

Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton

NAYS—136

Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inlee
Isakson
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kelly
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Martinez
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Hall (TX)
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Paul
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter

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
Hinche
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilde
Kilpatrick
Kleccka
Klink
Kucinich
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Luther
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)

Lazio
Pease

NOT VOTING—5

Scarborough
Stupak

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.—

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. 102. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.**—The extension of nondiscriminatory treatment pursuant to section 101(a) 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, chapter 1 of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (as designated by section 103(a)(2) of this Act) shall cease to apply to that country.

SEC. 103. RELIEF FROM MARKET DISRUPTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the title heading, by striking “**CURRENTLY**”;

(2) by inserting before section 401 the following:

“**CHAPTER 1—TRADE RELATIONS WITH CERTAIN COUNTRIES**”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new chapter:

“**CHAPTER 2—RELIEF FROM MARKET DISRUPTION TO INDUSTRIES AND DIVERSIFICATION OF TRADE TO THE UNITED STATES MARKET**

“**SEC. 421. ACTION TO ADDRESS MARKET DISRUPTION.**

“(a) **PRESIDENTIAL ACTION.**—If a product of the People's Republic of China is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten to cause market disruption to the domestic producers of a like or directly competitive product, the President shall, in accordance with the provisions of this section, proclaim increased duties or other import restrictions with respect to such product, to the extent and for such period as the President considers necessary to prevent or remedy the market disruption.

“(b) **INITIATION OF AN INVESTIGATION.**—(1) Upon the filing of a petition by an entity described in section 202(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2252(a)), upon the request of the President or the United States Trade Representative (in this subtitle referred to as the ‘Trade Representative’), upon resolution of either the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, or the Committee on Finance of the Senate (in this subtitle referred to as the ‘Committees’) or on its own motion, the United States International Trade Commission (in this subtitle referred to as the ‘Commission’) shall promptly make an investigation to determine whether products of the People's Republic of China are being imported into the United States in such increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten to cause market disruption to the domestic producers of like or directly competitive products.

“(2) The limitations on investigations set forth in section 202(h)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2252(h)(1)) shall apply to investigations conducted under this section.

“(3) The provisions of subsections (a)(8) and (i) of section 202 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2252(a)(8) and (i)), relating to treat-

ment of confidential business information, shall apply to investigations conducted under this section.

“(4) Whenever a petition is filed, or a request or resolution is received, under this subsection, the Commission shall transmit a copy thereof to the President, the Trade Representative, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, except that in the case of confidential business information, the copy may include only non-confidential summaries of such information.

“(5) The Commission shall publish notice of the commencement of any proceeding under this subsection in the Federal Register and shall, within a reasonable time thereafter, hold public hearings at which the Commission shall afford interested parties an opportunity to be present, to present evidence, to respond to the presentations of other parties, and otherwise to be heard.

“(c) **MARKET DISRUPTION.**—(1) For purposes of this section, market disruption exists whenever imports of an article like or directly competitive with an article produced by a domestic industry are increasing rapidly, either absolutely or relatively, so as to be a significant cause of material injury, or threat of material injury, to the domestic industry.

“(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘significant cause’ refers to a cause which contributes significantly to the material injury of the domestic industry, but need not be equal to or greater than any other cause.

“(d) **FACTORS IN DETERMINATION.**—In determining whether market disruption exists, the Commission shall consider objective factors, including—

“(1) the volume of imports of the product which is the subject of the investigation;

“(2) the effect of imports of such product on prices in the United States for like or directly competitive articles; and

“(3) the effect of imports of such product on the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles.

The presence or absence of any factor under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) is not necessarily dispositive of whether market disruption exists.

“(e) **TIME FOR COMMISSION DETERMINATIONS.**—The Commission shall make and transmit to the President and the Trade Representative its determination under subsection (b)(1) at the earliest practicable time, but in no case later than 60 days (or 90 days in the case of a petition requesting relief under subsection (i)) after the date on which the petition is filed, the request or resolution is received, or the motion is adopted, under subsection (b). If the Commissioners voting are equally divided with respect to its determination, then the determination agreed upon by either group of Commissioners may be considered by the President and the Trade Representative as the determination of the Commission.

“(f) **RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSION ON PROPOSED REMEDIES.**—If the Commission makes an affirmative determination under subsection (b), or a determination which the President or the Trade Representative may consider as affirmative under subsection (e), the Commission shall propose the amount of increase in, or imposition of, any duty or other import restrictions necessary to prevent or remedy the market disruption. Only those members of the Commission who agreed to the affirmative determination under subsection (b) are eligible to vote on the proposed action to prevent or remedy market disruption. Members of the Commission who did not agree to the affirmative determination may submit, in the report re-

quired under subsection (g), separate views regarding what action, if any, should be taken to prevent or remedy market disruption.

“(g) **REPORT BY COMMISSION.**—(1) Not later than 20 days after a determination under subsection (b) is made, the Commission shall submit a report to the President and the Trade Representative.

“(2) The Commission shall include in the report required under paragraph (1) the following:

“(A) The determination made under subsection (b) and an explanation of the basis for the determination.

“(B) If the determination under subsection (b) is affirmative, or may be considered by the President or the Trade Representative as affirmative under subsection (e), the recommendations of the Commission on proposed remedies under subsection (f) and an explanation of the basis for each recommendation.

“(C) Any dissenting or separate views by members of the Commission regarding the determination and any recommendation referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

“(D) A description of—

“(i) the short- and long-term effects that implementation of the action recommended under subsection (f) is likely to have on the petitioning domestic industry, on other domestic industries, and on consumers; and

“(ii) the short- and long-term effects of not taking the recommended action on the petitioning domestic industry, its workers, and the communities where production facilities of such industry are located, and on other domestic industries.

“(3) The Commission, after submitting a report to the President under paragraph (1), shall promptly make it available to the public (but shall not include confidential business information) and cause a summary thereof to be published in the Federal Register.

“(h) **OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT VIEWS AND EVIDENCE ON PROPOSED MEASURE AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE PRESIDENT.**—(1) Within 20 days after receipt of the Commission's report under subsection (g) (or 15 days in the case of an affirmative preliminary determination under subsection (i)(1)(B)), the Trade Representative shall publish in the Federal Register notice of any measure proposed by the Trade Representative to be taken pursuant to subsection (a) and of the opportunity, including a public hearing, if requested, for importers, exporters, and other interested parties to submit their views and evidence on the appropriateness of the proposed measure and whether it would be in the public interest.

“(2) Within 55 days after receipt of the report under subsection (g) (or 35 days in the case of an affirmative preliminary determination under subsection (i)(1)(B)), the Trade Representative, taking into account the views and evidence received under paragraph (1) on the measure proposed by the Trade Representative, shall make a recommendation to the President concerning what action, if any, to take to prevent or remedy the market disruption.

“(i) **CRITICAL CIRCUMSTANCES.**—(1) When a petition filed under subsection (b) alleges that critical circumstances exist and requests that provisional relief be provided under this subsection with respect to the product identified in the petition, the Commission shall, not later than 45 days after the petition containing the request is filed—

“(A) determine whether delay in taking action under this section would cause damage to the relevant domestic industry which would be difficult to repair; and

“(B) if the determination under subparagraph (A) is affirmative, make a preliminary

determination of whether imports of the product which is the subject of the investigation have caused or threatened to cause market disruption.

If the Commissioners voting are equally divided with respect to either of its determinations, then the determination agreed upon by either group of Commissioners may be considered by the President and the Trade Representative as the determination of the Commission.

“(2) On the date on which the Commission completes its determinations under paragraph (1), the Commission shall transmit a report on the determinations to the President and the Trade Representative, including the reasons for its determinations. If the determinations under paragraph (1) are affirmative, or may be considered by the President or the Trade Representative as affirmative under paragraph (1), the Commission shall include in its report its recommendations on proposed provisional measures to be taken to prevent or remedy the market disruption. Only those members of the Commission who agreed to the affirmative determinations under paragraph (1) are eligible to vote on the proposed provisional measures to prevent or remedy market disruption. Members of the Commission who did not agree to the affirmative determinations may submit, in the report, dissenting or separate views regarding the determination and any recommendation of provisional measures referred to in this paragraph.

“(3) If the determinations under paragraph (1) are affirmative, or may be considered by the President or the Trade Representative as affirmative under paragraph (1), the Trade Representative shall, within 10 days after receipt of the Commission’s report, determine the amount or extent of provisional relief that is necessary to prevent or remedy the market disruption and shall provide a recommendation to the President on what provisional measures, if any, to take.

“(4)(A) The President shall determine whether to provide provisional relief and proclaim such relief, if any, within 10 days after receipt of the recommendation from the Trade Representative.

“(B) Such relief may take the form of—

“(i) the imposition of or increase in any duty;

“(ii) any modification, or imposition of any quantitative restriction on the importation of an article into the United States; or

“(iii) any combination of actions under clauses (i) and (ii).

“(C) Any provisional action proclaimed by the President pursuant to a determination of critical circumstances shall remain in effect not more than 200 days.

“(D) Provisional relief shall cease to apply upon the effective date of relief proclaimed under subsection (a), upon a decision by the President not to provide such relief, or upon a negative determination by the Commission under subsection (b).

“(j) AGREEMENTS WITH THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.—(1) The Trade Representative is authorized to enter into agreements for the People’s Republic of China to take such action as necessary to prevent or remedy market disruption, and should seek to conclude such agreements before the expiration of the 60-day consultation period provided for under the product-specific safeguard provision of the Protocol of Accession of the People’s Republic of China to the WTO, which shall commence not later than 5 days after the Trade Representative receives an affirmative determination provided for in subsection (e) or a determination which the Trade Representative considers to be an affirmative determination pursuant to subsection (e).

“(2) If no agreement is reached with the People’s Republic of China pursuant to con-

sultations under paragraph (1), or if the President determines that an agreement reached pursuant to such consultations is not preventing or remedying the market disruption at issue, the President shall provide import relief in accordance with subsection (a).

“(k) STANDARD FOR PRESIDENTIAL ACTION.—(1) Within 15 days after receipt of a recommendation from the Trade Representative under subsection (h) on the appropriate action, if any, to take to prevent or remedy the market disruption, the President shall provide import relief for such industry pursuant to subsection (a), unless the President determines that provision of such relief is not in the national economic interest of the United States or, in extraordinary cases, that the taking of action pursuant to subsection (a) would cause serious harm to the national security of the United States.

“(2) The President may determine under paragraph (1) that providing import relief is not in the national economic interest of the United States only if the President finds that the taking of such action would have an adverse impact on the United States economy clearly greater than the benefits of such action.

“(l) PUBLICATION OF DECISION AND REPORTS.—(1) The President’s decision, including the reasons therefor and the scope and duration of any action taken, shall be published in the Federal Register.

“(2) The Commission shall promptly make public any report transmitted under this section, but shall not make public any information which the Commission determines to be confidential, and shall publish notice of such report in the Federal Register.

“(m) EFFECTIVE DATE OF RELIEF.—Import relief under this section shall take effect not later than 15 days after the President’s determination to provide such relief.

“(n) MODIFICATIONS OF RELIEF.—(1) At any time after the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date on which relief under subsection (m) first takes effect, the President may request that the Commission provide a report on the probable effect of the modification, reduction, or termination of the relief provided on the relevant industry. The Commission shall transmit such report to the President within 60 days of the request.

“(2) The President may, after receiving a report from the Commission under paragraph (1), take such action to modify, reduce, or terminate relief that the President determines is necessary to continue to prevent or remedy the market disruption at issue.

“(3) Upon the granting of relief under subsection (k), the Commission shall collect such data as is necessary to allow it to respond rapidly to a request by the President under paragraph (1).

“(o) EXTENSION OF ACTION.—(1) Upon request of the President, or upon petition on behalf of the industry concerned filed with the Commission not earlier than the date which is 9 months, and not later than the date which is 6 months, before the date any relief provided under subsection (k) is to terminate, the Commission shall investigate to determine whether action under this section continues to be necessary to prevent or remedy market disruption.

“(2) The Commission shall publish notice of the commencement of any proceeding under this subsection in the Federal Register and shall, within a reasonable time thereafter, hold a public hearing at which the Commission shall afford interested parties and consumers an opportunity to be present, to present evidence, and to respond to the presentations of other parties and consumers, and otherwise to be heard.

“(3) The Commission shall transmit to the President a report on its investigation and

determination under this subsection not later than 60 days before the action under subsection (m) is to terminate.

“(4) The President, after receiving an affirmative determination from the Commission under paragraph (3), may extend the effective period of any action under this section if the President determines that the action continues to be necessary to prevent or remedy the market disruption.

“SEC. 422. ACTION IN RESPONSE TO TRADE DIVERSION.

“(a) MONITORING BY CUSTOMS SERVICE.—In any case in which a WTO member other than the United States requests consultations with the People’s Republic of China under the product-specific safeguard provision of the Protocol of Accession of the People’s Republic of China to the World Trade Organization, the Trade Representative shall inform the United States Customs Service, which shall monitor imports into the United States of those products of Chinese origin that are the subject of the consultation request. Data from such monitoring shall promptly be made available to the Commission upon request by the Commission.

“(b) INITIATION OF INVESTIGATION.—(1) Upon the filing of a petition by an entity described in section 202(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, upon the request of the President or the Trade Representative, upon resolution of either of the Committees, or on its own motion, the Commission shall promptly make an investigation to determine whether an action described in subsection (c) has caused, or threatens to cause, a significant diversion of trade into the domestic market of the United States.

“(2) The Commission shall publish notice of the commencement of any proceeding under this subsection in the Federal Register and shall, within a reasonable time thereafter, hold public hearings at which the Commission shall afford interested parties an opportunity to be present, to present evidence, to respond to the presentations of other parties, and otherwise to be heard.

“(3) The provisions of subsections (a)(8) and (i) of section 202 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2252(a)(8) and (i)), relating to treatment of confidential business information, shall apply to investigations conducted under this section.

“(c) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—An action is described in this subsection if it is an action—

“(1) by the People’s Republic of China to prevent or remedy market disruption in a WTO member other than the United States;

“(2) by a WTO member other than the United States to withdraw concessions under the WTO Agreement or otherwise to limit imports to prevent or remedy market disruption;

“(3) by a WTO member other than the United States to apply a provisional safeguard within the meaning of the product-specific safeguard provision of the Protocol of Accession of the People’s Republic of China to the WTO; or

“(4) any combination of actions described in paragraphs (1) through (3).

“(d) BASIS FOR DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANT DIVERSION.—(1) In determining whether significant diversion or the threat thereof exists for purposes of this section, the Commission shall take into account, to the extent such evidence is reasonably available—

“(A) the monitoring conducted under subsection (a);

“(B) the actual or imminent increase in United States market share held by such imports from the People’s Republic of China;

“(C) the actual or imminent increase in volume of such imports into the United States;

“(D) the nature and extent of the action taken or proposed by the WTO member concerned;

“(E) the extent of exports from the People’s Republic of China to that WTO member and to the United States;

“(F) the actual or imminent changes in exports to that WTO member due to the action taken or proposed;

“(G) the actual or imminent diversion of exports from the People’s Republic of China to countries other than the United States;

“(H) cyclical or seasonal trends in import volumes into the United States of the products at issue; and

“(I) conditions of demand and supply in the United States market for the products at issue.

The presence or absence of any factor under any of subparagraphs (A) through (I) is not necessarily dispositive of whether a significant diversion of trade or the threat thereof exists.

“(2) For purposes of making its determination, the Commission shall examine changes in imports into the United States from the People’s Republic of China since the time that the WTO member commenced the investigation that led to a request for consultations described in subsection (a).

“(3) If more than 1 action by a WTO member or WTO members against a particular product is identified in the petition, request, or resolution under subsection (b) or during the investigation, the Commission may cumulatively assess the actual or likely effects of such actions jointly in determining whether a significant diversion of trade or threat thereof exists.

“(e) COMMISSION DETERMINATION; AGREEMENT AUTHORITY.—(1) The Commission shall make and transmit to the President and the Trade Representative its determination under subsection (b) at the earliest practicable time, but in no case later than 45 days after the date on which the petition is filed, the request or resolution is received, or the motion is adopted, under subsection (b). If the Commissioners voting are equally divided with respect to its determination, then the determination agreed upon by either group of Commissioners may be considered by the President and the Trade Representative as the determination of the Commission.

“(2) The Trade Representative is authorized to enter into agreements with the People’s Republic of China or the other WTO members concerned to take such action as necessary to prevent or remedy significant trade diversion or threat thereof into the domestic market of the United States, and should seek to conclude such agreements before the expiration of the 60-day consultation period provided for under the product-specific safeguard provision of the Protocol of Accession of the People’s Republic of China to the WTO, which shall commence not later than 5 days after the Trade Representative receives an affirmative determination provided for in paragraph (1) or a determination which the Trade Representative considers to be an affirmative determination pursuant to paragraph (1).

“(3) REPORT BY COMMISSION.—

“(A) Not later than 10 days after a determination under subsection (b), is made, the Commission shall transmit a report to the President and the Trade Representative.

“(B) The Commission shall include in the report required under subparagraph (A) the following:

“(i) The determination made under subsection (b) and an explanation of the basis for the determination.

“(ii) If the determination under subsection (b) is affirmative, or may be considered by the President or the Trade Representative as affirmative under subsection (e)(1), the recommendations of the Commission on increased tariffs or other import restrictions

to be imposed to prevent or remedy the trade diversion or threat thereof, and explanations of the bases for such recommendations. Only those members of the Commission who agreed to the affirmative determination under subsection (b) are eligible to vote on the proposed action to prevent or remedy the trade diversion or threat thereof.

“(iii) Any dissenting or separate views by members of the Commission regarding the determination and any recommendation referred to in clauses (i) and (ii).

“(iv) A description of—

“(I) the short- and long-term effects that implementation of the action recommended under clause (ii) is likely to have on the petitioning domestic industry, on other domestic industries, and on consumers; and

“(II) the short- and long-term effects of not taking the recommended action on the petitioning domestic industry, its workers and the communities where production facilities of such industry are located, and on other domestic industries.

“(C) The Commission, after submitting a report to the President under subparagraph (A), shall promptly make it available to the public (with the exception of confidential business information) and cause a summary thereof to be published in the Federal Register.

“(f) PUBLIC COMMENT.—If consultations fail to lead to an agreement with the People’s Republic of China or the WTO member concerned within 60 days, the Trade Representative shall promptly publish notice in the Federal Register of any proposed action to prevent or remedy the trade diversion, and provide an opportunity for interested persons to present views and evidence on whether the proposed action is in the public interest.

“(g) RECOMMENDATION TO THE PRESIDENT.—Within 20 days after the end of consultations pursuant to subsection (e), the Trade Representative shall make a recommendation to the President on what action, if any, should be taken to prevent or remedy the trade diversion or threat thereof.

“(h) PRESIDENTIAL ACTION.—Within 20 days after receipt of the recommendation from the Trade Representative, the President shall determine what action to take to prevent or remedy the trade diversion or threat thereof.

“(i) DURATION OF ACTION.—Action taken under subsection (h) shall be terminated not later than 30 days after expiration of the action taken by the WTO member or members involved against imports from the People’s Republic of China.

“(j) REVIEW OF CIRCUMSTANCES.—(1) The Commission shall review the continued need for action taken under subsection (h) if the WTO member or members involved notify the Committee on Safeguards of the WTO of any modification in the action taken by them against the People’s Republic of China pursuant to consultation referred to in subsection (a). The Commission shall, not later than 60 days after such notification, determine whether a significant diversion of trade continues to exist and report its determination to the President. The President shall determine, within 15 days after receiving the Commission’s report, whether to modify, withdraw, or keep in place the action taken under subsection (h).

“SEC. 423. REGULATIONS; TERMINATION OF PROVISION.

“(a) TO CARRY OUT RESTRICTIONS AND MONITORING.—The President shall by regulation provide for the efficient and fair administration of any restriction proclaimed pursuant to the subtitle and to provide for effective monitoring of imports under section 422(a).

“(b) TO CARRY OUT AGREEMENTS.—To carry out an agreement concluded pursuant to con-

sultations under section 421(j) or 422(e)(2), the President is authorized to prescribe regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of articles covered by such agreement.

“(c) TERMINATION DATE.—This subtitle and any regulations issued under this subtitle shall cease to be effective 12 years after the date of entry into force of the Protocol of Accession of the People’s Republic of China to the WTO.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table on contents of the Trade Act of 1974 is amended—

(1) in the item relating to title IV, by striking “CURRENTLY”;

(2) by inserting before the item relating to section 401 the following:

“CHAPTER 1—TRADE RELATIONS WITH CERTAIN COUNTRIES”; and

(3) by adding after the item relating to section 409 the following:

“CHAPTER 2—RELIEF FROM MARKET DISRUPTION TO INDUSTRIES AND DIVERSION OF TRADE TO THE UNITED STATES MARKET

“Sec. 421. Action to address market disruption.

“Sec. 422. Action in response to trade diversion.

“Sec. 423. Regulations; termination of provision.”

SEC. 104. AMENDMENT TO SECTION 123 OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974—COMPENSATION AUTHORITY.

Section 123(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2133(a)(1)) is amended by inserting after “title III” the following: “, or under chapter 2 of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974”.

DIVISION B—UNITED STATES—CHINA RELATIONS

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the “U.S.-China Relations Act of 2000”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this division is as follows:

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 202. Findings.

Sec. 203. Policy.

Sec. 204. Definitions.

TITLE III—CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Sec. 301. Establishment of Congressional-Executive Commission on the People’s Republic of China.

Sec. 302. Functions of the Commission.

Sec. 303. Membership of the Commission.

Sec. 304. Votes of the Commission.

Sec. 305. Expenditure of appropriations.

Sec. 306. Testimony of witnesses, production of evidence; issuance of subpoenas; administration of oaths.

Sec. 307. Appropriations for the Commission.

Sec. 308. Staff of the Commission.

Sec. 309. Printing and binding costs.

TITLE IV—MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA’S WTO COMMITMENTS

Subtitle A—Review of Membership of the People’s Republic of China in the WTO

Sec. 401. Review within the WTO.

Subtitle B—Authorization To Promote Compliance With Trade Agreements

Sec. 411. Findings.

Sec. 412. Purpose.

Sec. 413. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle C—Report on Compliance by the People’s Republic of China With WTO Obligations

Sec. 421. Report on compliance.

TITLE V—TRADE AND RULE OF LAW ISSUES IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Subtitle A—Task Force on Prohibition of Importation of Products of Forced or Prison Labor From the People's Republic of China

- Sec. 501. Establishment of Task Force.
 Sec. 502. Functions of Task Force.
 Sec. 503. Composition of Task Force.
 Sec. 504. Authorization of appropriations.
 Sec. 505. Reports to Congress.

Subtitle B—Assistance To Develop Commercial and Labor Rule of Law

- Sec. 511. Establishment of technical assistance and rule of law programs.
 Sec. 512. Administrative authorities.
 Sec. 513. Prohibition relating to human rights abuses.

- Sec. 514. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE VI—ACCESSION OF TAIWAN TO THE WTO

- Sec. 601. Accession of Taiwan to the WTO.

TITLE VII—RELATED ISSUES

- Sec. 701. Authorizations of appropriations for broadcasting capital improvements and international broadcasting operations.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) In 1980, the United States opened trade relations with the People's Republic of China by entering into a bilateral trade agreement, which was approved by joint resolution enacted pursuant to section 405(c) of the Trade Act of 1974.

(2) Since 1980, the President has consistently extended nondiscriminatory treatment to products of the People's Republic of China, pursuant to his authority under section 404 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(3) Since 1980, the United States has entered into several additional trade-related agreements with the People's Republic of China, including a memorandum of understanding on market access in 1992, 2 agreements on intellectual property rights protection in 1992 and 1995, and an agreement on agricultural cooperation in 1999.

(4) Trade in goods between the People's Republic of China and the United States totaled almost \$95,000,000,000 in 1999, compared with approximately \$18,000,000,000 in 1989, representing growth of approximately 428 percent over 10 years.

(5) The United States merchandise trade deficit with the People's Republic of China has grown from approximately \$6,000,000,000 in 1989 to over \$68,000,000,000 in 1999, a growth of over 1,000 percent.

(6) The People's Republic of China currently restricts imports through relatively high tariffs and nontariff barriers, including import licensing, technology transfer, and local content requirements.

(7) United States businesses attempting to sell goods to markets in the People's Republic of China have complained of uneven application of tariffs, customs procedures, and other laws, rules, and administrative measures affecting their ability to sell their products in the Chinese market.

(8) On November 15, 1999, the United States and the People's Republic of China concluded a bilateral agreement concerning terms of the People's Republic of China's eventual accession to the World Trade Organization.

(9) The commitments that the People's Republic of China made in its November 15, 1999, agreement with the United States promise to eliminate or greatly reduce the principal barriers to trade with and investment in the People's Republic of China, if those commitments are effectively complied with and enforced.

(10) The record of the People's Republic of China in implementing trade-related commitments has been mixed. While the People's Republic of China has generally met the requirements of the 1992 market access memorandum of understanding and the 1992 and 1995 agreements on intellectual property rights protection, other measures remain in place or have been put into place which tend to diminish the benefit to United States businesses, farmers, and workers from the People's Republic of China's implementation of those earlier commitments. Notably, administration of tariff-rate quotas and other trade-related laws remains opaque, new local content requirements have proliferated, restrictions on importation of animal and plant products are not always supported by sound science, and licensing requirements for importation and distribution of goods remain common. Finally, the Government of the People's Republic of China has failed to cooperate with the United States Customs Service in implementing a 1992 memorandum of understanding prohibiting trade in products made by prison labor.

(11) The human rights record of the People's Republic of China is a matter of very serious concern to the Congress. The Congress notes that the Department of State's 1999 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for the People's Republic of China finds that "[t]he Government's poor human rights record deteriorated markedly throughout the year, as the Government intensified efforts to suppress dissent, particularly organized dissent."

(12) The Congress deplores violations by the Government of the People's Republic of China of human rights, religious freedoms, and worker rights that are referred to in the Department of State's 1999 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for the People's Republic of China, including the banning of the Falun Gong spiritual movement, denial in many cases, particularly politically sensitive ones, of effective representation by counsel and public trials, extrajudicial killings and torture, forced abortion and sterilization, restriction of access to Tibet and Xinjiang, perpetuation of "reeducation through labor", denial of the right of workers to organize labor unions or bargain collectively with their employers, and failure to implement a 1992 memorandum of understanding prohibiting trade in products made by prison labor.

SEC. 203. POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to develop trade relations that broaden the benefits of trade, and lead to a leveling up, rather than a leveling down, of labor, environmental, commercial rule of law, market access, anticorruption, and other standards across national borders;

(2) to pursue effective enforcement of trade-related and other international commitments by foreign governments through enforcement mechanisms of international organizations and through the application of United States law as appropriate;

(3) to encourage foreign governments to conduct both commercial and noncommercial affairs according to the rule of law developed through democratic processes;

(4) to encourage the Government of the People's Republic of China to afford its workers internationally recognized worker rights;

(5) to encourage the Government of the People's Republic of China to protect the human rights of people within the territory of the People's Republic of China, and to take steps toward protecting such rights, including, but not limited to—

(A) ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

(B) protecting the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose a residence within the People's Republic of China and the right to leave from and return to the People's Republic of China; and

(C) affording a criminal defendant—

(i) the right to be tried in his or her presence, and to defend himself or herself in person or through legal assistance of his or her own choosing;

(ii) the right to be informed, if he or she does not have legal assistance, of the right set forth in clause (i);

(iii) the right to have legal assistance assigned to him or her in any case in which the interests of justice so require and without payment by him or her in any such case if he or she does not have sufficient means to pay for it;

(iv) the right to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent, and impartial tribunal established by the law;

(v) the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law; and

(vi) the right to be tried without undue delay; and

(6) to highlight in the United Nations Human Rights Commission and in other appropriate fora violations of human rights by foreign governments and to seek the support of other governments in urging improvements in human rights practices.

SEC. 204. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) **DISPUTE SETTLEMENT UNDERSTANDING.**—The term "Dispute Settlement Understanding" means the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes referred to in section 101(d)(16) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(16)).

(2) **GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.**—The term "Government of the People's Republic of China" means the central Government of the People's Republic of China and any other governmental entity, including any provincial, prefectural, or local entity and any enterprise that is controlled by the central Government or any such governmental entity or as to which the central Government or any such governmental entity is entitled to receive a majority of the profits.

(3) **INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED WORKER RIGHTS.**—The term "internationally recognized worker rights" has the meaning given that term in section 507(4) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2467(4)) and includes the right to the elimination of the "worst forms of child labor", as defined in section 507(6) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2467(6)).

(4) **TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.**—The term "Trade Representative" means the United States Trade Representative.

(5) **WTO; WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION.**—The terms "WTO" and "World Trade Organization" mean the organization established pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(6) **WTO AGREEMENT.**—The term "WTO Agreement" means the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization entered into on April 15, 1994.

(7) **WTO MEMBER.**—The term "WTO member" has the meaning given that term in section 2(10) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(10)).

TITLE III—CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SEC. 301. ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

There is established a Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China (in this title referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 302. FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) **MONITORING COMPLIANCE WITH HUMAN RIGHTS.**—The Commission shall monitor the acts of the People's Republic of China which reflect compliance with or violation of human rights, in particular, those contained in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including, but not limited to, effectively affording—

(1) the right to engage in free expression without fear of any prior restraints;

(2) the right to peaceful assembly without restrictions, in accordance with international law;

(3) religious freedom, including the right to worship free of involvement of and interference by the government;

(4) the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose a residence within the People's Republic of China and the right to leave from and return to the People's Republic of China;

(5) the right of a criminal defendant—

(A) to be tried in his or her presence, and to defend himself or herself in person or through legal assistance of his or her own choosing;

(B) to be informed, if he or she does not have legal assistance, of the right set forth in subparagraph (A);

(C) to have legal assistance assigned to him or her in any case in which the interests of justice so require and without payment by him or her in any such case if he or she does not have sufficient means to pay for it;

(D) to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent, and impartial tribunal established by the law;

(E) to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law; and

(F) to be tried without undue delay;

(6) the right to be free from torture and other forms of cruel or unusual punishment;

(7) protection of internationally recognized worker rights;

(8) freedom from incarceration as punishment for political opposition to the government;

(9) freedom from incarceration as punishment for exercising or advocating human rights (including those described in this section);

(10) freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile;

(11) the right to fair and public hearings by an independent tribunal for the determination of a citizen's rights and obligations; and

(12) free choice of employment.

(b) **VICTIMS LISTS.**—The Commission shall compile and maintain lists of persons believed to be imprisoned, detained, or placed under house arrest, tortured, or otherwise persecuted by the Government of the People's Republic of China due to their pursuit of the rights described in subsection (a). In compiling such lists, the Commission shall exercise appropriate discretion, including concerns regarding the safety and security of, and benefit to, the persons who may be included on the lists and their families.

(c) **MONITORING DEVELOPMENT OF RULE OF LAW.**—The Commission shall monitor the development of the rule of law in the People's Republic of China, including, but not limited to—

(1) progress toward the development of institutions of democratic governance;

(2) processes by which statutes, regulations, rules, and other legal acts of the Government of the People's Republic of China are developed and become binding within the People's Republic of China;

(3) the extent to which statutes, regulations, rules, administrative and judicial decisions, and other legal acts of the Government of the People's Republic of China are

published and are made accessible to the public;

(4) the extent to which administrative and judicial decisions are supported by statements of reasons that are based upon written statutes, regulations, rules and other legal acts of the Government of the People's Republic of China;

(5) the extent to which individuals are treated equally under the laws of the of the People's Republic of China without regard to citizenship;

(6) the extent to which administrative and judicial decisions are independent of political pressure or governmental interference and are reviewed by entities of appellate jurisdiction; and

(7) the extent to which laws in the People's Republic of China are written and administered in ways that are consistent with international human rights standards, including the requirements of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

(d) **BILATERAL COOPERATION.**—The Commission shall monitor and encourage the development of programs and activities of the United States Government and private organizations with a view toward increasing the interchange of people and ideas between the United States and the People's Republic of China and expanding cooperation in areas that include, but are not limited to—

(1) increasing enforcement of human rights described in subsection (a); and

(2) developing the rule of law in the People's Republic of China.

(e) **CONTACTS WITH NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.**—In performing the functions described in subsections (a) through (d), the Commission shall, as appropriate, seek out and maintain contacts with nongovernmental organizations, including receiving reports and updates from such organizations and evaluating such reports.

(f) **COOPERATION WITH SPECIAL COORDINATOR.**—In performing the functions described in subsections (a) through (d), the Commission shall cooperate with the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues in the Department of State.

(g) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—The Commission shall issue a report to the President and the Congress not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than the end of each 12-month period thereafter, setting forth the findings of the Commission during the preceding 12-month period, in carrying out subsections (a) through (c). The Commission's report may contain recommendations for legislative or executive action.

(h) **SPECIFIC INFORMATION IN ANNUAL REPORTS.**—The Commission's report under subsection (g) shall include specific information as to the nature and implementation of laws or policies concerning the rights set forth in paragraphs (1) through (12) of subsection (a), and as to restrictions applied to or discrimination against persons exercising any of the rights set forth in such paragraphs.

(i) **CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS ON ANNUAL REPORTS.**—(1) The Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives shall, not later than 30 days after the receipt by the Congress of the report referred to in subsection (g), hold hearings on the contents of the report, including any recommendations contained therein, for the purpose of receiving testimony from Members of Congress, and such appropriate representatives of Federal departments and agencies, and interested persons and groups, as the committee deems advisable, with a view to reporting to the House of Representatives any appropriate legislation in furtherance of such recommendations. If any such legislation is considered by the Committee on International Relations within 45 days

after receipt by the Congress of the report referred to in subsection (g), it shall be reported by the committee not later than 60 days after receipt by the Congress of such report.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) are enacted by the Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of the House, and they supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of the House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House.

(j) **SUPPLEMENTAL REPORTS.**—The Commission may submit to the President and the Congress reports that supplement the reports described in subsection (g), as appropriate, in carrying out subsections (a) through (c).

SEC. 303. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) **SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.**—The Commission shall be composed of 23 members as follows:

(1) Nine Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Five members shall be selected from the majority party and four members shall be selected, after consultation with the minority leader of the House, from the minority party.

(2) Nine Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate. Five members shall be selected, after consultation with the majority leader of the Senate, from the majority party, and four members shall be selected, after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate, from the minority party.

(3) One representative of the Department of State, appointed by the President of the United States from among officers and employees of that Department.

(4) One representative of the Department of Commerce, appointed by the President of the United States from among officers and employees of that Department.

(5) One representative of the Department of Labor, appointed by the President of the United States from among officers and employees of that Department.

(6) Two at-large representatives, appointed by the President of the United States, from among the officers and employees of the executive branch.

(b) **CHAIRMAN AND COCHAIRMAN.**—

(1) **DESIGNATION OF CHAIRMAN.**—At the beginning of each odd-numbered Congress, the President of the Senate, on the recommendation of the majority leader, shall designate one of the members of the Commission from the Senate as Chairman of the Commission. At the beginning of each even-numbered Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall designate one of the members of the Commission from the House as Chairman of the Commission.

(2) **DESIGNATION OF COCHAIRMAN.**—At the beginning of each odd-numbered Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall designate one of the members of the Commission from the House as Cochairman of the Commission. At the beginning of each even-numbered Congress, the President of the Senate, on the recommendation of the majority leader, shall designate one of the members of the Commission from the Senate as Cochairman of the Commission.

SEC. 304. VOTES OF THE COMMISSION.

Decisions of the Commission, including adoption of reports and recommendations to the executive branch or to the Congress,

shall be made by a majority vote of the members of the Commission present and voting. Two-thirds of the Members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for purposes of conducting business.

SEC. 305. EXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATIONS.

For each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made to the Commission, the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress on its expenditures under that appropriation.

SEC. 306. TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES, PRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE; ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS; ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS.

In carrying out this title, the Commission may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and electronically recorded data as it considers necessary. Subpoenas may be issued only pursuant to a two-thirds vote of members of the Commission present and voting. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the Commission or any member designated by the Chairman, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman or such member. The Chairman of the Commission, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

SEC. 307. APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COMMISSION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION; DISBURSEMENTS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission for fiscal year 2001, and each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions. Appropriations to the Commission are authorized to remain available until expended.

(2) DISBURSEMENTS.—Appropriations to the Commission shall be disbursed on vouchers approved—

(A) jointly by the Chairman and the Co-chairman; or

(B) by a majority of the members of the personnel and administration committee established pursuant to section 308.

(b) FOREIGN TRAVEL FOR OFFICIAL PURPOSES.—Foreign travel for official purposes by members and staff of the Commission may be authorized by either the Chairman or the Cochairman.

SEC. 308. STAFF OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE.—The Commission shall have a personnel and administration committee composed of the Chairman, the Cochairman, the senior member of the Commission from the minority party of the House of Representatives, and the senior member of the Commission from the minority party of the Senate.

