

the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 114.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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. 1587, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

REAFFIRMING UNWAVERING COMMITMENT TO TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 462) reaffirming unwavering commitment to the Taiwan Relations Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 462

Whereas April 10, 2004, marked the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.), codifying in law the basis for continued commercial, cultural, and other relations between the United States and Taiwan;

Whereas it is and will continue to be United States policy to further encourage and expand these extensive commercial, cultural, and other relations between the people of the United States and the people of Taiwan during the next quarter century;

Whereas since its enactment in 1979 the Taiwan Relations Act has been instrumental in maintaining peace, security, and stability in the Taiwan Strait;

Whereas when the Taiwan Relations Act was enacted, it affirmed that the decision of the United States to establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China was based on the expectation that the future of Taiwan would be determined by peaceful means;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China refuses to renounce the use of force against Taiwan;

Whereas the Department of Defense report entitled "Annual Report on the Military Power of the People's Republic of China," dated July 30, 2003, documents that the Government of the People's Republic of China is seeking coercive military options to resolve the Taiwan issue and, as of the date of the report, has deployed approximately 450 short-range ballistic missiles against Taiwan and is adding 75 missiles per year to this arsenal;

Whereas the escalating arms buildup of missiles and other offensive weapons by the

People's Republic of China in areas adjacent to the Taiwan Strait is a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area;

Whereas section 3 of the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3302) requires that the United States Government will make available defense articles and defense services in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability;

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act requires the United States to maintain the capacity to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people of Taiwan;

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act affirms the preservation and enhancement of the human rights of the people of Taiwan as an objective of the United States;

Whereas Taiwan serves as a model of democratic reform for the People's Republic of China;

Whereas Taiwan's 1996 election was the first time in five millennia of recorded Chinese history that a democratically elected president took office;

Whereas Taiwan's democracy has deepened with a peaceful transfer of power from one political party to another after the presidential election of 2000;

Whereas the relationship between the United States and Taiwan has deepened with Taiwan's evolution into a full-fledged, multi-party democracy that respects human rights and civil liberties;

Whereas high-level visits between government officials of the United States and Taiwan are not inconsistent with the "one China policy"; and

Whereas any attempt to determine Taiwan's future by other than peaceful means and other than with the express consent of the people of Taiwan would be considered of grave concern to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) Congress reaffirms its unwavering commitment to the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) as the cornerstone of United States relations with Taiwan;

(2) the military modernization and weapons procurement program of the People's Republic of China is a matter of grave concern, and particularly the current deployment of approximately 500 missiles directed toward Taiwan;

(3) the President should direct all appropriate United States Government officials to raise these grave concerns regarding military threats to Taiwan with officials of the Government of the People's Republic of China;

(4) the President and Congress should determine whether the escalating arms buildup, including deployment of offensive weaponry and missiles in areas adjacent to the Taiwan Strait, requires that additional defense articles and services be made available to Taiwan, and the United States Government should encourage the leadership of Taiwan to devote sufficient financial resources to the defense of their island;

(5) as recommended by the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, the Department of Defense should provide a comprehensive report on the nature and scope of military sales by the Russian Federation to the People's Republic of China to the Committees on International Relations and Armed Services of the House of Representatives and Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services of the Senate;

(6) the President should encourage further dialogue between democratic Taiwan and the People's Republic of China; and

(7) the United States Government should not discourage current officials of the Taiwan Government from visiting the United States on the basis that doing so would violate the "one China policy".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, is either gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LANTOS. No, Mr. Speaker. I am strongly in support of this legislation.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I seek time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) will control 20 minutes in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time be equally divided with the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 462, a resolution reaffirming the unwavering support of the Congress for the Taiwan Relations Act. This year marks the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act, one of Congress' most important and enduring pieces of legislation. Over the past quarter century, the Act has served as the foundation of the United States' relationship with the people of Taiwan and has ensured the island's security. On this anniversary, it is fitting and appropriate for the Congress to review the cross-strait issue and reassess the needs of our friends in Taiwan.

