RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 203, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

AYES—224

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sandlin
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—203

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Tauscher
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
White
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—7

Furse
Gonzalez
Lewis (GA)
McDade
Mollohan
Reyes
Ros-Lehtinen

☐ 1724

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. Ros-Lehtinen and Mr. Mollohan for, with Ms. Furse against.

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD RECONSIDER DECISION TO BE FORMALLY RECEIVED IN TIANANMEN SQUARE BY PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 454 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 454

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Con. Res. 285) expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should reconsider his decision to be formally received in Tiananmen Square by the Government of the People's Republic of China. The resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the resolution equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader or his designee and a Member opposed to the resolution; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON).

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the legislation and the rule.

Mr. Speaker, nine years ago the world witnessed the massacre of at least a thousand people by the Communist Chinese regime in a place called Tiananmen Square.

It was one of the most brazen and contemptible acts of terror by a government in recent history, violating all internationally recognized human rights, and cutting to the core against one of the most cherished American values, that of freedom of political expression.

Yet in a few weeks, the President of the United States will condone that terrorist act by the Communist Chinese regime, place those internationally recognized human rights on the back burner, and throw those cherished American values into the trash can by being formally received by the Butchers of Beijing right in that very place where the massacres occurred!

For years, Mr. Speaker, I have been appalled and aghast at the depths of shamelessness to which this administration has sunk in its cowardly but relentless effort to appease the government of Communist China, but this decision by President Clinton is the topper.

At least one can make a plausible-sounding, even if incorrect, case for granting Most-Favored-Nation trade status to China. But how in the world can this totally indecent decision be defended?

What reason could possibly be good enough? Are there jobs at stake if the President doesn't go to Tiananmen Square?

Would China perhaps do something irrational in its foreign policy if President Clinton doesn't go to Tiananmen? Of course not.

The only reason for President Clinton to engage in this full-blown publicity stunt for the Butchers of Beijing is the same reason that explains all of the rest of his appeasement policies toward China.

This administration has long since lost any sense of a moral compass when it comes to foreign policy, period.

The administration that said in 1992 that it would be the most ethical in history has categorically subordinated American values and

U.S. national security interests to the interests of the business community, which always wants to appease all foreign governments.

We have known this for years, but President Clinton's forthcoming farce in Tiananmen Square takes us to a new and extremely low level.

Now this administration is not only betraying our most fundamental principles, but it is doing so openly, brazenly, and apparently with no shame whatsoever.

It is disgusting, and the very least the President can do is reverse this decision.

This is an excellent resolution and I urge unanimous support for it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee met and granted a closed rule to House Concurrent Resolution 285. The rule provides for consideration of the concurrent resolution in the House with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the majority leader, or his designee, and a Member opposed. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, today is the ninth anniversary of the massacre at Tiananmen Square. It was on June 4, 1989, that the Chinese tyranny killed hundreds, perhaps thousands, of students who were peacefully calling for democracy in that square.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) in a letter asked us if we might wear a sign, and I am wearing here on my lapel a sign of memory, in memory of, the valiant students who were massacred that day, the unarmed representatives of the Chinese people who were massacred that day.

□ 1730

It is a date that will be recalled by history in infamous terms, in the most infamous of terms.

This month, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States seeks to become the first U.S. President to visit China since the brutal massacre of 1989, and we are informed that the President of the United States plans to commence his visit to China by attending ceremonies with the Chinese hierarchy precisely at Tiananmen Square. That act, if in fact it takes place, that the President of the United States take part in a ceremony in Tiananmen Square, that act, if it takes place, will be a condemnable act, Mr. Speaker.

Now in the past weeks we have learned that the President of the United States may, may have turned a blind eye as wealthy campaign contributors harmed our national security by helping the Chinese communists improve their ballistic warheads. We have learned that the President of the United States may have accepted campaign donations from the Chinese army, the communist Chinese army, at the same time that he changed United States policy to benefit the Chinese Communist missile program.

We have learned that the President of the United States may have ignored his own Secretary of State and the director of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Pentagon and allowed his campaign donors to help the Chinese communist military. And we have also learned that the President of the United States may have intervened personally to stop the Department of Justice's investigation into this matter.

Now the facts as we are learning them are deeply disturbing, and it is quite obvious that we do not know all the facts. These are serious matters, Mr. Speaker. The Chinese government, the Chinese Communist government, has at least 13 missiles aimed right now at United States cities. It would indeed be shocking if the President of the United States helped China to make those missiles more accurate.

It is clear that the American people deserve a thorough and complete explanation of the facts, and so unless and until we get such an explanation, we believe that the President should reconsider his visit at the very least to Tiananmen Square. We think that the Tiananmen Square visit is without any justification and is inherently not only unjustifiable but insensitive as well.

And so that is what the resolution that is being brought to the floor today in essence is all about, Mr. Speaker. It expresses the sense of Congress that President Clinton should reconsider his decision to be formally received by the Chinese tyranny in Tiananmen Square until the Government of China, of the Peoples Republic of China, acknowledges that Tiananmen Square massacre, pledges that such atrocities will never happen again, and releases those Chinese students that still to this moment remain in prison for supporting freedom and democracy in China.

Nine years ago today thousands of Chinese students peacefully gathered in Tiananmen Square to demonstrate their support for freedom and for democracy while soldiers of the Chinese regime, the Chinese Communist regime, were ordered to fire machine guns and tanks on unarmed civilians. Now according to the Chinese Red Cross, more than 2,000 Chinese pro democracy activists, demonstrators, Chinese citizens who believed in the right of the Chinese people to have self determination and freedom, thousands died that day at the hands of the Chinese tyrants.

And so that is why this simple resolution is just and proper, and that is why on this anniversary that we bring it to the floor.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the time.

As my colleague has described, this is a closed rule. It will allow consideration of H. Con. Res. 285, which expresses the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should reconsider his decision to be formally received in Tiananmen Square by the government of the People's Republic of China. This rule allows for 1 hour of debate and provides for one motion to recommit.

While I support this underlying resolution, and I just like to say that I would hope that we could have soon some resolution like this on the floor for the country of Sudan that I just returned from an 8-day trip, where 2 million people lost their lives and there is hardly any publicity about it, there is hardly any press about it, there is hardly anybody in the world that really cares about it. It just breaks your heart to see so many children and mothers that are dying from starvation, and to walk into and see killing fields where people have absolutely been shot, killed, hacked up with knives, being eaten by vultures. We talk about all these countries of the world, but there are so many countries where millions of people died and there is never a squawk out of this Congress. So I hope that some day we can start putting Sudan on the map.

I just like to say, relative to this resolution, I do have some reservations about the process in this Resolution 285. It was just introduced and the committee of jurisdiction has held no hearings that I know of, or markups on it. The rule was voted out of the Committee on Rules last night around 11 p.m. It is a closed rule which allows no amendments. This should be an open rule to allow the House to work its will. However, I reluctantly rise in support of this rule because of my concern for human rights abuses in China.

Today is the anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre. It has been 9 years since the killings of hundreds of unarmed civilians by the Chinese army in Beijing. The Chinese authorities have taken no steps to investigate these human rights violations, and Congress needs to send a strong message to the People's Republic of China that we have not forgotten Tiananmen Square.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I would inform the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) we have no other speakers, and I would inquire as to whether he does.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no Member here to speak on this particular rule, and therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that even in the short period of time that we have discussed this rule it has become apparent, especially because of the significance of the date that we bring this

rule to the floor, the date that we are acting, it has become apparent, the importance of this statement that the House will be making very clearly pursuant to the resolution that is being brought to the floor by this rule.

