

Sensenbrenner	Spratt	Velazquez
Serrano	Stabenow	Vento
Sessions	Stearns	Vitter
Shadegg	Stenholm	Walden
Shaw	Stump	Walsh
Shays	Sununu	Wamp
Sherman	Talent	Watkins
Sherwood	Tanner	Watt (NC)
Shimkus	Tauscher	Watts (OK)
Shows	Taylor (NC)	Waxman
Shuster	Terry	Weldon (FL)
Simpson	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Sisisky	Thornberry	Wexler
Skeen	Thune	Weygand
Skelton	Thurman	Whitfield
Smith (MI)	Tiahrt	Wicker
Smith (NJ)	Tierney	Wilson
Smith (TX)	Toomey	Wise
Smith (WA)	Towns	Wolf
Snyder	Traficant	Woolsey
Souder	Turner	Wynn
Spence	Upton	Young (FL)

NAYS—54

Aderholt	Hefley	Pickett
Baird	Hill (MT)	Pomeroy
Billbray	Hilleary	Ramstad
Bonior	Hilliard	Rogan
Borski	Holden	Sabo
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Schaffer
Clay	Klink	Slaughter
Clyburn	Kucinich	Stark
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Strickland
Crane	Lipinski	Sweeney
DeFazio	LoBiondo	Taylor (MS)
Dickey	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
English	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)
Filner	Moore	Udall (NM)
Ford	Oberstar	Visclosky
Gutierrez	Olver	Waters
Gutknecht	Peterson (MN)	Weller
Hastings (FL)	Phelps	Wu

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—34

Blunt	Hulshof	Pascrell
Burton	Jones (NC)	Pease
Chenoweth-Hage	Kasich	Rodriguez
Cummings	Larson	Rush
Delahunt	Lazio	Scarborough
Ehrlich	Maloney (NY)	Stupak
Engel	Martinez	Tauzin
Fattah	McKinney	Udall (CO)
Fossella	Minge	Weiner
Ganske	Mollohan	Young (AK)
Gibbons	Morella	
Gilchrest	Nadler	

1022

Mr. OBERSTAR changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. VENTO changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announcing that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution commending Israel's redeployment from southern Lebanon.

The message also announced that in accordance with sections 1928-1928d of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly during the Second Session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress, to be held in Budapest, Hungary, May 26-30, 2000—

the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), Acting Chairman;

the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER);

the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI); and

the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for a 1-minute speech. All other 1-minutes will be postponed until the end of the legislative day.

WELCOME TO REVEREND MONSIGNOR WILLIAM P. FAY

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome our guest chaplain, Monsignor William P. Fay. Monsignor Fay was recently elected to serve as the General Secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, U.S. Catholic Conference. His 5-year term begins next February.

He has served as Associate General Secretary of the conference since 1995. In this capacity, Monsignor Fay has overseen the public policy work of the U.S. Catholic Conference. Monsignor Fay helped to coordinate the most recent visit of Pope John Paul II to the United States when the Holy Father traveled to St. Louis in January 1999.

Monsignor Fay was ordained to the priesthood for the Archdiocese of Boston in 1974. After his ordination, Monsignor Fay was an associate pastor in several parishes in Massachusetts. Immediately before coming to the Catholic conference, he was a professor of philosophy at St. John's Seminary in Brighton, Massachusetts. He also served as the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts there and chairman of the department of philosophy.

Please join me in welcoming Monsignor William P. Fay.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4444, AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 510 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 510

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4444) to authorize extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People's Republic of China. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) three hours of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided among and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Representative Stark of California or his designee, and Representative Rohrabacher of California or his designee; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very dear friend from South Boston, Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) with whom I spend many long evenings upstairs in the Committee on Rules, including last night, to get this measure down here, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as is customary for consideration of trade legislation, H.Res. 510 is a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4444, a bill to authorize extension of normal trade relations to the People's Republic of China. The rule provides 3 hours of debate in the House equally divided among the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) or their designees.

The rule provides that in lieu of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the rule shall be considered as adopted. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, today's vote on trade with China is probably the most important vote that we will face in this session of Congress. Make no mistake about it. This vote is a win-win-win for America's workers, America's first-class businesses, and the very important goal of promoting American values. This will be a win for American workers because China will finally be required to play by the rules when they trade with America. They are opening their markets to American exporters which means good jobs across the United States. This is also a major win for world-class American businesses. We are home to the world's best high-tech companies, entertainers, farmers, and financial institutions.

1030

These industries are at the heart of my home State of California's vibrant growing economy. They dominate global markets, and they will do the same in China if we let them.

However, as good a trade deal as this is, it does not get any more one sided in our favor than this. We do not face a choice between American pocketbooks and American values.

The fact is, trade with China is good for the Chinese people. It is good for human rights. It is good for democratic reform. It is good for national security, and it is good for American values. Yes, high-tech industries strongly support this bill. Yes, farmers across America strongly support this bill.

Yes, this bill is key to spreading the Internet across China. That is all great. But the real story is that leading human rights activists, democratic reformers and religious leaders in China support permanent normal trade relations and China entering the World Trade Organization.

Mr. Speaker, China is in the midst of great and dynamic change; and free market reform is the primary engine pushing that change. In fact, market reform is the single most powerful force for positive change in the 5,000-year history of Chinese civilization.

Mr. Speaker, if we care about the Chinese people, we cannot ignore reality that free market reforms have lifted hundreds of millions of Chinese people out of the depths of poverty. They have led to greater personal freedom for nearly everyone in China.

Mr. Speaker, supporters of trade with China, those of us who are supporters are not fools. We know that there are huge problems in China, and we do not ignore those problems. China is a country of 1.3 billion people with, as I said, 5,000 years of history dominated by both poverty and repression. Freedom and prosperity will not come to China overnight, or in a year or two. But if we stand for trade, if we stand for trade, we stand with Martin Lee, the leading democracy activist in Hong Kong, with Chen Shui-bian, the newly-elected president of Taiwan, who, the morning after he was elected, said one of the top priorities is China's accession to the World Trade Organization.

Billy Graham, who has not injected himself into this debate, other than to say that he believes that communication with China and openness is very important for us. Colin Powell, who just yesterday talked about the importance of this with Governor George W. Bush; Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board; and, of course, former Presidents George Bush, Jimmy Carter, and Gerald Ford; as well as Ren Wanding, who is leader of China's 1978 Democracy Wall Movement in China; and a host of other Chinese human rights activists. People like Wei Jinhsheng, who for 7 years was imprisoned following the Tiananmen Square protests, people like this have come forward and said this is a very important thing to do.

So when we vote yes on permanent normal trade relations today, Mr. Speaker, we will be standing with winners. We stand with the people that will win in today's debate. We stand with the people that will win with this very important, but most important, Mr. Speaker, we stand with the winning tide of history that is slowly lifting the people of China from the depth of poverty and repression into the community of nations based on freedom and human dignity.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, my dear friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, every year Congress votes to extend normal trade relations with China. Today, the House will vote on whether to make that status permanent. Today, the House will decide whether we should treat the Chinese Government exactly the same way we treat nearly every other government.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Chinese Government has yet earned that privilege. Now, I am not saying we should not trade with China. It is the most populous country in the world; and, as such, it is a potential gold mine for American business. That is why I vote for annual normal trade relations for China.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we do not reconsider that status every year, we are going to lose what little chance we have of effecting any change in China. Mr. Speaker, China needs to change.