In contrast to many other pieces of 25-year-old legislation, the Taiwan Relations Act has exceeded expectations. The Act has allowed the United States to maintain its close ties with the people of Taiwan while actively engaging Asia's rising power, the People's Republic of China, on a myriad of fronts, including human rights. In doing so, the measure has been important to the maintenance of peace and stability across the Taiwan Strait and throughout the entire Western Pacific region.

The Taiwan Relations Act has also played an indirect role in promoting democracy in Taiwan by providing the conditions of external security that have allowed the people of Taiwan to focus on internal reform and democratization.

In the years since Congress passed the Taiwan Relations Act in 1979, Taiwan has developed into a lively and successful democracy, a tribute to the courage and determination of the island's remarkable people. The 1996 presidential election in Taiwan was the

first time in China's 5 millennia of recorded history that a fully democratically elected government assumed office. The election of 2000, which resulted in a peaceful transfer of power from one political party to another, evidenced a deepening democratic system. Two months ago, Taiwan completed its third direct presidential election.

The U.S. has watched this island nation develop into a mature, robust, vibrant democracy that respects human rights and civil liberties. Knowledge of our shared values has strengthened the commitment of Americans to stand by the people of Taiwan.

In contrast to Taiwan, Mr. Speaker, the mainland has failed to implement meaningful political reform, and the PRC's respect for fundamental human rights has deteriorated. Furthermore, the People's Republic of China has adopted a more aggressive military posture towards Taiwan. Over the past 5 years, the PRC has dramatically increased its stockpile of weapons. Today, China has approximately 500 missiles aimed at Taiwan, a matter of grave concern to the freedom-loving people of Taiwan and to all of us here in the United States. Given China's refusal to renounce the use of force against Taiwan, the arms buildup is a threat to peace and security in the Taiwan Strait and to the stability of the entire region.

Changes in cross-strait relations, Mr. Speaker, including democratization of Taiwan and an arms buildup by the People's Republic of China, requires that the United States continue to strengthen its support for the people and the democracy of Taiwan. H. Con. Res. 462 reinforces America's commitment to help Taiwan defend itself from outside coercion and intimidation. Continuing the tradition established by the Taiwan Relations Act, H. Con. Res. 462 urges the President and the Congress to reevaluate the defense needs of Taiwan and encourages the government of Taiwan to devote sufficient financial resources to defense of its island.

□ 2015

The resolution also, Mr. Speaker, encourages greater interaction between Taiwan and the U.S. with the goal of strengthening democracy on the island. Visits between the officials of the U.S. and Taiwan are not inconsistent with the One-China Policy. As such, officials of Taiwan should not be discouraged from visiting the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that increasingly warmer cross-strait relations will ultimately transcend the need for the Taiwan Relations Act, and resolutions such as this one would not be needed. In time, the democracy which Taiwan has cultivated can take further root and flourish throughout all of China. However, until that day comes, resolutions such as this one are necessary to clearly promote peace and security in the region and to ensure continuing democracy in Taiwan.

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

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to start off by saying that I really do not have a lot of disagreement with what the chairman has to say, because I certainly think we should be friends with Taiwan. I believe our goals are very similar. It is just that the approach I have would be quite different.

I happen to believe that we have ignored for too long in this country and in this body the foreign policy that was designed by our Founders, a foreign policy of nonintervention. I think it is better for us. I think it is healthy in all ways, both financially and in that it keeps us out of wars, and we are allowed to build friendships with all the nations of the world. The politics of nonintervention should be given some serious consideration.

Usually, the argument given me for that is that 200 years ago or 250 years ago things were different. Today we have had to go through the Cold War and communism; and, therefore, we are a powerful Nation and we have an empire to protect; and we have this moral obligation to police the world and take care of everybody.

