

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

There was no objection.

PROHIBITION OF UNITED STATES FUNDS TO CERTAIN CHINESE OFFICIALS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 302, I call up the bill (H.R. 967) to prohibit the use of United States funds to provide for the participation of certain Chinese officials in international conferences, programs, and activities, and to provide that certain Chinese officials shall be ineligible to receive visas and excluded from admission to the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 967 is as follows:

H.R. 967

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Despite public assurances by the Government of the People's Republic of China that it would abide by the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and despite the United Nations Charter requirement that all members promote respect for and observance of basic human rights, including freedom of religion, the Chinese Government continues to place severe restrictions on religious expression and practice.

(2) It has been reported that at an internal Central Communist Party meeting in 1994, President Jiang Zemin asserted that religion is one of the biggest threats to Communist Party rule in China and Tibet.

(3) On January 31, 1994, Premier Li Peng signed decrees number 144 and 145 which restrict worship, religious education, distribution of Bibles and other religious literature, and contact with foreign coreligionists.

(4) The Chinese Government has created official religious organizations that control all religious worship, activity, and association in China and Tibet and supplant the independent authority of the Roman Catholic Church, independent Protestant churches, and independent Buddhist, Taoist, and Islamic associations.

(5) In July 1995, Ye Xiaowen, a rigid communist hostile to religion, was appointed to head the Bureau of Religious Affairs, a Chinese Government agency controlled by the United Front Work Department of the Chinese Communist Party. The Bureau of Religious Affairs has administrative control over all religious worship and activity in China and Tibet through a system of granting or denying rights through an official registration system. Those who fail to or are not allowed to register are subject to punitive measures.

(6) In the past year, the Chinese Government has expressed great concern over the spread of Christianity and particularly over the rapid growth of Christian religious institutions other than those controlled by the Chinese Government, including the Roman Catholic Church and the evangelical Christian "house churches".

(7) Soon after the establishment of the People's Republic of China in 1949, the Chi-

nese Government imprisoned Christians who refused to relinquish their faith to become servants of communism, charging them as "counter revolutionaries" and sentencing them to 20 years or more in "reeducation through labor camps".

(8) Hundreds of Chinese Protestants and Catholics are among those now imprisoned, detained, or continuously harassed because of their religious beliefs or activities.

(9) The prisons and labor camps which hold these religious prisoners are run by the Ministry of Public Security and the Ministry of Justice of the Chinese Government.

(10) Although some negotiations have taken place, the Chinese Government refuses to permit the appointment by the Vatican of Catholic bishops and the ordination of priests not approved by the Government and insists on appointing its own "Catholic bishops".

(11) The Tenth Panchen Lama died in January 1989 at Tashilhunpo Monastery, his traditional spiritual seat in Shigatze, Tibet's second largest city.

(12) It has always been the right and the role of the Dalai Lama to recognize the successor to the Panchen Lama. On May 14, 1995, His Holiness the Dalai Lama announced recognition of a six-year-old boy, Gedhun Chockyi Nyima, as the Eleventh Panchen Lama, according to Tibetan tradition.

(13) The young boy recognized by the Dalai Lama and his family have been brought to Beijing by Chinese authorities and have not been seen for months. The Chinese authorities announced publicly in June 1996 that they are holding Gedhun Chockyi Nyima.

(14) Chadrrel Rimpoche, abbot of Tashilhunpo Monastery and head of the original search committee for the Eleventh Panchen Lama, and his assistant, Champa Chung, are believed to have been seized and detained by Chinese authorities in May of 1995.

(15) Chinese Government authorities subsequently detained other Tibetan Buddhists in connection with the selection of the Eleventh Panchen Lama, including Gyatrol Rimposhe, Shepa Kelsang, Lhakpa Tsering, and Ringkar Ngawang.

(16) The Chinese Government convened a conference in Beijing where Tibetan monks were coerced to select a rival candidate to the child recognized by the Dalai Lama as the Eleventh Panchen Lama.

(17) On November 29, 1995, officials of the Chinese Government orchestrated an elaborate ceremony designating a six-year-old boy selected by the Chinese Government as the Eleventh Panchen Lama and on December 8, 1995, a Government-sponsored ceremony was held in Shigatze, Tibet, where the boy selected by the Government was enthroned as the Eleventh Panchen Lama.

(18) By seeking to impose its own candidate as the Eleventh Panchen Lama and detaining the six-year-old boy recognized for that position in accordance with Tibetan tradition, the Chinese Government is infringing on a purely Tibetan religious matter, in blatant violation of the fundamental human rights of the Tibetan people.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President should make freedom of religion one of the major objectives of United States foreign policy with respect to China. As part of this policy, the Department of State should raise in every relevant bilateral and multilateral forum the issue of individuals imprisoned, detained, confined, or otherwise harassed by the Chinese Government on religious grounds. In its communications with the Chinese Government, the Department of State should provide specific names of individuals of concern and request a complete

and timely response from the Chinese Government regarding the individuals' whereabouts and condition, the charges against them, and sentence imposed. The goal of these official communications should be the expeditious release of all religious prisoners in China and Tibet and the end of the Chinese Government's policy and practice of harassing and repressing religious believers.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR THE PARTICIPATION OF CERTAIN CHINESE OFFICIALS IN CONFERENCES, EXCHANGES, PROGRAMS, AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal years after fiscal year 1997, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and the United States Agency for International Development may be used for the purpose of providing travel expenses and per diem for the participation of nationals of the People's Republic of China described in paragraphs (1) and (2) in conferences, exchanges, programs, and activities:

(1) The head of political secretary of any of the following Chinese Government-created or approved organizations:

(A) The Chinese Buddhist Association.