According to Mary Robinson, the chief of human rights of United Nations, in the last 2 years, human rights in China have gotten worse.

My friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman, just said that we are going to stand with these people if we vote for China. Here is some of the other people we are going to stand with. This is the government that killed its own people with demonstrating in Tiananmen Square.

This is the government that jails hundreds of people who believe in the Falun Gong spiritual movements.

It is the same government that sells missiles and nuclear technology to North Korea and Iraq.

This is the same government that is home to at least 1100 slaved labor camps; and this is the same government that devastates its environment by building the Three Gorges Dam, ignores workers' rights and trades in endangered species.

Mr. Speaker, if we grant the Chinese Government permanent normal trade relations, we will be giving away what little chance we have to exert some influence on some of these horrible practices, particularly, the abuse of religious freedoms.

The United States Commission on Internal Religious Freedom reported that in China that Roman Catholic and Protestant underground house churches suffered increased repression, the crackdown included the arrests of bishops, priests, and pastors, one of whom was found dead on the street moments after he was arrested.

Mr. Speaker, since the United States consumes one-third of China's exports, we have a great opportunity to change the current practices in China, and we should not squander that opportunity for the sake of the almighty dollar.

I am not naive enough to think that the United States should pass up all trade with China, but I do think that we should at least reconsider that decision each and every year. Each year that Congress reconsiders the most favored nation trading status for China, the debate resurfaces here in the halls of the Congress, in the newspapers, on television screens. Each year we have the debate, attention again is focused again on China; and heat is kept on. And if we are to make that status permanent, the debate would end and human and workers' rights would be completely off the radar screen.

If we do not reconsider China's trade status every year, we lock ourselves into an inescapable trade agreement that hurts workers, hurts the environment and does nothing to stop religious persecution, slave labor, or the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the lead author of the very important legislation which is incorporated in this bill, which I believe will play a key role in bringing about its victory today.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. I want to commend, the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) and the Committee on Rules for this excellent rule.

While providing China with permanent normal trade relations, PNTR, it

is very clearly and overwhelmingly in America's short-term and long-term national interests; and a convincing case can be made for passing PNTR on its merits alone. Legitimate specific concerns in Congress about China and Sino-American relations continue. That is why the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and this Member have offered a PNTR compatible parallel proposal in order to address those concerns which, I emphasize, this rule self-executes into H.R. 4444.

During the markup in the Committee on Ways and Means of that legislation, the important special 12-year import anti-surge protections for the U.S. as originally proposed in the Levin-Bereuter package were incorporated into the PNTR bill. This is an effective deterrent and defense against any huge import surges from China that could cause specific American business or agricultural sectors some damage. It is a special 12-year anti-surge provision that goes above and beyond that which we have with any other of the 135 members of the WTO.

With this rule, the PNTR legislation is expanded to incorporate the remainder of the Levin-Bereuter proposal which includes, first, the congressional executive commission on the People's Republic of China. This commission is based upon the OSCE or Helsinki Commission model and would be comprised of Members of this body, the other body, and of the executive branch.

The commission would produce an annual report to the President and Congress evaluating human rights in China with, should it deem appropriate, recommendations. Within 30 days of the receipt of that report, the House Committee on International Relations would be required to hold at least one public hearing on the report, and on the basis of that recommendation or recommendations in the report, decide, in a specified time frame a short period what legislation to report to the House floor.

Secondly, we enhance the monitoring enforcement of China's WTO commitments, and that is very important. The U.S. Trade Representative is directed to seek the annual review by the WTO of China's compliance with its commitments to the WTO and is required to report annually to the Congress on China's compliance record.

Additional staff and resources are authorized for the Departments of Commerce, State, and Agriculture and the USTR to monitor and support enforcement of China's trade commitments. A trade law technical assistance center would be established to assist businesses and workers in evaluating the potential remedies to any trade violations by China.

Third, a task force is created in the executive branch on prison labor exports. This would improve the enforcement of our laws preventing the importation of prison labor products. It would be authorized and the adminis-

tration will be directed to enter into agreements.

Then, of course, we express the sense of the Congress that Taiwan should enter the same General Council meeting of the WTO when China is provided WTO membership as provided in an earlier Dunn-Bereuter bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 4444.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to establishing permanent normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China. China's record on human rights, religious persecution, forced abortions, political freedom, and workers safety is bad. It is getting worse.

A recent study by the Congressional Research Service concluded that the annual congressional debate on China trade has, in fact, played a prominent role in winning the release of some Chinese political prisoners. And by granting China permanent normal trade relations, we will lose that opportunity to review China's human rights record.

There are some benefits to the United States in this trade agreement. Some companies in our country, of course, will make a few bucks, but if we look at the agreements that we have had with the Chinese Government, they have not fully kept the promises that they have made to us so many times before.

There is no reason to believe that it will honor the terms of this agreement. I have always been a student of Asia, at least I have tried to be. I lived in Asia for a few years, and the one thing that I know about Asians is that they respect courage. They respect patience. They respect politeness, but they really respect toughness. I think China looks at us on issues like this and laughs, and says Americans are weak. They give in too quickly on their principles.

This legislation is a dog, and it smells. It deserves to go down. Vote "no" on the rule. Vote "no" on the bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Fairfax, Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), my good friend, one of the great champions of globalization and trade.

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this and for the resolution. For America, this agreement is a one-way street, our markets are already open to the Chinese; if there is going to be job loss, we have seen it.

In terms of some of these low-wage markets that have already been moved in the Pacific Rim into China and to these other areas, what this does for

the first time, and by adopting PNTR, China's markets are now going to be more accessible to American companies, American products. 1.2 billion Chinese, America only has 5 percent of the world's consumers. China is the largest, second largest economy in the world, 100 million Chinese today making \$40,000 a year U.S. annually. A middle class that is burgeoning and growing, and this is going to increase the pressures for democratization inside of China.

1045

China already joins the WTO regardless of what we do here today. That already happens. The question is: Are American products, are American corporations, are American workers, going to get the WTO preference by our granting PNTR and does America get the benefits of the World Trade Organization tribunals for resolving trade issues that we do not get if we just go on to an annual basis?

Under PNTR, the answer is yes, we get those benefits. With only annual trade relations agreements the answer is no.

Look, we all agree that China's human rights record is abysmal; it is terrible. But does withholding PNTR bring about any of those changes? No. That is why Martin Lee, the great democracy leader in Hong Kong, the Dalai Lama and others endorse PNTR.

The best way to change China and to change their pitiful human rights record and their abuses is through trade, by opening up their borders, by exporting our values and our goods to China; to the opening of the Internet, the opening of their media, opening up to free commerce.

History teaches that revolutions occur when things are getting better, not when things are getting worse. It is a historical law of relative deprivation. Things are improving in China; and if the rising expectation of those people come forward, we will see this historical law move to a huge change in China in their human rights and democratic abuses that they have today.

Economic forces that will be unleashed by free trade and commerce are going to overwhelm the current forces fighting to maintain socialism, to main totalitarianism and repression in China. Political freedom will follow the economic freedom in the opening up of the markets in this case. Let us be visionary and understand that the information revolution that is taking this planet, the globalization of the economy, these are very strong forces which will be enhanced by adopting this agreement today, and this will change China forever in a way that withholding our support can never get to.

