquire SS-18 intercontinental nuclear missiles from Russia which could directly threaten the American people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning to proliferation matters, well, here the proponents of appeasement have really got some explaining to do. Hardly a day goes by when we do not read about

things like Chinese nuclear ring magnet shipments to places like Pakistan, chemical weapons technology transfers to Iran, cruise missile shipments to Iran, uranium processing technology to Iran, plutonium processing technology to Pakistan, and the list goes on and on and on. I could stand here for 20 minutes and continue reading these kind of rogue activities by this government.

Mr. Speaker, the real issue here today, though, is jobs, jobs, jobs, issues that our China policy really hits home on. Once again, our trade deficit with Communist China has surged, and now stand at \$34 billion. I wish every one of the men here in this body would take off their shirts and show me the label in the collar on their shirts. I bet them dollars to doughnuts there is not one made in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, Communist China does not grant fair access to our goods, period. Meanwhile, we continue to give China carte blanche in our markets with most-favored-nation trading status.

Mr. Speaker, this so-called relationship with Communist China that some people are obsessed with maintaining destroys American jobs, and this has got to stop. We have the power, especially the economic power, with 250 million Americans with the highest standard of living in the world and that buying power to bring pressure to bear on these tyrants, and we ought to use that, without firing a shot. We do it economically.

Terminating MFN is the 2 by 4 we need to get their attention. When the vast American market for Communist Chinese goods is shut off, even temporarily, these greedy dictators will start to show a little bit of flexibility. That is the only kind of language they understand.

So let us use it today by voting "aye" on the Rohrabacher resolution of disapproval of most-favored-nation trading status for Communist China. It does not have to be for a year, it does not have to be for 6 months. It can be for only 30 days. We would see them sit down at the table and start negotiating fair trading practices with America.

Mr. Speaker, after we pass the Cox resolution directing four committees of this House to hold hearings and report legislation on how to deal with this problem, those committees ought to report only substantive legislation which takes punitive measures against this outlaw regime which is in fact an enemy of the United States of America and certainly of every working American.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include the following extraneous material for the RECORD:

[From the Weekly Standard, June 3, 1996]

MOST FAVORED NATION—OR MOST APPEASED?

(By Robert Kagen)

Bill Clinton's announcement last week that he will seek unconditional renewal of China's most-favored-nation status is the

latest evidence of a metamorphosis remarkable even for this president. Though he relentlessly attacked the Bush administration's China policy as bereft of human-rights concerns during his 1992 candidacy, in office Clinton has become the spiritual godson of Henry Kissinger. After a very brief flirtation with risky originality, Clinton has sought safety in the conventional wisdom of the bipartisan foreign policy and business elite, in which he stands shoulder to shoulder with his presidential rival, Bob Dole.

Incoherence on China is not unique to Bill Clinton's foreign policy. It has been a problem for politicians of both parties since the late 1980s. The collapse of the Soviet Union and its Communist empire swept away the original foundation on which the Sino-American rapprochement was built in the early 1970s. America's interests and priorities have shifted as policymakers must now grapple with how to manage a world in which the United States is the sole superpower. At the same time, China's place in the constellation of global powers has shifted; from its position as the weakest side of the Sino-Soviet-American triangle as recently as 10 years ago, China seems poised over the coming decade to become the principal challenger to American dominance of the world order.

The lack of clarity and resolve in American policy toward China today is due to the failure of policymakers to recognize these changes and reorient American strategy to deal with them. The result has been worse than incoherence. American policies these days are starting to look a lot like the kind of appeasement that eventually leads to disaster.

Twenty-five years ago, the logic of the U.S.-China relationship was clear. At a time when American power seemed in Vietnam-saturated decline, Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger were searching for quick and easy ways of redressing the increasingly unfavorable U.S.-Soviet balance while shoring up Nixon's political standing at home. Playing the "China card" looked like a brilliant strategic gambit, a simple matter, as Kissinger recalled in his memoirs, of "align[ing] oneself with the weaker of two antagonistic partners, because this acted as a restraint on the stronger." Kissinger did not share the view of State Department Sinophiles that good relations with China were a worthy end in themselves; he considered them a means to the end of shaping Soviet behavior and inducing Soviet leaders to accept the outstretched hand of détente. Indeed, as former Kissinger aide Peter W. Rodman has noted, the real purpose of "triangular diplomacy" was not to forge a permanent strategic partnership with China against Russia but "to secure better relations with both."

The shift to a more enduring strategic partnership with China came during the Carter administration under the direction of national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski. Alarmed at the Soviet Union's increasing adventurousness in the Third World from Africa to Southeast Asia, Brzezinski sought to involve the Chinese more directly on the U.S. side in the worldwide anti-Soviet struggle. Kissinger aimed at playing both Communist giants against each other, but Brzezinski in 1978 traveled to Beijing to tell Deng Xiaoping that the United States had "made up its mind" and had chosen China. The price the Carter administration willingly paid for this new strategic partnership was the completion of the process of normalization Nixon had begun, including the revocation of U.S. recognition of Taiwan. In American foreign policy circles, Brzezinski's actions firmly established the still-extant bipartisan consensus on the overriding strategic importance of U.S.-Chinese relations.

The world of the 1970s looked very different from today's, however. The West was suffering from a paralyzing loss of confidence in its institutions and its liberal values. Communism still seemed to many around the world, and even to some in the United States, a viable if not superior alternative to capitalism. The great, resurgent successes of liberal capitalism—the Reagan boom here, the rise of the economic "tigers" in East Asia—lay in the future. The policymakers of the 1970s could not even have begun to imagine the worldwide democratic revolution that began in the 1980s in Latin America and Asia and then spread to Central and Eastern Europe and Russia. Instead, the United States was surrounded by dictatorships in its own hemisphere and maintained supportive relations with them and many others around the world.

In such a world, the strategic value of American rapprochement and then partnership with a Communist China seemed to outweigh the sacrifice of American ideals such a relationship required. Churchill had been willing to "sup with the devil" in order to defeat Hitler; few questioned the logic of closer U.S.-Chinese ties in a world where democracy and capitalism seemed to be imperiled by an expanding Soviet empire. In a world filled with dictatorships of both the left- and right-wing varieties, moreover, few believed the United States could afford to be picky about how its allies governed themselves.

Which is not to say that everyone in the United States was enthusiastic about the new partnership with Communist China. Conservative Republicans, including the old "China Lobby" with its bitter memories of 1949 and the "betrayal" of Chiang Kaishek, opposed some elements of the new course—especially when it was conducted by the Democratic administration of Jimmy Carter. Thus Robert Dole, although a devoted supporter of Nixon, vigorously opposed Carter's normalization of relations with China at the end of 1978. After normal ties were established, as Jim Mann of the Los Angeles Times has recently noted, Dole called on the White House to invite the president of Taiwan to Washington. From the floor of the Senate in 1979, he insisted that the Taiwan Relations Act must not leave America's old ally undefended against aggression by America's new ally. And when Carter proposed extending most-favored-nation status to China in 1980, Dole led the opposition and introduced legislation denying it to any nation that, like China, had not yet signed the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

Despite these efforts by its Republican allies, however, the authoritarian regime in Taiwan had a difficult time winning much support in the United States. The dominant view of American policymakers in both parties was that holding the prized China card was essential to America's strategic well-being and that other issues—like sentimental ties to Taiwan, like the sharp ideological differences between China and the United States—had to be set aside.

The resurgence of American power and will under Ronald Reagan ought to have changed this and many other calculations. And to some extent during the 1980s, it did. Reagan, who had achieved preeminence in the Republican party partly by leading a crusade against the Nixon-Kissinger foreign policy, did not share Kissinger's and Brzezinski's strong attachment to the China card. Reagan himself was a longtime supporter of Taiwan, and as Peter Rodman points out, in the Reagan administration "even the younger officials making Asia policy . . . thought that the Nixon, Ford, and Carter administration had all gone overboard in their sentimentality about China."

There was also strategic logic to the Reagan administration's de-emphasis of the relationships with China. At a time when Reagan was determined to challenge the Soviets directly on all fronts, both militarily and ideologically, a China policy born in a time of strategic weakness was less compelling. Reagan simply didn't believe he needed China as much as Nixon and Carter had.

The worldwide ideological offensive that Reagan launched at the start of his second year in office, moreover, could not fail to affect the nature of relations between the United States and China. By the mid-1980s, much of the world appeared to be moving steadily in the direction of liberal economics and liberal government. The dire circumstances that had given birth to the U.S.-China strategic partnership in the 1970s were rapidly giving way in the 1980s to a new international situation that required a recalculation of the value of close ties between the two global powers.

Finally, the beginning of the collapse of the Soviet empire in 1989 and the emergence of the United States as the world's dominant military, economic, cultural, and ideological power utterly shattered the original rationale for Sino-American partnership. In the post-Cold War era it was ludicrous to speak of playing the China card, as Kissinger had, to convince Moscow to embrace détente; or as Brzezinski had, to combat Soviet aggression in the Third World. It was no longer possible to describe U.S.-China relations as "align[ing] oneself with the weaker of two antagonistic partners," given the Soviet Union's free fall and China's explosive economic growth.

China itself had appeared to be part of the global trend toward freedom throughout the 1980s. The "Four Modernization," begun under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping in the late 1970s helped produce the Chinese economic miracle we know today. A Chinese "democracy movement" soon emerged, calling for a "Fifth Modernization," free elections, and in some instances openly praising American-style democracy. Though it was subject to government harassment, the existence of the democracy movement suggested to many American observers that political reform in China was the inevitable next step after Doug's economic reforms.

The massacre at Tiananmen Square in 1989 and the subsequent suppression of dissidents, which continues to this day, dashed these hopes. It could hardly have been better timed to force the United States to reconsider the unpleasant bargain it had made with its conscience in the 1970s. At the same time the old strategic rationale for the U.S.-China partnership was vanishing, the Chinese government cast a bright light on the acute ideological differences between the two countries. Indeed, after Tiananmen, China emerged as the most powerful opponent of American liberal principles in the world.