(B) The Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association.

(C) The National Congress of Catholic Representatives.

(D) The Chinese Catholic Bishops' Conference.

(E) The Chinese Protestant "Three Self" Patriotic Movement.

(F) The China Christian Council.

(G) The Chinese Taoist Association.

(H) The Chinese Islamic Association.

(2) Any military or civilian official or employee of the Government of the People's Republic of China who of any of the following policies or practices:

(A) Formulating, drafting, or implementing repressive religious policies.

(B) Imprisoning, detaining, or harassing individuals on religious grounds.

(C) Promoting or participating in policies or practices which hinder religious activities or the free expression of religious beliefs.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—

(1) Each Federal agency subject to the prohibition of subsection (a) shall certify in writing to the appropriate congressional committees no later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, that it did not pay, either directly or through a contractor or grantee, for travel expenses or per diem of any national of the People's Republic of China described in subsection (a).

(2) Each certification under paragraph (1) shall be supported by the following information:

(A) The name of each employee of any agency of the Government of the People's Republic of China whose travel expenses or per diem were paid by funds of the reporting agency of the United States Government.

(B) The procedures employed by the reporting agency of the United States Government to ascertain whether each individual under subparagraph (A) did or did not participate in activities described in subsection (a)(2).

(C) The reporting agency's basis for concluding that each individual under subparagraph (A) did not participate in such activities.

(c) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—For purpose as of this section the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 4. CERTAIN OFFICIALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA INELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE VISAS AND EXCLUDED FROM ADMISSION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any national of the People's Republic of China described in paragraphs (1) or (2) of section 3(a) shall be ineligible to receive visas and shall be excluded from admission into the United States.

SEC. 5. SUNSET PROVISION.

Section 4 shall cease to have effect 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the amendments printed in the bill are adopted.

The text of H.R. 967, as amended pursuant to House Resolution 302, is as follows:

H.R. 967

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

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President should make freedom of religion one of the major objectives of United States foreign policy with respect of China. As part of this policy, the Department of State should raise in every relevant bilateral and multilateral forum the issue of individuals imprisoned, detained, confined, or otherwise harassed by the Chinese Government on religious grounds. In its communications with the Chinese Government, the Department of State should provide specific names of individuals of concern and request a complete and timely response from the Chinese Government regarding the individuals' whereabouts and condition, the charges against them, and sentence imposed. The goal of these official communications should be the expeditious release of all religious prisoners in China and Tibet and the end of the Chinese Government's policy and practice of harassing and repressing religious believers.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR THE PARTICIPATION OF CERTAIN CHINESE OFFICIALS IN CONFERENCES, EXCHANGES, PROGRAMS, AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal years after fiscal year 1997, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and the United States Agency for International Development may be used for the purpose of providing travel expenses and per diem for the participation of nationals of the People's Republic of China described in paragraphs (1) and (2) in conferences, exchanges, programs, and activities:

(1) The head or political secretary of any of the following Chinese Government-created or approved organizations:

- (A) The Chinese Buddhist Association.
- (B) The Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association.
- (C) The National Congress of Catholic Representatives.
- (D) The Chinese Catholic Bishops' Conference.
- (E) The Chinese Protestant "Three Self" Patriotic Movement.
- (F) The China Christian Council.
- (G) The Chinese Taoist Association.
- (H) The Chinese Islamic Association.

(2) Any military or civilian official or employee of the Government of the People's Republic of China who carried out or directed the carrying out of any of the following policies or practices:

(A) Formulating, drafting, or implementing repressive religious policies.

(B) Imprisoning, detaining, or harassing individuals on religious grounds.

(C) Promoting or participating in policies or practices which hinder religious activities or the free expression of religious beliefs.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—

(1) Each Federal agency subject to the prohibition of subsection (a) shall certify in writing to the appropriate congressional committees no later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, that it did not pay, either directly or through a contractor or grantee, for travel expenses or per diem of any national of the People's Republic of China described in subsection (a).

(2) Each certification under paragraph (1) shall be supported by the following information:

(A) The name of each employee of any agency of the Government of the People's Republic of China whose travel expenses or per diem were paid by funds of the reporting agency of the United States Government.

(B) The procedures employed by the reporting agency of the United States Government to ascertain whether each individual under subparagraph (A) did or did not participate in activities described in subsection (a)(2).

(C) The reporting agency's basis for concluding that each individual under subparagraph (A) did not participate in such activities.

(c) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—For purposes of this section the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. CERTAIN OFFICIALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA INELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE VISAS AND EXCLUDED FROM ADMISSION.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any national of the People's Republic of China described in section 2(a)(2) (except the head of state, the head of government, and cabinet level ministers) shall be ineligible to receive visas and shall be excluded from admission into the United States.

(b) WAIVER.—The President may waive the requirement in subsection (a) with respect to an individual described in such subsection if the President—

(1) determines that it is vital to the national interest to do so; and

(2) provides written notification to the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 2(c)) containing a justification for the waiver.

SEC. 4. SUNSET PROVISION.

Sections 2 and 3 shall cease to have effect 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAVIS] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. 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. 967.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 967 prohibits travel grants and visas for Chinese officials who repress religion in China and in occupied Tibet.

There are hundreds, if not thousands, of Christians, Muslims, and Buddhists who are serving long prison sentences in China and in occupied Tibet for merely practicing their religious faith. Let me underscore that. Large numbers of Catholics, Protestants, Muslims, and Buddhists are spending many years of their lives in prison for following their religious practices.

For example, the Beijing Government sentenced a 76-year-old Protestant leader to 15 years in prison for distributing Bibles. It sentenced a 65-year-old evangelical elder to an 11-year prison term for belonging to an evangelical group outside the government-sanctioned religious organizations.

