

Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Ford  
Fossella  
Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill (IN)  
Hill (MT)  
Hilleary  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Isakson  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Kanjorski

Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kleczka  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
Kuykendall  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourrette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Ose  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri

Phelps  
Pickering  
Pickett  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaffer  
Schakowsky  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Spence  
Stabenow  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stump  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Talent  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Towns  
Traffant  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Velazquez

Vento  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watkins  
Watt (NC)

Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Weygand  
Whitford  
Wicker  
Wilson

Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman  
Brown (OH)  
Capuano  
Chenoweth-Hage  
Cubin  
Davis (FL)  
Forbes  
Hilliard  
Hutchinson  
Jones (OH)  
Larson  
Martinez  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McIntosh  
Pease  
Rodriguez  
Spratt  
Stupak  
Waxman  
Weiner

□ 1634

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REPORT ON H.R. 4516, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-635) on the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

## AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF NON-DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House today and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4444.

□ 1636

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4444) to authorize extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People's Republic of China, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the order of the House today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I say to my fellow Members that this debate today is likely the most important debate that we will make, not only in this Congress, perhaps in our entire careers.

I rise in strong and full support of this legislation which grants normal trading relations to China and helps to open its borders to the enterprising superiority of American workers, American businesses, and American farmers.

This historic legislation serves two critical American interests: first, it creates potentially hundreds of thousands of new higher-paying jobs for American workers; second, it helps our children and our grandchildren to live in a more peaceful world and enhance our national security.

Human rights, so important to us Americans, will be helped because we know from the testimony of many Chinese dissidents that continuing normal trade with China is a plus.

The environment is important, and this legislation will help improve environmental protection. This vote will be the most important vote that we as Members of this House will cast, as I said, in this Congress and perhaps in our congressional careers.

While the bill itself may be small, the issue surrounding NTR for China is massive. As chairman, I have worked hard to accommodate Members on both sides to produce a bill that addresses their concerns on issues, such as human rights, prison labor, environment, and anti-surge protections; and I am pleased that we can include that language for consideration by the House.

This parallel bill, as it is called, is bipartisan; and both the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) deserve enormous credit for its accomplishment.

Mr. Chairman, China represents over one-quarter of the world's population. Over 1 billion people will not be ignored in the international marketplace. Yes, we can agree that China's human rights do not measure up to our own standards; we can agree that their environmental and labor conditions need to be improved.

But how does suffering our economic relations with China help us to bring about the positive and monumental change which opponents to this bill say they want? Mr. Chairman, no opponent has been able to show me how we will be better off in accomplishing these goals if we turn down normal trading relations with China. If we fail today, it will certainly play into the hands of the hardliners in China, and that cannot be good for our national interests. I have said that it would be unthinkable for the Congress not to approve this historic legislation.

The American people are with us. By the most recent polling data, they

overwhelmingly support this bill because they know it is good for jobs in America and good for human rights and the environment in China.

Much of this debate has focused on exports, on crops and computers and cars and other material goods, and they are important. But the greatest American exports to China are those yet to come, the freedom of choice and the freedom of opportunity.

History has shown us that no government can withstand the power of individuals who are driven by the taste of freedom and the rewards of opportunity. We need to pass this bill.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, trade issues are never easy. They become more difficult as globalization has become global. It now includes the largest nation in the world. It is destined, according to World Bank estimates, to have the second largest national economy in the world in 20 years.

So China's integration into the world trading system inevitably presents both opportunities and challenges both. What we have to do is to take advantage of the benefits in the agreement that we negotiated with China and also actively address the problems in our relationship.

Briefly, the benefits, and there will be more discussion of this, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), chairman of the committee, has laid out some of them. Lower tariffs, dramatically lower tariffs over time for both agricultural and industrial products. Service, a dramatic breakthrough for our service industries. Telecommunications, China is exploding in terms of telecommunications. So vital barriers that now exist, for example, local content requirements, they are out the window under this agreement. Restrictions on distribution of our products made in the United States, they are gone over time under this agreement. Technology transfers that were required by China up to this point would no longer be available to the Chinese.

The point is clear: if we do not grant PNTR to China, it is going into the WTO in any event. In any event.

□ 1645

The U.S. has no veto power over their entry. And if we do not grant PNTR, most of the benefits that we negotiated with the Chinese Government will not be available to us but they will be to our competitors.

There has been some talk these months about the 1979 agreement between the U.S. and China giving us all of the benefits that we have since negotiated. I have read the documents many times, and that is simply incorrect. But I want to focus right now on the challenges, because there are challenges as well as opportunities. One of them is the issue of compliance.

There is weak rule of law today in China. How are we going to make sure that China complies with its agreements? The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and I have put together legislation to address this challenge as well as others, and there are some meaningful compliance provisions in our proposal. One relates to the USTR review, an annual review within our own ranks, detailed, meaningful.

Perhaps it is important granting resources to our agencies China specific, China specific, to enforce their agreement. And also there is, in essence, an instruction to our USTR that in the protocol discussions that will ensue now that the EU has reached agreement with China, that she will insist, she will work actively for an annual review within the WTO of the agreement by China.

That is the first aspect in terms of the challenge. The second one relates to the potential surges in products from China. It is going to compete with us. That is what trade is. It is competition. And there could be harmful surges from China into the U.S. that would hurt our workers and hurt our producers.

I will not go into detail now, but I can say, as someone who has worked on these issues now for 15 years and fought to keep the antidumping provisions in U.S. law in the Uruguay Round, and successfully, with the help of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), this provision, this specific provision as to surges from China and handling them, is the strongest anti-surge provision that will be in U.S. law.

Third relates to human rights, including international core labor standards in the U.S. law. First of all, in the legislation that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and I have proposed and will be before us tomorrow, what we do is to set up a task force, and a meaningful one, to pull together the agencies of the U.S. Government to work with Customs to make sure that our law on forced and prison labor products from China, that that law is implemented.

And then the commission that we have proposed; high level, at the executive-congressional level, full time, fully staffed, patterned after the Helsinki Commission, 25 years old. That commission was effective in Eastern Europe. This commission that we have put together on paper, if we work at it, will be effective in reality. There will be nine Members from the House, nine from the Senate, five from the executive at the highest levels. We will represent the majority on that commission.

The Helsinki Commission worked and this can work. It will work because we will be determined to make it work.

So, the provisions that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and others and I have worked on combines PNTR with this framework, with this plan of action that is the most

promising approach to take advantage of the opportunities and to meet the challenges. It allows us to both engage China and to confront. It recognizes the internal forces for change in China and reinforces them with external pressures by us.

I want to refer briefly, as I close, to two comments in recent articles, one by Dai Qing, who is perhaps China's most prominent environmentalist and independent political thinker, and here is what he said recently in a report in *The Washington Post*. In quotes. "There is a battle here between opening to the West and closing to the West. This fight is not over. One of the main economic and political problems in China today is our monopoly system, a monopoly on power and business monopolies. Both elements are mutually reinforcing. The WTO's rules would naturally encourage competition and that's bad for both monopolies."

And then an article just this last Sunday in *The New York Times*. This is a report, not an editorial, and it is entitled "Chinese See U.S. Trade Bill as Vital to Future Reforms." And after quoting a large number of people in China, including one who recently lost his job as a reformer, this is what all of them in this article say. "Chinese say their country is at a tipping point in its history. A yes vote on normal trade can propel it forward to greater liberalization and engagement with the West. A no vote from Congress will be seen as a slap in the face, throwing China back into conservatism and anti-American hatred."

Rejecting PNTR now that it has been combined with the proposals in our legislation would likely be a catalyst not for change but for chaos in the relationships between the U.S. and China. It would make both active engagement and constructive confrontation by the U.S. much more difficult.

There is a better course, colleagues, in this distinguished body at this distinguished moment. It is passage of PNTR, now combined with a framework, with a plan of action, with a strategy to assess the advantages and address the problems.

I was in China 10 days in January, in Beijing and then Hong Kong. After talking to students, after talking to intellectuals, to artists, as well as government officials, I came to the conclusion indelibly that change in China is irreversible but its direction is not inevitable. We must be activists in this process of change. We, the United States, cannot isolate China and its 1.2 billion people; and we must not isolate ourselves from impacting on China's future direction.

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 10 seconds to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, every now and then this Congress has the opportunity to

associate our country with the aspirations of people who sacrifice their lives and their livelihood for freedom. The PNTR vote that we are debating today gives us that challenge. It challenges the Congress to stand with the man before the tank, who courageously, courageously, stood his ground for freedom. It challenges us to speak out against the brutal occupation of Tibet and against the serious repression in China.

We have been told over the last decade that human rights in China would improve if we had unconditional trade benefits for China. Not so. More people are imprisoned for their beliefs in China today than at any time since the cultural revolution.