This is a date, the 4th of June, that will forever be recalled as an infamous date, as a date where unarmed people who represented the dignity of an entire nation were slaughtered by the weapons in possession of a totalitarian dictatorship that is still in power, that, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) stated, has not only not acknowledged its crime but continues to perpetuate crimes.

We have recently learned that the Chinese government is in the business of selling organs, human organs from prisoners, and if the price is right they will simply shoot the prisoner and sell the organ. That is the regime we are talking about. It is a regime that now Mr. Clinton, the President of the United States, is going to visit, and even though I still find it hard to believe, he apparently is going to be received officially for his state visit at the square where those thousands of Chinese innocent students were slaughtered. What pleasure, what profound and limitless pleasure would be obtained by the Chinese murderers if the President of the United States, the elected leader not only of the only superpower in the world but the ethical and moral leader of the world, agrees to be received by that regime of thugs in the same physical place where thousands of students were murdered for believing in the ideals that are also the ideals of the United States of America.

And so what we will be saying in this resolution is, ''No, Mr. President, if you think you have to go, and we think you shouldn't, but if you think you have to go, at the very least do not give the Chinese thugs the ultimate pleasure of showing their people that the President of the United States of America is willing to receive honors in the same place where the blood of the Chinese people flowed in rivers simply some years ago, a few years ago now. No, that is unacceptable.''

That is what we are saying in this resolution.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 454 and as the designee of the majority leader, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 285) expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should reconsider his decision to be formally received in Tiananmen Square by the Government of the People's Republic of China, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 285 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 285

Whereas 9 years ago on June 4, 1989, thousands of Chinese students peacefully gathered in Tiananmen Square to demonstrate their support for freedom and democracy;

Whereas it was with horror that the world witnessed the response of the Government of the People's Republic of China as tanks and military units marched into Tiananmen Square;

Whereas Chinese soldiers of the People's Republic of China were ordered to fire machine guns and tanks on young, unarmed civilians;

Whereas ''children were killed holding hands with their mothers'', according to a reliable eyewitness account;

Whereas according to the same eyewitness account, ''students were crushed by armored personnel carriers'';

Whereas more than 2,000 Chinese pro-democracy demonstrators died that day, according to the Chinese Red Cross;

Whereas hundreds continue to languish in prisons because of their belief in freedom and democracy;

Whereas 9 years after the massacre on June 4, 1989, the Government of the People's Republic of China has yet to acknowledge the Tiananmen Square massacre; and

Whereas, being formally received in Tiananmen Square, the President would bestow legitimacy on the Chinese Government's horrendous actions of 9 years ago: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should reconsider his decision to be formally received in Tiananmen Square until the Government of the People's Republic of China acknowledges the Tiananmen Square massacre, pledges that such atrocities will never happen again, and releases those Chinese students still imprisoned for supporting freedom and democracy that day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) for taking the time to craft this very timely and important resolution. H. Con. Res. 285 expresses a sense of the Congress that the President should reconsider his decision to be formally received in Tiananmen Square in the People's Republic of China by the government of the People's Republic of China. In light of China's actions in Tiananmen Square 9 years ago, it would be inappropriate for the President to go there. That square was the site where thousands of students and workers who held up a replica of the Statue of Liberty and looked towards our Nation for support were brutally gunned down and run over by the tanks in the People's Liberation Army.

□ 1745

Subsequent to that unforgivable crime against their own people, authorities within the PLA tried to smuggle to Los Angeles, to the street gangs here, Stinger missiles and thousands of AK–47s.

The People's Liberation Army runs a vast network of prisons and labor camps throughout China and occupied Tibet and holds untold numbers of Christians, Muslims and Buddhists for attempting to practice their religion without authorization from the state.

The People's Liberation Army threatens democratic Taiwan and fuels the nuclear arms race in South Asia by transferring nuclear and ballistic missile technology to Pakistan. Recently, high-placed authorities within the PLA were accused of influencing U.S. policy in order to obtain very critical and sensitive ballistic missile technology.

Our full Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight today has conducted a joint hearing on the sale of body parts by the People's Republic of China. The PLA is at the center of an international sale and transplant scheme that takes kidneys, corneas, livers and lungs from condemned prisoners and transplants them into wealthy patients who can afford the price.

There comes a time, Mr. Speaker, and a place, to put a limit on just what our Nation needs to do in order to engage China and its military. The administration gave a 17-gun salute in Washington to the Chinese general who orchestrated the Tiananmen massacre.

I ask, does the President really need to stand on that bloodstained Tiananmen Square so that Beijing can feel comfortable trading with us? I think not. Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to join us in supporting H. Con. Res. 285.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution. I think it is a bad policy, I think it is bad politics, and I think it is bad procedure.

On the face of it, the resolution seems innocuous. It declares the sense of Congress that the President should reconsider his decision to be formally received in Tiananmen Square when he visits China later this month, until the Chinese Government acknowledges the Tiananmen Square massacre, pledges that such a tragedy will never occur again and releases the Chinese students still imprisoned for their participation in the pro-democracy movement in 1989.

It is important to note, I think, that the resolution does not oppose the President's trip to China itself, but it does put conditions on the reception ceremonies that would inevitably make a successful visit less likely.

This resolution claims that, by attending arrival ceremonies in

Tiananmen Square, the President will somehow bestow legitimacy on the cruel events that took place there 9 years ago today. I think that is unfair to the President. I think it is absurd.

President Clinton has spoken out time after time against the brutal actions of the Chinese Government at Tiananmen Square. As Members will recall, President Clinton gave China's President a public lecture on this very issue at a joint press conference in Washington at the summit last fall, a lecture that many Members praised at the time.

The President, through his policy of engagement, has pushed aggressively on human rights, and he has gotten results. China has, with American prodding, released a number of political and religious prisoners, including Wei Jingsheng and Wang Dan. It has acknowledged its obligation to abide by the terms of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, a concession that makes it now impossible for Beijing to argue that human rights is a domestic concern in which we should not intrude.

China has begun to tolerate a level of public discussion and dissent that even a year ago would have been unimaginable. Of course, China has a long way to go in its human rights practices, but we should also recognize that the typical Chinese today has more personal freedoms and a better quality of life than at any time in history.

Tiananmen Square is the central feature of Beijing. The Great Hall of the People faces one side and the entrance to the Forbidden City faces another. It is China's equivalent of the White House south lawn. It is where heads of state visiting China are formally welcomed. It is where Prime Minister Major, President Chirac, Prime Minister Hashimoto and Prime Minister Netanyahu have all been welcomed in recent years.

So Mr. Clinton's presence there is similar. It has no suggestion of approval of China's human rights policies, any more than the presence of many Members of this body who have, accompanied by their Chinese hosts, visited Tiananmen Square in the past.

May I remind Members, for instance, that just last year the Speaker of the House of Representatives visited Tiananmen Square; and during his visit to China the Speaker enunciated a fundamental truth when he said, and I quote him now, ''If you can be respectful but firm, you can get a long way talking with the Chinese.''

China is a sovereign country. We cannot tell it where to hold its welcoming ceremonies. We would be deeply offended if the Chinese tried to dictate this to us. Why does anyone imagine that they will react differently?

The real question this resolution raises is how we can best promote human rights in China. Do we advance our human rights concerns by telling the Chinese where to receive the President of the United States, or do we advance those concerns by engaging with the Chinese?

This resolution suggests that we can improve China's human rights record behavior by telling the President not to go to Tiananmen Square. Frankly, in my view, that is a very superficial way to deal with a very difficult, complex issue. Do we really believe that this resolution will improve human rights conditions in China? And, if it does not, what then is the purpose of the resolution?