It changed Taiwan, which just a few years ago was a dictatorship. It changed Korea, which was a dictatorship. These forces are overwhelming and we are unleashing these forces by adopting this resolution today.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the rule and to vote yes on this resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), the chief deputy whip of the Democratic Party.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and permanent normal trade relations for China. We must stand up for human rights and democracy throughout the world. Where is the freedom of speech? Where is the freedom of assembly? Where is the freedom to organize? Where is the freedom to protest? Where is the freedom to pray? It is not in China. The people of China want to practice their own religion. They want to speak their mind. They want to live in a free, open, and democratic society. If we stand for civil rights and human rights in America and other places around the world, we must stand up for human rights in China and speak for those who are not able to speak for themselves.

Today with our vote we have an opportunity to speak for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose the rule and PNTR for China. It is not the right thing to do. It is not the right way to go. We are sending the wrong message. Let us stand up for human rights today.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Atlanta, Georgia (Mr. LINDER), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am the first one to stipulate that China has problems with its people and its government on human rights on labor and the environment. But after approving normal trade relations for 20 years, have we changed that? Is this about that? This is not a gift to the Chinese Government. It may be a gift to America's workers. We already have the lowest tariffs in the world, and all this will do will take down the tariffs in China and open a market of 1.3 billion people to our workers to sell goods and services.

It may be a gift to the Chinese people because they will have a much broader range of consumer products at a much lower price for them to buy, to enhance their standard of living.

Why permanent? The American businessman and woman needs some degree of predictability to make commitments over the long haul, and going back to the well once a year to ever-increasing votes, but once a year to hammer China on human rights to wonder if they are going to have open markets again does not give them the ability to make long-range plans.

Let me just close by saying something that Chris Patten wrote. He was the last governor of Hong Kong, the

British Empire. He wrote in the Economist, and he said if a spaceship had come to the planet from Mars in the 16th century and landed in the teepee settlements of North America to the typhoid-ridden flats of London, to the warring clans in Europe, and settled in the 16th century Mandarin Dynasty, he would have concluded without a second's thought that China would rule the world for centuries. They had invented gun powder, the printing press, the compass. They had an armada at sea. They had an efficient government, an improved cultural base, the envy of the world.

Then they withdrew behind the wall and history told a different tale. We are breaking down the great wall of China with our travel and our access to it. The last wall is tariffs to our products, the products that our workers make. We must help them bring that wall down. This bill will do it today, and I urge a yes vote.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the first of many on this side of the aisle that urge support of this rule to govern debate on extending permanent normal trade relations to China. We live in a rapidly changing and ever-shrinking world. Globalization has taken hold, whether we like it or not. Our challenge is to recognize the changes and to do our best to remain competitive and successful while we still retain our values, and today we can do both.

This week China moved closer to finalizing entry into the World Trade Organization, a rules-based organization that gives the international community tremendous leverage to ensure that China complies with its trade agreements and moves to a more open and free society. China's recent trade pact with the European community raises the stakes for PNTR here in the United States. Our working families and companies deserve a level playing field in competing for business in China.

Mr. Speaker, permanent normal trade relations with China is good for our businesses and even better for our working families. Moreover, many Chinese dissidents, including the Dalai Lama, have continually said that exposing the Chinese people to our way of life is the best way to encourage change in that country. I urge my colleagues to strongly support this rule and to even more strongly support permanent trade relations with China this afternoon.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, for the record, the Dalai Lama has not come out for this legislation.

This rule makes in order a commission to review human rights violations

in China. Why do we need a commission when we have a Congress? We cannot expect corporations to stand up for human rights. Congress must stand up for human rights. This Congress has the power in an annual review to uphold human rights and worker rights.

The commission could be called a fig leaf to try to cover up human rights and worker rights violations. Will we choose a fig leaf or will we use the power of our voting cards annually? Why have a commission when we have a Congress? It is upside down to insist that no U.S. trade review of human rights violations in China is better than an annual review. This Congress must insist that we stand up for America's dearest and most cherished values, for freedom, for justice. That is the American way; and if we are going to make this world a better place, we have to stand for it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of PNTR for China and for this rule. Without question, China has a horrible record on a whole series of issues: human rights, labor standards, religious freedom. That is not the question before the House today. The question before the House today is what path is most likely to make it better? And what we have seen, from Presidents Nixon to Reagan to Bush to Clinton, is an embracement of the policy of engagement, of bringing them into our world with our values to help improve the system. Giving China a stake in a different world order than the one they subscribe to now will have the best likelihood of moving them forward.

I want to make one critical point. However we vote on this, I do not think we should kid ourselves that this is going to solve the problem with China one way or the other. The problem of improving China's human rights record, their labor standards, their religious freedom, is going to take a whole lot of work for decades to come. This one vote is not going to cut it down or set it up. We have to keep working on the problem.

As human rights leaders in China, as Taiwan and a lot of people recognize, we are not going to make any progress whatsoever if we isolated China and cut them off from the rest of the world. Then they have nothing to lose by behaving in a way that the rest of the world does not like.

On the annual vote that we are giving up, we hear how great this annual vote is. It is kind of interesting in listening to the debate I have heard people say the annual vote has made no difference whatsoever but we cannot afford to lose it. That is sort of a contradictory argument. The bottom line is, whatever we do here in the U.S. has a minimum amount of impact on moving China forward. But the question is, what is going to move it forward or backwards? We are not going to stop

talking about China's human rights record just because we do not have an annual vote. I mean, who is kidding who on that? We are going to continue to talk about it, on a whole series of issues. But by not taking this vote, we lose the opportunity to pull China into the WTO, to pull them closer to the rest of the world, so that we have some hope of moving them forward.

This is not a guarantee. Anyone who stands up and says voting for this is somehow going to make democracy and freedom appear in China is kidding us, but it is going to move it in the right direction, and we should take this vote.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and against the PNTR China agreement. I feel that this is injustice and inequality to the environment and human rights and most importantly to the workers' rights. The issue is about principle, right and wrong, the future of this country. It is about the future of this country and protecting American jobs in the global economy. I do not oppose China's current trade status. I believe in annual review of China's smart policy.

Bishop Barnes from the San Bernardino diocese came to me to express his concern over religious freedom and humanitarian rights to the people, not only in this country but throughout the world as well. Close to 4 million veterans and 52 percent of Americans believe that this agreement would hurt American workers and that it is dangerous to American society. Yet some feel that this is best for the American people. This country's judicial system is based on what is called reasonable doubt. No man is convicted if there is reasonable doubt.

In this agreement, there is more than reasonable doubt; and yet some want to convict this country and its workers and say yes to a country that has violated every rule.

I say "si se puede." Say no to this rule. Say no to the PNTR China agreement.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of PNTR, a vote that is good for New York and the United States and an important step in integrating China with the West. China will enter the WTO regardless. This vote opens China to U.S. exports. Our market is already open. This is about fairness. I believe that a vote for PNTR is also a vote to improve labor rights, human rights, and respect for the environment in China. Many opponents of PNTR have taken this floor to discuss indefensible violations of basic human rights that are now occurring in China. Opponents of PNTR argue that we

should not give up the leverage of a yearly NTR vote; but for 20 years we have approved NTR, and these violations of human rights are still occurring.