We were told that unconditional trade benefits for China would stop China's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to rogue states. Again, not so. Not only does China continue to proliferate chemical, biological, and nuclear technology, and the delivery systems for them to rogue states, they have added Libya as one of their customers, as recently as this March 2000.

But even if we could ignore the serious repression and the dangerous proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, there is serious reason to reject this proposal on the basis of trade alone. Mr. Chairman, China has never honored any of its trade agreements with the United States, including its agreements for market access over the last 20 years; over and over again agreements on stopping the violation of intellectual property, and the piracy continues; and stopping prison labor exports from coming into the United States.

Indeed, the U.S. International Trade Commission said in their own analysis, projecting the China deal will result in the loss of 872,000 American jobs over the next decade. On the basis of trade alone, I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, our economic relationship with Communist China has been a disaster for the United States of America, a disaster; and it is in the making and we can see it coming, though we have people trying to prevent the American people from understanding the significance of what has been going on for these last 10 years.

Economically we have had year after year after year of a massive trade surplus with Communist China. What does that mean for the people of the United States? We are just going to laugh that off, where they have a trade surplus? They allow us to import all of their goods while they put restrictions on our goods?

In terms of our national security, they have used that trade surplus, which will be \$80 billion this year, to build up their military. And who do we think is being threatened by this mili-

tary buildup of the Communist Chinese? They now have the capability of murdering millions of Americans with nuclear weapons that they did not have the capability for 10 years ago, based on our technology and our money. I consider that a disastrous policy.

And morally, morally, has this worked in our benefit to have this relationship, which people now want to make permanent? That is what this is about, making a disastrous relationship with Communist China permanent. What has it done morally? Today, the Democratic movement in China, which used to be healthy, has been smashed. Religious believers are being persecuted, even to the point where people who believe in meditation and yoga are being thrown into prison by the thousands.

In Tibet, the genocide goes on. The Communist Chinese could drop an atomic bomb on Tibet and murder millions of people, and our business community would still be up here saying, well, how are we going to cut off progress by trying to confront them with this. No, we have to maintain our engagement.

PNTR basically says that we are going to make permanent the relationship that we have had for the last 10 years with Communist China. Freeze it. We are going to freeze it. Now, my colleagues may say, oh, no, that is wrong; they are going to bring down their unfair tariffs that they have had. No, I am afraid not. What will happen is, these tariffs, which have been disproportionate, monstrously disproportionate, will be brought down a little. They will still have a huge tariff disparity between the United States and China.

In other words, they will continue flooding our market with their goods, but what will happen? If we have a dispute with them in the future, if we pass PNTR, we have taken all of our bullets out of our gun to enforce our decisions. We are giving it to the World Trade Organization. Instead of being able to enforce our agreements with China, which we have not been able to enforce before, and they have broken their agreements with us, we are going to rely on panels and commissions of the World Trade Organization.

We have been told that if we engage with China, that we will liberalize China. We will make them more like us. They will become more Democratic.

□ 1700

It has gone the opposite direction. We have been dealing with gangsters, and right now we are talking about putting gangsters into the chamber of commerce. What makes my colleagues think that dealing with a gangster is going to do anything but corrupt their people rather than making them any better?

The debate is not about isolating China. Do not let anybody fool us. This is not about isolating China. It is not about severing our relations with

China. My colleagues will hear that over and over and over again in this debate. That is a ruse. It is not true. It is trying to get us off what this debate is really about.

What are we going to achieve by this decision today on permanent normal trade relations with China? What we are talking about is continuing to allow our big businessmen to massively invest in China with government guarantees to the Export-Import Bank and subsidized loans and guaranteed loans. That is the bottom line. That is what is pushing this.

We have people closing factories in the United States and opening them up to use slave labor in China, and they want the taxpayers to guarantee that. They do not care about morality. They do not care about human rights. This is a joke.

Even with the proposal of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), we are taking away our ability to enforce any type of human rights standards that we have been trying to push on Communist China. And they know it. They know that we are taking away our rights even to discuss it on the floor of the House every year, which has been one of the only things that have held them back. And even with that type of control or, at least, influence on them, they have gone in the opposite direction.

Let me close by saying this: I realize people who believe on the other side of this are sincere; they believe they are trying to better the prospects for peace in this world and better the prospects for freedom, which I think is nonsense. We do not treat tyrants that way. But we have tried this before. The world has tried this before.

We remember Neville Chamberlain as the man who gave away Czechoslovakia to Hitler and Munich, but we do not remember what Neville Chamberlain did in the years prior to Munich when Hitler had taken over Nazi Germany. Neville Chamberlain led up to Munich by creating an economic task force designed to invest in Germany so that the Germans would have so many economic ties they would never think of violating the peace. It reads almost verbatim the argument that we are getting today.

We do not make a liberal by hugging a Nazi. We do not treat gangsters as if they are democrats and expect them to be democratic people. No. We must stand together with the people in China who long for freedom and justice, and we will not do that by kowtowing to these dictators in Beijing and giving them what they want.

Do not give me this, the hardliners do not want us to give them this. The hardliners want to continue to have the type of trade surpluses that they have had and want us to have to only rely on the WTO if they break their word to us.

This whole idea of permanent normal trade relations with China is against the interest of the people of the United

States, against our moral position, and has undermined our national security as we wake up to find that we have built a monster that is capable, with the weapons systems and technologies that we have provided them, of killing millions of Americans.

I call on my colleagues to oppose normal trade relations with this monstrous regime in Communist China.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I respect the passion that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER), has. But I would remind him that he should go back to reexamining what his former governor, Ronald Reagan, did with regard to our Caribbean neighbors when the Caribbean neighbors were subject to the possibility of communist expansion and tyranny and Ronald Reagan initiated the Caribbean Basin Initiative, which was to make that economic outreach in hopes that economic improvement would lead them down the path to democratic institutions. It was a marvelous program, and it worked superbly well.

I would remind my distinguished colleague, too, that we have the missile capability to kill millions of Chinese people; and we do not want that to happen and we do not want China to consider using their capabilities against us, either. The best way we move down the path of guaranteeing that these things do not happen is establishing those better relations.

I would suggest to my colleague from California, talk to Dr. Billy Graham about it. His son has been doing missionary activity over there for several years and has distributed literally millions of Bibles in mainland China over the past several years, and they are actually printing their Bibles in the mainland right now.

So we have a chance to exert that personal contact and move it in a constructive direction.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) to elaborate a little further on this issue.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman for yielding me the time and for his strong, effective leadership on this historic issue.

Mr. Chairman, it is a great day in Congress when we can do something this positive for the American people. It is a great day in Congress when we can work together, both sides of the aisle, Democrats, Republicans, and independents alike, in a bipartisan, pragmatic, and common sense way on something so important to America's future.

My governor, Jesse Ventura, is not one to mince words; and he talks plain talk. When I invited him to testify before the Committee on Ways and Means on this important issue, he put it like this: he said, "This will be one of the

most important votes of the century in Congress. And by passing permanent normal trade relations with China, Congress will be doing more to expand our economy and create jobs than anything else we could possibly do."

Mr. Chairman, the governor of Minnesota got it right. I just hope we get it right.

Under the terms of the agreement, China's tariffs will fall from an average tariff of 25 percent to 9 percent. That is what it means to knock down trade barriers so that we can export more goods, expand our economy, and create more jobs.

As cultural tariffs will fall from an average of 32 percent, it is no wonder our farmers cannot sell grain to China, fall from an average of 32 percent to 15 percent by the year 2004.

Well, what do these tariff reductions mean? They mean that members of Minnesota's Medical Alley, America's Medical Alley, from big companies like Medtronic to small manufacturers like American Medical Supplies can improve and save and better Chinese lives. It means Minnesota's companies, America's companies, like Cargill, Pillsbury, General Mills, Jennie-O, Hormel, and others can sell more food and other products in China.

That means that efficient Minnesota farmers, America's farmers, corn growers, pork producers, soy bean farmers can export more food to the growing population in China. Mr. Chairman, the bottom line, it means a better quality of life for the Chinese people and a better quality of life for the American people.

What some critics do not understand is that trade is not a zero-sum game; it is a win-win for both economies, for both countries. It means Minnesota's jobs, America's jobs will continue to grow, our economy can expand, good jobs.

So I urge our colleagues to support this historic, momentous, critical issue. Vote "yes" on permanent normal trade relations with China.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE).

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

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, on January 1, 1979, I was one of the representatives of the United States and President Carter at the ceremonies in Beijing reestablishing normal relations with China.

Last week, I chatted with President Carter; and we reminisced about what had happened in the 2 decades in between. We share virtually identical views.

Twenty years ago, China was a closed society, virtually no phones, no newspapers, no access to the outside world, no private enterprise, no relations with citizens of the United States, no hope, and no future. And today that has changed, in large part because we have had normal relations with China, because we engage China.