A 60-year-old Roman Catholic priest was sentenced to 2 years of "reeducation through labor" for unknown charges. He had previously spent 13 years in prison because of his refusal to renounce ties with the Vatican.

The 6-year-old Panchen Lama and his family have been detained for 2 years, and their whereabouts are still unknown. The list goes on and on.

Although the President and Prime Minister of China have signed directives and set policy that are behind the current crackdown of religious practitioners, the bill does not prevent them or the cabinet ministers from receiving United States visas. However, it would stop others who carry out their directives by imprisoning, torturing, or repressing people for practicing their religion.

This measure sends a strong message that we find religious repression repugnant and at grave odds with important American values. It is simple, it is modest, and it is the right thing to do.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his hard work on this and all of these so-called China bills.

We should not be providing travel grants to any Chinese officials, and especially not to those who are repressing religious freedom in that country. Religious freedom is one of the most basic human rights that any individual can have. This Congress should encourage the Clinton administration to make ending religious persecution the most important part of its policy toward China.

The Chinese are committing horrible persecution, even as we speak. Nina Shea said in her recent book, "Lion's Den,"

Millions of American Christians pray in their churches each week, oblivious to the

fact that Christians in many parts of the world suffer brutal torture, arrest, imprisonment, and even death—their homes and communities laid waste—for no other reasons than that they are Christians. The shocking untold story of our time is that more Christians have died in this century simply for being Christians than from the first 19 centuries after the birth of Christ.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is simply deplorable.

In addition, Michael Horowitz, a leader in speaking out against this persecution, who happens to be Jewish, said in a recent interview,

I am speaking out on behalf of persecuted Christians precisely because I am a Jew in the most deeply rooted sense.

I see eerie parallels between the way the elites of the world are dealing with Christians, who have become the scapegoats of choice for thug regimes around the world, and the way the elites dealt with the Jews when Hitler came to power.

Another parallel,

Mr. Horowitz continued, is the tongue-tied silence of the Christian community in the face of this persecution. A similar silence was evident in the years leading to the Holocaust. Silence, anybody's silence, in the face of persecution is deadly. So, for me,

Mr. Horowitz said, sparking our campaign for awareness and action is the most important thing I expect to do. What thugs did to Jews, they are now doing to Christians. Christians are becoming the Jews of the 21st century.

□ 1545

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for not remaining silent on this issue. I hope the administration will follow his lead and end its silence on this most important issue. I think this is very important legislation, very valuable legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill and pass it by a very large margin.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This bill has, as its stated intention, to send a message to the country of China that we will not tolerate religious persecution, nor should anyone else in the world do so, and that is indeed a worthy message to send. This bill has also been described as a symbol to that effect, and that is also a worthy goal. And if the bill were to stop with its first section in which the Congress expresses its sense to that effect, this would be a worthy bill, but the bill fails to do so, and in failing to do so, it has two critical flaws which must lead me to speak in opposition to the bill.

The first is that this bill has as one of its central provisions to deny visas to those individuals who are thought to be associated with organizations inside China that are engaging in religious persecution. On the surface, this might have some appeal to suggest that we are going to keep these folks with whom we violently disagree outside our

borders. But think about it for a minute. If, in fact, our goal is to ultimately stop China and the rest of the world from engaging in religious persecution, we must in fact engage these individuals. We must hold them up. We must highlight the grave injustices that they are committing in China and allow that to undergo the scrutiny that invariably will occur in this country and around the world as these opinions, as these practices, are condemned and challenged and they are failed to be justified.

This is a collision with the truth. This is a collision with the fundamental values that represent who we are. We cannot have that conversation. We cannot have that criticism unless we have conversations with these people. So we must bring them into our country to expose them to that criticism and engage in a court of world opinion in which, on behalf of everybody in the world who disdains religious persecution, we speak out on their behalf, to have a conversation in which we ultimately will prevail.

The second fundamental flaw with this bill is it creates a serious risk, which no one can reasonably explain away, that we might suffer from the same lack of access to China. One of the most important things that is taking place in this country today is that there are many young men and women who are giving their lives to service, missionaries and advocates for human rights who are traveling to China.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that articles that were issued under Li Peng, 144 and 145, the Chinese now prohibit, strictly prohibit, any foreign proselytizing. If a missionary goes to China, he or she cannot speak out and proselytize, whether it be the Christian faith or any other faith.

So their law makes it a crime, and so much of a crime that deportation is the minimum of what would happen to that person. The maximum is that they will go to prison.

My staff and I and others in this Congress have worked to help people, some of whom were Americans who went over there and somehow drifted outside of the official boundaries and talked about Christ in one case, and he was arrested and was held and we had to intercede on his behalf. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is a valid point. But the issue I am referring to is a larger issue, and that is the grave risk that these individuals whom you describe will even lose the right to have access to the country, much as we would be denying to the individuals who are described in this bill, and that is a serious problem, to deprive our own folks who seek to speak out and

act against religious persecution in China an opportunity to go over there and to speak out with fear of imprisonment, but a choice that they have the right to make. We cannot afford to stop our advocacy, to stop our missionary work in China, by taking that risk, by denying access to individuals from China into this country.

So the unintended effect of this bill could conceivably be to cut off all dialogue, all debate, which we will ultimately win because we are right on the subject of religious persecution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I rise in support of this issue to tell the gentleman that he is moving in the right direction, and a similar bill to this same germaneness passed I think this House not too long ago, and I think the gentleman is going to receive a unanimous vote today.

But I come here today to suggest something. Mr. Speaker, we are going through a very contentious problem with my bill, which is a foreign operations appropriation bill, and in the foreign operations appropriation bill we have about 100 pages which appropriates the money that the gentleman has essentially authorized us to spend in foreign countries.

