

They are telling words from Richard Nixon, the person responsible for the so-called engagement, which has resulted in more espionage against our government, the arrest of Catholic bishops and persecution of people of faith. On his deathbed, Nixon, the architect for our present China policy said, "We may have created a Frankenstein."

The passage of PNTR will feed this Frankenstein that will come to haunt this country and haunt this House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with you William Safire's editorial from today's New York Times.

Today, Mr. Safire writes that before Richard Nixon died, Mr. Safire had a conversation with Nixon about China. Safire asked Nixon if they had gone a bit overboard on selling the American public on the political benefits of their China deal. Nixon replied that he was not as hopeful as he had once been, saying "We may have created a Frankenstein."

We may have created a Frankenstein. These are telling words coming from Nixon, the person most responsible for supposed American "engagement" with China . . . an engagement that over the past 30 years has refused to engage the Chinese with their gross human rights abuses, its espionage against the U.S., its proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, its plundering of Tibet.

On his deathbed, Nixon, the architect for our present China policy said "We may have created a Frankenstein."

Congress can prevent this Frankenstein from further atrocities and bad actions by voting against giving China permanent normal trade relations.

#### THE BIGGEST VOTE

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON.—The most far-reaching vote any representative will cast this year will take place next week. It will be on the bill to permanently guarantee that Congress will have no economic leverage to restrain China's internal repression of dissidents or external aggression against Taiwan.

Bill Clinton, architect of the discredited "strategic partnership" with Beijing, is lobbying for H.R. 4444 as part of his legacy thing. His strange bedfellow is the G.O.P. leadership, fairly slavering at the prospect of heavy contributions from U.S. companies that want to profit from building up China's industrial and electronic strength.

Clinton has been purchasing Democratic votes one by one. The latest convert to pulling the U.S. teeth is Charles Rangel of New York, who was seduced by last week's legislation to benefit African workers at the expense of Chinese laborers in sweatshops at slave wages. He is the ranking Democrat on Ways and Means, which yesterday voted to send the any-behavior-goes bill to the House floor.

The president's tactics include frightening Americans with "dangerous confrontation and constant insecurity" from angry China if his appeasement is not passed.

He also divides American farmers from workers with his mantra, "exports mean jobs." Of course they do; in the past decade, our trade deficit with China has ballooned from \$7 billion to \$70 billion. That means China's exports to the U.S. have created hundreds of thousands of jobs—in China. Clinton's trade deficit is certainly not creating net jobs for Americans.

His trade negotiator, Charlene Barshefsky, has become increasingly shrill, turning truth

on its head this week by telling Lally Weymouth of The Washington Post that "organized labor, human rights advocates and some environmentalists have aligned themselves with the Chinese army and hard-liners in Beijing who do not want accession for China."

Not to be outdone in twisting the truth and kowtowing to Communists, Republican investors and the Asia establishment assure us that only by abandoning yearly review of China's rights abuses and diplomatic conduct can we encourage democracy there.

I confess to writing speeches for Richard Nixon assuring conservatives that trade with China would lead to the evolution of democratic principles in Beijing. But we've been trading for 30 years now, financing its military-industrial base, enabling it to buy M-11 missiles from the Russians and advanced computer technology from us.

Has our strengthening of their regime brought political freedom? Ask the Falun Gong, jailed by the thousands for daring to organize; as the Tibetans, their ancient culture destroyed and nation colonized; ask the Taiwanese, who face an escalation of the military threat against them after the U.S. Congress spikes its cannon of economic retaliation.

Before Nixon died, I asked him—on the record—if perhaps we had gone a bit overboard on selling the American public on the political benefits of increased trade. That old realist, who had played the China card to exploit the split in the Communist world, replied with some sadness that he was not as hopeful as he had once been: "We may have created a Frankenstein."

(I was on the verge of correcting him that Dr. Frankenstein was the creator, and that he meant "Frankenstein's monster," but I bit my tongue.)

To provide a face-saver for Democrats uncomfortable with forever removing Scoop Jackson's economic pressure, Clinton's bipartisan allies have cooked up a toothless substitute: a committee to cluck-cluck loudly when China cracks down and acts up. We already have a State Department annual report that does that, to no effect on a China whose transgressions have always been waived.

Human rights advocates know the smart money in Washington is betting on the appeasers. Our only hope is that the undecideds in Congress consider that unemployment in their districts will not always be under 4 percent, and that when recession or aggression bites, voters will not forget who threw away economic restraints on China.

□ 2015

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### IN SUPPORT OF PNTR FOR CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, American business men and women have eyed China for years, knowing that the sky is the limit when it comes to selling American-made goods and services to the world's largest market. But Americans have found it difficult to trade with China since complete access to this vast market has been vastly restricted.

In today's global marketplace, we can no longer afford any restrictions on trade with the world's largest population. We must engage China to ensure that American companies and American workers have the tools to compete with other nations now already in these markets. Remember, when America competes, we win.

Over the past year, Mr. Speaker, I have worked with the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules, and a number of colleagues in support of extending permanent normal trading relations with China. Back home in New Jersey, I have met with hundreds of people from the business community to encourage them to organize and help spread the word about the benefits of increased trade with China that will bring benefits to the Garden State, and I would like to discuss for a few minutes a few of these items.

First, extending permanent normal trade relations with China is a win for fairness. This agreement forces China to adhere to our rules-based trading system. Without an agreement, there are no rules and we have no say whatsoever in how China conducts its business with the rest of the world.