1100

By granting PNTR, we allow for greatly increased interaction between China and the West. As one example, the ability to access the Internet over U.S. manufactured equipment could have a tremendous impact on the free flow of ideas in China.

The fact is that China is unique. No other country has gone to such lengths to isolate itself for so many hundreds of years.

PNTR presents a unique opportunity for us to get behind China's great wall and engage the Chinese people. Over time, PNTR will raise the standard of living of the people in China and its trading partners.

From a national security point of view, a stable China and a forward-looking U.S.-China relationship is in the interest of the United States. Our allies in the region, including Korea, Japan, and Taiwan, favor China's entry into the WTO. The Dalai Lama himself, who knows quite a bit about Chinese oppression, favors China's entrance into the WTO and its integration into the world community.

Change in China will take many years. I will vote for PNTR because it puts us on the right course morally and economically.

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

Mr. Speaker, last Sunday in Copenhagen, Denmark, the Dalai Lama said he supported China's entry into the World Trade Organization.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), a very hard-working Member from the Committee on Rules, my friend from the "Big D."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for giving me 1 minute to express my sincere appreciation, not only to him for the hard work he has done in this endeavor, but also for the good work that this is going to mean.

Twenty years we have been working with China, American businesses in China. Now is the time to make it permanent. Now is the time to say to American companies, please do, go invest in China. I believe that we are going to find that American and Chinese workers working together, that we are going to find products that flow between America and China will be to the advantage of free people.

That is what this is all about. This is about the ability of people in China to, not only have what they want, which is freedom, but also American products to enjoy. This will be a great day, not only in Beijing, but a great day in Washington.

I support the rule. I intend to vote for PNTR. I encourage my colleagues to do so also.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair please inform the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER), my dear friend, and myself how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) each have 15½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to tell my chairman that the Dalai Lama did not come out in favor of PNTR. He came out in favor of the World Trade Organization.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I just say, what I said, as I stood up, is that, in Copenhagen, Denmark last Sunday morning, the Dalai Lama said that he supported China's entry into the World Trade Organization.

Mr. MOAKLEY. That is right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DREIER. That is what I said.

Mr. MOAKLEY. But it did not say anything about the PNTR, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I understand that. But I think that the global community recognizes that the U.S. presence in the World Trade Organization enabling access to China is very important.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Dalai Lama did not come out in favor of PNTR.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I never said he did.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this letter is from the International Committee on Tibet.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK).

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

It is a bit of *deja vu* as I walk into this well and remember 1993 when the subject was NAFTA, and the sides were divided somewhat similarly. We kept hearing all of the former Presidents are in favor of this agreement, all of these industries are in favor of such agreement, this is going to do such wonderful things for us.

The reality is that we went from a \$3 billion trade surplus with Mexico after the passage of NAFTA to a \$17 billion trade deficit. Open warfare developed in Chiapas right after NAFTA passed. There was an increase in political assassinations in Mexico.

We find out in my home State of Pennsylvania last month we lost 22,000 jobs to Mexico after the passage of NAFTA. I would ask those that are in

support of PNTR, what are they willing to sacrifice on the altar of free trade. 22,000 Pennsylvania workers sacrificed their jobs. They laid their sacrifice on the altar of free trade. How much worse will it be when one was asked to make the same kind of sacrifice with a country that is so much larger than Mexico, and that is with China?

The reality is the Mexican workers make 60 cents an hour. Many of the Chinese workers make less than a quarter an hour. In fact, many of them work in state-owned industries that were really little more than slaves.

What happened to the fact that our forefathers said all men and women are created equal? What happened to the fact that the United States Congress is supposed to, not only control commerce, but is supposed to stand up for human rights and workers' rights and environmental conditions across this whole world? We have forgotten that now. We yield to corporate profits. We yield to what the next month's profits are going to be for these corporations.

The reality here is that, if somebody is making 25 cents an hour in a factory in Chongqing, what are they going to buy that we make in this country? Are they going to buy our Boeing airplanes? No. Are they going to buy our automobiles or our appliances? They are not even going to buy our beepers or our phones.

The reality is that Members should vote against this rule and vote against PNTR. It is the right thing to do. It is the moral thing to do.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have created 20 million jobs and have an unemployment rate of less than 4 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), chairman of the Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Material of the Committee on Commerce, a hard-working member of our whip team on this issue.

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and this legislation.

Let me relate a story, since I only have a minute. I attended a trip to China a few years ago. It was headed up by our former colleague, Jack Fields. One of the opportunities that we had was to have a luncheon with an American company, in this case AT&T, that was trying to penetrate the Chinese market in telephones.

I was seated beside a young lady, Chinese, in her late 20's who was the number one assistant to the executive vice president of AT&T. I asked her what her job was, and she related a little bit about her job. I said, What is your background? She said, Congressman, I am enjoying my lifelong dream. I said, What is that? She said, I was educated at Brown University in your country, I returned to China to build a new China, and I am working for an American company.

That really tells us what we need to know about this change that is taking place in China. We have to have the courage and we have to have the vision, and most of all, we have to have the patience that these young people can rise to leadership in China. We can do it by passing PNTR.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Committee on Rules rejected the Berman-Weldon amendment. That amendment would simply have provided that China loses its normal trade relations if it invades or blockades Taiwan.

Now, China will look at this rule and look at the RECORD of this House and see a green light to blockade Taiwan. It would keep its trade with the United States at the same time.

Taiwan can be blockaded easily. They merely need to hit one ship with a missile and announce that the next freighter will face a similar fate.

If my colleagues vote for this rule, they are endorsing a record that tells China blockade Taiwan and your friends in America will keep trading with you.

We have to defeat this rule regardless of what happens to the bill. Defeat the rule, demand the Berman-Weldon amendment, demand a chance to vote to say that we will send a clear message to China that, if it blockades or invades Taiwan, it loses its trade privileges.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that Chen Shui-bian the new President of Taiwan strongly supports the entry into the World Trade Organization without any conditions whatsoever because they know it will benefit both Taiwan, China, and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), a hard-working member of our whip team.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and extending permanent normal trade relations with China.

First, extending permanent normal trade relations with China is a win for fairness, Mr. Speaker. 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. China is an incredibly important emerging market with more than a billion consumers. America's world-class businesses, large and small, know that being shut out of China, especially as China opens its doors to the rest of the world, is a very big mistake.

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 serv-

ices, but will deliver a good old-fashioned dose of our democratic values and free market values. These ideals are already percolating in China. Interestingly enough, today there are more Chinese shareholders in private companies in China than there are members of the communist party.

Fourthly, international trade, whether with China or any other nation, means jobs to people in my State and our continued prosperity. 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 or foreign direct investment.

Fifth, and finally, in the interest of world peace, it is absolutely a mistake to isolate China with the world's largest standing Army. America's democratic allies in Asia support China's entry into the World Trade Organization because they know that a constructive relationship with China means a stable Asia that offers the best chance for reducing the regional tensions along the Taiwan Strait and for avoiding a new arms race elsewhere in Asia.

Mr. Speaker, PNTR in China is a win for American workers, farmers, and businesses of all sizes. It is a win for spreading American values.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, China's deplorable record on human rights should not be rewarded with permanent normal trade status. Normal trade relations would indicate that China is living by certain standards or norms, a respect for human dignity. However, the record on human rights and religious freedom in China is contrary to even the minimal norms of human decency.