Now, in addition to the 100 pages of my bill, we have 400 pages of authorization language that the gentleman's committee and the Senate have drafted, and in order to save time on all of these bills, let me suggest to the gentleman that we just group them all together, and I will put them in my appropriation bill, and we will save 6 or 7 hours on debating this issue and accomplish the mission that we are after, and that is to send China a message in writing a bill that the President will sign.

So I come here trying to facilitate the gentleman to tell him that he has a great bill, that he is a great chairman, that he is moving in the right direction, but we are running out of time here in this Congress to pass an appropriation bill. Since we now have 400 pages of authorization language in my bill, I am willing to make it 410, and I will accept this language in my bill, and then we can bring my bill out of committee and the gentleman's committee will be happy and my committee will be happy, the Congress will be happy, because we will have been able to resolve a problem that is going to keep us here for several weeks if we do not do something in a timely manner.

So I come here offering the gentleman a suggestion, a possibility, a vehicle to pass this legislation. Just tell me, this legislation is good, which I agree with the gentleman, it is good, and we would like to see this to become law, and I will take that language and just insert it in my bill and the President will sign it.

So I come here making a suggestion and in strong support in addition to that of a way to get this passed and all of these China bills that we are talking about passed. Let us just stick them in the appropriation bill like we do everything else.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman for his generous offer, and of course, the gentleman and I both should meet with leadership to further discuss the gentleman's proposal, but I thank the gentleman for his constructive suggestion.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

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

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the chairman of the subcommittee, who suggested that we can place all of these China bills in the foreign operations bill. As the ranking member on that committee, I heartily approve of the suggestion of our chairman, but I would not want to do that without the full debate that we are having here, and I think that is the value of this China package.

I think the value of the discussion probably exceeds some of the clout within this legislation because this is indeed a gentle touch, but nonetheless a necessary one, and I commend my colleagues, especially the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] for their leadership in putting this package together.

To the issue of freedom of religion in China, the reason that this legislation that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is proposing, promoting religious freedom in China, the persecution of Christians, Buddhists, Muslims, and others, is well documented. Do not take my word for it. The State Department's own Country Report states, in the area of freedom of religion, "Although the Constitution affirms toleration of religious beliefs, the Chinese government seeks to restrict all," and that is the Chinese Constitution affirms toleration of religious beliefs, "The Chinese government seeks to restrict all religious practice to closely controlled and government-sanctioned religious organizations and registered places of worship. At the annual National Religious Affairs Conference in January, religious policy was 'readjusted' to emphasize harder line aspects. During the year," that would be of 1996, "many religious

groups were subjected to increased restrictions, although the degree of restriction varied significantly in different regions of China."

"The campaign to shut down unauthorized groups is in the hands of the police and religious affairs officials and is being conducted concurrently with other police actions against criminals and underground separatists, pro-democracy and labor groups. The national goal for 1996 was to register or close down all unregistered religious groups."

"In 1996 police closed down dozens of underground mosques, temples and seminaries and hundreds of Protestant house church groups, many with significant memberships; leaders of such groups, including itinerant teachers and evangelists, increasingly have been detained for lengthy investigation. There are NGO reports of deaths of detainees by beating. Some congregations have been hit with heavy fines. In Shanghai, home of the patriotic Protestant headquarters, authorities have been particularly tough."

I will conclude from the pages of reports on lack of religious freedom in China, but to say that Premier Li Peng stated recently that China upholds freedom of religious belief, but that religion should serve the aims of socialism. That is from our Country Report that states the condition of religious freedom, or lack thereof, in China.

I too want to quote from Nina Shays' article and just state that in it she says, "Catholics and other Christians are being persecuted and martyred before an unknowing, indifferent world and before a largely mute Christian community." And that, unfortunately, is true as well.

That is why the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] in this legislation is so important, because we cannot continue to ignore religious persecution in China while we profess to support religious freedom throughout the world.

When President Jiang was here, again, at the famous breakfast, I handed him a letter from Ignatius Cardinal Kung Pin-Mei, the Bishop of Shanghai. Cardinal Kung asked President Jiang in this letter—

In the name of 8 million Roman Catholic faithful and clergy in China and also in my name, I respectfully appeal to you, Mr. Chairman Jiang, to defend the right of the Chinese citizens to true religious freedom and to permit the Roman Catholics to maintain religious communion with the Pope in order to keep the fullness of their faith.

I further appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, to immediately release Su Zhimin, Bishop of Baoding Diocese, Hebei and An Shuxin, Auxiliary Bishop of Baoding; Han Ding Xiang, Bishop of Yong Nian, Hebei; Zeng Fingmu, Bishop of Yu Jiang, Jiangxi; and all other faithful and clergy who are being held in detention camps, labor camps and jails in China.

□ 1600

The Cardinal goes on to say, "May China, under your able leadership, be internationally known as a country which has true religious freedom."

In calling for the freedom of these bishops, of course, Cardinal Kung, who is in exile because he cannot practice his faith in China, is calling the world's attention to the religious persecution of Catholics as well as Christians, Muslims and Buddhists in China. If this Congress is willing to withhold a visa to a family member of a Canadian businessman because he is doing business with Cuba, why should we not withhold a visa for a repressor of religion in China?

I urge my colleagues to support the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and vote "aye."

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. Speaker, again I want to emphasize how important it is to have the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] as chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and to have the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] who is leading the fight for this package of legislation, which is so important.

If these people that suffer in China today are going to be relieved of any of this oppression, it is going to be because of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], who do truly outstanding work on this.