But, Mr. Speaker, my answer to that is somewhat like the notion that we no longer have to pay attention to the Ten Commandments or the Bill of Rights. If principles were correct 200 years ago or 250 years ago, they should be correct today. So if a policy of friendship and trade with other nations and nonintervention were good 250 years ago, it should be good today.

I certainly think the Taiwan Relations Act qualifies as an entangling alliance, and that is what we have been warned about: "Do not get involved in entangling alliances." It gets us so involved, we get in too deep, and then we end up with a military answer to too many of our problems. I think that is what has happened certainly in the last 50 years.

I essentially have four objections to what we are doing. One is a moral objection. I will not dwell on the first three and I will not dwell on this one. But I do not believe one generation of Americans has a moral right to obligate another generation, because, in many ways, when we make this commitment, this is not just a friendly commitment; this is weapons and this is defense.

Most people interpret the Taiwan Relations Act as a commitment for our troops to go in and protect the Taiwanese if the Chinese would ever attack. Although it is not explicit in the act, many people interpret it that way. But I do not believe that we or a generation 25 years ago has the moral right to obligate another generation to such an overwhelming commitment, especially if it does not involve an at-

tack on our national security. Some say that if Taiwan would be attacked, it would be. But, quite frankly, it is a stretch to say that settling that dispute over there has something to do with an attack on our national security.

Economics is another issue. We are running out of money; and these endless commitments, military commitments and commitments overseas, cannot go on forever. Our national debt is going up between \$600 billion and \$700 billion a year, so eventually my arguments will win out, because we are going to run out of money and this country is going to go broke. So there is an economic argument against that.

Also, looking for guidance in the Constitution. It is very clear that the Constitution does not give us this authority to assume responsibility for everybody, and to assume the entire responsibility for Taiwan is more than I can read into the Constitution.

But the issue I want to talk about more than those first three is really the practical approach to what we are doing. I happen to believe that the policy of the One-China Policy does not make a whole lot of sense. We want Taiwan to be protected, so we say we have a One-China Policy, which occurred in 1982. But in order to say we have a One-China Policy, then we immediately give weapons to Taiwan to defend against China.

So this, to me, just does not quite add up. If we put arms in Taiwan, why would we not expect the Chinese to put arms in opposition, because they are only answering what we are doing? What happened when the Soviets went to Cuba? They put arms there. We did not like that. What would happen if the Chinese went into Cuba or Mexico? We are not going to like that. So I think this part is in conflict with what the National Relations Act says, because we are seeking a peaceful resolution of this.

So I would urge my colleagues to be cautious about this. I know this will be overwhelmingly passed; but, nevertheless, it is these types of commitments, these types of alliances that we make that commit us to positions that are hard to back away from. This is why we get into these hot wars, these shooting wars, when really I do not think it is necessary.

There is no reason in the world why we cannot have friendship with China and with Taiwan. But there is something awfully inconsistent with our One-China Policy, when at the same time we are arming part of China in order to defend itself. The two just do not coexist.

Self-determination, I truly believe, is worth looking at. Self-determination is something that we should champion. Therefore, I am on the strong side of Taiwan in determining what they want by self-determination. But what do we do? Our administration tells them they should not have a referendum on whether or not they want to be independent and have self-determination.

So in one sense we try to help them; and, in the other sense, we say do not do it.

I am just arguing that we do not have to desert Taiwan. We can be very supportive of their efforts, and we can do it in a much more peaceful way and at least be a lot more consistent.

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

Mr. PAUL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for yielding.

I just want to correct the impression the gentleman left with his observation, which implied that Taiwan is getting economic aid from the United States.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I will answer that.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have not yet made my point. Taiwan is getting no economic aid from the United States.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is correct. I did not say that, so the gentleman has implied that; and that is incorrect that I said it.

I do know that it is a potential military base for us, because when I was in the Air Force, on more than one occasion I landed on Taiwan. So they are certainly a close military ally.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution and urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

The 25th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act is an exceptional opportunity to understand the ongoing and growing relevance of this critically important law and to discuss the future relations between the United States and Taiwan.