In the ensuing years, China would significantly increase its military spending, even as both Soviet and American defense spending declined, and with the clear aim of using its growing military power to enhance its influence abroad. The fruits of these efforts have been apparent in recent years, as China, in the words of Sen. John McCain, has increasingly been "displaying very aggressive behavior"—in the South China Sea, against a newly democratic Taiwan, and in a growing propensity to make arms sales to many of the world's rogue states.

Under these new circumstances, it would seem to make little sense to continue pursuing the old Cold War policies toward China. Yet remarkably, that is just what the Bush administration tried to do after 1989, and

what the purveyors of the bipartisan consensus, including most recently the Clinton administration, have been trying to do ever since. Even after the Cold War, the United States maintained "overriding strategic interests in engaging China," former secretary of state James Baker declares in his memoirs, but nowhere does he explain exactly what those "overriding strategic interests" are.

In fact, the most common explanations of the strategic importance of the U.S.-China relationship today are fraught with contradictions. American business leaders, and their supporters in the administration and Congress, constantly point to China's potentially vast market for American goods. But it is striking how unimpressive the economic numbers really are. Last year, American merchandise exports to China amounted to \$12 billion, about 2 percent of overall exports. By comparison, American exports to Taiwan, with a population one-sixtieth as large as the mainland's, were \$19 billion. Meanwhile, China has amassed a \$34 billion trade surplus with the United States, enough to send Patrick Buchanan into fits of protectionist hysteria. Well might the boosters of the U.S.-China trade relationship insist, like Rep. Toby Roth, that "the key is not where China is today. What is important is where China is headed." But how impressive does the future look? Roth boasts that "in just 15 years, China will be our 13th largest export market." Now there's a strategic imperative!

In the late 19th century, many American businessmen succumbed to what some historians now call "the myth of the China market." The businessmen, the politicians, and the policymakers of the day could see only the unimaginable bounty that lay in the future of such a populous country—even though earnings in the near-term proved minuscule and businesses had to suffer losses in an effort to wheedle their way into the good graces of the Chinese powers that controlled foreign trade. A full century later, the bounty is still elusive, but the myth is just as potent.

And today's proponents of the China trade on strategic grounds have adopted another 19th-century nostrum as well: the conviction that increasing trade is the solvent for all the problems of mankind. Nations that trade with one another, the theory goes, will not let clashing strategic interests get in the way of making a buck. After all, Rep. Roth insists, "Economic strength, not military might, determines the world's great powers today." In testimony before Congress recently, Clinton administration official Stuart Eizenstat defended the renewal of most-favored-nation status for China on the grounds that the "commercial relationship provides one of the strongest foundations for our engagement." Argues undersecretary of state Peter Tarnoff: "Our economic and commercial relations increase China's stake in cooperating with us and in complying with international norms." Robert Dole, once the mainland's foe, now agrees: In a May 9 speech, he argued that "extension of most-favored-nation status [is] the best way to promote our long-term interests in China. . . . In China, continuing trade offers the prospect of continuing change."

Is that true? Few Republicans and conservatives would say that trade will reform Castro's Cuba. Nor would they be likely to forget that during the Cold War, the Jackson-Vanik restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union did not prevent political liberalization. On the contrary, the denial of most-favored-nation status to the Soviets may have encouraged reform by forcing the Communist leaders in Moscow to undertake political liberalization as the prerequisite for economic growth.

The view that economics is paramount while military, strategic, and political issues are of declining importance—so-called Manchester liberalism—was rampant in the 19th and early 20th centuries, right up until the outbreak of World War I. It is as dangerous a misconception today as it was then. Nevertheless, this assumption now lies at the heart of American China policy. We need to engage so we can trade, say the businessmen; yes, say the China experts, and we need to trade so we can engage.

In their search for a new rationale for preserving a close relationship between the United States and China, the adherents of today's bipartisan consensus have had to employ such logic constantly. Indeed, the logic of the U.S.-China relationship today has turned in on itself. In the 1970s, the case for strategic partnership with China was that it was necessary to meet the threat posed by the Soviet Union. Today, it seems, strategic partnership with China is necessary to meet the threat posed by China. Secretary of State Warren Christopher put the case best in his speech on May 17. He noted the "importance of China to our future security and well-being." And what, in addition to the lure of the market, is that importance? The answer is that "China can tip the balance in Asia between stability and conflict." In other words, we need a good relationship with China because China is dangerous. Or as Eizenstat put it, "It is when China's policies are the most difficult that engagement becomes the most essential."

It's a nice racket the Chinese have going. By the current circular logic of American policy, the more trouble the Chinese make—whether in Taiwan, or on trade, or in the South China Sea, or in weapons sales to rogue states—the harder the United States has to work to "engage." There is no dispute on this point now between the leading figures of both parties. Henry Kissinger, in an op-ed piece a few weeks ago, declared that "after Chinese leaders had been pilloried and threatened with sanctions for years," what was needed now was "a serious strategic and political dialogue, . . . a sustained effort to define a common assessment of the future of Asia." Christopher soon after announced his intention to "develop a more regular dialogue between our two countries." The idea is that regular consultations will "facilitate a candid exchange of views, provide a more effective means for managing specific problems, and allow us to approach individual issues within the broader strategic framework of our overall relationship."

We may be forgiven for doubting whether such candid talks will make a big difference. After all, it's not as if efforts at assiduous diplomacy haven't been tried. After the massacre in Tiananmen Square in 1989, President Bush and his secretary of state saw their man task as protecting the important strategic relationship with China from American outrage at Beijing's massive abuse of individual rights. According to Baker, President Bush's first reaction upon hearing of the assault at Tiananmen was: "It's going to be difficult to manage this problem." And indeed it was, as Baker's memoirs amply demonstrate. Baker employed precisely the negotiating style that the China experts insist is the only kind capable of producing results—quiet negotiations, no public threats, none of the "spasmodic harassment" Kissinger finds so detrimental, and constant attention to the fact that, as Baker writes, "face is unusually important to [the Chinese], so an interlocutor must negotiate a delicate balance that nudges them toward a preferred course without embarrassing them in the process." Despite all this subtle diplomacy, the Chinese gave Baker absolutely nothing for his troubles. Chinese officials, Baker re-

calls, "had no compunction about asking for American concessions while simultaneously ignoring my request for 'visible and positive Chinese steps' to make it easier to allay congressional and public anger with Beijing." Throughout the four years of the Bush administration, Baker acknowledges, "the Chinese relationship essentially treaded water."

Under present policies, in the years to come the United States will continue to tread water, or worse. The truth is, our posture today is, simply, plain old appeasement. One bit of proof is that we are not supposed even to use the word "containment" to describe our policy toward China lest we suggest to the Chinese that in some way we may consider them adversaries. The United States "should not, and will not, adopt a policy of containment towards China," declares Undersecretary Tarnoff. Why not? Because "we would gain nothing and risk much if China were to become isolated and unstable." In other words, even if it were necessary to contain China, it would be too dangerous to attempt the task. This is Kissinger's view, as well. Any attempt to pursue a policy of "containment" of China, Kissinger has argued, is "reckless" and a "pipe dream."

Such a skittish approach to another world power might be forgivable if our own nation were weak. But the same people who fear a policy of "containment" often boast that China needs the United States more than the United States needs China. In a trade war, for instance, Eizenstat argues that "China has a lot more to lose than we do." Like that \$34 billion trade surplus, for instance. According to Baker, the Chinese "need our help to sustain their economic growth." And Baker, who got nowhere in four years if subtle diplomacy with Beijing, even believes that the Chinese understand toughness: "Strength inevitably irritates the Chinese, but they understand it. And the absence of resolve in dealing with them can lead to serious miscalculation on their part."

And yet "the absence of resolve" would seem to be the best characterization of the policy that the Bush administration and now the Clinton administration have chosen to pursue toward China. When Baker negotiated with the Chinese during the Bush years, he always went out of his way to make clear that the Bush administration was entirely "committed to maintaining the relationship," that it was always "seeking ways to reconcile our estrangement." Little wonder that, according to Baker, the Chinese "seemed utterly oblivious to our concerns." It is axiomatic that if the United States enters all negotiations with China with the mutual understanding that ultimately American leaders will not allow an estrangement in the relationship, then the Chinese will win in most of the negotiations.

In every relationship between nations there is a horse and a rider, Bismarck once noted, and one should endeavor to be the rider. American policy toward China today almost guarantees that we will be the horse.

How can the United States restore the resolve that James Baker believes is so essential to effective dealings with China? This week Congress is debating and voting on the renewal of most-favored-nation status for China. It will surely pass, and perhaps it ought to. The fact of U.S.-China relations should not rest on this relatively narrow issue. The problem with our China policy goes deeper than simple trade rules. Dealing with an increasingly powerful and ambitious China over the coming years will require a strong and determined America willing either to engage or to contain China, depending on Chinese behavior.

Still, most-favored-nation status has become a symbol of China's whip hand over us.

Our unwillingness to pay what is still a relatively small economic price in terms of lost trade opportunities; our fear that any crisis in U.S.-Chinese relations that might result from denial of most-favored-nation status is too dangerous to risk; our concern that in any confrontation it is we, not they, who will be most likely to blink—these are all sizable cracks in our armor the Chinese can exploit, have exploited, and, indeed, are exploiting.

Thus one can only conclude that before we can conduct a successful strategy of compelling China to "play by the rules of the international system," in the words of Bob Dole, we will have to break our addiction to the China-market myth. And that can only come about if policymakers, economists, and businessmen begin to look at the hard truth and stop allowing their dreams of a gold rush to outweigh more vital concerns—not only America's strategic interests, but the basic liberties of more than a billion people living beneath the yoke.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, for yielding me the customary half hour and I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make two things clear at the beginning of this debate.