(b) COMMITTEE FUNCTIONS.—All decisions pertaining to the hiring, firing, and fixing of pay of personnel of the Commission shall be by a majority vote of the personnel and administration committee, except that—

(1) the Chairman shall be entitled to appoint and fix the pay of the staff director, and the Cochairman shall be entitled to appoint and fix the pay of the Cochairman's senior staff member; and

(2) the Chairman and Cochairman shall each have the authority to appoint, with the approval of the personnel and administration committee, at least 4 professional staff members who shall be responsible to the Chairman or the Cochairman (as the case may be) who appointed them.

Subject to subsection (d), the personnel and administration committee may appoint and fix the pay of such other personnel as it considers desirable.

(c) STAFF APPOINTMENTS.—All staff appointments shall be made without regard to

the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and general schedule pay rates.

(d) QUALIFICATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF.—The personnel and administration committee shall ensure that the professional staff of the Commission consists of persons with expertise in areas including human rights, internationally recognized worker rights, international economics, law (including international law), rule of law and other foreign assistance programming, Chinese politics, economy and culture, and the Chinese language.

(e) COMMISSION EMPLOYEES AS CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of pay and other employment benefits, rights, and privileges, and for all other purposes, any employee of the Commission shall be considered to be a congressional employee as defined in section 2107 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) COMPETITIVE STATUS.—For purposes of section 3304(c)(1) of title 5, United States Code, employees of the Commission shall be considered as if they are in positions in which they are paid by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 309. PRINTING AND BINDING COSTS.

For purposes of costs relating to printing and binding, including the costs of personnel detailed from the Government Printing Office, the Commission shall be deemed to be a committee of the Congress.

TITLE IV—MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA'S WTO COMMITMENTS

Subtitle A—Review of Membership of the People's Republic of China in the WTO

SEC. 401. REVIEW WITHIN THE WTO.

It shall be the objective of the United States to obtain as part of the Protocol of Accession of the People's Republic of China to the WTO, an annual review within the WTO of the compliance by the People's Republic of China with its terms of accession to the WTO.

Subtitle B—Authorization To Promote Compliance With Trade Agreements

SEC. 411. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) The opening of world markets through the elimination of tariff and nontariff barriers has contributed to a 56-percent increase in exports of United States goods and services since 1992.

(2) Such export expansion, along with an increase in trade generally, has helped fuel the longest economic expansion in United States history.

(3) The United States Government must continue to be vigilant in monitoring and enforcing the compliance by our trading partners with trade agreements in order for United States businesses, workers, and farmers to continue to benefit from the opportunities created by market-opening trade agreements.

(4) The People's Republic of China, as part of its accession to the World Trade Organization, has committed to eliminating significant trade barriers in the agricultural, services, and manufacturing sectors that, if realized, would provide considerable opportunities for United States farmers, businesses, and workers.

(5) For these opportunities to be fully realized, the United States Government must effectively monitor and enforce its rights under the agreements on the accession of the People's Republic of China to the WTO.

SEC. 412. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to authorize additional resources for the agencies and departments engaged in monitoring and enforcement of United States trade agreements and trade laws with respect to the People's Republic of China.

SEC. 413. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2001, and each fiscal year thereafter, for additional staff for—

(1) monitoring compliance by the People's Republic of China with its commitments under the WTO, assisting United States negotiators with ongoing negotiations in the WTO, and defending United States anti-dumping and countervailing duty measures with respect to products of the People's Republic of China;

(2) enforcement of United States trade laws with respect to products of the People's Republic of China; and

(3) a Trade Law Technical Assistance Center to assist small- and medium-sized businesses, workers, and unions in evaluating potential remedies available under the trade laws of the United States with respect to trade involving the People's Republic of China.

(b) OVERSEAS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce and the Department of State, in addition to amounts otherwise available, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2001, and each fiscal year thereafter, to provide staff for monitoring in the People's Republic of China that country's compliance with its international trade obligations and to support the enforcement of the trade laws of the United States, as part of an Overseas Compliance Program which monitors abroad compliance with international trade obligations and supports the enforcement of United States trade laws.

(2) REPORTING.—The annual report on compliance by the People's Republic of China submitted to the Congress under section 421 of this Act shall include the findings of the Overseas Compliance Program with respect to the People's Republic of China.

(c) USTR.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the United States Trade Representative, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2001, and each fiscal year thereafter, for additional staff in—

(1) the Office of the General Counsel, the Monitoring and Enforcement Unit, and the Office of the Deputy United States Trade Representative in Geneva, Switzerland, to investigate, prosecute, and defend cases before the WTO, and to administer United States trade laws, including title III of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411, et seq.) and other trade laws relating to intellectual property, government procurement, and telecommunications, with respect to the People's Republic of China;

(2) the Office of Economic Affairs, to analyze the impact on the economy of the United States, including United States exports, of acts of the Government of the People's Republic of China affecting access to markets in the People's Republic of China and to support the Office of the General Counsel in presenting cases to the WTO involving the People's Republic of China;

(3) the geographic office for the People's Republic of China; and

(4) offices relating to the WTO and to different sectors of the economy, including agriculture, industry, services, and intellectual

property rights protection, to monitor and enforce the trade agreement obligations of the People's Republic of China in those sectors.

(d) DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2001, and each fiscal year thereafter, for additional staff to increase legal and technical expertise in areas covered by trade agreements and United States trade law, including food safety and biotechnology, for purposes of monitoring compliance by the People's Republic of China with its trade agreement obligations.

Subtitle C—Report on Compliance by the People's Republic of China With WTO Obligations

SEC. 421. REPORT ON COMPLIANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the entry into force of the Protocol of Accession of the People's Republic of China to the WTO, and annually thereafter, the Trade Representative shall submit a report to Congress on compliance by the People's Republic of China with commitments made in connection with its accession to the World Trade Organization, including both multilateral commitments and any bilateral commitments made to the United States.

(b) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—In preparing the report described in subsection (a), the Trade Representative shall seek public participation by publishing a notice in the Federal Register and holding a public hearing.

TITLE V—TRADE AND RULE OF LAW ISSUES IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Subtitle A—Task Force on Prohibition of Importation of Products of Forced or Prison Labor From the People's Republic of China

SEC. 501. ESTABLISHMENT OF TASK FORCE.

There is hereby established a task force on prohibition of importation of products of forced or prison labor from the People's Republic of China (hereafter in this subtitle referred to as the "Task Force").

SEC. 502. FUNCTIONS OF TASK FORCE.

The Task Force shall monitor and promote effective enforcement of and compliance with section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307) by performing the following functions:

(1) Coordinate closely with the United States Customs Service to promote maximum effectiveness in the enforcement by the Customs Service of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the products of the People's Republic of China. In order to assure such coordination, the Customs Service shall keep the Task Force informed, on a regular basis, of the progress of its investigations of allegations that goods are being entered into the United States, or that such entry is being attempted, in violation of the prohibition in section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 on entry into the United States of goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in the People's Republic of China by convict labor, forced labor, or indentured labor under penal sanctions. Such investigations may include visits to foreign sites where goods allegedly are being mined, produced, or manufactured in a manner that would lead to prohibition of their importation into the United States under section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

(2) Make recommendations to the Customs Service on seeking new agreements with the People's Republic of China to allow Customs Service officials to visit sites where goods may be mined, produced, or manufactured by convict labor, forced labor, or indentured labor under penal sanctions.

(3) Work with the Customs Service to assist the People's Republic of China and other foreign governments in monitoring the sale of goods mined, produced, or manufactured by convict labor, forced labor, or indentured labor under penal sanctions to ensure that such goods are not exported to the United States.

(4) Coordinate closely with the Customs Service to promote maximum effectiveness in the enforcement by the Customs Service of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the products of the People's Republic of China. In order to assure such coordination, the Customs Service shall keep the Task Force informed, on a regular basis, of the progress of its monitoring of ports of the United States to ensure that goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in the People's Republic of China by convict labor, forced labor, or indentured labor under penal sanctions are not imported into the United States.

(5) Advise the Customs Service in performing such other functions, consistent with existing authority, to ensure the effective enforcement of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

(6) Provide to the Customs Service all information obtained by the departments represented on the Task Force relating to the use of convict labor, forced labor, or/and indentured labor under penal sanctions in the mining, production, or manufacture of goods which may be imported into the United States.

SEC. 503. COMPOSITION OF TASK FORCE.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of State, the Commissioner of Customs, and the heads of other executive branch agencies, as appropriate, acting through their respective designees at or above the level of Deputy Assistant Secretary, or in the case of the Customs Service, at or above the level of Assistant Commissioner, shall compose the Task Force. The designee of the Secretary of the Treasury shall chair the Task Force.

SEC. 504. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2001, and each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the Task Force to carry out the functions described in section 502.

SEC. 505. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) FREQUENCY OF REPORTS.—Not later than the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than the end of each 1-year period thereafter, the Task Force shall submit to the Congress a report on the work of the Task Force during the preceding 1-year period.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—Each report under subsection (a) shall set forth, at a minimum—

(1) the number of allegations of violations of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to products of the Peoples' Republic of China that were investigated during the preceding 1-year period;

(2) the number of actual violations of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the products of the People's Republic of China that were discovered during the preceding 1-year period;

(3) in the case of each attempted entry of products of the People's Republic of China in violation of such section 307 discovered during the preceding 1-year period—

(A) the identity of the exporter of the goods;

(B) the identity of the person or persons who attempted to sell the goods for export; and

(C) the identity of all parties involved in transshipment of the goods; and

(4) such other information as the Task Force considers useful in monitoring and enforcing compliance with section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Subtitle B—Assistance To Develop Commercial and Labor Rule of Law

SEC. 511. ESTABLISHMENT OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RULE OF LAW PROGRAMS.

(a) COMMERCE RULE OF LAW PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is authorized to establish a program to conduct rule of law training and technical assistance related to commercial activities in the People's Republic of China.

(b) LABOR RULE OF LAW PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is authorized to establish a program to conduct rule of law training and technical assistance related to the protection of internationally recognized worker rights in the People's Republic of China.

(2) USE OF AMOUNTS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall focus on activities including, but not limited to—

(A) developing, laws, regulations, and other measures to implement internationally recognized worker rights;

(B) establishing national mechanisms for the enforcement of national labor laws and regulations;

(C) training government officials concerned with implementation and enforcement of national labor laws and regulations; and

(D) developing an educational infrastructure to educate workers about their legal rights and protections under national labor laws and regulations.

(3) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Labor may not provide assistance under the program established under this subsection to the All-China Federation of Trade Unions.

(c) LEGAL SYSTEM AND CIVIL SOCIETY RULE OF LAW PROGRAM.—The Secretary of State is authorized to establish a program to conduct rule of law training and technical assistance related to development of the legal system and civil society generally in the People's Republic of China.

(d) CONDUCT OF PROGRAMS.—The programs authorized by this section may be used to conduct activities such as seminars and workshops, drafting of commercial and labor codes, legal training, publications, financing the operating costs for nongovernmental organizations working in this area, and funding the travel of individuals to the United States and to the People's Republic of China to provide and receive training.

SEC. 512. ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITIES.

In carrying out the programs authorized by section 511, the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor (in consultation with the Secretary of State) may utilize any of the authorities contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Foreign Service Act of 1980.

SEC. 513. PROHIBITION RELATING TO HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.

Amounts made available to carry out this subtitle may not be provided to a component of a ministry or other administrative unit of the national, provincial, or other local governments of the People's Republic of China, to a nongovernmental organization, or to an official of such governments or organizations, if the President has credible evidence that such component, administrative unit, organization or official has been materially responsible for the commission of human rights violations.

SEC. 514. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **COMMERCIAL LAW PROGRAM.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to carry out the program described in section 511(a) such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2001, and each fiscal year thereafter.

(b) **LABOR LAW PROGRAM.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor to carry out the program described in section 511(b) such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2001, and each fiscal year thereafter.

(c) **LEGAL SYSTEM AND CIVIL SOCIETY RULE OF LAW PROGRAM.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State to carry out the program described in section 511(c) such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2001, and each fiscal year thereafter.

(d) **CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER LAWS.**—Except as provided in this division, funds may be made available to carry out the purposes of this subtitle notwithstanding any other provision of law.

TITLE VI—ACCESSION OF TAIWAN TO THE WTO**SEC. 601. ACCESSION OF TAIWAN TO THE WTO.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) immediately upon approval by the General Council of the WTO of the terms and conditions of the accession of the People's Republic of China to the WTO, the United States representative to the WTO should request that the General Council of the WTO consider Taiwan's accession to the WTO as the next order of business of the Council during the same session; and

(2) the United States should be prepared to aggressively counter any effort by any WTO member, upon the approval of the General Council of the WTO of the terms and conditions of the accession of the People's Republic of China to the WTO, to block the accession of Taiwan to the WTO.

TITLE VII—RELATED ISSUES**SEC. 701. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BROADCASTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS.**

(a) **BROADCASTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS.**—In addition to such sums as may otherwise be authorized to be appropriated, there are authorized to be appropriated for "Department of State and Related Agency, Related Agency, Broadcasting Board of Governors, Broadcasting Capital Improvements" \$65,000,000 for the fiscal year 2001.

(b) **INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In addition to such sums as are otherwise authorized to be appropriated, there are authorized to be appropriated \$34,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002 for "Department of State and Related Agency, Related Agency, Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Operations" for the purposes under paragraph (2).

(2) **USES OF FUNDS.**—In addition to other authorized purposes, funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be used for the following:

(A) To increase personnel for the program development office to enhance marketing programming in the People's Republic of China and neighboring countries.

(B) To enable Radio Free Asia's expansion of news research, production, call-in show capability, and web site/Internet enhancement for the People's Republic of China and neighboring countries.

(C) VOA enhancements, including the opening of new news bureaus in Taipei and Shanghai, enhancement of TV Mandarin, and an increase of stringer presence abroad.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize extension of nondiscriminatory

treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People's Republic of China, and to establish a framework for relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) each will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4444.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, at this historic moment in this debate today, all Members should keep an open mind to objectively make the right decision, without pressure from outside groups, as to what is in the best interests of the United States, its people and its values. This vote will be the most important vote that we cast in our congressional careers. Why? Because it will affect America for generations to come.

International trade has meant a greater standard of living for our families here at home. Yes, nearly \$3,000 more in purchasing power a year, employment for over 12 million American workers, and wages that are up to 20 percent higher than those for the domestic market, that is what trade has meant to Americans.

But passage of this historic legislation will mean more than just American jobs created here at home. It will mean the expansion of American ideals, principles, and values throughout the world, as well as the Orient.

We have already started to see that sort of change occur, as China has opened up since Nixon's memorable visit. Today, most Americans do not know that over 90 percent of China's 930,000 villages now hold democratic elections for their local leaders, and that means nearly 1 billion rural Chinese have started to experience the freedom that democratic elections produce.

The bill's opponents raise concerns about China's human rights standards and environmental and labor conditions; and, yes, they need to be greatly improved. But how would severing our relations with China help to achieve this change which opponents say they want? It does not.

How will failure to pass this accomplish anything the opponents say they want? It will not. How does cutting off U.S. workers, farmers and businesses to a market of 1.3 billion customers, a market the Europeans and Japanese

will have ready access to, help our cause? It will not.

1215

Voting against this bill will help the Japanese, it will help the Europeans, but it will hurt America, and it will hurt the very people who want human rights and religious freedom in China to have a better chance to ultimately reach that goal.

How will denying American culture and American products and services to the Chinese help? How will it help to close off more of America within China? It will not. How does strengthening the hand of hard-liners in Beijing improve our national security? It will not. That is why we cannot afford to fail here today.

One of the best ways to open the minds of the Chinese is through open markets, and engagement with China does not mean endorsement of their human rights record. Congress, in the past has, and will continue, to monitor China's human rights record, and thanks to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), this bill provides a way to do that. But we deny the unchangeable tides of history if we think we can force China to alter its behavior by simply turning our backs on them.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues hear from no one else today before they vote on this historic issue, they should listen to the American people. The American people want America to get the benefit of the Chinese concessions which opens their markets to our product. They have said this overwhelmingly in all of the polling data in the last week. The American people, not Wall Street, not Main Street, not special interests, but American family interests. The overwhelming majority of Americans say that expanded trade with China will not only boost U.S. jobs, but it will improve China's human rights, improve the environment, and bring about the type of change and freedoms with which we stand here today and so jealously cherish. History has shown us that no government can withstand the power of individuals who are driven by the taste of freedom and the rewards of opportunity.

So I say to my colleagues, let us make history today and pass this legislation for American values that we all hold so dear.

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

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

Let me take this opportunity to thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle for the level of the debate which we will have. Truly, this is a very contentious issue. Members have deep-seated feelings. I do not remember anything being lobbied so hard by the administration, by the private sector, the Chamber of Commerce and unions, and certainly our constituents. But we have to appreciate the fact that no

matter how Members vote, even though I rise in strong support of PNTR, that we have to respect the Members for believing what they are doing is in the best interests of their districts, as well as the country, and remember that we do our best work when we work in a bipartisan way. So at the end of the day, I do hope that we are able to say that regardless of the outcome of the vote, it was one of the finest hours of this honorable body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), a senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the dean of our Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that this is probably going to be the most important national security foreign policy vote that we will be taking in a number of years. I have to say that there are two most important relationships from a foreign policy point of view that the United States will have in the next 20 years. One is obviously the U.S.-Russian relationship, and the other is the U.S.-China relationship.

China is 22 percent of the world population. One out of every five people on this Earth is Chinese. China will soon have a capacity in terms of its growth that will be second only to the United States. China will never be our friend, but this vote will determine whether or not we will be able to coexist with China, or whether China will become an enemy of the United States, so that we can have for the next 40 or 50 years another Cold War.

What surprises me are the two issues that have been raised by the opponents. One is the economic issue, and the other is the human rights issue. I would like to address those.

In terms of the economic issues, we are by far the most powerful economy in this world. We are second to none. We have the best educated workforce, we have the most talented workforce, we have the best R&D, we have the best higher education system, second to none. We should not fear anybody. We have an unemployment rate of under 4 percent, the lowest in decades, and as my colleagues know, we have a growth rate for the last 10 years, over 120 months that would be the envy of all other trading partners of the United States.

Yet, many people are opposed to this. At the same time, believe it or not, the United States, under this agreement, under this bill, gives up nothing. Our tariffs do not go down to the Chinese products; we do not give them larger distribution markets. So why are they opposed to this, particularly when China's tariffs will go from 25 percent down to 9 percent for all U.S. goods; automobiles, 100 percent today, if we export into China will go down to 20 percent, but the UAW is opposed. The Teamsters Union would have hundreds and thousands of more jobs because

more packages will go to China from U.S. products, but they are opposed as well.

Mr. Speaker, this is an agreement in the interest of the American worker, and this is an agreement that will create more jobs, more growth, and more prosperity for America.

Now, let me also talk about the issue of human rights. China's human rights record is terrible. We understand that. We, obviously, should put the focus on them, and we believe that the Levin-Bereuter bill, will, in fact, do that. But what is really interesting is that many of the Chinese dissidents that have the luxury of living in the United States are opposed to this. But those that live in China, the Chinese Democracy Movement, they want us to pass this, because they want to engage the United States. They think if they gain economic power, they will be able to oppose the central government of China. So we need to vote yes on this legislation for the future of our country and certainly, for prosperity and peace throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a yes vote on this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in vehement opposition to granting the People's Republic of China (PRC) permanent and unconditional trade relations status. Although proponents of this measure call it permanent normal trade relations, or PNTR, there is nothing normal about this relationship. The PRC makes promises to the U.S., the U.S. engages Beijing and Beijing breaks those promises. But China has absolutely no reason to keep their promises. The U.S. grants China most favored nation (MFN) trading status year after year while ignoring China's myriad of trade, labor, human rights, and nonproliferation violations. Now, the Administration wants Congress to hand over our only form of leverage to Beijing. I oppose extending permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) to China because the agreement signed last November is bad for U.S. as well as Chinese workers, and because the legislation before us cannot deliver what its backers promise.

I. THE AGREEMENT

We don't really know what the agreement between the U.S. and China will bear because China breaks its current agreements on nonproliferation, intellectual property rights, human rights and forced labor. Chinese officials have been telling the U.S. that they're opening their markets and telling their own business leaders that once they've entered the WTO, they'll protect certain markets—such as telecom, electronics and autos. Unfair competition is an integral part of Beijing's economic system. China restricts imports of U.S. goods through various formal and informal trade barriers. The 1992 memorandum of understanding agreement China signed on market access and intellectual property has been and continues to be violated. China cannot be trusted.

Factory workers in China earn as little as thirteen cents per hour. The average individual income in China is \$108. This hardly sounds

like a burgeoning middle class. But the Administration keeps telling us—as they did with NAFTA and Mexico—that if we don't capitalize on this market, Europe will. All I know is that a Chinese factory worker, or a rural peasant, making \$108 per year isn't able to afford goods made in the U.S. when they can't even afford goods made in their own country. I do know that this agreement encourages U.S. businesses to set-up shop in China and ensures them access to exploit China's cheap labor. This is a bad deal for the U.S. workers and a bad deal for the Chinese worker.

II. THE LEGISLATION BEFORE US

Many Members feel that they are able to vote for today's bill because it offers assurances that workers and human rights will be protected while promoting the rule of law in China. This is a tall order when we have yet to get China to keep any of its commitments made to the U.S.

The bill before us sets up another commission to monitor human rights. On May 18, 1998, 375 Members of the 105th Congress voted to establish the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom. When the Commission brought its findings on China's egregious religious violations, the 106th Congress looked the other way. The Commission recommended that we not give PNTR to China at this time. If this body is going to ignore the recommendations of the Commission that we established, why would we want to set-up another one? No Commission will be effective if Congress is going to ignore the fact that China abuses its people for practicing Falun Gong or any other religion not endorsed by the barbaric regime. The human rights provision in this legislation is hollow. The provisions set forth by the Levin-Bereuter proposal do not guarantee enforcement of China's harsh practices.

III. CONCLUSION

I'm not suggesting we end trade with China. I'm not even asking that we reform our trading practices with China. I merely want China to abide by the promises it has already made.

I urge my colleagues to look closely at China's record. I urge my colleagues to scrutinize China's current practices and ask yourselves if you believe China will keep its word. I don't! Oppose Congress giving up its only tool to enforce China's promises. Oppose PNTR for China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the distinguished minority leader, a gentleman who recognizes that the trade deal with China gives away our leverage to protect the lives of environmental, human, and religious activists in China; who recognizes that the Religious Freedom Commission set up by Congress in 1998 recommended Congress not give PNTR to China; who recognizes that the Levin-Bereuter provisions are hollow and do not provide for human rights violation enforcement; and recognizes that this agreement does not provide enforcement of China's promises.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for a wonderful institution.

This is the room where all of the feelings and emotions of the American people on this very important issue get channeled and espoused and spoken as we make a collective decision on what is a very, very important issue for our country, for China, and for the world.

I believe and fully expect this debate to be in the tradition of John Quincy Adams and James Madison and Daniel Webster and Henry Clay, and other great voices that have been heard in this building through the years.

As I begin the debate, I would like to commend the leaders on both sides of the aisle who have worked to carry on this debate in the highest tradition of the House. I commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) who has led the opposition on our side. There is not a greater proponent of human rights that I know.

I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) who have worked so hard to espouse their viewpoint. I commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) who is one of the finest people I have ever known in the Congress, who does everything from his heart to do what is right. I honor the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). There is not a greater fighter for human rights in our Congress than she is and a more staunch advocate for her views.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak on this issue. This debate is testament to what makes the United States the greatest country that has ever existed in the history of the world, based on the ideals of freedom; freedom of expression and freedom and liberty of religion and political speech.

These ideals are what cause me to finally be against this bill. This debate would not happen in China. This freedom of expression that we are exercising on this floor and outside this building and in rooms all over this country in the last days would not happen in a country like China. In fact, if one insisted on speaking against the policy of the government in China, one would be arrested.

America began with a simple revolutionary statement: We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And remember that when these rights were proclaimed 100 years later, Abraham Lincoln made it clear that the rights that were set out in the declaration were not just for the American people, but applied to everyone. Abraham Lincoln said this, the Declaration of Independence gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world for future time.

These ideals guided us through all kinds of conflicts and difficulties, World War II, the Cold War, bringing down the Berlin Wall, Soviet communism, the civil rights movement in our own country, apartheid in South

Africa. I remember standing on this floor with many of my colleagues against the wind of public opinion, here and in the world, saying that the only way we will bring change in South Africa is by standing for these ideals, even though the rest of the world would not.

Some would argue that this is just about trade. I would remind them that our greatest export is not our products and our services, our greatest exports are our ideals and our values. Getting acceptance of these ideals is also vital for trade. A country that fails to respect basic rights of people will not respect the rule of law, and without the rule of law in China, the rights of our businesses will not be accepted.

China has not obeyed the agreements that they have made with us on trade. We have been promised access; we have not gotten it. We have been promised protection of intellectual property; we have not gotten it. Our trade deficit is now \$85 billion with China, the highest as a percent of total trade of any country in the world. We export more now to Singapore, a nation of 3.5 million people, than we export to China, a country of 1.3 billion people. The track record is poor on compliance with treaties. Let us not reward them before we get them to comply. China's leaders show contempt for the rule of law.

1230

People are persecuted for their religious beliefs. People are in prison and tortured for speaking out politically. They are cooperating in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. They threaten Taiwan even up to and including the latest election in Taiwan.

The issue today is not trade. The issue today is whether or not to take away the annual leverage that comes with our voted-on review of progress on human rights in China. China will be in the WTO. We trade with China now. As I said, we have a deficit of \$85 billion a year. The issue is, will we take away the review, the leverage? Advocates of doing this say the annual review is meaningless. If it is so meaningless, why does the Chinese Government insist, as a price of giving us access to their market, that we take it away?

I will say why they ask for it so vociferously because they do not want the pressure. They do not want the annual debate on this floor. They do not want the light of the world to come in and see how they are performing, and this real pressure, I submit, will bring change. If we do not lead, who will? I ask, if we give this up, is anyone else in the world going to ask for this kind of review? I think not.

When we debated apartheid in South Africa, everybody in the world said lay off of South Africa. Trade will change them. Do we really believe that we would have an end to apartheid in South Africa if we had not stood alone, leading the world, to say this must not stand?

Supporters say that trade alone will solve the problem. There is some truth

in that argument. I give them credit because I agree in part with that agreement. I want more trade with China. I want the Internet in China. I want the people to use computers in China. I think it will have an impact, but the evidence that we have to deal with is that as trade has expanded, repression of rights has also expanded.

Our own U.S. State Department has said in its last three reviews of human rights that there has been bad deterioration each and every year. Last week, I met with Wei Jingsheng, a hero of mine. He lives here, in forced exile without his family and friends who are still in China. He was jailed for 17 years for writing on the Democracy Wall thoughts about political freedom and liberty in China.

He told me in my office that when we press for human rights, things get better in China, and when we lay off on human rights things get worse. He said this, in 1979 President Carter normalized relations in China. He was in prison soon thereafter. He said in 1989 President Bush guaranteed MFN, even though there were problems in China, and soon thereafter the guns blazed in Tiananmen Square. He said in 1994, President Clinton delinked MFN and trade with other kinds of questions in China on human rights. He said he was immediately arrested. In 1997, after intense pressure from President Clinton and many in this room, he was finally released, under duress, to come to the United States. When we stand up, things get better in China for human rights. When we stand down, things get worse; and that is what this debate and that is what this question is all about.

These have been good days in America. This debate has been healthy for America. I am pleased that so many people have participated in this debate. I am pleased there has been so much conversation and communication between our citizens and our representatives. I am pleased and proud to stand with labor activists and environmentalists and human rights activists and religious leaders. I am also proud that our business leaders have come here and argued from their heart about what they believe is right.

The lobbying and the conversation is about to end. We are about to have to vote. All I ask is that as we vote, we keep in our heart and our mind two quotes: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among them are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness", and that this Declaration of Independence "gave liberty not alone to the people of this country but hope to all the world for future time."

This country is an ideal and now in 2000, on this question, I hope we will stand for those ideals.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are

here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversations are in violation of the rules of the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, today both sides agree on the importance of today's vote. This is not a vote about severing ties with China or isolating China, which is absurd. This is not even about trade with China, frankly, just free trade anyway. It is about a specific trade policy and policies of the United States Government in dealing with one of the world's most powerful dictatorships.

The debate today, and in this debate, we will hear about jobs and the selling of American products; and when we hear people talk about that, I hope that the people who are listening will remind themselves that these people are not talking about the sale of U.S. consumer items. What they are talking about, when they talk about this commercial tie with China, is not the sale of commercial items but the transfer of factories and technology, this transfer to Communist China of American factories. Almost none of this trade deals with consumer items.

Yesterday, of course, we heard from the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) that once there, our business leaders who set up these factories in China end up in partnership, if not controlled by, the People's Liberation Army. We are setting the People's Liberation Army up in business with normal trade relations, and this makes it permanent normal trade relations.

The driving force behind this debate, which the other side dutifully refuses to acknowledge, is that with PNTR, as they have set it up, the American corporate interests will continue to be eligible for American-taxpayer subsidized loans and taxpayer-guaranteed loans through the Export-Import Bank and other financial institutions. Without NTR, those corporate interests building factories in China will not get the loan subsidies and the guarantees supported by the American taxpayer. So much for free trade.

That is the primary issue here and yet the other side continually refuses to address that issue of subsidized transfer of technology and manufacturing to Communist China.

This vote is about confirming government policies that have created a perverse incentive for American businessmen to close manufacturing facilities in the United States, where they have no loan guarantees, and set them up in Communist China. Over the last 10 years, American investment backed by the U.S. taxpayer has built the manufacturing and technological infrastructure of the world's worst human rights abuser, Communist China, a major competitor of the United States and a country that is America's number one potential enemy in the years ahead.

Nixon, on his death bed, told writer William Safire that his China strategy may have created a Frankenstein.

Our policy of most favored nation status, or normal trade relations, has created a monster that uses slave labor to compete with the American worker and is in the process of building a high-tech military force capable of defeating our military if there is a confrontation and incinerating millions of Americans, if necessary.

The over-\$500 billion in trade surplus that we have had under this normal trade relations that people want to now make permanent, what have they done with this \$500 billion in trade surplus over these last 10 years? Well, that is about the same amount of money they pumped into modernizing their military, building their missiles and rockets, building their airplanes and ships; and often, of course, these things are being built in factories supplied to them by American investors.

Today we are voting whether or not to freeze NTR in place and to make it permanent. We are voting today to take away Congress' annual review of the heinous human rights abuses that have gotten worse under NTR, and we are voting to muzzle those in Congress who fear the technological transfer and the building of manufacturing plants in Communist China.

The last thing we should do is make this system permanent and to limit congressional oversight and debate and to turn all enforcement mechanisms for disputes over to Third World-dominated World Trade Organization panels and commissions.

Let us champion liberty and justice. Let us not finance our competitors and our potential enemies. Let us defeat making permanent normal trading status that has worked against our country's security and against the economic interests of the American people. If we do not champion liberty and justice, who will? If we do not champion liberty and justice, we will not only be betraying our Founding Fathers but we will be demoralizing those people all over the world who look to America for hope. We will be betraying the vision of America as a shining city on a hill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard some very intense rhetoric thus far in this discussion of granting permanent normal trade relations for China, and I think it is important for folks to recognize that the permanent normal trade relations with China opens China's market to the United States, which has not been opened heretofore. If we were to continue the annual renewal of normal trade relations with China, 134 countries on the face of this earth will have access to that huge market, the biggest market on the face of this earth. They will have accessed that market, and we will be the only country that has not accessed that market.

We have let them, since 1980, access our market and that has produced indeed a rather sizable trade deficit; and it has produced a sizable trade deficit because we have not enjoyed reciprocity. What we are accomplishing here with China's accession into the World Trade Organization is reciprocity.

I would like to include one more comment here and it is by Clyde Prestowitz, and it was in the Wall Street Journal and he points out, "There is a final, most important reason to grant China PNTR." And keep in mind he was a trade negotiator for the Reagan administration, and he is currently president of the Economic Strategy Institute, a Washington-based think tank. He says, "For 30 years the U.S. has worked to bring China more fully into the community of nations, and to promote both economic development and a more liberal society. The policy has been working. Anyone who saw China in the early 1980s and compares it with today must be amazed. Bicycles and drab Mao suits have morphed into traffic jams and bright fashions; the freedom and the range of individual choices available to the average person has expanded exponentially. After years of estrangement, China is asking to join the international community. To turn it down at the very moment it is moving in the direction we have desired would be a tragic and historic mistake."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), our distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about another facet of this great debate about opening up trade with China. For decades our foreign policy needed to rely on strong international leadership that was backed by scientific ingenuity embodied in the tip of ballistic missiles. It was our unwavering commitment to freedom and confidence in our ideals that helped to seal the victory over Communism. Although our ideals and our commitment are the same today, clearly the tools of freedom and democracy are changing.

1245

In the next century, it will be the diplomacy of trade, and the growth of the Internet that ensure continued United States leadership throughout the globe.

The power of the Internet will define the way we communicate in our personal relationships, our business dealings, and in our political advocacy throughout this new century. And once again, the United States is leading the revolution. In fact, some of the most powerful and innovative high-tech companies in the world are based in the United States.

These companies employ the most highly-paid, highly-skilled workforce in the world and are helping to raise the standard of living for millions of Americans. So what does it mean that

the new bilateral trade agreement signed between the United States and China commits China to living under the information technology agreement?

Mr. Speaker, it means that tariffs on United States computer equipment will phase down to zero in China and the growing middle class in China will begin to have access to low-cost tools with which to link themselves to the world.

Despite attempts by the Beijing government to control content on the Web, the unleashing of the Internet by foreign-owned companies can only mean less control from Beijing and greater independence and control for the Chinese people to experience economic freedom. The Internet is a liberating force for Chinese citizenry who are anxious to engage in the world.

If we do not normalize trade relations with China, however, we will cede our international leadership to our trading partners, such as the European Union, which just finalized a trade agreement with China last week.

Equally as important, if we do not clear the way for China's accession to the World Trade Organization, the strong democratic government which continues to flourish on the island of Taiwan will never be admitted to this international body of trading nations. That is why Chen Shui-bian, the newly-elected President of Taiwan, supports normalizing the trade between China and the United States.

Clearly, the United States and every other WTO member country will benefit by having Taiwan as an official member of the WTO. Yet it is the policy of the WTO that Taiwan will not accede to the body and enjoy the benefits of its membership until China itself accedes.

Earlier this year, I introduced a resolution to express a sense of Congress that Taiwan should accede to the WTO as the next order of business at the same general council meeting at which China accedes.

I am very pleased that my colleagues, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) have agreed to include this language in their proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has proven to be on the right side of history time and time again, because we do not deny the fundamental need of the human spirit, individual liberty.

As the promise of free and fair trade spreads this message, we should neither fear this opportunity nor apologize for the advancement of American ideals. Engaging China as a willing trade partner and taking our message to her people will prove time and time again to be the right course.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this effort.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the sovereign State of Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, up until the vote in the Committee on Ways and Means last week, I had truly been undecided by this issue. I believe in the benefits of free trade, but that does not mean that one signs up for a bad deal; that is why I voted against NAFTA. But as a supporter of annual renewal of normal trade relations with China, I found it hard to be adamantly opposed to doing in one vote what I was prepared to do on a year-by-year basis, especially considering the benefits of the agreement to the United States.

I take human rights, labor rights, religious freedom and environmental protection seriously, and no Member of this House has had a stronger labor voting record over the last 12 years. But I find it hard to accept the notion that the failure to move China sufficiently on these issues meant that we had to continue the same old strategy.

I took seriously the argument that China has never lived up to its trade agreements in the past, and it certainly bothers me, and I think it will be a long-term struggle to get China to fully implement this agreement, a job with a greater chance of success if we work within the world community, rather going our own way.

I believe the Levin-Bereuter proposal to be crucial to this vote and want to commend both gentlemen for their outstanding efforts. While opponents of China PNTR must oppose and downplay the proposal at this time, I think a commission which functions daily to promote the cause of human rights and labor rights in China is far more valuable than an annual debate that threatens nobody.

And I found great comfort in my talk with former President Jimmy Carter about advancing human and labor rights in China. Who, in the annals of American political life, has more impeccable credentials about human rights than Jimmy Carter?

Finally, I do worry about the national security implications of rejection of China by the United States. I fail to see how this helps Taiwan or how it helps make China a more responsible actor in the Asia-Pacific region. It would not be fair to say that China would be isolated if we deny them PNTR, because they will still be part of the WTO, no matter what we do. It would be fair to say, however, they would be more isolated from us.

It is a tough call, Mr. Speaker, but in the last analysis, granting China PNTR is far better for the United States than denying it.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT).

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

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill. I rise in opposition to granting Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China. Let me be very clear, I am not opposed

to an open trade policy and I am not an isolationist. But, I also do not believe in trade at any price. Our experiences in this body and on this floor with so-called "free trade" agreements show they have all come with fairly high price tags. They end up being neither free nor fair.