I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), and my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH), for introducing this resolution and for highlighting the important matters pending in the U.S.-Taiwan relationship.

Mr. Speaker, when I first visited Taiwan decades ago, Taiwan's people were governed by an authoritarian regime which silenced independent media, threw the political opposition in jail, and refused to live by internationally recognized human rights.

Today, Taiwan has become a fully developed democracy, complete with hard-fought elections, tight margins of victory, and a prosperous economy. This is sort of the American Dream in foreign policy, to look at totalitarian, dictatorial societies which are destitute and see them develop into democratic, prosperous nations.

Under the Taiwan Relations Act, Taiwan's GDP has increased ten-fold between 1979 and today. Two-way trade between Taiwan and the United States has grown from \$7 billion to over \$65

billion during this period. The Taiwan Relations Act has ensured that the United States provides Taiwan with sufficient military equipment to defend itself. Our Nation even sent aircraft carriers into the Taiwan Strait to make it clear that the United States would not abandoned Taiwan to an uncertain fate.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Taiwan Relations Act has effectively provided an institutional framework and a legal basis for a strong political security and economic relationship between Taiwan and the United States. It has proven to be an enormously flexible and durable law which has prevented various administrations from selling out Taiwan and its people due to pressure from Mainland China.

The 25th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act gives us a chance to think about new directions in our relationship with Taiwan. We must redouble our efforts to build closer ties to Taiwan, while at the same time maintaining a mutually productive relationship with the PRC.

We can have a constructive relationship with Beijing while still protecting Taiwan's core interests. Beijing must understand that, from an American perspective, any settlement between China and Taiwan must be arrived at through peaceful means, without coercion, and with the full support of the people of Taiwan.

To ensure that the Taiwanese people are not forced into an unwise deal with Beijing, we must continue to support Taiwan's legitimate defense needs, and the leadership of Taiwan must devote sufficient funds to defending their country. To that end, I strongly support the possible sale of the Aegis system to Taiwan and the expansion of high-level military and political exchanges between our two nations.

Mr. Speaker, when President Lee Teng-hui wished to give a speech at his alma mater, Cornell University, it was my great pleasure and privilege to win passage of a resolution demanding that the Department of State grant him a visa. We won that battle, and the world kept spinning.

Mr. Speaker, it was a great pleasure for me to host Taiwan's Vice President, Annette Lu, during a recent visit to San Francisco. It is my fondest hope that Congress will have the honor of greeting both President Chen and Vice President Lu in Washington in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, under the umbrella of the Taiwan Relations Act, the United States and Taiwan have brought democracy to 25 million people, secured their economic future and protected them from hostile military threats.

□ 2030

This, Mr. Speaker, is an amazing achievement. I strongly support this legislation and urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

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

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

Very briefly, let me mention that this last election was marred by news revealing that there was an assassination attempt. It has been very much in the news in question about the authenticity of this assassination. And, actually, the election itself is believed to be under a cloud with many people in Taiwan. So to paint too rosy a picture on that, I am pleased that they are making progress, but it is not quite as rosy as it has been portrayed here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the policy of the United States of America was articulately restated today by the Bush administration, and that statement is that there is only one China. The one China policy and the Taiwan Relations Act have resulted in stability and peace between China and Taiwan for more than a generation. This policy has created security for our allies, benefited U.S. interests in the region, and allowed for unprecedented economic growth in the region, improving the lives of millions of people.

While the Taiwan Relations Act allows for the U.S. to supply military assistance to Taiwan to defend itself, this resolution ignores a very important component of the U.S. policy that is critical to this debate. In light of the rising tensions between China and Taiwan, potentially dangerous tensions, Taiwan has a responsibility, in fact, the obligation, not to pursue policies that would unilaterally alter its current status.

The Taiwan Relations Act is intended to defend Taiwan, but it must not be considered a blank check to commit U.S. forces to defend any pursuit of independence by political leaders in Taipei.