First of all, the people's Republic of China has one of the worst human rights records in the world. The unconscionable mistreatment of the Chinese citizens is completely abhorrent. And we, the United States of America, need to do absolutely everything we can to change it.

Second, most-favored-nation status is not special treatment. Most-favored-nation trading status is the status this country accords to 181 countries, nearly every country in the world.

Only seven nations are not granted MFN trade status with the United States.

Since February 1, 1980, China has received MFN status under the 1974 Trade Act. The particulars of this law, the so-called Jackson-Vanik amendment, requires nonmarket economies—or communist countries—to have their trade status reconsidered each year.

Jackson-Vanik passed in 1974 and is based entirely on an outdated cold war strategy—that was put into effect 22 years ago, Mr. Speaker.

Today, Communism continues to crumble around the globe. Each time a country embraces democracy it is thanks entirely to our diplomatic efforts. And we shouldn't stop now.

Because, Mr. Speaker, one quarter of the world's population live in China—1.2 billion people. And very single one of them deserves their chance at freedom and democracy. Just as other people enjoy.

The choice is isolationism or direct engagement. And we accomplished very little with isolationism.

So unless we maintain normal trade relations with China—we lose the chance to show those 1.2 billion people how great democracy is. We lose the chance to end the unspeakable human rights abuse and the horrifying popu-

lation control efforts that take place in China.

This is our chance to lift the iron curtain of oppression and show one quarter of our world what democracy is like.

And, Mr. Speaker, we've tried it the other way. We tried isolating China 20 years ago. It didn't work then and I don't think it will work today. In fact, I would argue that it actually made the oppression worse.

It's time to try something else. Because every day that these abuses take place; every day a baby girl is abandoned or worse; every day a student fighting for freedom is jailed—we share in some of the guilt. I for one believe we must do every thing we can to end these abuses and end them here and end them now.

If we do not take this chance we wash our hands of the lives of the Chinese people. We pass on the opportunity to negotiate with them on human rights. We pass on the chance to negotiate on nuclear weapons.

If we pass on the chance to talk to China, Mr. Speaker, we got no one to blame but ourselves when they don't listen.

MFN status will help the people of China by bringing businesses into the country, increasing wages, and putting increased pressure on the Chinese Government to improve their human rights record.

I think it's a good idea. It is a good rule, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 2400

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON], who is an outstanding freshman Member of this body. He has spent a lot of time in China and Taiwan.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity. This is something that every one of us has struggled with. I know I have probably spent more time on this issue in the last 6 months than I have any other issue, because it really cuts to the core of our values.

Of course we decry the human rights abuses that have happened in China. They are terrible, they are vile. Of course we are very sick and saddened by the nonproliferation issues that continue to be violated in China. Of course we are saddened and we are upset by the fact that they are pirating our software and our music and we are losing billions of dollars because of that. Of course we are sickened and saddened, me especially; having served a mission for my church in Taiwan, nobody was angrier than I to see friends and loved ones over there that I worked so long with for the 2 years, that I was there being threatened by missiles in the Taiwan Strait when that occurred. When we look at all of these terrible, terrible atrocities that

are being committed in China, I think the gut instinct is let us come down hard, let us show them that we mean business. Let us get back to what John Wayne would do and be tough with these guys and make them learn a lesson. But I fear that throwing the baby out with the bath water is the worst thing that we could possibly do.

Think about it. Has there ever been any relationship in your life that you have improved upon or imparted your values to by walking away from that relationship? Severing MFN with China would be tantamount to a declaration of war, I believe, and would lead, I think, ultimately to a cold war, because relationships would quickly deteriorate and ultimately most sides would end up not communicating.

We in our Western understanding of things believe that we know that the right thing to do is to be tough with these people, but let us look at the idea of saving face that is so important to the Chinese culture.

I believe that the freedoms that we enjoy, the values that we hold dearly, will only come to pass in China when the people in China rise up and make it so. A great philosopher once said, more powerful than any invading army or any tactic is an idea whose time has come. I believe the idea of freedom is an idea whose time has come in China, as it was in Taiwan about 20 years ago.

When I lived in Taiwan, it was an oppressive regime. You could not speak out against the government. Freedom of the press was nonexistent. But economic reform spurred political reform, and the same thing will happen in China. But we have got to be articulate in our values. I think the administration can do a better job, a much better job articulating our values, but we will not improve anything if we walk away from the table, and the very things that we care so deeply about will be harmed irreparably if we walk away from this relationship.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Mr. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me the time and rise in opposition to the rule, with all the greatest regard for the chairman of the Committee on Rules and our distinguished ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for the following reason. This issue before the House of Representatives this evening is a very important one to the American people. Nothing less is at stake than our economic future, our democratic principles, and our national security. That is why I oppose this rule, because this rule says that tomorrow, while Members are away during a funeral and votes are not going to happen until 3 o'clock, we will have our chance to debate the rule while Members are not here. Then, after Members return, we will be given 15 minutes to make our case against MFN for China. I cannot support the

curbing of debate that is happening in the House of Representatives under this rule.

I know the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee did his best, but I think that this rule is an arrogant act on the part of the Republican leadership to stifle debate here on this issue. What are they afraid of? Are they afraid of the truth? Are they afraid of the American people weighing in? Are they afraid, as we had hoped, that this debate would take place when it always has in July? Are they afraid of 100,000 young people who gathered in Golden Gate Park to promote freedom of expression in Tibet, who heard from a monk who had been imprisoned by the Chinese for 33 years describe his torture by the Chinese, and who was freed only by international pressure led by the Italian government? Are they afraid of those people?

Why can we not have this debate while Members who here in Congress? Why can we not have the appropriate time, as we have always had, for the grassroots people to weigh in? They believe, and I hope they are always right, that their opinion makes a difference to their Member of Congress and that they should have the opportunity for public comment that the fast track of MFN allows, provides for, but that this leadership in this House of Representatives has decided to curtail. That is why I oppose the rule.

Let us talk about what is at stake. The previous speaker talked about economic reform leading to political reform. Well, let us quote directly from not my word but this administration's own country report on China, on the subject of repression in China. The State Department country report says, "The experience of China in the past few years demonstrates that while economic growth, trade and social mobility create an improved standard of living, they cannot by themselves bring about greater respect for human rights in the absence of a willingness by political authorities to abide by the fundamental international norms." It went on further to say that by year's end, this is 1995, almost all public dissent against the public authorities was silenced.

Why is this important also in terms of proliferation? I said first about our democratic principles being at stake. We talk about democratic principles. We want to ban investment in Burma, no business going on there. But when it comes to China, we cannot even raise a tariff because some businesses might lose a profit on their bottom line, because it is certainly not about American jobs. This is a job loser for America.

We can see by this chart, Mr. Speaker, maybe you cannot, the trade balance with China, when we started this debate in 1989, was reported for 1988 to be \$3,479 million. In that time, it has increased 1,000 percent. The trade deficit for last year as reported in this 7-year period is \$34 billion. Yes, that

gives us leverage. It is not about any country that has human rights abuses, dear ranking member. It is about a country that has a \$34 billion trade deficit with the United States, which gives us leverage, which should give us leverage.

Certainly we are not going to revoke MFN for China; the President will not allow it. We should certainly use our voices and our leverage on that issue to send a strong message from this Congress at least that we will stand for human rights. It is not enough to say they have merit or that even they have priority but they are important enough for us to use our muscle on them, our economic muscle on them.

In addition to this trade deficit, we have the transfer of technology to China which businesses are doing. We are almost encouraging it so they can access the market. We have the ripping off of our intellectual property. That piracy is not even counted of the billions of dollars in the trade deficit. So it is a better economic future. Where are our jobs? If Boeing is transferring the production of the tail section of their planes to China to be produced by workers who make \$50 a month, how can that be a job winner for us?

On the issue of proliferation, I said it undermined our democratic principles, our moral authority to talk about human rights any place if we cannot talk about it where some business is at stake.

Second, I talked about how this trade with China is robbing our economic future. You want to do business in China? You open up a factory there. You give your technology plans to the government, they open up factories with your technology plans and tell you to create an export plan for the products that you make in China.

This isn't about United States products made in China. Only 2 percent of our exports are allowed into the Chinese market. Over one-third of China's exports flood United States markets. Is this going to isolate China? Where are they going to take one-third of their exports? Let us be reasonable to the American worker.

The third issue is proliferation. I do not have too much time to go into all of that except to say that this administration and the administration before it has looked the other way on the proliferation of missile technology and nuclear technology to Pakistan, of missile technology, nuclear technology, biological technology and chemical technology to Iran, at the same time as we are having nice little resolutions about boycotting Iran and having a secondary boycott on companies that invest in petroleum in Iran until Iran stops its production of weapons of mass destruction. But we do not want to go to the source, the source of that technology to Iran, because some big businesses might lose a little bit of their access.

So this, I repeat, undermines our democratic principles, threatens our

economic future, and threatens our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to vote no on the rule and no on MFN for China.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend the Committee on Rules for coming up with the rule they have. Obviously the vote on the motion to disapprove will be allowed tomorrow and, of course, the other piece of legislation will also be discussed, which will mandate that the four committees of jurisdiction that have jurisdiction over the issues that we are concerned about with China will report back by September 30 after holding hearings and possible legislation. I think it is a good solution in terms of crafting the rule. I think we will be able to get to the nub of the issue with that particular rule.

China is the most important relationship that the United States will have over the next 25 years. China comprises 22 percent of the world population. We cannot isolate the Chinese. If we walk away from the Chinese, the Japanese, the Europeans, the Brazilians, every other country will go into China.