Since 1992, we have entered into four bilateral trade agreements with China. In these agreements, China agreed to open their markets, end exporting products made in forced labor camps, limit quotas on Chinese textiles exports and pledged to protect US patents, trademarks and copyrights for intellectual piracy.

Yet, according to annual reports of the United States Trade Representative and the U.S. State Department, China has violated each of these agreements. Is it any wonder our trade deficit with China has grown from \$6 billion in 1989 to \$70 billion in 1999?

In terms of trade alone, there is more than enough reason to merit a "no" vote. Yet there are many other reasons which stack together in building a no vote.

I am particularly disturbed when I hear how this bill is somehow American agriculture's new best friend. Under last year's agreement for China's accession to the World Trade Organization, China agreed to import "all types of U.S. wheat from all regions of the U.S. to all ports in China." Yet, it is very interesting to note China's chief WTO negotiator said earlier this year that his government agreed only theoretically.

"... It is a complete misunderstanding to expect this grain to enter the country... Beijing only conceded a theoretical opportunity for the export of grain," he was quoted as saying in the South China Morning Post.

As far as beef is concerned, the Administration said it expects China to lift the ban on all U.S. meat and poultry exports, yet this same Chinese official said: "In terms of meat imports, we have not actually made any material concessions."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues why are we so willing to jump on the agriculture bandwagon? Growers in my district are already placed on an uneven slope because of the phase out of Methyl Bromide. With entry into the WTO—which incidentally recognizes China as a 'developing' nation the same as Mexico and Chile—Chinese farmers will be allowed to use Methyl Bromide until 2015 while our producers adhere to the Montreal Protocol and phase out the fumigant.

Though we have extended our unilateral phase out until 2005, where is there a guarantee the WTO will not continue to define China as a developing country allowing even further unfavorable treatment?

In regards to our relationship with Taiwan—who happens to be one of our largest trading partners—I am very disappointed that we didn't allow the amendment of my good friend, the gentleman from California, to ensure that should we adopt this agreement if China should attack or blockade Taiwan, PNTR would be revoked. I think that is a very reasonable and balanced approach.

It also leads to a bigger problem—that of U.S. national security interests. China is one of the world's largest exporters of missile technology and weapons of mass destruction. Their clientele reads like America's Most Wanted list: Libya, Iran, North Korea. China has repeatedly sold components and missiles

capable of carrying nuclear, biological and chemical weapons to rogue nations. Should we dismiss the Cox Report and its findings that China has stolen information on our latest nuclear weapons placing us at jeopardy?

In its findings, the Cox Report wrote, “. . . a PRC (People's Republic of China) deployment of mobile thermonuclear weapons, or neutron bombs, based on stolen U.S. design information, could have significant effect on the regional balance of power, particularly with respect to Taiwan. PRC deployments of advanced nuclear weapons based on stolen U.S. design information would pose greater risks to U.S. troops and interests in Asia and the Pacific.”

In terms of human rights and religious persecution, the Chinese record is simply abysmal. I have never been one to insist our trading partners or even our allies to be just like us in the way they conduct their lives. I fully support self determination but the Chinese record in this area is horrible. I reject the notion that somehow China will mystically transform itself into a Western-style democracy in the areas of free speech, worker's rights, political dissent, religious persecution and protecting the environment with this agreement.

What this comes down to is big business is looking to become even bigger. Sometimes, however, the price of doing business is just too steep to pay.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) who realizes that, like NAFTA, PNTR will promote global business and undermine environmental protections, undermine labor standards and undermine human rights.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, here in Congress we pride ourselves in our commitment toward the spread of democratic ideals and the improvement of human rights around the globe, but something in our China policy is amiss.

During the weeks approaching this vote, America's most prominent CEOs walked the halls of Congress and told us they want access to the 1.2 billion Chinese customers, what they do not say is that their real interest is in access to 1.2 billion Chinese workers, workers whom they pay 20 cents, 30 cents, 40 cents an hour.

These CEOs will tell us that increasing trade with China will allow human rights to improve. They will tell us that democracy will flourish with increased trade. But as these CEOs speak democratic ideals, their companies systematically violate the most fundamental of human and worker rights. Engagement with China, 10 years of engagement has not worked because investors in China have not wanted change.

In the last 5 years, Western investment in developing countries has shifted from countries like India, a democracy, to countries like China, where workers are paid only a few cents an hour, from countries like Taiwan, a democracy, to countries like Indonesia with authoritarian regimes.

The share of developing country exports to the U.S. for democratic na-

tions fell from 53 percent to 34 percent. In manufacturing goods, developing democracies saw their share of developing country exports fall 21 points from 56 percent to 35 percent. The money went from developing democracies to developing authoritarian countries.

Western corporations want to invest in countries that have below-poverty wages, poor environmental standards, no worker benefits, no opportunity to bargain collectively. As developing countries make progress towards democracies, as they increase worker rights and create laws to protect the environment, the American business community punishes them by pulling its trade and investment in favor of a totalitarian government.

Decisions, Mr. Speaker, about the Chinese economy are made by three groups, the Chinese Communist party, the People's Liberation Army, and Western investors. Which one of these three want Chinese society to change? Does the Chinese Communist party want the Chinese people to enjoy increased human rights? I do not think so. Does the People's Liberation Army want to close the labor camps in China? I do not think so. Do Western investors want Chinese workers to bargain collectively and pay higher wages? I do not think so.

Mr. Speaker, passing PNTR will lock in the status quo: More slave labor, more child labor, more human rights violations, more threats against Taiwan, more crackdowns on religious freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues vote “no” on PNTR.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 33 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 38½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 37 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) has 39½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that we have heard today that there is reciprocity in PNTR. Anyone who talks about reciprocity in PNTR probably has not read this. Let me just say that, at the end of 5 years, there are still going to be 25 percent tariffs; on cars, 45 percent; on motorcycles, 30 percent; these are all tariffs on American goods while our tariff has virtually been eliminated.

There is no reciprocity with PNTR. They may bring down their outrageously immoral and anti-American tariffs, this unfair situation we have now, but they then still keep the tariffs way above anything in the United States. We eliminate ours. They freeze their high tariffs against their products in permanently. That is not reciprocity.

Plus there are still requirements that American companies going there will

have to partner in many cases, for example, 51 percent of all telecommunications investment has to be owned and controlled by Chinese. We are providing them technology, manufacturing, investment. What are they providing us? They are flooding our markets with cheap goods and putting our people out of work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues come to the floor and vote, there are three questions that we must consider. First, will China comply with the agreements under PNTR better than they have done in the past? Two, will China continue to use its trade surplus with the U.S. to expand its military complex? Three, will democracy increase in China because of this agreement?

Let us look at this first chart. I would like to point out that China has lowered its tariffs as part of its prior agreement. In fact, in 1995, they lowered it from 42 percent to 17 percent. But as my colleagues can see, the deficit increased dramatically. In fact, last year, it was \$70 billion. So based on history, I questioned the real benefits of China's lowering its tariffs.

I would also like to point out that while some agricultural products received very favorable treatment, others did not. So I submit that not everyone will benefit from this agreement.

Remember, there are 700 million farmers in China, and we have about 2 million. In this chart, my colleagues will see that China consistently overproduces its agriculture commodities and actually exports some citrus products up to 300 times what it imports.

Finally, can China be trusted? China, as we know, has violated both the letter and the spirit of past agreements, ranging from intellectual property rights to weapon proliferation.

Furthermore, China's defense spending has grown roughly at the same rate as its economy. We can expect the trend to continue as China takes in more U.S. dollars.

On a final note, our last chart, in 1989, students erected this statue in Tiananmen Square, the Goddess of Democracy, a model of the Statue of Liberty because the symbol of democracy was a movement in China at that time, that point.

I ask my colleagues, in conclusion, is China closer to freedom than it was in 1989? Are they continuing to get more belligerent? The real question is, would it not be wiser to grant incremental agreements with China and then trust but verify periodically? Those are the questions you must answer honestly before you vote “yes” for PNTR.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to some of the points brought up by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

First of all, some of the agricultural and other export subsidies are eliminated by the agreement or substantially reduced and that will affect the trade statistics be offered now and in the future. Additionally, of course, in the PNTR agreement that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and I offered, we have strong compliance and enforcement resources made available to our executive branch to better assure that China does keep its promise and promote the rule of law.

China does have a mixed trade record on compliance. But I would remind the gentleman, that just very recently, kept their promise to buy citrus products from the gentleman's State. However, I say most importantly, China's entry into the WTO subjects them to the WTO dispute settlement mechanism. That is the big advancement to require compliance with the trade promises in its accession agreements.

Mr. Speaker, extending my remarks this member reminds his colleague that today this body will cast one of its most significant votes affecting American national security and economic prosperity when it determines the fate of permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status for China. Despite the supercharged and misleading claims by opponents that this is a vote about rewarding China, it is not that at all, but instead a vote for our own national interests. And, PNTR is, indeed, in America's short- and long-term national interest for three crucial reasons.

First, PNTR benefits American economic prosperity. Regardless of how this body votes on PNTR, China will join the WTO and be required to take major actions to open up its vast market of 1.2 billion consumers. As part of China's WTO accession process, the U.S. negotiated an outstanding market access agreement which significantly lowers China's high import tariffs and allows for direct marketing and distributing in China. For example, the tariff on beef will fall from 45 percent to just 12 percent. Quantitative restrictions on oilseeds and soybean imports are abolished. Indeed, it is projected that by 2003, China could account for 37 percent of future growth in U.S. agricultural exports. Given that America's markets are already open at WTO standards to Chinese exports, the U.S. has effectively given up nothing; all the concessions have been made by China. Prior to the agreement, China frequently required manufacturing offsets—most products sold in China had to be made in China. This export-oriented agreement abolishes that unfair offset and eliminates currently required industrial technology transfers allowing products made in America to be sold in China. Approval of PNTR makes it less likely that American companies need to open foreign factories and thereby export jobs.

To access all of these benefits, WTO rules require the U.S. to provide China with permanent Normal Trade Relations status, something that is granted to all the other 135 members of the WTO and have provided to China on an annual basis for over 20 years. The failure to provide PNTR to China will remove the legal obligation for China to provide any of

these hard-sought benefits to the United States even as China is required to open up its market to our foreign competitors and all other WTO members. Without PNTR, America is unilaterally giving away the Chinese marketplace to our Japanese, European and other international competitors at the disastrous expense of U.S. exports and the jobs they create at home.

Second, PNTR supports the U.S. national security objective of maintaining peace and stability in East Asia. Sino-American relations are increasingly problematic and uncertain. In the wake of our accidental bombing of China's embassy in Belgrade and China's confusion about U.S. continuing support for Taiwan, rejection of PNTR could result in a resurgence of resentful nationalism as hard-liners in Beijing characterize a negative PNTR vote as an American attempt to weaken and contain China. Resources China currently devotes to economic reform could easily be reallocated to military expansion with adverse consequences for Taiwan and our allies in Korea and Japan, and a destabilized region. Confronting China in this scenario will require much more than the 100,000 strong force we presently have in the Pacific. China is not a strategic partner; it is increasingly as economic competitor that is growing as a regional power. However, it is not an adversary. If the United States is astute and firm—if America increases our engagement with China and helps integrate it into the international community—it is certainly still possible to encourage China along the path to a complementary relationship with America instead of an incredible level of conflict.

Third, China is emerging from years of isolation and the future direction of China remains in flux—more than any major country. WTO accession and PNTR are critical for the success of China's economic reform process and Chinese leaders, like Premier Zhu Ronghi, who support it. These reforms, being pursued over the formidable opposition of old-style Communist hardliners, will eventually provide the foundation for a more open economy there, a process that, in the long term, should facilitate political liberalization and improved human rights. In the near term, China will be required more and more to govern civil society on the basis of the rule of law, clearly a positive development we should be encouraging.

China's accession to the WTO with PNTR status does not guarantee that China will always take a responsible, constructive course. That is why the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and this Member proposed an initiative that incorporates special import anti-surge protections for the U.S. and other trade enforcement resources for our government to ensure China's compliance with WTO rules. This initiative also proposes a new Congressional-Executive Commission on Chinese Human Rights that will report to the Congress annually on human rights concerns, including recommendations for timely legislative action.

When it is time to cast the vote, Congress must ask, "is PNTR in America's long and short term national interest?" On all accounts, the answer is clearly, "yes."

THE LEVIN-BEREUTER PROPOSAL

Mr. Speaker, following the signing of the "Agreement on Market Access Between the People's Republic of China and the United States of America" on November 15, 1999, it

became apparent to this Member that the House would finally consider providing China with Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) in the context of China's accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO) sometime during this Congress. However, the concerns in Congress about Sino-American relations continue to multiply in scope and seriousness. These concerns are strong enough with enough of our colleagues so as to make the passage of a simple, clean PNTR bill uncertain. Something else would be needed to help address these concerns in a meaningful way and replace what has become an annual debate on China resulting from the annual NTR renewal process. This Member concluded that there would be a need for PNTR-compatible parallel legislation. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was of the same mind-frame and working on his won parallel proposal. About a month ago we combined our efforts and have worked closely together in a very cooperative and bipartisan manner to produce the China-specific Levin-Bereuter proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the special 12-year important anti-surge protections in our original package were incorporated into H.R. 4444 by the Ways and Means Committee during its mark-up of the bill. The remainder of the Levin-Bereuter proposal was incorporated into H.R. 4444 by the Rules Committee.

This includes:

1. The Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China. This Commission is based on the OSCE Commission model and would be comprised of nine Members of the House, nine Senators and five appointees from 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 this report, the House International Relations Committee would be required to hold at least one public hearing on the report, and on the basis of recommendations in the report, decide, in a timely manner, what legislation to report for House action.

2. Monitoring and Enforcement of China's WTO Commitments. Included in this section of the legislative proposal is a direction to the U.S. Trade Representative to seek an annual review by the WTO of China's compliance and commitments to the WTO. We authorize additional staff and resources to the Department of Commerce, State, and Agriculture and to the USTR to monitor and support the enforcement of China's trade commitments. The establishment of a Trade Law Technical Assistance Center to assist businesses and workers in evaluating the potential remedies to any trade violations by China is also authorized. We also require an annual report by the USTR to the Congress evaluating China's compliance with its WTO commitments.

3. Task Force on Prison Labor Exports. The Levin-Bereuter proposal establishes a new inter-agency task force to improve the enforcement of our own laws preventing the importation of prison labor products. It also directs the U.S. to enter into new agreements with China to improve the ability to investigate prison-labor export concerns.

4. Trade and Rule of Law Programs. The proposal authorizes new commercial, labor, legal and civil society rule of law programs for China.

5. Taiwan and the WTO. Incorporating the language of H. Con. Res. 262, the Dunn-Bereuter resolution, we call for the accession of Taiwan to the WTO as the next order of business at the same general council meeting after China's accession—in other words, the near simultaneity of accession by Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, this Member believes that these additional provisions, particularly the Commission on Chinese Human Rights with the guaranteed review of its findings and recommendations by the appropriate standing committee in the House, do, indeed, address the multi-faceted concerns of our colleagues. The Levin-Bereuter initiative assures that China's compliance with their commitments and their human rights record will certainly not be ignored by the Congress or the Executive Branch after China receives PNTR. The Commission will be a far more effective way to address human rights issues than the noisy but ineffective annual debate on extending NTR.

Now, to respond to some of the points that have been raised in this debate, this Member will offer the following rebuttals:

ON GRANTING PNTR VERSUS GRANTING NTR

China has been provided with Normal Trade Relations (previously known as Most Favored Nation) status since 1979—for over 20 years. During the first 10 of those years, no one objected even though the economic and human rights situation in China was worse than today. Since the U.S. gives up nothing and China makes all the concessions with the new bilateral WTO accession agreement, what is the real difference between providing NTR and PNTR for China? The removal of what has become a noisy but ineffective debate on China. Indeed, with PNTR, we will replace this one-day debate with a Congressional-Executive Commission on Chinese Human Rights that will concentrate on China every day—365 days a year, will report annually to Congress and whose report and recommendations are guaranteed to be considered in the Congress annually.

ON THE TRANSFER OF U.S. JOBS TO CHINA

Since, in the U.S.-China bilateral trade agreement the U.S. gives up nothing, who benefits most from PNTR? U.S. exporters.

Since the bilateral agreement requires China to halt its current practice of requiring technology transfer and manufacturing offsets, who benefits most from PNTR? American workers. This provision makes it much less likely that U.S. companies build factories in China. With PNTR, American products can be exported, distributed and marketed directly in China. That means jobs STAY in America.

Opponents reference to an International Trade Commission (ITC) study purportedly stating PNTR will result in job losses is wrong. Here in writing is a letter from the ITC itself verifying that it did not generate any forecasts regarding jobs. The ITC itself says that its study has been misrepresented and its methodology misunderstood by the special-interest supported Economic Policy Institute reported opponents are quoting.

ON THE CONCERN THAT PNTR ONLY BENEFITS COMMUNISTS

The claim is made that PNTR only rewards the Communists in China. That is inaccurate. Up 40% of the Chinese economy, according to the State Department, is now privatized and corporatized and this sector of the Chinese economy is growing every day. These are pri-

vate enterprises, non-communist entrepreneurs and American investors. This is the economic sector that will IMPORT American products, services and ideas. In contrast, the Communist hardliners are opposed to PNTR and China's WTO accession because they accurately see PNTR and WTO accession as foundations for building a strong private sector—the nemesis of Communist control!

ON THE CONCERN THAT CHINA HAS NEVER COMPLIED WITH TRADE AGREEMENTS

China's record is admittedly mixed. Failure to provide PNTR guarantees that America's Japanese, European and other foreign competitors have access to China's market at the disastrous expense of U.S. exports. Even a deal honored in a patchy manner would help American business more than no deal at all. Allowing Airbus rather than Boeing to export to China hurts American workers. That's why Boeing's 40,000-strong machinists union endorses PNTR.

The Levin-Bereuter addition to PNTR has important China trade compliance monitoring and enforcement resources.

Access to the WTO dispute settlement process, available only with PNTR, gives us a significant multi-lateral trade agreement enforcement mechanism.

China HAS complied with trade agreements—note the recent Bilateral Agricultural agreement. China has already purchased wheat from the Northwest, Citrus from Florida, California and Arizona and hogs from Nebraska.

ON THE U.S.-CHINA TRADE DEFICIT

Opponents are taking the ITC study way out of context. The ITC does not take U.S. services or distribution into account. Services now represent 2/3 of the U.S. economy. The ITC only examines 1/3 of the U.S. economy.

While the ITC report stated that the U.S. bilateral trade deficit with China would likely increase at first with China's accession to the WTO, it also continued stating that “at the same time the U.S. global trade deficit would decrease as a result of larger exports to other East Asian countries.” Overall, we benefit and our deficit decreases.

China will join the WTO regardless of our vote today. Failure to provide PNTR unilaterally gives away the Chinese market to our Japanese, European and other foreign competitors at the expense of American exports—our outstanding and hard-sought agreement with China is export-oriented allowing products made in America to be sold and distributed in China. Restricting U.S. exports, which denial of PNTR would do, would increase our deficit with China. Giving American exports a fair chance to compete in China will help lower the deficit.

ON CONCERNS WITH REGARD TO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Religious freedom is repressed in China. Promoting economic reform and rule of law in China, which PNTR and engagement does, is superior to isolating China and turning our back on religious followers. Voting NO on PNTR only bolsters the position of the hardliners in Beijing—the very element repressing religion. That is why religious leaders, including the Dalai Lama, and especially those in the underground in China support China's accession to the WTO and reliable U.S. engagement.

The Helsinki-type Human Rights Commission in the PNTR legislation is required to

monitor and report on “religious freedom, including the right to worship free of involvement of and interference by the government”. Voting no on PNTR is a rejection of this Commission.

When asked whether the new Commission on Chinese Human Rights truly addresses the concerns raised by the current Religious Freedom Commission, Commissioner Elliot Abrams responded, “I think it does address the kind of concerns that we've raised. We're looking for some kind of mechanism for constant monitoring, and it does address that.” (Ways and Means Committee testimony, 5/3/00)

ON TAIWAN AND WTO

President Chen of Taiwan has endorsed PNTR for China (LA Times Interview, 3/22/00). It appears a little self-presumptuous for us to claim to know and care more about Taiwan's position than Taiwan's own democratically-elected President.

The Levin-Bereuter addition to the PNTR legislation calls for the near simultaneity of WTO accession by Taiwan—as the next order of business at the same general council meeting after China's accession.

Given Taiwan's significant investment in China, it is in China's own self-interest to allow Taiwan's accession.

If China threatens or attacks Taiwan, the President of the United States already has the authority under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) to suspend PNTR benefits. He can even go much further and restrict imports from or even embargo China! IEEPA is fully consistent with Article 21 of the WTO. Remember, Iran, Iraq and Libya all have PNTR and Cuba is a member of the WTO, yet we have WTO-consistent embargoes against all of them!

Mr. Speaker, this Member strongly urges adoption passage of H.R. 4444.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) from Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I do want to compliment everyone involved in this process. When the democratically-elected representative legislative system functions, it is a wonder to behold, and we are in the process of doing that today.

1300

I do hear these concerns. I am not going to talk about trade, although I am on the Subcommittee on Trade. Just go back and read the history on Smoot-Hawley. No one should argue that this is not going to benefit all concerned, especially the United States.

I do want to address my colleagues who are concerned about the progress that has been made in China with this Communist regime that has been in for about 50 years. We inherited a lot of concepts of Western Civilization. Probably the most important, coming from the Greeks, is the inherent worth of the individual, the concept that one is worth something simply because one is alive. We have institutions structured

on that basis. The institutions are here to further the individual, not the other way around.

But if we go back to 1776 when we declared our independence and we said all men are created equal, it was 12 years later, in 1788, that we wrote the Constitution. There was not religious freedom as we know it in the first amendment in 1788. It was not until 1791, when the Bill of Rights was ratified. And as a matter of fact, the Bill of Rights was not ratified in Massachusetts, Georgia, or Connecticut until 1939.

Eighty-nine years after the Declaration of Independence, the 13th Amendment ended slavery; 144 years after the Declaration of Independence, women were given the right to vote; 178 years after the Declaration of Independence, we said separate but equal is inherently unequal; and it was 186 years after the Declaration of Independence that we said one person, one vote. The purest statement of all men are created equal.

So when people are upset over a 10- or a 20- or a 30-year period of the failure of China to take a foreign concept, the inherent worth of the individual, and fundamentally restructure their society, I would say, take a look at our history.

And lastly, let me say this, for those of my colleagues who are going to vote "no." We do know what that "no" vote means. It does not mean that we will keep China out of the WTO. It does mean that the hard-liners, the people who are looking for excuses inside China to continue to foment real concern about our national security, will have a card that they can play at any time. And probably, most importantly, one of the reasons I am so pleased we have come together today is that it will be reported that my colleagues voting "no" are on the wrong side of history.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, my first concern in evaluating this agreement has been deciding what course would be most supportive of the interests of central Texas families. I believe that more trade will mean more good, high-wage, technology jobs not only for central Texas but for all of America.

A vote against normal trade with China will only deny American firms the access to Chinese markets that will now be open to all of our competitors around the world. This would likely disrupt commerce without resolving any of our human rights, worker rights or environmental concerns.

I applaud the successful effort of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) to amend this bill to create a commission to monitor human rights and trade policy in China. To be sure, this is an imperfect answer, but so is the way we have conducted our annual

review process for the last 20 years. That unusual existing process does not appear to have been particularly effective over in the last two decades in securing improvement in these areas either. I believe that this Commission represents a better alternative. We will not gain leverage over the Chinese by voting against continuing our commercial relationship. Rather, engagement and continual annual reminders through this commission of the need to have a more open Chinese society are more likely to produce that result.

I also appreciate the willingness of the administration to provide both more meaningful environmental review of our trade agreements and the first genuine participation by the environmental and public health communities in shaping trade policy. Our trade policy must be significantly improved to take into consideration the environmental and public health consequences of our decisions. Recognizing its many shortcomings, and recognizing the need for significant reforms to open it up to meaningful public participation, the World Trade Organization will at least be one more form of international rule with which the Chinese must comply.

Both sides of this debate have advanced some meritorious arguments, and some overstatements. I believe a vote to continue normal trade relations with China, a country containing one-fifth of the people of the world, will neither guarantee a new China nor the catastrophic end of old jobs in America. On balance, an affirmative vote is the best overall choice for the security of American families.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT), who recognizes that a trade deal with China gives away our leverage to protect the lives and human beings and slaves in China.

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

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today as a strong supporter of fair trade and free trade, but as one who is convinced that relinquishing the leveraging tool the annual vote on normal trade relations provides is a grave mistake.

Let me be clear. I am not here to call for an end to our trade relationship with China. I know the importance of trade to our current economic prosperity, and I support economic engagement. I supported NAFTA, GATT, Fast Track, and the African trade bill we just recently passed. But what I cannot support is relinquishing our annual review of China's progress towards free market reform and a democratic society. I cannot, in good conscience, award China PNTR when there are serious national security concerns; when China's records of compliance with past agreements leaves much to be desired; and when China's progress on economic power and technological development has overlooked progress on human rights and religious freedom.

I was one of the authors of the International Religious Freedom Act, which established an independent commission led by Ambassador-at-Large Bob Seiple. This commission released earlier this month a report which notes a marked deterioration in China's religious freedom during the last year. This is unconscionable.

If America stands for anything, it stands for personal freedom and inalienable rights for all people. Granting PNTR today sends China the message that we approve of their political system as it stands today, and that is clearly not the case.

While I was home last weekend, I talked to a number of farmers and small businessmen who expressed their concern that they felt like they were not getting a fair shake, and I could not agree more. Our farmers and small business people are facing tremendous challenges these days. But I am convinced that replacing annual normal trade relations with permanent normal trade relations is not the answer.

I am not sure this switch will solve our problem. Vote "no."

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I did want to say, with respect to the gentleman from Tennessee, that first of all the commission established by the initiative of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and this member gives Congress this annual report and recommendations not just annually but on any occasion during the year. And the House International Relations Committee would be required upon receipt of an annual report of findings and recommendations to hold at least one public hearing, within 30 days, to make a decision within 45 days whether to advance legislation to the floor and to have such resolution available for House action within 60 days from the receipt of the annual report.

This OSCE-type commission is a far more effective mechanism than the annual ineffective harangue during the NTR extension vote that goes on here once a year.

Mr. Speaker, this Member would also say that action on the recommendation of the OSCE-type Commission, the China Human Rights Commission, takes only the action of this Congress, unlike the Helsinki Commission, which effectively requires the action of over 50 nation members.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) and would just note that I disagree totally with what was just said.

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in February this year, China's army threatened long-distance missile strikes against the U.S. Later that month, its defense minister threatened to attack U.S. aircraft carriers if they came near

the Taiwan Strait. In April, the Chinese military review threatened neutron bomb attacks against both U.S. carriers and against the U.S. mainland. America was threatened with heavy casualties.

The leading reformer that we are asked to support, the Chinese premier, has pledged to end the democratic independence of Taiwan, a critical U.S. ally. The outrageous threats of Chinese militarists during the lead-up to this PNTR vote have been beyond the pale.

Let us engage China, yes. Let us trade with China. But at this time let us continue to review the relationship on an annual basis. Reject permanent PNTR.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), a respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I will enter quotations from Chinese human rights' activists at the appropriate place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who all agree that the best way to open minds is through open markets.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I in Congress remain deeply concerned about human rights' violations in China, but one of the best ways to instill American ideals of individual freedom and liberty is through opening China's borders to American goods and services. That is what this agreement does, and that is why I support this agreement. China's old hard-line regime would like nothing more than for these American values and ideas to be denied access to their country. China's membership in the WTO will force China to play by the rules, protecting human rights.

May I suggest that engaging China is the best possible way that Americans can influence Chinese behavior, enhance human rights, strengthen labor standards, and improve the environment. And as we can see, a number of human rights' activists in China agree that opening the markets would open the door for improving human rights.

Mr. Speaker, China's involvement in the international trading community has already improved human rights. We know that the most repressive periods of China's history occurred at times of international isolation. Exposure to the outside world has increased openness, social mobility, and personal liberties for the Chinese people. I think people need to recognize that engagement does not mean endorsement. Congress will continue to monitor China's human rights' record. Nothing prevents Congress from legally sanctioning China and invoking its penalties should Congress feel China has violated the spirit and the rule of law with respect to human rights, even if we pass this agreement.

Annual human rights reviews will continue. Future administrations will

continue to conduct annual reviews of China's human rights' record. Nothing in this legislation changes that. Rather, we have enhanced it under this legislation thanks to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

I would ask everyone to keep in mind that this legislation is not only about exporting American goods to China; it is also about exporting American values.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the quotes I referred to earlier:

Human Rights Activists Agree that open markets mean open minds.

The participation of China in the WTO would not only have economic and political benefits, but would serve to bolster those in China who understand that the country must embrace the rule of law, which of course is a key principle underlying active membership in global trade organizations . . . For those of us who have long pressed for vigorous adherence to the rule of law in China, it is encouraging that so many Chinese officials support the nation's entry into groups such as the WTO."—Martin Lee, Chairman of the Democratic Party of Hong Kong.

"An isolated China will resist change at home and be likely to behave more aggressively towards its regional neighbors. None of that serves American interests. Admitting China into the WTO may not cause it to shed dictatorship for democracy. But it's the right step toward realizing that goal."—Randy Tate, Co-Chair of Working Families for Free Trade, and Former Executive Director of the Christian Coalition.

"All of the fights—for a better environment, labor rights and human rights—these fights we will fight in China tomorrow. But first we must break the monopoly of the state. To do that, we need a freer market and the competition mandated by the WTO."—Dai Qing, prominent Chinese environmentalist.

"It is obvious this is a good thing for China . . . I appreciate the efforts of friends and colleagues to help our human rights situation but it doesn't make sense to use trade as a lever. It just doesn't work."—Bao Tong, prominent Chinese dissident.

"For so many years of China's reform and opening, these areas couldn't be opened up and remained state monopolies. But if economic monopolies can be broken, controls in other areas can have breakthroughs as well. These breakthroughs won't necessarily happen soon. But in the final analysis, in the minds of ordinary people, it will show that breakthroughs that were impossible in the past are indeed possible."—Li Ke, Former Chinese Editor of the Democratic Journal Fangfa.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I think anyone listening to this debate would agree that we are all interested in changing the behavior of the Chinese Government towards its people and human rights and all the rest. We differ merely on how best to do it.

I am not going to talk about trade either, much, except to say that this should not be called the China PNTR

bill; it ought to be the America PNTR bill. We give up no leverage. We can change tomorrow what we have done today. There is nothing permanent around here.

But let me just say why I think it is America's trade bill. The problem is we do not have any closed markets to China. They have got their stuff here. If my colleagues do not believe me, go to Wal-Mart. The problem is, we cannot get our stuff there. And that is why this is a good deal for America's workers.

One cannot, by voting no, isolate China. One, by voting no, can isolate us. Do my colleagues not understand that the EU, the South Americans, Japan, and the rest of Asia are going to move into that market while we sit here and watch job loss occur in our country because we are the ones isolated?

1315

Now, let me say something about that. If one reads history, every great civilization that has fallen has in one way or another practiced some form of isolationism. They have tried to erect barriers against the outside world. China is now and has been paying a terrible price. China used to be traders years ago, centuries ago. They went into an isolation mode, and now we see the remnants of what was once a great free civilization in the throes of this communist dictatorship.

This is about America in the next century. As I believe the last century was about the United States and the Soviet Union and the military powers that existed then, the Cold War, this new century is about trade and about our relationship with China, leading the world toward human rights through openness and engagement.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), someone who realizes that slave labor is not the American way to get cheap T-shirts at Wal-Mart.

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, we should not reward a totalitarian regime that is run by a Communist party, a dictatorship, with little regard for human dignity and common decency. We should not reward a nation that has, through its actions and deeds, done so much evil.

Mr. Speaker, we are free Americans, nurtured on the Declaration of Independence. We are the land of Lincoln, Washington, and Jefferson, Americans who believe in justice and the dignity of man.

So let us not abandon our patriotic morals in favor of corporate profits. Let me run that by my colleagues once again. Let us not abandon our patriotic morals in favor of corporate profits. Let us not forget the democratic ideals that formed the foundation of this Nation.

I urge my colleagues to remember the lessons from our idealistic youth of right and wrong and do what is right and vote "no" on PNTR from China.

Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the world lies an ancient nation with over 1.2 billion people living on a land mass covering 3.7 million miles. It is a 3,500-year-old civilization that has been at times a friend, at times an enemy, and at times a stranger. It is a nation of contradictions: clinging to its 3,500-year-old traditions yet reaching to embrace the 21st century; governing by a communist ideology yet striving for capitalist riches. With more than a hint of elitism and without the self-effacing humility Confucius taught, the Chinese referred to their nation as the Middle Kingdom for hundreds of years until the mid-19th century when Britain and Western powers fought, won and carved up China like freshly killed fame.

For the Chinese, one of the worst things to suffer from is the loss of respect or "to lose face", and in the years following the first Opium Wars, that is exactly what happened to China. It was not just one Chinese person who "lost face", it was an entire nation. Therein lies the psyche of the Chinese civilization and of many of the Chinese people. Wounds still fresh from its harried humiliation by the Western powers—150 years is merely a catnap for a nation so old—China yearns to be a global superpower. For much of the 20th century, China has been playing catch up with the West. An inordinate amount of time and energy went toward improving China's economy, military and diplomacy to achieve the most elusive yet important goal for the Chinese people as a collective whole—to regain what had been lost—respect. It is the motivational undercurrent in China's actions. That is the important lesson to be learned for the international community, and the United States in particular. The lesson is that China is willing to do whatever it takes, regardless of ruling ideology, to become a global superpower.

The dangers of such a motivating factor are readily apparent. China, despite its official pronouncements, has acted in some instances no different than a rogue nation, such as Libya, North Korea, or Iraq. Military spending has shot up over 40 percent in the 1990's, and research and development of high-tech weapons of warfare and mass destruction have been prioritized. China has illegally sold nuclear technology to Pakistan, smuggled AK-47s into San Francisco, and collaborates with terrorist nations such as Iran to improve their missile and weapons technology. The leaders in Beijing also shot missiles at Taiwan when that democratic island of 22 million people held its first democratic elections. This year, the Chinese leaders in Beijing boldly trumpeted the threat of force to retake Taiwan if reunification talks do not begin.

In addition, China's utter contempt for human rights is well documented. In fact, this year the Clinton administration's own State Department came out with a report detailing China's deteriorating human rights record. On November 29, 1999, Chinese police summarily arrested and beat Fu Sheng, a member of the illegal China Democracy Party. Since last July, more than 35,000 people associated with the Falun Gong spiritual movement have been detained. No one is safe. Even Christians are imprisoned and thrown in forced labor camps strictly on the basis of their religious beliefs. As recently as February of this year, the 80-

year-old head of China's underground Roman Catholic Church who was previously imprisoned for nearly 30 years for refusing to denounce the Pope.

China, despite its communist roots and totalitarian regime, realizes that in the modern world it not only takes military strength to become a superpower, it also takes economic strength. By borrowing pages from the success stories of Japan, Singapore, Taiwan and Hong Kong, China turned toward and embraced a managed market economy driven by export growth as one of the primary engines for economic growth.

As part of the plan to raise China's stature in the international community, China has been involved in long and protracted negotiations to join GATT, and now, WTO. The 13-year long effort finally came to a head on November 15, 1999 when the administration signed an agreement with China to provide for her accession to the WTO.

China is widely viewed as having made a number of major concessions in the agreement, but can we really trust China? Chinese leaders say one thing and do another. China has historically agreed to many things and has implemented relatively few of them. For example, after threatened with major trade sanctions by the United States, China agreed to a sweeping 1992 market access agreement to remove major market barriers to United States products. The agreement was supposed to have been fully implemented by the end of 1997. We're still waiting.

Mr. Speaker, growing up in post-World War II Chicago was a learning experience for me. In school, in church, and in the ballfields, we learned the difference between right and wrong, good and bad, friends and enemies.

When we played 16-inch softball, we knew the rules, and we played by them. We played with honor. It was wrong to cheat, and cheaters were punished. In school, we learned about our Nation's history and how to be good citizens and proud patriots. In the schoolyards, we learned who were our friends and who weren't. In church, we learned about morality, God's teachings on good and evil, and right and wrong. Those lessons remain with me to this day.

These things don't change and, unfortunately, neither has the People's Republic of China. Despite all their words, despite all their promises, their actions speak louder. They continue to imprison and torture Chinese dissidents, set up slave labor camps, practice forced abortions, shoot missiles at democratic Taiwan, sell weapons technology to Libya, and break trade agreements. They pretend to be our friends, yet through their actions, reveal themselves as anything but.

We should not reward a totalitarian regime that is run by a Communist party—a dictatorship with little regard for human dignity and common decency. We should not reward a nation that has, through its actions and deeds, done so much that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, we are free Americans nurtured on the Declaration of Independence. We are the land of Lincoln, Washington, and Jefferson—Americans who believe in justice and the dignity of man.