In China, many religious believers are detained and imprisoned. Until there is general progress on religious freedom and until there is at least a measure of respect for human dignity, I cannot in good conscience support permanent normal trade relations with China.

If China wants normal trade relations, let them treat their people normally.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Newport Beach, California (Mr. COX), my very good friend, chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, who has worked long and hard on this issue and is a strong supporter of both the rule and PNTR.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, the chairman, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule for consideration of our debate on permanent normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China, because it makes in order legislation to correct a serious flaw in the

bill sent up here by the Clinton-Gore administration to establish PNTR.

That bill did two things. It provided for permanent normal trade relations, but it also would have repealed our annual debate on human rights here in the Congress.

I am happy to say that our annual role for Congress will now be preserved. In addition to consideration of human rights in the commission that will be set up to evaluate China's human rights performance each year, there will now be a mandatory procedure in the Congress for consideration of these as well on an annual basis.

The human rights on which we will focus will be expanded from the original Jackson-Vanik focused solely on immigration to include religious freedom, the plight of political prisoners, protections against arbitrary arrest, and that heinous form of punishment exile that has been reserved for such democracy activists as Wei Jinhsheng.

We must not and we will not, as a result of this rule, throw out the human rights baby with the trade sanctions bath water.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, none of us have rose-colored glasses when it comes to China, but we have to ask this question: What is the more powerful force for breaking the strangle cord of the Chinese Government. Twenty million Chinese armed with cell phones and Internet access and independent businesses or 435 members of the House giving sometimes eloquent speeches about China. Chinese freedom will advance when the Chinese have an independent basis to break the strangle cord of the Chinese Government, and this agreement will advance that cause.

Three days ago, aerospace machinists, Local 751, representing 44,000 aerospace workers in the Puget Sound area endorse this treaty. They did this for this reason, they recognize the real contest here is this, who will have the trade benefits of this agreements, the workers in Toulouse, France or the workers in Seattle, Washington.

1115

I am voting for the workers in Seattle, Washington, to make sure those workers have the benefit of this agreement; those workers get those trade benefits. I am supporting those workers in this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Palm Beach, Florida (Mr. FOLEY), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his eloquence in the debate.

I am quite shocked at the Democrats not supporting their President today or their Vice President in his trade pol-

icy. In the twilight of his administration, I would think the party would rally behind the President and support him.

As chairman of the House Entertainment Industry Caucus, this is a good bill for videos, for movies, and for music sales. As co-chair of the Travel and Tourism Caucus, we can expect more travel in both directions because of this bill.

And as a representative of Florida's vital citrus industry, we finally have our enjoyable and nutritious product making its way to China, and more will be on its way thanks to this bill.

Relative to the comments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania about Taiwan, if, in fact, China attacks Taiwan, the President can put in a trade sanction against the Chinese. There is protection in law to prevent those types of occurrences.

But, please, I admonish the people on the other side of the aisle to support their President in the final months of his administration; support the Vice President, as he tries to succeed President Clinton, and do what is right for international policy, human rights for the Chinese, more business for all in China, and more business for United States companies.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

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

Let us be clear what this debate is about. There is a reason why the largest multinational corporations in this country are spending tens of millions of dollars to see this legislation passed, and that reason is they like doing business in China where they can pay people 10 cents an hour, 15 cents an hour, rather than paying the workers in this country a living wage.

And there is another reason why the environmental community is opposed to this agreement, why the veterans community is opposed to this agreement, why religious organizations like the National Conference of Catholic Bishops are opposed to this agreement, and that is this agreement is bad for workers, it is bad for human rights, it is bad for the environment, and it is bad for national security.

I would hope that the Members of this Congress have the courage to stand up to the big money interests who are flooding Congress with contributions, with lobbying efforts, and with advertising, and do the right thing for the vast majority of the American people. Vote against this rule; vote against this agreement.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire as to the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 8½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING), another of our hard-working advocacy workers here in the House.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in strong support of this rule and the underlying legislation.

This monumental piece of trade legislation will provide tremendous benefits for Americans. By prying open the closed door of Communist China, Western ideals, freedoms, as well as trade, will be let in.

Now, corn and soybeans are the heart of the district I represent in Illinois, and this legislation is very important to our Nation's struggling agricultural economy. Opponents of PNTR say that China gets everything it wants, unconditional, unlimited, permanent access for Chinese-made goods into the U.S. market. The reality is that China has access to U.S. markets right now and will continue to have that access regardless of the outcome of this vote. China will be admitted to the World Trade Organization with or without our approval. This vote comes down to whether the U.S. will have improved access to the Chinese market or will we cede that to our European and Asian competitors.

Opponents of this bill talk about human rights. While it is true the Chinese record on human rights is not good, closing the door between the U.S. and China will not advance the cause of human rights.

There are currently 9 million Internet users in China, and that figure doubles every 6 months. The Chinese have tried to censor their Internet. We would not like that, but they have failed in that attempt. The number one item that people in China log on the Internet for is news.

A vote for PNTR is a vote for development of the Internet. This is right for America. It is right to do now. Vote "yes."

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today to support granting China permanent normal trade relations.

The growing relationship between the United States and China has helped support my home State of North Carolina's economy and its leadership in world trade. Even without PNTR, in 1998 alone, my State exported over \$215 million worth of goods, everything from stone and glass to electronics, to this market. This measure will reduce barriers to our exports and create more opportunities to support our goals.

The rapidly growing Triangle area saw their exports jump 86 percent in just 5 years. Granting China PNTR will

also open up their market to our high-quality North Carolina agricultural products, from tobacco, to pork, to poultry. Our Nation's economic future depends upon our access to new and growing markets and investing in our people and our technology to compete and winning in these global markets. This is an essential component of that policy.

While I support the opening of the relationship with China, I, like many others today, am concerned about the human rights record. But I side with Reverend Billy Graham, who said, "I believe it is far better for us to thoughtfully strengthen positive aspects of our relationship with China than to threaten it as an adversary. It is my experience nations can respond with friendship just as much as people do," and I happen to agree with Reverend Graham.

By exporting our American goods and services and citizenship to the Chinese market, we will also export American values, information, freedom, democracy and human rights.

Mr. Speaker, at the dawn of this next century, America is enjoying unprecedented opportunity and we should move forward.

But, Mr. Speaker, if our nation is to continue to prosper, we must not slam the door on one fourth of the world's population. From the factory to the farm, PNTR is a good deal for American businesses and farmers and a good deal for the Chinese people. I urge Members to vote in favor of H.R. 4444.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), a hard-working member of the Committee on Rules and Secretary of the Republican Conference.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of granting permanent normal trade relation status to China, and I want to congratulate the Chairman of the Committee on Rules (Mr. DREIER), and so many others, on their very hard work on this issue.

We come here together on the eve of a very historical vote that will define our vision as a Congress and secure America's place in the world community. The evidence of the importance of granting PNTR is clear.

Just look at my home State of Ohio. Ohio is the Nation's fifth largest soybean producer and sixth largest corn producer. Under these terms, Chinese tariffs on soybeans will be set at a new low of 3 percent and 1 percent for grains. This means increased exports for Ohio. Increased exports means new business, new jobs, and greater prosperity in Ohio.