Today, China has gone from virtually no phones to about 130 million phones. They talk about freedom of speech. That is what phones, especially digital cell phones, help facilitate.

Today, China has gone from virtually no newspapers whatsoever to millions of users of the Internet, the greatest democratizing tool the world has every known, for it opens people to news, to ideas from every corner of the world. That is progress.

In fact, President Carter and I shared the thought that China, despite all its still existing problems, has probably advanced the human condition more in the past 20 years than any other nation in history.

But let us turn to this agreement. It should be a no-brainer. We give no tariff reductions or additional market entry whatsoever. They lower their tariffs drastically and open their markets. That is a clear winner for our exports.

Last week we negotiated the strongest anti-surge controls ever legislated. We can now stop surges of Chinese exports. We could not before. That is a winner.

This is a historic vote. We can draw a circle that either includes China or excludes China, almost one quarter of the people of the planet Earth. We can maximize our influence or decimate our influence. The choice is ours. History demands a "yes" vote.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to granting permanent normal trade relations to China. We cannot reward China with PNTR while she continues to violate the human rights of her people. We are sending the wrong message to the rest of the world. The spirit of history is upon us, and we must be guided by the spirit of history to do the right thing. Granting PNTR allows China to continue the terrible abuses without any consequences.

I ask my colleagues, how much are we prepared to pay? Are we prepared to sell our souls? Are we prepared to betray our conscience? Are we prepared to deny our shared values of freedom, justice, and democracy?

Where is the freedom of speech? Where is the freedom of worship? Where is the freedom of assembly? Where is the freedom to organize? Where is the freedom to protest? Where is the freedom? It is not in China.

Can we forget Tiananmen Square, 11 years ago, June 4, 1989? We cannot forget, and we must not forget.

Some of us have worked too long and too hard for civil rights and human rights here at home and other places in the world not to stand up for human rights in China.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in trade, free and fair trade. But I do not believe in

trade at any price. And the price of granting PNTR for China is much too high. It is a price we should not be prepared to pay.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose normal trade relations for China.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that we heard about reference to Ronald Reagan and China. I worked with President Reagan on some of the speeches that he gave when he went to China; and we should not forget that, during Ronald Reagan's time, Ronald Reagan strategized in order to develop a democratic movement in China, which, after Ronald Reagan left office, was smashed, yes. But during Ronald Reagan's time, when he supported expanding our relationship with China, he also supported and was very active in making sure that there was a democratic movement.

That was a force within China. Now that that has been destroyed by the Communist Chinese Government, there is no excuse for continuing those same strategies.

When it came to the Soviet Union, Ronald Reagan made himself very clear; we never provided anything like that. He tried to undermine the economic strength of the Soviet Union to bring about peace and democratization. That is what worked, because there was not a democracy movement in the Soviet Union.

Let us read history, and let us learn from it. What we have now is we are going in the opposite direction.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

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

Mr. Chairman, we talk about checks and balances. What kind of checks and balances will we have on China if they get permanent trade status?

We have been reviewing them once a year and, because of that, they know that once a year we are going to vote on it and we can withdraw that favorable status that they have.

□ 1715

They have 35 to 40 percent of our market. Thirty-five to 40 percent of their exports come to the United States. They are not going to cut off their nose to spite their face if we do not go along with them on this permanent trade status today. It means too much to them.

What I want Members to do right now is to look back and see what has happened in China just recently and what they have been doing. They stole our nuclear secrets. They were involved in espionage at Los Alamos and Livermore Laboratories and they now have the ability to kill 50 million people in this country with one missile on a mobile launch vehicle with 10 W-88 warheads. They did not have that before. This just happened recently.

Do my colleagues remember Tiananmen Square? I think the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) cited that very thoroughly and very well. There are 10 million people in slave labor camps making tennis shoes and other things for nothing but a bowl of gruel a day. And we talk about human rights.

They are taking people who are alive in prisons and if you or I want a kidney and we are willing to go to China, for 30 to \$35,000 they will take that person and they will kill him today, they will extricate their kidney, take it out of them, and they will immediately transplant it into you if you need it. If you have the money, you can go to China and get it. They will make a match, they will check your blood type and immediately you will get a kidney out of a live human being, guaranteed fresh. That goes on today.

They have tried to influence our political process. We know that Liu Chao Ying met with Johnny Chung in Hong Kong and the head of the People's Liberation Army intelligence service, comparable to our CIA or DIA, Mr. Ji, came in and said, we like your President, we want to see him reelected and he gave \$300,000 to them.

Millions of dollars came in from that part of the world to try to influence our elections. Does that sound like they want to work with us? They now control or will control both ends of the Panama Canal. Li Ka Shing who is tied in with the People's Liberation Army and the Communist hierarchy in China now has ports at both ends of the Panama Canal and in the not too distant future they will be able to stop us from using it.

Today we just found out the other canal in the world, the Suez Canal that is so important to all of us and to transportation of commerce, they now have the same organization headed by Li Ka Shing and the People's Liberation Army, they are going to have Port Said on the Suez Canal. They are moving around the world pieces of influence like chess pieces and they are going to checkmate us if we are not very careful and we are giving them the money and the influence to do it.

Their trade surplus with us was \$68 billion last year; and I submit if we pass this, it is going to be greater. Once American commerce goes over there and finds they can get labor for 50 cents an hour or less, you think they are going to want to pull out, especially if the human rights problems get worse and worse over there or they start trying to block our shipping if we do not do what they want? Of course not.

We are getting pressure today by many business interests. What do you think it is going to be like when they start moving their plants over there and paying slave wages to people over there to produce goods and services? They are going to go along with whatever it takes because it means the almighty dollar. They are going to make

money. All I can say to my colleagues is there are a million reasons not to approve this and only one to approve it. I submit that we should not approve it.

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

I would like to remind my distinguished colleague from Indiana that there is nothing about this action we are about to take that is irrevocable by any future Congress. Permanent trade relations can be granted today and taken away tomorrow. This is an action that Congress can take any time that it is so inclined to do so. I would like to remind my colleague, too, that he made reference to the fact of the \$68 billion trade deficit we have with China.

If you lock yourself out of the Chinese market, how do you plan to address that? What the existing relationship does is guarantee that we do not have access to their market. Permanent normal trade relations with China gives us access to their market as they have access to our market at this time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRANE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, real briefly let me just ask the gentleman this. Does he really believe after American industry invests plant and equipment and money over there that they are going to allow us to withdraw permanent trade status?

Mr. CRANE. If I can reclaim my time, they have already invested.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. But there will be more.

Mr. CRANE. I have the headquarters of Motorola in my district. Motorola has a plant they have had in Shanghai for some time. I was over there. I had the opportunity to visit with the head of the Motorola plant in Shanghai. He made reference to the fact that in their plant, they provide the employees clean working conditions, they provide overtime pay for more than a 40-hour workweek, they provide health care benefits to their employees.

And I said, gee, did you bring that all over from the United States and they said, no, those are the guidelines of the Chinese government to foreign companies doing business there. I thought about it for a moment because there were some grungy Chinese factories in Shanghai that I had seen when I was walking around neighborhoods. And I thought about it for a moment, that if the gentleman from Indiana is working in a grungy Chinese factory and I am working for Motorola and we are having our Tsingtaos together at the end of a long workday and the gentleman is moaning about the grungy working conditions and no overtime pay and no health care benefits, it is only logical that I am going to say, hey, why do you work there? Come work for Motorola.

Ben Franklin made the observation, a good example is the best sermon. We provide that good example and the best

sermon. It is something that has an effect that goes beyond just the parochial interests of that company.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Twenty-three years ago I was 19 years old and I was peddling a bike around in Taiwan. I was sent there as a missionary for the Mormon church. One of my responsibilities was to go around and knock on people's doors to try to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ.

It is interesting, this Friday I will be going back to Taiwan a lot less humble and lowly than I was 22 years ago. I will be meeting with the newly elected President, President Chen Shui-bian, who by the way is a strong advocate of permanent normal trade relations between China and the United States. I made these comments because I remember in the 1970s when I lived in Taiwan. We have had some examples of history.

Let me tell my colleagues about the history of Taiwan. I know. I lived there. I speak the language. I know the people. In the 1970s, Taiwan was anything but the free democracy we see today. We just saw with this recent election, a free and democratic election in Taiwan, the second of its kind in 5,000 years. But it was not always that way.

In fact, Taiwan had a very oppressive governmental regime. There was not freedom of speech. There was not freedom of the press. In fact, I remember talking with an individual in the park one day, he was being critical of the government, we never saw him again; and we were told that he went to prison. The fact is Taiwan was not a free society. But they engaged with the West, they adopted economic reforms. If we can use history, let us use the history of that region.