So we have to engage the Chinese. I think, as the gentleman from Arizona said, if we cut off MFN, that is tantamount to declaring war with China. China then will become a very belligerent power. Right now they are not expansionary, as we saw with the Soviet Union. But if China should become expansionary and build up their armaments, then the Japanese, then the South Koreans, then the Indonesians, then all of Asia will build up arms and we will have a tinderbox in Asia for the next 10 to 20 years and it will be a threat to world peace and a threat to our children and grandchildren. That is why this issue is important.

□ 0015

Now let me address for a moment the issue of the trade deficit. If we can stop spending 6 months a year on the issue of Most Favored Nation status with China, we can then get to the issues of opening up the Chinese market. And we can do it by exercising section 301, just as we saw last week on the issue of intellectual properties. What we did there, if my colleagues will recall, is tell the Chinese we will impose \$2.3 billion worth of sanctions against them unless they come to an agreement with us on the piracy of our intellectual property. They have agreed with us.

Now, obviously, we are going to have to make sure that agreement is enforced. But the fact of the matter is that the only way we are going to be able to deal with the Chinese is by engaging them, not by trying to isolate them, because that will not work. And the key obviously is the fact that we must try to bring China into the civilized nations of the world over time.

So I would support this rule. I would obviously vote against the motion that the gentleman of the Committee on Rules will offer, and certainly support the gentleman's resolution that will require the four committees to look into this matter, hold hearings and obviously pass legislation should it become necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California, Mr. DUKE CUNNINGHAM, a member of the Committee on National Security.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the rule and in opposition to MFN.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], another valuable member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Glens Falls, NY, and I rise in support of this eminently good and wise, non-controversial rule, and I am asking to revise and extend my remarks in deference to my colleagues at this late hour, and I would suggest to the gentlewoman from California that the problem is scheduling, not rulemaking.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Glens Falls, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, a rule that will allow for the timely consideration of a bill to disapprove normalized trade relations with China. Or, in the archaic language of diplomacy, we are considering China's Most Favored Nation status, which the President has recently renewed. MFN for China has become a perennial issue—year after year we debate whether or not Congress should overrule the decision to renew normal trade relations—there are no special deals here—with China, the country with the largest population in the world. I welcome the debate, but I will again oppose raising additional trade barriers to one of the world's fastest growing economies. To do so would cost American jobs and ultimately diminish western democratic influence in this crucial region. I agree that China's leaders have acted in bad faith in areas of human rights, arms trades, and intellectual property. These problems must be addressed—and they will be—through the proper channels. We cannot ignore our leadership responsibilities in encouraging democratization and responsible actions in China, but this is exactly what we would be doing if we quit the field today. We must stay engaged in China in order to be a part of the—admittedly slow—process of reform, because many of the reforms in China that we have witnessed to this point have their roots in the free flow of commerce between that country and the United States. So, I urge my colleagues to support the rule, and oppose House Joint Resolution 182.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I think we have to examine what confronts us here. It is not simply what the Chinese do, it is the magnitude to which they can do it. If China was a country of 50, 60, 100 million, even 200 million people, operating with the kind of system that they operate under, we might be able to survive it; 50, 100 million people working in a totally controlled economy, working in prison, slave wages, slave manufacturing, we might be able to, through contact and through constant pressures, make some progress here.

This is a country with 1.2 billion people. Before they have an impact from our economic exchanges they will destroy the economic life of this country if we do not alter the trading practice.

In the last 20 years we have seen the workweek wage of an average factory worker in America drop by \$60, not go up, but go down by \$60 a week. Sixty percent of Americans have lost ground on their paycheck as a flood of Chinese goods have come into this country.

We talk about the French. The French would each have to buy \$4,000 apiece in goods to replace America's demand to China. Forty-five billion dollars of sales in this country does but one thing, it puts American families at risk, it depresses American wages, and it goes on to do damage to our environment.

We can put scrubbers on our factories and clean up the rivers and the pollution that goes into the oceans. As China's economy grows, the pollution it puts into the air and the rivers will continue to devastate the environment of our globe: Missile technology, biotech weapons, chemical weapons proliferated by the Chinese to Iran and every other dangerous corner of the globe.

We were all saddened and frightened by the scene of American personnel barracks in Saudi Arabia being hit by a traditional bomb. What will happen when our Chinese trading partners ship to the Iranians nuclear chemical and biological weapons? What kind of challenges will confront us for the safety of American personnel and indeed the people in this country as well?

China, to be dealt with as a normal trading partner in this global community? Remember the Taiwanese elections a short time ago, as the Taiwanese citizens went to the polls to exercise their right to vote for a new congress and a new president? What did the Chinese government do? They brought their fire power to the straits of Taiwan and tried to intimidate the Taiwanese from a free election.

We have to defend the principles we believe in and the families we represent. The only way to do that is to vote down MFN.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time. I rise in opposition to the rule.

As the gentleman from New York, Chairman SOLOMON, pointed out, this MFN resolution should be given 20 hours of debate, guaranteed by statute. But in a phenomenal show of arrogance, the Republican leadership has said no.

This MFN debate reminds me a little bit of the Medicare debate; Republicans choking off debate, the Gingrich leadership team cutting back-room deals with powerful interest groups, consideration of the legislation in the middle of the night.

This bill will cost millions, will cost millions of American jobs. Our trade deficit with China, as my friend from California said, almost nonexistent only a few years ago, has climbed to \$32 billion a year and rising. Within a couple of years it will surpass that of Japan.

MFN is an economic loser for America. We sell more to Belgium. As a Nation we export more to Belgium than we do to China. Conversely, 40 percent of all of Chinese exports are sold into the United States. Simply put, China needs us more than we need them.

How much more can China do to its people and how much more can China do to rest of the world? How many more times can they stick their thumbs in the eyes of their people and the rest of the world before we in this body finally say to MFN? Massacring students in Beijing, selling nuclear technology to rogue nations, slave labor camps, illegally smuggling 2,000 AK-47s into the United States, forced abortions and sterilizations, forcible seizure of Tibetan children, forcing 12-year-old Chinese children to make toys for 12-year-old American children.

It is time we say no to MFN. It is time we say no to the Chinese government. It is time we say no to those abuses. Vote no on the rule, vote no on MFN.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to the previous speaker that the way to be effective on the floor of this Congress is to be as less partisan as we can.

If the gentleman would notice, even the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], and myself and others have been critical of this administration and the previous administrations. We have been critical of both political parties. But when the gentleman stands up here and says the arrogance of the Republican Party by limiting this debate, which should have 20 hours of debate, to 4 hours, let me tell him it was done on a bipartisan basis and it was done, the same thing, under 15 consecutive Democrat leaderships. So let us be bipartisan about this and keep it on a high plane.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr.

WOLF]. On the highest plane I know, this man has been a leader and advocate of human rights throughout the entire world for his entire career here.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I do not even know what to say. I feel so bound up inside about what we are doing tonight. This is fundamentally an evil group of people. This is the evil empire of modern times.

They have Catholic priests and bishops in jail as we now speak who are being tortured. They are torturing Buddhist monks and raping Buddhist nuns. They have more slave labor gulag camps than they had when Solzhenitsyn wrote "Gulag Archipelago." They were selling AK-47's and shoulder missiles that could take 747s out of the sky in Boston, in Chicago, or in L.A.

This is a fundamentally evil group of people, and I worry that 3 or 4 years from now we will have to deal with those people on a military basis. I wish we had a better piece of tandem legislation. The piece of tandem legislation does not do MFN? If they get it, fine, but we should have abolished the People's Liberation Army and done all these things that are important.

The last thing is, having served here since 1980, no Member of Congress would have had the guts or the courage to come to this floor during the 1980s, when Scharansky was in Perm Camp 35 and Sakharov was under house arrest, no Member of Congress would have had the guts or the courage to stand up and say that we should have given the Soviet Union MFN. And now we are just clamoring to give it to a regime that is the evil empire number one of this world.

I oppose the rule, but the rule is important. I just oppose MFN. I think all of us have to ask ourselves, and the gentleman from New Jersey, CHRIS SMITH, said it better than anybody, what threshold do we have in our own conscience that will make us finally say enough is enough? If they continue to do next year what they have done this year, raping nuns and imprisoning bishops and priests, what will be enough is enough? Each person should ask their own conscience that because we will have to deal with this issue again.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and with all the admiration that I have, both in my head and in my heart, for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] who are two very strong advocates of human rights, it just shows even more strongly what a tough issue this is for everybody.

I am a strong advocate for MFN. I seem to disagree with Mr. WOLF and Ms. PELOSI on this particular issue, but it is not because I am not outraged about MFN, or that I am not upset with the Chinese Government for orphanages and abortion, or that I am

not outraged at the Chinese for the kinds of things that they do in ring sales and foreign sales to the Pakistanis or into the Middle East. But I vote for MFN this year because I vote for the American principles of democracy and human rights, where we have as our pillar, in our foreign policy, that we stress human rights more than any other country in the world.

Now, if we walk away from China, do we have confidence that the Japanese are now going to begin to turn around China? I do not. Korea? No. Europe? No. The United States, with President Carter and President Bush and President Clinton, each one of those individuals can and should do a better job in terms of future Presidents and bilateral relations, stressing our human rights, but we must engage, we must argue, we must debate this issue with maybe the most important country for our citizens in the next 25 to 50 years: 1.3 billion people, the largest standing army.

So for our principles of human rights, I believe we should engage this country and not walk away.

Second, it is because MFN is in our best interests. We are not doing a favor for the Chinese. We create American jobs by doing this. Not right away, not enough with the trade deficit that we have, but let me give Members a quick example.

In Indiana we make brakes for Boeing and McDonnell Douglas commercial airliners. That market is not growing domestically. Our families that get \$16 and \$17 an hour making these brakes for these commercial airliners are not going to have these jobs if we just sell these airliners to Arizona and California and New Jersey.