The only practical way to promote human rights in China is by maintaining the policy of engagement toward China that has been followed by every administration, Democratic and Republican, since President Nixon. Engagement works. It is not easy, it does not produce results as quickly as we might like, but if we are to have any chance of pushing the Chinese toward greater respect of human rights, we must continue to engage with them. Insults will not do the trick.

There are things that we can do that hold out the promise of improving human rights in China.

We must make it clear to China that, until it changes its human rights practices, it cannot become a modern, stable, prosperous country.

We must make it clear to China that, unless it improves its human rights performance, it will never be a fully accepted member of the international community.

We must make it clear that it is in China's own interests that it adhere at least to minimal international standards of due process, accountability, transparency and the rule of law.

We must continue to press China on these contentious human rights issues. We must not abandon our efforts, but we must be ready for the long pull.

I do not question the sincerity of those who will speak in support this resolution today, and I fully understand how the votes will go in a few minutes. All of us were appalled by China's brutal actions in Tiananmen Square 9 years ago. All of us agree that the Chinese Government should formally and publicly repent its tragic actions and immediately release those who are still imprisoned for their participation in the pro-democracy movement of 1989.

We are not considering this resolution today in isolation. This resolution must be put in the context of other measures this House has debated in recent months. It is part of a pattern that has seen this House take up one anti-China resolution or amendment after another since the U.S.-China summit last fall. Together, these measures are immensely complicating the management of this most difficult foreign policy relationship.

I understand that many Members of this House do not favor a policy of constructive engagement with China. That is, of course, their prerogative. For myself, I do not want to undermine the policy of engagement. I do not want to promote a policy of confrontation, and that is what I believe these resolutions and amendments do.

There are many Chinese policies that I abhor, as much, I think, as any Member of this House. We should speak out against those policies, but we should also think about what actions will change those policies and bring results.

Anti-China rhetoric may make some feel good, but it will not bring the results that we seek. It complicates the issue. The President's policies have led to some improvements in the human rights situation in China. This resolution will not.

Finally, I voice my dismay with the procedure followed for this resolution. It was introduced only yesterday and went directly to the Committee on Rules. The Committee on International Relations has jurisdiction over such resolutions, but apparently the chairman waived consideration in order to facilitate the resolution coming up today.

I understand that today is a significant date, but that is not an excuse for a flawed, hurried process. There has been no consideration of this resolution or the difficult issues it addresses by the Committee on International Relations. There has been no consultation with the administration, at least to my knowledge. Little thought has been given to the foreign policy implications of this resolution. This is not a deliberative, careful process. A flawed process is producing, I think, a flawed product. This does not reflect well on the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I take second place to no one in my support for human rights and freedom in China, but that is not what we are debating in this resolution. Let us consider how we can promote the values of freedom and justice in China, but let us do it thoughtfully, deliberatively and free of partisan and political motives.

This resolution will not advance freedom in China. It will not help those who, 9 years after the tragedy we commemorate today, continue to suffer for their belief that the Chinese people should enjoy the same liberties we in this country so cherish.

This resolution will not prod Chinese authorities to open their country to the forces of pluralism and the winds of democracy. It will do none of these things. It will only convince Chinese leaders that many in this institution, the House of Representatives, want to declare a war of words against China. It will promote confrontation and make it less likely that the Chinese will listen to us on human rights or the other issues of deep importance to us.

The administration, of course, opposes this resolution, and so should all those who are interested in results and not just rhetoric. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH),

our distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a yes vote on this important human rights resolution. Nine years ago today, the ground of Tiananmen Square was hallowed by the blood of thousands of peaceful democracy advocates. Those Chinese patriots were slaughtered by a communist regime that remains unapologetic for its actions and that continues to deny the truth of what happened. It is repugnant that the President of the United States of America, the country that, foremost of any of the world, ought to bear the standard of freedom and democracy, would meet at the very site with dictators who continue to lie about the murders committed less than a decade ago.

□ 1800

This resolution is not anti-China. It is anti-abuse, the abuse that was endured by those democracy activists, that was witnessed by the world via C-SPAN, via CNN and other networks that were there on the scene.

Mr. Speaker, in December of 1996 General Chi Haotian, the Defense Minister of the People's Republic of China and the operational commander of the forces that attacked the pro-democracy demonstrators, was invited to the United States by the Clinton Administration. During his visit, he was given full military honors, a 19-gun salute, visits with several military bases, and a tour of the Sandia Nuclear Laboratory. He even had a personal meeting with President Clinton at the White House.

General Chi said that not a single person, and I quote, not a single person lost his life in Tiananmen Square. He claimed that on June 4, 1989 the People's Liberation Army did nothing more violent than pushing people whom he called hooligans.

The supposed idea behind these official visits such as General Chi's visit and President Clinton's trip to Beijing is to foster mutual understanding. That is just what they say. If we are going to live in the same world with governments run by people like General Chi, the argument goes, we had better get to know each other.

General Chi's big lie about Tiananmen Square certainly helped many Americans understand what he and his government are really like. However, in China the visit by the Butcher of Beijing was a public relations coup. He could not have gotten better press, being feted at the White House and being given all of these honors. Again, this is the man that ordered the killing of those students.

I believe that the process of getting acquainted must be a reciprocal one. In an effort to help General Chi understand that in America it matters whether you tell the truth, my Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights invited him or any other representative of the Chinese Government to appear at a hearing on the Tiananmen massacre. If he could present convincing and compelling evidence that the massacre was really a myth after all, those of us who view the Beijing government and had our views shaped by that massacre would have to admit that we were wrong.

We were prepared to give General Chi an opportunity to substantiate his claim that China has sold no illegal weapons to Iran. Perhaps he could have shown us that there were no persecuted Christians in China, no ethnic and religious persecution in Tibet and Xinjiang, no forced abortions, which are millions per year, women who are literally thrust and brought into these abortion mills, no coerced sterilizations, and no dying rooms for unwanted children. These claims would have all been contrary to the evidence, but in America everyone is given a fair opportunity to be heard.

Unfortunately, General Chi did not respond to our invitation, and the place we had saved for a representative, either he or a member of the government, sat empty during that hearing, at which time we heard from multiple eyewitnesses, including an editor from the People's Daily who recounted the horrors of Tiananmen Square.

In commentary about Tiananmen Square, Mr. Chairman, Nicholas Kristoff of the New York Times, who was in the Square that night, reported, and I quote, ''The troops began shooting. Some people fell to the ground, wounded or dead. Each time the soldiers fired again and more people fell to the ground.''

When he went to the Xiehe hospital, the nearest to the Square, ''it was a bloody mess with hundreds of injured lying on the floors. I saw the bullet holes,'' Nicholas Kristoff goes on to say, ''in the ambulances.''

Jan Wong of the Toronto Globe and Mail, looking down from the balcony at the Peking Hotel, ''watched in horror as the army shot directly into the crowds. People fell with gaping wounds.'' Later, she reported, ''The soldiers strafed ambulances and shot medical workers trying to rescue the wounded.'' ''In all,'' she reported, ''I recorded eight long murderous volleys.'' Dozens died before her very eyes.

This is what Tiananmen Square means to the people of China and to the world. If President Clinton goes there and stands shoulder to shoulder with the very people who ordered the massacre, that gesture will be a thousand times more powerful than any mere words he may exchange with those who mowed down and bayonetted students and democracy activists. It will be the diplomatic equivalent of dancing on the graves of the courageous and innocent victims of Tiananmen square.

Mr. President, for God's sake and for the sake of the people of China and for the sake of everything the U.S. used to and hopefully still stands for, do not mark the ninth anniversary of the murder at Tiananmen Square by celebrating with the murderers at the scene of the crimes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the resolution. I put a question to my colleagues: What were 122 Members of the House of Representatives doing visiting Beijing in 1997? I visited there four times with 39 of them, including the Speaker of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), chair of the Subcommittee on Asia, 39 members.