One thing that I like particularly about this package of China bills is that we get to hone in on particular aspects of Communist China's dictatorial methods and irresponsible practices.

So far we have been able to demonstrate China's abusive treatment of political opposition, its use of slave labor, and its rogue proliferation activities. Now Chairman GILMAN with his Free the Clergy Act has brought to light China's abominable record of persecuting religious believers. After all, that is what we Americans cherish the most. We like to live where we want to live, work where we want to work, and worship in the church or the religion of our choice.

Think of it in this manner. We are better able to see just how methodical is the tyranny of Communist totalitarians. Mr. Speaker, religious faith of any sort is dangerous to Communists because faith leads to strength and independence, and Communists like their people to be weak, and they like them to be dependent, not independent. They are easier to control that way. That is why ever since Lenin, Communist totalitarians have been destroying places of worship; killing and jailing priests, ministers, rabbis; raiding prayer sessions; and filling people's heads with atheistic propaganda.

That is part of the Communist doctrine, atheism. That is why they have to set up sham churches led by men who ought to be ashamed of themselves. I think it is a disgrace that we

would even let these people in this country. It is beyond belief that we would fund their travel in this country with taxpayer dollars. That is why this is such a thoughtful and necessary bill.

To those who say denying visas to these persecutors or denying funding to these charlatan religious figures would deny us the opportunity to turn them, or something like that, I say, wake up. We cannot turn totalitarians. Did we turn Brezhnev or Gorbachev by letting them tour America? Absolutely not. Did we turn Jiang last week after we rolled out the red carpet for him and gave him all the goodies? His offensive and arrogant speech before he left this country gave us the answer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great bill. Chairman GILMAN has enlightened us by introducing this and bringing this to the floor. It should pass immediately.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], a member of our committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 967, and commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for the moral leadership that he is providing to the Members of the Committee on International Relations. During my tenure here in this body, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has been a strong voice for morality in American foreign policy, and a man who I deeply respect. It is no surprise that he would be the author of this piece of legislation.

When discussing this bill, we must understand that the Chinese Communist Government is the most egregious persecutor of religious believers in the world. In China there are more Christians, Buddhists, and Muslims as political prisoners, being held as political prisoners, being held in slave labor camps, than in all the other countries of the world combined.

Recently the Chinese Government kidnapped a 6-year-old boy in Tibet. What was his crime? He was a 6-year-old boy that was a designated leader in the Dalai Lama's Buddhist faith. The Chinese Communists took this young boy and they tried to replace him with another young boy that is designated by the Communist Party. In other words, the Communist Party in China is trying to replace the Dalai Lama, take over their religion, oppress these people who have a different faith than this atheistic Communist ideology that controls their actions.

This bill that we are discussing today will deny American tax dollars to pay for the visits of any member of the Communist Chinese Government involved in persecuting religious believers or leaders in State-created mock religious organizations, so that they cannot visit the United States at tax-

payer expense unless the President of the United States certifies that it is in the national interests of the United States to do so.

Symbolically, this bill sends a message to both President Clinton and the Chinese Communist leadership that religious freedom does matter to the people of the United States and to our elected representatives. It sends a message to the oppressed people of the world, and especially the repressed believers in China, that we care about freedom of religion and we care about them.

This bill prevents certain officials from visiting here at taxpayers' expense. But we are not talking about certain officials, what we are talking about is the worst of all officials on this planet. We are talking about government officials who are engaged in torture and repression of people for their religious convictions.

In committee it was argued, and we have just heard argued today on this floor, it is OK to condemn religious persecution, just do not do anything about it. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we do not want Communist jailers and torturers, people who have tortured people for their belief in God, to be visiting this country.

At the very least, if we are going to do something about it, at the very least, we should set a standard and say that people who are engaged in this antihuman rights campaign in China and in other countries to oppress people's religious beliefs, that they should not visit our country at taxpayers' expense.

It is absurd and nonsensical to argue that these brutal thugs will change their ways if they simply come to the United States and enjoy some chablis and California cuisine with the people here, and our liberalism will just sort of ooze over them and they will change.

We do not want the Adolph Eichmanns of this generation visiting the United States at taxpayers' expense. The Nazis would not change their ways because they were horrible people. They were villains, they were evil, they should not have visited the United States at our expense because they were not going to change their ways.

The same is true for the people who engage in torture and oppression in Communist China today. We do not want to change their minds, we want to change their position. We want them out of power. If we are going to bring anybody to the United States, it should be members of those religious communities who are being oppressed in China.

Our heart goes out to the Christians, to the Muslims, to the Buddhists who are being tortured and brutalized by this clique of thugs in China. Let us bring them here. Let us express our appreciation to those people. Let us socialize with them. Let us send the message that we are on their side, and not the side of these people with blood running off of their hands. We should be on

the side of the oppressed wherever in this world there is oppression. We should never be on the side of the oppressor. We should never give the image that that is what we are.

Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy that last month our trade deficit swelled. What was the reason for this in the United States, between the United States and China? Because we were buying Christmas tree decorations from a government, from a country that is dominated by a government that is the worst oppressor of Christians on this planet. This is Kafkaesque, inviting these oppressors here to socialize with us, thinking they will change their ways.

Let us stand for morality, let us stand for justice. Let us just not speak clichés about human rights, let us do something about it, so the people of the world will know that America still stands for something. Support the Gilman amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. There are some points I want to make to clarify a point I had made earlier.

For a point of clarification, I want to say how appropriate the legislation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is. Some have said, why should we deny visas? It is the policy of the Clinton administration to deny visas to family members, say, for example, of Canadian businessmen if those Canadian businessmen are doing business with Cuba. Their children cannot get a visa to the United States. If that is the Clinton administration policy, why then would they, and I do not necessarily support that, in fact, I do not, but how can the administration that supports that then turn around and say, but we think it is inappropriate to deny the visa of a torturer and a persecutor of religion in China and Tibet?