I cannot and I will not support an ambiguous resolution that could one day serve as a premise to commit American sons and daughters to defend the reckless political actions of Taiwan's leaders. The presidential elections earlier this year in Taiwan and the controversy regarding how they were conducted should raise very serious concerns in this House.

The future of Taiwan's relationship with the U.S. is dependent upon a peaceful and stable Taiwan Strait. This is clear.

A similar message is absent from this resolution that also must be sent to Taiwan's leadership. I will oppose this resolution today because it fails to send a message of prudence and responsible behavior to both China and Taiwan. That is the foundation of the one China policy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond briefly, and I think it needs to be responded to.

The Taiwan Relations Act made it very clear in section 3 that there is no ambiguity about the policy. It is very

clear to make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability.

Nobody in their right mind or in their wildest dreams would ever conceive of Taiwan attacking the mainland. It is all about a credible deterrence so that that dialogue between Beijing and Taipei can go forward, and that is why I think that this law has been so important in helping to maintain that protective cocoon, if you will, so that this dialogue again could go forward without an invasion from the People's Republic of China.

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

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

Once again, I want to make the point about the inconsistency of our policy. In 1979, the Taiwan Relations Act was put in place mainly because we orchestrated getting them kicked out of the U.N., so we had to do something, so we passed this act, and we ended official relations. We do not have ambassadors to Taiwan. That is part of this absurdity of the one China policy. Yet, at the same time, we feel this obligation and this commitment to make sure they have these weapons for defense. I mean, it just does not add up.

All we need is a consistent pattern saying that people have a right to self-determination and encourage it and get out of the way. Those people over there in Taiwan right now, they are investing in China. The natural courses of events will take care of it. We have the South Koreans wanting to deal with the North Koreans, and we tend to get in the way; and here we have the Taiwanese who are investing, and they would like to work some of this out, and too often we get in the way.

Now, the chairman mentioned a phrase in the resolution in defense of his position, but it is one that I am concerned about. It says, in section 3, requires the United States Government to make available defense articles. We do not have any choice. We make an absolute commitment that we are going to put those weapons there, and we are looking for trouble. I mean, this is how you start wars, putting weapons in there.

Once again, what if they did that in Cuba? What did we do when Russia did it in Cuba? Can we not have any understanding or empathy of what happens? And what if they did it in Mexico? We would have no part of it.

So this, to me, just does not make any sense.

And then in the next phrase, I am also concerned about this, and it restates the position in the Taiwan Relations Act, whereas the Taiwan Relations Act requires the United States to maintain the capacity to resist any resort to force.

Now, we have to think about that. Most people interpret that as, we are on our way, the boys are ready to go.

No matter how thinly we are spread around the world, the capacity is now currently interpreted that, yes, we would come to their aid, and it sounds like people in support of this resolution would support that. But that is not the way this country is supposed to go to war. And this, to me, is a preamble, if there is a skirmish or a fight over there and it is going to be bigger because we are there and providing the weapons.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), my distinguished colleague on the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of this resolution.

We look at Taiwan today and, as the gentleman from California pointed out before, it is a success story. Taiwan is a democracy. Taiwan has an economy that is the 16th largest in the world. I come from the premise that we should be supportive of countries that are supportive of us, and Taiwan has been a good friend of the United States and has shown that it is a true democracy.

I had the honor of meeting with President Chen in New York several months ago, and I have always been a great admirer of a country that took a system that was autocratic and undemocratic and transformed it into a very democratic country.

Now the Taiwan Relations Act in 1979 was crafted very delicately because, yes, we do have a one China policy, but we do not want to abandon our friends in Taiwan. Therefore, I believe it is the responsibility of our country to ensure that the people of Taiwan have the capability not to be overrun by anyone else and to have the capability to defend themselves.