On the visits each time, each one of us went to Tiananmen Square. No one in this House failed to condemn the atrocities in Tiananmen Square, nor are in support of what happens there.

The President has spoken clearly and often in condemnation of human rights violations in China. When we traveled there, Speaker GINGRICH, I was there on March 30 when he said if we can be respectful, but firm, we can get a long way talking with the Chinese.

I have been in those rooms with the Prime Minister and the Vice Premier, with other distinguished Chinese persons. In each instance our priorities were human rights, democracy, the rule of law; and in each instance we raised those questions time and time again.

Fundamentally, the question of the arrival ceremony becomes a question about whether or not President Clinton goes to China. When a foreign leader goes to China, the leader has a welcoming ceremony, and that is where the ceremony is, period.

We have discussed it with the Chinese at great length. Not surprisingly, the Chinese leaders consider China their country, not ours, and feel that a guest should have the ceremony where they always have had it. I am not aware of other countries that do arrival ceremonies where and when we tell them.

Finally, I will put this question to my colleagues: When President Richard Nixon went to China, the Red Guard, Mao Tse-tung, and countless other official individuals reigned supreme. The question that I put: Was China as bad on human rights then when President Nixon visited? The answer is, of course, it was. But it was right to be engaged then, and it is right to be engaged now.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard some of my colleagues say that we have to make it clear to China that if they are to join the people of nations, that they are going to have to change their policies. I have heard some of my colleagues say that we have to be respectful, but firm. I have been in Congress now for 16 years, and every single year I have heard that same kind of statement. Every single year, the situation either remains the same or worse.

Recently, a Clinton administration official said frankly on the human rights front, the situation has deteriorated. They are rounding up dissidents and harassing them more.

There were 7,300 young men and women who wanted nothing more than liberty and freedom 9 years ago and were brutally massacred or hurt in Tiananmen Square. Many of them are still in communist Chinese gulags today.

What are we going to do about it? We have got to continue to be engaged with them. We have a $60 billion trade deficit that is really putting pressure on communist China. They are using 10 million men, women, and children in slave labor camps, gulags, to make tennis shoes and things that we buy in this country every day.

Yet, when they commit human rights atrocities like Tiananmen Square, we say we have to keep engaged. We have to be respectful, but firm. We have to make it clear to them they have got to change, but they do not change. It goes on year after year after year.

Today, we had a hearing before our committee. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and I cochaired that meeting. We had Harry Wu testify before our committee, and Wei Jingsheng before the committee. Both of them told us very clearly that in the prisons over there they are killing prisoners for body parts.

They come to foreign countries, and they say to foreign countries, if you want a kidney, we will get it for you for $30,000. Then they go back for tissue samples and blood samples, and they find a prisoner or group of prisoners. They say, okay, come over here on a certain date, and I will kill them and give you their kidneys, and they do it.

They are making an estimated minimum of $60 million a year by harvesting body parts off of prisoners, many of them possibly political dissidents, and selling them to people around the world. I cannot hardly believe that. It is ghoulish. Yet, we turn our backs on that.

It is going on today. They are doing it in Taiwan. They are doing it in Macao. They are doing it all over Southeast Asia. They are doing it even here in the United States, where people have already been arrested trying to sell these body parts.

But we have to stay engaged with them. We have to look the other way while these human rights atrocities continue to take place. I say, why? Are we our brother's keeper or not? Are we supposed to turn our head and look the other way just for the almighty dollar? Is American business so callous that they do not care about people in other parts of the world?

Obviously we want to make money. Money is very important. But, for God's sake, what about human beings who are suffering? We look the other way.

What kind of penalties do we impose on the Chinese Government for these atrocities? Nothing. Nothing. We talk about it year after year after year. Many of my colleagues have been here as long as I have, and nothing changes. There are still 10 million people in those gulags making tennis shoes for us, slave labor camps, being paid nothing, but we look the other way. We have got to stay constructively engaged with no penalties.

I submit to my colleagues, we have got to put some pressure on them. We have done it before, I think, when we had some property rights. A couple years ago I think we put some pressure on China and they relented, but it was only because we put pressure on them. But we do not do that anymore. Very rare cases.

So I would just like to say to my colleagues we need to put pressure on communist China. We now believe that we have had technology transferred that has endangered the very security of every man, woman, and child in this country, or possibly may have. We know that the Chinese Communist government has given political contributions in this country, and they do not do it for their health. They must have been doing it, trying to influence our policies in some way.

These things need to be investigated thoroughly before the President of the United States goes over there in Tiananmen Square where this massacre took place and starts shaking hands with the President of China, who lied to the American people when he said there were no political contributions coming from them into this country, and he knew it.

I would just like to end up by saying this to my colleagues: For God's sweet sake, think about those people over there who are dying today while we are so callously looking the other way.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as I listen to this debate, I think we are back into debate like we just finished on the prayer amendment. The question is: Does the President of the United States condone what happened in Tiananmen Square? Is anybody seriously asserting that the President of the United States condones what happened there? The answer is absolutely not. He has spoken about it over and over again.

I would respect the matters of this resolution if they would put in it what they really want, which is that the President should not go. To say to the President of the United States, look, Bill, when you get over there, tell them where you are going to land and where you want to meet them and what door you want to go into, the Great Hall of the People. Just send over a letter to the Chinese Government and say, I am not coming in the front door, I want to come in around back through the alley.

That is so ridiculous as to make the Chinese either laugh or be angry, one way or the other. It is their country. They decide how every official delegation comes to China.

I traveled with the President on his South American trip and his African trip. People in Brazil and Argentina were distressed by the amount of intrusion we made about how the President comes into a country.

□ 1815

For us to stand here on the floor and seriously say he should not go to the official reception place of the Chinese Government is just simply ridiculous.

Now, I believe that we have no choice but to remain engaged with China. For us to return to the pre-Nixon era, when we said they are communists so we are not going to talk to them, is simply not possible. Clearly, the events in South Asia that everybody was out here 2 weeks ago passing resolutions about, that is, the exchange of nuclear technology with Pakistan, and the whole problem of the Pakistan-China-India triangle, is an issue that must be discussed at the highest level.

If Members and I share a concern about peace in the world, we have to be talking to the people who have the ability to control that situation. For us to say to the President, why do you not start by insulting the Chinese, tell them where you are going to land, you are going to go into Nanking, the old south capital, you are not going to Beijing because that represents a bad place, would be like saying to Yeltsin, I do not think I am going to come into Moscow because that is where a lot of tragedy and trauma occurred.

Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution is very ill-conceived and bad public policy.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

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

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this resolution, which could not have come at a more poignant time. Nine years ago today thousands of young Chinese men and women lost their lives while demonstrating support for freedom and democracy. This peaceful demonstration came to a violent end when Chinese soldiers of the People's Republic of China were ordered to fire machine guns and tanks on these innocent unarmed civilians. Many of the survivors remain incarcerated today.

I realize I have a somewhat different point of view than many of my colleagues. In fact, I urged the President to go to China. There was a letter circulated recently asking him not to go. I think that would be a tragic mistake. I think he should go. I think there are a lot of valuable things he could accomplish. I think he can reaffirm the moral values of the American people in terms of human rights, nonproliferation, and on and on. He should have gone long ago, in fact, not for just some kind of a photo opportunity, but to discuss the serious issues facing our Nation today.

