COMMUNIST CHINA SUBSIDY REDUCTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 302, and as the designee of the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, I call up the bill (H.R. 2605) to require the United States to oppose the making of concessional loans by international financial institutions to any entity in the People's Republic of China, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 2605 is as follows:

H.R. 2605

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Communist China Subsidy Reduction Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the People's Republic of China has enjoyed ready access to international capital through commercial loans, direct investment, sales of securities, bond sales, and foreign aid;

(2) regarding international commercial lending, the People's Republic of China had $48,000,000,000 in loans outstanding from private creditors in 1995;

(3) regarding international direct investment, international direct investment in the People's Republic of China from 1993 through 1995 totaled $97,151,000,000, and in 1996 alone totaled $47,000,000,000;

(4) regarding investment in Chinese securities, the aggregate value of outstanding Chinese securities currently held by Chinese nationals and foreign persons is $175,000,000,000, and from 1993 through 1995 foreign persons invested $10,540,000,000 in Chinese stocks;

(5) regarding investment in Chinese bonds, entities controlled by the Government of the People's Republic of China have issued 75 bonds since 1988, including 36 dollar-denominated bond offerings valued at more than $6,700,000,000, and the total value of long-term Chinese bonds outstanding as of January 1, 1996, was $11,709,000,000;

(6) regarding international assistance, the People's Republic of China received almost $1,000,000,000 in foreign aid grants and an additional $1,566,000,000 in technical assistance grants from 1993 through 1995, and in 1995 received $5,540,000,000 in bilateral assistance loans, including concessional aid, export credits, and related assistance; and

(7) regarding international financial institutions—

(A) despite the People's Republic of China's access to international capital and world financial markets, international financial institutions have annually provided it with more than $4,000,000,000 in loans in recent years, amounting to almost a third of the loan commitments of the Asian Development Bank and 17.1 percent of the loan approvals by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in 1995; and

(B) the People's Republic of China borrows more from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Asian Development Bank than any other country, and loan commitments from those institutions to the People's Republic of China quadrupled from $1,100,000,000 in 1985 to $4,300,000,000 by 1995.

SEC. 3. OPPOSITION OF UNITED STATES TO CONCESSIONAL LOANS TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

Title XV of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262o—262o–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1503. OPPOSITION OF UNITED STATES TO CONCESSIONAL LOANS TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors at each international financial institution (as defined in section 1702(c)(2) of the International Financial Institutions Act) to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose the provision by the institution of concessional loans to the People's Republic of China, any citizen or national of the People's Republic of China, or any entity established in the People's Republic of China.

''(b) CONCESSIONAL LOANS DEFINED.—As used in subsection (a), the term 'concessional loans' means loans with highly subsidized interest rates, grace periods for repayment of 5 years or more, and maturities of 20 years or more.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the amendments printed in Part 5 of House Report 105–379 are adopted.

The text of H.R. 2605, as amended by the amendments printed in Part 5 of House Report 105–379 is as follows:

H.R. 2605

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Communist China Subsidy Reduction Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the People's Republic of China has enjoyed ready access to international capital through commercial loans, direct investment, sales of securities, bond sales, and foreign aid;

(2) regarding international commercial lending, the People's Republic of China had $48,000,000,000 in loans outstanding from private creditors in 1995;

(3) regarding international direct investment, international direct investment in the People's Republic of China from 1993 through 1995 totaled $97,151,000,000, and in 1996 alone totaled $47,000,000,000;

(4) regarding investment in Chinese securities, the aggregate value of outstanding Chinese securities currently held by Chinese nationals and foreign persons is $175,000,000,000, and from 1993 through 1995 foreign persons invested $10,540,000,000 in Chinese stocks;

(5) regarding investment in Chinese bonds, entities controlled by the Government of the People's Republic of China have issued 75 bonds since 1988, including 36 dollar-denominated bond offerings valued at more than $6,700,000,000, and the total value of long-term Chinese bonds outstanding as of January 1, 1996, was $11,709,000,000;

(6) regarding international assistance, the People's Republic of China received almost $1,000,000,000 in foreign aid grants and an additional $1,566,000,000 in technical assistance grants from 1993 through 1995, and in 1995 received $5,540,000,000 in bilateral assistance loans, including concessional aid, export credits, and related assistance; and

(7) regarding international financial institutions—

(A) despite the People's Republic of China's access to international capital and world financial markets, international financial institutions have annually provided it with more than $4,000,000,000 in loans in recent years, amounting to almost a third of the loan commitments of the Asian Development Bank and 17.1 percent of the loan approvals by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in 1995; and

(B) the People's Republic of China borrows more from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Asian Development Bank than any other country, and loan commitments from those institutions to the People's Republic of China quadrupled from $1,100,000,000 in 1985 to $4,300,000,000 by 1995.

SEC. 3. OPPOSITION OF UNITED STATES TO CONCESSIONAL LOANS TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

Title XV of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262o—262o–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1503. OPPOSITION OF UNITED STATES TO CONCESSIONAL LOANS TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors at each international financial institution (as defined in section 1702(c)(2) of the International Financial Institutions Act) to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose the provision by the institution of concessional loans to the People's Republic of China, any citizen or national of the People's Republic of China, or any entity established in the People's Republic of China.

''(b) CONCESSIONAL LOANS DEFINED.—As used in subsection (a), the term 'concessional loans' means loans with highly subsidized interest rates, grace periods for repayment of 5 years or more, and maturities of 20 years or more.''.

SEC. 4. PRINCIPLES THAT SHOULD BE ADHERED TO BY ANY UNITED STATES NATIONAL CONDUCTING AN INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION PROJECT IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to create principles governing the conduct of industrial cooperation projects of United States nationals in the People's Republic of China.

(b) STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES.—It is the sense of the Congress that any United States national conducting an industrial cooperation project in the People's Republic of China should:

(1) Suspend the use of any goods, wares, articles, or merchandise that the United States national has reason to believe were mined, produced, or manufactured, in whole or in part, by convict labor or forced labor, and refuse to use forced labor in the industrial cooperation project.

(2) Seek to ensure that political or religious views, sex, ethnic or national background, involvement in political activities or nonviolent demonstrations, or association with suspected or known dissidents will not prohibit hiring, lead to harassment, demotion, or dismissal, or in any way affect the status or terms of employment in the industrial cooperation project. The United States national should not discriminate in terms or conditions of employment in the industrial cooperation project against persons with past records of arrest or internal exile for nonviolent protest or membership in unofficial organizations committed to nonviolence.

(3) Ensure that methods of production used in the industrial cooperation project do not pose an unnecessary physical danger to workers and neighboring populations or property, and that the industrial cooperation project does not unnecessarily risk harm to the surrounding environment; and consult with community leaders regarding environmental protection with respect to the industrial cooperation project.