Now, in the resolution, it says that the Department of Defense report, our Department of Defense report entitled Annual Report on the Military Power of the People's Republic of China dated July 30, 2003, documents, and I am reading, that the government of the People's Republic of China is seeking coercive military options to resolve the Taiwan issue and, as of the date of the report, has deployed approximately 450 short-range ballistic missiles against Taiwan and is adding 75 missiles per year to this arsenal; whereas the Taiwan Relations Act requires the U.S. to maintain the capacity to resist any force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security or the social or economic system of the people of Taiwan.

This is what the Taiwan Relations Act commits us to do. It is what we should do. It is right. It is proper. We stand with the people of Taiwan and their democratic ways, and I am proud to be a part of reaffirming the unwavering commitment to the Taiwan Relations Act by the United States Congress.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, we have no additional requests for time. We yield back the balance of our time, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Let me just restate my general position, because my defense is that of a foreign policy of nonintervention, sincerely believing it is in the best interests of our people and the world that we get less involved militaristically.

Once again, I would like to make the point that if it is a true and correct principle because of its age, it is not negated. If it is a true principle and worked 200 years ago or 400 years ago, it is still a principle today; and it should not be discarded.

I would like to just close with quoting from the Founders. First, very simply, from Jefferson. His advice was, "Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

John Quincy Adams: "Wherever the standard of freedom and independence has been or shall be unfurled, there will her heart, her benedictions, and her prayers be. But she goes," and "she" is referring to us, the United States, "but she goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own. She will commend the general cause by the countenance of her voice, and the benignant sympathy of her example."

And our first President. He is well-known for his farewell address, and in that address he says, "Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing."

Force gets us nowhere. Persuasion is the answer. Peace and commerce is what we should pursue.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the ROC. The Republic of China, more commonly known as Taiwan, is a democratic haven perched on the edge of Asia and confronted everyday with the scourge of communism.

H. Con. Res. 462 reaffirms an unwavering commitment by the United States to the Taiwan Relations Act and to the ROC.

From the moment the communists overran the Chinese mainland, the Republic of China on Taiwan has been threatened with invasion and destruction. The dictators in Beijing have sought to isolate Taiwan from the rest of the world. They put pressure on Taiwan to be subservient to Beijing's dictates. Despite this constant shadow, the people of Taiwan have built a vibrant market economy and an equally vibrant democracy based on the rule of law.

As Taiwan has prospered and worked to achieve full democracy, the United States has stood shoulder to shoulder with Taiwan against the potential onslaught of the so-called "People's" Republic of China. Unlike in mainland China, the people of Taiwan enjoy many of the freedoms that we in the United States also enjoy.

As mainland China develops economically, it would be easy for the United States to focus on Beijing and forget about our longstanding ally. This is not and never should be the case. The United States must continue to be a partner with Taiwan. We must do what we can to help Taiwan maintain its political and economic independence. Although the United States does not maintain full diplomatic relations with the ROC, our commitment, outlined in the Taiwan Relations Act, has never wavered.

The communist government in Beijing has made it clear time and again that it will not back away from its Taiwan policy. Whether it is naval exercises in the Taiwan Straits or objecting to Taiwan's membership in the World Health Organization, Beijing continues to menace the ROC.

When you look at a map of Asia, the PRC clearly dwarfs Taiwan. It is many, many times bigger geographically and many, many times more populated. Any time it chooses, the PRC could overrun Taiwan and end the democratic experiment in that country. It is only the backing of the United States and the U.S. commitment outlined in the Taiwan Relations Act, that has kept the communists at bay.

As the PRC continues to develop economically and politically, it is important that the United States have allies in the region with whom we can work vis-à-vis mainland China. Taiwan is such an ally. They share our values of democracy and market economics. We must ensure that Taiwan remains free to act independently of China. The Taiwan Relations Act ensures that they are able to do so.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 462, reaffirming our unwavering support to the Taiwan Relations Act, and the people of the Republic of China or Taiwan.

For more than two decades, the Taiwan Relations Act has been the basis for the U.S.-Taiwan relationship, and a cornerstone of stability in Taiwan, and in the Western Pacific. And while the set of circumstances that made the Taiwan Relations Act necessary remains a regrettable chapter in U.S. history, its presence has helped ensure the safety of the people of Taiwan for the last 25 years.