However, he should not go to Tiananmen Square. In fact, just 3 days ago I sent a letter to President Clinton, and I will quote it:

> I must urge you in the strongest terms to avoid any official activities in Tiananmen Square. No American President should appear at Tiananmen Square, at a minimum, until Chinese officials acknowledge young Chinese men and women whose blood was shed 9 years ago this week. Your visit there would set back the Chinese struggle for human rights, and would be an insult to those heroic students who gave their lives for the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, Chinese officials must acknowledge the bloodshed that occurred in Tiananmen Square if they expect to advance a constructive relationship with the United States. I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution. It is not about trying to dictate to the President where he should go or where he should not go, it is simply about common sense. It is simply about reaffirming our values. That is a great opportunity to build constructively this relationship.

A lot of folks who have said that MFN does not work, they say so because I do not think we have been constructively engaged. We do not take the opportunities to use the bully pulpit to speak plainly with our colleagues on another continent.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER).

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am outraged at the atrocities at Tiananmen Square 9 years ago. I, too, as the concurrent resolution states, am outraged that children were killed holding the hands of their mothers, outraged that students were crushed by armored personnel carriers. As the resolution says, I am outraged that more than 2,000 Chinese, pro-democracy demonstrators, died that day.

But is this resolution about changing policy in China? Unfortunately, it is not. It is just yet another partisan political attempt to embarrass the President. While I would never dare impugn the motives of those speaking in favor of the resolution, where were all the voices, where was the Speaker's voice, when he supported extending China once again Most Favored Nation trading status? Where were all the voices who support extending Most Favored Nation trading status on China? Why were they not talking about the atrocities then?

To support China-MFN and to support this concurrent resolution is intellectually incompatible, because to do so is to argue that these brave souls, 2,000 of them that lost their lives, their lives are worthy of changing a ceremony but they are not worthy of changing our economic policy. Those lives are worthy of changing some ceremonial thing that the President will do, where he will walk, but they are not worthy of us, God forbid, losing a buck.

I am sure those that bring back the memory of those whose lives were lost in Tiananmen Square are very genuine, very genuine in their memories. But I respectfully suggest to bring up the memories of such brave freedom fighters in the context of something that is not a great debate about policy about China, but is yet just another attempt to rebuke the President on an international stage, is not what we ought to do.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, our relations with the People's Republic of China are multidimensional. We have trade relations, we have security relations, and yes, we care about human rights in China. Yes, we should talk about these things always together. But there are people of good will on both sides who believe that keeping tariff rates low is a way for us to engage China. That is the view of the President of the United States.

While I am one who has voted against MFN, and so probably do not fall into the category that my colleague just described of being inconsistent, I do not see it as hypocrisy when people wish to stand up for human rights and also wish to stand up for low tariff rates.

It seems to me that when we have a vote on this in just a little while, we are likely to have about 90 percent of the Congress voting together, because on either side of the MFN issue, we ought to agree that human rights in China are important. Because our relations, our bilateral relations with the People's Republic of China are complex, it is, to state the obvious, that human rights is not all there is.

But if the President of the United States were to appear in Tiananmen Square, with all of the symbolism that that carries, were to appear in this very public killing field, that visit, that event, would be all about human rights and nothing else. That is why the President ought not to do it.

It is not just that over 2,000 people were killed by PLA troops and tanks on that day, as estimated by the Chinese Red Cross and other reliable sources, including eyewitness accounts. It is that the survivors of those democracy demonstrations are still in jail today, in 1998. It is awfully difficult to imagine an America that stands for freedom sending its President to the very site of this notorious event, which all the world saw and still concerns itself with, and not send the kind of signal that all of us hope is not sent, that America no longer cares about freedom. We do care about freedom. I believe President Clinton cares about freedom. That is why he should not go there.

Last year I went with the leadership of this Congress to meet with President Jiang Zemin in Beijing. We were not received in Tiananmen Square. It was not necessary for us to be received there. The Vice President of the United States, AL GORE, last year went to the People's Republic of China. He was not received in Tiananmen Square.

President Clinton should not become the first American President, the only American President, to be received in Tiananmen Square since that horrible occurrence in 1989. That is what this resolution is all about. I am very confident that it will receive broad and bipartisan support. I am very confident that the advice that we will be giving I think will be received as it is intended, for the good of the United States of America, for the good of human rights around the world.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not think supporting this resolution is standing up for human rights. I think well-intentioned people can disagree about this, but for me this is the essence of meaningless symbolism over real substance.

If Members do not think the President should go to China, bring forth a resolution saying that the President should not go to China. If Members do not believe in the policy of constructive engagement, then come out and speak against that particular policy. If Members want to do something that will hurt the Chinese and bear the consequences of it, then come out for MFN. If Members want to withhold imports and trade benefits because of the constant and continuous policy of proliferation of nuclear and missile technology, deal with that.

But do not say, all this is fine, constructive engagement is good, going to China makes sense, renew MFN, but, Mr. Speaker, do not go to the place that for all of us symbolizes the most horrible, indescribable terror imaginable and the example of brute government force, do not go there, as your statement of protest.

Mr. President, go there, speak against that horror, speak against what we do not want, push an agenda which is meaningful and real in terms of helping America's interest in stability and the interests of nonproliferation and the cause of human rights, but

do not take the cheap symbolism of this kind of resolution as a substitute for a policy.

I have watched, too much, people who write letters urging the President to allow American satellites and Chinese launchers and then pass one House bill to stop it, and people who stand up and decry China and then go vote for MFN because American corporations want it.

I agree with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) about his point, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this resolution. The resolution calls for the release of prisoners. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and I went into prison. In fact, this is Beijing Prison Number 1. This is the back of the head of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

These were prisoners, Tiananmen Square prisoners, and we picked the socks up off the line that the prisoners were making. There were 1,000 to 2,000 people killed, but there were men, many of them or most of them, and I see the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CHRIS SMITH) in the back there, who remembers vividly when we went in the Beijing Prison Number 1. What it says was Hosiery Factory, when it was basically a very, very brutal prison.

For their families, it is absolutely important to pass the resolution. It is not a free vote, because I will tell the Members, tomorrow morning on Radio Free Europe and Radio Free Asia and Voice of America, if you will, this will go on, that the United States Congress has passed this. What it will say is that the people's body, the United States Congress, has passed this resolution.

If you were a mom or dad who had had your son or daughter killed, and I have brutal pictures of those who have been run over by tanks, this would send a message. But for those who are in prison and languishing, it will send a message: One, he ought not to go to Tiananmen Square, and I am one who has been opposed to MFN; but two, I think for the children, for the prisoners that are in there who made these socks, and these have golfers on them and they do not play golf in China, they are for export to the United States, this resolution is a good resolution.

I strongly hope that it is passed by an overwhelming margin, because tomorrow in Beijing when they hear, I think it will send a positive message, and the prisoners in Beijing Prison Number 1 and throughout the gulags will find out about this resolution. Their moms, their dads, their wives, their families within the next couple of weeks will tell them, and that will give them hope.

I appreciate the sponsorship of this, and I strongly support this, and hope it can be almost by unanimous vote.

□ 1830

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today with my prized possession which is the great icon, the picture, probably one of the greatest symbols of the 20th century, of the lone man before the tank. And it is signed by almost every important dissident who has come out of China. It is a great treasure to me because of the courage of the people that are represented here.

I rise today in support of the resolution, and I want to tell my colleagues why. But, first of all, I want to associate myself with some of the remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), because far too often we have resolutions on the floor that serve as a fig leaf for those who, when the really serious issues come up like trade status and the rest, are never with us.

Members are quick to criticize the impact of the President's policies while they have stuck with him every time a vote is taken, but use these issues for political purposes and bring up resolutions, as I say, to make themselves well, when they are voting against the really serious issues that we have to deal with.

Having said that, I want to say that this is not about whether the President should go to China. I think the President should go to China when the time is right. He thinks that is now. I disagree, but I am not against his going to China.