Secondly, it is a win for U.S. workers and businesses, Mr. Speaker. China is an incredibly important emerging market with more than a billion consumers.

Thirdly, trade with China is a win for American values inside China. Through free and fair trade, America will not only export many products and services, but we will deliver a good old-fashioned dose of our democratic values and free market ideas.

Fourthly, international trade whether it be with China or any other Nation means jobs for my State of New Jersey, and that is the bottom line, continued prosperity for all of us. Out of New Jersey's 4.1 million member workforce, almost 600,000 people statewide from main street to Fortune 500 companies are employed because of exports, imports and foreign direct investment. Currently, China ranked as New Jersey's ninth largest export destination in 1998, an increase from 13th in 1993. Our Garden State has exported \$668 million in merchandise to China in 1998, more than double what was exported 5 years earlier.

With a formal trade agreement in practice, imagine the potential as access to China's vast markets is improved. Enormous opportunities exist for our State's telecommunications,

our environmental technology, our health care industry, our agriculture and food processing industries.

Fifth and finally, in the interest of world peace, it is absolutely a mistake to isolate China, a nation with the world's largest standing army, an estimated 2.6 million member force.

America's democratic allies in Asia support China's entry into the World Trade Organization because they know that a constructive relationship with China and a stable Asia offers the best chance for reducing regional tensions along the Taiwan Strait and for avoiding a new arms race elsewhere in Asia and throughout the world.

As I work to pass PNTR for China, I am fully aware of the controversies surrounding this vote. Indeed, humanitarian and environmental issues remain important to me in our dealings with China, but I refuse to believe that if we walk away from China our national interest would be better served. In fact, I am positive to do so would greatly deter from our ability and our credibility to push reform in China and around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, as General Colin Powell has said, and I quote, from every standpoint, from a strategic standpoint, from the standpoint of our national interest, from the standpoint of our trading interest and our economic interest, it serves all of our purposes to grant China this status.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### INTRODUCTION OF LIVE LONG AND PROSPER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, May is Older Americans Month, a time for Americans to celebrate the many contributions our seniors have made to this country. It is also a time to reflect upon the changing look of our society and to advance policies that meet the needs of this and future generations of older Americans. By the year 2030, the number of older Americans is expected to be more than double, to 70 million, representing one-fifth of our total population. As the number of elderly Americans increases, the need for long-term home or institutional care will become even more pressing.

Are we now prepared to meet this future need? The sad fact is that neither the public nor the private sectors have adequately planned to meet this demand. In most cases, they are not aware that Medicaid requires divesting of assets and they do not understand that Medicare provides only minimal

long-term care coverage. As for private insurance, it currently finances only an estimated 7 percent of long-term care expenditures.

Given America's ticking demographic time bomb, it is imperative that Congress address this issue now. That is why I rise today to introduce the Live Long and Prosper Act, which directly addresses what we must do now to help meet the needs of older Americans of the future. This comprehensive legislation builds upon the long-term care financing provisions created by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996.

To better prepare the public for long-term care expenses, first the bill provides for an above-the-line income tax deduction for the cost of long-term care insurance premiums for the taxpayer, his or her spouse and dependents. It also allows employers to provide long-term care insurance coverage as part of a cafeteria plan. Surprisingly, long-term care insurance currently is not allowed under these types of employer-employee arrangements.

Third, the bill would provide a personal exemption to the more than 7 million Americans who provide long-term custodial care for a relative in their home. Together, these provisions represent a market-based solution to the ever-growing demand for long-term care services and financing. But financial incentives alone will not advance the public's understanding of the need to plan for long-term care nor will they spur public debate on what more must be done.

The Live Long and Prosper Act calls for a biannual national White House summit on long-term care. The summit will bring together experts in the fields of long-term care insurance, retirement savings, care givers and others and will be cohosted by the President and congressional leaders. Its goal is to design and develop recommendations for additional research, reforms in public policy and improvements required in the field of long-term care insurance.

The bill also directs the Department of Labor to create and maintain an outreach program, to include public service announcements, forums, educational materials, and long-term care Internet sites. The Department of Health and Human Services will conduct studies focusing on the future demand for long-term care services and public and private options to finance them.

Finally, the bill contains several other provisions designed to improve awareness of and to strengthen the process for long-term care information delivery.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, the Center for Long-term Care and Financing describes long-term care as the sleeping giant of all U.S. social problems. Demographic changes, quality of care concerns, the rising cost of nursing home care and limited public finances all cry out for action in this area and

call on this body to make long-term care a top policy priority.

I believe that the Live Long and Prosper Act is a comprehensive first step in what should be a bipartisan effort to address this vital issue. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the bill and join me in this effort.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4475, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-626) on the resolution (H. Res. 505) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4475) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4392, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-627) on the resolution (H. Res. 506) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4392) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### IN SUPPORT OF TOUGH GUN LEGISLATION AFTER THE MILLION MOMS MARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today a week after the Million Mom March to remind the Congress that even though the march is over, the cause is not. On the eve of the march, some argued that we were being rabble-rousers and troublemakers. They argued then and they still argue that we are too emotional in pulling for tough gun control legislation, common sense gun control legislation. The National Rifle Association argues that we need, and I quote, gun education and not gun legislation, end of quote.

Well, as we all know, you cannot teach a child not to be a child. We all know that children often lash out in anger, without thinking, and they later wish that the things done and said can be taken back. But once a trigger is