The fact is, they adopted market reforms as China has and they moved to political reforms which go hand in hand with market reforms. I know we want changes now; we want them immediately. Let me tell my colleagues about the people, the Chinese employees of American companies who were in my office last week and talked about their conversion to Christianity and the conversions were made while they worked at American companies.

In talking to their American counterparts who were Christians, they got an opportunity to believe. One of the Chinese employees talked to me about how she joined a house church 2 years ago, five people in that church, now over 200. She told me the fact that in 1994, China allowed to be printed 400,000 Bibles into the Chinese language. The number this year is 4 million. The fact is there are good changes. No, they are not perfect but there are good changes happening. Let us not abandon these people. Let us maintain our skeptical nature with the Chinese government

and the oppressive regime, but let us not abandon the American people just to save our own consciences.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his leadership in this issue. The world's most important relationship over the next 20 years will be between the United States, the world's greatest military power and economic power, and China, the world's oldest culture and largest population. The change in China since Nixon began diplomatic and economic engagement has been nothing short of phenomenal.

The forces of change and reform will win out sooner if the United States is engaged than if we play into the hands and forces of repression. Isolation simply does not work. In South Africa, it took all of the world's developed powers coalesced against a relatively small country to change apartheid.

The rest of the world does not agree with us on China. We cannot even force change in Cuba, a tiny country with an aging dictator and a population about the size of Michigan. The United States could accelerate change in China, and that will not just have significant benefits for our businesses, it will also benefit the environment. But that takes modern technology and investment, services that the Chinese need that we are good at and that will improve their environment while it provides us with economic opportunities.

Over half a century ago, the Marshall Plan invested not just in our devastated allies but in our defeated enemies in Europe. The Russians, however, denied us a partnership in Eastern Europe because they knew it would hasten the emergence of democracies and free enterprise.

Today, after having spent trillions of American tax dollars to win the Cold War, we have an opportunity to accept an offer from the forces of Chinese reform. Approval of normal trade relations will not change China overnight. We will have to remain vigilant to make sure we use every tool we have to make sure the Chinese adhere to the agreement, but it will give us firmer footing in the Chinese economy, it will give us beachheads and inroads of the type that so terrified Stalin and continue to terrify the Chinese dictators. A vote for permanent normal trade relations will hasten human rights, environmental protection and a stronger economy in China and the United States.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to granting permanent normal

trade relations with China. China should not be rewarded for its domestic and international record of abuses of workers, religious leaders and democracy activists, nor for its repeated abrogations of international treaties.

An annual review of this Nation's trade status as opposed to permanent certification such as this bill would provide is a critical means by which China and other nations can be held accountable for their actions. We need to do this since as The New York Times noted today, China is not known for its strict adherence to trade agreements. In fact, it is known for exactly the opposite.

Granting permanent normal trade relations with China as well as the country's accession to the WTO represent another missed opportunity to incorporate strong protections for human rights, worker rights, and environmental rights in trade agreements. I agree that expanded trade under the right terms can raise standards of living for all; but I will continue to fight for fair agreements that ensure that standards to protect the environment, workers, and human rights are not compromised in the process.

Unfortunately, granting PNTR will only exacerbate the race to the bottom where corporations can circle the globe looking for and pressuring for the lowest standards, setting up low-wage sweatshops, dumping their pollution, and creating unsafe conditions for the public.

This race to the bottom puts countries with higher standards at a disadvantage and makes new environmental and workers protections harder to enact.

Most supporters of PNTR and WTO acceptance for China admit that China continues to be a rogue nation.

Even the Clinton Administration's own briefing book in favor of PNTR for China says: "China denies or curtails basic freedoms, including freedom of speech, association, and religion."

But proponents argue that economic engagement will ultimately result in a more democratic system there. I disagree.

China's pattern of violating the rights of its own people has continued despite the increased economic ties of most favored nation status that Congress has granted year after year.

The State Department's most recent Annual Country Report of Human Rights report states that China's human record has "deteriorated markedly throughout the year as the government intensified efforts to suppress dissent."

The first report of the congressionally chartered United States Commission on International Religious Freedom noted that "Chinese government violations of religious freedom increased markedly during the past year." The Commission recommended against Congress granting PNTR until China makes demonstrated and substantial progress in respect for religious freedom.

The National Labor Committee issued a report on May 10 that gives a picture of the unacceptable working conditions that flourish inside many factories in China making goods for US companies like Wal-Mart, Nike and Huffy.

The NLC found factories making goods for American companies where workers were being held under conditions of indentured servitude, forced to work 12 to 14 hours a day, seven days a week, with only one day off a month, while earning an average wage of 3 cents an hour.

Even after months of work, 46 percent of the workers surveyed earned nothing at all—in fact they owed money to the company. The workers were allowed out of the factory for just an hour and a half a day. And when the workers protested being forced to work from 7:30 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., seven days a week, for literally pennies an hour, 800 workers were fired.

There is no credible reason to believe that conditions like these will be improved by giving up our right to review to China's trade status. The U.S. bilateral negotiating position with China would be crippled if the country were granted PNTR and admitted to the WTO. Our large trade deficit with China, expected to be over \$60 billion this year, potentially gives the U.S. significant bargaining power to enforce and strengthen our existing trade laws. But this bargaining power would be further limited by the WTO.

Some have argued that parallel legislation or a side agreement will remedy the problems I have discussed. But, we have been down that side agreement road before and it is not pretty. It is filled with the raw sewage and other environmental destruction that lines the border with Mexico under the NAFTA side agreement.

Finally, China's history of failing to comply with trade agreements leads me to view new agreements with a skeptical eye.

China has broken nearly every agreement—from market access to prison labor to intellectual property rights—it has made with the United States. For example, in 1992 and 1994, China signed agreements that it would not export products made by slave labor to the US and would allow visits of US officials to any suspected site.

But, the State Department's Human Rights Report specifically finds that: "in all cases [of forced labor identified by US customs], the [Chinese] Ministry of Justice refused the request, ignored it, or simply denied it without further elaboration.

This is not a record worthy of further trust.

I believe that China should be held accountable for its widespread abuses. Granting China special status as a trading partner is the wrong way to accomplish that goal. I urge my Colleagues to join me in opposition to PNTR for China.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) who is one of the few Ph.D.s and scientists we have with us here in the United States Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, when I came here several years ago, I bought the argument that if we engage with China that they would change and so I voted for most-favored-nation trading status.

Well, China did change. They got worse. Our own State Department says that their already poor human rights record deteriorated markedly throughout the last year as the government in-

tensified efforts to suppress dissent, particularly organized dissent. Documented human rights abuses include extrajudicial killings, torture and mistreatment of prisoners, forced detentions, arbitrary arrest and detention, lengthy incommunicado detention and denial of due process.

They continue to steal our intellectual property rights as they ignore copyrights and patents. Slave labor goes on, perhaps intensified. I am particularly concerned about the theft of technology. They have stolen our missile secrets. They have stolen our bomb secrets. Contrary to our Constitution and in violation of our laws, they sought to and perhaps were successful in buying the last presidential election. They threatened to nuke us if we object to their intentions with Taiwan. It is simplistic and naive to believe that either the PNTR or membership in WTO will move China toward international development, as President Clinton says, in the right direction.

□ 1730

Certainly what they are going to do is what every major power does; they are going to do what is in their own best interests, advancing their own strategic interests.

Finally, I am particularly concerned about the effect of this on our national security. Last year we had a \$68 billion trade deficit. This is money which they could and did use to arm themselves. Those arms may very well be used against our people.

For two very good reasons, a no vote is the right vote. First of all, we need to send the message that this is unacceptable international behavior; secondly, it is really not very bright to arm your enemy.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, this evening we are beginning what I believe is a very historic debate in this body. I know that is sometimes an overworked word; but I think one has to go back to the last century, to the early part of the last century, and look at the vote and debate on the League of Nations, or the middle of the century to look at the debate on lend-lease, or towards the end of the century to look at the debate on Desert Storm, to find issues and foreign policy that really were pivotal to the future of this country.

I say pivotal to the future of this country, because I believe, as important as the issues about trade and human rights and economic advantages are, this issue is not really about China, it is about America. As we embark on this century and this new millennium, the United States has to decide what role it is going to play in the world. There is this much discussed "death of distance" that we hear about today, but it is real. State-of-the-art telecommunications systems have

brought about a global village. Now people from every corner of the planet are only a phone call, a satellite hook-up, an e-mail away from each other. But in the wrong hands, technology has the potential to do great harm. As weapons of mass destruction continue to proliferate, every nation now faces the prospect of nuclear, chemical, or biological attacks from a rogue state that is just a half world away, or a terrorist group that has no fixed location.

Confusion could reign in a world with such promise and peril. But that does not have to be the case, if America maintains its position of world leadership. Throughout this last century, we set the example for the world. Our vision helped to bring to this planet an unprecedented era of peace and prosperity at its end.