So, let us not abandon our patriotic morals in favor of corporate profits. Let us not forget the democratic ideals that form the foundation of this nation.

I urge my colleagues to remember the lessons from their youth—of right and wrong—and do what is right.

Vote "no" to PNTR for China.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

Mr. Speaker, I was rated in the top five free traders in the 105th Congress; and yet, I reluctantly oppose PNTR for China, for a couple of different reasons.

First of all, we have a mechanical problem. And that is, if my colleagues look at WTO, it is a rule-based system. And yet, look at the dispute over hormone beef. Look at the dispute over bananas with EU. And what we see is another culture that has democratic governance, that has intellectual property rights, that has a rule of law, that has property rights, has basically said, we are just going to ignore the rules of WTO, we are going to ignore our agreement with America because we want to.

And if we have that kind of disagreement within a culture that is very similar to our own, can my colleagues imagine the disagreement that we will find in a culture that is very different.

In fact, history suggests that that inclination is right, because the 1998 USTR's Foreign Trade Barriers Report said that fully 400 of 1,200, one-third, of all products that were in the 1992 agreement between China and America were still subject to nontariff barriers.

So what we are doing here is we are dropping a 400-pound gorilla in the swimming pool, and it will have implications for WTO itself.

Also, we have a problem in that any time with the Cox report that we have a country engaged in espionage to steal our nuclear secrets, I do not know that that deserves award. That does not make common sense to me.

And three, and most disturbing to me, is that, if we look in the South China Sea, I think we see a trend toward if not expansionism, certainly bullying. If we look at Mischief Reef, if we look at Spratly Islands, if we look at how in 1997 China moved an oil drilling rig into what was clearly territorial water of Vietnam, if my colleagues look at their behavior toward Taiwan, if we look at their taking of the Paracel Islands in the 1970s from Vietnam, we see a trend that is disturbing.

So I will admit that is a very blunt instrument, but is the only instrument that I have to use as a legislator in signaling displeasure toward China's behavior.

We also need to look at OPEC and other arrangements that help companies to go to China and displace them.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues who are wavering on China PNTR to cast a "yes" vote for U.S. world leadership, U.S. jobs, and the continued prosperity of the U.S. economy.

The "yes" vote that we cast today is not a vote for China. It is a vote for the United States. It is not a vote to allow China into our market. China is already in our market. Rather, it is a vote to allow our workers, our farmers, our investors, ideals and ingenuity to compete successfully in the world market.

This is not a vote to maintain the status quo. Rejecting this resolution today will not force the world economy into a fixed and stationary condition, with the U.S. as leader in its own smug, self-satisfied isolation.

Denying China PNTR will not deny the Chinese access to the WTO, nor will it deny them access to European service providers, Asian technology, or Latin American grains. Denying China PNTR denies only the United States.

If there is one thing we have learned in these early moments of the 21st century, it is this: The new economy allows nothing to remain static, no one to remain unaffected, and no single player to hold all the cards.

So before my colleagues waver toward a "no" vote today, imagine for a moment the world we create by denying PNTR for China. Do not just imagine the morning after the vote when financial markets register the most immediate and negative response to our action. Imagine further into the future as European and Asian competitors lock out our workers, investors, and farmers from the largest market in the world. Imagine 5 years into the future, then 10, then 20 when the full and awful truth of our action is evident in the remains of a once great world economic power. Make no mistake, denying China PNTR denies our own future.

I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, Franklin Roosevelt once said, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

While some of our trade policy today causes very genuine and legitimate concern and hesitation on the part of our working people, we must be guided by hope and opportunity, not fear and trepidation.

Right now our policy with China does not work, the status quo is not good. We have too many big trade deficits, too many human rights violations. So we have negotiated a new one for our new economy with our old enduring values.

What does China get from this agreement? They have to cut tariffs, open up

their markets. Our goods penetrate their markets across the board, telecommunications, agriculture, you name it.

What do we give? Nothing. We just accept this agreement. This benefits America.

Secondly, on human rights, I want to applaud the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN). We talk about MFN being annual review of human rights. With this new human rights institution, a committee, we will monitor human rights daily by the hour, with staff, with Members, not yearly with MFN.

Finally, on human rights, a human rights leader in China, Ran Wan Ding said this: Before the sky was black. Now there is light. This can be a new beginning. With our new economy, let's open up one of the oldest cultures in world history to American optimism, to American products, and to American values.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) who realizes that to honor China and punish Cuba is the height of hypocrisy.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am a firm believer in self-determination for China. Now China is a Communist country whether we agree with it or not. However, countries, regardless of their political or economic system, should not be rewarded when they are allowed to round up and intimidate and arrest people, put people in slave labor camps with no due process.

Why would the United States enact a trade policy that rewards this behavior, as well as environmental degradation and religious persecution and violation of women's rights? This is wrong.

Annual review, at the very least, provides a tool to help ensure China's respect for human rights and nuclear nonproliferation.

With regard to our own country, the Economic Policy Institute estimates over 870,000 United States jobs will be lost over the next decade, with the loss of over 84,000 jobs in my own State of California. This is really scary.

We do not want to cut off our relationship with China. I support fair and free trade. We simply believe that human rights and fairness for American and Chinese workers should be the bottom line.

This vote defines who we are as a people and as a Nation. I urge my colleagues to oppose PNTR for China.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Long Beach, California (Mr. HORN).

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, since becoming a Member of Congress in 1993, I have opposed normal trade relations

with China as a matter of conscience. I see no change in the human rights situation in China.

The level of trade between our two countries began to grow two decades ago, but the daily lot of the average Chinese worker is dismal. There is no excuse for American companies in China to pay workers as little as 22 cents an hour for 12- and 15-hour shifts.

Trade has increased wealth in China, and some people enjoy limited freedom in their personal lives. Mostly, they are in the Party. But the Chinese Communist Party still oversees a system that jails, tortures, and kills those it deems to be a threat to the Party's arbitrary rule. China's own constitution states that Chinese citizens are entitled to the rights of freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religious belief.

Really?

Ask tens of thousands of Tibetans, Christians, Falun Gong practitioners, or human rights and labor activists. It is hard to hear their voices. They are imprisoned, and worse, for exercising those basic rights.

Today we can send a strong message: human rights cannot be separated from our other policy interests in China. This debate is as much about how we define ourselves and what this Nation stands for. It is not just about China's conduct.

Some Members of Congress hope we can address this fundamental issue by creating a commission to monitor human rights failures in China. Unfortunately, this commission would be powerless to sanction Chinese misbehavior. The real questions in the debate are very clear: Why would we think that a country that does not respect the most basic rights of its own people will now respect the rights of its foreign trade partners? How do we expect to enforce fair trade rules when they have been unable to enforce them in the past? Having witnessed China's threats against Taiwan and the United States, what will it take to condemn China's actions in the future?

In 1981, 15 university presidents met with students in 25 universities, technical institutes, and specialized colleges. When we talked to students—out of the eyes and ears of Chinese intelligence agents—those students wanted "freedom."

To open up our markets involves mutual trust and respect.

This Congress should not send a signal that we honor a country that has little regard for America or the values in which Americans believe most strongly—dignity, fairness, and individual freedom.

This Congress should vote "no."

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

(Mr. HILL of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, listening to this debate, one would, I think, come to the conclusion that this is a complex issue. But it

really is not. There are three basic questions I think we have to answer.

One, is it going to help or hurt our economy if China gets PNTR and joins the World Trade Organization? Second, can we best advance the cause of human rights and religious freedom in China by isolating them or engaging them in further trade. And third, are our security interests in that region going to be hurt or helped by China's membership into the WTO?

Now, how we answer that question is really how we look at the world and, to a greater extent, how we look at the United States.

Pessimists would look at this issue and they would see only the risks. I choose to look at this issue and see opportunities. I believe that more trade is more good than bad. I believe that more markets for agricultural products and for manufactured goods is more good than bad. And I believe that our economy, our workers, our farmers, our entrepreneurs can compete with the people in China. So I choose to be an optimist.

This is really a one-sided agreement. China gives up everything. They give up access to their markets. They tear down the barriers and tariffs. And we get more access and opportunity in the process.

1330

But this is also going to unleash another form of competition and that is the competition of values. Do Members believe that their values or our values are going to prevail in that competition? Because after this occurs, China will no longer be able to lock our values out of their society. There are more people in China who speak English than there are in the United States. There is a hunger for our values and our system there. I believe our values will prevail.

How about our security interest? All the past Secretaries of Defense and current ones support this agreement, but let us look at what our allies say. Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, all say that China's membership in WTO and permanent normal trade relations will make our security interest more secure in that region.

So I choose to be an optimist. I choose to believe in America, in our values. I urge my colleagues to support PNTR, to support China's membership in the WTO, and to vote for this bill.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, we should vote for PNTR today. At the beginning of the millennium, we should not regress and isolate China. We should help engage China in the world community. In truth, we had a Cold War. Communism lost, capitalism won. Now our economic and political system will help deliver freedom, peace and prosperity throughout the world because free markets cannot prosper in authoritarian regimes. In a global

economy, authoritarian regimes cannot long survive the impact of freedom and free markets. Engaging China and exposing China to the sunlight of free market economies and democratic values is the best way to bring about evolution towards freedom in China. We here in Congress all agree upon our goals: a strong, free, prosperous America in a world that is free, peaceful, and prosperous. But like a family, we in Congress and people in our great country can disagree on the best way to achieve that goal. It is my strong belief that helping to engage China in the world community will advance the cause of freedom.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) who recognizes to open our border to cheap Chinese assault weapons will cause the deaths of thousands of American children.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I look at this bill and I ask myself, why did I come here? I came here to defend the rights of Americans and the rights of people all around the world.

I look at China, I see no freedom of speech, no freedom of religion, no freedom of association, no freedom to do anything unless the government says so. That alone is enough to vote against this bill.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and recognize that he represents many people in the Armed Forces who will suffer by the things that are produced in those factories that we are building for the Communist Chinese.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to extending PNTR for China. I want to start by quoting Bill Safire who wrote in his column on May 18 in *The New York Times*:

I confess to writing speeches for Richard Nixon assuring conservatives that trade with China would lead to the evolution of democratic principles in Beijing.

I further quote Mr. Safire:

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.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has tried for more than three decades to build a relationship with China and to foster democratic values in the communist nation. In 1995, we extended most favored nation status to China if China would agree to stop its abusive human rights practices and stop exporting nuclear technology. The very next year, the CIA reported that China was the greatest supplier of weapons-of-mass-destruction-related goods and technology to foreign countries. Despite repeated promises that trade would make China more free, it has failed to end its long and established history of human rights abuses like forced abortion and sterilization.

Years of maintaining the lax policy of constructive engagement with China

have proven dangerous. As the Rumsfeld Commission found in 1998, China's proliferation of ballistic missiles and other weapons of mass destruction threatens the security of the United States. When China steals technology and sells it to our enemies, steals our nuclear secrets and tries to influence our election process, how can we grant PNTR for China? Extending normal trade relations status to China impacts more than the economy, Mr. Speaker. It takes away our economic leverage with a Communist country, and it stands to affect the security of each and every American citizen.

I close by repeating William Safire:

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.

Mr. Speaker, until China can prove to the people of America that it can be trusted, we should not pass PNTR for China.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of permanent normal trade relations with China. The economic benefits are undeniable for our country and are particularly favorable for my region and my State. North Carolina has much to gain from opening and expanding markets in China, currently our 13th largest export market and the consumer of over \$300 million in North Carolina goods and services annually. The commodities of goods involved range from pork and poultry and soybeans to furniture, communications equipment, software and computers—very broad economic benefits indeed.

But this debate, Mr. Speaker, is not just about trade. I have not heard any proponent suggest that we should turn a blind eye to human rights and political problems in China in the name of commerce. Nor is this legislation a blessing of China's past and current behavior, no matter how often the opponents of the bill might repeat it.

On the contrary, the point is to bring China within a framework that will provide powerful incentives and constraints to play by the rules, both in the realm of trade and beyond. As China moves further into the world economy, we need to be clear-eyed about our future with China. We must continue to press on human rights and religious freedom and the self-determination of Taiwan, the freedom of Tibet, nuclear proliferation, and espionage. Isolating China economically will do more harm than good in all of these areas.

Martin Lee, the chairman of the Democratic Party of Hong Kong and a human rights leader has said: "The participation of China in the WTO would not only have economic and political benefits but would serve to bolster those in China who understand that the country must embrace the rule of law."

Trade is no panacea. But to refuse trade, to isolate China economically, would risk empowering the most rigid, hard-line anti-democratic elements of China, those who want to pull their country away from the democratic world. This is not a prospect America or the Chinese people can afford.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of opening opportunities for American workers, farmers, and businesses, and I stand with those committed to improving our national security, economic freedom in China, and the quality of life for the Chinese people. I rise in support of Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China.

As my colleagues know, in November the United States and China signed a bilateral agreement to bring China into the World Trade Organization (WTO). The agreement would open Chinese markets to our goods and services and reduce Chinese tariffs and quotas on our products. What does the United States give up? Nothing. All we have to do is grant PNTR to benefit from this decidedly one-way deal.

The economic benefits are undeniable for our country and are particularly favorable for my region and state. It is clear that North Carolina has much to gain from opening and expanding markets in China, currently our 13th largest export market and consumer of over \$300 million in North Carolina goods and services.

The Chinese will be compelled to open their markets to services like telecommunications, banking, software, computer, and environmental services. Tariffs will be eliminated on computers, telecommunications equipment, semiconductors, and furniture. North Carolina companies will benefit from major tariff reductions on optical fibers, chemicals, pulp and paper, wood products, agriculture equipment, medical equipment, and environmental technology equipment. In agriculture, our farmers will no longer have to compete with export subsidies on China's agriculture products and will benefit from tariff cuts on poultry, pork, tobacco, soybeans, and other commodities. For the first time, our companies will be able to sell and distribute products in China made by workers here in America, without being forced to relocate manufacturing to China, sell through the Chinese government or transfer valuable technology.

Now that the European Union has signed an agreement with China, clearing the last remaining hurdle to China's accession to the WTO, a vote against PNTR could cost America jobs, as our competitors in Europe, Asia and elsewhere capture Chinese markets that we otherwise would have served. To benefit from the agreement that opens Chinese markets to American products and investment, this Congress must first grant permanent normal trading status—the same arrangement we have given all other countries in the WTO.

Much has been said about what we lose if we give up an annual review of our trade status with China. I would just suggest that our annual vote has not been particularly effective. Even after Tiananmen Square, this body did not revoke "most favored nation" status. I do not suggest turning a blind eye to the human rights and political situation in China in the name of commerce, nor do I view this agreement as a blessing of China's past and current behavior. On the contrary, the point is to bring China within a framework that will provide

powerful incentives and constraints to play by the rules, both in the realm of trade and beyond.

As China moves further into the world economy, we need to be clear-eyed about the future of our relationship and must continue to press on issues such as human rights, religious freedom, the self-determination of Taiwan, the freedom of Tibet, nuclear proliferation, and espionage. I believe isolating China economically would do more harm than good in these areas.

Martin Lee, chairman of the Democratic Party of Hong Kong and a leader of the human rights movement, wrote: "The participation of China in the WTO would not only have economic and political benefits, but would serve to bolster those in China who understand that the country must embrace the rule of law." To him, the agreement "represents the best long-term hope for China to become a member of good standing in the international community. We fear that should ratification fail, any hope for political and legal reform process would also recede."

A recent New York Times article ("Chinese See U.S. Bill as Vital to Future Reforms," May 21) noted that a "broad array of educated Chinese—top government officials, publishers, bankers, artists, lawyers and pro-democracy advocates—have come together in extraordinary agreement on the issue, investing their hope for progress in China" in this vote. "Chinese government leaders and economists hope the normalization of trade with America will help close inefficient state enterprises. Authors and artists here are convinced it will reduce censorship. Lawyers suggest it will force China's mercurial judges to follow the law."

Zhou Daichun, a commercial lawyer in Beijing said, "What's important is not how this vote will affect this or that industry. What's important is that this is an opportunity to push for reform and reorganization in China and without that impetus, many reforms are impossible."

Taiwan supports China's entry into the WTO. And the Dalai Lama, the spiritual leader of Tibet, has said, "Joining the WTO, I think, is one way (for China) to change in the right direction . . . I have always stressed that China should not be isolated. China must be brought into the mainstream of the world community . . . Forces of democracy in China get more encouragement through that way."

As we all know, Chinese actions demand our attention. Mr. LEVIN and Mr. BEREUTER have crafted provisions included in this legislation that help us maintain our sharp focus on the issues of human rights, religious freedom, and economic fair play. Under the Levin-Bereuter provisions, the U.S. will create a Congressional-Executive Commission on China, modeled after the Helsinki Commission, to evaluate human rights in China. The Commission will submit an annual report of its findings to the President and Congress, including WTO-consistent recommendations for action. This bill puts into law China-specific anti-surge safeguards to guard American businesses and workers from import surges from China. We strengthen monitoring and enforcement of China's commitment to WTO obligations with an annual review of China within the WTO.

Mr. Speaker, only through a comprehensive system of relationships can the United States hope to influence the internal policies of the Chinese government. This vote is a significant

opportunity for us to encourage positive change in China. We must pull China in the right direction, not turn our backs. Trade is no panacea. But to refuse trade, to isolate China economically, would risk empowering the most rigid, hard-line, anti-democratic elements of China, those who want to pull their country away from the democratic world. This is not a prospect America or the Chinese people can afford.

In light of this strategy of engagement and our nation's interest, not only in selling to China, but also in bringing China into conformity with accepted rules of international conduct, I urge my colleagues to support PNTR.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) who understands that the slogan "We Bring Good Things to Life" will not help murdered female children in China.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, that I can address you from this well today is a tribute to the courage, the perseverance and the sacrifice of my parents. My father left for America when I was 4 months old, and I did not see him again until I was 7. I could only recognize him from photographs. My parents endured 7 years of separation so that they could bring our family to this place of freedom and of opportunity. People have said to me, "You're a trade lawyer. You've got to like this agreement. You represent a trade-dependent district. You have to support this agreement. If you have to vote your conscience, just vote and walk away."

I refuse to do that because I will refuse to turn my back on the sacrifice of my parents and countless other Americans who have stood and fought in the cause of freedom. This is a bad trade agreement. This is bad policy, and this is counter to fundamental American values.

It is a bad agreement because the basic concept is wrong. Let us take the WTO proponents' arguments at their face value. America is a market economy. China is not. America has an exchangeable currency. China does not. If we both dropped our tariffs to absolute zero, we would lose control over our imports and China would not. Through their command and control economy they can still determine how much to buy and exactly from whom to buy.

This is a flawed agreement. This is bad policy because the day after we vote to give China permanent most favored nation trading status, hard-liners in Beijing will say, We thumbed our noses at the Americans with respect to nuclear weapons, we thumbed our noses at the Americans with respect to missile proliferation, we thumbed our noses at the Americans with respect to human rights, we thumbed our noses at the Americans with respect to saber rattling in the Taiwan Strait, we thumbed our noses at the Americans with respect to all these things and yet they still gave us the central goal of our foreign policy for the last 12 years. Why should we ever listen to what the Americans have to say?

But the most important reason for voting no is to keep our commitment to American values and the sacrifices of countless families like mine and every other American family today.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, when the students in Tiananmen Square looked to America, they saw the Statue of Liberty. When we look to China, we see dollar signs. I think their vision is better than ours. I have heard some statements by proponents that I disagree with.

China gives up everything in this deal? Not true. They become enriched. This regime becomes more powerful, flush with cash.

If you have capitalism and Communists existing in China, it is the political death warrant of the Chinese Communist regime? I disagree. When people take to the streets, they will bring out tanks bought with this money.

The ultimate question was, is this about being friend or foe with China? One of the first speakers said this will determine whether or not we are friends or foes. The Communist Chinese will never be our friends. How can somebody be your friend when the government punishes somebody for having one child too many they say is enough, three times your annual salary if you have more than one child? You can never be America's friends when you murder people under government authority. You can never be America's friends when you cheat on agreements signed. For the last 20 years, they have cheated on every textile agreement signed with the United States.

These people are not our friends. They are the enemy of every freedom-loving person in the world.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), a respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of granting normal trade relations to China. First and close to my heart, Michigan farm families, employers and working men and women win with this. Passage of today's legislation will mean that Michigan farmers will no longer have to compete with high tariff barriers on U.S. agricultural products. Restrictions on the importation of meat and poultry will be eliminated and products like fruit and vegetables will see tariffs cut in the range of 65 to 75 percent. Tariffs on auto parts will be reduced by 57 percent. And motor vehicles, cut by 70 percent. I do not need to tell Members that these things mean a lot to the people of Michigan and America.

There are some people who claim that we cannot grant normal trade relations with China because of their human rights record. We can all agree that China's people are mistreated, but

I will not agree that isolating China is an improvement.

I would like to illustrate some of the changes that our trade with China has resulted in. In 1990, 400,000 Bibles were sent to China. This year, we will deliver 4 million Bibles to China. Human rights activists who have been involved in China for years have voiced their support for this agreement, including the Reverend Billy Graham and Leonard Woodcock, the former President of the United Autoworkers and former Ambassador to China.

I would like to address one other issue that is very important to me. I have worked hard to advance the issue of international adoption. China's cruel policy of limited family size has left thousands of orphans living in deplorable conditions. However, since opening relations with China, adoption agencies have been able to go into China and develop a network to allow these children to come to the United States. In 1989, 200 Chinese children were adopted. In 1998 over 4,000 Chinese orphans were adopted by loving American families.

I urge a yes vote on normal trade status for China.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

1345

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, if we deny PNTR to China, businesses, workers, farmers and ranchers in my district in East Texas and across the Nation will lose the benefits of a trade agreement that, on its face, is very favorable to the United States. Unlike the NAFTA agreement in which the United States had to eliminate its own trade barriers, China will reduce its tariffs on American goods, while we make no similar concessions. Rejecting PNTR means the benefits of trade and job growth will go to other nations who open the door to trade, while we slam it shut.

As a Member of the Committee on Armed Services, I believe granting PNTR to China is in America's national security interests. While dealing with China as a rising economic and military power will not be easy, we should not make the road more difficult than it has to be. If we reject PNTR, we will be sending a powerful signal to China and the entire world that we are walking away from a constructive relationship with China.

On the other hand, engagement will further our nuclear nonproliferation efforts, encourage the Chinese to embrace democracy and the rule of law, and further the expansion of human rights and freedom for the Chinese people. Progress in these areas will not be uninterrupted, but history and common sense and human relationships teach us that engagement is the best hope for world peace for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 45 seconds to

the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI), who understands that the 600,000 jobs lost because of the \$70 billion trade deficit to China has affected many of the footwear manufacturers in the northeastern part of this country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I cannot give up my vote and I cannot give up the voice of the people I represent on an annual basis, to hand that over to the World Trade Organization in the hope that the farmers and the fishermen and the people who are working in forestry and small business and family business are going to have their interests looked out for. I cannot turn that over on a permanent basis to the World Trade Organization.

I tried to work with the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) to fashion serious and substantive parallel legislation that would allow this Congress and each one of us to have a vote and a voice, a guarantee that we would have a vote and voice, and that it would be tied to bilateral trade and economic sanctions which would be in compliance, which we could do and still retain our authority. This legislation does not do it, the leadership did not allow it, and as a result of those concerns, I am going to be voting against this legislation.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, noting that the other side still ignores the charges that PNTR freezes in the taxpayer subsidies for businesses closing here and setting up shop in China, I would yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, we have not talked much about our national security. The Chinese have a \$68 billion trade surplus; and after this agreement is signed, if it passes today and passes the Senate and is signed by the President, they are going to have more of a surplus, and that is more money with which to buy rope to hang us with.

Let us look at what the Chinese have done and what they are doing. They stole our nuclear secrets. They are now capable, with our secrets they stole from the Los Alamos and Livermore Laboratories, they are able to build a mobile launch missile carrier, a rocket that can fire halfway around the world and can split into 10 parts with our W-88 warhead and hit 10 cities and kill over 50 million people, and we have no defense for it. We have been cutting our defense budget.

They now have access to both ends of the Panama Canal, one of the things that is most important to our commerce. They are going to control the Panama Canal. Just yesterday we found out they are going to control part of the Suez Canal and probably all of it. They signed a 30-year agreement

with Egypt to have Port Said controlled by them, in effect, because they are going to control the shipping port there.

They are building the largest army in the world. They have the largest standing army in the world, and it is going to get bigger, and we are going to pay for it. We are going to pay for it, and all the while our defenses are being lowered and lowered.

They threatened Los Angeles when we talked about coming to the aid of our ally, Taiwan. So they have threatened the United States in the not too distant pass. Yet we continue to say, Don't worry about that.

They are stealing from us. They are stealing our secrets. They are an enemy of the free world. They threatened Taiwan, as well as the rest of that part of the world, and I think they are a threat to the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, what are we doing about it? Instead of facing up to it and building our defenses to be prepared, we are doing exactly what happened prior to World War II. We unilaterally disarmed prior to World War II, and Winston Churchill warned about the future and the Nazis, and nobody paid any attention. What did they do? They gave more commerce to Germany, while Hitler built up his military. What are we doing? We are doing the same thing with China; and we ought to think about that. Long-term, what does it mean for America and our security?

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), a respected Member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of PNTR for China for three reasons.

First, it does not just enable America's goods and services to flow into the fastest-growing market in the world by cutting China's tariffs. It also eliminates state-mandated middlemen and China's prohibition on our distributing and servicing our own products. It eliminates quotas and special licensing requirements, and prohibits conditioning investment on local content requirements, offsets, research in China or technology transfer.

Secondly, it will help us enforce our trade agreements with China because we will not be solo at the enforcement table. All 136 nation members of the WTO will be on the enforcement team. Further, this is a unique, remarkably enforceable agreement because the obligations it imposes are concrete and specific, with clear time tables for implementation and firm end dates for full compliance. In addition, for the first time the agreement involves surge protections, unique provisions that will enable us to moderate any surge of imports to protect American producers and give them the time they need to become competitive.

Finally, this agreement is the best way to change China's policy toward human rights. As a Chinese evangelist Christian clergyman testified, "The WTO agreement obligates China to play by the rules. In the process, China will need to strengthen its legal institutions, train more legal professionals, learn to follow international legal procedures, and educate its people about the concept of rights, law, and international norms. This process alone is a breakthrough with important philosophical implications for China as a nation. When a Chinese realizes that he has rights as an investor that government should not violate, then more likely he will also realize that he has other rights as a human being."

Support PNTR for China. It is good for the United States, it is good for reform in China, and it will move us toward a more prosperous and peaceful world.

This week, the U.S. House of Representatives will vote on a bill that would do more to strengthen our economy and provide job security for American workers than any vote this year. The bill would simply open China's market to American-made products. Home to more than one billion potential consumers, China presently blocks American goods with high tariffs, arbitrary requirements, and wholesale prohibitions on direct business dealings with the Chinese people, while exporting freely to U.S. shores.

All this will change if Congress passes legislation granting china Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR), the same status China has enjoyed for 20 years and the same status as our other trading partners. President Clinton and former Presidents Carter and Ford support this measure, as do Senators DODD and LIEBERMAN.

The reason is simple: under the new trade agreement the United States recently negotiated, China will tear down the walls that keep our goods and services out of their markets and nearly every American industry will benefit. The agreement reduces or eliminates manufacturing and farming tariffs. It eliminates state-mandated middlemen so we can sell directly to Chinese consumers. It permits American-owned distribution and customer support operations so we can service the products we sell. It protects intellectual property rights for software, movies, music and high-tech designs. And it prohibits conditioning investment on offsets, local content, or technology transfer requirements.

This is good for working families in Connecticut because it means we'll sell more Connecticut made jet engines, elevators, construction equipment, medical equipment, pharmaceuticals, environmental technology, and insurance products in China. This will benefit hundreds of small shops supplying exporters and create more high wage jobs as on average export related jobs pay up to 20 percent more than non-export related jobs.

By granting PNTR, we will be the beneficiaries of these across-the-board concessions that will bring down the curtain on Chinese protectionism. And what is the price for all these benefits? They are free—ours for the taking. The United States doesn't have high tariffs nor barriers to trade from China, so we are not forced to give up anything in exchange

for Chinese concessions. All Congress must do is approve PNTR—make permanent the trading status that we have approved every year for 20 years and for essentially every other country in the world. It is the bargain of the century.

China has every reason to make such concessions: they are trying to reform their economy. After decades of economic dead ends, Chinese leaders have concluded that the most efficient way to grow their economy is by entering the international market and accepting its international rules. While this will cause some problems, China has changed enough in the last decade to understand that entering the international market and abiding by international rules is their only hope of prosperity.

This dramatic decision by China has three consequences for us: first, if we don't pass PNTR, we won't receive any of the benefits of the agreement we negotiated with China, while Europe, Japan, and other trading nations will. With their products 10 percent to 50 percent cheaper, we will lose significant export trade so critical to our economic health.

Second, instead of working alone to enforce trade agreements with China as we have in the past, we will have the help of all 136 members of the World Trade Organization. If China fails to deliver, the WTO lays out clear and decisive steps to hold China accountable. Furthermore, this agreement is unique. It has very precise timetables for very specific actions, making enforcement far easier. In addition, it includes new protections no trade agreement has ever provided. Its "surge" protections allow a timely response to slow down any big increase in imports. From my work on voluntary restraint agreements in the past, I know this approach works and enables U.S. competitors to succeed.

Third, it is the best way to reduce abuses of human rights in China. As a Chinese Christian clergyman testified "The WTO agreement obligates China to play by the rules. In the process, China will need to strengthen its legal institutions, train more legal professionals, learn to follow international legal procedures and educate its people about the concept of rights, law and international norms. This process alone is a breakthrough with important philosophical implications for China as a nation. When a Chinese realizes that he has rights as an investor that government should not violate, then more likely he will also realize that he has other rights as a human being."

Free trade is a potent catalyst for change because it works from the inside out. under PNTR, we get to post the best advertisement in the world for democracy in the heart of China itself. Signing a free trade agreement with China, opening its markets to our goods and values, bringing china into the rule based international trading community, is not only good for Connecticut jobs, but it is good for reform in China and will move us toward a more prosperous world community. Congress should pass PNTR.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this vote is about choosing an alternative to a policy of annual review which has failed to open China's markets and its people to the United States. To be sure, this is a vote about trade and export of American goods and services, but it is

also about trade and export of American ideals and principles.

We can make a difference in China when it comes to human rights, when it comes to religious freedom and workers' rights. Today's vote will determine whether we will make a difference in China. I urge everyone to vote yes for permanent normal trade relations with China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who recognizes that forced child labor is not stylish, even at the Gap.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons to oppose PNTR for China, such as gross violations of human rights and the lack of fair labor standards in China. These reasons have all been expressed eloquently by other speakers.

What concerns me most is our Nation's selective trade policies and the policies of the WTO itself. Why China and not Cuba? Cuba is only 90 miles from our shores. I am especially concerned about our Nation's policy toward Cuba. The people of Cuba would like to buy food and medicine and agricultural products from the United States, yet the United States continues to maintain an embargo against Cuba.

It makes no sense to expand trade benefits for China while prohibiting all trade with Cuba. What is good for the goose is good for the gander.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, we hear time and again that greater trade will somehow make China freer. I suggest that greater trade as it is structured through PNTR will enhance the dictatorship in China.

People in China themselves do not need to be convinced that they want the tyrant's boot off of their face. This idea that if we trade more we are going to reach more people with the Internet, telephones, et cetera, it is ridiculous. Those people know they do not want to live in tyranny.

But what we are doing by giving this PNTR, we are giving the Communist Chinese regime their number one primary objective. We will embolden them. They think we are suckers, they think we are saps, they think we are cowards, unable to watch out for our own interests or to champion the cause of liberty and justice.

Why should we be setting up factories? Again, the opposition refuses to address that the fact that taxpayers under this proposal will pay subsidies to businessmen who set up factories over there and close them in the United States. That is a central point here.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I will have to leave this debate at this point. I am chairing a hearing today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have wondered long and hard what one might say in the very few minutes that I have to convince my colleagues that this is not the thing to do. It is hard to determine what few important words might get us to realize that giving China permanent trade relations with America is wrong today. I feel very, very passionately about that. But I also want to say that there are good friends and others in this room who feel passionately that we should, and that is the beauty and the wonder of this debate. It has brought together such a mismatched group of people in Congress to come together and oppose and be for this particular amendment. That is the beauty of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear, we are not debating an end to normal trade relations with China. We are not isolating China. Now, I support normal trade with China, with congressional review. I simply oppose making this permanent, in light of China's present conduct.

China has normal trade relations with us today, right now; and they are going to continue to have normal trade relations under the same terms, whether the President's bill passes or does not. Both China and the United States will be able to trade with each other under the WTO rules, whether this bill passes or not. This is the one issue in my few minutes I hope Members will listen to.

The United States will not lose any advantage to international competition or competitors by not approving this bill. This has been a real, honest to goodness fear for many of our Members, so please listen to this very carefully. I quote, "The United States and China agree to accord firms, companies, corporations and trading organizations of the other party treatment no less favorable than is afforded to any third country or region." Where did that come from? That is Article 3(A) of the 1979 Bilateral Trade Agreement, our current agreement.

If China joins the WTO, they have to give the United States the same trade privileges they grant any WTO member nation, regardless of whether we approve or disapprove permanent relations.

So why are so many people adamant about passing PNTR? What does the bill really do? The answer is that it restricts the practical ability of this Congress to monitor China's progress in fair trade, in human rights and in military threats.

So for my colleagues who were thinking of voting yes in order to not shut down trade with China, please reevaluate that. Under our current agreement, China trade will continue, and likely expand, whether this measure passes or not.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume simply to respond very quickly to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Georgia has not read the entire agreement or read the 1979 agreement between the Chinese and the U.S., obviously, because what he said is not valid. There are many things in this agreement which are not included in the 1979 agreement, and we will lose the benefit of those if we do not approve this bill today.

1400

That happens to be a fact and a reality. Unfortunately, the 1979 agreement the Chinese made with us is not as broad, not as comprehensive, will not include all of the concessions that will be available to us if we approve this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me this time, to rise in support of permanent normal trade relations with China.

Passage of this agreement helps us, not them. They have agreed to lower tariffs on agricultural produce by over 50 percent, industrial tariffs from 24.6 percent a couple of years ago down to 9.4 percent, and most importantly, provide access to telecommunications, insurance, banking, and information technology markets. Although I do recognize the benefits of U.S. engagement with China, I also understand our concerns about labor conditions, human rights and national security. After all, I serve on the Committee on Intelligence.

But if the goal is to promote constructive change in China, we had best be at the table. Because if we do not pass normal trade relations with China and they do join the WTO, these decisions about making long-term changes internally in China will go to the Pacific Rim countries like Japan and Korea and to the Europeans.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, sound policy, not only for the issues of democracy, human rights, but it is also good for trade and for the economy of our Nation.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the eloquent gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I come from a city that in many ways exemplifies this transition to a global economy, for Memphis is the distribution capital of the United States. Every conceivable product from soybeans to microprocessors lands in our airports, docks at our harbors, or travels our highways. Markets and trade directly affect how people in my district live.

This agreement, as it has been said over and over again, only opens their markets to ensure that cotton and wheat and soybeans, jet engines, insurance, automobiles, and even Internet

services can be sold to our new friends in China. At a time when family farmers are struggling, it seems to me to be only right that we open up a market where 1.2 billion people live.

But our vote today should not be interpreted as a blank check for the deplorable abuses taking place in China. As a matter of fact, trade should not be interpreted as acceptance, but as really a challenge. For trade builds wealth, wealth spreads freedom, and freedom defeats tyranny. In cities across the world our values are followed, our products are imitated, and our culture is envied. Give those in China the opportunity to envy us here in America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support normalizing permanent trade relations with China.

Mr. Speaker, today America has a straightforward choice to make: whether we want to benefit from a historic opportunity to open China's market to American goods, agricultural products, and services—or whether we want to isolate the 1.2 billion people of China, and in turn, punish America and the American worker.

I have scrutinized this legislation to see if it will truly promote American interests and values. Like some who may oppose this legislation, I have long been concerned with human rights in China. I want freedom and democracy to flourish just as much as anyone else. And I have scrutinized this bill's impact on workers here at home. I have listened to those arguments. And I have concluded that normalizing trade relations with China is right for America. It is right for ensuring American engagement as a world leader and safeguarding our national security interests; it is right for promoting American competitiveness abroad; and it is right for the ideals of human rights and democracy.

Guaranteeing America's National Security Interests. America has fought three wars in Asia in the last 50 years. I don't want to see us fight another. Cordell Hull, a great Tennessean—who hailed from Carthage and who held the seat that Vice President GORE held and that his father held before him—had a favorite saying: "When goods don't cross borders, armies do." Integrating China into the global trading system will do more for the cause of national security than a fleet of warships could ever do. One must only look at what happen in the recent elections in Taiwan. The power of inclusion in the WTO counseled against any belligerence that the Chinese may have contemplated in the aftermath of the Taiwanese election. China held back, and the cause of peaceful reconciliation was advanced—in no small measure, because China knew that its trading partners were watching. America has genuine strategic interests in Asia, and as Secretary Cohen, Secretary Albright, the Joint Chiefs, Gen. Colin Powell and many others have said, normalizing trade relations with China will greatly advance the cause of peace and security.