In stark contrast to his predecessor Jimmy Carter, President Reagan worked to improve the mutual friendship and security between Taiwan and the United States. A strong voice for freedom and democracy, President Reagan sought to provide greater security to the people of Taiwan by making a number of assurances to Taiwan. Among other things, President Reagan promised not to set a date for ending defensive arms sales to Taiwan; not to consult with the unelected leaders of Communist China before making any arms sales to Taiwan; not to pressure Taiwan to negotiate with Communist China on the issue of reunification; and not to abandon the Taiwan Relations Act.

Over the last 25 years, Taiwan has made a full transition to democracy. The Taiwan Relations Act, President Reagan's efforts, and

most of all the work of the people of Taiwan have helped to make these changes a reality.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this resolution will send a strong message to the leaders of Communist China that America is a partner and a friend to Taiwan, and that America has no plans to abandon our commitment to the people of Taiwan or their fundamental right to self-determination.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RENZI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 462.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN SUPPORT OF FULL MEMBERSHIP OF ISRAEL IN THE WEQG

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 615) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in support of full membership of Israel in the Western European and Others Group (WEQG) at the United Nations, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 615

Whereas since the mid-1960s, the member states of the United Nations have been divided into five groups, including the Western European and Others Group and the African, Asian, Latin American, and Eastern European groups;

Whereas the United Nations increasingly relies on this "Group System" to facilitate its work and two leading United Nations organs, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, have passed numerous resolutions granting this system a central role in United Nations elections;

Whereas Israel has been refused admission to the Asian Group of the United Nations and is therefore denied the rights and privileges of full membership in the United Nations;

Whereas exclusion of Israel violates crucial principles of the United Nations Charter, including the right of states to be treated in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality and the right to vote and participate fully in the United Nations General Assembly;

Whereas the Bureau of every United Nations conference comprises one representative from each group in the United Nations and Israel is therefore denied access to this vital apparatus enjoyed by other United Nations member states;

Whereas on May 30, 2000, Israel accepted an invitation to become a temporary member of

the Western European and Others Group at the United Nations;

Whereas Israel's membership in the Western European and Others Group is limited and, as a temporary member, Israel is not allowed to compete for open seats or to run for positions in major bodies of the United Nations, such as the Security Council, or United Nations-affiliated agencies, such as the United Nations Commission on Human Rights;

Whereas Israel is only allowed to participate in limited activities of the Western European and Others Group at the United Nations headquarters and is excluded from discussions and consultations of the Group at the United Nations offices in Geneva, Nairobi, Rome, and Vienna;

Whereas the Western European and Others Group includes Canada, Australia, and the United States;

Whereas Israel is linked to Western European and Others Group member states by strong economic, political, and cultural ties;

Whereas the Western European and Others Group is the only bloc which is not purely geographical but rather comprises countries which share a Western democratic tradition; and

Whereas Israel is a free and democratic country and its voting pattern in the United Nations is consistent with that of the Western European and Others Group member states: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the President should direct the Secretary of State and the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to seek an immediate end to the persistent and deplorable inequality experienced by Israel in the United Nations;

(2) United States interests would be well served if Israel were afforded the benefits of full membership in the Western European and Others Group at the United Nations so that it could fully participate in the United Nations system;

(3) consistent with section 405(a) of division C of H.R. 1950, as passed the House of Representatives on July 16, 2003, "the Secretary of State and other appropriate officials of the United States Government should pursue an aggressive diplomatic effort and should take all necessary steps to ensure the extension and upgrade of Israel's membership in the Western European and Others Group at the United Nations"; and

(4) the Secretary of State should continue to submit to Congress on a regular basis a report which describes actions taken by the United States Government to encourage the Western European and Others Group member states to accept Israel as a full member of their group and describes the responses thereto from the member states.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. 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 the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.