International trade has connected our world's economies as never before and has made our people more dependent upon each other. This interconnectedness gives every nation a giant incentive to keep the peace. It has worked in the past, just look at how far we have come; and it will work in the future, if the United States continues to lead.

Mr. Chairman, America cannot maintain its leadership role by refusing to trade with the world's largest economy. PNTR is in our economic self-interest, there can be no doubt about that, but it is also vital for peace and freedom throughout the world. If we choose to abdicate our leadership, the consequences are dire.

Will America continue to show through the power of its example that representative government and free trade lead to stability, peace, and prosperity? That is the real issue we are dealing with today.

I believe America has a mission. It is our duty to show that freedom works, and that is why I support PNTR; and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the very distinguished senior Member and expert on security issues.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support permanent normal trade relations for China. I will vote in favor of it, not only because of the benefits that American farmers and businesses stand to gain in terms of increased trade, which are substantial, but also because of the impact approval of PNTR will have for U.S. national security and stability in Asia.

A solid trade relationship with China with its huge potential markets is important to Missouri. In 1998, China was Missouri's sixth most important export market, and the United States' fourth largest trading partner. From 1991 to 1998, U.S. exports to China more than doubled. The agreement that the administration reached with China last November concerning China's accession to the World Trade Organization commits China to eliminate export

subsidies and lower tariffs dramatically, reduce its farm supports, and play by the same trade rules as we do.

Further concessions recently gained by the European Union would increase the benefits, as the agreement would apply to all parties to the World Trade Organization.

Congressional approval of PNTR also has implications for U.S. national security. Early this year, I led a small House Committee on Armed Services delegation on a trip to the Asia Pacific region. Although we did not visit China, we found in our meetings with officials how much they told us the value of America's presence and engagement to the region is important.

The state of U.S.-China relations is critical to the future stability, prosperity, and peace in Asia. Encouraging China to participate in global economic institutions is in our interests because it will bring China under a system of global trade rules and draw it into the world community. It is in our long-term interests to develop a relationship with China that is stable and predictable. China will enter the World Trade Organization based upon the votes of all 135 WTO members.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

The President and the Republican leaders and Wall Street say this agreement is about jobs. Well, it is about jobs, job gains in China, and lost jobs for American workers. We are running a 60 billion trade deficit with China, and the President's own analysts, in looking at this agreement, the International Trade Commission, say it will reach a \$120 billion deficit in 10 years under this agreement, if they live up to it. That is if they live up to the agreement.

Does anyone really believe that the Chinese workers at 20 cents an hour constitute a huge market for U.S. goods? No. They represent a huge pool of cheap, oppressed labor that U.S. firms hope to better exploit under this agreement. It is about U.S. capital fleeing to China, manufacturing fleeing to China, to exploit cheap labor.

They say it is about trust, this agreement is about trust. The Chinese have broken every trade agreement they have ever signed with the United States of America. They are violating them today, the 1979, the 1992, the 1994, the 1996.

They are saying, oh, they are going to lower tariff barriers. Guess what? The Chinese do not use tariffs to keep our goods out. They have a host of non-tariff barriers that are constantly mutating, unwritten rules to keep out U.S. goods, and, guess what? Their leaders have gone on the radio and in the press and television and told their people not to worry, they can and will maintain those barriers against U.S. manufacturers under this agreement. They have given up nothing but beau-

tiful words. That is the statement of their own chief negotiator.

It is about trust. It is about broken trust. They have broken it again and again, and now we are saying, "Oh, we trust them this time."

It is about the environment. There is not one word, not one word, in this agreement about the environment. The Chinese are the greatest producers of ozone-depleting chemicals in the world. Not one word. The Chinese are the greatest producers of global warming gases. Not one word. The Chinese are the greatest violators of the CITES Agreement. The last Siberian tiger, the last Asian rhinoceros, will die to go into their medicines. Not one word in this agreement.

No to so-called permanent normal trade relations for a nation that does not act normally.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF). There has been no stronger voice for human rights in this body than this gentleman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I am a free trader. I voted for NAFTA. I was one of the 30 Republicans that voted to bomb Kosovo, so I am kind of tired with the argument with regard to isolationists.

What about the eight Catholic bishops, and now we know from the CIA briefing there are more? What about the 50 evangelical house pastors that are in jail? What about the over 400 Buddhist monks and nuns that have been persecuted and are suffering in that dirty jail in Lasa? What about the Muslims that are being persecuted in the northwest portion of the country? What about the fact that there are more slave labor camps in China today than there were in the Soviet Union when Solzhenitsyn wrote the book Gulag Archipelago? What about the 500 women a day in China that commit suicide, 56 percent of all the women in the world that commit suicide, because of forced abortions and their population policies? What about the organ program, where they will kill people to sell the organs?

I ask our side, and our side is forgetting the legacy of Ronald Reagan, I ask our side, I wrote our side seven letters, get the CIA briefing; go find out who they are selling the weapons to. Only 45 Members took the time to get the briefing, and yet every major defense organization and veterans group came out against this: The VFW, the American Legion, the Purple Heart.

What about the missiles directed against the United States? What about the Cruise missiles they just purchased from China? What about the assault weapons they put into this country? What about it?

If this Congress, a Republican Congress, votes to give MFN, we will be on the wrong side of the American people, and we will be on the wrong side of history, and we, those who vote this way, if this PNTR passes, will have the same feelings that Chamberlain had when he

returned from Nazi Germany and said, "We have peace in our times, go home and get a good sleep," and then the bombs began.

Vote no and give it an opportunity. For the handful of undecideds that have not made a decision, how will you feel about this vote 5 and 10 and 15 years from now? How will you feel about it if after this vote takes and they invade Taiwan and American men and women are killed?

Vote no tomorrow when you are given a chance.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague from Illinois, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade, for his leadership on this historic moment here as we debate the issue of trade with China.

Some have stood here in this well, and more will, saying we should vote no as a sign of moral superiority over the Chinese. Some will say we should vote no because they dislike the political views of the Chinese leadership, and some will vote no because they say that we should close the door, essentially build a trade wall around China.

Well, what this is all about is whether or not we as Americans want to engage in trade and sell our products to the world's most populous nation, a nation of 1.3 billion people. We are going to be casting the vote, not whether or not we want to sell our products made in States like my home State of Illinois, or other States in our Nation to, 1.3 billion people. And who gets hurt if we say no? Clearly those involved in manufacturing products, those who are involved in creating new technologies, as well as those who provide food and fiber.

I am proud to say that my State of Illinois leads in all three areas as a major exporting State. Illinois ranks third in exports in technology, Illinois ranks third in exports in agricultural products, and Illinois ranks at the top in manufacturing exports. China is a tremendous market.

Think about it. The new economy, technology today, the average wage for our technology jobs in Illinois are 77 percent higher than traditional business sector jobs. China now has the potential, because of its huge population and the desire by the average Chinese to go online and have a computer at home, China next year has the potential not only to be the second largest PC market for personal computers on the globe, but also the second largest market for semiconductors.

Ronald Reagan won the Cold War and brought down the Berlin Wall and brought freedom into the former Soviet Union because of the television and the fax machine, and, of course, his leadership. Today we have the opportunity, because of the Internet, to expand our values of freedom. Let us vote aye on permanent normal trade relations with China.



Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes and 10 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Michigan for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, we are here today to begin debate on the most important piece of legislation pending before this Congress in this session, and probably for many years to come, whether to grant PNTR to China and pave the way for their entry into the World Trade Organization.

I am supportive of PNTR because I believe its passage is crucial to our long-term economic prosperity, as well as our strategic and national security interests in the 21st century. I also believe in what former Secretary of State Cordell Hull was famous for saying, and that is, "When goods and products cross borders, armies do not."

But I do not want to stand up here and oversell the merits of PNTR. I think the rhetoric on both sides has been overblown on this issue from time to time.

□ 1745

But I do believe that the passage is vitally important to our long-term relationship with the world's most populated nation. And I also believe that we are at the crossroads of our relationship with China. We can go one of two directions. We can either continue to isolate and demonize and pursue a failed trade policy, a policy that is failing our American workers and American farmers today, and even failing the people in China themselves; or we could pursue a new policy through enhanced trade and, through strategic engagement with China, offer what I view is the best hope for peace and prosperity and hopefully greater stability in this world for our children.

But there are more notable and expert people than I on China that have weighed in on this. Former President Jimmy Carter made this statement in regards to PNTR, "When I became President, one of the greatest challenges that I had to face was whether I should normalize diplomatic relations with China. There is no doubt in my mind that a negative vote on this issue in Congress will be a serious setback and impediment for the further democratization, freedom and human rights in China."

And perhaps the foremost human rights activist in China today, Martin Lee, had this to say in support of PNTR during a discussion that I personally had with him: "in short bring China into the international forum and hold her to the agreement rather than exclude her. How can human rights improve by keeping China out? You punish the government, but you punish the people even more."