Ensuring American Competitiveness. China will come into the World Trade Organization and the international economic system whether we like it or not. We cannot stop this process, even if we wanted to. The only question before us is: should we lead and promote our values of competition and fairness or should we sit on the sidelines while other countries

profit from selling to the Chinese? Ask the small business owner or farmer in my state, and the answer will be clear: of course, we want to benefit from this deal. For the first time, China is slashing tariffs and barriers to America's superior goods, services, and farm products. Our trade negotiators made absolutely no concessions to China; it is, as the President has said, "one-way" deal. We will be able to sell them everything from wheat to jet engines to insurance to Internet services. If we turn our back on that opportunity, we will only be punishing ourselves. And I simply cannot go home to the hardworking people of my state and say that I kicked away a once-in-a-lifetime chance to help them lead, compete, and win.

Promoting Human Rights and Democracy. The Chinese people, like all of God's children, deserve the basic dignities and rights that accompany freedom. By making China play by the rules, and by exposing the Chinese people to American values and American know-how, I submit that freedom will inevitably follow. This won't be easy, and it won't happen overnight, and I am a clear-eyed realist. But I also know that no political change can happen overnight. We have to have a toe-hold there, and we have to expand it and build bridges between our two countries. We don't have to approve of everything they do, and we won't. But if we isolate China, we will embolden the hard-liners and the rejectionists. When American companies go to China, they'll pay a better wage, and they'll give workers more freedom. And when the Chinese people click onto the Internet, there will be no stopping the flow of ideas, and we all know that great political transformations have their seeds in the spread of powerful ideas. If we are truly concerned about the cause of human rights and democracy, we must engage China, not isolate it.

Mr. Speaker, today in the People's House we have an opportunity to grant PNTR not for China, but for America. This legislation helps American businesses, American farmers, and American workers, and it will help spread the irresistible American forces of freedom, democracy, peace and stability. To those who would rather hold on to a symbolic annual vote, my response is simple: I cannot in good conscience sacrifice American leadership and American businesses, farmers, and workers on the altar of symbolism. We have the power to make the future more profitable and more secure for all of God's children—and history will not forgive us if we fail to do what's right.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), who recognizes that China sells weapons to terrorists which may very well be turned on American civilians.

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

Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues have received a copy of the report, Made in China. This report outlines why corporations like Wal-Mart and Nike have become identified with child labor, forced labor, and hazardous working conditions. These are not the values we want to bring to other countries.

By granting PNTR, we give up any hope of influencing China's policy on workers and human rights. We are in-

viting U.S. companies to leave the U.S. to produce goods in a country which does not support the minimum wage, basic safety regulations, or the right of association.

Mr. Speaker, let us export our values, not our jobs. I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, we have been told wonderful things will flow from expanded trade with China. Workers' rights will be respected, religious freedom will be enhanced, and probably Jeffersonian study groups will be popping up all over China before long.

Well, let us look at the historical facts which, in reality, is all we have in order to determine future actions on the part of the Communist Chinese.

In fact, from the last 10 years since Tiananmen Square, China has been engaged. For the past 10 years, investments in China have grown exponentially, factories have been built employing Chinese workers, creating enormous expansion of Chinese GNP. These things are indisputable facts.

Mr. Speaker, here are some more facts. Over the last 10 years, according to the State Department and the newly created United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, there has been a steady deterioration, I say deterioration, of human rights, workers' rights, religious liberty.

I just came from the Committee on International Relations where this report was given to us by the Commission. Here it is. The Report of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom. The Commission members are from all sides of the political spectrum. Rabbi David Saperstein, the Chair, told us that every single part of the spectrum was represented on this commission, and here is what they reported. Quote: "A grant of PNTR at this juncture could be seen by the Chinese people struggling for religious freedom as an abandonment of their cause at a moment of great difficulty. The Commission, therefore, believes that Congress should not approve PNTR for China until China makes substantial improvements in respect for religious freedom as measured by the following standards," and then it lists them out.

This is the Commission report. We are waiting for the Bereuter Commission; we have a Commission report right before us today. It was established by this Congress. The report was issued on May 1. It is in front of us. Read it. Anybody who is going to be influenced by the Bereuter Commission in the future, Members have it before them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "no" vote.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), our distinguished colleague.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of giving American

farmers, producers, and exporters a level playing field in China bypassing permanent normal trade relations.

While there have been compelling arguments made on both sides of this difficult issue, I believe that approving PNTR is clearly in America's best interests. This opportunity is especially important to our Nation's farmers. The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that farm exports to China could grow by \$2 billion annually as a result of PNTR. But normalizing trade with China would do far more than just increase American exports. It will also expand democratic influence in China as American businesses bring our democratic ideals directly to the Chinese people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support PNTR.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COYNE), who recognizes that the 500,000 Bibles printed in China in China is not even enough to provide one to each political or religious prisoner, much less leave any in the motel rooms.

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

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to PNTR for China.

Granting permanent normal trade relations to China would send the wrong message to the Chinese government and to the American people. China's workers earn pitifully low wages and work without even minimal safety standards in their factories. The factories in China are not subject to environmental standards common in other countries around the world. Some claim that by trading with China, workers' rights and environmental standards will improve. In China, however, labor leaders are routinely arrested and detained for long periods under harsh conditions.

The Chinese government has shown over and over again that it will not tolerate the formation of labor unions. It is unlikely that foreign or Chinese factory owners will push to change this policy. Manufacturing firms in China are also not likely to demand environmental standards.

Ending the United States' right to review the terms of trade with China yearly will only slow the pace of reform and remove a powerful deterrent to the most flagrant, visible abuses of human rights in China. I encourage my colleagues to vote against PNTR until the Chinese government makes visible progress on these issues.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the leader in human rights in this Congress.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, a man does not live by bread alone, and if one listens to the debate, one would begin to wonder.

It was 55 years ago last month that Dietrich Bonhoeffer was marched from his prison cell in Flossenburg Prison in

Nazi Germany and hung because he stood on behalf of human rights and speaking out. There are modern Dietrich Bonhoeffers in prison today in China, and this Congress and this administration ignores it.

We talk about the Berlin Wall falling; to my side, the Berlin Wall did not fall. Ronald Reagan pushed it down. He pushed it down with the help of the Pope and the AFL-CIO who helped Lech Walesa and Natan Sharansky and Andrei Sakharov and others.

We say that we are changing the tactics that work to defeat communism. Can anyone imagine a Member getting up in this body in the 1980s saying, let us help give more money to Russia, that way we will defeat them.

We say we are a pro-family Congress and a pro-family party. Mr. Speaker, 500 women a day in China commit suicide and endure forced abortion and forced sterilization.

We say we are for a strong defense, and if Members got the CIA briefing and unfortunately, not many did, they see the threat to this country, and they see that every major veterans' group supports defeat of this.

In closing, Ronald Reagan said on December 4, 1992, "Do not forget those who suffer under tyranny and violence. Do not abandon them to the evils of totalitarian rule or democratic neglect. For the freedom we celebrate is not the freedom to starve, the freedom to languish in a long, starless night of the soul. This, at least, is something that should be beyond debate."

Mr. Speaker, I urge and pray that the Members who are undecided, particularly on our side, which has been a party that has been against communism, for human rights, for religious freedom and for defense, will vote this down.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA).

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that we have heard a lot said, I am not going to go over the statistics here, I am just going to say that not only for New Jersey, but for the Nation, the bottom line here is that this is a jobs bill. It is a jobs bill for all of us throughout the country.

I must say to my colleagues that all reliable and objective economists and business analysts agree and assert these truths. We would not have all of the governors and all of the business groups and all of the groups across the country with a strong endorsement here, including defense groups supporting this, if these truths were not self-evident.

Mr. Speaker, I must also tell my colleagues that it is an American jobs bill because it is estimated that a quarter of a trillion dollars in infrastructure

over the next 10 years will have to be spent in China, and that means American energy, gas, construction, telecom, and engineering companies will compete for the vast majority of these dollars. By the way, it should be stressed, there is no doubt but that the European Union and Japan is waiting to take over these markets if we fail in this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I am in strong support of granting Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China. This will be one of the most significant votes in years. The stakes are high. This is a defining moment for American workers and American businesses. When the House votes on Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) for China we will be deciding whether the United States will continue to lead in the global economy.

AN AMERICAN JOBS BILL

Mr. Speaker, this legislation can not just be considered a trade bill. Today we will vote on an American jobs bill. The benefits of trade with China effect every state in the nation. Direct exports from my state of New Jersey to China totaled over \$373 million in 1998. Approximately 25% of all goods produced in New Jersey are exported. New Jersey ports and their workers handled \$9.4 billion in imports from China in that same year. It is also estimated that 1 out of every 8 New Jersey jobs are connected to producing goods for export. The bottom line is that trade with China creates millions of good jobs at good wages in New Jersey and all across the nation.

This is an American jobs bill because it is estimated that China will need to spend almost a quarter of a trillion dollars on infrastructure alone over the next ten years. American energy, gas, construction, telecom, and engineering companies will compete for a majority of these dollars. A recent study by Goldman Sachs estimates that increased access to China's markets from PNTR would be worth an additional \$13 billion annually to U.S. workers, farmers and companies by 2005.

In the expanding global economy, we cannot ignore that China represents a dynamic, expanding market for our exports. Once Congress votes for PNTR and China enters the World Trade Organization (WTO), American businesses, manufacturers, and farmers will have unprecedented direct access to China's 1.3 billion people. This will open the door for them to do what they do best—compete and win by offering the best product or service.

It is the American economy that stands to win from approval of PNTR. Denial of PNTR status to China will damage our own economy and only serve the interests of our international trade competitors. The Europeans have already negotiated a trade deal with China and are just waiting for us to turn our back on potential Chinese customers so they can step into the breach. Japan is also waiting for these trade advantages.

CONCERNS ABOUT CHINA

I understand the concerns raised by those who oppose PNTR for China. I, too, continue to be deeply concerned about some of the actions of China's government. Clearly, there exists much room for improvement. But with this vote, the question is not whether we approve or disapprove of China's record on human rights or their international posturing. The question is what is the best way to approach China to influence their future behavior?

I believe the answer is for Congress to grant PNTR. In fact former Presidents Bush, Carter and Ford, Governor Bush and Vice President Gore, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, the Reverend Billy Graham, nine former Secretaries of the Treasury, six former Secretaries of State, eight former Secretaries of Agriculture, 40 Governors, and leading Chinese activists all believe the answer is for Congress to grant PNTR for China.

If Congress votes in favor of PNTR, China will not change overnight. It will take time for the old monolith to fall away in favor of a dynamic new society. But just look at the difference American business is making in China. The best and brightest of Chinese workers are flocking away from the old state owned enterprises in favor of working for foreign owned businesses. American businesses offer the Chinese not only better pay and benefits but also allows them the opportunity to excel and move up the economic and social ladder. I submit that the momentum behind these changes once unleashed will be impossible to slow.

Clearly, trade relations will strengthen the rule of law. And an historical truth is that economic ties open borders and expand human rights, bringing them closer to the world community.

CONCLUSION

Yes, it will take time for China to change. But their participation in the WTO will pull them closer into the family of nations and enforce the rule of law. Our engagement with China will create jobs here at home and will breathe the entrepreneurial spirit and freedom throughout their land.

In summary: (1) this landmark agreement will mean more American jobs at good wages here at home.

(2) This will strengthen rule of law and expand human rights by bringing them into the world community.

(3) And significantly, if we reject PNTR it will further open the European countries and Japan to take over these profitable markets. I urge support for PNTR.

I urge my colleagues to support PNTR for China.

SUPPORT FOR PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

American Leaders and Veterans: Presidents Bush and Ford, both World War II veterans; General Colin Powell; Joint Chiefs of Staff; Secretary of Defense William Cohen; Former Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney; Six former Secretaries of State; Forty seven Governors including George W. Bush; and Senator John McCain.

Business Groups: New Jersey Chamber of Commerce; New Jersey Business and Industry Association; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and National Association of Manufacturers.

Agriculture: New Jersey Farm Bureau; and Northeast Farmer Cooperative (representing New Jersey Dairy Farmers).

Religious Leaders: The Reverend Billy Graham, and Pat Robertson.

All believe the answer is for Congress to grant PNTR for China.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

During the last several months, it has become clear to me that the action we are taking today is not just the annual review of whether China should be given normal trade relations, but a major policy initiative by the Clinton administration.

I am concerned that the rejection of this agreement could have serious national security ramifications. However, that does not mean that this body should just automatically approve permanent normal trade relations with China.

It was important to me, and I think to many Members of this body, that in order for us to support this change, there needed to be an adequate package of related issues incorporated in the vote. That has happened.

First, we have incorporated the provisions concerning human rights. I do not think any of us believe that we would now reject the annual review of normal trade relations with China. That has been an ineffective way to review human rights progress within China. The new mechanism which institutionalizes that review will be a more effective way to review human rights.

1415

Second, the provisions provide for enforcement of our trade laws against China.

Third, we have codified the new surge provisions which provide a more liberal standard to be able to take action against China for illegally imported products.

Fourth, the President has made it clear that environment and labor will be our priorities in the new rounds of WTO discussions.

Lastly, let me say that I applaud the administration in its commitment to use all the resources of its office to enforce our existing trade laws. It is important that we not only protect U.S. industries against illegally imported products from China, but from all of our trading partners.

I believe that if we look at the total package, plus the statements that have been made by the administration, we now have a package that is worth supporting.

Mr. Speaker, if the sole issue before us today is whether Congress will approve the administration's initiative to normalize trade with China, subject China to the standards of the rule of law within WTO, based upon the package that is being presented and the commitments of the administration, I believe it is in our national interests to approve this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4444, and urge the House to adopt this important measure.

I am pleased that the Rules Committee has incorporated the bipartisan Levin-Bereuter provisions into the underlying bill which authorizes the accession of China into the WTO. My

support for this legislation was and is contingent on the Levin-Bereuter provisions on human rights, workers' rights, and anti-surge safeguards. In addition, I am pleased that the legislation provides for strict monitoring and enforcement of China's compliance with its WTO obligations by the United States.

During the past several months, I have received a great deal of information from the opponents and proponents of PNTR. The information that I have received has been very helpful in my consideration of this difficult issue.

It has been increasingly clear that this vote on PNTR is not just another trade vote, but a major foreign policy initiative by our government. Traditionally Congress has delegated this responsibility to the President. Regardless of how one feels about trade with China, I am convinced that the rejection of this agreement by Congress will have serious ramifications for the natural security interests of the United States and our friends in Asia. The failure of this legislation will strengthen the hand of the hard-liners in Beijing who want to keep China out of the community of nations.

With respect to the economic issues that underlie this agreement, we must recognize that China already has access to our markets. The bilateral agreement concluded between the United States and China as part of China's accession to the WTO will only help US manufacturers, producers and farmers gain access to the China market.

With respect to human rights, I have always believed that trade could be an effective tool in achieving human rights goals. Human rights considerations have led me to consistently oppose the annual extension of most favored nation for China. Yet I acknowledge that the annual review of NTR has not been effective in advancing human rights in China. Most human rights advocates have now concluded that it is unrealistic to expect that the US would ever revoke NTR for China.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly review the important provisions of the legislation that have led me to my decision to support this proposal. The key provisions address my concerns regarding human rights, oversight and enforcement of China's WTO obligations, workers' rights, and anti-surge provisions. They impose conditions that are much stronger than have ever been presented during the consideration of the annual extension of trade with China.

Most important, the legislation would establish a Congressional-Executive Commission on China. This Commission is modeled on the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), of which I am proud to serve as a member and a Commissioner. The China Commission will: (1) monitor human rights and religious freedom in China; (2) monitor overall aspects of labor market issues in China; and (3) monitor and encourage the development of rule-of-law and democracy-building in China.

The Commission will submit annual reports to Congress and the President, including appropriate WTO-consistent recommendations for legislative and/or executive action. It will maintain a list of victims of human rights abuses in China, and it will provide Members of Congress with information on the issues within its purview.

I expect that the Commission will institutionalize Congressional examination of measures by the Chinese Government that affect US interests. It will serve to identify needed

reforms in China's policies and call attention to any troubling activities of the Chinese government. Nobody supposes that passage of PNTR will bring an immediate end to the abusive practices of the Chinese government. PNTR will, however, bring the pressure of international economic activity to bear on the repressive practices of the Chinese.

At the same time, the Commission will provide an important conduit between Chinese citizens, on the one hand, and the U.S. Government and public, on the other hand. I firmly believe that increased exposure to U.S. values will accelerate progress in China on human rights and economic freedom. Finally, the Commission will be a strong, effective, an unique point of contact on China issues between Congress and the Administration.

The legislation also requires the U.S. Trade Representative to issue an annual report on China's compliance with WTO obligations. The report will cover compliance by China with commitments made in connection with its accession to the WTO, including both multilateral commitments and any bilateral commitments made to the U.S. The report will be a guide to where and how to commit the enforcement resources of the US Government.

The Administration has also agreed to press for a mechanism for reviewing China's compliance with WTO obligations on an annual basis. Such a mechanism will be especially valuable as we proceed through the early stages of development of a free market and the rule of law in China.

The legislation also calls for additional resources to be allocated to the U.S. Trade Representative as well as other Cabinet agencies to strengthen the ability of the United States to monitor and enforce Chinese compliance with trade agreements.

We are all aware that China has engaged in abusive and horrendous practices of employing forced and prison labor in the production of goods. Our efforts to highlight these practices and pressure the Chinese to end them have had little success to this point. This legislation instructs the President to establish an interagency task force to monitor and promote effective enforcement of the prohibition on the importation of goods made by forced or prison labor into the United States.

The legislation before us also calls for the allocation of resources to the Departments of Commerce, State, and Labor to provide training and technical assistance in China for purposes of developing the rule of law with respect to commercial and labor market standards. The departments will establish programs to assist China in bringing its laws into compliance with international requirements, including WTO rules, and in developing processes to enforce the rule of law.

One of the strongest features of the bilateral agreement negotiated by the Clinton Administration is product-specific safeguard which will be included in China's protocol of accession to the WTO. This special anti-surge safeguard will apply to China for a period of 12 years following China's accession to the WTO. These provisions are more reasonable, and more favorable for U.S. industry and workers, than the comparable provisions that apply in general U.S. trade law to our other trading partners. The China safeguard contains lower causation and injury standards than ordinarily would apply between WTO members under section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974. The codification

of this provision by the Levin-Bereuter package is a vital feature of today's legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that we should amend our trade laws to apply the China standards on dumping to all countries. Such Congressional action would be consistent with our WTO obligations. I have prepared and offered such a bipartisan amendment, with my colleague Mr. English of Pennsylvania, in both the Ways & Means Committee and in the Rules Committee. The amendment contains several provisions from HR 1505, the bipartisan Fair Trade Law Enhancement Act of 1999, introduced by Representative ENGLISH and myself in the first session of this Congress.

In 1999, we witnessed a surge of subsidized imported steel into the U.S. While some of that import surge came from China, it also came from Russia, Japan, Brazil, and South Korea. Our existing anti-dumping and countervailing duty laws and relief under Section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974 were not able to help U.S. industries from these illegal imports. The new surge provisions negotiated with China will help in regards to future China imports. However, they will do nothing to help in regards to our other trading partners. Under WTO, we should use the more realistic China causation standards for all countries rather than using the causation standards included, for example, currently in Section 201. My amendment would have corrected this inconsistency.

Unfortunately, my amendment was not made in order for consideration by the full House. I am hopeful that, after we act today to codify the trade laws applying to China, the next logical step will be to extend these standards to all of our trading partners. In addition, the Administration has given me assurances that it will vigorously use the full resources of its authority to enforce existing trade laws and that the Administration will not tolerate any illegal dumping. The Commerce Department is currently preparing a detailed report and analysis on last year's steel dumping. I plan to work closely with the Administration and concerned members from both sides of the aisle and workers and management in affected industries to make sure that we adopt measures to prevent future occurrences similar to what happened in 1999.

There has been much discussion as to how to advance international standards for labor and environment in our trade negotiations. Progress in that regard has been made in the China agreement.

It is also important to note that President Clinton made it clear to our trading partners in Seattle that any future trade rounds under the World Trade Organization must include the discussion of international labor and environmental standards. I wholeheartedly support the President in insisting that international labor and environmental standards be included among our nation's priorities in negotiations with our trading partners.

The sole issue before us today is whether Congress will approve the Administration's initiative to normalize trade with China and subject China to the standards and rule of law within the World Trade Organization. We all understand that China is far from a model citizen in the world community of nations. The question is how to move the world's largest country, a country which, in our lifetimes, will become the world's largest economy, in the di-

rection of democracy, openness, and economic freedom. Based on the full package that is being presented and the steps taken by the Administration to enforce our existing trade laws, I believe that Congress's ratification of the President's ratification of the President's initiative is in the best interest of our country.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), who understands that China will soon surpass the United States to become the leading emitter of greenhouse gases and that will not abate.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, although I am for free and fair trade, as well as engagement with China, now is not the time for permanent normal trade relations. China has simply not matured enough politically or economically to have permanent normal trade relations with the U.S.

China still poses a danger to our national security, has a record of gross human rights violations, including the use of prison labor, and a lack of religious freedom. China also has a terrible record on the environment and has some of the most polluted cities in the entire world.

I think it is dangerous to give up the most important leverage we have in order to get China to comply with the agreements, the annual review process, and the carrot of permanent relations. You do not give away the carrot before you get the results that you want.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose granting permanent normal trade relations to China.

Although I am for free and fair trade, as well as engagement with China, now is not the time for Permanent NTR.

China, has simply not matured enough politically or economically to have permanent normal trade relations with the United States. China still poses a danger to our national security, has a record of gross human rights violations, including the use of prison labor and a lack of religious freedom. China also has a terrible record on the environment and has some of the most polluted cities in the world.

Additionally, China has violated every agreement it has made with the United States. Even the Administration doesn't trust them in this respect, which is why they've proposed a rapid response team to monitor China's compliance with this deal.

I think it is dangerous to give up the most important leverage we have in getting China to comply with its agreements, the annual review process and the carrot of permanent relations. You don't give away the carrot before you get the result you want.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to oppose granting China Permanent NTR until they have proven they can abide by their international obligations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) The Chair announces that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) has 18½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 15½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL)

has 25½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 27½ remaining.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK).

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

Mr. Speaker, our decision to give permanent normal trade relations to China should not be based on what is profitable for our country today at the expense of our future.

Arguments that trade with China would lead to the evolution of democratic principles which will spread to the people hold no weight. The truth is, we have been engaged in trade with China for 30 years; yet they remain the most repressive government in the world. Has our strengthening of China's regime through trade brought political freedom? Absolutely not.

I cannot close my eyes to the human rights abuses, to the political oppression of religious intolerance of the Chinese Government. I cannot turn a deaf ear to the workers on both sides of the ocean who clamor for better working conditions and fairer wages.

I refuse to turn my back on the nuclear and security threat that China poses to our great Nation and its neighbors like Taiwan. And it is unbelievable to me that we are on the brink of giving the Chinese all of our electronic and computer capability to help them guide their missiles to our cities.

As the dragon stands knocking at our door, knocking ever so loudly, do we permanently give it free access inside, when in the past it is broken its promises, stolen our technology, compromised our security? Do we allow the Chinese Government to prosper when it treats its citizens, the very people it should be protecting so poorly, so unjustly?

China has been promising economic concessions to buy its way into the WTO. But it has shown no willingness to change its political dogma. Abolishing our yearly review of trade relations gives carte blanche to the Chinese Government. We should not permanently reward and appease its intransigence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against PNTR for China.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

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

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Permanent Trade relations with China.

My district encompasses the Sacramento Valley in California. Agriculture is the dominant industry in the region. One of the reasons I support free trade is that it's good for my farmers.

We've all heard about how PNTR with China will increase Ag. exports and boost the rural economy. We've also heard about how PNTR with China will increase exports in manufacturing, high tech, and services. All these things are true.

In fact, during the debate over PNTR with China, the proponents have consistently high-

lighted the tremendous export possibilities of trade with China.

But free trade benefits all Americans, not just companies that export. Lets review some of the benefits of free trade to the American people.

1. Comparative Advantage.—In the theory of Comparative Advantage, Americans will produce products that we are best at producing and other nations will produce products that they are best at producing.

With free trade, we don't have to waste time and labor on producing low quality products. By importing certain goods, American workers are freed to produce higher quality items that bring higher wages.

2. Increase Competitiveness.—Open trade forces American companies to compete with foreign companies. This competitiveness causes U.S. businesses to continually try to improve their products and lower their prices.

Does anyone in this Congress believe that the U.S. auto industry would be as healthy, or that U.S. cars would be of such high quality, if not for the competition from Japan?

As a result of that competition, our auto industry is competitive around the world and American consumers can buy world class American/made automobiles.

3. Keeps Inflation in Check.—Trade also helps keep inflation in check by acting as a safety valve when the economy heats up. The recent period of robust economic growth, low unemployment, and low inflation is unprecedented in our history. A significant portion of this success is attributed the fact that our markets are open.

As we consider this vote today, let us keep one thing in mind. Tariffs are really taxes on consumers. When we reduce barriers to trade, consumers win. In fact, American families save thousands of dollars a year because of trade, freeing up money that can be spent on a home, or education or health care.

As we vote today, I urge my colleagues to consider all the ways the American people benefit from trade.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in appreciation of the deliberations that have occurred on this very important vote. I also rise to say that this morning I saw the story of a young Chinese woman coming off the bus in China from a village with her 5-year-old child loaded down with her bags, looking for a better quality of life. As I watched her seeking a greater place in the sun for that little boy, I knew that this vote today had to be more than efforts on behalf of trade between the United States of America and China. It had to be a vote with backbone.

This vote to support PNTR has to be a vote to trade with China and exchange democracy, to trade and exchange the products of the United States made by American workers and made in America; to create opportunities for intellectual and academic change; to create the opportunity to export technology to China and to close the digital divide in places like

the 18th Congressional District; and by greater trade in opportunities for American businessmen. I hope to see an increase in the opportunities for capital investment in rural and urban America.

Trade is, of course, the engine of the 21st century. The PNTR is not closing the door; it is opening the door of democracy to China.

I rise to support this legislation, and I would ask that we do it with a backbone on behalf of the American people of the United States of America, so that our exports include both our goods and commodities as well as our values of democracy, peace, and a better quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of granting Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China. I have come to this conclusion after intensely listening to arguments for some period of time from many supporters and opponents of the PNTR, and weighing the pros and cons of this extremely important trade bill.

I want to thank Chairman ARCHER and Ranking Member RANGEL for their important work on this legislation. They should be commended for their hard work.

It is my hope that every one's views on this bill will be respected on this vote, and that we will find a constructive way to unify after this vote for the good of all Americans. This is truly a vote of conscience that each and every member has wrestled with.

For several years, I have recognized that trade with China has value for Americans and the people of China, yet I have reservations. My record on trade measures since coming to Congress demonstrates my willingness to evaluate each vote on its own merits. Each year that I have voted for most-favored-nation status for China, I have likewise raised my voice against the "undemocratic" ways of that nation.

It is imperative that we recognize that American companies must reinvest in rural and urban America as a result of PNTR. Unlike during the Cold War, we have unparalleled opportunities to bring the people of China and America much closer together. America has a responsibility to invest and to establish a rapid response for companies that are affected as a result of job loss.

I have been working very closely with the Administration to secure a commitment to designate the Department of Labor to study job losses and to provide added relief to American workers adversely affected by the PNTR agreement.

I have also worked to establish a Task Force on small businesses from a range of agencies within the United States government to facilitate and negotiate doing business in China. This Task Force would be responsible for specifically encouraging trade between United States small businesses and these newly established small business in China.

We are not here to discuss whether China will gain access to the WTO. We recognize it will do so and that the unconditional most-favored nation (MFN) principle requires that trade concessions be granted "immediately and unconditionally" to all 135 WTO Members. More importantly, the World Trade Organization is not nor should it be a human rights policy toward China. Nothing about this vote

should reflect our Nation's views about current or past human rights practices in China. This is about how to bring about change over the long-term.

The World Trade Organization would strengthen against surges in imports from China and open Chinese markets to more U.S. exports. The November 1999 Agreement between the United States and China contains a product-specific safeguard, which will be included in China's protocol of accession to the WTO. A provision was recently added to this legislation that spells out procedures for effectively invoking that safeguard.

H.R. 4444 presently before the House enables the United States to grant PNTR to China once it has completed its accession, provided that it is on terms at least as good as those in our 1999 bilateral agreement. By granting permanent trade relations to China, it will open its markets to an unprecedented degree, while in return the United States simply maintains its current market access policies. The enhanced trade and services for American and Chinese companies could be dramatic for Texans and Americans as a whole.

Texas alone has export sales to China of more than \$580 million in 1998—nearly 50 percent above its sales in 1993. Shipments through the Port of Houston with China including Hong Kong totaled \$444 million in 1998. In 1999, air cargo trade between Houston and China, including Hong Kong totaled \$1.5 million kilograms and was valued at \$56 million. In short, China has come a long way since we established relations in 1971, and develop further relations through PNTR.

Through the PNTR deal, we gain even more significant concessions regarding PNTR. U.S. companies would be able to take advantage of several provisions of the U.S.-China Trade deal after China accedes to the WTO, but only if Congress permanently normalizes China's trade status. For example, tariffs on industrial products on coming into China would fall to an average of 9.4 percent by 2005 from 24 percent. Agricultural tariffs will fall to 17.5 percent from 31 percent.

In addition, the technology industry in my district would benefit from PNTR. For example, foreign companies would be able to own up to 49% of Chinese telecommunications ventures upon China's entry into the WTO, and up to 50% in the second year. And China will import some 40 foreign films in the first year of the agreement, up from 10, and allow foreign films and musical companies to share in distribution revenues on 20 of these firms. The benefits are clearly advantageous to our industries as we support democratization in China.

PNTR is more than a matter of economics for so many of us—including those that have worked on the promotion of democracy and the rule of law around the world. I happen to have been one who with great trepidation voted for the MFN status, based upon the many strong arguments that have been made that if you continue to expose a nation to opportunity, to democracy, to the respect of human rights, would see gradually those parts of the world. I am hoping and would hope most of us would like to believe that we have that kind of trend moving forward in China.

I have had discussions with Former President Jimmy Carter, who strongly voiced his support for granting PNTR to China. Clearly, religious oppression is a continuous concern

as a general matter in China. Nevertheless, President Carter eloquently emphasized that villages outside large cities in China are having free elections and that the freedom to practice one's religion has been growing. This is a very positive development. The Chinese people must be counted on to relish these rights and to fight for opportunities at the table of democracy.

Former President Jimmy Carter has worked relentlessly since leaving the oval office to press for open, free, and fair elections all over the world. He has been advocating a powerful human rights agenda within our foreign policy and I salute him for his efforts.

PNTR could help many of these villagers find ways to improve their economic and social well being. For example, some companies are simply showing the Chinese how to improve fertilizers to improve agricultural growth. The people of China certainly should be empowered with the ability to feed their people. That should be a basic right.

At the same time, Americans should understand that granting PNTR should not remove the responsibility from Congress, this Administration, or any future Administration in assessing and responding to any drastic negative impact on Americans as a result of this legislation. For this reason, I expect to develop specific proposals with the Administration that will help small businesses under the PNTR. This is vital to small businesses, especially minority and women-owned entities.

In the 18th Congressional District in Houston Texas, which has a per capita income of \$11,091, many of my constituents have not prospered as much as others throughout the Nation. PNTR will spur capital investments, and investment opportunities that would come from international trade.

There will be more appropriate opportunities for expressing dissatisfaction with China's human rights record. I strongly share the view that we must keep pressure on China. A congressional-executive commission within this legislation would help monitor human rights and labor rights while placing safeguards against import surges could play a pivotal role regarding our concerns in China. By addressing human rights matters when they arise, the United States can continue to play a crucial role in demanding that the Chinese leadership live up to WTO commitments.

We must also recognize that the United States has held a vote on renewal of PNTR status for China every year since 1990, never once actually withdrawing NTR status. Unfortunately, the annual NTR vote has been less than effective in promoting the protection of human rights standards in China.

Some argue that granting PNTR means the United States loses leverage over China by surrendering annual reviews. I have considered the gravity of this question for some time. In my work in Congress on numerous rights matters, whether domestic or internationally oriented, I have focused much of my attention as a Representative of the 18th Congressional District on the promotion of economic, civil, and political rights. I have never hesitated to expressly address basic human rights violations wherever they may occur and specifically in the context of the annual review process for normal trade relations (NTR) with China.

Under the proposed legislation, U.S. industries or workers claiming injury due to import surges from China would have legal recourse

to the International Trade Commission and in other venues. This would protect our workers or U.S. industries that suffer job losses from as a result of the agreement with China.

The vote on PNTR provides a unique opportunity to support the democratization of China. We should be honest that it will not happen overnight. It will only happen over time.

Mr. Speaker, a "no" vote would damage our Sino-American relations—both economic and strategic—for years to come. By denying permanent normal trade relations status, we would irreparably damage our relationship with China, a country of 1.2 billion. I do not think we can afford to follow such a perilous course.

As I review our options today, I am simply unconvinced that constraining China in our trade relations within the WTO will help advance human rights in China. To the contrary, I have become increasingly convinced that changes resulting from the deal, including greater foreign investment and trade, will benefit ordinary Chinese workers and businessmen with the outside world.

Finally, I have deliberated very carefully about the magnitude of this decision. I recognize that trade with China and trade generally is good for our economy and the American people. At the same time, I look forward to opportunities through the WTO to enhance the protection of human rights as I and other lawmakers have advocated.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for PNTR should not leave any American workers behind. We must export democracy to China and not ignore this momentous opportunity. For these reasons, I will vote to give opportunities to the American worker, I will vote to give opportunities to American businesses, and I will vote to give opportunities to the people of China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who recognizes that women in China are only allowed to have one child if they are married, and unmarried women are forced to have abortions.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, one of the more compelling arguments for PNTR is that it will improve the life of Chinese workers and that U.S. companies will export higher wages and better working conditions, but this factual and shocking report says exactly the opposite, that, in fact, U.S. companies are instead taking advantage of the nearest slave labor conditions and wages, that persist in Chinese factories. But we should not be surprised that companies like Wal-Mart, half of whose U.S. workers qualify for food stamps, have workers in China, nearly half of which owe the factory money after working for a month, 12 to 14 hours a day, making Kathie Lee handbags. Opponents of this proposal dismiss as isolationists and antiprogress, but we favor establishing rules that protect workers and establish our ideals.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose

this measure of permanent normal trade relations for the People's Republic of China. It does not represent a fair trade agreement for our Nation's textile workers. For the tens of thousands of textile employees in North Carolina's 8th Congressional District, this agreement continues down the road of trading away their jobs to cheap products. The end result of NAFTA, Africa/CBI, and now PNTR has been the continued erosion of one of our Nation's oldest industries.

I believe in opening new markets for our products and I am supportive of encouraging a fair trade agreement with China. However, we cannot continue to benefit foreign industries at the expense of our textile workers. I am fully aware of the potential benefits of trade with China. However, it is wrong to ask the workers of the 8th District of North Carolina and across the country to make sacrifices for those abroad when so many are struggling to make ends meet right here at home. I invite my colleagues who believe PNTR is great for America to come to my district and see the real effects of so-called free trade.

Mr. Speaker, oppose this measure.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Cincinnati, Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of PNTR. I have to say I have listened to a lot of the debate and many of the arguments that are made against PNTR I think simply are not focused on what we are voting on today. They are not relevant to the vote today.

What we are voting on today is whether the United States is going to be able to take advantage of a one-sided trade agreement that only benefits us with the Chinese by normalizing trade relations with China. Yes, putting China in the same category as emerging countries in Eastern Europe like Romania, countries in Africa like Kenya or Egypt, rather than putting China in the category of enemy countries like Libya or Iraq or Cuba, that is all this is about.

Why can we not take advantage of this one-sided trade agreement that only benefits us unless we do this today? Because then they will not have the ability in WTO to give us the benefits they have just negotiated with us.

This is about jobs. It is about exports from my district and other districts. The most important export is going to be the export of U.S. ideas and U.S. values, to bring China into the mainstream.

With all due respect, so many of the arguments being made about human rights, about the environments, about national security, they are not relevant to the vote we are making today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of continued Normal Trade Relations between the United States and China.

Trade with China has been a significant factor in the economic expansion we've been able to enjoy during the 1990s. In my own district, Greater Cincinnati companies exports to China have almost doubled in this decade alone. That means more jobs for my constituents, more prosperity for the families and businesses in Southwest Ohio, and a healthier economy for the area I represent, for the state of Ohio as a whole and, indeed, for the entire nation.

For those of my colleagues who are undecided on this subject, I'd urge you to take a close look at this PNTR agreement, because it makes so much sense. This is a totally one-sided agreement. Because we already have an essentially open market, we've given away nothing to get this deal, but we've received unprecedented concessions from the Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, China has a long way to go on improving labor standards, human rights and environmental protection. That's why I believe our most important export to China won't be out products and services. Our most important export is our ideas and our beliefs about freedom and democracy.

