

Again, I commend Congressman DAVIS and the members of the subcommittee for crafting this non-controversial and important legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, this has taken a lot of work on behalf of a lot of people. I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for her help in helping bring the city to the table; Mike Rogers, the Mayor, and the entire council, for being flexible on this issue; to Wayne Curry, the chief executive of Prince Georges County; Doug Duncan, the county executive in Montgomery County; Cathy Hanley, the supervisor and the chairman at Fairfax County. I think all worked together with the regional congressional delegation to bring this about and save Congress a lot of time on this bill, and also do what is right for the region. I appreciate their efforts.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman DAVIS and delegate HOLMES-NORTON for their continued leadership and hard work on this bill which will provide the newly created District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority with the ability to issue bonds. Since this new authority will oversee operations at the Blue Plains Water Treatment Facility, it is important that it have the necessary power to deal with issues of concern at the plant.

The citizens living in the Washington metropolitan region remain concerned about operations and management problems at the Blue Plains and the environmental and safety impact of the problems Blue Plains has been experiencing. At a time when we are substantially improving the region's water quality, it is important that we preserve our fragile environment and protect human health.

The ability of this new independent authority to function effectively will go a long way in helping to alleviate some of these concerns. Granting bonding ability will enable the authority to collect its own revenues. This will move us a step closer to ensuring protection of human life and the environment while providing for better operations, proper equipment, financial stability, and sufficient staffing levels. It will enable Blue Plains to manage its business affairs outside the domain of the District's tenuous budgetary affairs. I believe residents living in the surrounding jurisdictions will take comfort in knowing that.

The establishment of the authority is a good step in the right direction. However, one additional step is critical. The authority must be given the power to raise capital to operate and make much needed improvements at the Blue Plains plant.

I would be remiss if I did not express my satisfaction with the cooperative efforts of the suburban jurisdictions and the District. It would have been very difficult to bring this legislation to the floor without their collaboration and support. Again, I want to thank Chairman DAVIS for working with Members in the region to develop a bill which we can all support, and I urge swift adoption of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3663.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1300

#### DISAPPROVAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR CHINA

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 463, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 182 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 182

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress does not approve the extension of the authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 recommended by the President to the Congress on May 31, 1996, with respect to the People's Republic of China.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 463, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] will each be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield half of my time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] and that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] and that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Joint Resolution 182.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I speak today in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 182, which would disapprove the extension of most-favored-nation status, or more accurately, normal trade relations to the People's Republic of China. On June 18, the Committee on Ways and Means reported this resolution adversely by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 31 to 6.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in this Chamber share a common goal of fostering freedom, democracy, and human rights in China. We of course have deep concerns about China's human rights record, which demonstrates that serious abuses and strong-arm tactics occur all too often. Yet, steady improvements over the decade in the daily lives of the Chinese people is also clearly in evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution because it would have the effect of severing completely our trading relations with China. Such a step would be counterproductive to fostering the growth of freedom and democracy in that nation and would extinguish our ability to improve the human rights situation there.

We have proof that the commercial opportunities set in motion by MFN trade status have given Chinese workers and firms a strong stake in the free market reforms occurring in China and allow our companies to lead by example in spreading our values and ideals throughout the country.

We have no proof that ending this relationship would somehow force China to improve human rights in that country. We have isolated China before, and it did not work. The conditions were worse. Revoking MFN will be an empty gesture and could return us to that cold environment.

In addition, United States commercial involvement with China is critical to our economic objectives. China, whose economy is now the third largest in the world, continues to embark on massive infrastructure programs, spending billions of dollars annually in sectors in which we lead: High technology, aerospace, petrochemical, and telecommunication. With per capita income doubling every 6 or 7 years, the Chinese economy is expanding at an outstanding pace and has an insatiable appetite for goods.

Our participation in that huge market translates directly into U.S. jobs. Our trade relationships with the Chinese have created 200,000 high-paying jobs in the United States, with another 400,000 United States jobs indirectly supported in transportation, production, and distribution fields.

Finally, our interests concerning national security are at stake in this debate. Our presence in China puts us in the best position to influence the Chinese Government concerning sensitive issues in the region, including North Korea, weapons proliferation, and military expansion in the South China Sea.

The recent agreement with China on protecting intellectual property is powerful evidence that our existing section 301 process is effective in dealing with bilateral trade disputes between the United States and China that exists under current law. As a result, it is not necessary to use the heavy-handed threat of removing MFN to handle such issues.

In the future, I intend to address whether it is in our best interests to change the annual review process so that we no longer are forced to put our trading relationship with China at risk every year. In addition, our committee will consider legislation that would change the misleading term, "Most Favored Nation." The term implies that we are extending benefits that are greater than the normal tariffs that we extend to other nations under the World Trade Organization. However, we seek to do no more than to extend to China the same normal benefits that we give to all other trading partners.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the relationship between the United States and China is troubled. However, the solution is not to walk away. Instead, we should maintain free and open trade. That gives us the greatest opportunity to move step by step to a solution that would be far, far better in the minds of the American people.