□ 0030

But if we sell these airliners to Russia, to China, to Korea, to Japan, we will continue to see wages go up for our workers. We will continue to see better security for our work force, and hopefully it will not just be airliners, it will be computers, it will be manufacturing equipment, it will be a host of things. But I have confidence, Mr. Speaker, that Americans will stand up for human rights and will stand up and try to create better jobs for American families.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER], one of the outstanding free traders in this Congress for the last, I guess, 16 years, vice chairman of our Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be on the same side of the issue with my chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], in supporting this rule. I happen to believe that it is a very fair and balanced rule. It has come up in a very timely manner and, as Chairman SOLOMON said earlier, it is following the proce-

dures that we have gone through in the past.

After 7 years of this debate, there is no question at all that the membership of this House, even if they have served here for only 18 months, has had the chance to look at the issue of MFN for China. Cutting off MFN would clearly hurt the United States. It seems to me that, as we look at this question, ending normal relations with China would be devastating. We have all acknowledged that we very much want to do what we can to assist those who have been victimized by reprehensible human rights violations that we have seen for the past several years. Weapons transfers, saber rattling with Taiwan, intellectual property rights violations, Tibet, all of these things are priority concerns of ours.

The fact of the matter is we need to recognize that over the past several years, while the situation was horrible on June 4, 1989, with the Tiananmen Square massacre and many other murders have taken place, we saw a video in our Republican conference yesterday showing that. But if we compare the Cultural Revolution that took place under Mao Tse Tung and the Great Leap Forward and the export of revolution as my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], discussed that took place under Mao Tse Tung to the China of today, while it is not perfect, it is still horrible, it is better than it was. Why? Because today we are engaged.

We disengaged from China with Chiang Kai-shek in 1949, left for Taiwan, up until the last several years, when Richard Nixon began that opening in the 1970's. I will tell my colleagues that, as we look at this issue, are we going to take a step backward and go back to the policies where under Mao Tse Tung 60 million Chinese people were starved, a million people during the Cultural Revolution were killed by the government? The answer is a resounding "no". What we need to do is we need to recognize that the single most powerful force for change is the one that my party stands strongly for, and that is the free market. We believe very strongly in the free market and the power of it.

It is more powerful than any U.S. Government coercion that we could possibly apply. The fact of the matter is, we join together, very much wanting to address these concerns. This rule makes in order a resolution which will allow us to look at the concerns that we will allow us to look at the concerns that we all want to address. But to disengage would be preposterous. The United States of America is the third most populous Nation on the face of the Earth. Yet the People's Republic of China has almost five times the population of the United States.

The gentleman from California, BOB MATSUI, my very dear friend, said it perfectly. Over the next quarter century it is going to be the single most important relationship that we have. It

is very important that we maintain those ties. As I got on a plane, I was stuck in Pittsburgh the night before last. I happened to sit next to a Chinese American civil engineer from Iowa. He brought the issue up to me saying: I lived through the cultural revolution. It was very, very difficult. I saw friends who were victims of the human rights violations, and people were starving. Today when I talk to my family, things have improved. Let us not go back to those horrible times in the past. Let us address our concerns today and move forward.

Support this rule and defeat the resolution of disapproval.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Miami, FL [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], another very valuable member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, last week I finished reading a biography of a Father Maximillian Kolbe, now Saint Maximillian Kolbe. He died at Auschwitz. Pope John Paul has called him the patron saint of our century. In that biography, I learned the name of the company that in August of 1942 was given the contract to build 4 vast crematoria with gas chambers at Auschwitz. The name of the company was Topf and Sohne.

The other company that I learned about, I.G. Farbenindustrie, shared in the profits with the Nazis from the slave labor in the concentration camps.

I wonder if Hitler had not invaded Poland, maybe even afterwards if we had been willing to sit down and reach a peace agreement with him, whether we would not be having tonight's discussion perhaps each year with regard to MFN with the so-called Third Reich. Could we have stopped the construction of the crematoriums had there been engagement? Coexistence with Hitler? Probably not. But would it have been better for an American company to construct the crematoriums than a German company or a French company or a Canadian company? I do not believe so, Mr. Speaker.

I recognize that each situation has its peculiarities in each nation that we deal with. I recognize that China is geographically distanced to the United States and economically very powerful. But I cannot and I will not vote to continue a normal economic relationship with that government that our colleague, Mr. WOLF, has so eloquently described, as well as Mr. SOLOMON, that government of opprobrium.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio, [Ms. KAPTUR] is

recognized for 4 minutes and 30 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlemen for yielding time to me.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule and certainly in strong opposition to MFN. This rule was concocted late last night in the wee hours, around midnight, when none of the Members were here except but a few of us who overheard that there might be a meeting up there in the third corner, none of the press was around.

What we have here is merely another attempt by Speaker GINGRICH and Mr. ARMEY to railroad debate in this House on a measure so vital to the American people as well as to the cause of liberty in China. Under normal circumstances, I guess it would be said, but I am so outraged that it is hard to be sad as we consider this here this evening. In Washington it is now nearly 1 a.m., and most of the membership has gone home. People here are bleary-eyed, and yet this is what we are subjected to.

Tomorrow when most of our membership is gone, we will try to attempt to take up the merits of this. What disrespect we show to Bill Emerson, our dear colleague, by the manner in which this is being conducted.

I also want to say to my good friend, the gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman PELOSI, and to the gentleman from Virginia, FRANK WOLF, this Chamber should treat you better. Everyone of our colleagues who is here and who is a party to this deplorable rule and the manner in which it is being considered, shame on you. Shame on you. Shame on you, Speaker GINGRICH, wherever you are. You were out here making noise a few minutes ago, and Mr. ARMEY, for not showing the courtesy to the Members who have worked so hard to represent the best values that we represent as a country.

But do you know what? I have been at this podium before. I have the benefit of 14 years of seniority in this people's House. I remember when they railroaded GATT through here. Boy, do I remember that. I remember standing in this well and saying, American people, remember this one. I remember some of the Members in here snickered. Do you know what? They do. And I remember the NAFTA vote. I remember we almost carried it, and then 63 deals were made. And do you know what? The American people, they remember that, too.

And now we have got China MFN. It is merely another battle in a war, but it is out there in the country because the country ultimately learns what happens here no matter how hard we try to muzzle debate. In this legislation, the United States becomes the most unfavored nation, the most unfavored nation.

Take a look here. Every single year that we have had most-favored-nation, what a misnomer that is, the United States has amassed growing trade deficits with China. Until this year, we are

at a level of over \$40 billion, which translates into an additional loss at home of 800,000 jobs in this country. By names of companies you know: Nike, we have got Members here who are going to sell out for tennis shoes. We have got members in this Chamber, why, by golly, they are going to sell out for Wal-Mart, 700 sweatshops over in China that make that junk that they send in over to our shores. Well, Bill Clinton gets a lot of money from Sam Walton's family. I feel sad about that. But I care more about freedom and the way people are treated.

We have got some Members here who are going to sell out for Barbie dolls when the vote comes up here tonight and tomorrow. How sad.

You have an accounting to do in a higher life for the votes you will cast on this issue. Commercialism, that is what has become the basis of our foreign policy in the post-cold war world in which we are living.

In fact, the words of democracy, the hope for democracy, respect for the rule of law, the dignity of working people, the promotion of a sustainable environment, those are all illusions as we stand here in this Chamber this evening.

We have no evidence that China has done anything to warrant this favored treatment which will give them a 2 percent tariff level of goods into our market while they maintain a 30 percent to 40 percent tariff against our goods. And they now have the second largest amount of dollars reserves in the world, \$70 billion, which they use to buy weapons pointed at us and at their neighbors. So that is what China MFN creates.

What a shame. What a shame. Maintaining the status quo by voting for MFN is a disgrace.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the arguments over and over: by engaging with China, we can influence the behavior of the Chinese Government with regards to fair trade, human and labor rights, and proliferation. Members on both sides of the aisle have repeatedly expressed skepticism about this approach, and events continue to prove us right.

Recently, a disturbing new rationale for denying MFN has come to light: China has become the major contributor to weapons proliferation and instability in Asia, with Pakistan being one of the major recipients of Chinese nuclear technology and delivery systems.

As has been reported in the media recently, there is undeniable evidence from our own intelligence agencies that Pakistan has deployed nuclear-capable Chinese M-11 missiles, obtained through a secretive transfers that both countries have tried to cover up. Yet, incredibly, despite the overwhelming evidence, the administration seems unwilling to impose the tough economic that both nations clearly deserve.

Unfortunately, this is not the first time that the dangerous, destabilizing transfers of advanced weapons and nuclear technology from China to Pakistan have gone unpunished. Earlier this year, we failed to punish China or Pakistan for the transfer of 5,000 ring magnets, devices used for the production of weapons-grade enriched uranium. We officially bought into the unbelievable Chinese Government explanation that they were unaware of the transfer. We also went ahead with the transfer of \$368 million in United States conventional weapons to Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to get tough with China, Pakistan and other nations contributing to the spread of nuclear weapons. Denying MFN to China is a good place to start, an effective way to show that we're serious about non-proliferation.

□ 0045

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], one of the Members of this Congress I love to listen to because he speaks right from his heart. He is one of the leading advocates for human rights in this entire Congress.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with Members of this body a notice that I just received in the mail. It seems that the Citizens for a Sound Economy are going to count my vote against most-favored-nation status against me when they are trying to calculate whether or not they will present to me next year's Jefferson Award.

How about that?

As far as I am concerned, the Citizens for a Sound Economy can take their

award, and they can take it back, and what they can do is they can rename it the "Mao Award" or they can rename it the "Lenin Prize" or the "Goebbels Award," or whatever award they want, but they are insulting the Members of this Congress by calling it a Jefferson Award and then counting it against us for voting not to give world's worst tyranny an advantageous trading relationship with this country.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman would do me a favor, if he is sending his back, would he put mine in the same box?

Mr. ROHRBACHER. It is unbelievable.