As the United States and China develop closer ties—as individuals from both countries begin to interact more often with each other—it's going to be impossible for the Chinese government to prevent our values and ideas from spreading. You can already see it happening with the spread of the internet in China, despite the best efforts of their government to slow it down.

Mr. Speaker, we can choose to get rid of normal trade relations with China, and stand on the sidelines when our European and Asian competitors take our place. Or we can build a strong bilateral relationship through engagement—opening their country to our products and ideas.

I urge my colleagues to support the rational approach—and to support normal trade relations with China.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of PNTR. I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI); and, of course, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) for their leadership in this particular measure.

I would also like to thank the Committee on Rules for putting forward the Levin-Bereuter parallel language that will ensure that we have mechanisms to monitor China and to try to get us closer to freer and fairer trade.

I do not disagree with those who say that human rights is a problem, that worker conditions are a problem, environmental conditions are a problem in China. They are. One cannot pick up a newspaper without reading about the persecution of the Falun Gong. Worker

rights, they still do not exist in China, and certainly we know that China has not been the best in enforcing the agreements it has signed.

The question is not so much that China has not done the best it could. The question is, how do we get it to perform better? Is it better to try to engage it and bring it along so it can join the community of nations? Or is it better to shove it off to the corner, put on a dunce cap and say they cannot come out of the corner until they act better?

Isolation has been proven over the centuries to not work. Engagement, while it may work slowly, works. I would rather tell China, join us and do it the right way than tell them sit in that corner until we think they are doing the right thing.

It is time for us to understand that we cannot close our eyes to China. China has problems. It will have problems for a long time; but it is up to us, as the leader in this world, to bring China, as we have done with other countries, forward so it can act among the community of nations the way we would like to see it act.

I have the very basic concerns that many of my colleagues who are going to vote no have as well, but I cannot close my eyes to the fact that China is big, it is here, and it is not going away.

Let us learn from our experiences. Let us move forward, and let us use the power of the greatest democracy in the world to show the rest of the world that China, too, can join us as neighbor and partner and be part of that community of nations that will make us proud to trade with them freely and fairly.

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

Mr. Speaker, when I suggested to the gentleman that I heard William Clay Ford, Jr., say that the Ford Motor Company delivers excellent products and strives to make the world a better place, this gentleman recognized that Ford was going to have to change that and say they would deliver excellent products and strive to make the world a better place for polluters, slavery, intolerance, and repression.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, on human rights, China has failed with over 1,000 executions of dissenters since 1998. On religious rights, China has created an atmosphere of dread and torture and arrest which are commonplace, and on military aggression China's policies are still of great concern.

This weekend we celebrate Memorial Day and are reminded that freedom is not free. Our veterans laid down their lives fighting such dictatorships such as China. What is our generation going to do, lay down and let them make the deal just because we have a buck to save? Do we not care about what this country was founded on? Do we not

care about human rights? This is a travesty. This Congress passed sanctions against South Africa when Nelson Mandela was tortured and jailed in South Africa. What would we do today if this was an apartheid? I guess what we would do is do even more deals with P.W. Botha, because that is just what this Congress is going to do when it does PNTR for China, is lay down with dictators like P.W. Botha and China.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is now a great pleasure for me to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), a true leader in human rights in this Congress.

1430

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1992 presidential campaign, Mr. Clinton accused his opponent of coddling the dictator of China and promised that, if he was elected, he would deny MFN to China "as long as they keep locking people up." Today China is locking people up and torturing them big time.

Faced, in the spring of 1993, with a vote that was likely to strip China of MFN, President Clinton preempted congressional action with the issuance of an Executive Order that gave the PRC one more year to reform. For MFN to continue, significant progress in human rights was established. The President said in May 28, 1993, "Starting today, the U.S. will speak with one voice on China policy."

We are here today because the American people continue to harbor profound concerns about a range of practices by China's Communist leaders. The President went on. He said that "the core of the policy will be a resolute insistence upon significant progress on human rights in China."

"Whether I extend MFN next year", the President went on, "will depend on whether China makes significant progress in improving its human rights record."

I had nothing but praise for the President, Mr. Speaker. I did not realize at the time that we had been had.

As the probationary year progressed, profound doubt concerning the President's commitment to his own policy emerged. So midway through that probationary period in January of 1994, I led a human rights mission to China and was shocked and dismayed to be told by high Chinese officials with whom I met that the Clinton administration would continue MFN without conditions, and that his human rights linkage was pure fiction meaningless and political. It turns out the President was bluffing. The fix was in, and the Chinese dictatorship knew it. A terrible setback for human rights, democracy, the environment, and security issues.

Let me just point out, Mr. Speaker, once that delinking took place, the hard-liners knew for sure that as long

as the Clinton administration was in place, there would never be a change. This administration and some in Congress will fight hard to protect intellectual property rights and copyright infringement.

Sanctions for the protection of CDs are wise public policy but are deemed impermissible to employ in the effort to protect Chinese men, women and children from government abuse.

Torture, forced abortion, all kinds of human rights abuses, all of them taken together warrants no sanctions whatsoever. Steal some of our CDs, and we will bring the full brunt of those sanctions against you. Sometimes I think we got our priorities wrong.

Earlier today, Mr. Speaker, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom testified before the Committee on International Relations and made it very clear that there has been a marked deterioration in religious freedom in China and admonished Congress not to confer PNTR on the PRC. I ask Members to read the 77-page State Department Woman Rights report replete with human rights abuses.

Mr. Speaker, to date there has yet to be any serious credible linkage of trade and human rights. Yet today we are being asked to forgo any possibility of linkage in the future.

Deny China PNTR today—require them to make progress in the direction of reform and protection of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1992 Presidential Campaign, Mr. Clinton accused his opponent of coddling the dictators of China and promised that he, if elected, would deny MFN to China "as long as they keep locking people up." Today Clinton is locking people up—and torturing them—big time.

Faced in the spring of 1993 with a vote that was likely to strip China of MFN, President Clinton pre-empted Congressional action with the issuance of an executive order that gave the PRC one more year of MFN. For MFN to continue, "Significant Progress" in human rights was established as the new standard. The president said in a speech on May 28, 1993:

Starting today, the United States will speak with one voice on China policy. We no longer have an Executive Branch policy and a Congressional policy. We have an American policy.

We are here today because the American people continue to harbor profound concerns about a range of practices by China's communist leaders. We are concerned that many activists and pro-democracy leaders, including some from Tiananmen Square, continue to languish behind prison bars in China for no crime other than exercising their consciences. We are concerned by the Dalai Lama's reports of Chinese abuses against the people and culture of Tibet . . .

The core of this policy will be a resolute insistence upon significant progress on human rights in China. To implement this policy, I am signing today an Executive Order that will have the effect of extending Most Favored Nation status for China for 12 months. Whether I extend MFN next year, however, will depend upon whether China makes significant progress in improving its human rights record.

I had nothing but praise for the president. I didn't realize at the time that we had been

had. As the "probationary year" progressed, profound doubt concerning the President's commitment to his own policy emerged.

So, midway through the "probationary period," in Jan. of 1994, I led a human rights mission to China and was shocked and dismayed to be told by high Chinese government officials with whom I met, that President Clinton would continue MFN without conditions and that his brand of human rights linkage was pure fiction, meaningless and political.

Turns out the President was indeed bluffing, the fix was in, and the Chinese dictatorship knew it. A terrible setback for human rights, democracy, the environment and security issues.

In a breathtaking capitulation, the Administration officially de-linked human rights and trade in the Spring of 1994—and the Chinese hardliners then knew for absolute certain that for this Administration profits trump respect for human life and that sanctions were to be reserved exclusively for commercial concerns, such as intellectual property rights, copyright infringement, and the pirating of CDs and video cassettes. Then, and only then, would this Administration mount up on its hind legs to fight and employ the credible threat of sanctions to ameliorate Beijing's behavior.

In an article in the Washington Post in June 9, 1998, we get this insight, "A few months after President Clinton de-linked MFN from progress on human rights, there was a meeting at the White House to assess the effects of the Administration's new China policy. At the meeting, president Clinton announced, "I hate our China policy. I wish I was running against our China policy. I mean, we give them MFN and change our commercial policy and what has changed?" So reports the Washington Post.

As Chairman of the International Operations and Human Rights Subcommittee, I have chaired 18 hearings and markups on human rights abuses in China. Not only has nothing changed for the better with our defacto delinking policy, human rights abuses have changed for the worse. The delinkage policy experiment which will be made permanent today if this legislation passes—will worsen the situation.

Human rights abuses have gotten progressively worse in virtually every category. At a hearing this morning with the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, Rabbi Saperstein and two commissioners testified that there was a ". . . sharp deterioration in freedom of religion in China during the last year. The Commission believes that an unconditional grant of PNTR at this moment may be taken as a signal of American indifference to religious freedom. The government of China attaches great symbolic importance to steps such as the grant of PNTR, and presents them to the Chinese people as proof of international acceptance and approval." Rabbi Saperstein admonished Congress to vote "No" on PNTR.

I urge members to read the 77 page State Department report, which details pervasive torture, forced abortion, and new, frightening crackdowns on dissidents and religious believers. The U.S. State Department Report states:

Abuses included instances of extra judicial killings, torture and mistreatment of prisoners, forced confessions, arbitrary arrest and detention, lengthy incommunicado detention, and denial of due process. Prison

conditions at most facilities remained harsh. In many cases, particularly in sensitive political cases, the judicial system denies criminal defendants basic legal safeguards and due process because authorities attach higher priority to maintaining public order and suppressing political opposition than to enforcing legal norms. The Government infringed on citizens' privacy rights. The Government tightened restrictions on freedom of speech and of the press, and increased controls on the Internet; self-censorship by journalists also increased. The Government severely restricted freedom of assembly, and continued to restrict freedom of association. The government continued to restrict freedom of religion, and intensified controls on some unregistered churches. The Government continued to restrict freedom of movement. The Government does not permit independent domestic nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) to monitor publicly human rights conditions. Violence against women, including coercive family planning practices—which sometimes include forced abortions and forced sterilization; prostitution; discrimination against women; trafficking in women and children; abuse of children; and discrimination against the disabled and minorities are all problems. The Government continued to restrict tightly worker rights, and forced labor in prison facilities remains a serious problem. Child labor persists. Particularly serious human rights abuses persisted in some minority areas, especially in Tibet and Xinjiang, where restrictions on religion and other fundamental freedoms intensified

. . . . Police and other elements of the security apparatus employed torture and degrading treatment in dealing with detainees and prisoners. Former detainees and the press reported credibly that officials used electric shocks, prolonged periods of solitary confinement, incommunicado detention, beatings, shackles, and other forms of abuse against detained men and women

The Chinese dictators—our business partners—excel in the torture chamber business and even the internet in China is used against its users. The State Department points out that:

The Government increased monitoring of the Internet during the year, and placed restrictions on information available on the Internet. The Government has special Internet police units to monitor and increase control of Internet content and access Web pages run by Falun Gong followers were targeted specifically by the government as part of its crackdown against the group that began in July.

The repression of human rights in general and the barbaric forced abortion policy is having a devastating impact on women's lives. The State Department Human Rights Report says that 500 Chinese women commit suicide each and every day.

Mr. Speaker to date there has yet to be any serious, credible linkage of trade and human rights, yet we are being asked today to forgo any possible linkage in the future. This is a real vote—the dictatorship will actually lose something they want. Deny China's PNTR today—require them to move in the direction of reform and the protection of human rights.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, people are split on both sides of this, but I would like to relay a story. Hall Rogers and some of my Democrat colleagues went to Hanoi. We spoke to the

Communist Chinese Prime Minister. I asked him, Mr. Prime Minister, why do you not get involved in trade?

In perfect English, he said, Congressman, we are Communists. He said, If we get involved in trade, people out there will have, in his term, things, private property and property, and we as, Communists, will be out of business. At that point, I said, Trade is good.

If we take a look at where China was 20 years ago, I was there, and where they are now, no, they will lie, cheat, steal. They are a national security risk. But I think the question is where do we want China to be 20 years from now. I think we have an ability to open those markets and move them to the right instead of going back to the left. I think it is in the best interest for national security and human rights to let them move in that direction.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of this language of this treaty. I truly believe that the failure to enact PNTR will deprive the United States of meaningful market access. China has access to our markets. We need access to their markets.

This agreement will provide a landmark set of rules in protecting patents, copyrights, trademarks, and other forms of intellectual property protection. This system protects Americans' research, innovation, and creates incentives for further investment of technological services.

We need this treaty today. There is no way that we can be the leader of the world. Our chair at the table of the world is empty. No agreement ever before has contained stronger language to strengthen the guarantees of fair trade and to address practices that distort trade and investment.

It will help American workers by eliminating practices that can cost American jobs and force unfair transfer of technology to China. For the first time, Americans will have the means to combat many of these practices.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China (H.R. 4444).

The potential of Permanent Normal Trade Relations is far from being realized by many Americans, in fact, it is far from being realized by many of my colleagues. I am here to express the reason I support this measure. What we are doing should not be looked at as a favor for China, but as an act that is in the best interest of America and Americans. And certainly, my district, my state, our country, our American workers. Without PNTR, American workers, American farmers, and American business will be left behind.

While groups, such as Asian, Latin American, Canadian and European competitors reap the benefits of PNTR, American workers, American farmers, and American businesses will miss out on opportunities that may possibly raise their economic standards. To compete effectively, American workers, American

farmers, and American businesses, need the access provided by granting PNTR—the ability to export and distribute goods in China. This access will allow our businesses to export to China from here at home and to have their own distribution networks in China. This is more convenient than being forced to set up factories in China to sell products through Chinese partners. This will provide the opportunity for our firms to attain the access they need to China's fastgrowing services market in sectors like telecommunications. This agreement truly strengthens our ability to ensure fair trade and protect U.S. agricultural and manufacturing bases from unwanted import surges, unfair pricing, and unwarranted abusive investment practices.

I truly believe that failure to enact PNTR will deprive the United States of meaningful market access for goods—key elements that are necessary to safeguard American workers from unfair import surges from China. This agreement will also provide a landmark set of rules for protecting patents, copyrights, trademarks and other forms of intellectual property. This system protects Americans' research and innovation and creates incentives for further investment and technological progress worldwide.

Our firms also need access to China's fastgrowing services market in sectors like telecommunications. Just think, this access will allow, for the first time, our companies the ability to sell and distribute products in China made by workers here at home without being forced to transfer our technology to China. This ability to work at home also sets the stage for increased trade, which will play a part in raising the living standards here in America.

The U.S., the world's largest exporter, will gain the most from a strong, open, multilateral trading system. This trading system will help raise living standards for American working families that depend on export-related jobs. It is a fact that jobs supported by goods exports pay 13–16% more than the national average. Denying China PNTR will cost American exports and the jobs they support as well as higher paying jobs. We must not allow our competitors in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere to capture Chinese markets.

Simply stated, if Congress enacts PNTR there will be more exports to China of products made in the United States by American workers and products grown by our farmers. If Congress does not grant PNTR, our competitors will enjoy the full market access and enforcement rights in China that we will be denied. No agreement ever on WTO accession has ever contained stronger measures to strengthen guarantees of fair trade and to address practices that distort trade and investment. Mainly, it will help American workers by eliminating practices that can cost American jobs and force the unfair transfer of U.S. technology to China. For the first time, Americans will have the means to combat measures such as forced technology transfer, frequent mandated offsets, frivolous local content requirements, and other unfair practices that drain jobs and technology away from the U.S. Passage of PNTR will open China to American values and practices also. U.S. companies are more committed than their Asian competitors to progressive labor management practices and protecting the safety of their workers. It is clear, our decision could fundamentally

change not only our relationship with China, but China itself.

Since I am a representative of Dallas, Texas, let me expound on how PNTR will help Texas and my district. The U.S.-China Bilateral Agreement on China's accession to the WTO opens an important market to Texas' exports, by benefiting key industries, busily creating export, and blossoming employment opportunities. Texas' exports to China are broadly diversified with almost every major product category registering exports to the Chinese market in 1998. Texas' merchandise exports sales to China totaled over \$583 million in 1998—a 46% increase from the \$399 million sold to China in 1993. Included in Texas' exports to China are sales from key metropolitan areas. For example, my district, Dallas, grossed \$92 million in sales. The agreement will open the market for a wide range of services, including telecommunications, banking, insurance, financial services, professional, hotel, restaurant, tourism, motion pictures, video distribution, software, business, computer, environmental, and distribution and related services. This will occur not only in Texas, but also throughout America.

It's simple, granting PNTR will not erase the horrific acts of the Chinese Government, but it will enable self-protection and allow opportunities for American workers. Opportunities that we should not allow to pass us by due to past actions of the Chinese Government.

Let me end by acknowledging the work that all of my colleagues have and continue to do in order to ensure America's leadership position in the world. As Members of Congress and leaders, we must realize that now is the time to encourage China to evolve. We can advance America's economic system without diluting the goals we stand for and the goals that allow democracy to prevail.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that so many observers have gotten it wrong. The China trade vote is not about protectionism versus free trade; it's not about business versus labor; it's not even about China haters versus China apologists. No, it is about a vision of world trade worthy of America in the 21st Century. It is about whether 21st century globalism will have any guiding principle or whether it will be an aimless trading frenzy.

Proponents of Permanent Normal Trade Relations say that the deal reached with China will give China unprecedented access to American business, that American traders have given up nothing in the deal to gain concessions for China, that China will enter the World Trade Organization regardless of Congress' decision on PNTR, and that American industry must not let other countries gain advantages in a market of 1.3 billion potential customers. Proponents concede that China does have a poor record of abiding by trade agreements as well as a poor record with respect to worker's rights, human rights, and environmental protection, and then they say the situation can be rectified through the rule-based trade agreement and constructive en-

agement derived from that trade. They argue that trade has a liberalizing influence on society. The most frequent argument is that the internet will irrevocably open China. Engagement, they say, is preferable to isolationism. There are a few grains of truth in their arguments, but this agreement falls far short of what we need and so, this is not the right thing to do.

I too am for engagement, real engagement. Proponents of PNTR say that the presence of thousands of American traders carrying checkbooks and adhering to American factory standards will unleash the altruistic intentions of a billion Chinese. Of course, that has not happened anywhere else in the world. Business in America did not by itself produce the social progress we extol. It did not happen in American factories; it did not happen in civil rights; it did not happen in environmental protection. In every case we had to re-enforce economic activity with rules of social behavior—in insuring collective bargaining, in opening public accommodations through civil rights legislation, and in outlawing pollution. Unfettered business did not do these things. We needed a system of rules. Even trade requires a system of rules. This whole debate is about whether to bring China into a rule-based trade regime. The great irony of all this is that proponents of PNTR insist on the need for rule-based trade agreements, backed up with sanctions, trade actions intended to induce good behavior on all sides. So, why do we need rule-based agreements in trade, but not in any other area we think is important?

Real engagement extends beyond just trade, and it extends beyond China. Of course, trade is good. We in the United States are a more prosperous country because goods, services, and people can move freely among Oregon, Texas, New Jersey and the other states. Each state does not try to be self-sufficient. But such free trade works because it is fair trade. Although there is some competition between states, everyone can be confident that each state plays by nearly equal rules with regard to environment, workers' conditions, and product safety. Open trade requires expectations of fair standards of behavior. Trade in the 21st century will be, and must be, about more than how many widgets enter and leave a port.

We do not want to insult an independent and proud sovereign nation. In order to accomplish the goals of our negotiations we should not alienate the other parties. But we must not give up on values. Some say workers rights are irrelevant, or human rights, or religious rights, or environmental protection. They are not irrelevant. The citizens in my district tell me these concerns are not irrelevant. To them the proponents say, these may be important, but trade will take care of them. This trickle-down is specious. It has not worked that way in the past. It has not worked that way elsewhere in the world.

I cannot support this legislation to grant permanent normal trade relations because it fails to consider anything but trade. This is not ready for a vote. The administration should first put in place mechanisms to deal with these other things—in the trade agreement, in the WTO, in the ILO, in the World Bank. Worker's rights, environmental protection, and human rights are not irrelevant concerns. I do not expect full, immediate accomplishment of our goals in these difficult areas, but silence on these issues will not lead to progress.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill before us today. I also emphasize to them and to the administration that after today's vote, whatever the outcome, we have much work to do to make sure we address these concerns.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

This is not a vote to trade or not to trade—the issue is yearly oversight or no oversight. Given China's record of violating virtually every international agreement it enters into, the leverage of oversight is critical.

Trade and Oversight are not mutually exclusive. We can have both. Even U.S. Trade Representatives Charlene Barshefsky, during recent testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, acknowledged that the U.S. could obtain all of the tariff cuts China would be required to make upon entry into the WTO even if Congress did not grant PNTR.

The same arguments for PNTR were put forth by proponents of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). The result of NAFTA has been 500,000 lost jobs for American workers and a ballooning trade deficit with Mexico of \$22 billion.

Why will no one talk about the impact of this agreement on our trade deficit? There is considerable foreign capital in our stock market which will leave the US if a better deal arises. Our overall trade deficit has already surpassed \$331 billion, a figure that is beginning to sound alarms for many financial analysts concerned about the long-term stability of the U.S. dollar. The Secretary of the Treasury told me Monday and this problem must be addressed.

Moreover, the \$2 billion in goods the U.S. exports to China are not purchased by the Chinese. They are merely supplies for the U.S. plants that are operating there. Compare that to the fact that the Chinese sell \$80 billion in goods to the US annually. If the Chinese continue their practice of not buying US goods, this will not be a home run for American.

China continues to threaten Taiwan, a country our nation has pledged to protect. Granting PNTR would send the wrong signal to Beijing that military action against Taiwan would be tolerated.

Finally, large companies have lobbied hard for Congress to pass PNTR for China. Corporations must be concerned about their bottom line. But the 570,000 persons I represent have other issues. There has been no ground swell for this trade deal from our community. I have even received some letters from workers who say they've been asked to write in favor of PNTR but they fear if it passes, it will mean the loss of their jobs. Chinese laborers earn only one twentieth what American workers do.

Trade will go on. Wouldn't it be nice if it were fair trade.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article from yesterday's New York Times, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 23, 2000]
 JOINING THE CLUB: LIKE OTHERS, CHINA WILL
 TRY TO PROTECT ITS OWN INDUSTRIES
 (By Craig S. Smith)

SHANGHAI, May 22—Sun Guomin, a poor farmer in a village west of here, represents an example of why American business executives and government officials may be disappointed once China enters the World Trade Organization.

While American businesses have been dreaming of the vast potential markets for their goods and services in China, the government is unlikely to allow the West the kind of access those dreams are made of. For if Beijing immediately did everything the trade organization requires, Mr. Sun and millions like him could be driven out of business.

And with droves of laid-off workers already mounting sporadic protests across the country, giving foreign competition a hand in wiping out whole industries could amount to political suicide for China's governing Communist Party.

Agriculture is one of the most vulnerable areas.

Mr. Sun, 68, is struggling to get by on his six and a half acres of land in the village of Nansong, west of Shanghai, where he lives in a mud house on a dirt path with his wife, Chen Baonan.

He has already stopped growing barely, once a major crop in this part of the flat Yangtze River delta, because it does not pay. He and his neighbors still grow rapeseed, the source of canola oil, and the plant's brilliant yellow flowers carpet the delta with color each spring.

But the price the government pays for rapeseed has fallen so low, Mr. Sun says, that he is better off pressing the seeds himself and using the cooking oil at home. He would gladly lease his field to a factory, but the government will not let him, citing a need to preserve farmland. He and his wife have opened a small store in the front of their house, where they make about five cents a day selling cigarettes and beer.

Joining the W.T.O. threatens to make China's agricultural economics even worse.

Last year China imported record quantities of rapeseed and soybeans, because foreign oilseed production is cheaper and the quality often higher than that of domestically grown crops. But to enter the trade group, China has agreed to lift quotas that it now uses to restrict the import of edible oils. A surge in imports would further dampen demand for seeds from people like Mr. Sun.

The problem exists pretty much across the board.

The Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, a top government research institute in Beijing, recently estimated that prices for Chinese grain and other agricultural products would continue to exceed those of the global market for the next 20 years.

Thanks to huge mechanized farms, the American cost of production is often lower than that in China, where farming employs as many as 600 million people, fields are fragmented and transportation is slow.

And many other labor-intensive industries are in the same boat.

Many of the country's 100-plus automobile assembly plants face extinction if imports surge as tariffs fall, and chemical plants could be crippled by foreign competition. The Chinese government wants to reform the economy, but it favors a cautious, go-slow approach rather than risk widespread unrest that could undermine its rule.

"It's important to think about stability," said Zhou Hanming, a lawyer who advises the government about the W.T.O.

Mr. Zhou says that the two to five years in which the organization requires members to

put most of its mandated measures into effect is too short a time, and that China will do what it must to shelter industries until they are ready to face global competition.

"We're working very hard on a large number of new laws and regulations that will offer protection of national industries, vulnerable industries, infant industries," he said.

Mr. Zhou, one of dozens of experts Beijing has enlisted to prepare the country to defend its industries, is studying ways to use anti-dumping rules. Under China's trade deal with the United States, Washington insisted that it be allowed to levy punitive duties against imports that it deems to be sold below cost. Washington wanted the clause to protect the American textile industry from cheap Chinese imports, but China has seized on the provision to protect its own threatened industries.

"We're going to learn how to use the same weapon," Mr. Zhou said.

The country will also use other means to give threatened industries an edge, including preferential bank loans and tax breaks. And Beijing may end longstanding tax breaks for foreign companies that were intended to encourage investment.

But China does hope to use its membership in the trade group as a lever to move moribund state industries toward real reform.

Take the pharmaceutical industry, which still relies largely on copies, often illegal, of Western compounds. China will come under pressure from the group to enforce the intellectual property rights of foreign drug makers. To survive, Chinese pharmaceutical firms will have to invest in research and development and begin producing original drugs.

"The pressure will help force us to depend on ourselves," said Wang Li, general manager of the Shanghai Joy Biopharm company, a state-owned drug laboratory started five years ago to develop commercially viable pharmaceuticals for the domestic industry.

And China hopes that membership in the group will spur foreign investment, which fell last year for the first time since investors withdrew after the crackdown on pro-democracy protesters at Tianamen Square in June 1989.

Multinational corporations have already begun signaling their willingness to pump more money into China after it joins. Nonetheless, protection is high on Beijing's agenda.

China is not known for its strict adherence to trade agreements. In 1995, Trade Minister Wu Yi signed a deal with the United States trade representative, Charlene Barshefsky, that promised to protect American intellectual property rights. But counterfeiting of computer software and movies on compact disks is now more common than ever. Street hawkers sell the latest Hollywood blockbusters in most Chinese cities, and the police ignore the activity.

Nor has China proven a progressive member of another trade club. As a member of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum, it has resisted moves to speed the liberalization of financial services.

* * * * *

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

(Mr. FARR of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this permanent status and in support of annual status.

"Dear Representative Farr/Sam, . . . [it is] the very strong sentiment of the Labor Council delegates that the agreement negotiated with China . . . is a bad deal for working people in this country. . . . It should not be ratified by Congress. We urge you to vote against it."—Amy Newell, Business Agent, Santa Cruz Central Labor Committee, AFL-CIO, in a letter dated March 20, 2000.

"Dear Congressman Farr/Sam, I am writing to you today to let you know how important Congressional approval of the Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China (PNTR) is for Monterey County growers! . . . Both California and Monterey County stand to gain jobs and business growth from your approval of PNTR. . . . I urge you to look carefully at the PNTR China issue and lend your immediate support to this extremely important matter!"—Sharan Lanini, Executive Director, Monterey County Farm Bureau, in a letter dated March 24, 2000.

How could two views on the same issue coming out of roughly the same regional community be so incredibly disparate? Yet, this is the issue I am faced with as a U.S. Congressman as the vote on China and WTO approaches.

The issue at hand is whether the United States will grant China Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR). The U.S. already provides China with NTR—Normal Trade Relations—status, a trade arrangement that is currently renewed or denied on an annual basis. China has been granted NTR (previously referred to as "MFN"—Most Favored Nation status) for 19 years in a row. I have supported annual NTR for China in the past.

The difference this year is not just whether to make permanent the annual NTR debate for China. The difference this year is that American approval of PNTR will provide the United States the same access to Chinese markets as other World Trade Organization (WTO) members. Without PNTR, the U.S. will continue to trade with China on a bilateral basis and under conditions separate and different from the rest of the world. PNTR would establish new rules between the two countries equal to the rest of the world and new grounds for settling trade disputes.

Most people know that I am a strong believer in trade. My votes on NAFTA, GATT and WTO are no secret. I regularly defend the Market Access Program (MAP) which provides federal funds to advertise American products overseas as a way to increase demand in foreign markets for U.S.-made items. The fastest growing market for products coming out of the Central Coast—particularly agriculture—is in Asia. In fact, Asian markets accounted for over 285 million pounds of export products from Monterey County alone in 1998. This figure could easily grow exponentially if full and fair access to the China market were made available to our growers. According to statistics the Department of Commerce released last month, the Santa Cruz-Watsonville area saw an 839 percent increase in exports to China over 1993–98. Salinas saw a 743 percent increase in its exports to China over the same period.

I want to see that kind of economic opportunity available to all California communities and all communities across the country. I want to see China open up to Central Coast agriculture. I want to see America finally get a break at marketing its goods to the potential

billion Chinese patrons. Ultimately, that means more business for local growers, more jobs for local workers, increased shipping operations for local truckers, and better economic conditions all around.

But in negotiating a trade deal with China (or any entity on any issue) we should look for the best deal that advances all of the United States' interests. Economics is not the only issue at stake here; there are others, including the non-tangible issues of human rights and personal freedoms. There is wide disagreement on whether PNTR helps or hinders these causes within China.

If human rights and environmental stewardship are important interests to the United States, then it is right of us to try to find ways to advance these issues world wide. If China is a concern of ours, then we ought to try to sway Chinese leadership to move toward accommodation in these areas. The best way to do that is to require that China return to Congress each year to make its case that it deserves special trade status because it has made efforts to correct environmental and human rights deficiencies. PNTR eliminates that tool and robs us of the chance to hold China accountable.

So, I will vote "no" on PNTR for China. I do so fully supportive of open and fair trade, but also mindful of using American influence to keep China on track to being a better citizen of the world.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI).

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

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the proposition.

A DIFFICULT DECISION

Mr. Speaker, over the last three months, I have conducted a thorough analysis of extending Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status to China, thereby putting U.S. trade relations with China on the same plane as our relations with virtually every other country in the World Trade Organization. During this time, I have remained undecided on this issue. I have listened to every possible argument in this debate and comprehensively examined the legislation's potential effects so that I could learn more about the quality of jobs that expanded trade can bring and the potential effects of trade on human rights. I also wanted to study the impact of trade on not only our workers, but also the international labor standards for other workers around the world. First and foremost among my considerations during my deliberations, however, was determining the consequences of this legislation for the people working, the families living, and the businesses operating in Northeastern and Central Pennsylvania.

This has been an extremely difficult decision for me. In the long term, I believe that international trade benefits the United States when conducted fairly. Our nation cannot repeat the mistakes of 1930 when Congress enacted the Smoot-Hawley bill, which helped to precipitate the Great Depression. Freer trade among nations increases wealth for all and improves relations with our allies, similar to the 1960s when we reduced a number of trade barriers.

NAFTA AND PNTR

But international trade has not always helped everyone. In the short term, absent the

creation of an effective economic safety net, increased international trade will produce winners and losers in our economy. In 1993, I voted against the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), primarily because there were insufficient protections in place to preserve the economic security of average, working Americans and lower-income workers in labor-intensive industries. Over time, my doubts were proven correct. After NAFTA, some sectors of our economy grew, while others did not. Additionally, workers in some regions of our country have flourished under NAFTA, while workers in other regions have experienced wage stagnation or lost their jobs outright.

Six-and-a-half years after the NAFTA vote, our country has another opportunity to consider the issue of increased global trade. The debate on PNTR, however, differs significantly from our deliberations over NAFTA. Under NAFTA, we created the world's largest free trade area with two other countries, Mexico and Canada. NAFTA not only eliminated tariffs between the United States, Mexico, and Canada, but it also required us to enter into an expansive range of commitments and agreements to integrate the economies of the three nations.

Through PNTR we are only seeking to place U.S. trade relations with China on the same footing as our relations with virtually every other country in the world, including nations like Argentina, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, and Switzerland. In other words, the economic integration required by PNTR is significantly less than that required by NAFTA. Under PNTR, we will not eliminate or even lower our tariffs for the goods we import from China. Thus, a product produced in the United States, Mexico, and Canada, which is not subject to a tariff, will often still remain cheaper than the same item manufactured in China, which will still be subject to the tariffs that we apply not only to China, but also to Germany, France, Brazil, Japan, and Great Britain. Moreover, as a result of this agreement China will significantly lower trade barriers for U.S. products to enter the Chinese marketplace.

COMPETING VIEWPOINTS

In order to educate myself more fully about the reasons to support and oppose PNTR status for China, I have met with hundreds of individuals in recent weeks and months and have heard from thousands more. On one side of this debate, the business community maintains that the United States stands to gain tens of thousands of high-tech jobs as a result of PNTR. In the short term, however, our economy will likely face job losses in low-tech, labor-intensive industries. Additionally, I fear that in the short term only selected communities in our country—like those within the Silicon Valley of California, in the high-tech corridor of Northern Virginia, and along Wall Street in New York—will benefit from extending PNTR.

Supporters of the agreement further contend that denial of PNTR would hurt American families who would pay more for consumer goods. They estimate these higher prices could cost more than \$10 billion each year. Additionally, supporters of PNTR insist that the best way to improve China's record on human rights, religious freedom, and free speech is to engage and not isolate the Chinese people in the world economy. Finally, PNTR's supporters note that because the Europeans have re-

cently entered into an agreement with the Chinese government, China is all the more likely to join the World Trade Organization this year. Consequently, we need PNTR so that U.S. workers, farmers, and businesses can remain competitive with our trading partners in Europe, the Americas, and Asia.

On the other side of this debate, I have heard many reasons to oppose PNTR. Some interest groups have estimated that our nation will lose tens of thousands of jobs as a result of PNTR. Just as I doubt the number of projected jobs that supporters believe will be created by this decision, I also am skeptical of the anticipated jobs that opponents believe will be lost because of this legislation. In reality, the net change in jobs probably lies between these two estimates.

Others opposed to this legislation feel that by granting PNTR to China we will condone that nation's record of human rights abuses. But using trade as leverage against the Chinese government is not only unenforceable, I believe it is also likely to bring change to the most oppressed Chinese people. There is a great danger in the arguments that some have put forth in attempting to demonize the Chinese government. If we care about improving our relations with China and improving the quality of life for the Chinese people, we must remain engaged. As Dai Qing, perhaps China's most prominent environmentalist and independent political thinker, states, "All of the fights—for a better environment, labor rights, and human rights—these fights we will fight in China tomorrow. But first we must break the monopoly of the state. To do that, we need a freer market and the competition mandated by the World Trade Organization."

A THIRD WAY

During this debate over Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China, I fear that we may have unfortunately again neglected to address an issue that we should have considered during our deliberations over NAFTA. In this country, a paradox arises because the two diverging viewpoints on extending trade to other nations fail to join together to advance the real interests of all Americans. If we defeat PNTR today, our low-tech, labor-intensive jobs will still continue to be lost by trade that already exists with China and our other leading trading partners around the world under current trade agreements. Additionally, the U.S. stands to lose our opportunity to create new, high-tech jobs for workers in our Nation because we will have failed to open the Chinese market.

It is also a false hope that the defeat of PNTR will provide job security for those jobs already lost or about to be lost to global trade. According to the Congressional Research Service, which provides Congress with non-partisan analysis, Pennsylvania has already lost 18,663 jobs to Canada and Mexico since passage of NAFTA. This trend will likely continue in the future, even if we do not pass PNTR today.

With or without PNTR, our economy will certainly change in positive and negative ways because of increased worldwide competition in the years ahead. I have, therefore, asked myself what can be done now in the United States to help those regions of the country and those sectors of our economy that need assistance in order to ensure that all American workers and businesses can benefit tomorrow from increased global trade. By providing short-term support for these communities,

businesses, and workers, we can ultimately ensure that everyone in our economy profits from international trade.

We are fortunate that our economy continues to grow and prosper. President Clinton has led the Nation to the strongest economy the world has ever seen. He has created the most economic opportunities for working families in the last 30 years, and I know that he shares my concerns for those Americans who have not fully participated in the economic expansion of the last eight years. His leadership in reducing the budget deficit, lowering taxes for lower- and middle-income Americans, and supporting workers' rights has strengthened our economic outlook for the 21st century.