In fact, Mr. Lee also talked about the power that the Internet provides by

empowering the people within China with the free flow of information and ideas to make the changes that have to be made by them to improve human rights, labor conditions and hopefully for a free and democratic society.

Now, those on the other side opposing this, I think, do so for legitimate reasons: job security at home, concern about human rights and political freedoms abroad. I share these same concerns. I think we merely differ over the best strategy on how to achieve these very important objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote yes for PNTR for many of the same reasons I vote for most of the issues in this Congress, through the eyes of my two little boys, Johnny who is going to be 4 in August and Matthew who is going to be 2 this Saturday. They both, God willing, will live through and see most if not all of the 21st century. That is why in my heart and with my conscience, I support PNTR. I do so because I believe this legislation today gives us our best opportunity to provide our children for tomorrow the most prosperous, stable, and peaceful world in which to live as they embark upon their marvelous journey through the 21st century.

So I urge my colleagues to support passage of PNTR tomorrow, if for nothing else, for the sake of the future of our children in the 21st century.

#### THE WTO AGREEMENT

This trade agreement with China is truly historic because it is one-sided. In October of 1999, the United States and China reached a trade agreement that drastically and unilaterally lowers China's trade tariffs to our manufactured goods and farm products. The United States did not lower a single tariff to Chinese goods. China made this agreement in an effort to gain America's support for its admission into the World Trade Organization (WTO). Along with our support for China's entry into the WTO, we must grant the same trade status as we do all other WTO member nations.

But let me be clear, this trade agreement will not make it any easier for China to export more products into our country. This agreement will not make it any easier for any company to close a plant here to relocate in China. This trade agreement will, however, make it easier for U.S. firms to sell products in Chinese markets.

#### AMERICAN TRADE

The United States is the world's largest exporter, selling over 26% more products abroad than our nearest competitor. International trade has been crucial in maintaining the longest economic expansion in American history. The jobs of millions of American workers and the growth of thousands of American businesses, large and small, are tied to global trading and the accessibility of worldwide markets.

#### WISCONSIN TRADE

Companies large and small in my home state of Wisconsin benefit from international trade. Companies like Accelerated Genetics in Westby, who have 215 employees and sell \$20 million in annual sales, export over 45% of their total business. The Turkey Store in Barron County exports almost 20% of their turkey products. Ashley Furniture in Arcadia sells

furniture in 96 different countries around the world. The Trane Company, which has gone so far as to merge its domestic and international administrative units into one unified worldwide operation, exports 30–40% of their total products. Trade is clearly a crucial part of these companies' business, and that is only the tip of the iceberg.

#### FARMERS AND TRADE

The fate of our farmers is also linked to continued exports in world markets. American farmers are the most efficient and productive farmers in the world. At the same time, the United States has less than 4% of the world population, while China has 20%. U.S. agriculture productivity is increasing, but domestic demand for its products is stagnant. We must be able to export more of our agricultural products to relieve the oversupply of products in our nation which is driving prices down.

The U.S. Dept. of Agriculture projects U.S. farm exports will increase by \$2 billion annually by 2005 with passage of the China trade agreement. China has agreed to reduce dairy tariffs from 50% to 12% enabling west coast dairy producers to export more of their products. Those exports should relieve the supply pressure on our own domestic market which is suppressing commodity prices. If Congress fails to pass this legislation, U.S. farmers and other workers will lose out on a vast new market in an economy that has grown about 10% annually over the last 20 years.

#### MARTIN LEE

In my conversation with Martin Lee, he expressed to me his sincere belief that, given China's almost certain accession to the WTO, it is in the best interest of the Chinese people for Congress to approve PNTR. He believes a vote for PNTR will ensure that the United States remains a full partner in the world community's engagement with China, and will strengthen our position as a leader of reform. The status quo, he said, will have no effect on human rights in China, and in fact, may result in entrenching hard-line, anti-reform positions. Making it easier for U.S. products and services to reach Chinese markets will force the Chinese government to strengthen its legal system and respect the rule of law, which will only serve to protect the political, labor and civil rights of individuals in China. We emphasized that through the power of the Internet and the free flow of information and ideas that increased trade brings, faster progress can be made on human rights, labor conditions and eventually, a free and democratic China.

#### WORKER RIGHTS

Former United Auto Workers president, Leonard Woodcock, is also urging Congress to pass PNTR and support China's entry into the WTO. He argues that increased access to Chinese markets eventually will improve conditions for Chinese workers. "American labor has a tremendous interest in China's trading on fair terms with the United States," Woodcock said. "The agreement we signed with China this past November marks the largest single step ever taken toward achieving that goal."

#### IMPORTANCE OF VOTE

We face an important decision in Congress, a decision that will shape our relationship with the world's most populous nation. If you support greater economic opportunities here at home, as well as the advancement of human rights and labor conditions in China, you

should support granting permanent normal trade relation status for China.

While I do not want to oversee the merits of this trade agreement. I refuse to support the current policy which is failing American workers and farmers, and in allowing repressive conditions to continue in China. I support passage of the China trade agreement because I believe it gives us the best hope for a more prosperous, safe and secure future for our children as we embark upon our marvelous journey into the 21st century.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

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

Mr. Chairman, after all is said and done, this debate is all about two words, corporate greed. The largest multinational corporations in this country are spending tens of millions of dollars on campaign contributions, advertising, and lobbying for one major reason, they must prefer to hire desperate Chinese workers at 10 cents, 15 cents or 20 cents an hour than higher American workers at a living wage.

Why would they want to hire an American when they can employ Chinese women at 20 cents an hour and force them to work seven days a week, 12 hours a day and arrest them when they try to form a union? That is a good place for a large multinational corporation to do business.

Mr. Chairman, American workers today are working longer hours for lower wages than they were 25 years ago. We do not need to punish them further and by expanding the already huge trade deficit that we have with China and costs us hundreds of thousands of more jobs and push wages down lower in this country.

Mr. Chairman, this agreement is opposed by unions representing millions of American workers, by environmental organizations concerned about the fragility of this planet's environment, by religious groups such as the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops who are concerned about religious freedom and human rights, by veterans organizations, like the American Legion and the VFW who are concerned about the issues of national security.

Mr. Chairman, let us have the guts to stand up to the big money interests who are more concerned about their bottom line than the best interests of the American people. Let us vote no on this issue.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, this debate could not occur today in China without both sides being arrested, and this bill does not make a difference to change that. I am for engagement, but this bill engages the throats of the American workers. My colleagues talk about farmers and the great 9 percent tariff. Well, as soon as this bill passes, the currency is going to be manipulated, and it is going to vanish like that. It

happened in NAFTA; it is going to vanish.

We want to talk about helping farmers, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) has a bill, where is that bill? All of the sudden, we have to have sanctions and cannot engage countries. Do my colleagues know why the bill of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is not here on the floor? Because Wall Street does not want that bill. There is not enough money to be made, but Wall Street wants this bill. A few on Wall Street want this bill, not the entire American business community, but a few on Wall Street because they want to go over there, manufacture the products and sell them back here.

The U.S. Chamber says we are going to get jobs out of this? That is like saying that you are going to send Jesse James to bring in the Dalton brothers. We are not going to get a single job out of this. The American worker is on a treadmill; they are strangled. They can barely make it, and what is going to happen with this agreement is that Wall Street is going to take over. And it is not going to be Main Street; it is going to be Wall Street.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the undecided Members of this Congress realize they have a choice today to stand up for American workers. All we are asking for is a level playing field, not an advantage, just a level playing field. That is what this is about.

I hope the undecided Members, Mr. Chairman, realize that this is the most critical vote in 50-some years, if we want to support American workers, their families and their communities. We are not helping a single Chinese individual by this bill. All we are doing is ripping down the American work structure. Do not permanentize this. If this is forced to be renegotiated, let me tell my colleagues, the American worker will win. Vote no.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my colleagues today, whom are we rewarding in China by opening up China to our products and services? Clearly, we are awarding American workers and farmers who will be able to sell their products in China, but whom in China are we rewarding? Some opponents of PNTR seem to think that this arrangement would reward the government in Beijing which they believe is unworthy. Mr. Chairman, I lived in Hong Kong, and I have traveled extensively and repeatedly throughout Southeast Asia, including China; and I think that is the fundamentally wrong way to view this deal.

First of all, it assumes that the Chinese political leadership is a unified monolith of some sort. In fact, there are many factions in Chinese leadership, many factions in Beijing, tensions between Beijing and the provinces and fundamental world view differences between reformers in China who have initiated economic and political reform,

who support engagement with the West, who have introduced the free enterprise system to a limited degree, and who encourage following the rule of law on the one hand, versus reactionary elements, in particular in the military, who would revert to the old ways of Mao Tse-type communism.