And it is not about whether we should be engaged with China, because we certainly should be engaged with China, but in a sustainably and constructive way, which I do not think we are right now.

The reason why I am opposed to the President being received in Tiananmen Square is because the President is trying to frame his visit as the end of the Tiananmen era. That is not so. And just saying it will not make it so.

The Tiananmen era will not be over until the Chinese regime reverses the decision of Tiananmen Square; until the over 100 people who were arrested at that time are freed and are allowed to speak freely in China; until the over 2,000 political prisoners are freed, not exiled but allowed to stay in China and speak freely, and over 200,000 people who are in reform-through-labor camps because of their political beliefs are released.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to say that Mr. Harry Wu said this morning if the President goes to Tiananmen Square, he will join the Chinese regime on the wrong side of history. I urge our colleagues to vote aye.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 285 expressing the sense of Congress that President Clinton ought not to be received by the Chinese Government on his arrival at Tiananmen Square when he goes there later this month.

Mr. Speaker, as many in this body know, I am one who believes very strongly in a policy of engagement. I am one that supported China MFN. I believe that engagement works. I believe that when American citizens, businesspeople, students, and academicians travel to China, we help to spread our values there. And I do believe that makes a difference. I also do not oppose the President's visiting China. Indeed, I believe he should visit China, because I believe it is an important element of a sound foreign policy for China.

Others that have supported this resolution have talked about the abuses that are going on today in China. They have talked about widespread political prisoners. They have talked about body parts being sold commercially and about forced abortions. We know there are human rights abuses in China—some of them alleged, some that we know take place.

But that is not what this resolution is about. The resolution says that this President ought not to be received as an official part of his visit in Tiananmen Square because of the very symbolism that an event there would suggest. It would suggest that the United States, that the President of the United States, forgives and forgets what happened there only 9 years ago when the Chinese Government callously crushed an incipient student political democracy movement. It was brutal, and we all saw it on television.

And, yes, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) said that I was in Tiananmen Square with him. Yes, I was there. But I think there is a difference in walking across Tiananmen Square and being officially received there as part of the opening ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, the President should go to China, but he ought to be in control of his own visit. No Chinese visitor would agree to be received on American soil at the site of some atrocity against its citizens in this country, if such an event were to occur. If we believe in freedom and human rights for Chinese, our president should not visit in any official capacity the scene of the brutal repression.

Mr. Speaker, I say, ''Mr. President, make your visit. Stay engaged. But do not say to the Chinese that we condone and forgive what happened there 9 years ago. Mr. President, do not go to Tiananmen Square on this visit.''

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

(Mr. DOOLEY of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

It was over 20 years ago the Republican President Nixon fought off the forces of isolationism and turned this country towards a direction of engagement with China. When I hear many of the speakers today that are suggesting that our President should not be entertained on Tiananmen Square, that are suggesting which door he should enter when he goes to the Great Hall of China, I am troubled by that, because it seems to me that we have seen clear demonstration over the last 20 years that this policy of constructive engagement has done more to advance the interest of human rights, the interest of religious freedom in China than any policy of isolationism could have ever achieved.

Sure, there are still problems in human rights. There are still problems in religious persecution. But for us to suggest and to dictate to this President how and where he should be entertained is clearly not appropriate. It does not serve us well to dictate to the President that he should insult the host, the President of China and the citizens of China.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote against this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for his leadership on this.

Mr. Speaker, the President ''continues to coddle China, despite its continuing crackdown on democratic reforms, its brutal subjugation of Tibet, and its irresponsible export of technology.'' That is not my opinion.

Let me read that again. The President ''continues to coddle China, despite its continuing crackdown on democratic reforms, its brutal subjugation of Tibet, and its irresponsible export of technology.'' December 11, 1992, William Clinton when he was President-elect.

Mr. Speaker, talk about a whopper. I mean, if my colleagues wonder why the American people distrust our leadership, it is when they say one thing to get elected and, when they get elected, they do exactly the opposite.

We heard earlier in the debate that he is just yielding to the interests of that country, that they set the schedule. But when another President of the United States went to Bitburg, where Nazi butchers had killed Jews that were buried in that cemetery, there was a justified outcry in America, and from the other side of the aisle, that said that we do not think the President should go to Bitburg.

Mr. Speaker, what is the double standard here? Thousands of students were butchered. Many are in prison today. And the last thing we need from the President of the United States is to break his word that he gave the American people about coddling the Chinese, about not standing up for human rights, because he ran on it. We would like him to keep his word and not do what would be a terrible signal to those who are trying to stand up for human rights and democratic reforms around the world.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE).

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I think with the eloquence of many who have spoken here on both sides, it is important to remember what happened 9 years ago in Tiananmen Square. The people must remember. The U.S. Congress must remember. The President of the United States and, yes, the Chinese people and government must remember.

But I have got to ask, too, why do we not remember and remember how important it is to engage? Would anyone have seriously suggested that Presidents Reagan or Bush or FORD or Carter, going all the way back, should never have gone to Moscow to meet with the Soviet Union, now, of course, the Russians, because of the gulags, because of the Korean Air 007 shooting down, because of the oppression in Afghanistan and countless other countries? Of course not. We knew they had to go.

Or Richard Nixon, should he not have gone to China? Talk about human rights violations. Mao Tse-tung and the Red Guard were running in full bloom at the time. Millions massacred, millions incarcerated. Deng Xiaoping himself, a later leader of China, was being subjected to imprisonment by the Red Guard, but we had to engage.

The President of the United States standing in Tiananmen Square does not gloss over what happened there; it highlights it. It highlights it because of the attention it draws, and I think President Clinton will stand well in representing what Americans believe.

We have to look at this trip in the entirety, not in separate events. And that is what I think is important, is what does the President come back with?

Finally, I am a little tired of micromanaging by Congress. I am tired when the Speaker of the House goes to Israel and decides it is okay to bash foreign policy on foreign soil. I am tired of Congress trying to micromanage the foreign policy of this country. It is fair to hold the President accountable, but let the President do what the Constitution says he is to do.

Many, and I am one of them who has supported MFN status, but I would be insulted if someone tried to say that business was trumping blood in that situation. So it is that I feel the President should be given the leeway and the discretion to do what he knows is fair to be done, and then it is fair to judge him on the entirety.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), a member of the committee.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be blunt. The presence of the President in the United States, President Clinton with his record on human rights, in Tiananmen Square makes a mockery of this country's sincere commitment to human rights and democracy.

This administration has the worst human rights record of any administration in my lifetime. And any utterance the President of the United States might make about human rights in Tiananmen Square, where thousands of young people struggling for democracy in China were murdered, just takes away from any message that we might have as a people to the peoples of the world that we are serious when we talk about democracy and freedom.

In reality, it will be seen as purely posturing by a President that has time and again said making money and making sure that the Chinese can keep that $50 billion trade surplus to be used to build up their own weapons systems which they then use to suppress their people is much more important than human rights.

President Clinton said, well, we must have Most Favored Nation status again just recently; and he told the people of the United States that this was because China can help us. It is not good in human rights. At least it can help us in a broader role by bringing peace to Asia or whatever. And further evidence of this, of the role they can play, is the important role that the President said that we can be working with China in some strategic relationship in the 21st century.

But what constructive role was he talking about with Beijing as a strategic partner? Since May 26, one week previous to the President's statement, U.S. intelligence has been tracking a Chinese cargo freighter that departed from Shanghai loaded with missiles and electronic components to be used for nuclear weapons steaming for Pakistan. Steaming for Pakistan. With that type of a record I would suggest that China cannot help us with anything, and they are not good for human rights.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 285 which urges President Clinton reconsider his decision to be received in Tiananmen Square.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush condemned the Chinese government when the killings occurred; and President Clinton has repeatedly been on record

and made clear his view that the breakup of the demonstrations and killing of innocent civilians was unacceptable and a great mistake by the Chinese leaders.