We have heard today the charge that those of us who are opposed to most-favored-nation status for China are talking about isolating and walking away from China. That is not the case. China is not a country to be ignored, but right now it is being run by tyrants and despots, and they are not a group of people that we should be providing advantageous trade relations with our own people.

The question is whether or not Communist China should continue to enjoy the advantageous trade relationship that it has because it is enjoying the same trade relationship that we give to democratic countries. No one is talking about walking away, no one is talking about an embargo, no one is talking about isolating China, but does any one really believe we should give these dictators, these people who are bullying their own neighbors, who are stepping on the faces of their own people with their combat boots, we should give

them advantageous trade relationship with our country?

Every year since 1989, when the Tiananmen Square democracy advocates were massacred, we have seen the situation in China to continue to decline. The theory is, if we engage them, if we trade with them, give them this most advantageous trade relationship with us, things will get better. That is nothing more than a theory, and it is being proven wrong in practice. To continue to have our policies based on a theory that is not working is totally insane, and we will pay a price. In fact, the American people are already paying the price for that insanity.

Granting most-favored-nation status to China while it is going in the wrong direction is exactly the wrong signal to send to these despots. What we are doing is encouraging those dictators to continue their repression, and we are demoralizing those elements in China that want a better world.

Whose side are we on as we celebrate our fourth of July? Are we on the side of our own working people, on the side of those people who struggle for democracy, or are we just on the side of corporate profits? I do not believe that is what this country was founded on.

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

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress the Republican majority claimed that the House was going to consider bills under an open process. I would like to point out that 60 percent of the legislation this session has been considered under a restrictive process.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following extraneous material for the record:

The material referred to is as follows:

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

| Bill No. | Title | Resolution No. | Process used for floor consideration | Amendments in order |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| H.R. 1* | Compliance | H. Res. 6 | Closed | None. |
| H. Res. 6 | Opening Day Rules Package | H. Res. 5 | Closed | None. |
| H.R. 5* | Unfunded Mandates | H. Res. 38 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.J. Res. 2* | Balanced Budget | H. Res. 44 | Restrictive | 2R: 4D. |
| H. Res. 43 | Committee Hearings Scheduling | H. Res. 43 (OJ) | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 101 | To transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico. | H. Res. 51 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 400 | To provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park Preserve. | H. Res. 52 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 440 | To provide for the conveyance of lands to certain individuals in Butte County, California. | H. Res. 53 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 2* | Line Item Veto | H. Res. 55 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 665* | Victim Restitution Act of 1995 | H. Res. 61 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 666* | Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995 | H. Res. 60 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 667* | Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995 | H. Res. 63 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 668* | The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act | H. Res. 69 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 728* | Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants | H. Res. 79 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 7* | National Security Revitalization Act | H. Res. 83 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 729* | Death Penalty/Habeas | N/A | Restrictive | N/A. |
| S. 2 | Senate Compliance | N/A | Closed | None. |
| H.R. 831 | To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed. | H. Res. 88 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 830* | The Paperwork Reduction Act | H. Res. 91 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 889 | Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority | H. Res. 92 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 450* | Regulatory Moratorium | H. Res. 93 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 1022* | Risk Assessment | H. Res. 96 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 926* | Regulatory Flexibility | H. Res. 100 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 925* | Private Property Protection Act | H. Res. 101 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 1058* | Securities Litigation Reform Act | H. Res. 105 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 988* | The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995 | H. Res. 104 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.R. 956* | Product Liability and Legal Reform Act | H. Res. 109 | Restrictive | 8D; 7R. |
| H.R. 1158 | Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions | H. Res. 115 | Restrictive | N/A. |
| H.J. Res. 73* | Term Limits | H. Res. 116 | Restrictive | 1D; 3R. |
| H.R. 4* | Welfare Reform | H. Res. 119 | Restrictive | 5D; 26R. |
| H.R. 1271* | Family Privacy Act | H. Res. 125 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 660* | Housing for Older Persons Act | H. Res. 126 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1215* | The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995 | H. Res. 129 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 483 | Medicare Select Extension | H. Res. 130 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 655 | Hydrogen Future Act | H. Res. 136 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 1361 | Coast Guard Authorization | H. Res. 139 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 961 | Clean Water Act | H. Res. 140 | Open | N/A. |
| H.R. 535 | Coming National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act | H. Res. 144 | Open | N/A. |

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

| Bill No. | Title | Resolution No. | Process used for floor consideration | Amendments in order |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| H.R. 584 | Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa. | H. Res. 145 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 614 | Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility. | H. Res. 146 | Open | N/A |
| H. Con. Res. 67 | Budget Resolution | H. Res. 149 | Restrictive | 3D: 1R |
| H.R. 1561 | American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 | H. Res. 155 | Restrictive | N/A |
| H.R. 1530 | National Defense Authorization Act: FY 1996 | H. Res. 164 | Restrictive | 36R: 18D: 2 |
| H.R. 1817 | Military Construction Appropriations: FY 1996 | H. Res. 167 | Open | Bipartisan. |
| H.R. 1854 | Legislative Branch Appropriations | H. Res. 169 | Restrictive | N/A |
| H.R. 1868 | Foreign Operations Appropriations | H. Res. 170 | Open | 5R: 4D: 2 |
| H.R. 1905 | Energy & Water Appropriations | H. Res. 171 | Open | Bipartisan. |
| H.J. Res. 79 | Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag. | H. Res. 173 | Closed | N/A |
| H.R. 1944 | Recissions Bill | H. Res. 175 | Restrictive | N/A |
| H.R. 1868 (2nd rule) | Foreign Operations Appropriations | H. Res. 177 | Restrictive | N/A |
| H.R. 1977 *Rule Defeated* | Interior Appropriations | H. Res. 185 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 1977 | Interior Appropriations | H. Res. 187 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 1976 | Agriculture Appropriations | H. Res. 188 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 1977 (3rd rule) | Interior Appropriations | H. Res. 189 | Restrictive | N/A |
| H.R. 2020 | Treasury Postal Appropriations | H. Res. 190 | Open | N/A |
| H.J. Res. 96 | Disapproving MFN for China | H. Res. 193 | Restrictive | N/A |
| H.R. 2002 | Transportation Appropriations | H. Res. 194 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 70 | Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil | H. Res. 197 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 2076 | Commerce, Justice Appropriations | H. Res. 198 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 2099 | VA/HUD Appropriations | H. Res. 201 | Open | N/A |
| S. 21 | Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia | H. Res. 204 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 2126 | Defense Appropriations | H. Res. 205 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 1555 | Communications Act of 1995 | H. Res. 207 | Restrictive | 2R/3D/3 Bi-partisan. |
| H.R. 2127 | Labor/HHS Appropriations Act | H. Res. 208 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 1594 | Economically Targeted Investments | H. Res. 215 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 1655 | Intelligence Authorization | H. Res. 216 | Restrictive | N/A |
| H.R. 1162 | Deficit Reduction Lock Box | H. Res. 218 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 1670 | Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995 | H. Res. 219 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 1617 | To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS). | H. Res. 222 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 2274 | National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 | H. Res. 224 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 927 | Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995 | H. Res. 225 | Restrictive | 2R/2D. |
| H.R. 743 | The Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of 1995 | H. Res. 226 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 1170 | 3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions | H. Res. 227 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 1601 | International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995 | H. Res. 228 | Open | N/A |
| H.J. Res. 108 | Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996 | H. Res. 230 | Closed | N/A |
| H.R. 2405 | Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995 | H. Res. 234 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 2259 | To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments | H. Res. 237 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 2425 | Medicare Preservation Act | H. Res. 238 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 2492 | Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill | H. Res. 239 | Restrictive | N/A |
| H.R. 2491 | 7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform. | H. Res. 245 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H. Con. Res. 109 | Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995 | H. Res. 251 | Closed | N/A |
| H.R. 1833 | D.C. Appropriations FY 1996 | H. Res. 252 | Restrictive | N/A |
| H.R. 2546 | Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996 | H. Res. 257 | Closed | N/A |
| H.J. Res. 115 | Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit | H. Res. 258 | Restrictive | 5R |
| H.R. 2586 | ICC Termination | H. Res. 259 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 2539 | Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996 | H. Res. 261 | Closed | N/A |
| H.J. Res. 115 | Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt | H. Res. 262 | Closed | N/A |
| H. Res. 250 | House Gift Rule Reform | H. Res. 268 | Closed | 2R |
| H.R. 2564 | Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 | H. Res. 269 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 2606 | Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia Deployment | H. Res. 273 | Restrictive | N/A |
| H.R. 1788 | Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995 | H. Res. 289 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 1350 | Maritime Security Act of 1995 | H. Res. 287 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 2621 | To Protect Federal Trust Funds | H. Res. 293 | Closed | N/A |
| H.R. 1745 | Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995 | H. Res. 303 | Open | N/A |
| H. Res. 304 | Providing for Debate and Consideration of Three Measures Relating to U.S. Troop Deployments in Bosnia. | N/A | Closed | 1D: 2R |
| H. Res. 309 | Revised Budget Resolution | H. Res. 309 | Closed | N/A |
| H.R. 558 | Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act ... | H. Res. 313 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 2677 | The National Parks and National Wildlife Refuge Systems Freedom Act of 1995. | H. Res. 323 | Closed | N/A |
| PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION | | | | |
| H.R. 1643 | To authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (MFN) to the products of Bulgaria. | H. Res. 334 | Closed | N/A |
| H.J. Res. 134 | Making continuing appropriations/establishing procedures making the transmission of the continuing resolution H.J. Res. 134. | H. Res. 336 | Closed | N/A |
| H. Con. Res. 131 | Conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, Massachusetts. | H. Res. 338 | Closed | N/A |
| H.R. 1358 | Social Security Guarantee Act | H. Res. 355 | Closed | N/A |
| H.R. 2924 | The Agricultural Market Transition Program | H. Res. 366 | Restrictive | 5D: 9R: 2 |
| H.R. 994 | Regulatory Sunset & Review Act of 1995 | H. Res. 368 | Open rule: Rule tabled | Bipartisan. |
| H.R. 3021 | To Guarantee the Continuing Full Investment of Social Security and Other Federal Funds in Obligations of the United States. | H. Res. 371 | Closed rule | N/A |
| H.R. 3019 | A Further Downpayment Toward a Balanced Budget | H. Res. 372 | Restrictive | 2D/2R |
| H.R. 2703 | The Effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996 | H. Res. 380 | Restrictive | 6D: 7R: 4 |
| H.R. 2202 | The Immigration and National Interest Act of 1995 | H. Res. 384 | Restrictive | Bipartisan. |
| H.J. Res. 165 | Making further continuing appropriations for FY 1996 | H. Res. 386 | Closed | 12D: 19R: 1 |
| H.R. 125 | The Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996. | H. Res. 388 | Closed | Bipartisan. |
| H.R. 3136 | The Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996 | H. Res. 391 | Closed | N/A |
| H.R. 3103 | The Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act of 1996 | H. Res. 392 | Restrictive | N/A |
| H.J. Res. 159 | Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment | H. Res. 395 | Restrictive | 1D |
| H.R. 842 | Truth in Budgeting Act | H. Res. 396 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 2715 | Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996 | H. Res. 409 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 1675 | National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995 | H. Res. 410 | Open | N/A |
| H.J. Res. 175 | Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996 | H. Res. 411 | Closed | N/A |
| H.R. 2641 | United States Marshals Service Improvement Act of 1996 | H. Res. 418 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 2149 | The Ocean Shipping Reform Act | H. Res. 419 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 2974 | To amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to provide enhanced penalties for crimes against elderly and child victims. | H. Res. 421 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 3120 | To amend Title 18, United States Code, with respect to witness retaliation, witness tampering and jury tampering. | H. Res. 422 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 2406 | The United States Housing Act of 1996 | H. Res. 426 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 3322 | Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996 | H. Res. 427 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 3286 | The Adoption Promotion and Stability Act of 1996 | H. Res. 428 | Restrictive | 1D: 1R |
| H.R. 3230 | Defense Authorization Bill FY 1997 | H. Res. 430 | Restrictive | 41 amends: 20D: 17R: 4 bipartisan |