It is on the subject of Tibet I am going to use a little more of my time. The country report on China and Tibet reports that during the year 1996, authorities increased repression, imprisonment, and abuse or torture of monks and nuns accused of political activism. This is a tactic the Chinese use. They accuse the nuns and priests of activism because of their loyalty to the Dalai Lama, His Holiness.

According to authoritative Chinese press reports from May, Beijing launched a campaign to limit criminal activity in the guise of religious practice. The crackdown appears to have three goals: to stop acts of defiance, to break the political power wielded by the Lamas and to remove officials loyal to the Dalai Lama.

In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, the Chinese authorities have kidnapped the Panchen Lama and installed their own successor to His Holiness, the Dalai Lama. Imagine, imagine that they

have kidnapped this child and replaced him with another child.

I just want to reiterate what my colleagues have mentioned as well. When I asked the question and others in the room asked the question about religious repression in China, President Jiang categorically denied that there was religious repression in China, right there before a mixed audience, the House and Senate, bicameral, bipartisan; categorically denied. That was an untruth. We must show the world what the truth is. This legislation does that, and has a penalty attached to it. I urge my colleagues to support the Gilman amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and classmate for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I was very privileged to work with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and others in what ended up to be a bipartisan way in putting together H.R. 2095, the China Human Rights and Democracy Act. One of the key items in H.R. 2095 is our goal of ensuring that those who are responsible for religious persecution are not able to receive visas to come into this country.

I say that as one who is strongly committed to what I still believe is the most powerful force for positive change in the 5,000-year history of China, that being economic reform. Our commercial ties there are key to that.

So I think it is very, very important to note that people like our new colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. JOE PITTS], who joined me when we met with the Chinese Ambassador to specifically ask for the release of Pastor Su, and unfortunately that has not happened, and I believe we need to continue on a separate track to apply as much pressure.

Now, quiet diplomacy is the route we are taking, but frankly, as we proceed with a debate like this, I think it is very fair for those of us who want to strengthen ties but at the same time raise our voices to let our concern be heard.

□ 1615

So it seems to me that we have a very, very important responsibility to support this legislation because we do have many people who have faced religious persecution and we need to do what we can to release them. I agree with the statements that my colleagues have made, we should not reward those who are responsible for it by granting them visas to come into this country.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the dis-

tinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong, strong support of this bill. I would hope it could be almost passed with a unanimous vote, because it is important to note, the Chinese Government is watching really today.

In fact, this debate right now is being watched in Beijing. This debate right now is being watched up on Connecticut Avenue at the Chinese Embassy. What is said here and what tabulation up on both of these things and the tabulation on the board at the end is a message to the Chinese Government that they will get literally in about a half hour from now. The message is the body is divided, or the message is that we are together.

There is major, major persecution. I almost feel it is a redundancy to say, but there are probably six or seven Catholic bishops in jail today as we meet. And all the people that gave the announcement, including the administration, that Bishop Su was out of jail, it is just not true. He is not out of jail.

In fact, we have a press release dated today that says Bishop Su is still in jail. It says he was never released, as reported by the news agency. He is now being held in the detention center. So he is not out of jail.

They are also persecuting the Protestant Church. There have been a number of Protestant pastors who have been arrested.

For those in this body who maintain that they care about diversity, they are persecuting a lot of Muslims in China in addition to we all know what they are doing with regard to Tibet.

Mr. Speaker, I just urge that we pass this vote with, hopefully, a unanimous vote or almost a unanimous vote, knowing that the Chinese in Beijing are watching and the Chinese up at the Chinese Embassy are watching, and also the people of China.

And can my colleagues imagine, if they were the loved one of a Catholic bishop or a Catholic priest or a Protestant pastor or a Buddhist monk or a Buddhist nun, and they heard that the United States Congress, the people's House, had passed this resolution by an overwhelming vote with regard to, free the clergy, can we imagine the inspiration that we would get?

So I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the other gentleman that worked on this bill for their support.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how many speakers are left on the other side.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have two other speakers that are not here. They have been detained. I believe they are working on some committee work. So I would be the last speaker. So if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAVIS] would like to close on his side, then I will close on our side.

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

Again, I think it is perfectly clear that the issue here is not whether there is any lack of disgust or resolve with respect to religious persecution that is occurring within the boundaries of China. The issue here is the best way to deal with that.

I think it is also fair to say that there is yet to be any credible argument to refute the fact that, by denying visas here, we are disengaging ourselves from an important conversation that needs to be held not just within the borders of this country in the conferences we have on human rights, but in the court of world opinion throughout the world, which we are responsible for conducting by bringing people together to debate issues and values.

Of course, we should not be afraid to debate those who would try to defend some of the reprehensible practices that currently occur in China, and we should welcome the scrutiny that we can bring to bear on these folks by bringing them to conferences and having them speak.

As has been suggested by a number of people here today, it is our burden to raise awareness of these issues, to expose these practices to the world and let the heat of truth bear upon them, because we will prevail, ultimately, in convincing the rest of the world that more pressure needs to be brought to bear on China to put an end to what is occurring there.

One of the supporters of the bill made the comment, we need to show the world where the truth is. I would suggest to my colleagues that it is fundamentally the case, as our first amendment stands for, that there is no better way to do that than to make sure that we have an open and honest discussion in this country that has to include the people who would, amazingly enough, attempt to defend some of these reprehensible practices that are occurring in China.