Traditionally, the Chinese Government welcomes heads of state by arrival ceremonies held at the Great Hall of People which is next to Tiananmen Square. All dignitaries from around the world are accorded the same reception at the Great Hall, as was done with Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto, French President Chirac, British Prime Minister Major, Russian President Yeltsin, and even Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu.

Mr. Speaker, are we as a Nation greater than all of these democratic nations combined? It seems to me that we are bordering along the line of arrogance to tell another sovereign nation how it should receive our President. The reception of these world leaders at the Great Hall did not signify their government's condoning the Tiananmen Square massacre. Likewise, President Clinton's reception at the Great Hall cannot be construed as bestowing legitimacy on the Chinese Government's brutal actions 9 years ago.

□ 1845

Mr. Speaker, contrary to the views of my friends in the Republican majority, I honestly believe the presence of President Clinton on Tiananmen Square will reinforce and reaffirm fundamental basic democratic values and principles to all the leaders and the people of China. President Clinton should respect Chinese protocol and use the opportunity of the Great Hall to expressly honor the memories of those who died in Tiananmen Square, while urging that China continue progress at all levels for human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that our colleagues vote against this measure.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair advise us how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in many instances we see bravery by going forward, marching strong and tall. I would hope this country would view the visit of the President of the United States just in that form.

I, too, was outraged and overcome with sadness at the tragedy of Tiananmen Square in 1989. Thousands of Chinese students marched peaceably, children were killed and students were trampled, and horrendous and horrific acts perpetrated on the people of China who wanted freedom.

But I would say that this resolution does not speak to that question. For if it seriously did, and I believe in human rights and have argued vigorously against the travesties in Rwanda and Burundi and Bosnia and places around the world, we would not want our President not to go and confront the leaders and the tragedy of Tiananmen Square.

We would want our President to stand tall in that square and declare a day of freedom for all of those prisoners who are incarcerated. We would want our President to challenge the Chinese on their own territory about the travesty of the lack of human rights and human dignity in that country.

This resolution is not a resolution to bring about those kinds of acts. It is a partisan one, although I do not in any way argue against those who are committed to the issues of human rights. I know that they are standing on solid ground. I simply ask them to reconsider whether or not any action will come out of this.

I believe it is extremely important that our President go bravely into China, stand up for what America believes in, the human dignity of all people, ask for those incarcerated because of their difference in views to be freed now and immediately. That is what I want the President of the United States to do, to stand for freedom and human rights, to do it and say it loudly and to bring the United Nations along with him. I believe we can do this better if we allow our President to represent us in the way he should.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution that simply asks President Clinton not to be formally received at the site of Tiananmen Square.

Tiananmen Square is probably the site of the worst government violence brought upon an unarmed population in the last thirty years, where at least 2000 people were murdered by their own government.

I adamantly believe that the President, in light of explosive allegations that the Chinese military was attempting to funnel illegal campaign donations to political candidates and because of China's weapons and nuclear proliferation, should not even travel to the People's Republic of China at this point.

But if he is, the President must send the strongest signal to China that we will not accept such butchery on an innocent people.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the distinguished minority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this debate has been a good debate and I want to thank the committee for bringing it to the floor. The debate is about H. Con. Res. 285, expressing the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should reconsider his decision to be formally received in Tiananmen Square by the government of the People's Republic of China.

It is unusual. I think we have acknowledged that. It is an unusual thing to bring such a resolution to the floor. It is probably even more unusual for the resolution to have been brought to the floor by me or to have been submitted by me. I listened to the debate, and good points were made on both sides of the debate, and I want to thank everybody who participated in the debate.

Why would I do this? It is not my usual posture to suggest that I should describe for the President how and where he should travel, where he should be received when he travels. What would compel me to do this? What compels me is the love of freedom and the scene of that love of freedom that I saw 9 years ago on this day, the young students in China gathered together on Tiananmen Square.

They gathered for the purpose of celebrating freedom and democracy. They gathered for the purpose of hoping and dreaming, wishing, praying and, no doubt, demanding freedom and democracy for themselves. They gathered around them on that square the symbols of freedom that they knew, even from their relatively closed society, they knew symbols of freedom from around the globe. One such symbol of freedom that they knew of was the Statue of Liberty in the United States. The students had built a papier mache model of that statue and it was, I am sure, something of enormous encouragement to them.

Then the troops confronted the students, armed troops, tanks, we have all seen the pictures. We sit there and we wonder why would a lone figure stand in the face of those tanks. Why would the students risk the carnage that they experienced? The same reason people have risked their personal lives and their fortunes and their sacred honor before, for the love of freedom.

They saw during all that carnage their comrades fall, fellow students. They must have been as horrified as we were as we watched the scenes. They saw the symbol of liberty, the Statue of Liberty in papier mache, crushed under the tanks. They later experienced the arrests and some of them are there today.

One of the things I marveled about 9 years ago and one of the things I marvel about today, no matter how rigorously the Government of China keeps the message of freedom out, the message is heard by these young people. I guess there is an old line, with love all things are possible, and with the love of freedom they hear the message of freedom.

They look to America as the peoples of the world look to America for freedom, and they see in America many, many symbols of freedom, the Statue of Liberty that they reproduced. I expect this building is seen by many people around the world and would be seen by these young people today in their prisons or worrying about arrest, this Capitol would be a symbol of freedom. The White House is seen as a symbol of freedom, the eagle.

Mr. Speaker, to most of the world the President of the United States, the American presidency is a symbol of freedom. What an honor. What an honor for this great Nation to have our head of State recognized as a head of State, as a symbol of a thing so precious as freedom.

They saw the Chinese army crush their symbol of freedom and it broke their hearts. Should these young people now see the symbol of freedom, the American presidency, received in Tiananmen Square, celebrated by that same government that was so callous and so cruel, so harsh, so brutal in crushing their love of freedom?

It is not about the President, Mr. Speaker. It is not about the Congress. It is not about you and I. It is not about American business enterprise. It is not about trade. It is about young people with freedom and the love of freedom in their hearts and their hopes and their dreams, who should not have to observe one of the great world symbols of freedom received on what is to them sacred, hallowed ground by the despotic government that crushed their dream.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, nine years ago, the People's Liberation Army and the State Security Forces of the People's Republic of China turned their weapons on a group of unarmed, peaceful demonstrators who had gathered in the center of Beijing for several weeks to protest the corruption of the communist Chinese government and demand democratic reforms and greater freedom. Many of those who had gathered there were students—the best and brightest of China—but there were also factory workers, older people, families and even party members. They had come to Tiananmen Square—the physical and psychic center of China's capital city—to peacefully petition for change in their government. This peaceful petition was met with bullets and tanks. Between 2,000 and 5,000 people were killed in and around Tiananmen Square by Chinese military and police forces. They were shot in the back as they ran away. They were crushed under tank treads. They were killed by indiscriminate machine gunfire. They put their own lives at risk to save others. They are heroes and martyrs, and we will never know many of their names even though we watched their fate unfold on CNN. We cannot allow their memory to die and we cannot allow what they stood for to be diminished.

By ordering Chinese troops and police to fire on their own people, Jiang Zemin, Li Peng and the rest of the Chinese Politburo earned their place in history. Nothing that has happened since can change this fact. President Clinton seems determined, however, to create his own place in history as the American leader who turned his back on the democracy movement in China in order to avoid offending his authoritarian hosts. The Chinese leadership remains unapologetic about the events of June 4, 1989 and they continue to vilify, imprison and exile these brave democracy activists. By standing in Tiananmen Square with these men, President Clinton lends them and their policies—including the actions of June 4th—the veneer of legitimacy they have sought since that fateful day. This is unacceptable.