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

| Bill No. | Title | Resolution No. | Process used for floor consideration | Amendments in order |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| H.R. 3415 | Repeal of the 4.3-Cent Increase in Transportation Fuel Taxes | H. Res. 436 | Closed | N/A |
| H.R. 3259 | Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 1997 | H. Res. 437 | Restrictive | N/A |
| H.R. 3144 | The Defend America Act | H. Res. 438 | Restrictive | 1D. |
| H.R. 3448/H.R. 1227 | The Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996, and The Employee Commuting Flexibility Act of 1996, | H. Res. 440 | Restrictive | 2R. |
| H.R. 3517 | Military Construction Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 442 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 3540 | Foreign Operations Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 445 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 3562 | The Wisconsin Works Waiver Approval Act | H. Res. 446 | Restrictive | N/A |
| H.R. 2754 | Shipbuilding Trade Agreement Act | H. Res. 448 | Restrictive | 1R. |
| H.R. 3603 | Agriculture Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 451 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 3610 | Defense Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 453 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 3662 | Interior Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 455 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 3666 | VA/HUD Appropriations | H. Res. 456 | Open | N/A |
| H.R. 3675 | Transportation Appropriations FY 1997 | H. Res. 460 | Open | N/A |
| H.J. Res. 182/H.Res. 461 | Disapproving MFN Status for the Peoples Republic of China | H. Res. 463 | Closed | N/A |

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation 1st Session, 53% restrictive; 47% open. *** All legislation 2d Session, 60% restrictive; 40% open. **** All legislation 104th Congress, 56% restrictive; 44% open. ***** NR indicates that the legislation being considered by the House for amendment has circumvented standard procedure and was never reported from any House committee. ***** PQ Indicates that previous question was ordered on the resolution. ***** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103d Congress. N/A means not available.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the outstanding gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], the next chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Now, that was a real introduction.

Mr. Speaker, I thought the name of this game was how to get economic growth. I now find that this foreign policy, this trade policy, that normally set by the President with bipartisan support, is now dependent on just how much we hate these bums that are running China, and if I had only known that, I would not even know why we are doing business with Japan. I mean I was younger then, but it seemed to me that they were not very nice people then. And Germany; my God, the atrocities that were committed then. And Italy; they were not considered friends of ours. My God.

And when it comes to personal experience, those North Koreans, they were chasing me all around North Korea, and the Chinese shot me. And still we got sanctions against Cuba, and really they have not bothered me too much.

But the truth of the matter is, what are sanctions, and what is most-favored-nation treatment? It is not most favored nation. We are saying, if the United States does not get there first, then our so-called friends are going to get there. We also are saying if we get out of there, our great friends will be in there before we can pull out our equipment.

And so this is not a question about who you like and who you do not like, because I am certain that this is not going to be an anti-Communist type of thing with my friends supporting trade with North Vietnam, with my friends supporting trade with North Korea. My God, the Communists, all around us. They are just not shooting us, they are buying things from us, and they are creating jobs from us, and what choices do we have?

If we apply sanctions against them and it is a unilateral sanction, how do we hurt them? We do not have any friends in the United Nations that can depend on our credibility. We now have already told the United Nations, "Elect

who you want for a secretary general, we're vetoing ahead of time."

We now told people that are doing trade with this little island in the Caribbean, "You dare do trade with them," or, "You do trade, have your companies any place where any Cuban says he has a piece of land, and we're going to take away your visas and have sanctions against you."

Who believes us any more? Why cannot the United States have credibility? Why cannot we believe in something and say what the name of the game is? Do we want to find atrocities? Answer: "You bet your life." And we are doing business in Africa with countries. We say we are going to have sanctions against Nigeria. Who is joining us with the sanctions? If we are going to hurt somebody, make certain that we win and stop teasing around throwing out sanctions or we are not going to trade with them when other people are going to trade.

I say, "Don't hurt yourself just because you're dealing with a bunch of bums. You're dealing with 1.2 billion dollars' worth of good people led by a bunch of bums. Well, what's your option? You just going to say, 'I quit; I am not going to play the game; you didn't pass the personality test?'"

It is dollars and cents. It is hard bucks.

They already said we have to balance the budget, and of course my President now finds it very convenient to adopt most of these ideas. He says balance the budget. He already said we have to cut revenues, and my President says, makes some sense, too: We have got to have tax cuts. He already said that we have to shrink Government. Well, my God, Government is being shrunk. But a strange thing is happening in this country, and that is that the old people are living older, and since they believe the answer to every social ill that we have are penitentiaries, they are building more jails.

Oh, we are not going to spend on education; leave that to the local kids. Well, the local kids are failing, they are in the street, they are jobless, they are ignorant, they have no training, they end up with drugs, making kids, getting violent, going to jail.

Oh, how are we going to deal with that? Well, the only name that we have

in town is expanding the economy, and the only way we can expand the economy is not consuming everything that we make but by selling it to somebody even if we do not like the people we are selling it to.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be yielding myself the balance of the time, but in doing so I will yield up to a minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend from Glens Falls for yielding to me, and I do so simply to respond to the statement that was made about the Citizens for a Sound Economy and by my very dear friend from California who reminds me that we agree over 90 percent of the time on issues, as I do with many of my friends on this side of the aisle who disagree with me on this question.

Citizens for a Sound Economy feels very strongly about the need to extend MFN because, if we were to cut off trade with China, we would clearly be hurting most the people we want to help here in the United States; the reason being, CSE opposes tax increases. They very much want to cut the tax burden on those working Americans who benefit from toys, shoes, and clothing, and what is necessary is for us to do everything that we can to maintain that. It would be a \$600 million tax increase. CSE stands for free trade and lower taxes, and that is the reason they have taken the position that they have.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I was simply going to urge every Member of the House to come over here and vote for this rule. It is a fair rule. It is the kind of rule that we have had for 17 consecutive years when we continued to renew MFN for China all these years, so there is no reason for any of us to vote against it, and then I would urge my colleagues to vote for the resolution of disapproval for all of the reasons we have said before.

But I just have to respond a little bit because, as I look at this little note that is going around from the Citizens for a Sound Economy, and I look at

what it says, it says that, "We may not give you this Jefferson Award again if you vote against giving MFN for China."

As my colleagues know, to me that is intimidation at its worst. I wonder if they have PAC checks, and now they are not going to give JERRY SOLOMON a PAC check. Well, let me just tell them, "If you have them, why don't you keep them? I don't want it; OK?" And any other industry who does not want to give JERRY SOLOMON a PAC check because he is going to vote for this motion to disapprove MFN for China because he believes in human rights for decent people and American foreign policy through all Presidents, whether they be Republican or Democrat, has always been to promote democracies around the world and to encourage human rights for all people. That is what this is all about.

I really resent this, and I am going to send mine back along with the gentleman's, but having said that, let us get back to what I think we all ought to vote for, this rule, and then take the bill up tomorrow, and let us vote to disapprove MFN for China, and then let us pass the resolution that talks about all of the rogue activities of this dictatorship with arms sales and with all of the activities that they undertake.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have serious concerns about this rule and about the bill it makes in order.

I am strongly opposed to the protection that the rule provides for the legislative provision that freezes fuel economy, or CAFE, standards for the second year in a row. This is unwarranted protection for a controversial and major provision which should not be in an appropriations bill.

This legislative rider is a blatant attack on the environment; support for the fuel economy standards freeze is, in fact, opposition to pollution reduction, national energy security, and consumer savings at the gasoline pump.

By reducing oil consumption, CAFE standards have been enormously successful in cutting pollution. By preventing the emission of millions of tons of carcinogenic hydrocarbon into the air we breathe, the standards have improved air quality, including that in heavily polluted cities like my own of Los Angeles. But we have a long way to go before we have clean air.