If anyone is being rewarded in China with a vote for permanent normal trade relations, it is the reformers who have been catalysts for change, for progress for the good. What have these reformers accomplished so far? I believe they have put China on a voyage in the direction towards freedom. There is a long way to go, but there has been substantial progress. President Bush himself said that the people of China enjoy much greater freedom today than when we lived in China, and that is the trend that we can be rewarding.

In China today, local villages are having democratic elections for municipal leaders. Millions of Chinese are practicing religions, including Christian religions. Workers can choose where they work for. Travel is open, including travel abroad, and almost half of economic output in China is now privately owned. Millions of Chinese citizens have access to the Internet, and there they have unlimited information and ideas, including ideas about personal freedom, political freedom, the rule of law, all of the values that we cherish.

A vote for permanent normal trade relations with China reinforces the reformers; it reinforces this trend. China has a long way to go, but I urge my colleagues to vote to help further empower the Chinese citizens to achieve the freedoms that we take for granted. Help the Chinese people on the beginning of this voyage towards freedom. Vote yes for permanent normal trade relations.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Let me tell my colleagues, I rise in strong support of this bill, and I want to speak to the opponents of this bill. I think it is important that we note that my colleagues' concerns are important, and I do not disagree with my colleagues' concerns when it comes to job loss through trade, and I do not disagree with the concerns with respect to human rights. My colleagues are right about the ailments; but they are wrong about the cause, and they are wrong about what prescription they would use to try and deal with this.

We cannot stop the world and get off, and we cannot go back to the 17th century, we cannot go back to mercantilism, because it does not work. We are a Nation of 4 percent of the world's population. We consume 20 percent of

the world's goods and services. The alternative to a bill like this that lowers tariffs against U.S. goods and services is to lift tariffs against imports coming into this country. That might work in the very short run, but it would fail miserably in the long run, and American workers would pay dearly for that, as would the American consumer.

Mr. Chairman, the best thing we can do is to adopt bills that open more markets to U.S. goods and services abroad and allow the American worker to compete on a level playing field where productivity, which we have the most productive workforce in the world, bar none, is the key factor. We cannot change the rules of economics in the modern world. Anything we try to do on this floor, it will not work.

Second of all, with respect to the fact that the Chinese have an authoritarian dictatorship, we understand that; but if the United States is to walk away from that, our trading partners throughout the rest of the world, the European Union, the other countries in Asia, are only too happy to pick up the slack and trade with them. This is not South Africa. This is not apartheid. This is much different than that. We do much better by engaging the Chinese than walking away. Not passing PNTR will not free one political prisoner, and it will probably stall a move towards decentralization of the Chinese economy, market liberalization and political liberalization.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a grave mistake not to pass this. The United States will be much better off in the long run, American workers and American consumers, and ultimately, the Chinese people as well.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation granting China permanent normal trade relations, or PNTR, as a part of a bilateral trade agreement between the United States and China. This agreement will allow for China's entry into the World Trade Organization and significantly reduce tariffs and other barriers to United States goods and services. This agreement is in the best interest of America, including our workers and businesses.

PNTR will accomplish much more for the United States than it will cost. The agreement reduces Chinese tariffs on United States exports to China, on average, by more than 50 percent. Currently U.S. exports are subject to tariffs of 25 percent on industrial products, 13 percent on information technology products, and nearly 32 percent on agricultural products. These tariffs price our goods out of the market. Conversely, since the United States market is virtually wide open, most Chinese goods are not subject to tariffs.

The United States-China Bilateral WTO Agreement lowers tariffs against United States exports but not against Chinese imports. Perhaps even more significant are the provisions in the agreement which require elimination of state subsidies and allow for United States exporters to conduct trade and distribution with private parties in China, rather than state-owned and controlled trading companies.

Take, for example, the United States petrochemical industry, which employs tens of thou-

sands in Harris County and throughout Texas. The petrochemical industry is the most productive in the world, even though it pays comparatively higher wages and is subject to strict worker and environmental safety laws. While we lead the world in exports of petrochemical products, United States market share in China is almost nonexistent at \$2 billion, or less than 5 percent. The elimination of state subsidies for domestic Chinese producers, along with a reduction in tariffs against United States exports, will allow United States producers to enjoy our comparative advantage and create jobs at home. This holds true for the huge Texas agriculture production market and oil fields services too.

This agreement also includes significant safeguards against unfair Chinese imports and failure by the Chinese to move toward market liberalization. Chinese imports will be subject to countervailing duties, or tariffs, for 12 years after entry into the WTO against import surges that threaten to disrupt United States markets, and for 15 years against imports "dumped" on the U.S. market as a result of predatory pricing actions. In some cases, this language is tougher than current law. And, I want to commend our colleagues, Mr. LEVIN and Mr. BE-REUTER for their work in putting these provisions into law and lessening the discretion in their implementation.

The agreement also will open up the Chinese consumer market to United States telecommunication, automobile and financial services industries where we have been locked out. Imagine the power of the Internet to promote democracy in China, or the lack of power by the state to control free speech, thought and expression through the Internet.

We currently have a trade deficit with China due in large part to the fact our markets are open to their goods and China's markets are restricted to ours. Failing to pass PNTR will do nothing to reduce this trade deficit, and in fact, may make it worse. Alternatively, raising U.S. barriers to trade would fail in a trade war greatly at our own expense. A nation such as the United States which represents 4 percent of world population, but consumes 20 percent of the world's goods and services, cannot long prosper in a closed market. Only gaining greater access to other markets can the United States continue to grow and create jobs.

It is true that in some areas, cheap labor puts U.S. manufacturing at a disadvantage; but again, whether we pass PNTR or not will not alleviate the disadvantage. On balance, however, we know that trade creates more jobs than it costs, particularly in those industries where the United States is more productive. But we should also be concerned about those who lose their jobs due to trade.

My support for PNTR is conditioned on the establishment of a Presidential commission to look at our trade adjustment assistance programs and make recommendations to the Congress on how we might better provide workers with the tools to make the shift to other high-paying jobs. Tariffs and other barriers provide only a short-term remedy and should be reserved for punitive action, not as a long-term solution.

With respect to whether the United States should enter into such an agreement with China given its record on human rights, use of slave and child labor, and sometimes belligerent attitudes toward its neighbors and the

United States, we must consider whether those of us who regret such actions can effectively change them through engagement or disengagement.

I believe walking away from China would be a failure which would free not a single political prisoner, would not ease tensions with Taiwan, and would only strengthen the resolve of those in the Chinese People's Liberation Army who oppose this agreement and any economic liberalization as well.

Furthermore, the Levin-Bereuter provision contained in this bill ensures that the United States will maintain public pressure on China's treatment of its own people and its labor policy. This Helsinki-style congressional commission will bring to light abuses, rather than allow them to foster in the shadows under disengagement.

The WTO bans child and slave labor, and the United States and other industrialized nations must remain vigilant to enforce sanctions against such practices in China and everywhere else in the world.

Greater economic ties not only benefit the United States, but will help bring social and political change in China. Few can deny that consumerism has changed the former Soviet bloc, Europe or even America, putting greater freedom in the hands of individuals. If the Congress fails to adopt PNTR and the United States walks away, change in China will happen less quickly and at our expense.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I am at the same podium, but this is a terrible deal. We have lost our moral compass. We really have. It is a bad deal for the United States, and it is certainly a bad deal for New Jersey and my district, the 8th Congressional District.

We are expected to lose, according to the government's own reports, over 22,000 jobs. We have been granting NTR each and every year for the past 20 years, and what have we seen? What has happened? Human rights, labor rights, environmental rights, national security interests have gotten worse year after year; and it has been documented. So with this vote, the downward spiral will continue to plummet.

Mr. Chairman, 875,000 jobs lost, sucked out of the economy. Not only has NTR been disastrous, but our increasing trade with China has done nothing to foster this so-called reform. Last week, the World Bank, over United States objections, agreed to provide \$232 million in loans to the government of Iran against our wishes.

□ 1800

The State Department stated that giving support to Iran will, quote, send the wrong signal, the State Department said, to their government. That government which is regressive, intolerant, non-Democratic, aggressive. Does that sound familiar?

The irony, of course, is that these are the same people in the State Department who are spending night and day trying to send the Chinese Government the wrong signal about PNTR. We need a no vote for America tomorrow.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the legislation before us today authorizing the extension of non-discriminatory treatment to the People's Republic of China. Congress should not give up the leverage we presently have which provides for an annual review of normal trade relations with China. We have ongoing significant concerns in our relations with China with regard to trade enforcement, with regard to violations of human rights, with regard to religious freedom, with regard to China's nuclear proliferation and other important issues.

These issues can and must be addressed before we approve the measure before us today. Yes, let us consider business with China in the days ahead, but first let us take a good, hard look at these violations. Extending normal trade relations to China on a permanent basis will send a powerful message determining China's role in the global economy and in the community of nations for years to come, but it is a message we can ill afford to send so long as there is no freedom of speech there, no freedom of association, and no freedom of religion in China.