For all of these reasons, I am strongly opposed to severing relations with China, to bringing down the curtain, to denying engagement, to help to bring about in the years to come a better situation in that country, and I urge my colleagues to vote no on this resolution.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, each year the President must seek a waiver from Congress to allow China to have most-favored-nation [MFN] status. Each year, China gives me at least one new reason to oppose normalized trade with China.

China consistently and flagrantly violates our laws and repudiates our values. China was caught red-handed sending materials to create nuclear weapons—last year to Iran and this year to Pakistan. World peace threatened, just to make a buck.

China's human rights violations have been a longstanding problem. Who among us could forget the sight of those tanks crushing students whose only crime was to meet publicly and peacefully to voice their opposition to their government? China still refuses its citizens the right to speak freely and to meet publicly.

This year's transgressions implicate China's top government officials. A series of Chinese companies operated by the children of senior Chinese officials played a major role in the illicit copying of over \$2 billion of United States commercial goods.

Even worse, the son-in-law of China's top leader, Deng Shau Xiaoping, along with other relatives of top Chinese Government officials, has been implicated in the biggest seizure of illegal guns in our Nation's history. As you know, on May 22, 1996, U.S. customs officials intercepted \$4 million worth of illegal AK-47 automatic weapons. The link between this ille-

gal shipment and the Chinese Government is direct and indisputable.

I wrote the President urging him to bar all trade in the United States with the companies involved in this outrageous gun running scheme. The problem is not just the companies but to the government of China which exhibits a pattern of flaunting of United States and international laws.

The Chinese Government has no regard for the safety of our streets and our children, or the safety of our world. For these reasons, I adamantly oppose granting China favorable trading status.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] for yielding me this time.

There is no dispute about the outrageous human rights violations in China. The government has silenced dissidents, and the Tiananmen Square episode could still occur today in China. The use of labor, slave labor, continues in China. In addition, China is responsible for nuclear proliferation, the proliferation of other weapons of mass destruction. There is no dispute about that.

It is also clear that the conduct in China is financed because of access to the United States market. It is our consumers that are helping to finance the type of outrageous conduct within China. There is a lopsided balance of payment. We import \$33 to \$34 billion more products from China than we export ever year.

The Jackson-Vanik provisions were expressly created in order to make it clear that access to the U.S. market is not automatic and that nonmarket economies that do not perform to a certain standard are denied access to our market.

The United States has shown leadership before. It was the leadership of the United States to use trade sanctions in South Africa that brought down the apartheid practices of that country. It was the United States using the Jackson-Vanik provisions that changed the immigration policies of the Soviet Union. We have used trade policies in Uganda and Romania and other countries to bring about changes in those countries. When we exercise leadership, it is part of the proudest moments in the history of this country.

Certainly there are naysayers, naysayers who have financial interests in continuing a relationship with China. We always hear that. But when we stand tall, we bring about change. The United States has done it before, we should do it in China, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to make it clear that access to the United States market in China must maintain a standard of acceptable conduct that they do not today.

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

Mr. CARDIN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland and congratulate him on his well-reasoned statement.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a lot of talk today about how bad things are in China. I am not here to rebut any of that. Yes, things are bad in China. They have been worse. We preferred to ignore them, though, when they were worse, because we did not have to face them.

I first went to China in the early 1970's. At that time it was perfectly obvious that we were faced with a tremendous task of trying to pull a very backward and a very crude nation into the modern world. We have made progress; not all of the progress I want to make and not all of the progress we should make.

However, by cutting off normal relationships, normal trade relationships to China, we would only succeed in isolating ourselves from China again and isolating the Chinese from the reality of the Western World. We should be building bridges at this time in our history, and not burning bridges.

Mr. Speaker, it is a lot easier to burn bridges, and we have a lot of bridge-burners in our Congress here. It is far more difficult to build the bridges. What kind of bridges should we be building? We should be bringing more Chinese students and encouraging more Chinese students to come here and be exposed to the Western ideal. We should be sending our students to China to help expose them to our Western ideas. We need some innovative thoughts, which I would hope that some of the committees of this Congress could come up with, other than the burning-bridge technique that is tried here on this resolution today.

It is far more difficult to do that, but it will be far more productive if we think of China as how we can bring their thoughts and their ideas into the modern times, into the Western ideal, remembering all the time that they have had almost 6,000 years of isolation from Western ideas, that their standards are far different than ours, that conditions are, yes, bad in China, but they have been far worse, and we should continue trying to make them better rather than throwing bombs and getting out.

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

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 15 minutes of my 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] and that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I say to my colleagues, I sit here in continued amazement, because I keep hearing there is no disputing, from my side of the aisle by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER]; there is no disputing from the Democrat side of the aisle, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], that this Chinese Government is a rogue government, that they keep proliferating with nuclear activity, they keep dehumanizing people, and it goes on and on and on, but there is no disputing all this. All of my colleagues know and they admit it, but then they make all of these kinds of excuses.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stand up to the financial interests that consistently push for business as usual with the criminal regime in Beijing, and it is time to discard the false dogma that says that if we just keep trading with Communist China, things will get better.