In fact, as a result of the meeting that recently occurred with the President of China here with our President, there is a delegation of religious leaders from our country who will be visiting China in the future to pursue exactly the type of conversation that we may ultimately lose if this bill were to pass and China were to retaliate by denying visas to our religious leaders who seek to enter that country to shake the opinion of not just people around the world but people inside the borders of China who sympathize with us and want to fight to stop human rights abuses.

Let me finally say, there has been some suggestion that there ought not to be any controversy with respect to this bill. And that certainly would be true if the bill had ended with the first section, as I described earlier, which simply states the sense of Congress that we should, under no circumstances, tolerate religious persecution in China. But because the bill goes so much further and because it contains the two inherent flaws that I

have referred to, the bill was in fact heavily opposed in the committee when it first came up and in fact failed.

And, in fact, there was opposition to that bill from the chairman of the subcommittee, who has jurisdiction over China. And there was opposition from other prominent members of the majority party. The bill only passed when it was brought up on a motion for reconsideration; and even then, it was a very close vote with strong bipartisan opposition.

So the bill and its objectives is noble. And certainly we need to work together, Democrats and Republicans, put politics aside, to not just call attention to the religious persecution that occurs in China but to find effective ways to stop it.

This bill is not an effective way to stop it. This bill will discontinue some very important conversations that have led us to the progress we have had to date, and it also may have the effect of cutting off our ability to send some of our religious leaders into China to hopefully build up more momentum within that country to stop their own religious persecution. For those reasons, I would urge that this bill be defeated.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for this bill, and especially the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] for his leadership in crafting this package, which is comprehensive, mutually reinforcing, and really sends a clear, unambiguous message to the dictatorship in Beijing that we mean business.

Yes, there are some who do not support linking most favored nation status. And the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], who spoke earlier so eloquently, is one of those. But this is one of those issues that most of us, almost all of us, can coalesce around and really present a genuine, authentic, united front that we will not tolerate human rights abuses in any way, shape, or form.

First, the bill that is before us would prohibit U.S. taxpayer funding for participation in U.S. cultural or educational supported exchange programs to PRC officials who have been directly involved in persecution, as well as to the officials who direct the agencies that have committed the persecution, including, but not limited to, the heads of Government-run religious front organizations.

What do we mean by that? No travel expenses. The U.S. taxpayer will not foot the bill to bring these people to our shores. No per diem expenses. We are not going to shell out money so they can eat high on the hog while back home they are the persecutors.

Second, the bill would deny U.S. visas to people who actually partici-

pated in or directed religious persecution. Like other visa exclusion grounds for terrorists and narcotraffickers, this would be adjudicated on a case-by-case basis by consular officers.

The Government of China, as we know so clearly, and every reputable human rights group bears witness to this and the State Department country reports on human rights practices also bear witness to this terrible truth that millions of Christians are being persecuted today.

It is strictly forbidden to be a Christian outside the official church run by the Government. If you want to be a Catholic, for example, the Government requires you to join a church that does not recognize the Pope, has censored huge portions of the Bible. It is almost like Swiss cheese; whole parts of the Bible have been ripped out and are strictly prohibited from being taught. And they can never say anything about government policy and the linkage that policy might have to morality.

It also proscribes the teaching of religion to anyone under the age of 18. So no young people can hear about God in China in the officially-run churches. And if they do so in the underground church, the full weight of the dictatorship is levied against them.

Catholics who insist on belonging to the real Catholic Church have been imprisoned. This includes, at least four Catholic bishops and dozens, literally dozens, of priests. As a matter of fact, when the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I met with Li Peng in Beijing years ago back in 1994, we handed him a list of imprisoned pastors. He would not even look at it and just was in total denial in a way that is much akin to what President Jiang Zemin was when he said to us, incredulously, that they have had religious freedom in China since Mao. Do any of my colleagues in this Chamber believe that, the Cultural Revolution, when it was a high tide of crackdown, that that was religious tolerance? Of course not.

We know since 1894, with the issuance of Decrees 194 and 195, the crackdown has accelerated, and they are trying to stamp out from the face of that country any kind of religious observance that is not carefully circumscribed and run by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

The situation, Mr. Speaker, is no better for other religious believers either. The Government has conducted a ruthless campaign against Tibetans, including the destruction of monasteries, the imprisonment and torture of monks and nuns, and the arrest and subsequent disappearance of the 7-year-old child, the Panchen Lama.

In Xinjiang Autonomous Region, formerly the independent nation of East Turkistan, Moslem leaders are persecuted for fidelity to their religion, the Islam. Recently we had a hearing in my subcommittee and we heard the kind of horrific excesses that the security forces bring to bear against those who want to practice their Moslem faith.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of this bill have already gone, and this happened in committee, and I regret that it happened, but it happened. There have been changes in this bill. This has been a modified bill. The committee adopted an amendment that stripped all the findings of fact from the bill on the ground that the Chinese Government had not been asked for its opinion on these findings.

Another amendment was adopted that limited the denial of visas to persons who either carried out persecution themselves or directed the carrying out of persecution.

Another amendment to the visa provision limitation made a special exemption to the heads of the state-run churches. So the gentleman is incorrect based on the plain language of the bill, religious affairs ministers and cabinet ministers and heads of state.

Finally, even in a narrow class of cases, we provided the President with waiver authority that, in the event he finds that admitting one of these persecutors is somehow vital to the national interest of the United States, he can do so.

This is an extremely moderate bill. Any of my colleagues who pretend otherwise ought to read the bill over again.

I ask my colleagues to read the bill. When it talks about those who will be denied per diem and travel expenses and perhaps they may be denied a visa, we are talking, and this is right from the bill,

any military or civilian officer or employee of the Government of the People's Republic of China who carried out or directed the carrying out of any of the following policies or practices formulating, drafting, or implementing repressive religious policies, imprisoning, detaining, or harassing individuals on religious grounds, or promoting or participating in policies or practices which hinder religious activities or the free expression of religious beliefs.