In addition, CAFE standards have proved to be successful in saving an estimated 3 million barrels of oil a day, thereby reducing U.S. dependence on imported oil. There is no doubt that, without these standards, we would be importing far more oil than we already do. Those imports account for 52 percent of U.S. oil consumption, while contributing \$60 billion annually to our trade deficit.

And, of direct importance to consumers, CAFE standards result in savings when they purchase gasoline. Because fuel economy standards doubled between 1975 and the late 1980's, a new car purchaser saves an average of \$3,300 at the gas pump over the lifetime of a car. CAFE standards mean over \$40 billion in consumer savings annually.

By continuing this freeze, we are preventing full implementation of the law that was enacted in 1975. Specifically, the freeze is block-

ing improvements in the CAFE standards for light trucks. This means that our constituents who purchase the very popular minivans, sport utility vehicles, jeeps, and pickups are denied the benefits of existing fuel-saving technologies.

These vehicles have become the most prevalent example of the gas guzzlers we have sought to do away with—they now comprise over 40 percent of the new vehicle market, increasing the demand for oil and, so, increasing pollution as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am also disturbed by some of the other provisions of this important piece of legislation, which affects, in one way or another, all Americans.

Specifically, many of us regret that the bill makes such drastic reductions in Amtrak's funding. Amtrak's capital improvement would be nearly halved; the fund for improvements in the Northeast corridor would be eliminated entirely. This is, Mr. Speaker, bad transportation policy.

Instead of cutting in half this funding for Amtrak, we ought to be providing funds to improve and expand rail service in the United States. We are currently making an investment that is totally inadequate; our rail system is nowhere near so cost-effective or consumer oriented as it should be. But, instead of providing the funds to overcome those deficiencies, the action we are taking today represents a giant step backward.

An effective, efficient rail system is essential to the quality of life and economic vitality of our Nation, and improving rail service should be a top priority; instead it has been sadly neglected. Trains run infrequently; the most popular ones are overcrowded; and passengers have well-founded fears about safety and the lack of good, reliable service.

We should be trying to meet the demands of customers—and would-be customers—by improving our Nation's rail program. Rail service should not be relegated to the past, or to the bottom of our list of priorities; it should not be taking a back seat to the enormous amount of funding we continue to pour into our multi-billion-dollar highway system.

As the respected columnist, Jessica Mathews, pointed out in her recent Washington Post article, Amtrak has suffered from chronic underfunding; what it needs most is a guaranteed source of capital, and more than 3 percent of transportation funds it receives. We have a transportation system that heavily subsidizes travel by road and air—but ignores rail—and by doing so, we have serious congestion both on the ground and in the air.

A great investment in Amtrak would help us solve those serious problems. I urge my colleagues to consider that as we debate this appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the article by Jessica Mathews to my colleagues for their attention, and I include it at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, June 24, 1996]

TIME TO MAKE PLANS—AND TRACKS

(Jessica Mathews)

American visitors to Europe and Japan this summer will have an experience you cannot have anywhere in America.

They will fly to a major airport like Amsterdam, Paris or Osaka, collect their bags, push their cart through customs and a few steps farther, still inside the airport, be at the doorway of an intercity train.

What's special about this quick and easy connection that non-Americans take for granted? First, of course, is the existence of healthy, heavily capitalized rail service, seen as integral to a national transportation system. Trains keep air and highway traffic flowing, and nothing competes with rail in an overall package of speed, cost, comfort, convenience and use of energy and land for trips in the range of 100 to 500 miles.

Anyone who thinks that rail travel is a nostalgia trip should take a look at the investment plans of the booming, modernization-obsessed Asian economies. China, Taiwan, Malaysia, South Korea and others are all investing heavily in high-speed rail.

That's the second characteristic missing for Americans: existing and planned service is high-speed rail, not futuristic magnetic levitation technology, but conventional rails in the here-and-now. After decades of undercapitalization, "high-speed" in the United States means only 100 mph to 125 mph, whereas France's 200 mph TGV would make the Washington-New York trip, downtown to downtown, into a one-hour commute.

The third factor is more subtle. Money can't buy it, and technology is no substitute. It is the connection: Air connects to rail, rail to transit, transit to bicycle and pedestrian options, and all of them are laid out to fit with the road system. It sounds basic and it is, but such links are so rare in this country that they're given a fancy name—intermodal connections. The missing element in the United States is planning.

Central planning is, of course, a dirty word here, but when we are serious about doing something well on a national scale, we plan just like everyone else. You can drive on one good road from Maine to Florida because the interstate highway system was laid out as a national system. To overcome our aversion in the 1950s, we pretended that all this planning was in the service of national defense (to move missiles on the roads). In 1996, with tourism/recreation the world's largest industry (and the United States' second-largest employer) and trade an ever-rising share of the global economy, we can no longer afford the hangup.

Missed connections persist at the state and regional level, even when comprehensive planning is attempted, because separate transportation trust funds with separate sources of revenue pit the various modes of travel against each other. The air, rail, transit and highway industries see themselves as competitors, not colleagues serving a broader public interest.

"That half-penny [of the federal gas tax] belongs to transit," says transit's chief lobbyist. "Why should we use our money [air ticket-tax funds] on rail?" asks an airline spokesman. And so New York's once-great Kennedy Airport lies gasping out in the suburbs, strangled by clogged highways, for lack of rail service from downtown. It's not a New York problem. It is obscenely difficult everywhere in this country to spend transportation money according to self-evident, local need.

Two things need to change: the chronic underfunding of rail and the separate pots of money that stand in the way of sensible spending. Eventually, the airport and highway trust funds and other appropriations must be combined into a single source of money allocated by need rather than mode of service. That will take some time. Meanwhile, urgent action is needed to rebuild passenger rail.

What Amtrak needs most of all is a guaranteed source of capital to buy the rolling stock that will reduce heavy maintenance costs on the antiquated equipment it inherited, improve service and attract new passengers. A recent test vote in the Senate approved a plan to allocate a half-cent of gasoline taxes, about \$500 million per year, for

that purpose. Last week, both Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott and Rep. Frank Wolf (R-Va.), in charge of transportation spending in the House, gave the idea a cautious blessing.

Approval is still far from certain, but it is essential. Congress and the administration have previously decided that Amtrak must operate free of public support by 2001—a status that has no precedent anywhere in the world and justification. All other modes of transport are subsidized, roads and highways especially heavily. Why should rail alone not be publicly supported?

Whatever its wisdom, the goal has been set, at least for the time being. If there is the slightest chance that it can be met, capital funding of at least \$2.5 billion over five years is the bare minimum cost.

The evidence is all around us that a transportation system that pours money into roads and air travel and starves everything else doesn't work. Spending for airports and highways soared in the '80s, and now economic losses from congestion on the ground and in the air are setting records. In that same time, support for rail declined by a third. It now gets a bare 3 percent of federal transportation funds.

Undercapitalized businesses fail every day. That could happen to Amtrak. Or it could succeed with payoffs in quality of life and national competitiveness out of all proportion to the federal cost. It's up to Congress.

Mr. SOLOMON. 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.

□ 0100

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3675, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT 1997

Ms. GREENE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 460 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 460

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker, may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3675) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 401(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with the colon on page 10, line 25, through "program" on page 11, line 3.

Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. The amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes. After the reading of the final lines of the bill, a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted shall, if offered by the majority leader or a designee, have precedence over a motion to amend. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto the final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The amendment considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole as follows:

Page 8, line 18, strike "proceeds from the sale of".

Page 8, line 20, strike "credited as offsetting collections to this account so as to result" and insert in lieu thereof "disposed of in a manner resulting".

Page 8, line 22, strike the comma after the figure and all that follows through "Act" on page 9, line 1.

Page 11, line 18, strike "\$2,742,602,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,642,500,000".

Page 27, line 4, strike "\$400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$460,000,000".

Page 48, line 12, strike the colon and all that follows through "funds" on line 15.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. GREENE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. GREENE of Utah. For purposes of debate only, Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 460 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3675, the fiscal year 1997 Transportation appropriations bill. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

The rule contains a technical waiver of section 401(a) of the Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of legis-

lation containing contract authority not previously subject to appropriations, and two waivers of rule XXI: clause 6, prohibiting reappropriations, and clause 2, prohibiting unauthorized and legislative provisions, with the exception, as requested by the authorizing committee, of a provision relating to funding for a boating safety grant program.

In keeping with our commitment to ensure that the appropriations bills comply with authorizations, the rule resolves certain concerns expressed by the authorizing committee by providing that an amendment printed in section 2 of the resolution is considered as adopted.

In order to better accommodate members' schedules, the rule allows the chairman to postpone votes and reduce voting time to 5 minutes. The rule also permits the majority leader to offer the privileged motion to rise and report the bill back to the House at any time after the final lines of the bill have been read. Finally, the rule provides for priority consideration of amendments that have been pre-printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this is the seventh appropriations bill that we have considered this year, and that all seven appropriations bills have been considered under open rules. Under this open, deliberative process, we have given every member of the House an opportunity to offer an amendment on any issue they feel important.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again emphasize that this is an open rule, providing for fair consideration of the important issues contained in this bill. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for this open rule. The Rules Committee acted appropriately in exposing certain parts of this bill to points of order. In doing so, they followed the long-standing tradition in the House of honoring the authorizing committees' request to be able to raise points of order against legislative language in spending bills. This rule will give them that opportunity.

I also commend Mr. WOLF and Mr. COLEMAN for this bipartisan bill they've put together which I fully support.

This bill allocates \$12.5 billion for transportation programs across the country which are very good investments in our country's infrastructure.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill emphasizes safety. It allocates \$4.9 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration to continue the good work they do making sure our skies are safe. Thanks to this bill, the FAA will be