Tiananmen Square is more than a vast expanse of concrete in the middle of Beijing through which one must inevitably cross. It is more than a typical example of totalitarian architecture; and it is more than a place for ceremonial receptions of foreign dignitaries. Tiananmen Square evokes a visceral emotional reaction within those of us who followed the events of May and June of 1989. It is the place where we saw the spirit of freedom and democracy living in the faces of tens of thousands of Chinese people. It is also the place where we saw their dreams of freedom and democracy crushed by their own brutal and illegitimate government. In 1989, Jiang Zemin and Li Peng—among others—made the decision to use force against peaceful demonstrators at Tiananmen Square. In June 1998, they will be at Tiananmen Square to greet the President of the United States. I believe that such an act is an insult to the memory of those who died in the Tiananmen Square massacre and those who remain in prison or in exile today as a result of their participation in that historic protest. Is this the message that we want to send to those inside China and around the world who are fighting for freedom and democracy?

I strongly support the substance of this resolution and I am pleased that the House has seen fit to bring it to the floor today. I believe that it is important that President Clinton visit China, and that the U.S. remain engaged with China. I do not, however, believe that it is inconsistent with engagement to join my colleagues in calling on the President to honor the memory of those brave Chinese men and women who died nine years ago in the name of freedom and democracy by refusing to stand in Tiananmen Square with the architects of the massacre that is synonymous with that place. Engagement does not mean we fail to stand with those who are our values, rather than those who repudiate our values. Engagement does not mean that must allow the Chinese dictatorship to manipulate a visit by the U.S. president to their own political purposes. U.S. policy should not get ''beyond Tiananmen Square'' until and unless the Chinese government admits that what happened there nine years ago was a mistake and apologizes to the Chinese people for this crime which was committed against them. When that happens, I will be the first one to urge our President to visit Tiananmen Square. Unless he goes to lay a wreath there in memory of the victims of June 4th, however, he should not go to Tiananmen Square on this trip.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The concurrent resolution is considered as read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 454, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. 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 305, nays 116, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

YEAS—305

Abercrombie	Diaz-Balart	Hyde
Aderholt	Dickey	Inglis
Archer	Doggett	Istook
Armey	Doolittle	Jackson (IL)
Bachus	Doyle	Jenkins
Baesler	Dreier	Johnson (CT)
Baker	Duncan	Johnson (WI)
Ballenger	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Barcia	Ehlers	Jones
Barr	Ehrlich	Kasich
Barrett (NE)	Emerson	Kelly
Bartlett	English	Kennedy (RI)
Barton	Ensign	Kennelly
Bass	Etheridge	Kildee
Bateman	Evans	King (NY)
Bereuter	Everett	Kingston
Bilbray	Ewing	Klug
Bilirakis	Fawell	Knollenberg
Bliley	Foley	Kolbe
Blunt	Forbes	Kucinich
Boehlert	Fossella	LaHood
Boehner	Fowler	Lampson
Bonilla	Fox	Lantos
Bonior	Franks (NJ)	Largent
Bono	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Boswell	Gallegly	LaTourette
Boyd	Ganske	Lazio
Brady (TX)	Gejdenson	Lee
Bryant	Gekas	Levin
Bunning	Gephardt	Lewis (CA)
Burton	Gibbons	Lewis (KY)
Buyer	Gilchrest	Linder
Callahan	Gilman	Lipinski
Calvert	Gingrich	Livingston
Camp	Goode	LoBiondo
Campbell	Goodlatte	Lowey
Canady	Goodling	Lucas
Cannon	Goss	Maloney (CT)
Capps	Graham	Maloney (NY)
Cardin	Granger	Manton
Castle	Greenwood	Manzullo
Chabot	Gutierrez	Mascara
Chambliss	Gutknecht	McCarthy (NY)
Chenoweth	Hall (OH)	McCollum
Christensen	Hall (TX)	McCrery
Clay	Hansen	McHale
Coble	Harman	McHugh
Coburn	Hastert	McInnis
Collins	Hastings (WA)	McIntosh
Combest	Hayworth	McIntyre
Cook	Hefley	McKeon
Cooksey	Herger	McKinney
Costello	Hill	McNulty
Cox	Hilleary	Meeks (NY)
Crane	Hinojosa	Menendez
Crapo	Hobson	Metcalf
Cubin	Hoekstra	Mica
Cunningham	Holden	Miller (CA)
Davis (VA)	Hooley	Miller (FL)
Deal	Horn	Minge
DeFazio	Hostettler	Moran (KS)
Delahunt	Hulshof	Morella
DeLauro	Hunter	Nadler
DeLay	Hutchinson	Nethercutt

Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—116

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Borski
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Carson
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Edwards
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frost
Gillmor
Gordon
Green
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Leach
Lofgren
Luther
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Millender-McDonald
Mink
Moakley
Murtha
Neal
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pastor
Pickett
Rahall
Rangel
Rodriguez
Roemer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Skaggs
Skelton
Smith, Adam
Stokes
Stupak
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—13

Burr
Engel
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gonzalez
Lewis (GA)
McDade
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Reyes
Ros-Lehtinen
Serrano

□ 1916

Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. OLVER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. MEEHAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. MCINNIS, WALSH, MCHUGH, MASCARA and MANTON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1614

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1614.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1150, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION REFORM ACT OF 1998

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to previous order of the House, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1150) to ensure that federally funded agricultural research, extension, and education address high-priority concerns with national or multistate significance, to reform, extend, and eliminate certain agricultural research programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

UNFUNDED MANDATES POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order under section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act regarding unfunded intergovernmental mandates on every single senior citizen homeowner in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, this does increase property taxes on senior citizens, and everybody ought to be listening.

Pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget Act, the language on which this point of order is premised is contained in section 502 of the subtitle A of title V, ''Reductions in Payments for Administrative Costs for Food Stamps,'' of the conference report.

(For section 502, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 22, 1998, page H2185.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York makes a point of order that the conference report violates section 425(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and according to section 426 (b)(2) of the Act, the gentleman must specify the precise language of his objection in the conference report on which he predicates this point of order.

Having met this threshold burden, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate. Pursuant to section 426 (b)(3) of the Act and after debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: Will the House now consider the conference report?

Will the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) claim the 10 minutes in opposition?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

I do want the Members to listen up. It is very, very important. We are about to force every single senior citizen homeowner in America to pay more real estate taxes. That is why I raise this point of order against this unfunded mandate.

This conference report would lower each State's reimbursement for administrative costs in the food stamp program by an amount to be determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. That provision, my colleagues, according to CBO would limit the Federal Government's responsibility to provide funding to States and local governments to cover the administrative costs of the food stamp program.

Mr. Speaker, the National Governors Association opposes this provision, and almost every single individual governor in America has expressed outright hostility to this reneging on them and putting more costs on our States and our local governments, and that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned CBO had scored this legislation as exceeding the unfunded mandate threshold in the law, which is $50 million. In fact, those costs on the States are much, much higher, in the hundreds of millions of dollars in administrative costs to our individual States and each one of our counties and cities and towns and villages that we represent. And that is according to the National Governors Association, my colleagues.

Overall, this represents a cost shift from the Federal Government to the States as high in my State of New York as $280 million, $280 million, of which local governments are going to have to pay 25 percent of that cost. That is what we are leveling on our senior citizens. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is a ''yes'' vote for this unfunded mandate is a vote to increase property taxes on every single one of our homeowners that own a home in America.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many families living in my district on fixed incomes that it is almost impossible