If my colleagues question the importance of these economic benefits, then they should keep this fact firmly in mind: China will join the WTO with our without our support. Therefore, the question that really faces us is whether we want to be a part of the process and reap the significant economic benefits or whether we want to find ourselves on the outside looking in.

If anyone should remain unpersuaded by irrefutable economic benefits for

America, then remember that our vote also represents new hope for the people of China. I firmly believe the best way to foster change and social improvement for China is for the United States to remain engaged. Let us shine the light of liberty across the ocean, over the Great Wall, and into the heart of China by expanding our trade relationship.

Greater economic freedom is a precursor to political freedom. We must decide whether we will extend our hands to assist the pro-reform elements in Chinese society or turn our backs and allow the misguided militant socialist forces to strengthen their hold. We must take the battle of freedom versus tyranny to the Chinese people.

Change in China will not occur overnight, but change will not occur at all if we shut out China from the world market and shut ourselves off from the world as well. We cannot turn our backs on the Chinese people, and we cannot turn our backs on this opportunity for America. We must support PNTR.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that my colleagues on the Republican side are extolling us Democrats to support our President, yet for 7½ years I would have thought, to hear them, that he is the devil himself. For the last few months, however, they are saying they agree with him.

I rise in opposition to permanent normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China. Over the last few months, I have felt that the progress of China on both the social and economic front have evaporated compared to when I was there and what I saw 2 years ago. I see a Chinese retrenchment, I see a clamping down more on social and religious freedom, continuing threats on Taiwan, and again not opening their markets as easily as they should have, until now that we have this big treaty. I think we need to look at their record on religious and social freedoms and their record on Taiwan.

Each year I have supported granting normal trade relations with China, and even last year, even though Beijing condoned the stoning of the U.S. embassy. I think we should be concerned when a superpower is willing to reach that level to advance their foreign policy initiatives.

China is a great country. Cultural wonders and discoveries by this great nation have benefited mankind for many years, and the people of China should continue to express their individual initiative. But we cannot overlook the tool of moderation that Congress has been able to use by looking at this every year.

I want our business communities to have every opportunity possible to sell

their products, but not our industries, to China. However, this desire is not strong enough to overlook the continuing problems China is experiencing as it tries to transition to a free market economy.

How will China employ the millions of displaced workers moving from their cities in search of jobs? Will they move the production from our country to theirs? William Jennings Bryan said that "American principles are above price; American values are not bought and sold." And what he was really saying is that Americans should value our basic freedoms of individual liberty, religious freedom, and freedom of speech.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote against this resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan opposed Communism with a passion. Reagan once even said about the old Soviet Union that they were an evil empire, and the Communist world was stunned. They were angered over Reagan's statement.

But Ronald Reagan never flinched, and Ronald Reagan taught us all a lesson we should not forget today. Look at the history. After Reagan's pressure, the Soviet Union disintegrated and the Berlin Wall collapsed. Communism became an endangered species. The world was safer until today.

Today, the Congress of the United States breathes a second life into Communism. I say if Congress joins the White House in granting this Communist nation, that has missiles pointed at us, a sweetheart trade deal worth \$80 billion a year, then Congress, in my opinion, will do several things: they will now stabilize Communism around the world. We will now finance the resurgence of Communism. We, in fact, reinvent Communism today. And, finally, I think we endanger America.

How soon we forget, my colleagues, Soviet Union, the Berlin Wall, Vietnam, North Korea, Ronald Reagan's struggle keeping the pressure on, making sure those Communists did not destroy free enterprise, did not destroy America.

I say a Congress that today will prop up Communism is a Congress that today endangers every worker, every one of our kids, and every one of our grandkids by giving a country \$80 billion a year whose missiles are pointed at every major American city, and Taiwan, who we have turned our backs on.

1130

I yield back Pearl Harbor. I yield back Ronald Reagan. And I yield back the second breath of life that Congress is granting to the Communist bloc nations.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Sanibel, Florida (Mr. GOSS), the very

distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on Rules, chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process, and, most important in this instance, the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for the opportunity to speak and also for his very extraordinary leadership in bringing this matter finally to culmination.

Mr. Speaker, I think that, as we go through the debate today, we are going to find out that there are many ways to look at this debate, many ways to look at the issue. We certainly have already heard some during the subject of this very fair rule, very appropriate rule for this particular legislation.

My perspective today is the consequences of this debate on our national security. There will be consequences. There is no question about that. The status quo can no longer remain once this debate has been engaged. And it has been engaged.

So what we have to look at, from my perspective, is what is best for the security of the United States of America, Americans at home and abroad, in whatever their pursuit may be.

I cannot predict with any certainty, and neither can anybody else, whether China will be our allies or our opponents or our friends or our enemies as we go into the future. But I can say with very sincere conviction, from my perspective as the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that supporting this legislation is in the best national security interest. I firmly believe that.

I make this assertion after reviewing the materials, after discussing with knowledgeable people, and after weighing the pros and cons literally on a yellow pad of a China opened up for U.S. trade and influence versus a China isolated as a denied area to the powers of the free market and the beneficial influences of the United States.

I also believe that the true reformers in China, and there are some, will have their best opportunity for success in a society that is more open to new ideas and new products. I know there are some who will be disagreeing with that. I know there are some who have said that CIA has taken a policy position one way or another on this matter. That is simply not true. CIA does not take policy positions. It is not a policy agency. It is a capability agency, and it also does provide assessments about threats to national security.

As I said, the status quo is over. We are now into the next century and a new type of relationship with China. I think that we need to understand there are short-term consequences of getting

things wrong because things are so tense in the Taiwan Straits and a miscalculation could hurt.

One of the best ways to avoid miscalculation is to have open dialogue and open understanding. I think that is yet another reason to move forward with this legislation.

For any Members who feel that my position would like further explanation more than time allows now, I would be happy to consult with them if they will come and contact me on the floor of the House during this debate. I will be happy to share my yellow pad on how I got to this conclusion.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for the opportunity to state my position.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe in the New Economy, but I believe in a New Economy with Old Values. I believe in full commerce with China, but I believe in commerce with a conscience.

I rise in opposition to permanent normal trade relations with China. We should vote "yes" on full trade with China. But Congress should keep its ability to check on our relations with a police state. And as long as China remains a police state, we must never have relations with China which are permanent, which are normal, or which are insulated from moral concerns.

Until China has proven itself a full member of the moral citizenship of the world, we should play the moral role of keeping a check upon them while having full trade relations.

Under the 1979 bilateral agreement with China, which they cannot get out of, we get most of the benefits of WTO, almost all of them. That is really not in dispute. But if we break the link with human rights, with forced labor, with religious repression, with nuclear proliferation, we will break faith with 200 years of American leadership in the world; we will dim the beacon of freedom and diminish America in the eyes of those who yearn for the simple right to live without fear of a police raid in the night.

This vote may be about stock values; yes, but it is also about human values. That is the role of the United States in this debate.

We believe in the Internet. I have worked on the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade and Consumer Protection for 24 years. I believe in its power. But in the United States, we hold sacrosanct the ability of an American to put full encryption, full privacy protection, on their information as they are talking to other citizens in our country. The police must get a court order to gain access to that information.

In China, they are prohibiting encryption; they are prohibiting privacy. The Internet is the best of wires and it is the worst of wires simulta-

neously. Yes, it will give people the power to communicate; but it is also going to give the PLA, the police in China, the ability to gain access to any information they want about any individual in their country.