(4) Strive to establish a private business enterprise when involved in an industrial cooperation project with the Government of the People's Republic of China or other state entity.

(5) Discourage any Chinese military presence on the premises of any industrial cooperation projects which involve dual-use technologies.

(6) Undertake to promote freedom of association and assembly among the employees of the United States national. The United States national should protest any infringement by the Government of the People's Republic of China of these freedoms to the International Labor Organization's office in Beijing.

(7) Provide the Department of State with information relevant to the Department's efforts to collect information on prisoners for the purposes of the Prisoner Information Registry, and for other reporting purposes.

(8) Discourage or undertake to prevent compulsory political indoctrination programs from taking place on the premises of the industrial cooperation project.

(9) Promote freedom of expression, including the freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any media. To this end, the United States national should raise with appropriate authorities of the Government of the People's Republic of China concerns about restrictions on the free flow of information.

(10) Undertake to prevent harassment of workers who, consistent with the United Nations World Population Plan of Action, decide freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children; and prohibit compulsory population control activities on the premises of the industrial cooperation project.

(c) PROMOTION OF PRINCIPLES BY OTHER NATIONS.—The Secretary of State shall forward a copy of the principles set forth in subsection (b) to the member nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and encourage them to promote principles similar to these principles.

(d) REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each United States national conducting an industrial cooperation project in the People's Republic of China shall register with the Secretary of State and indicate that the United States national agrees to implement the principles set forth in subsection (b). No fee shall be required for registration under this subsection.

(2) PREFERENCE FOR PARTICIPATION IN TRADE MISSIONS.—The Secretary of Commerce shall consult the register prior to the selection of private sector participants in any form of trade mission to China, and undertake to involve those United States nationals that have registered their adoption of the principles set forth above.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term ''industrial cooperation project'' refers to a for-profit activity the business operations of which employ more than 25 individuals or have assets greater than $25,000; and

(2) the term ''United States national'' means—

(A) a citizen or national of the United States or a permanent resident of the United States; and

(B) a corporation, partnership, or other business association organized under the laws of the United States, any State or territory thereof, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 5. PROMOTION OF EDUCATIONAL, CULTURAL, SCIENTIFIC, AGRICULTURAL, MILITARY, LEGAL, POLITICAL, AND ARTISTIC EXCHANGES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA.

(a) EXCHANGES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA.—Agencies of the United States Government which engage in educational, cultural, scientific, agricultural, military, legal, political, and artistic exchanges shall endeavor to initiate or expand such exchange programs with regard to China.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that a federally chartered not-for-profit organization should be established to fund exchanges between the United States and China through private donations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume, and in doing so remind all of us of a revolutionary poem. It starts off:

Listen, my children, and you shall hear, of the midnight ride of Paul Revere,
One if by land, and two if by sea, and I on the opposite shore will be, ready to ride and spread the alarm . . .

And it goes on, and he talked about the alarm of the British.

Mr. Speaker, I am no Paul Revere, but I am here today to talk about another alarm, and that is the alarm of soft money.

Now my colleagues have heard a lot about soft money flowing into the United States from a country called China. Well, this debate right now is about soft money flowing out of the United States and to China.

My colleagues, what is soft money? Better listen up because our taxpayers want to know this.

Mr. Speaker, what is soft money that we are talking about in this debate? Well, listen to what it is. It is no interest, not low interest, no interest, 35-year loans with a 10-year grace period, $20 billion of taxpayer-funded loans to China. Can my colleagues imagine? I wish that all of the businesses in the Hudson Valley could have these kind of no-interest, 35-year, taxpayer-funded loans with a 10-year grace period for free. Would not that be nice if we could have that, my colleagues?

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a straightforward bill. It simply requires the Secretary of the Treasury to direct the U.S. executive directors of the international financial institutions to oppose all concessional or soft loans to the Government of Communist China, a rich nation with tons of money out there to buy military hardware that some day may be used against this country.

This bill defines soft loans, and listen to it again, as those with over 20 years' maturity, 5-or-more-year grace periods, and very, very low or no interest rates at all.

Mr. Speaker, this is also one of the easiest votes we should have in this Congress during this nine-bill presentation here today. How in the world could we ever justify, morally that is, making easy money loans funded by American workers and American taxpayers to the government of this totalitarian dictatorship that kills its own people, is engaged in a massive military buildup, and which happens to despise the United States of America? That massive military buildup is being paid for by these free-interest loans that we are giving them.

Before I speak to those who may stand here today and defend these loans on the basis of supposed human needs, environmental protection or whatever, let me provide a little background for those colleagues, because I do not think unless they served on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services or the Committee on International Relations, they probably have not really looked into this.

But in 1996, the Government of Communist China received over $4 billion, $4 billion in taxpayer-funded loans from the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank. Of that, $500 million was in the form of soft loans from the World Bank's International Development Association, or better known as the IDA. Over the past decade China has received over $20 billion in taxpayer-funded loans, including over $7 billion in soft loans from the IDA alone.

What are these IDA loans? They are 35-year, interest-free giveaways, that is what. That is what they are, and despite a 1977 law that requires the United States to oppose multilateral loans to countries with a pattern of gross violation of human rights, the United States continues to support these loans, including soft loan giveaways, to China. Why? Because of a loophole in the law allowing the exception for basic human needs.

Now, that sounds humanitarian; does it not? There is a lot of trouble with that term, Mr. Speaker. According to the Congressional Research Service, it has absolutely no clear meaning in U.S. law. Thus it is subject to interpretation and hence abuse, and boy, oh, boy, is it being abused, and that is what we have gotten from the Clinton administration. With the fashionable sustainable development, a core policy of this administration, environmental loans, such as a recent IDA loan for the Yunnan environment, have garnered U.S. support.

Previous administrations were no better. The Bush administration was just as bad. The fact is we have failed to oppose these IDA loans for China in any serious way for a long, long time.

What we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a little bit of definition creep into the term ''basic human needs.''

Why are these soft loans to Communist China a bad idea? First, China does not need them. They are a wealthy nation. They have got more money in the bank than we have in the United States of America, and as I said before, soft loans only account for one-eighth of the taxpayer-funded loans to China in 1996, only one-eighth of them.

China also borrows heavily in the private capital markets and has over $75 billion in foreign exchange reserves. Do my colleagues believe that, $75 billion in reserves? And we are continuing to hand out this interest-loan-free money? That begs the question, why does China need any taxpayer-funded loans, especially from the United States of America?

□ 2130

Second, with these soft loans to governments, why are they bad economics? In fact, what are they, other than the failed philosophy of socialism, and that underpins government-to-government loans?