Of primary importance to me in this debate is how we will overcome the negative consequences of increased trade, especially for those older workers who may lose their jobs. From my perspective, workers and families displaced by greater global competition must ultimately retain at least the same quality of life as they would have obtained under their old jobs. Our government can accomplish this objective through a number of mechanisms. We could, for example, enact legislation to:

Promote investment in economically distressed areas. Through President Clinton's New Markets initiative, we can increase investments in the untapped potential of our Nation's underserved markets and create long-term partnerships that will lead to lasting economic change in distressed communities. One component of the New Markets Initiative is the America's Private Investment Companies (APIC) bill, and I have been an ardent supporter of this legislation. APICs would make large-scale investments in businesses operating in distressed urban centers, mid-sized cities, small towns, and rural areas, to stimulate job growth and economic development. Because we recently reached a bipartisan agreement between President Clinton and Speaker Hastert on this economic development package, I am hopeful that will pass this legislation later this year. I do, however, regret that this package is not before us today.

Enhance job training and trade adjustment programs. We must additionally give workers the tools they need to succeed in the global economy through reforms of our nation's trade adjustment and economic development assistance programs. We can accomplish this goal by extending trade adjustment assistance eligibility to those who lose their jobs due to shifts in production and strengthening the linkage between income support and early enrollment in retraining. We should also create an Office of Community Economic Adjustment within the Economic Development Administration in order to ensure that economically distressed regions of our country receive access to all available federal resources in times of need. Again, we are unfortunately not voting on such legislation today.

Safety net tools, like promoting investments in distressed areas and enhancing job training and trade adjustment programs, will not only mitigate the negative effects flowing from increased trade, but also lift up displaced workers and communities traditionally hurt by greater global trade. The business community and labor organizations should recognize the benefits of taking these proactive steps to help all Americans participate in the prosperity of trade. In the future when we consider other trade measures in Congress, I hope that we

will expand the debate to include these quality of life protections.

OPPOSE THE LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, in the past the American public has demonstrated good judgment in determining how we should conduct trade with other nations. In reaching my final decision to oppose this legislation, I have asked myself the same four basic questions used by many Americans when debating trade issues. Those questions are:

Who benefits from the PNTR package in the United States?

What are the advantages of the PNTR package for American workers?

What regions of the country will benefit or lose under the PNTR package?

Who benefits in China from the PNTR package?

As I noted earlier, while PNTR's supporters state that thousands of jobs will be created as the result of the agreement, I worry that many workers and businesses in Northeastern and Central Pennsylvania will not reap those benefits in the short term and possibly not even the long term. Moreover, the PNTR agreement fails to mitigate the potential damages caused by increased competition in the global marketplace for our communities at home. Workers that lose their jobs because of increased trade will further lose from a poorly constructed economic safety net. This outcome will lead to a further widening in the gap between the income of wealthy individuals and average, hard-working Americans in this country, a far more worrisome problem because of its potential future effects on our society.

Admittedly, some workers in some sectors of our economy will undoubtedly win under this PNTR package. We cannot, however, overlook the fact that some workers will not only lose their economic security, but they could also potentially experience changes in the structure of their families and their respect for their government as a result of this legislation. I cannot support this legislation, because it fails to mitigate these and other losses that workers, families, and businesses may face from increased trade.

Finally, during this PNTR debate I have often heard from my constituents that China "cannot be trusted." In reality, they are saying that the Chinese government cannot be trusted. Efforts to include provisions in this PNTR package that establish a commission to monitor human rights, labor standards, and religious freedom in China are a step in the right direction, as is requiring the Administration to report annually to Congress on China's compliance with international standards. I commend my colleagues Congressmen SANDY LEVIN and DOUG BEREUTER for their bipartisan and hard work on this issue. Although it may be the best we can ask from the Chinese government at this time, we need to really know whether we can trust the Chinese government in the future before moving ahead.

Mr. Speaker, an agreement such as this one is a contract. As I recall from my days as an attorney, people generally enter into contracts only if all parties to the agreement believe that they will win under the arrangement. China may feel they have a winning deal with the United States on this PNTR package. From the perspective of the United States, however, this PNTR agreement fails to strengthen the short- and long-term economic security for all regions of our country and all

American workers. Rejecting this legislation is not rejecting trade with China. It merely means that we will continue to have the opportunity to review on an annual basis our current trade policy with China and examine changes in that nation's trade record and human rights performance. Regretfully, I must oppose this bill.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) who understands that the Dalai Lama never said he supports PNTR and understands that there is a difference between China acceding to WTO and Congress passing PNTR.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, has the Chinese Government earned our trust? No. China has violated the term of four previous agreements we signed with them.

Has the WTO earned our trust? No. The WTO repeatedly rules in favor of the multinational companies, and ignores the workers, their human rights and the environment.

Look at the banana issue. When the WTO ruled in favor of one company, Chiquita International; they ignored all Caribbean nations whose main exports are bananas. Now thousands of farmers are without work. We cannot trust the WTO to look out for the people. We cannot trust China to look out for the people. Who can we trust?

I urge my colleagues to consider their responsibility and vote "no" on this bill.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4444. I absolutely do not believe that it is in our country's best interest to grant Permanent Normal Trade Relations to China. I have listened carefully to both sides of the debate and I know that each side has valid concerns. But in the end, I think there is too much at stake for Congress to give up oversight on this issue.

Taking away our ability to impose unilateral trade sanctions against a country like China is simply not acceptable. Without this option, the U.S. will lose its leverage to influence China towards improving environmental standards, as well as human rights and labor rights violations. Under the WTO rules, we would lose our ability to unilaterally punish a nation or a company for these types of violations. China has simply not been a trustworthy trading partner, and has violated the terms of all four bilateral trade agreements it has previously signed with the U.S.

In addition, I am more than concerned about China's human rights record. Along with the poor treatment of the work force, the Chinese Communist party's human rights record only seems to be getting worse, not better, even in the midst of economic opening. Government restrictions on free speech and the press, as well as forced imprisonment for expressing one's political or religious beliefs, have dented political opening.

On the economic front, the U.S. balance of payments last year shows that our trade deficit with China is growing rapidly. In the end, I believe that extending PNTR will result in a net loss of jobs for Americans, not gains.

Finally, I am very concerned about the discovery last year of Chinese espionage. I do not believe that a country that steals our military secrets should be granted trade benefits!

When I weigh the gravity of these factors, I believe it is in our best interests to oppose

Permanent Normal Trade Relations to China, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 4444.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair announces that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 21½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 25½ minutes remaining.

The Chair intends at the conclusion, as we wrap up, to begin with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), then the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) to follow, then the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) to follow, and to finish with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of normalizing trade in China.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and all the Members that are fighting so diligently to bring the side of the American workers to the floor here of the House.

Let me just re-stress, and I made these statements last night, this is from the Ohio Department of Commerce, Director Gary Suhadolnik, and this documents where baby chickens were fed arsenic in the water. They were killed. They contained 18 percent arsenic in their systems, and they were put into the Easter baskets of American children. Luckily, we caught 350 of the baskets before the rest could come over the market.

There are other examples in here of hideous examples of dangers to American children because these products come in. China does have respect for our American children. They do not have respect for what comes over from China. If this agreement passes, we are going to have more of this. We are going to have our markets flooded.

On the other end, we have been so comfortable. We wear engagement here like a coat. It gets a little bit hot, one takes it off, the word engagement.

We talk about the farmers, once again the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) has a bill that unleashes all the sanctions around the world. But all of a sudden, we cannot talk about engagement when we talk about the Nethercutt bill, which if my colleagues really want to help the farmers, they would pass it.

If my colleagues want to pass this bill to help the farmers like my colleagues say, that 9 percent tariff reduc-

tion is going to vanish. It is going to vanish instantly when they manipulate their currency in China like it happened in Mexico, and my colleagues know it.

We have got to stand up for American workers. Despite all the lucrative predictions that the China WTO deal will open up new opportunities for American farmers and businesses, I remain convinced that this trade deal represents a bad deal for the United States.

The International Trade Commission analyzed a similar trade deal that was on the table in April and concluded that it would lead to an increase in the U.S. trade deficit.

Then people say, well, this is not permanent. You bet your life if my colleagues vote for this, the undecided Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, if they hear this message, if they vote for this, it is going to be permanent. It will not be undone.

Stand up for American workers for a change.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4444, a bill to grant permanent normal trade relations status to China. The central tenet of America's trade policy should be threefold: opening markets for goods produced by American workers, improving our nations economy, and promoting American values and ideals abroad. In this sense, I believe that our trade policy should encourage reform, while demanding a level playing field for international commerce. This has already yielded many benefits for America in rural and urban areas alike. Indeed, within my congressional district in southwest Virginia, approximately one in every four jobs is tied to exports. The expansion in free trade in recent years has allowed Lynchburg and Roanoke to become two of the 25 fastest growing export regions in the U.S.

However, we have yet to include one of the world's largest emerging markets in this process. China, a nation of over 1 billion people, has been hamstrung over the years with outmoded laws and trading practices put in place by the Communist regime. Even with these barriers in place, China is becoming a thriving market for U.S. products and services, and is already our 5th largest trading partner. If we can bring China into a rules-based trading system and dismantle the barriers put in place by it's failed economic philosophy, we can open up a massive new market to American goods and services.

Some have argued that opening the U.S. market to Chinese-made goods will have a detrimental effect on U.S. workers. Nothing could be further from the truth. The United States already has an open market for most goods originating in China and the rest of the world. It is China whose market is closed to the products designed by U.S. engineers, manufactured by U.S. workers and exported by U.S. companies. If we open this market to

U.S. goods and services, American workers stand to gain a tremendous benefit from the additional demand generated by China's huge population.

At the same time, I do share the concerns many have raised regarding our national security and China. Specifically, I am concerned with the findings of the Cox Commission that indicates that China is engaged in a concerted campaign to steal militarily sensitive equipment. These efforts by the Chinese government combined with the provocative stance towards the democratic republic of Taiwan, are a cause for serious concern.

I am also deeply concerned with the pattern of human rights abuses by the Chinese government. Human rights in China is imperative and the United States must continue to press China in that direction. As a nation dedicated to freedom and the rights of the individual, we have a responsibility to speak out when those rights are violated, whether at home or abroad.

The most effective way to influence change in China is to engage the Chinese government in ways that emphasize open trade and democratic reform. If we attempt to isolate China, the reality is that we will lose jobs to other nations that will not cut off trade, but rather take advantage of the situation. With PNTR the United States can use the WTO to eliminate unfair Chinese trade barriers that exclude American products. Failing to pass PNTR simply gives the lion's share of trade benefits away to other nations, while doing nothing to help U.S. workers and consumers.

It is critical that we adopt the approach of opening China up through increased westernization of the Chinese people. Trade and contact is building greater desire for western ways, including democracy. The Chinese people have a long history and change will be slow. The way to fight for progressive reform in China is not by abandoning the playing field, but through continued exposure to democratic ideas such as free markets and free speech.

The Internet revolution has eliminated economic and political barriers throughout the world. Free markets and free speech go hand in hand. With 8.9 million Internet users and over 15,000 web sites already based within China, the Internet has the potential to offer a dramatic improvement in the quality of life for millions of Chinese citizens as well.

By offering China the opportunity to enter the community of rule-abiding nations, we have a chance to create real and lasting change in China. At the same time, we must continue to work aggressively to ensure that China follows the rules of the international trading community.

Trade and commerce will lead directly to progress and freedom. We must continue fighting for a level playing field for trade—one on which our nation, our American workers and American consumers alike can win.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. (The gentleman from Arizona delivered the following speech in Chinese.)

In the world today the single most important bilateral relationship is the relationship between the U.S. and China. Passage of PNTR not only benefits the economies of both countries,

but it also advances the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I just spoke to the Chinese people in their native tongue.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) that those remarks may not be a part of the official RECORD unless the gentleman supplies a translation.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, it will probably be hard to translate.

Mr. Speaker, I just spoke to the Chinese people in their native tongue about the benefits of PNTR to both our countries and how it will advance the cause of freedom.

Unfortunately, to the majority of the Americans, this debate has been framed as a stark choice between free trade and human rights. In truth, increased trade with China is both.

Many Americans understand the economic benefit of PNTR to the United States. First is the dramatic reduction of trade barriers imposed on U.S. exports of goods and services. Whether it is a car battery or a semiconductor, U.S. companies will enjoy the lowest tariffs on their products in the history of U.S. trade with China.

But free trade will also improve the human rights situation. Even His Holiness the Dalai Lama, the exiled Tibetan spiritual leader who has suffered oppression at the hands of the Chinese Government, understands the importance of engaging China. In a recent interview, he said, I have always stressed that China should not be isolated. China must be brought into the mainstream of the world community.

By saying no to isolationism and embracing engagement, we can spread the gospel of free trade, democracy, human rights, and religious freedom one worker, one village, one city, and one province at a time.

Let us all know and take note the most important export that we have is our American values and democracy. Let us not be afraid. Let us have conviction in our ideals and know that they will move China.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and I do so with no illusions about China's records on human rights, worker rights, and environmental protection. I will not pretend that China is where it should be on any of these fronts.

In terms of economics, this is a one-way deal. We get significant reductions in barriers that stand in the way of the sale of American products in China. We give no greater access to America's markets for Chinese products than were provided for years and years.

Economic benefits for the United States are not the only reality that confronts us today. Another reality is that isolating China will do not a thing to bring about a more just economic or political order there.

The answer is not turning our back on China. The answer is pushing our

democratic values upon China through commerce and communication with its citizens. This engagement will steer forces of individual inspiration and aspiration and initiative in China that will, in the long run, no authoritarian government can ever contain.

There is a claim here that we have to choose between American prosperity and Chinese human rights. I say choose both. Vote "yes."

1445

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly to oppose this bill. It is a difficult bill. There is merit on both sides, but I want to tell my colleagues that I oppose passing this trade agreement before we get our fundamental values in place.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most difficult votes I will take, but I must rise in opposition to permanent normal trade relations for China. There are strong arguments on both sides of this issue. For some, PNTR will be a benefit. But, for many, too many, PNTR will be a burden. Clearly, certain sectors of the service industry will win by having access to China's 1.3 billion consumers. And, though not certain, I hope agriculture will win by selling our commodities. We have made some progress on the Blue Mold issue affecting North Carolina tobacco, but more progress needs to be made. In my congressional district, however, there will be too many losers.

Indeed, the results of the administration's own analysis have led some to project losses of more than 800,000 U.S. jobs with the granting of PNTR. Notwithstanding this vote, the United States and China will continue to be trading partners. But, there can be no free trade without freedom. More importantly, there can be no free trade without fair trade.

Before establishing a permanent arrangement with China, one that is not subject to annual review, we must insist on some fundamental conditions. We must end our trade imbalance; urge the Chinese to end its labor, human rights and religious abuses; force China to respect the environment and ensure that those at the bottom of America's economy benefit from the agreement comparable to those at the top. Vote against this bill.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who realizes that we cannot negotiate with people who randomly kill prisoners to harvest human organs for sale.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I support a trade regime that advances the living standards of Americans and that creates hope for the Chinese people; and that is why I oppose permanent normal trade relations with China. Because it says one more time that we are pushing ahead with trade agreements without any regard for environmental and labor standards, and without any regard for religious and political freedoms.

We never proceed on a trade agreement without protection for intellec-

tual property. All would concede the consequences for companies here and the rule of law there. I want to see trade bring new openness to China, new economic opportunities and the rise of freedom. But what has the experience of the past decade taught us? Look at their record. China has engaged in unfair trade practices, pirated intellectual property, participated in weapons proliferation, suppressed democracy, and acted with belligerence towards Taiwan; all this while Congress has provided most favored nation status.

Do we truly believe that by granting China permanent MFN and foregoing the yearly review that these abuses will somehow improve? Let us vote against this effort. Let us impose on China the opportunity for freedom, and if they cannot do that, they should forfeit the benefits that other nations enjoy.

Without granting permanent MFN to China, and without their membership in the World Trade Organization, our trade deficit with China has soared from \$2.8 billion in 1987 to \$68.7 billion in 1999. This is what happens when we are completely indifferent to standards abroad. This imbalance costs jobs in Connecticut and across the country. It hurts employers. I have listened to arguments that trade with China will bring change—that once China is open to American goods, they will also be open to American ideals of freedom. I want to see trade bring a new openness to China, new economic opportunities, and a rise of freedom. That's why I supported MFN for China during my first years in Congress. I believed that argument. But what has the experience of the past decade taught us. Let's look at China's record.

But, China has engaged in unfair trade practices, pirated intellectual property, participated in weapons proliferation, suppressed democracy, and acted with belligerence toward Taiwan. There is no evidence that China is responding and that it deserves a new trade regime with the United States. And all the while, this Congress has granted China Most Favored Nation Trading Status. Do we truly believe that by granting China permanent MFN, and forgoing a yearly review, that this record or abuses will somehow improve?

Right now, on labor standards and Democratic rights, China is surrounded by a Great Wall. It is holding back its people's hopes for democratic freedoms. It threatens to bring down economic standards here. This Congress should say to China clearly and unequivocally that China must break down this wall, truly open its markets, raise labor standards, and freedom, or China should forfeit their rights to the benefits that all nations enjoy.

Only by voting "no" will this great body ever again debate what standards should matter in our trade relations with China. Oppose permanent most favored nation status for China.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, if we want to send a message to the Chinese people, we might as well try to mail it in a letter because they will not hear it in the

sweatshops and the prisons. And the text of this bill does not do anything for them.

So if we want to send a message to the Chinese people, we should vote "no," and then we can really try to help them out.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of granting permanent normal trade relations, H.R. 4444, for the People's Republic of China.

I have long subscribed to Ronald Reagan's philosophy on dealing with adversaries: contain them militarily, engage them diplomatically and flood them with western goods and influences. I believe a similar combination will work on China.

Many Americans are rightly concerned about human rights; and religious and political freedom in China. However, rejecting normal trading practices with China will not improve freedom in China. In fact, it will plunge China further into isolation and reduce freedom.

Pat Robertson, with the Christian Broadcasting Network, and Rev. Richard Cizik, with the National Association of Evangelicals agree that engagement with China has and will continue to improve human rights in China.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help our American economy improve human rights in China. Vote "yes" on H.R. 4444.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending permanent normal trade relations status to China.

I have heard two arguments recently against granting China this trade status which I think deserve examination.

1. Critics say we should not grant PNTR status to China because we will lose leverage on all future trade agreements. This allegation represents a fundamental misunderstanding of the vast benefits this agreement offers America. PNTR status will allow the United States to establish reciprocal access to Chinese markets, for the first time. Passage of this bill will allow the United States to take advantage of the enormously favorable bilateral trade agreement negotiated with China for entry into the World Trade Organization. It should be noted that this is a one-way arrangement—China will dramatically reduce industrial and agricultural tariffs on American products while we change nothing about our trade laws. China will enter the World Trade Organization with or without Congressional approval of PNTR—but if we don't pass this legislation the consequences for American exporters will be devastating. 134 other countries will have access to the Chinese market on the very favorable terms that the United States negotiated, while we will be locked out. This is not a position of leverage—this is a position of extreme weakness.

Opposing PNTR effectively isolates the United States from this market.

2. Critics say this represents a benefit from shadowy special interests, but is not in overall American interests. Opponents who believe that we should turn our backs on one of the world's largest export markets do a disservice to export dependent jobs across the nation. International trade, considering all imports and exports, now constitutes 29 percent of the gross domestic product, up from 7 percent in 1950. In Washington State, our economy is even more dependent on trade, with foreign exports alone accounting for nearly 25 percent of the gross state product. Export-related jobs represented 31 percent of the total increase in jobs in the state over the last 30 years and these jobs pay 46 percent more than the overall state average. Who are these supposed shadowy special interests then? How about the semiconductor, computer and telecommunications industries, the backbone of the New American economy—their tariff rates will fall to zero—the workers in these sectors represent a valuable special interest. Pacific Northwest wheat farmers have not been able to sell to China for more than 20 years—the bilateral agreement will open this vast market for the first time. Tariffs on Washington apples will fall from 30 percent to 10 percent, making their products much more competitive—these farmers are a valuable special interest.

This is a good agreement, and is in the interests of all Americans and all trade interests.

Aside from its importance to the agricultural community of eastern Washington, this measure is critically important to the enormous number of aerospace workers throughout our state. Over the last few months, I have been in contact with the presidents of union locals who asked my support for PNTR because it would help U.S. aerospace workers. Last week, I was visited by a delegation of union presidents who represent a national coalition of unions who are supporting this measure. They are committed to human rights and environmental protection but they are also committed to expanding the rank and file membership in their unions through expanded trade with China.

I believe Members should recognize this diversity of opinion within the labor movement. While some AFL-CIO unions are offering serious opposition to PNTR, the largest locals in my State have endorsed PNTR. The International Association of Machinists, and the Society of Professional Engineering Employees in Aerospace, both AFL-CIO affiliates, have endorsed this legislation. I would hope that Members of this body would hear the pleas of local unions that are trying to preserve their jobs and not lose access to future markets.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS).

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago I delivered the commencement address at my alma mater, Oklahoma State University. I entitled that speech "International Trade: Opportunity or Destruction. Which Way America?"

As I stand before my colleagues today, we are going to answer that question. We build economic opportunities for our children and grandchildren; and provide opportunities to ex-

port American values for freedom of religion, speech, and human rights to China. I want to emphasize five facts: One, we are in a global competitive world, and we are not going back. Two, 134 countries of the WTO have already approved permanent trading relationships with China. We are the only country that is lingering behind. Three, China can already enter the United States markets. That is why we have an \$80 billion trade imbalance. Four, this agreement will allow us—the USA—to enter China's market of 1.3 billion people and will let us have the opportunity also to market the values that we believe in: freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, and, yes, human rights. Fact five: I am a grandfather. I could step back and say, "Why should I care? This is not going to affect me." But, my colleagues, are we going to give our children and our grandchildren the tools of opportunity to compete in this global economy or place them in an unfair position to maintain America's leadership in the world. I stand in support of this legislation. We must give our children and grandchildren the tools to compete in this world.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention some of the points today about which I think there is not nearly as much disagreement as we have had on others.

The first is I think it is perfectly clear that we have to engage China in commerce. These are the ties that bind. This is a country with a population in excess of 1.2 billion people and growing.

I think it is terribly important to point out that the Taiwanese, who have been under as much risk as anyone in the world with China's behavior, strongly support the adoption of this bill and view it as a very important step towards achieving a more peaceful resolution of their differences over the next decade.

I think it is fair to say that there is no question that the concessions the United States has extracted to further access to China are very, very strong. In Florida, my home State, there will be significant reductions in tariffs on orange juice, grapefruit concentrate, and fertilizer. And the fertilizer industry will begin to privatize over time in China.

Who will benefit under this agreement? In 1997, 82 percent of the exporters to China were small and medium-sized businesses. In my State, Florida, in 1997, 52 percent of the exporters to China were small businesses, businesses with 100 employees or less.

We are bringing China into the rule of law. One of the things that separates those that oppose this bill from those that support it is how quickly can we do that. It will take time to change attitudes, to change systems. And make no mistake about it, we will have to fight like the dickens to enforce these rules.

Finally, in closing, we need to respect and address the concerns that have been raised in opposition to this

bill, and I believe the Bereuter-Levin proposal will do that and would strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to granting of a permanent normal trade relationship with China.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the story of two workers: one in Liaoyang in Northeast China and one in the 7th District in Chicago, Illinois.

They have never met. They probably never will meet.

But their fates are tied together as if they were family members . . . and their fates meet here, today on the floor of the House.

The workers at the Liaoyang Ferro-alloy Factory, the fourth largest in the city, employing 5,000 workers began huge demonstrations on May 18.

Even though the workers only earn what would be considered here starvation wages, they had not been paid in two years. The union had done nothing for them.

Because the world was watching and this vote was pending local officials could not crush the demonstrations as they did with 20,000 Yanjiazhan mine workers in a nearby city earlier this year.

As a result the factory agreed to pay back wages.

In the 7th District of Illinois on Chicago's Westside there is a mini renaissance of manufacturing. Some of it is the result of the Chicago Manufacturing Center which has offices in the same building as my district office. They are struggling to bring manufacturing back to the inner city . . . such as a plant to make awnings.

These struggling new small businesses, the engine of job creation today, and their workers are about to be thrown into unfair competition with factories in China like the one I just spoke of.

According to the U.S. Trade Representative's own model, over the next ten years, this bill will create 276,221 jobs, but it will result in the loss of 1,148,313 jobs.

A net loss of 872,091 desperately needed U.S. jobs.

Those job losses will occur in every state and in every sector of the economy including agriculture. That's with, the job losses will occur in my state and they will occur in every state of this great union.

If all you care about is making our economy grow then you must vote against PNTR for China. Don't throw these working families into the unemployment line.

Despite the "dot Com" hype, it is the consumer spending of working families which is sustaining our economy.

If you care at all about real people, if the quality of life of our people, and the people of China matter at all to you. Then you must also vote against PNTR for China.

More than 2000 years ago the ancient Greeks taught us the fate of those who were seduced by the alluring voices and false promises of the Sirens.

Mr. Speaker, let us not be seduced by the Sirens of the 21st century, who sing of globalism as an end in itself, and who abandon our people for sweet promises.

Let us steer for our North Star, our goal of a fair economy, a level playing field . . . that's the road to global prosperity. Vote "no" on Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), who understands that granting PNTR would allow China to continue to regularly threaten the Democratic Nation of Taiwan and the U.S. with military attack.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this vote defines what kind of a Nation we want to be. There is no doubt that business will make a lot of money if this bill passes; but are we only for the almighty dollar, or are we for morality and doing what is right? The almighty dollar or human rights? The almighty dollar or American jobs? The almighty dollar or environmental concerns?

Why can we not continue our annual review of China instead of giving them a permanent blank check? It is the only leverage we have. Is it only the almighty dollar that counts? Shame on us if it is true. Vote "no."

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

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, I have supported Most Favored Nation status for China. I have expressed my concerns about human rights in trips to China, in speeches before the National Defense University of the PLA, and at Fudan University in Shanghai. I have talked about my concerns about Taiwan. But I do believe that engagement is more productive than isolation.

This year I have been undecided up until this very moment. I have been undecided, Mr. Speaker, because of our national security, and I want to talk to that issue for a few moments.

I was a member of the Cox committee. For 7 months, I sat behind closed doors and looked at the evidence that the FBI and the CIA had relative to the acquiring of technology from America, some of our most sensitive technology. The fact that China acquired over 500 HPCs, high performance computers, when in 1995 they had none and in 3 years they had over 500. I have looked at the transfer of missile technology, which has not just helped the Chinese but also been transferred to North Korea. I looked at the fact that China was able to use our weapons design for our nuclear warheads, which has now benefited their nuclear warhead program. The access to telecommunications technology, satellite launching technology which can also be used from Irving nuclear missiles. And I looked at China acquiring encryption.

But, Mr. Speaker, through it all, when all was said and done, I looked at the fact that China was a willing buyer, but up until 5 years ago we were not a willing seller. It was not China

stealing America's technology; it was a wholesale auctioning of our most sensitive technology by this White House. In every single case, the evidence points to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, where this President and this Vice President auctioned off America's national security. And we cannot use this debate to blame the Chinese people. We should not use this debate to say China stole our technology.

In spite of President Clinton, I will vote for MFN, and hope that a new administration will take a different tact in terms of America's national security.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), who worked so hard on this piece of legislation.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of passage of PNTR and also rise to commend President Clinton and the administration for their terrific effort to negotiate an agreement that is good for U.S. workers, that is good for U.S. businesses, and that is good for U.S. farmers.

It is such a wonderful deal because this is one of the few agreements that we have ever had the chance to vote on where the United States gave up nothing. We did not reduce a tariff, we did not reduce a quota, and in return we got significant across-the-board reductions in tariffs and increased market access, which is going to increase the influence that the United States has on the internal affairs of China.

That is important, because many of us are very concerned about the progress on human rights and religious freedoms in China. But it is inconceivable that we are going to have more influence in seeing progress in those areas by adopting a policy which further isolates the United States from the affairs in China. We are going to do more to empower the Chinese citizens to make progress in their efforts to advance democracy, in their efforts to advance greater personal freedoms by extending the hand of economic cooperation.

This policy of economic engagement is one which is going to ensure that China becomes a part of the body of nations that do comply with the rules of law. It is going to also be an instrument that is going to ensure that with additional U.S. investment and additional U.S. trade that we will see an accelerated enhancement of the per capita GDP and the standard of living in China that will also result in greater benefits and progress on human rights as well as labor and environmental conditions.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who understands that ADM may have to change its slogan to "Supermarket to a More Polluted World" if in fact this awful resolution passes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strongest opposition to permanent trade privileges for China.

Trade does not bring freedom. Only enforceable laws in democratic republics bring freedom. Trade does not bring peace. Before World War II, the largest trading relationship in the world was not Nazi Germany's with England. Did that stop totalitarianism's rise? Trade does not build a middle class. Only laws governing workers' rights to organize undergird the rise of a strong middle class with good wages and benefits.

This is not a fight about expanding America's export markets. This is a fight about China becoming a vast export platform 12 times the size of Mexico's, taking our markets in Asia's rim and sending a glut of sweatshop and agricultural commodities back here to our shores.

This is a heroic fight for democratic values in the harsh countryside and in the industrial sweatshops in China, in places most Americans, including this Congress, will never visit. Will we side with the chauffeured limousine class, advertisers, retailers, and global companies that soothingly tell us "everything will be all right," or will we stand with the freedom fighters in China and throughout the world?

For those fighting permanent privileges for China on the basis of democratic values. I say, hurray.

1500

For those courageous people in Taiwan standing tall for sovereignty and self-determination, indeed for nationhood, I say, keep the flame of liberty burning. For those fighting permanent privileges for China on the basis of religious freedom, I say, God bless you. For those fighting for one-half billion working women and girls in China be afforded dignity and respect, I say, if not with this vote, then when?

For those fighting permanent trade privileges for China on the basis of freedom of assembly, whether it is for the Falun Gong or for the murdered freedom fighters in Tiananmen Square, I say, keep standing tall in liberty's cause. Happy Memorial Day. Vote "no" on permanent trade relations with China.

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this most important trade agreement. Failure by this Congress to extend PNTR would squander a decade and a half of negotiations, invite the unraveling of China's extensive WTO commitments, and punish American businesses and farmers by shutting them out of the world's biggest emerging market for the foreseeable future.

The best way to encourage the type of behavior we desire is through policies that promote the rule of law, free trade, economic reform, and democratization. For these are the seeds from which democracy can grow.

Therefore, I believe we should continue to pursue our historic and long-

standing policy of engagement rather than containment. Vote for this legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I would actually like to take my time here to have a colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

I think that one of the things that strengthens this proposal over any of the other trade agreements that we have really has come through the work of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER). And so I would like to enter into a colloquy for the purposes of showing the American people and our friends in labor that there are some real strengths in this that are necessary for this debate to move on.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) is what tools will the Commission have at its disposal to press for better enforcement of human rights and worker rights in China?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. THURMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for asking about this commission that is now part of this legislation.

This is a unique commission, high level, executive, and congressional. There will be 18 Members of Congress. There will be five members, high level from the executive. So it will be monitoring human rights, the rule of law, full-time staff, every day, every month, not just one time a year. It is going to be required to report to us every year.

This commission will be empowered to make recommendations to this Congress, recommendations for action by the Congress or by the President. Its recommendations could include actions by the United States Representative to IMF or to the World Bank or legislation and recommendations regarding legislation that controls the sensitive exports.

Let me also say this commission is modeled after the Helsinki Commission. It was successful. A number of us worked with it when it was impacting rights in the Soviet Union. It was a constant pressure point, as this commission will be. It will add external pressure to the internal pressures.

There have been reports in recent days in the paper of dissidents in China, and here is what they say: A broad array of dissidents, environmentalists, and labor activists in China appear united in their support of Congressional passage of the permanent normal trade relations act with this commission and that this combines external pressure with internal.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I say to the gen-

tleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) quickly because I would also like the gentleman to talk a little bit about the antisurge provision because I think this is, too, stemming from the NAFTA. I would also like the gentleman to talk a little bit about the staff in China.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, quickly, the permanent staff can be stationed here. It can be stationed in China.

Let me say a word about the surge provision, the toughest antisurge provision in American law. If there is an inflow of products from China that would hurt American workers and producers, workers and producers can file a complaint, swift action with the standard of causation, which will allow us to act if there is this surge.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) understands that the average Chinese worker earns 108 bucks a year, hardly enough if they spent every nickel they earned every year in the United States to make a dent in our \$80 billion trade deficit with China.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, even as we talk on the floor, the Chinese are planning not to comply with any of this. They say already that they have a cautious, go-slow approach, otherwise they will risk widespread unrest that could undermine their rule. They are not going to comply with WTO's 5-year rule. They say they will do everything they can to shelter their industries, and that is no surprise to us.

Yesterday, on the floor, a colleague told me about a General Motors plant closing down in his district in Flint, and the last act that those workers had to do was to undo that piece of machinery and crate it up to be shipped over to its new homes and its new workers; and then General Motors had the effrontery to classify that as an export.

Do we want to see that happen to all the jobs in this country? We want to trade with China, and we will trade with China. But would it not be wonderful if, for one chance in our life, that this would be absolutely fair trade?

We are not going to be selling any goods over there. Everything is going to be manufactured there, as other colleagues have said before, and brought right back here at one-twentieth of the cost manufactured here, but it will be sold here at the maximum they could get.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that Members understand that

there is a profound difference between the Helsinki Commission, which I chair, which was formed back in 1976 to implement the Helsinki Final Act to which the USSR and the Warsaw Pact nations and others were a party to. They signed on the dotted line.

The commission that is contemplated in this legislation is a watchdog commission. It is like any other commission that might be formed, but there is no participation by China or any of the other countries in Asia, so there is a major difference. So I would hope we would no longer somehow compare it to the Helsinki Commission. There is no real comparison between the two.

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I think at this time it might help to share with us the remaining time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) has 9¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) has 14½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 21 minutes remaining.

Let me just repeat that we intend in the closing part of the debate to begin with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), then to go to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), then to go to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and then finish up with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

Mr. RANGEL. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that that order will be after a quorum call?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. RANGEL. So that it could very well be that we will have to have some speakers that have large amounts of time before that quorum call to call on several of their speakers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Correct.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to recognize the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), for their leadership on this matter.

I rise in support of permanent normal trade relations with China. If Congress does not grant permanent normal trade relations to China, it will be the worst economic mistake this country has made since the Great Depression.

Without a doubt, this agreement is good from an economic standpoint, from a human rights standpoint, from a national security standpoint. Nearly every industry in the United States will see a direct benefit from tariff reductions on American goods going into China.

Agriculture, financial services, insurance, telecommunications, information

and technology, and a host of other industries will directly benefit from this agreement. Jobs will also be created to meet the growing demand for products in China.

American agriculture will benefit as much as anyone. More rice, wheat, cotton, soybeans, poultry, pork, beef and a host of other products will be sent to China directly from Arkansas and other States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), who lives next to the area where a civil action was written, understands that passage of PNTR will lead the U.S. corporations doing business in China simply to be able to continue to avoid stringent environmental regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, a vote for permanent normal trade relations with China gives up favorable United States Trade Agreement enforcement rights, it relinquishes forever any ability to use as leverage our existing periodic review process to, at least, try to effect universally acknowledged violations of human rights, including worker rights, religious intolerance, the spreading of technological and other information for dangerous weaponry, environmental degradation, and a long history of noncompliance with virtually every bilateral agreement negotiated between the United States and China in recent generations.

It does so despite the fact that it will have an adverse effect on the jobs of many who are the least prepared to deal with such a loss, and that is mostly because we have failed in advance of expanding ever-open market initiatives, to put in place effective transition assistance and worker training and re-training and health care for those who are unable to afford it through the unexpected job loss. And all of this is done unnecessarily.

Contrary to those who misinform us with claims that granting PNTR to China benefits the United States, that is inaccurate. And it is not accurate, as inferred and misstated, that in failing to give PNTR to China, we would give a benefit to the European Union that we would not get in the United States. Legal analysis shows otherwise.

In fact, if China, in acceding to the WTO, grants market-opening concessions to WTO members other than the United States, then existing bilateral trade agreements between China and the United States require that China grant those same concessions to the United States, even if Congress does not grant PNTR to China.

Sound legal analysis of the controlling bilateral trade documents since 1979 show this to be true. Further, the bilateral agreements be-

tween China and the United States have far superior mechanisms for enforcing trade agreement violations than has the so far grossly slow and relatively ineffectual WTO Claims process. The need to retain our advantage of enforcement and to forego being constrained only to the WTO process is extremely important given China's history of noncompliance. In fact, it was the United States' ability to use the so-called 301 Sanctions, as allowed in the bilateral agreements between the countries that finally forced China's compliance with the 1992 Trade Agreements on Intellectual Property.

There is reason to be concerned that Chinese officials are already backing away from the 1999 U.S.-China Bilateral Agreement, which is the basis for the request for PNTR. Consider just two of several statements by Chinese negotiators and/or authoritative sources:

On wheat, where the Administration Summary of the United States-China WTO Agreement, February 15, 2000, says "China will import all types of U.S. wheat from all regions of the United States to all ports in China . . .," China's chief WTO negotiator was quoted in the South China Morning Post on January 7, 2000, as saying: "It is a complete misunderstanding to expect this grain to enter the country . . . Beijing only conceded a theoretical opportunity for the export of grain."