We should condition any deal with China on their keeping out their one million semiautomatic assault weapons that they were selling in the United States for under a hundred bucks apiece until 1994. This agreement makes those weapons legal again.

We should condition this agreement on the prohibition of them reselling nuclear materials into Pakistan or any other country in the world. They have been historically the K-Mart of international nuclear commerce.

We should condition this deal yearly—full trade relations with us and access to our American market—upon their maintenance of human rights, religious dignity, the abolishment of slave labor in their country.

Vote for Commerce with a conscience. Vote "no" on this rule. Vote "no" on PNTR.

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

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of being elected to the Congress in November of 1980, the same day that Ronald Reagan was elected President of the United States; and Ronald Reagan said, "Give people a taste of freedom, and they will thirst for more." That is exactly what is happening today in the People's Republic of China.

My friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), just said that, basically, the genie is out of the bottle and the Internet is expanding. There are 9 million Internet users in China today, 70 million cellular telephones. So the fact is the genie is out of the bottle. And guess what? They are getting that taste of freedom, and they are thirsting for more.

Now, we have people who are here making all kinds of arguments with a load of acronyms: PNTR, PLA, MFN, MTR, WTO. All of these acronyms are being thrown out there. Somebody supports PNTR. Somebody does not support PNTR.

The fact of the matter is the Dalai Lama stands for human rights. The Dalai Lama's statement in Copenhagen, Denmark, last Sunday was very clear. The Dalai Lama, the great spiritual leader of Tibet, said that openness and creating greater economic freedom will, in fact, lead to democracy, and he never supported anything that would isolate China.

A "no" vote on this rule and on this vote that we are going to have later this afternoon would, in fact, isolate China. It would really isolate the United States of America, the great global leader, the beacon of hope and opportunity for the rest of the world. It would isolate us from China, and it would jeopardize our ability to get our American values into China.

Look at other leaders. I am so proud of what my friend, the gentleman from

Florida (Mr. GOSS), just said here. He spent time working on this issue. There is no one who is more committed to the security of the United States of America than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS). I believe that any Member who has any question on the issue of national security should, in fact, talk with him.

My friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), sitting in the second row here, has anguished over this issue. He has opposed it in the past but has come to the conclusion that expanding freedom this way is the way to go. And the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) sitting two rows behind him who has worked long and hard in support of this and is vigorously pursuing human rights with the Bereuter-Levin proposal.

And when we look at others who want to encourage openness, the Reverend Billy Graham is not involving himself in this debate, but he is a strong supporter of openness. And openness with China is, obviously, going to be promoted through granting permanent normal trade relations.

The former Presidents who stood with President Clinton down at the White House just a couple of weeks ago in strong support of this, talking about the national security aspect.

I know this issue of Taiwan is going to be an important part of the debate over the next several hours. The morning after the election, Chen Shui-bian, the least desirable candidate in the eyes of Beijing, who was elected president on Taiwan, that great island with 24 million people, said that he believed that China's entry into the World Trade Organization was very important because he knows, and it is included in the Bereuter-Levin resolution, we call for simultaneity. But, frankly, Taiwan will enter the World Trade Organization shortly after China does.

This is the right thing to do, Mr. Speaker. I believe that we need to stand with the likes of Colin Powell and those former Presidents and all who are pursuing freedom.

So I urge an "aye" vote on the rule and an "aye" vote on permanent normal trade relations so that we can, in fact, continue to be the world's paramount leader.

Mr. STARK, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of the rule on H.R. 4444. I cosponsored two amendments to this bill to clarify some of the many concerns I have with granting China permanent normal trade relations status. Unfortunately the rule blocked these amendments in the continued interest of those Members under the influence of big business campaign cash, big business, and the administration that have been pushing for passage of this legislation.

The first amendment addressed Taiwan's accession to the World Trade Organization. The amendment would have guaranteed Taiwan's accession by conditioning permanent normal trade relations [PNTR] status to China on Taiwan's entrance to the WTO. Once China enters the WTO it will actively spearhead efforts to block Taiwan's entry into the

WTO. Proponents of permanent NTR claim that this is nothing more than a scare tactic on the part of PNTR opponents. However this claim is well founded in the truth and the Pelosi-Stark amendment is quite necessary.

The administration assured me that China has already verbally agreed to allow Taiwan to enter the WTO without resistance from China after China accedes to the Organization. If China has made a verbal agreement, then there should be no problem with legislating such a proposal. However, on May 16, 2000, the very same day I offered a similar amendment to the Ways and Means Committee markup bill, China proved that it will, in fact, try to block Taiwan's entry into the WTO. The PRC led the charge against Taiwan's fourth bid for observer status in the World Health Organization [WHO]. If China is willing to go to great lengths to block Taiwan from the World Health Organization, it is certain to lead a full campaign against Taiwan's application for WTO membership.

China has demonstrated time and again that it is not to be trusted. China has broken every bilateral agreement it has with the United States. If we can't trust China with a signed agreement then this Congress is completely foolish to trust them with a verbal agreement. China has no intention of allowing Taiwan to enter the WTO without a fight. The Pelosi-Stark amendment to condition PNTR on Taiwan's WTO accession ensures a smooth accession for that democratic nation.

I also cosponsored an amendment with Representatives PELOSI and MARKEY that conditions extension of permanent NTR on an additional agreement between the United States and China on President Clinton's 1994 embargo on arms and ammunition imports.

In 1994, as a condition of granting China annual MFN status, President Clinton issued an order than bans the imports of assault weapons from China. Under World Trade Organization [WTO] rules, the United States is required to treat foreign and domestic goods identically. Although the United States bans these imports from China, it continues to manufacture and sell assault weapons. Clearly, by banning China from selling to the United States market, but allowing domestic manufacturers to continue with business as usual, the United States does not treat foreign and domestic goods identically.

This means that once China accedes to the WTO, they will have every right as a member to dispute the United States ban. And since the order does violate WTO rules, the WTO will most likely find the United States in violation treating China's assault weapons differently from those in the United States. This would mean that the United States would have to lift the import ban on China, or ban the sale and manufacture of its own assault weapons as well as the imports from other countries.

China accounted for 42 percent of all rifles imported into the United States civilian market between 1987 and 1994, the year in which President Clinton finally blocked the flood of assault weapons from the China. The PRC's weapons dumping was so great that it increased the overall import of guns into the United States. Chinese rifles and handguns accounted for 15 percent of all firearms imported for the civilian market in six of the eight years between 1987 and 1994. The import of Chinese guns was effectively stopped in 1994 when President Clinton imposed a ban as a

condition of renewing China's most favored nation status.

Proponents of PNTR will claim that the United States ban will be upheld if challenged by China under the WTO dispute settlement process. The claim is that the United States can hide behind the clause that allows for protection of security interests. However, this clause is narrowly defined providing an exception only as a means for self-defense. No WTO dispute settlement body is going to believe that the United States needs to keep Chinese assault weapons off its streets for national security reasons.

If we grant China permanent most favored nation trade status, China, not the Members of the 106th Congress, will dictate United States gun import policy.

The issues I have presented today are just two, of a much greater list, of the problems I have with granting China permanent NTR status. But they clearly highlight two problems with the current negotiated bilateral trade agreement between the United States and China. In addition, these amendments would serve to demonstrate that granting China PNTR is not a win-win situation for the United States. Many people will suffer if we grant permanent normal trade relations to China without receiving some significant concessions from China first. These amendments are two concessions China must make before Congress votes to relinquish the only leverage it has with China.