History yields us no evidence whatsoever that governments loaning money to governments results in rising prosperity for the masses of people on either side. That is because governments do not create prosperity, Mr. Speaker. Business and industry do. The debacle of socialism in this country should have gotten us over this a long time ago.

Third, anyone that thinks when a body is undisciplined and unaccountable, as the World Bank makes a soft loan to the Communists in Beijing, and the money does not line the pockets of corrupt officials there? You better know it does. That person is, quite frankly, a sucker, ladies and gentlemen.

Fourth, by making soft money available to Beijing, we are subsidizing a military buildup of massive proportions. I do not know how many can see this, but take a look at what I am about to say. Communist Chinese military spending has increased by double digits for a decade now, doubling their defense budget, while at the same time we have been cutting back for the last 13 years, and so have our allies all over this world. They are buying weapons that cost billions of dollars, weapons that may one day be turned on U.S. soldiers.

Mr. ROHRABACHER and I have been publicizing all year the fact that China is, as we speak, attempting to take possession of the Russian Sunburn missile built with the express intent of taking out U.S. Aegis-equipped ships and sought by China with the express intent of keeping U.S. ships out of the Straits of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, this is a Russian destroyer, and these are the new missiles mounted on it now owned by the People's Republic of China. That is what can be used against the United States of America in the not too distant future if we ever had to defend the Taiwan Straits or other areas in the Asia-Pacific area.

Mr. Speaker, soft loans to the Government in China are a geostrategic mistake of colossal proportions.

The fifth and final reason to oppose these loans is that they are just plain immoral. Let us remember that no matter the fancy title of the project, whether it is to be poverty reduction or sustainable development, these loans go to the Government of Communist China. Yes, these loans go to the butchers of Beijing. It is a moral outrage to sit here and see this continue to happen year after year after year.

That is the same regime that killed 1,000 people at Tiananmen Square, the regime that has a slave labor gulag of over 6 million prisoners, 6 million. That is half the population of New York State almost. The regime that even President Clinton's State Department says has silenced all opposition by imprisonment, exile, and intimidation.

And for that alone, according to the 1977 law, they ought to be banned from these kinds of loans, but they continue to go on and on and on. How can we loan soft money to them? How can we put the good name of the American worker behind these loans?

It will be argued that our no vote will reduce our influence in the World Bank. Mr. Speaker, do not believe that for a minute. The rest of the world is always looking for our lead. Witness Bosnia. We leave, and the Europeans leave.

Even if other nations do loan to China over our no vote, so what? Their taxpayers will get the shaft, and not ours.

It will be argued that the U.S. businesses will not be able to bid on the projects funded by these loans. So what? Freedom, national security, and the interests of the taxpayers are, quite simply, the highest priority, higher than the interests of a few businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I frankly think this bill is the bare minimum that we can do. I personally feel that the arguments I have made should apply to all taxpayer-funded loans to China. We should oppose them all. If the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank continue to loan to Communist China, we should withdraw from those organizations. But this bill does not do that at all. Again, it only applies to soft money, no cuts in any funding to any of these international banks.

Again, I am going to call your attention to what is soft money we are talking about holding up here. Again, it is no-interest, 35-year loans with a 10-year grace period, $20 billion of which have been given to them over the last 10 years and, with this bill before us today, puts an end to that, and, above all, it sends a message that we will not do business with people with these kind of human rights violations.

I would urge support of the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. It is punitive in nature, it is bad public policy, and it is an infringement on the constitutional prerogative of the Executive Branch.

As tomorrow I will oppose so-called fast track authority because I think it is constitutionally unenforceable for Congress to give up its power to amend a bill, I think it is also inappropriate for us to infringe on the authority of the Chief Executive to implement United States foreign policy.

First of all, we are not talking about United States loans; not at all. What we are talking about are international financial institutions. We are talking about the World Bank, we are talking about the International Development Association, we are talking about the Asian Development Bank, et cetera.

These banks try very hard to be nonpolitical, nonpartisan, and countries have a vote with respect to each and every loan that is going to be given. They also have criteria for countries who are eligible. They have criteria for loans that are eligible.

What this bill does, it says forget about the eligibility of a country, forget about the eligibility of a particular loan, forget about whether other countries might be much worse than China, forget about whether other countries are getting amounts of money as great as or greater than China. We want, today, to target China, because we want to have eight bills bashing China so we can achieve some political mileage out of it.

Well, not only is it bad public policy, but I just think it could be very, very harmful, too, diplomatically. China is a country of 1.25 billion people. Our relations with China have been unsteady, uneasy, over the years, but in 1979 we had a great breakthrough; we reestablished diplomatic relations.

The China of today is not the China of 20 years ago or 30 years ago. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has pointed to many, many imperfections. I would agree with the gentleman on a number of those.

On the other hand, they have made tremendous strides too, tremendous improvements. Twenty years ago, the second language was Russian. Today, the students are studying as a second language English. They are going not to Moscow; they are going to New York City, they are going to Philadelphia, they are going to Boston, they are going to San Francisco, et cetera.

The relationship that exists between the United States, the most powerful nation on the face of this Earth, and China, the most populous nation on the face of the Earth, is probably the most important bilateral relationship that we have today, for the next decade, and maybe for the next century or so. This will only poison the well. This will do no good whatsoever.

We will also impair our effectiveness tremendously. We will have no flexibility within these international financial institutions. We would have no leverage whatsoever. As a matter of fact, everybody would say, ''Okay, we dismiss the United States. What we are going to do now we must do without regard to the United States of America.'' And they will go ahead and do it. It will demean our own country for no good purpose whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read the statement of administration policy with respect to this bill.

The administration opposes H.R. 2605, which would require United States executive directors at each international financial institution to oppose concessional loans to the People's Republic of China or any Chinese citizen or any Chinese entity. H.R. 2605 would unconstitutionally infringe on the President's authority to conduct foreign affairs. In addition, such requirements are rarely an effective policy tool, and often hinder efforts to advance United States priorities within international financial institutions.'

There is another reason, too. This bill was recently introduced, just a few weeks or so ago. It is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. There has not been one minute of hearings on this bill, no time for people to come in and testify to see all the difficulties with it. It is my understanding that the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services strongly opposes this bill, it is my understanding that the chairman of the relevant subcommittee of jurisdiction opposes this bill, and I would hope that everyone in this body would oppose this bill.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from Niagara Falls, New York [Mr. LAFALCE], mentions that the administration is opposed to this bill. The administration has been opposed to every single one of these Chinese bills, and I am very proud they have passed overwhelmingly with Democrat support from his side of the aisle. I believe this one will too.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and once again praise the gentleman for his great work in bringing all of these bills to the floor.

[Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. GILMAN. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me time and his support of this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice in support of this important measure directing the President to instruct our representatives to international institutions to vote against concessional assistance for the People's Republic of China.

Introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, who has been a tireless advocate for the protection of human rights inside China, this legislation puts an end to continued subsidies to the People's Republic of China.

China has ample access to the world's capital markets, and continued loans to that country from multilateral development banks siphons off resources from other countries with little or no access to global financial markets.

By this bill, we are calling on our executive directors of all multilateral development banks extending credits to China to review all their loan policies to ensure that China will not continue to divert scarce development assistance from needier countries.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for the amendments to this bill that were offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], and the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], that would create a voluntary set of principles promoting good corporate citizenship by American companies operating in China. Companies adopting that code would be given preference for participation in trade missions to China.

This measure points us in the right direction, and I commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for his leadership and urge support for this important measure.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the ranking Democratic member on this committee for his very generous gesture and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is the sixth bill before this body in the past 2 days that deals with the People's Republic of Communist China. The first would have the American people believe that it enforces a ban against products that were made with slave labor from being brought into this country.

What it does in reality, if you read the summary, is it provides another $2 million for us to find out which products were made with slave labor, but they still come in. They compete with glove factories and garment plants in south Mississippi, and probably compete with products made in every single congressional district in this country, but they still come in.

The second one would be a prohibition of funds to Chinese religious officials. What it really does is deny people who are appointed by the Communist Chinese regime to be figurehead religious people, and they are really not. It denies their visas. That is all it does.

The third is called the Forced Abortion Condemnation Act. I have a 100 percent voting record with the National Right-to-Life. All it does is condemn what they do and deny visas again to a handful of people from Communist China who want to come in. It does not change their way of thinking.

The fourth is called the Political Freedom in China Act, and it spends $2.2 million to monitor human rights. They literally sit there and watch as the Chinese murder their own people, force abortions on their own people, torture their own people. It does not change anything.

□ 2145

It pays $2 million, $2.2 million for Americans to go over there and watch.

The fifth is called Radio Free Asia Act, and if the money was appropriated, it would spend $50 million to broadcast signals that are in all probability jammed by the People's Republic of China, telling them that they have a bad government. Great idea, but the signal is jammed. It does not accomplish anything. Again, it makes us feel good, like we are trying to do something, but we are really not.

And this bill, the Communist China Subsidy Reduction Act. I do not think the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] gave a fair representation of what he is trying to accomplish, and I really do not oppose it. How can one oppose a bill that does nothing? And it does nothing. All it does is have the United States oppose the extension of concessional loans by international financial institutions to any entity in the People's Republic of China. To just oppose it does not mean it does not happen. It still happens. It is one of those feel-good, make the American people happy, bamboozle the American people, make them think we are getting tough with the Communist Chinese, but it does not. We had a chance last night to get tough with the Communist Chinese.

I guess the first question is, for some people in our country, why would we want to? Why take on the people in Peking? Why tell them that they need to change their behavior? Well, I agree. The first 6 bills pretty well spelled it out. They are forcing abortions. They have phoney religions. They persecute people for simply practicing their religion. There is no political freedom. There is no free air time on the radio and television to tell the truth about what is going on. So all of those things need to change. But this does not change it. We had a chance last night to change that.

But what else are the Chinese doing? While this session of Congress, the 105th session of Congress has been meeting, the Chinese Communists have acquired ports on both ends of the Panama Canal. These ports were built by the American people. They used to be ours. Because of a very bad treaty in 1977, they were reverted to the Republic of Panama. The Republic of Panama, in the most shadiest of deals, turned down two American firms that bid high for the use of those ports and gave them instead to a company called Hutchinson out of Hong Kong, and as of July 1, Hutchinson is now in the People's Republic of China. So there is one port directly across from our Howard Air Force Base in Panama on the Pacific side, another on the Atlantic side, both of which are fully capable of blocking all entry and exit from the Panama Canal. They now control it. That frightens me as a member of the Committee on National Security.

What else have they done? Most recently, the Chinese Ocean Shipping Company, a firm that is 100 percent owned by the People's Republic of China, a Communist totalitarian state,

leased the San Diego Naval Shipyard that we accessed. I am very proud of the House Committee on National Security, because we passed legislation to ban that lease. I helped my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and others, to make that amendment pass. It went to the Senate. They did nothing. The effect is, we do nothing. Now the Chinese Communist shipping company controls what used to be an American naval base in San Diego.

Let us talk about the missiles. We have heard about the missiles repeatedly. Something the American people, by omission or commission were never told about the Gulf War is that during the Gulf War a Chinese Silkworm missile came within 100 yards of one of our battleships, 100 yards. It was shot down by an American fighter plane. What if it had hit? Do my colleagues remember when the Exocet missile hit the Stark? Do my colleagues remember when the Argentine missiles hit the British destroyer? People die, and they die very quickly when a missile hits a ship. That missile was either given or sold to the Iraqis by the Chinese Communists.

As we speak, the Chinese Communists are selling missiles to Iran. They are selling missiles to Iraq. They are either selling or giving missiles to North Korea. These are not onetime indiscretions on the part of the Chinese Communists. These are things that are going on every day and have gone on every day.

I look in the back of the room and I see the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], who served as a Marine in the Vietnam war, and any Marine in that war knows that he had to worry about every step that he took, because the next step may be to land on a Chinese Communist landmine that were given to the North Vietnamese during that war.

This is not something that is just happening today. It is a period, it is a systematic series of aggressive acts against the United States of America that spans three decades. And what do we do about it? Thus far we have passed five bills that do nothing, and we are debating a sixth bill that does nothing. I want to change that. I want to offer a motion to recommit, because the rule that passed yesterday denies every Member of this body, not just Democrats, every Member of this body their constitutional right to amend a bill on the House floor.

We all ran for office. We were all elected by 1/435th of the people of this country, and yet a couple of people in a room up there called the Committee on Rules decided that the rest of us do not deserve the right to approve these bills. But what they did do was allow for a motion to recommit where one could try to amend this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to offer a motion to recommit. I am going to offer a motion to recommit to try to do what is right, not for the big bosses who go to the teas and the coffees at the White House, or who give phoney loans to the other political party so that they can kind of process it through and use it during their elections, because they really have tainted both political parties, I mean let us be honest with each other. That is what they have done and they have not done it for our benefit, they did it for theirs.