Some are comparing Communist China today to the depths of the Cultural Revolution 30 years ago when millions of people were being slaughtered, and they say that things have gotten better. Well, my goodness, Mr. Speaker, that is a pathetically low standard.

The fact is the behavior of the Beijing dictatorship is much worse than it was 5 or even 10 years ago, and you all sit here today and admit it. The trade deficit which destroys American jobs has tripled in the last 10 years. We all know it. Their military budget has more than doubled when ours and every other military budget in the world has been going down. It was just 3 months ago that they were lobbing missiles right off the Taiwanese coast in an act of intimidation.

Mr. Speaker, things are not getting better, they are getting worse and everybody in this Chamber knows it. How high does the trade deficit need to go before we react? How many more trade agreements does Communist China have to violate? You have all read about it in liberal newspapers, like The New York Times and The Washington Post, and how many people have to be imprisoned or killed for their political beliefs before we stand up on their behalf? Whatever happened to American foreign policy that looks out for human decency around this world? How much nuclear and chemical weapons material does Communist China have to ship to fellow rogue regimes, like Iran, our enemy, before we punish them? What will it take? Do they really have to make good on their threats to bomb Los Angeles?

Mr. Speaker, this dictatorial regime represents a growing threat to American interests, American jobs, and yes, even more importantly to American lives. I say to my colleagues, do not come back here 15 years from now and say, my goodness, I did not know it. They must be dealt with now, Mr.

Speaker. History shows us very clearly that appeasement of tyrants does not work. In fact, it leads to more intransigence.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I want everybody to come over to this Chamber and vote regardless of whether they have GE and IBM in their districts like I do with 25,000 employees and stand up for what is right in this country. We can cut off most-favored-nation treatment today and in a month we can restore it, because the Chinese will come to the table. They are smart people. They will then negotiate fair trade with this country, they will improve their human rights violations, and that is what this whole debate is all about.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is a violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, Teddy Roosevelt once said, "The only safe rule is to promise little and faithfully to keep every promise; to speak softly and carry a big stick." That is where that great quotation came from. Well, America's new policy seems to be one of empty promises and empty threats, a policy toward China where we speak softly and carry no stick whatsoever.

My colleagues, we have the opportunity to send a message to the world that America will not support this rogue nation, that we will not condone terrorism, oppression, and intolerance. Today we have the opportunity to effect a change in China's policies, and tell the rest of the world America allies itself with only those nations that advance and encourage fairness, those nations who foster democracy, and those nations who embrace freedom.

We hold the power today, my colleagues, the power to help the people of China break the bonds of mass misery, not for their votes, not for their money, but because it is right. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], a respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I come from the Nation's most trade-dependent State, so the question of United States-China trade is crucial to the people I represent in Congress. In fact, Washington State ranks first among all 50 States in exports to China.

Contrary to what opponents of MFN suggest—trade with China does promote change. U.S. trade and investment teach the skills of free enterprise that are fundamental to a free society.

Washington State exports a number of U.S. products, from aircraft to software. And every single airplane and every single CD carries with them the seeds of change. These products serve to further unleash the free-market desires of the Chinese people. And I am certain that everyone of my colleagues would agree that it is in our national interest to move China toward a free market.

At the same time, we must make clear to the Chinese that their participation in the world economy and in international security arrangements can come about only with concrete evidence that China is abiding by norms of international behavior. Let me be clear: disengagement will not help us improve our relationship with China.

I suspect that my colleagues who oppose MFN would have had a difficult time suggesting that disengagement would have been the better course of action in addressing intellectual property piracy in China. In fact, it was only through engagement that we have been so successful on this front.

I propose that we use the following criteria to find the answer on difficult MFN cases like China's. We should extend normal trade status, or MFN, to a nation if: it allows U.S. investors and operators in; the rule of law is advancing; a multilateral action is unattainable; or we have that nation's assistance on a critical geopolitical issue.

Conversely, we should deny normal trade status to governments abusing their people if: a multilateral action is doable; they will not help the United States on other geopolitical issues; they do not allow U.S. employers in; and they do not respect the rule of law.

Indeed, I would go one step further by stating that the burden of proof is on those who deny normal trade status with China.

They must prove that an act of protest—such as denying to China normal trade status—would demonstrably improve the human rights situation in China, or how it would address grinding poverty or lessen religious persecution.

The only thing we know for certain is that an act of protest such as denying MFN would increase unemployment and suffering in the United States and result in a tremendous setback in our bilateral relationship with China.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution of disapproval.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind my colleagues that China never was willing to deal with intellectual property rights until they were faced with the threat of trade sanctions.

At this point I am delighted to yield 11 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] who has been a leader in fighting for open trade, for human rights, and for bringing China