I urge Members to vote against this rule and send a message to the Rules Committee that these concerns must be addressed by the House before we sell our country to China lock, stock, and barrel.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 294, nays 136, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

YEAS—294

Ackerman	Bentsen	Brady (TX)
Aderholt	Bereuter	Bryant
Allen	Berry	Burr
Archer	Biggert	Burton
Armey	Bilbray	Buyer
Bachus	Bilirakis	Callahan
Baird	Bishop	Calvert
Baker	Bileley	Camp
Ballenger	Blumenauer	Campbell
Barr	Blunt	Canady
Barrett (NE)	Boehlert	Cannon
Bartlett	Boehner	Capps
Barton	Bonilla	Carson
Bass	Bono	Castle
Bateman	Boswell	Chabot
Becerra	Boyd	Chambliss

Chenoweth-Hage Hoyer
 Clayton Hulshof
 Clement Hunter
 Coble Hutchinson
 Coburn Hyde
 Collins Insee
 Combust Isakson
 Cook Istook
 Cooksey Jefferson
 Cox Jenkins
 Cramer John
 Crane Johnson (CT)
 Cubin Johnson, E. B.
 Cunningham Johnson, Sam
 Davis (FL) Kasich
 Davis (VA) Kelly
 Deal Kind (WI)
 DeGette King (NY)
 DeLay Kingston
 DeMint Knollenberg
 Diaz-Balart Kolbe
 Dickey Kuykendall
 Dicks LaFalce
 Dixon LaHood
 Doggett Largent
 Dooley Latham
 Doolittle LaTourette
 Dreier Leach
 Duncan Levin
 Dunn Lewis (CA)
 Edwards Lewis (KY)
 Ehlers Linder
 Ehrlich LoBiondo
 Emerson Lofgren
 English Lowey
 Eshoo Lucas (KY)
 Etheridge Lucas (OK)
 Everett Maloney (CT)
 Ewing Maloney (NY)
 Fletcher Manzullo
 Foley Martinez
 Ford Matsui
 Fossella McCollum
 Fowler McCrery
 Franks (NJ) McDermott
 Frelinghuysen McHugh
 Frost McInnis
 Gallegly McIntosh
 Ganske McKeon
 Gekas Meehan
 Gibbons Meeks (NY)
 Gilchrest Metcalf
 Gillmor Mica
 Gilman Miller (FL)
 Gonzalez Miller, Gary
 Goodlatte Minge
 Goodling Moore
 Gordon Moran (KS)
 Goss Moran (VA)
 Graham Morella
 Granger Myrick
 Green (WI) Napolitano
 Greenwood Neal
 Gutknecht Nethercutt
 Hall (TX) Ney
 Hansen Northup
 Hastert Norwood
 Hastings (WA) Nussle
 Hayes Ortiz
 Hayworth Ose
 Hefley Oxley
 Herger Packard
 Hill (IN) Pastor
 Hill (MT) Paul
 Hilleary Peterson (PA)
 Hinojosa Petri
 Hobson Pickering
 Hoekstra Pickett
 Hooley Pitts
 Horn Pombo
 Hostettler Pomeroy
 Houghton Porter

NAYS—136

Abercrombie Brown (OH)
 Andrews Capuano
 Baca Cardin
 Baldacci Clay
 Baldwin Clyburn
 Barcia Condit
 Barrett (WI) Conyers
 Berkley Costello
 Berman Coyne
 Blagojevich Crowley
 Bonior Cummings
 Borski Danner
 Boucher Davis (IL)
 Brady (PA) DeFazio
 Brown (FL) Delahunt

Portman
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Quinn
 Radanovich
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Regula
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Riley
 Roemer
 Rogan
 Rogers
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roukema
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Salmon
 Sandlin
 Sanford
 Sawyer
 Saxton
 Schaffer
 Scott
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Skeen
 Skelton
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Souder
 Spence
 Stearns
 Stenholm
 Stump
 Sununu
 Sweeney
 Talent
 Tancredo
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Tauzin
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thompson (CA)
 Thornberry
 Thune
 Thurman
 Tiahrt
 Toomey
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Upton
 Vitter
 Walden
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Watkins
 Watts (OK)
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

Gutierrez
 Hall (OH)
 Hastings (FL)
 Hilliard
 Hinchey
 Hoefel
 Holden
 Holt
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kleczka
 Klink
 Kucinich
 Lampson
 Lantos
 Larson
 Lee
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 Luther
 Markey
 Mascara
 McCarthy (MO)
 Lazio
 Pease
 McCarthy (NY)
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meek (FL)
 Menendez
 Millender
 McDonald
 Miller, George
 Mink
 Moakley
 Molohan
 Murtha
 Nadler
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Oliver
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Phelps
 Rahall
 Rivers
 Rodriguez
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Scarborough
 Stupak
 Sabo
 Sanchez
 Sanders
 Schakowsky
 Sherman
 Shows
 Sisisky
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Spratt
 Stabenow
 Stark
 Strickland
 Taylor (MS)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Towns
 Traficant
 Udall (NM)
 Velazquez
 Vento
 Visclosky
 Waters
 Watt (NC)
 Waxman
 Wexler
 Weygand
 Wise
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn

NOT VOTING—5

1205

Mr. WYNN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."
 So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, and pursuant to Section 301 of Public Law 104-1, the Chair announces on behalf of the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives and the majority and minority leaders of the United States Senate their joint appointment of the following individuals to a 5-year term to the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance to fill the existing vacancies thereon:

Ms. Barbara L. Camens, Washington, D.C.

Ms. Roberta L. Holzwarth, Rockford, Illinois.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 510, I call up the bill (H.R. 4444) to authorize extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People's Republic of China, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 510, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 4444 is as follows:

H.R. 4444

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

SECTION 1. TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATIONS AND EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any provision of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), the President may—

(1) determine that such title should no longer apply to the People's Republic of China; and

(2) after making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to the People's Republic of China, proclaim the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of that country.

(b) ACCESSION OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION.—Prior to making the determination provided for in subsection (a)(1) and pursuant to the provisions of section 122 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3532), the President shall transmit a report to Congress certifying that the terms and conditions for the accession of the People's Republic of China to the World Trade Organization are at least equivalent to those agreed between the United States and the People's Republic of China on November 15, 1999.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.—The extension of nondiscriminatory treatment pursuant to section 1(a)(1) shall be effective no earlier than the effective date of the accession of the People's Republic of China to the World Trade Organization.

(b) TERMINATION OF APPLICABILITY OF TITLE IV.—On and after the effective date under subsection (a) of the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China, title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 shall cease to apply to that country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment printed in House Report 106-636 is adopted in lieu of the amendment printed in the bill.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 106-626 is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

DIVISION A—NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS FOR THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TITLE I—NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS

SEC. 101. TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF CHAPTER 1 OF TITLE IV OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATIONS AND EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any provision of chapter 1 of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), as designated by section 103(a)(2) of this Act, the President may—

(1) determine that such chapter should no longer apply to the People's Republic of China; and

(2) after making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to the People's Republic of China, proclaim the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of that country.

(b) ACCESSION OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION.—