Communist China, after doing all of the things that I have talked about, enjoys a $40 billion trade surplus with our Nation. That means at the end of every year, they will have $40 billion more of our money than we will of theirs. How do they have such a big trade surplus? Well, it is very simple. This Congress, after all the ranting and raving and chest-pounding over the evils of the Clinton coffees, turned right around and gave most favored nation status to China. It means that their goods can come into our country with a 2 percent tariff, but if one is an American and one is trying to sell their product in that totalitarian Communist regime, they, No. 1, will decide whether or not they will even let you, and if they let you, they are going to charge your product a 30 to 40 percent tariff just to have the opportunity to be sold there.

We charge them 2 percent, they charge us 30 to 40 percent. It is wrong. It is not fair. We wonder why they give those monies in campaign contributions? That is my hunch why they do it. They have a heck of a deal, we got a horrible deal. I would like to change that.

Last night I offered a motion to recommit to change that, to say that on a quarterly basis, the United States Secretary of the Treasury would review what they charge us to have access to their products and their market, and just say, for the next quarter, that is what we are going to charge them. We do not set a tariff. We tell the Chinese we will be as fair with you as you have been with us. So maybe the people in Waynesboro, MS who are losing their jobs at the glove factory to gloves that are made with political prison labor in China will have a fair shot at the American market and a fair shot at the Chinese market.

Guess what? Almost every Democrat voted for that, but I am sorry to say that only six of my Republican friends chose to stand up to the Speaker of the House, who is the number one fundraiser for that political party, who got Chinese money, and say, you know what? That is wrong. Let us fix it, let us do something about it.

I want to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT], the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY], the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] and the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. SMITH]. What they showed last night was real American courage, because they put what was best for this country ahead of what is best for their political party. They put their constituents ahead of what was best for the Speaker of the House.

That is why we run for office. That is why we stand in the rain, that is why we stand at football stadiums, that is why we stand in front of Wal-Marts, that is why we call up our friends and ask for money, that is why some of us mortgage our houses so we can raise enough money to go on television to run for political office, because we do it to try to make things right. They did that, and every one of them was threatened today, because they did what was right for America, and not what was right for their political party. Shame on you; shame on the people who threatened them.

We are going to have a chance, once again. As I said, I have no objection to the bill of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. It does not do anything, but I am going to try to make it better. I am going to try to call for some basic fairness between what the Chinese charge us to have access to their markets and what we charge them. That is all we want. Fairness.

I hope my colleagues will give us that chance. I hope my colleagues will put partisan politics aside, whether you are Democrat or Republican. I hope, for once, my colleagues will do for the people what they promised they would do for them, and that is do what is best for our country, regardless of whether it is good for this political party or that political party. For once, let us look out for the American working person.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the gentleman's speech, and it is good to see him really get excited for a change here, and I agree with what the gentleman is saying.

The gentleman is probably going to get a move to call this not in order, ruled out of order because it has to go through Ways and Means, or what have you, but in my view, this is just something that could be done, just simply that, as the gentleman talks about, in fairness. We are going to trade with you, you are going to get the same breaks that we get, and I commend the gentleman for making this effort, and I would ask that people make the effort to vote and to support the gentleman on this effort, and I compliment the gentleman on taking the time to do this.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I am not precisely sure of what the exact rule is, or what the Committee on Rules has put forward with respect to

the possibility of an amendment of this nature. I have the greatest respect for the intentions of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] in presenting this bill, both with respect to how the bill was put together and to what the implications of the bill are, and I would, far from speaking for him, nonetheless posit the proposition to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and Members of the House, that essentially what the gentleman from Mississippi is proposing is entirely consonant with the object of the bill before us.

So in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just bring a bit of historical perspective to consideration of the bill.

At one point, and I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will recall, we had a Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee which concerned itself with, among other things, the terms and conditions of international trade on the high seas. I consider that I was a reasonably well-informed individual in my life prior to coming to the Congress, but nonetheless was rather shocked and very chagrined to discover the degree to which disregard for the rules of international trade and disregard for the contractual agreements that had been reached between the United States and other nations, particularly China, was the fact of the matter before us in that committee.

□ 2200

We found that there were shipping trade violations, and I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] was a Member of that committee and could attest to the fact that I, among others, upon discovering it, simply could not understand why we do not enforce the rules we already have. I think we as Americans take some pride in the fact that we try to keep our agreements, we try to live up to our contracts. That was not taking place.

We have just had recent evidence of what can happen when we do take a stand. The proposition of gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] is such that we can, if it is put forward and agreed to, take the kind of stand that has been exemplified, Mr. Speaker, in recent days with the decision of the Maritime Commission to fine certain Japanese companies, shipping companies, for not living up to the rules and regulations to which they had agreed and which we live up to.

The fines were such that when they were imposed, that the executive, in the form, of course, of the President and his administration, was forced into the position, and, in fact, it may be apocryphal, but I heard at one point that the President or someone under his immediate authority said, can they do that? Who are these people? They are our Maritime Commission, and by God, they were doing their job. What their job was is not to turn the American people into suckers and saps, where they are not made to be fools. People know that when it is happening.

One of the reasons there is cynicism abroad in the United States today is people know that they are being played for suckers. They do not like it. They want us, if we are on the floor of this House, free men and women elected by free men and women, to not be made fools of. They expect us to insist as legislators, as national legislators, that we carry these things out, that we see to it that the rules and regulations are obeyed. I think that is the intention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] with the bill.

I would like to say that I support the idea of reciprocity, and would ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], in the context of what is possible under the rules as applied to the bill, whether or not the intent of the proposal of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR], that is, that a review and reciprocity be instituted with respect to tariffs, might be possible to incorporate into the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, in my 20 years in the Congress I guess I have never been accused of being soft on communism before. It is rather funny. But here I am, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] going after me.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that was said in a jocular fashion, and I can assure the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON], neither the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] nor myself meant to impose any such kind of admonition on the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] with respect to his staunch defense of freedom against communism.

However, I do think in the spirit of the bill he put forward, we are requesting that he take into consideration the thrust of the proposition of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my good friend, the gentleman from Hawaii, first of all, the gentleman's amendment is out of order. Let me just say that the reason this is a middle-ground bill, and I will say it to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] as well, is because all nine of these bills were reported out of committee, reported out of the Committee on International Relations, reported out of the Committee on Banking and Financial Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on National Security, or they were waived by jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, let me, and I never want to do this, but let me admonish my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR], a little bit. All of these bills were put together on a bipartisan nature. That is why they are middle of the road. Believe me, on all nine of these bills I had tougher measures, but the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and others objected to them. We made the decision to only put out the bills that were agreed to on a bipartisan basis. All nine are bipartisan.

I would say to the gentleman from Mississippi, the days are gone forever when a Member can stand here on this floor and just write out an amendment and send it to the desk without anybody ever having seen it. We do not do that. We do not allow it in the Committee on Rules.