The USTR fact sheet states: "China will allow 49% foreign investment in all services, it will allow 50% foreign ownership for value-added in two years and paging services in three years. In contradiction, AFX-ASIA, November 22, 1999, asserts: ". . . foreign companies will be allowed to acquire the 25% stakes in operators of local commerce, long distance and international calls, and the maximum permitted foreign stake in telecom operators will be raised to 49% six years after WTO entry, the official in the ministry's [China's Ministry of Information Industry] policy and regulation department said."

The list goes on and on, but it should be noted that the United States Trade Representative has publicly stated that major differences remain on the "commitments on a wide range of WTO rules including subsidies, technical standards, a mechanism to review implementation and many other issues."

This is not an argument over trade or no trade. Despite attempts by some to paint those who would vote "no" on PNTR as isolationists, I—and most other objecting parties—support trade, and support trade with China. We have \$80 billion of trade with China now as well as a trade imbalance (in China's favor and not in our interests) of \$70 billion per year. No one proposes ending trade with China. What is opposed is the expansion of trade privileges to China without retaining the ability to enforce effective compliance with those trade agreements. Furthermore, there is opposition to surrendering what appears to be a final opportunity to inject into multi-lateral trade agreements protection for workers, for the environment, for human rights and against religious intolerance. It is a chance to retain some leverage against China's long standing conduct of making weapons of mass destruction or related technology and/or information available to nations such as Pakistan and Iran, all very much against our national security.

That other countries in the WTO have poor records in some of these areas also, is not

sufficient reason to forego the annual opportunity to raise these issues with China. The WTO is itself flawed by the absence of mechanisms to review individual members' compliance with reasonable international standards in these areas. While no one contends that every country must meet the exact standards set by the United States or any other nation, there certainly are recognizable thresholds of conduct (child labor, the right to associate, the right to believe in one's religion) that should and could be negotiated and incorporated in trade agreements.

We would be remiss to add a country as large as China, with such an atrocious record, without first seeking to correct deficiencies in the WTO. At the very least, if such a country is to be allowed to join WTO, some review of its conduct in complying with international norms or evidence of improvement in these areas over time, should be required.

My colleagues DAVID OBEY and BARNEY FRANK have made several good points in recent presentations on the issue. "As trade between highly developed, high wage countries, and under developed low wage countries has become a larger and larger share of the mix, negative side effects have appeared in high wage countries like ours. A downward pressure on wages because of that expanded trade between very unlike economies has reinforced other economic trends and policy actions, producing an ever widening income gap between those that invest and those that work. A rising tide no longer lifts all boats. In fact, the ability of those with large amounts of capital to pay any price necessary for what they want has, in the global economy and local neighborhood alike, driven some costs far above what can be afforded by those whose boats are anchored to low wages. That has happened with the price of housing. It has happened with the price of education—especially at private institutions. It has happened with the price of medical care."

"Downward pressure on wages in economies like our own have been accompanied by greater incentives to minimize environmental costs that go into any product because we are told these products are in competition with products produced in countries with much less concern for either well-paid workers or well-protected environments. This has made it more difficult to protect gains that industrial countries have made in raising workers' living standards or cleaning up the environments in which they live.

There is no question that in macro economic terms, totally open trade can produce more goods at lower costs worldwide. And normally that would be a blessing.

But when that becomes the only goal, or at times the only result, it carries a high price for those who do not possess large amounts of capital because their wages cease to rise. And the communities they live in come under pressure to allow corporations to do less and less to clean up pollution, all in the name of remaining globally competitive in a world where there are almost no restraints on the movement of the power of capital and ever increasing restraints in the power of everything and everyone else—governments, consumers, and labor."

No one expects equal income for all people. The need for society to have risk takers who can amass wealth for investment to produce economic growth for everyone is bound to

produce inequality. "But as Pope John Paul once observed, there are certain "norms of decency" that must be respected in order to produce economic justice and the social cohesion that is necessary for any economic system to function." The last decades have produced just the opposite—the widest gap between the wealthiest one percent of our people and the least wealthy twenty percent—at any time since the birth of the twentieth century.

Since new globalized trading realities have helped produce the problem, they must also be part of the effort to fix it. Trade agreements are an appropriate place to address such issues. While Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, asserts that we must not allow our "inability" to help workers who are being injured to reduce our support for open trade, I believe BARNEY FRANK has it more accurate when he says, "The problem we face is not inability, but unwillingness to do so."

It is appropriate to set new trading rules, new sets of power relationships, and wider representation of interest at the negotiating table. Congress should have a commitment, as should society, to greater educational opportunity and training opportunities for workers and children in working class families. It should have a greater commitment to health care for every person regardless of financial circumstances, especially those of families of workers whose corporate employers are being squeezed by the pressures of globalization to shrink the safety net businesses used to provide.

In essence, this vote is about doing all the right things before and not after we give away our leverage to obtain them.

The real shame of this debate is that few people understand that we can, in effect, retain our leverage to enforce the values in which we believe and continue to trade. A more honest debate with less demagoging and less misinformation—as well as a willingness by those who stand to gain a tremendous amount economically to acknowledge and not dismiss the concerns of others—could have resulted in Congressional action that would have protected all Americans.

The American public will not be pleased when analysis shows that Congress has unnecessarily voted to surrender the U.S. capacity to best enforce its interests. It will be all the more unhappy when it hears that Congress did so while also giving away our only leverage to protect fundamental individual rights of autonomy and association, and to safe guard distributive justice and social well being of a sort that cannot be measured by maximization of corporate shareholders returns or aggregate monetary wealth.

I ask for a vote against this, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there may be a motion to recommit that involves what would happen if there was armed conflict between China and Taiwan.

In my judgment, if this motion were approved, language would be attached

to the bill requiring the United States to withdraw PNTR from China in the event of a Chinese attack on or blockade of Taiwan. This language is in direct violation of GATT Article I which requires that all WTO members grant each other "any advantage, favor, privilege, or immunity" provided to other countries "immediately and unconditionally." And this would, in fact, be a condition.

A condition like the one included in the motion to recommit is discriminatory and disadvantageous, violating this fundamental WTO principle. If it is adopted, we will lose the full benefits to America's farmers and workers of the strong rules-based and enforceable market opening agreement we negotiated in November.

Let me assure my colleagues that even without the approval of the motion to recommit, the United States and the Congress retain the authority to take whatever actions we deem appropriate to address our national security concerns in the event of a blockade or attack on Taiwan.

Article 21 of the GATT agreement states that nothing in the agreement "shall be construed . . . to prevent any contracting party from taking any action which it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests . . . taken in time of war or other emergency in international relations."

This provision has enabled the United States to conduct embargoes against Czechoslovakia in 1949, Nicaragua in 1985, and the embargo we have maintained against Cuba since 1962. All of these nations were WTO members at the time, and in each case the United States's position was upheld.

Though this motion seeks to protect Taiwan, I would argue that it will do just the opposite. Approving this motion will send a dire message to the Chinese that no longer is the United States interested in working with China openly, no longer do we seek to change China by bringing it into the greater community of nations and exposing it to the rule of law. Rather, we will be starting down the road of isolating China from the world and encouraging mistrust and conflict. If this latter course of action is taken, I firmly believe that Taiwan will be put at risk.

Indeed, the Taiwanese Government is the first to point out these points in its support of Chinese accession to the WTO and its support of our extension of PNTR for China.

If my colleagues are truly concerned about the welfare of Taiwan, I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to recommit and to vote for the bill.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as one who has consistently

voted against normal trading relations for the People's Republic of China. Today, however, I will vote for PNTR because I believe the facts have dramatically changed. Our deep disagreement today is not on the ends that American policy seeks to achieve, adherence to human rights and worker rights by all nations. Our difference is on the means to achieve those ends.

Contrary to what critics say, PNTR provides no blank check for China. In fact, China has agreed to make historic trade concessions that it has never agreed to before, opening its markets, slashing its tariffs, and agreeing to abide by the global trading system based on the rule of law. If they renege, so can we. In contrast, our annual votes never required China to make any concessions whatsoever. Still, China has received NTR status year after year after year. At best, our annual votes on NTR had a minimal effect in mitigating repression and human rights in China. As the current ranking member and for a decade chairman of the Helsinki Commission which monitors and advocates human rights, I believe that the Levin-Bereuter proposal is an important contribution to this bill. The bipartisan proposal would establish a congressional executive commission on China. As our experience with the Helsinki Commission indicates, a China commission will be a more effective mechanism for maintaining pressure on China on human rights, worker rights, and rule of law issues than our brief annual reviews.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by noting that this vote also is critical, in my opinion, for our core national security interests, which include the stability of China and Asia in general, and the peaceful resolution of differences between the PRC and Taiwan. That is why our allies in the region support PNTR and China's accession to the WTO. Engaging China through trade and the WTO enhances, in my opinion, the possibility for dialogue on other security interests from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to global climate change.

Mr. Speaker, as the most powerful Nation on Earth, we have a responsibility to engage China, the most populous nation on Earth and move it, if we can, toward democratic reform, market economics, the rule of law, and respect for basic human rights. As President Kennedy stated in 1962, "Economic isolation and political leadership are wholly incompatible. The United States has encouraged sweeping changes in free world economic patterns in order to strengthen the forces of freedom." These words still ring true today. Let us seize this opportunity for a more stable and safer 21st century.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the permanent normal trade relations with China. Today's Detroit News quotes a business executive's position on China, and I quote: "We're not interested in China per se but free trade." This executive said it all. Proponents are not interested in fair trade but free trade, where the United States once again freely negotiates away our markets, our jobs, our values, our ideals and our beliefs.

In 1993, I raised the issue that these free trade agreements would jeopardize the natural resources of our country and of our Great Lakes water. I was ridiculed. But now we know that I was correct. Under these free trade agreements, despite assurances and side agreements, our sovereignty over our own natural resources are at risk. The Nova Group's proposal to ship Lake Superior water demonstrates the economic feasibility to ship Great Lakes water to China. This is the first drop in a flood of attacks that will come on our Nation's natural resources and our own sovereignty, all in the name of free trade.

As a country, as elected representatives, as Americans, we stand for principles, values and beliefs that are not free but fair. Do not freely give away our natural resources, our sovereignty and our American beliefs and ideals. Vote no on permanent normal trade relations with China.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China.

Today's Detroit News quotes a business executive's position on China, and I quote: "We're not interested in China per se, but free trade." This executive said it all! Proponents are not interested in fair trade, but free trade, where the United States once again freely negotiates away our markets, our jobs, our values, our ideals, and our beliefs.

A year ago, over 200 Members of this House joined to stop the illegal steel dumping by China and others in our market. China freely dumped steel while negotiating this deal. Miners in my district and steelworkers all across this nation were laid off because of illegal dumping of steel by China.

In the 90's, the U.S. negotiated four major trade agreements with China, from beef to auto parts, each violated with impunity—no remedy and no sanctions. More "free" trade.

Is it no wonder our trade deficit continues to soar each month? China is now the second largest contributor to our trade deficit which now stands at \$70 billion per year. This year China will surpass Japan as our largest trade deficit partner. More "free" give away trade!

In 1993, I raised the issue that these "free" trade agreements would jeopardize our natural resources such as Great Lakes water. I was ridiculed, but now we know I was correct. Under these "free" trade agreements, despite assurances and side agreements, our sovereignty over our own natural resources are at risk. The Nova Group's proposal to ship Lake Superior water demonstrates the economic feasibility to ship Great Lakes water to China, and this is the first drop in a flood of attacks that will come at our nation's natural resources and our own sovereignty, all in the name of free trade. As the business executive said,

"We're not interested in China per se—but free trade."

We, as Members of this House, must be interested in China, its people, our people, our constituents, our American ideas, and our American values and we should only freely export ideals, principles, and our American values such as: families should be allowed to freely have children—not forced abortions and sterilizations; products and goods produced should be produced with pride and ingenuity—not by prisoner and child labor; freedom to assemble, organize and question your government—not crushing ideals of freedom, hope, justice, and religious freedom with tanks in Tiananmen Square.

As a country, as elected representatives, as Americans, we stand for principles, values, and beliefs that are not free but fair. Do not freely give away our natural resources, our sovereignty, our American beliefs and ideals. Vote "no" on Permanent Normal Relations with China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the African Growth and Opportunity Act and CBI because those regions of the world had never had an opportunity to have a trade agreement with our country. But today I rise in opposition to permanent normalization of trade with China. I have said that PNTR should stand for perpetrating a notion of trade reform. Perpetrating a notion that China will change, perpetrating a notion that environmental conditions will improve, perpetrating a notion that we will be more secure, and perpetrating a notion that human rights will improve.

Let us trade with China, but let us not fool ourselves. Let us not reward China for noncompliance. I tell my son Mervyn, who is 17, You do right, I will help you. You do wrong, you will get nothing from me. That is what we should tell China: You do right, we will trade with you. You do not, we will not.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the average American in 1998 made a nickel less in real terms for 1 hour's worth of labor than they made 18 years before that in 1980. What we are engaged in today is a race to the bottom, a race to pay the lowest wage, a race to give the least benefits, a race to not have a safe workplace, a race to not have to worry about the environment. The Chinese Government said that we will reform. My position in opposition to this bill is they should reform, and then we should revisit the issue. We owe this generation and the next generation of American workers hope in their economic future. We do not give that to them today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise first to express my strong opposition to granting China Permanent Normal Trade Relations. Until China reforms its worker rights and establishes environmental standards, approval of their status is simply another stop in the race to the bottom of the economic barrel. Secondly, as I listen to my colleagues rise in support of this bill or, conversely, to voice their opposition, I cannot help but think that we must focus our attention on the broader trade policy goals of the United States.

This week's vote on PNTR deals with only one of the two pillars that the world trading system is built upon—open markets. While this is a very important objective, we must place equal value on the second pillar—rules against unfair trade. We all know what happens if we continue to strengthen just one half of any foundation, while ignoring the other half. Eventually the entire structure will come crashing to the ground. The international trading system is no different. As we talk this week about opening up the world's largest market, let us not forget about the importance of enforcing the rules of fair trade.

The United States and the World Trade Organization (WTO) are not committed to free trade. However, free trade must also be fair trade. That is why there are internationally established rules, and U.S. laws consistent with these rules, which serve to protect domestic industries from being wiped out by unfair foreign trade practices. Unfortunately, these rules against unfair trade are only as good as the bodies that enforce them, and our own International Trade Commission (USITC), in particular, has decidedly chosen to ignore its mandate to uphold the laws.

In recent cases, the USITC has denied relief to American industries injured by unfairly traded goods. In fact, the current USITC Commissioners individually have voted in favor of U.S. industries less than half the time in investigations and contested sunset reviews, even after the U.S. Department of Commerce has found that U.S. industries have been victimized by massive foreign dumping.

Understanding that these industries that are losing before the USITC are not merely crying wolf. Because of the enormous industry-wide commitment that is required to bring an anti-dumping or countervailing duty case, only the most dire cases ever come before the ITC. These are industries that have been bloodied and battered by lengthy assaults from foreign industries, and have turned to the U.S. government and its supposed policy of zero tolerance for unfair trade as their last resort. Until the USITC reverses its record, or its responsibilities are assumed by another agency, I believe its policy toward American trade laws should be made known.

Although the American steel industry is not the only industry that has been victimized by decisions handed down by the ITC, it is one that I can speak of personally because it is such a vital industry to the people of my district. At the height of the recent steel crisis, the American steel industry and its workers filed several cold-rolled steel cases. The facts were simple: thousands of workers lost their jobs; five steel companies went bankrupt; operating profits turned to operating losses; and the U.S. Department of Commerce eventually found that twelve countries were dumping at substantial margins. Yet somehow the USITC determined that the domestic industry was not

injured by this illegal dumping. Perhaps, it is time for the USITC to reevaluate its understanding of the world "injury," because there are thousands of American steelworkers who have an entirely different understanding.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, today we are going to make an economic decision, but we are also making a moral decision. I believe that being an American means something. The thousands of men and women who have sacrificed their lives for this country did so out of reverence for its values, individual liberty, personal dignity, self-determination. When we encourage unrestricted trade with a nation like China, which disregards these values, we dishonor America's heroes. China uses child labor, slave labor, and allows abhorrent working conditions to flourish. It persecutes Christians, Buddhists and other religious people, threatening them with fines, imprisonment and even death. I believe our national honor depends on us standing with the persecuted in China, our own workers and against this trade deal for multinational corporations.

Mr. Speaker, granting China permanent normal trade relations is a mistake for our workers, our businesses and our democratic values.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, as I tried to make my case earlier that this trade agreement is just not in fundamental American interests, I would like to restate that argument very briefly. If we both, America and China, dropped our trade quotas, dropped our tariffs to zero, we would lose control over imports and China would not. China has a nonconvertible currency. They have a second level of control, because you cannot get the foreign currency to buy goods and bring it here.

We have heard many, many arguments today also about the salutary effect of business. When I was young, I believed in the Tooth Fairy, I believed in Santa Claus, and I believed that all these good things just came sort of naturally. Later on I figured out that my parents made deep, deep sacrifices and worked hard to put things on the table so that we could have things in our family. The problem here is that we would like to believe that trade will automatically change everything, that it has this wonderful transformative effect.

But the truth is that generations before us made deep, deep sacrifices. They knew that it was more than about business, that the business of America must be more than business alone. They made broad sacrifices. They did not see their business as business alone. They saw the business of America as pressing hard on a broad set of human values, of human rights, of civil liberties, of the rule of law. We must stand in that tradition today.

About 2,500 years ago, in a space not much larger than this, 300 Spartans stood tall against 100,000 Persians. With typical candor, our Republican friends have said that this vote would not be called a moment before there were 218 votes. We do not need 300 Spartans today to keep the forces of darkness back. We only need 217 others to stand in this space.

History is focused upon this Chamber. As Abraham Lincoln said in sending the Emancipation Proclamation forth, "Let our actions be judged by beneficent history and a just God." And if each and every one of you can say that you are willing to be judged by history and by God based on your actions today, then I will be comfortable with your actions. Do what is right. Do what is right today in this Chamber.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard today from many of our colleagues who say they recognize that human rights in China are deplorable. They recognize that the environment is damaged by China wantonly without regard to what it will do to future generations. We recognize that political prisoners are imprisoned every day and that human rights and religion are trod upon. Everybody says that that is going on in China. There is no disagreement. Some people have said, Let's have a commission. Well, if you have been like me and served on a children's commission and a Medicare commission and a Social Security commission, you know that in this town to create a commission is to prevent anything from happening. I dismiss the idea of the Levin-Bereuter commission as a fig leaf which will do nothing to change China's behavior.

But I would also like to suggest that the harm done to America may not be very great if the people who want most favored nation prevail; it is just who you are going to hurt and who you are going to help. Arguably those people pushing for most favored nation are trying to help General Electric and the huge corporations that are already the richest in history. And so if this passes, those corporations will all make two bits, 50 cents a share more in earnings. And that will help millions of Americans a few bucks here and a few bucks there, and it will probably help the CEOs of those corporations get another million or two in stock options.

Who is it going to hurt? I will tell you who it is going to hurt. It is going to hurt probably a couple of hundred thousand Americans real bad. It is going to hurt those people who are going to lose their jobs overnight. They are going to get hurt 30 or 40,000 bucks because they are going to be out of work. They may lose their homes; they may lose a chance for their children to go to college. But I do not suppose anybody cares about them because the truth is those people may lose their jobs in 10 years, anyway, through the growth of technology because they do not have the training to keep up.

1530

They are the people who still work with their hands in factories, they still have minimum skills, they do heavy lifting in warehouses. They are the people that we are running higgeldy-piggeldy to eliminate from the workforce because they belong to unions and cost us a lot in benefits.

So when you think about how you are going to vote, you can think about those families who may be looking for Hamburger Helper on the dinner table because Dad lost his job as a result of this, or you can think about the people who are already making millions of dollars in stock options and the people whose pensions are a little higher. If you are a Federal employee and in the C fund, your retirement is going to do a little better.

That is it. It is as simple as all that. The big corporations get helped big time, and a few of our middle-class Americans have their lives destroyed if you vote for this terrible, terrible giveaway of our leverage to make China do the right thing.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 5 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

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

Mr. Speaker, in March of 1941 our former colleague, Carl Anderson, a Representative from Minnesota, warned us about the danger of arming potential adversaries. He said then that the chances of war with Japan were 50-50, and, that if our fleet had to meet the Japanese fleet, we would meet a fleet which was built with American steel and fueled with American petroleum.

A few months later at Pearl Harbor, 21 American ships were destroyed, 300 planes were destroyed, and 5,000 Americans were killed and wounded by a Japanese fleet that was built with American steel and fueled with American petroleum.

Well, whichever side of this debate one is on, everyone here has to concede American dollars are arming Communist China today. Let us look at what they have done with the \$350 billion that they have amassed in trade surplus over the last 8 years. The Sovrenny class missile destroyers, straight from the Russians, designed for one purpose, to kill American aircraft carriers, were purchased with American trade dollars. The SU-27 fighter aircraft, high performance aircraft, capable of effective warfare against America's top line fighters, were purchased with American trade dollars. On top of that, kilo class submarines, AWACS aircraft, air-to-air refueling capability, sophisticated communications equipment, all purchased with American trade dollars, and compounding the danger, China's own sales to nations like Iraq, Iran, Libya, Syria and North Korea of components for weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, we have just left the bloodiest century in the history of the

world. In a way it is a century of triumph for America. The story of the 20th century is the story of a great Democrat President, FDR, who stood with Winston Churchill against Germany's Hitler. It is the story of a great Republican President, Ronald Reagan, who faced down the Soviet empire and disassembled Soviet Union.

But it is also a story of tragedy, because 617,000 Americans lie in cemeteries across this country and in the oceans of the world and the battlefields of the world as people who were killed in action saving the world for freedom in this last century.

Many of them fought in wars for which we were unprepared; that is a tragedy of the 20th century. But the greater tragedy, which could be the tragedy of the 21st century, could happen if this country, having fought and bled and sacrificed to dissolve the Soviet empire, through a massive infusion of cash produces, by our own hand, another military superpower, and if the cemeteries of this country one day hold the bodies of Americans in uniform killed with weapons purchased by American trade dollars. That will be the greatest tragedy of this new 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, let us avoid that tragedy. Vote no on PNTR.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation.

We have hammered out an agreement that safeguards the legitimate interests and concerns of Alabama's coke industry and assures the long term viability of that industry. This is not only a victory for the coke industry and its employees, but also for Alabama's coal industry which supplies the basic raw materials for the production of coke.

I was skeptical of this agreement at first because of my concerns about our national security and China's human rights violations. However, I am now persuaded by the support for this agreement by the Taiwanese government, dissidents within China, and reformers within their government that it is not only in our best interests, but will also encourage the likelihood of positive reform of their poor record on human rights and religious persecution.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), who has played so vitally important a role in this effort.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 decades we have observed incredible changes, the cause of freedom, both economic and political freedom, sweep across our globe. I recall very well 10 years ago this last October as the Berlin Wall was getting ready to come down, we heard a speech from the

first elected leader of South Korea, one of those countries which we maintained an economic tie with and brought about economic reform and political reform in. He said in his speech here, "The forces of freedom and liberty are eroding the foundations of closed societies. The efficiency of the market economy and the benefits of an open society have become undeniable. Now these universal ideals, symbolized by the United States of America, have begun to undermine the fortresses of repression."

I was struck with that speech that he gave a decade ago right here in this Chamber; and, Mr. Speaker, if we stand with the likes of Colin Powell, the Dalai Lama, Billy Graham, the former Presidents, and a wide range of leaders in China and dissidents who understand the power of opening this up, we will one day see the first elected leader from the People's Republic of China stand right here in this Chamber delivering a familiar, similar speech.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I encourage my colleagues to vote yes on what many have described as the most important vote of our careers.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a gentleman that has contributed so much to this debate.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my brother, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and especially, if I might, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

I want to comment briefly on some of the arguments here, for example, the job loss, the reference to 800,000, based, it is said, on an ITC report. But here is what the ITC says, that that briefing paper in several ways misrepresents the work and the findings of the ITC.

But China will become increasingly a competitor, and that is why we have an anti-surge provision, the strongest in American law.

It is also said China never has abided by a trade agreement. That is not true. They have abided in part in some. But it is going to be a special challenge to implement compliance by China, and that is why we have in our proposal additional resources and a provision for an annual review within the WTO sought by the U.S.

Human rights, the annual review has not been an effective mechanism. It was not used after Tianenman, and there is no strategy for its effective use in the future. We can do better. We can do better. The Helsinki Commission-type will help us. It will be up to us to make sure it will do better than that. That commission worked despite, not because of, the Soviet Union.

We should not isolate China, nor should we in the U.S. isolate ourselves

from pressing China to move in the right direction.

Passing PNTR will allow us to actively engage China and constructively confront it. Rejecting PNTR would likely lead to chaos in our relationship with China, making both active engagement and constructive confrontation far more difficult.

This debate is about difficult judgments about a huge country far away, and about immense pressures much closer to home. Democracy is about resolving competing and conflicting pressures. Taking these pressures fully into account, there are important occasions when we must rise above them. With leadership, a democracy can be more than the sum of particular pressures. Today the challenge before us in this House is to exercise such leadership. Today the challenge is before us. Let us meet that challenge.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his work on the commission.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, greed has rolled in like a bulldozer over all of the numerous logical reasons supporting the denial of a permanent trade agreement with China. The mega-profits to be realized by the corporate elite are so overwhelming that this juggernaut cannot be halted. What an irony it is that the larger part of the evil empire is now going to be a recipient of large-scale investments from the leader of capitalism in the free world.

This act will have tornado-like devastation on the employment of hundreds of thousands of ordinary men and women in this Nation. Workers on both sides of the world will be the victims of this agreement. Chinese laborers paid 25 cents per hour or less will fill the bank accounts of multinational corporations. American workers will be forced to struggle harder and work more hours as industrial and manufacturing jobs are moved to China. Only lower-paying service jobs or high-tech positions requiring a college education will be left on our shores.

Mr. Speaker, it is irresponsible to consider trade legislation like this without considering the consequences. We need to right now begin to prepare for all those workers that are going to be thrown out of work. I urge a no vote on this legislation.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who has been a leader for human rights, for dignity, and for fair trade with China for many years.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time so generously.

Mr. Speaker, today Congress is poised to take a vote which will define us as a Nation. We will decide whether we will uphold the principles upon which our great country was founded. We will decide if we will support the pillars of our foreign policy, promoting democratic values, stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, growing our economy by promoting our exports abroad, or if we will squander our leverage to please some in the business community who do not share our responsibility to the public interest.

In the public interest, I am pleased to join in opposition to this PNTR resolution. I am pleased to join the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the National Catholic Conference of Bishops, the International Campaign for Tibet, the China Democratic Party, the Sierra Club, and many other organizations committed to promoting human rights, fair trade, and protecting our environment.

In the course of the debate preceding today's vote, some have said that the annual review of China's trade status has not been useful. They failed to mention that conditioning MFN on improvements in China's trade, human rights and proliferation behavior has never become law. It is the Bush-Clinton policy which has prevailed every year and produced record deficits. This year it will be over \$85 billion in trade deficit with China, more people in prison for their political and religious beliefs than at any time since the cultural revolution, and an expansion in China's proliferation activities, from Pakistan, making South Asia a more dangerous place, to Iran, making the Persian Gulf a more dangerous place, to Libya, threatening stability in the Middle East, as well as threatening the security of Taiwan.

1545

Most recently, this Libyan sale was in March of the year 2000; this is current and ongoing. And despite the failure of this policy of turning back or conditioning MFN, now called NTR, on improvement in these areas, despite the Bush/Clinton failure, they are asking us to make it permanent. On top of all of that, there is little reason to believe that the Chinese will comply with this trade agreement.

They have violated every bilateral agreement with the U.S. that they have signed on trade. We must not let the Beijing regime dictate the terms of surrender of our annual review of the U.S./China relationship.

Mr. Speaker, China's trade surplus of \$85 billion for this year enables the Chinese Government to buy products, to buy political support and to buy silence from countries throughout the world. But we must not be silent, we must speak out for freedom, because it is in our national security interests to do so.

Democratic countries do not invade their neighbors. Democratic countries

respect the rule of law, facilitating, for one thing, trade. We must speak out for freedom, because it is the right thing to do and honors the sacrifice of our country's founders.

Before I close, I want to say, I think that this has been a very constructive debate. The Members have been very courteous to listen and to exchange ideas in a very, shall we say, spirited way. And I want to thank all of my colleagues for listening and to those who have listened, as we ponder our vote today, I want my colleagues to think of two questions. First of all, what credibility do we have as a country that is the leader of the free world to speak about freedom?

Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to ponder two questions; what credibility do we have as the leader of the free world to speak out against human rights abuses anywhere in the world if we will put deals ahead of ideals in China?

Finally, what does it profit a country if it gains the whole world and suffers the loss of its soul? I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair announces that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 7 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) has 4½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take advantage of this opportunity to commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are supportive of this effort that we are initiating here with Mainland China, one-fifth of the world's population. And I want to congratulate them for the support they gave us just 2 weeks ago, when 309 Members on a bipartisan basis supported my Africa bill and the Caribbean Basin bill, and we made an outreach to underdeveloped portions of the world in sub-Saharan Africa. And it is because of our belief that, based upon experience with the 48 countries there and the 700 million population, that kind of an outreach has a positive effect and it does raise the standards, the human rights issues are addressed when we have this kind of contact.

While we have more ways to go with some of the other sub-Saharan African countries, and we do with China, too, this is a positive initiative working in the right direction, and I think everyone who supports it should be commended.

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

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

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 226]

Abercrombie Cummings Hobson
 Ackerman Cunningham Hoeffel
 Aderholt Danner Hoekstra
 Allen Davis (FL) Holden
 Andrews Davis (IL) Holt
 Arney Davis (VA) Hooley
 Baca Deal Horn
 Bachus DeFazio Hostettler
 Baird DeGette Houghton
 Baker Delahunt Hoyer
 Baldacci DeLauro Hulshof
 Baldwin DeLay Hunter
 Ballenger DeMint Hutchinson
 Barcia Deutsch Hyde
 Barr Diaz-Balart Insole
 Barrett (NE) Dickey Isakson
 Barrett (WI) Dicks Jackson (IL)
 Bartlett Dingell Jackson-Lee
 Barton Dixon (TX)
 Bass Doggett Jefferson
 Bateman Dooley Jenkins
 Becerra Doolittle John
 Bentsen Doyle Johnson (CT)
 Bereuter Dreier Johnson, E. B.
 Berkley Duncan Johnson, Sam
 Berry Dunn Jones (NC)
 Biggert Edwards Jones (OH)
 Bilbray Ehlers Kanjorski
 Bilirakis Ehrlich Kaptur
 Bishop Emerson Kelly
 Blagojevich Engel Kennedy
 Bliley English Kildee
 Blumenuaer Eshoo Kilpatrick
 Boehlert Etheridge Kind (WI)
 Boehner Evans King (NY)
 Bonilla Everrett Kingston
 Bonior Ewing Kleczka
 Bono Farr Klink
 Borski Fattah Knollenberg
 Boswell Filner Kolbe
 Boucher Fletcher Kucinich
 Boyd Foley Kuykendall
 Brady (PA) Forbes LaFalce
 Brady (TX) Ford LaHood
 Brown (FL) Fossella Lampson
 Brown (OH) Franks (NJ) Lantos
 Bryant Frelinghuysen Largent
 Burr Gallegly Larson
 Burton Ganske Latham
 Buyer Gejdenson LaTourrette
 Callahan Gephardt Lazio
 Calvert Gibbons Leach
 Camp Gilchrest Lee
 Campbell Gillmor Levin
 Canady Gilman Lewis (CA)
 Cannon Gonzalez Lewis (GA)
 Capps Goode Lewis (KY)
 Capuano Goodlatte Linder
 Cardin Goodling Lipinski
 Carson Gordon LoBiondo
 Castle Goss Lofgren
 Chabot Graham Lowey
 Chambliss Granger Lucas (KY)
 Chenoweth-Hage Green (TX) Lucas (OK)
 Clay Green (WI) Luther
 Clayton Greenwood Maloney (CT)
 Clement Gutierrez Maloney (NY)
 Clyburn Gutknecht Manzullo
 Coble Hall (OH) Markey
 Coburn Hall (TX) Martinez
 Collins Hansen Mascara
 Combest Hastings (FL) Matsui
 Condit Hastings (WA) McCarthy (MO)
 Conyers Hayes McCarthy (NY)
 Cook Hayworth McCollum
 Cooksey Hefley McCrery
 Costello Herger McDermott
 Cox Hill (IN) McGovern
 Coyne Hill (MT) McHugh
 Cramer Hilleary McInnis
 Crane Hilliard McIntyre
 Crowley Hinchey McKeon
 Cubin Hinojosa McKinney

McNulty Quinn
 Meehan Radanovich
 Meek (FL) Rahall
 Meeks (NY) Ramstad
 Menendez Rangel
 Metcalf Regula
 Mica Reyes
 Millender- Reynolds
 McDonald Riley
 Miller (FL) Rivers
 Miller, Gary Rodriguez
 Miller, George Roemer
 Minge Rogan
 Mink Rogers
 Moakley Rohrabacher
 Mollohan Ros-Lehtinen
 Moore Rothman
 Moran (KS) Roukema
 Moran (VA) Roybal-Allard
 Morella Royce
 Murtha Ryan (WI)
 Myrick Ryun (KS)
 Nadler Sabo
 Napolitano Salmon
 Neal Sanchez
 Nethercutt Sanders
 Ney Sandlin
 Northup Sanford
 Norwood Sawyer
 Nussle Saxton
 Oberstar Schaffer
 Obey Schakowsky
 Olver Scott
 Ortiz Sensenbrenner
 Ose Serrano
 Owens Sessions
 Oxley Shadegg
 Packard Shaw
 Pallone Shays
 Pascrell Sherman
 Pastor Sherwood
 Paul Shimkus
 Payne Shows
 Pease Shuster
 Pelosi Simpson
 Peterson (MN) Sisisky
 Peterson (PA) Skeen
 Petri Skelton
 Phelps Slaughter
 Pickering Smith (MI)
 Pickett Smith (NJ)
 Pitts Smith (TX)
 Pombo Smith (WA)
 Pomeroy Snyder
 Porter Souder
 Portman Spence
 Price (NC) Spratt
 Pryce (OH) Stabenow

Stark
 Stenholm
 Strickland
 Stump
 Stupak
 Sununu
 Sweeney
 Talent
 Tancredo
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Tauzin
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Thune
 Thurman
 Tiahrt
 Toomey
 Towns
 Traficant
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Velazquez
 Vento
 Visclosky
 Vitter
 Walden
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Waters
 Watkins
 Watt (NC)
 Watts (OK)
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Wexler
 Weygand
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson
 Wise
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Young (FL)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). On this rollcall, four hundred nineteen Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) will yield 2 minutes to the Majority Leader, and then we will have closing statements from each of the managers beginning with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), who will have 4½ minutes; the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), who will have 4 minutes; the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who will have 4½ minutes; and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), who will have 4 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I support permanent normal trade relations with China because I profoundly believe that it will advance the cause of human rights for the Chinese people. Mr. Speaker, I believe free and open trade is not only the best way to make China a free and open nation, but it may be the only way.

A vote to open the China market and the world experience to the Chinese people is a vote to open markets. What is a market, Mr. Speaker? Market is simply an arena in which there is a sharing of information about market transactions, informations about desires, wants, hopes and dreams, and economic conditions.

But, Mr. Speaker, one cannot share that information about economics without also sharing information about culture, politics, religion, and values. Information, Mr. Speaker, is the life blood of a market. It is also poison to dictators, because dictators know that it is the truth that will set one free. They also know that, in a modern technology age, information is the basis by which one acquires truth.

When we open the China market, citizens from all over China will be carrying devices like this, a simple little pocket PC. With that PC, they can connect to the Internet every bit of information about culture, religion, markets, economics, and freedom and dignity available on this Earth. They cannot be stopped.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that the pen is mightier than the sword. I would argue that the PC is mightier than the shackles of tyranny.

When the people of China are free to transact in world markets, and when they share this information about freedom, they will learn the lessons of liberty, they will see liberty working out in the lives of the other citizens in the world, and they will demand it of their nation, and they will change their government.

The Communist hard-liners know this, Mr. Speaker, and that is why they do mischief to our efforts today. That is why they disrupt it, because they fear the freedom that comes from commerce and is contagious throughout all of human spirit.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what life will be for the Chinese people 5 or 10 or 15 years from now when we vote for freedom and commerce today. I cannot guarantee my colleagues that their life will be better. But I can tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, if we vote "no" today, if we deny them the chance, we will condemn them to a continued life of despair.

I for one choose to vote, instead, for my fondest hope, for the hope of freedom, dignity, commerce, and prosperity, for the beautiful people of China so that their children, like our children, in this wide open world can come home and say in that magical voice, Mom, dad, I got the job.