This is very, very, I think, clear and very tight, and this is the minimum that we should be doing.

Finally, just let me make a point about one particular Catholic priest that I met when I was there, and I have met many people in the underground church, but Bishop Su of Baoding Province, a man who has spent almost 20 years in the Laogai, in the gulags of China, he has been tortured in hideous ways, sleep deprivation, genitals being cattle-prodded, and all kinds of horrible things. Here he is, a Catholic bishop.

□ 1630

The Chinese Government has now re-arrested him. Madeleine Albright and our very distinguished State Department announced with much flourish that he had been released. It turns out that was another case of disinformation. We have reliable, I will not say it is absolutely correct, nobody ever knows in a closed society, but very reliable information strongly suggesting that he is still being held in

Jingyuan County Detention Center in Baoding Province. As Members know, there was all this talk that constructive engagement somehow is working. "Look, Bishop Su has been released." No, he is still in prison. What was his crime? He wants to preach the gospel. He wants to talk about Christ. He celebrated mass for our very small delegation in a small, dingy apartment. The next day we heard that he was arrested. I did not even want to meet with him. I thought that might bring the security apparatus down upon his head, and sure enough it did. So if Members think that preaching is free and somehow not censored, we are only fooling ourselves. For meeting with me and 5 or 6 other people and celebrating mass, this man is now in prison.

When we toast glasses and we say let us have more partnership and constructive engagement, let us not forget the men and women who are languishing in these gulags simply because of their faith. This is Muslims, Buddhists, Catholics, evangelical Protestants in the People's Republic of China.

They do this for the human rights activists as well, as we all know. Wei Jingsheng is just one of many who had the courage to speak out and say basic human rights need to be protected. He is also languishing in a prison and has been severely beaten.

Finally, just let me say a point about the heads of these officially recognized churches. This is what Jiang Zemin said recently in the People's Daily, March 14, 1996. He said state religious policy is to "actively guide religion so that it can be adapted to socialist society." I met with the head of the Religious Affairs Department on a number of occasions, here and in the People's Republic of China. I asked him if he was a believer. He said absolutely not. He is an avowed atheist. He said in the Chinese press that the handling of religious matters needed to be done according to the dictates of Lenin. He did not even say Mao. He said Lenin. We all know what Lenin did to the church and how he persecuted the church in the former Soviet Union.

Rev. Deng Fucun, the general secretary of the government-run Three Self Patriotic Movement, made the preposterous claim in the Western press on July 16 that there was no such thing as an underground church. I and many of my colleagues have met numerous members who were part of this underground church. They are brave souls. Some surface. Many are in hiding.

Another atheist who heads the Protestant church, again government-run, said, and I quote, that there is no persecution in China. Again these people become front people. Let us not forget that this has happened in other Communist dictatorships. People come here, and again what the bill proscribes is that we feed them, we pay for their food and we pay for their lodging and their airfare and the like.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very modest bill. This will advance the ball a little

bit, not a whole lot but a little bit in the realm of religious freedom. We stand today with the oppressed, not the oppressor. I hope that people will support this important bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, if the bill were to have the effect of causing the Chinese Government to deny visas to some of our religious leaders who attempt to support the underground church he refers to, how does that advance our cause of stopping religious persecution?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. First of all, we are talking about people who have persecuted. We are talking about saying that there is some penalty affixed. First of all, if our people meet with the underground church over there, as I have discovered and others have discovered, that means potentially that these people that we meet with end up going to prison. They without question will get interrogated, but they might even go to prison for a week, a month, who knows how long. That is all up to the dictates of the State. Right now they are people who it is probably better we have a minimum, if no contact with because we would do nothing but lead the secret police to their doorsteps.

Let me also say for these others to come here at our expense to me just, when they are fronting, especially if they have been found to be persecutors, is to allow the jailers and the persecutors to come here. We need to have a penalty affixed to that. That is why this is such a modest bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REGULA). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 366, nays 54, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 595]

YEAS—366

Abercrombie
Aderholt

Allen
Andrews

Archer
Armey

Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett

Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (WI)
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston

LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascarella
Pastor
Paxon
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow

NAYS—54

Ackerman
Becerra
Berman
Brown (CA)
Clay
Clyburn
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeLauro
Dellums
Dingell
Fattah
Fazio
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Houghton

NOT VOTING—13

Carson
Conyers
Cubin
Forbes
Gonzalez

□ 1658

Messrs. McDERMOTT, FRANK of Massachusetts, THOMPSON, NADLER, SERRANO, MARTINEZ, STOKES, RUSH, VENTO and Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. McCARTHY of Missouri and Messrs. SKELTON, CANNON, MORAN of Virginia, BONIOR and ALLEN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MR. WISE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KOLBE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 185, not voting 21, as follows:

Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Johnson, E. B.
Kennelly
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lofgren
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
McDermott
McGovern
Milleander-McDonald
Minge
Mink
Nadler
Paul
Payne
Pickett

Portman
Riley
Schiff

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Billakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bono
Boyd
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas

[Roll No. 596]

AYES—227

Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gillman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley

NOES—185

Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt

Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gephardt
Gordon
Green
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther

Boehner
Carson
Conyers
Cubin
Davis (FL)
Forbes
Gonzalez

Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Milleander-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers

NOT VOTING—21

Gutierrez
Hoyer
John
Johnson, Sam
McKinney
Mica
Neal

□ 1718

Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, MARKEY and DEUTSCH changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1119) "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 858) "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the