Today Members have to have that amendment drafted by the bill drafting commission here. They have to submit that amendment and so many copies. We distribute it to every single committee of jurisdiction so everybody knows what these amendments are.

What is in these bills that are on the floor? They are all bipartisan. We asked for amendments on both sides of the aisle, and this was not just me, this was the staff of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICK GEPHARDT] and the staff of the gentlewoman from California, [Ms. NANCY PELOSI], and Democrat staff on that side of the aisle contacted every Democrat and said, bring your amendments up to the Committee on Rules. Any significant amendment that was brought to us we made in order. We not only made them in order, two Republican amendments, five Democrat amendments, and five bipartisan amendments, we not only made them in order, we self-executed them into the bill, so when they came to this floor, they were totally bipartisan. That is what is on this floor right now.

By the way, I would say to my friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR], he was not in the Committee on Rules and did not bring any bill before us, any amendment before us. If he had, we would probably have self-executed it into the bill. I do not really know what his amendment would have done, but we certainly would have taken a good look at it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] for his remarks on this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment. I tend to agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] that much of what we have done so far on these various bills have not done a whole lot. We have talked about rectifying the conditions in China, changing human rights, dealing with forced labor, providing for religious freedom, and dealing with the abortion issue. I do not think much will come of those amendments. I felt that some of those were technically flawed. This amendment is different. This is a much better amendment. This amendment gets to the heart of the matter.

It is possible, due to a veto or some other technique, that this does not become law, but it should. If it became law, it would restrict our funding for

the Chinese. This is what should be done.

I do not believe that the type of legislation that we have been passing can really change the nature of China. I believe that we have a responsibility here in the Congress to provide for the freest society possible and to set the best example for the record, and that is the best way to change the internal affairs of other nations, and that we do not have this moral authority or constitutional authority to impose our will. But in the same light, we do not have the responsibility or authority, nor should we ever take hard-earned funds from the American taxpayers to subsidize regimes like Red China. So this is why I feel strongly about this issue, that we should stop this loaning through these international agencies.

When the foreign operations appropriation bill came to the floor, we discussed the issue of the Export-Import Bank. This does not deal with the Export-Import Bank, this deals with the $4 billion they get from the international agency.

I applaud the chairman for dealing with this. But I proposed an amendment that would deal with the direct subsidies of $4 billion more from the Export-Import Bank which goes to Red China. We were able to garner 40 votes to send a message and say that China should not be receiving these subsidies. So even with the best of light on legislation like this, it is moving in the right direction, it is doing the right thing, but still, the American people will be obliged to provide $4 billion worth of aid to Red China through the Export-Import Bank. I do not believe this is a proper function for government. I do not believe for a minute the American people want to do this. I believe it is endorsement of a system that we do not like.

At the same time, I do not believe these token bills that we have passed will do hardly anything to change the internal nature of what is occurring in Red China. But if we could send them a message and say we would not subsidize them, take the funds away, someday maybe we will reconsider taking away the funds from the Ex-Im, but we ought to pass this bill tonight.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify a point. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules said that the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services had reported out the bill. Then he changed that and said, well, they did not report it out, but they had waived jurisdiction.

If they did do this, it was not by committee vote, it was by unilateral decision of the chairman without any consultation with the minority. And it is further my understanding that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, who, according to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, waived jurisdiction, also opposes this bill.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I just spoke with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and he said he would vote for the bill.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, because he is one of the most respected Members of this body, not knowing what he is going to say, I am going to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BLUNT]. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, one thing for sure, I am certainly not going to oppose the gentleman's bill or his efforts.

I must disagree in one area. I think the gentleman's bill will do an awful lot. It sets the tone of the way we should be looking at China, and perhaps the greatest national security threat in our history is looking at us, and we are financing it.

Some of the young Members do not know this, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] does. Years ago I had language in a defense appropriation bill that Chairman Rostenkowski would not tolerate. He demanded the rule be left open, and it was, I say to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

When we came over to the floor, completely open, he says, I will not do waivers of points of order against this bill because I will strike the Traficant language. Listen to what the Traficant language was. It says if a foreign country denies American companies the right to bid on their government contracts, their companies domiciled therein, incorporated under their law, cannot bid on our defense contracts.

That went really to the wire, did it not, because the first title of that appropriation bill was the Army, and I raised a point of order. The point of order was sustained because the authorization bill was not passed, and I struck every penny in it for the Army.

The second title was the Air Force. They sustained the strike, and the Air Force was completely obliterated from the bill. Then the leaders came over and said, we cannot have the Senate write the bill. If you yield back those strikes, we will allow your provision. I say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR], that is what it took to pass that provision.

Let me say this to the gentleman, our trade program is goofy. We will probably annualize a $60 billion trade surplus for China next year. I am not going to talk about human rights. I am going to talk about business. Look at the scoreboard. We are getting our clock cleaned.

I know this is not germane, and I know there are going to be some parliamentary maneuvers, but I want to say this to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR], he is on the right track. I did it once before, and I had to do something I did not like doing, but when we get to the point where we are issuing Chinese boots to our military troops, we had better sit back and take a good look.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida, Mr. BILL YOUNG, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHN MURTHA, for looking into that issue and taking care of it.

But I support this bill from the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. I support every bill that has come out here relative to China. I supported this rule. I was wishing I had more time to really talk about those Communist dictators, but with that I will let it lay.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, Mr. DANA ROHRABACHER, who is one of the most fierce fighters for human rights in this entire body.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2605. In 1997, Communist China will have a $50 billion trade surplus with the United States of America. That is $50 billion. At the same time, China is the largest recipient of international financial loans and subsidies, including an annual amount of almost $4 billion in U.S. loans and subsidies through international financial institutions.

□ 2215

At the same time that all that is going on, China is engaged in a massive buildup of its military capabilities. Who are those military men in the employ of the Communist Chinese dictatorship going to use those weapons against? It makes no sense for us to be financing projects for the Communist Chinese while they are building up their military and they have the weapons to use against us that we are financing by making sure they do not have to pay for other things.

They have got the money to pay for those other projects themselves. If they have got the money to build up their military, they can pay for all of their own projects. Sometimes it is argued they say, well, American companies will not get this project or that project in building up some infrastructure or whatever project unless we give them some type of a subsidized loan.

Why should we subsidize those projects, those public work projects, in Communist China? We have got lots of public work projects we could finance with that money in the United States. None of this makes any sense. And the money is drawn right out of the pool of money that is available to the American people.

Vote ''yes'' on Solomon. Vote to support a sane policy on providing loans to this dictatorship.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODE].

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] for emphasizing trade equity. I also commend the chairman of the Committee on Rules for his package of bills and do not seek to do any harm to his position, but I do seek the position of making it better.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] simply wants to add a fourth section to a three-section bill. The persecution of Christians in China is atrocious. Their policy of abortion is atrocious. In China, the tolerance of those who do not believe as they believe is bad, to say the least.

But my father used to say, ''If you want to get somebody's attention, you got to hit him in the pocketbook.'' And the trade equity provisions pushed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] would hit the Chinese in the pocketbook. I urge my colleagues to support his position and make a good bill better.

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] saying that he wishes I brought it before the Committee on Rules. Earlier this year, my colleague, I brought an amendment to have all DOD employees drug tested before the Committee on Rules. The committee never even voted on it.

Then I brought Medicare subvention before the Committee on Rules, something that my colleague is a cosponsor of. He voted against it in the Committee on Rules, and he voted against bringing it to the floor.

So if I am a little hesitant to bring this important measure to the Committee on Rules, it is for good reason. It is because the Committee on Rules has not been fair and people in the Committee on Rules have voted in the Committee on Rules against bills that they have cosponsored bringing them to the floor.

Mr. SOLOMON. Boy, oh boy. I just wish I had a little more time here. We would get into a donnybrook, my colleagues. But I will not do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE].

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding me the time.

I rise in support of the Communist China Subsidy Reduction Act. And I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for all the work that he has put into this legislation and the entire ''Policy for Freedom China'' package that we have been considering today.

We have had many debates on the floor about trade between our country and the People's Republic of China. We have a debate every year. It is one thing to disagree with the terms of trade between our country and China. But I hope we can all agree to end below-market-rate loans for China.

There are many reasons for supporting this act and opposing below-market-rate loans made by U.S.-supported international financial institutions. We should oppose these loans to the repressive Beijing regime on human rights grounds alone. It is more than clear that the human rights situation in China is not improving. And these loans are financed by American taxpayers, and that is wrong.

But let us leave aside the horrific human rights abuses and security concerns we need to have and focus on our economic side of this debate. The bottom line is that China does not need these loans. China is attracting all types of foreign investment, $50 billion in foreign investment in 1996 alone, much of it from U.S. companies. Beijing also has been raising funds through commercial loans and bond sales, all at market rates.

The People's Republic of China is now sitting on the highest foreign exchange mound in the world, in large part because of its trade surplus with the United States made possible by restrictions on American access to China's markets. I share the frustrations that have been expressed in this debate about our economic playing field.

Because of these high investments in trade levels, the Chinese economy is growing at unprecedented rates. In 1994, 12 percent. In 1995, 10 percent; 1996, 13½ percent. By contrast, the U.S. economy is growing at some 3 percent. Yet, we are providing China with below-market loan rates. What sense does this make?

I have heard some from the administration argue that this legislation is unnecessary. There are plans to phase out these loans, they say. That may be true. But that, in and of itself, is no reason to oppose this legislation. Let us make a strong statement of principle that cheap loans to China financed by the American taxpayers are not something this Congress supports. It is the least we can do.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], the chairman of the Policy Committee of the Republican Party. He is responsible for having coordinated these nine pieces of legislation.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and I thank all of the speakers that preceded for their careful attention to the bill before us, which is, as the other bills have been in the last day and a half since we have been debating them, focused and targeted on a specific problem with a very measured response.

The problem is actually an opportunity. The problem is that what was once a developing nation, nation in poverty, is now a growing nation. In fact, it has one of the fastest growing economies on Earth. It has the largest foreign exchange reserves on Earth and ready access to the world's capital markets, as witness the fact that it has sold $6.75 billion worth of U.S.-dollar-denominated bonds.

Since July 1, the People's Republic of China includes the thriving market of Hong Kong, with its access to world capital markets. It is true, as has been stated in debate already, that it is administration policy, Clinton administration policy, to end China's access to so-called concessional lending. Concessional lending is, of course, well below market lending at either little or no interest, with long maturities, such as 20 years.

The Treasury has been making progress, and the Treasury has this policy precisely because of China's large foreign exchange reserves and their access to capital markets. Already they have terminated the People's Republic of China's access to the concessional loan facility of the Asian Development Bank.

It is important that we are working in concert with administration policy. It is important because their opposition to this legislation makes it clear that all that they oppose is Congress having a say-so in the matter.

In truth, the administration was supposed to have and intended to terminate below-market, subsidy, taxpayer-financed lending to the People's Republic of China and to Communist Chinese enterprises a year ago. Now they are talking about doing it a year henceforth.

The reason Congress needs to act is that, in our system of government, we control the purse strings, it is the taxpayers' money, and the time has come, as all can see, to recognize that the nation with the largest foreign exchange reserves in the world, with so much outstanding credit, that is, loans that it has made to others, $48 billion in outstanding loans from private creditors as of 2 years ago, and that number has gone up, that that nation no longer needs to have access to concessional lending from multilateral development banks that is meant for nations in poverty who do not have access to capital markets.

This is precisely the right remedy. It is precisely the right remedy. This bill clarifies policy, applies sensible policy, and applies it across the board in a fair way. It is a pro-free-market bill. It is a pro-American bill, and it is a pro-China bill.

As we have seen in the debate over so many of these other bills, if we are to be a friend of China, we have to be a friend of an increasingly free China. We have to be honest with ourselves and recognize that trade with China, which, as we all recognize, runs mostly one way right now, they have an enormous trade surplus with us, we have a lot of money over there, but, frankly, we import from them, whereas they do not buy our things, that it is, unfortunately, one way to their advantage.

Whereas Taiwan, a much smaller country with a fraction of the population, buys 60 percent more from the United States than does the People's

Republic of China, China is hoarding these foreign exchange reserves, apparently to a purpose. That is their right. They have access to our capital markets. They are selling their bonds and stocks, so on, over here. That is their right. But then the appropriate response is not for the United States to subsidize lending back to that same trading partner.

And so this bill, the Communist Chinese Subsidy Reduction Act, which targets only those loans that are below market, that are clearly subsidies from the taxpayer, is exactly the right thing to do. It is why the chairman is right to bring it. It is why the Committee on Banking and Finance is right to send it to the floor. And it is why I hope all of my colleagues will vote now in favor of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, I would like to be recognized for a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 2605) to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment. At the end of the bill insert the following:

SEC. 4. QUARTERLY ADJUSTMENT OF TARIFFS ON PRODUCTS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(A) QUARTERLY DETERMINATIONS BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall determine, at the end of each calendar quarter—

(1) the dollar amount of tariffs paid to the People's Republic of China during that quarter by persons for exporting goods and services from the United States to the People's Republic of China; and

(2) the dollar amount of tariffs paid to the United States during that quarter by persons for importing goods and services from the People's Republic of China into the United States.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF TARIFFS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Treasury shall adjust the tariffs on all products of the People's Republic of China so that an amount is collected on imports of products of the People's Republic of China, during the 3-month period beginning 30 days after the end of the calendar quarter for which a determination is made under subsection (a), equal to the amount by which the dollar amount computed under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) exceeds the dollar amount computed under paragraph (2) of subsection (a).

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit with instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit with instructions is not germane to this underlying bill. The fundamental purpose, or common thread, of the bill is very narrow and only concerns concessional loans to China. The range of methods employed in the bill is similarly narrow, and the bill is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Finance.

The motion, however, deals with the reciprocal tariff treatment of products of China. This is clearly not within the very narrow purpose of this bill. The issue of tariffs is also outside the range of methods employed in this bill and contains matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

There has been a protocol under previous Democrat leadership and Republican leadership today that amendments of this nature which would either raise or lower tariffs or raise or lower taxes are not allowed in motions to recommit on the floor. They must clear with the Committee on Ways and Means first.

□ 2230

Therefore, the motion to recommit with instructions is not germane, and I urge the Chair to sustain the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BLUNT]. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as much as any Member of this body lives and breathes, this amendment is very much germane. Mr. SOLOMON'S bill does one thing. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to kind of something, do something about the Chinese Communists. My amendment directs the Secretary of the Treasury to do something about the gross injustice between what the Communist Chinese charge American products when our products go to their country and the fact that they only pay 2 percent when they come to ours. Why are we doing this? Why were there 5 votes in the past 2 days? It is because they force abortions, it is because they are thugs, they do not have religious freedom, they do not have political freedom. They are selling missiles and weapons to our enemies. They are buying ports on both ends of the Panama Canal.

Mr. SOLOMON. Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman is not speaking to the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Member to confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as I said, every bill that we have voted on is trying to affect Chinese policy. This bill is asking the Secretary of the Treasury to take steps to affect Chinese policy. My amendment asks the Secretary of the Treasury to take substantial, realistic steps to affect Chinese policy. We are only going to get one last chance this session to do something substantive. As I have pointed out, the Committee on Rules has voted against bills that they are cosponsors of.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not speaking to the point of order. We have some integrity in this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the Member to speak to the point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. The Speaker knows I am speaking to the point of order. The gentleman may not, but you do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Members of this House to do what each of us begged for the opportunity to do every other year, and, that is, stand up for the rights of the American citizens, to strike a blow against the thugs when we get the chance. Tonight we have a chance. Tonight we can decide that we will have some lame excuse and go back and tell the constituents of each of our individual districts, that, ''Doggone it, we couldn't do anything about those Chinese thugs because the Rules Committee said we weren't germane.'' Or we can say that there are some things more important than the rules of the House in the integrity of this Nation, simple things like right and wrong, simple fairness for the American working people. That is more important than the rules of the House that can be changed at any moment. That is what I am asking Members of this body to vote on, and that is why I am asking Members to vote against tabling this motion and then turn around to vote for this motion to recommit so that all of these things that have done nothing will at least be followed up by a measure that does something for the people of America and gets the attention of the thugs in Peking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] makes the point of order that the amendment proposed in the motion to recommit is not germane.

The test of germaneness in this situation is the relationship of the amendment proposed in the motion to recommit to the provisions of the bill as a whole.

The bill, H.R. 2605, provides that the Secretary of Treasury instruct the United States Executive Directors to oppose concessional loans at each international financial institution to the People's Republic of China, any citizen or national of the People's Republic of China, or any entity established in the People's Republic of China.

The amendment proposed in the motion to recommit would amend the tariff schedules of the United States to achieve reciprocity between the aggregate amount of Chinese tariffs on American products and the aggregate amount of American tariffs on Chinese products.

As noted in section 798c of the House Rules and Manual, to be germane an amendment should address the same legislative jurisdiction as is addressed in the bill. Here, although the bill addresses the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the amendment addresses the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

On this basis, the Chair finds that the amendment is a ''proposition on a subject different from that under consideration'' within the meaning of clause 7 of rule XVI. That is, the amendment is not germane. The point of order is sustained. The motion to recommit is not in order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask a parliamentary inquiry as to which is the proper motion to question the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may appeal the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that in previous instances in this esteemed body, Speakers, when a question of the ruling of the Chair would be brought before it, would allow the Members to decide whether or not they wanted to vote on something. I would very much appreciate it if this Speaker would allow the Members to decide whether or not we will vote on this. If this Speaker chooses not to do so, then I will ask the Members to vote against the ruling of the Chair so that this motion to recommit can be brought before this body and voted on by the 435 Members who were each elected by the citizens of this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has ruled. Does the gentleman wish to appeal the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. COX OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] to lay the appeal on the table.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 192, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 604]

YEAS—220

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NAYS—192

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—21

Barr
Boehner
Carson
Cubin
Dixon
Flake
Foglietta
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Granger
LaTourette
McKinney
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Neal
Riley
Schiff
Smith (OR)
Stark
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2256

Messrs. RANGEL, RUSH, and MORAN of Virginia changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. COLLINS of Georgia, KINGSTON, and NEUMANN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). The question is on passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 354, noes 59, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 605]

AYES—354

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Ensign
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Fattah
Fawell
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—59

Ackerman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Blagojevich
Brown (CA)
Campbell
Castle
Conyers
Coyne
Davis (FL)
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Engel
English
Eshoo
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Furse
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Hastert
Hinchey
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lofgren
Lowey
Manzullo
McDermott
Meek
Millender-McDonald
Minge
Mink
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Obey
Olver
Pastor
Payne
Pickett
Roemer
Sabo
Serrano
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Stabenow
Tauscher
Thurman
Velazquez
Watt (NC)
Waxman

NOT VOTING—20

Carson
Cubin
Dixon
Flake
Foglietta
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Houghton
LaTourette
McKinney
Miller (CA)
Neal
Rangel
Riley
Rush
Schiff
Smith (OR)
Stark
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2316

Mrs. LOWEY, and Messrs. FAZIO of California, MANZULLO and NADLER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1378. An act to extend the authorization of use of official mail in the location and recovery of missing children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition, to the Committee on House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate and concurrent resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1377. An act to amend the Act incorporating the American Legion to make a technical correction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing printing of a revised edition of the publication entitled ''Our Flag''; to the Committee on House Oversight.

S. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution authorizing printing of the brochure entitled ''How Our Laws Are Made''; to the Committee on House Oversight.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1119. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2160. An act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2160. An act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1119. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 7, 1997, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5788. A letter from the Vice Chair, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Chile, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

5789. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and RECORDS Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Parris Island and Hampton, South Carolina) [MM Docket No. 96–250, RM–8952] received October 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5790. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and RECORDS Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Winner and