Mr. Chairman, China's enormous trade deficit with us of some \$70 billion has fueled its military build-up and has emboldened the dictators in Beijing to claim areas in the Philippines and other Democratic neighbors in the region. China's illegal occupation of Tibet and its brutal repression of the Tibetan people continues unabated.

We are told today by many of our colleagues that by giving permanent normal trade relations to the People's Republic of China we will be granting significant benefits to American business without giving anything away to China. I strongly disagree with that contention. I believe that supporting PNTR will give China something it desperately needs and wants, relief from the spotlight of its poor human rights record.

Under the current annual review arrangement, we in the Congress are able to open a door to fully examine the human rights situation in China each and every year.

I ask my colleagues, are Chinese human rights and labor practices important to us? I believe they are. I believe they are the most important in the world today. China has the world's largest population, one of the fastest growing economies. If China is allowed to trample on its individual freedoms, then how can we tell Indonesia or Malaysia or Nigeria or Sudan or any other nation that they cannot?

A recent joint report by the Council on Foreign Relations, the National De-

fense University, and the Institute for Defense Analysis on China Nuclear Weapons and Arms Control noted that the U.S. Government remains concerned about China's arms control performance, reporting that China has not brought its biological warfare activities into accord with its international treaty obligations; and its continued support to Pakistan's weapons program has been a source of mounting concern as well.

I submit to my colleagues, by granting PNTR to China we will be sacrificing much of our ability to affect public scrutiny on China's human rights practices.

I would also note that the recent report of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom included a recommendation by all 9 commissioners that the Congress not grant PNTR to China until substantial improvements are made in respect for religious freedom in that country.

While the nine voting members of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom include strong free trade proponents and who represent a wide diversity of opinion and religions, they are unanimous that China needs to take concrete steps to release all persons imprisoned for their religious beliefs, to ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and to take other measures to improve respect for religious freedom.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues to oppose this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the legislation before us today authorizing the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment to the People's Republic of China.

Congress should not give up the leverage we presently have which provides for an annual review of normal trade relations with China. We have ongoing significant concerns in our relations with China with regard to trade enforcement, human rights, religious freedom, nuclear proliferation and other important issues. These issues can—and must—be addressed before we approve the measure before us today.

Extending "normal trade relations" to China on a permanent basis will send a powerful message determining China's role in the global economy and in the community of nations for years to come. But it is a message we can ill afford to send—so long as there is no freedom of speech, no freedom of association, and no freedom of religion in China.

On May 10th, our International Relations Committee held a hearing on extending PNTR to China including Representatives CHRIS COX and SANDER LEVIN who argued for the consideration of so-called parallel legislation. It is my understanding that the study group advocated in this legislation, including the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China, is now contained in the bill before us today, H.R. 4444.

It is my understanding that this Commission has no enforcement mechanism and largely duplicates existing human rights monitoring and reporting requirements. In a press report from China on May 12th, shortly after our hearing, China said it opposed any plans by the U.S. to set up a group to monitor human

rights as a condition to granting permanent normal trade relations. The Spokeswoman of the Chinese Foreign Ministry said that such a watchdog body constituted interference in China's internal affairs. She noted that "This is something we can by no means accept".

In short, there are no indications that this commission can play an effective role in promoting human rights inside China. I would note, furthermore, that this proposal is in the jurisdiction of the International Relations Committee and should receive full and ample review by our panel before it is brought to the floor of the House.

China's enormous trade deficit with us of some \$70 billion has fueled its military build-up and has emboldened the dictators in Beijing to claim areas of the Philippines and other democratic neighbors in the region. China's illegal occupation of Tibet and brutal repression of the Tibetan people continues unabated.

We are told today by many of our colleagues that by giving Permanent Normal Trade Relations to the People's Republic of China, we will be granting significant benefits to American businesses without giving away anything to China.

I strongly disagree with that contention. I believe that supporting PNTR will give China something it desperately wants: relief from the spotlight on its poor human rights record. Under the current annual review arrangement, we in the Congress are able to open a door to examine the human rights situation in China each and every year.

Along with our attention comes the attention of the world. Our hearings and debates focus the cameras and tape recorders and word processors of the news media. We have the bully pulpit on this issue, and I am very concerned that once we give it away, we will never get it back.

I ask my colleagues, are Chinese human rights and labor practices important to us? I believe that they are the most important in the world today. China has the world's largest population and one of the fastest growing economies. If China is allowed to trample on individual freedoms, then how can we tell Indonesia or Malaysia or Nigeria or Sudan or any other nation that they cannot?

The Beijing regime has fought a vigorous public relations battle to win this philosophical argument. They have manipulated prisoner releases, effectively blackmailed dozens of countries and nearly corrupted some of very own American corporations with their efforts. We cannot shrink from this battle of values. Public opinion polls show that many Americans have deep reservations about our policies toward China and the proposal to extend normal trade relations to that country.

A recent joint report by the Council on Foreign Relations, the National Defense University and the Institute for Defense Analysis on China, Nuclear Weapons, and Arms Control noted that the U.S. government remains concerned about China's arms control performance. It reports that China has not brought its biological warfare activities into accord with its treaty obligations. And its continued support to Pakistan's weapons programs has been a source of mounting concern as well.

By granting PNTR to China, we will sacrifice much of our ability to affect public scrutiny on Chinese human rights practices. I would also note that the recent report of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom included a recommendation by all nine

commissioners that the Congress not grant PNTR to China until substantial improvements are made in respect for religious freedom in that country.

While the nine voting members of the U.S. Commission on Int'l Religious Freedom include strong free trade proponents and who represent a wide diversity of opinion and religions, they are unanimous that China needs to take concrete steps to release all persons imprisoned for their religious beliefs, to ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and to take other measures to improve respect for religious freedom.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues to oppose this measure.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would remind our distinguished colleague that the estimates are that in less than 5 years, 230 million Chinese will be classified as middle-income consumers with an annual retail sales rate exceeding \$90 billion, almost \$1 trillion, a year; and I would urge him also to try and have an opportunity to speak with Billy Graham's son who has been involved in the missionary activities in Mainland China for several years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON).

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, one of the advantages of old age is not necessarily wisdom but a lot of experience, and I do not pretend to try to convince those who are already convinced of their position. I just want to say how I feel about this particular issue.

I am very strongly in favor of permanent normal trading relations with China, and I will say why. I have found, in my experience, that for every job that goes overseas that there are two jobs that are created in this country. One can say 850,000 have left. I do not know what the number is, but I bet many fold have come back into this country. That has been my experience.

One does not send a job abroad to make a product primarily to send back into the United States. Sometimes that happens, but it is mostly to take care of that market.

Secondly, we are not standing here making a decision in isolation. There are other people out there who do not want us to have this agreement. They want us to stay absolutely still in the water so their businesses, whether it is the South Koreans or the Germans or the Japanese, can get in there and take the lead on this, and once one has been in business there, in established relationships, it is very difficult to get in.

Lastly, from a very practical standpoint, I have set up about four plants in China, and the experience which we have had has been we have moved in, we have given people dignity, good paying jobs, benefits. They have then gone out into their community and changed the democratic, the political, the human rights, the environmental aspects of those communities. One does not stand back and say, you fix it and

then we will come in. You come in and fix it and help them work through this, that has been my experience.

I just wanted to share that.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I was over in the office listening to the debate and I know, as anyone here knows that has been listening, that the opponents of this legislation feel very strongly about it. We understand, those of us who support it, those feelings; and it is tough.

Let me just say this: Number one, nothing around here is permanent. If one believes that, we can change the law tomorrow if the Chinese misbehave, as some have said.

More important than that, this is not about China. I hear people talking about what is going on in China: China, China, China. This is about what is good for us. This is a trade bill for the United States, not for China.

Know what is important in this bill that nobody has thought about it and talked about, and I think is very crucial? It is that as good as the tariffs coming down so our stuff can go over there and go in that is made in this country providing jobs for our citizens, but the second thing is that the Chinese, in this agreement, agree to do away with their government-owned corporations that limit the amount of exports by that mechanism to go in there.

So what we can have with this agreement for us, not for China, I do not much care what happens in terms of China other than how it affects the citizens of this country, and what is good for us is we have private enterprise in this country doing business with private enterprise in China.

My colleagues say they want to change the status quo in China? That is going to change the status quo in China more than any other single thing, in my judgment, we could possibly do.

So I say this is a trade bill not for China but for us. It is good for the United States. It is good for our citizens.

I will say one other thing. China cannot be isolated by voting no. Know who is going to be isolated if my colleagues vote no? They are going to isolate us, because the EU, the European Union, the South Americans, Japan, and the rest of Asia are going to take that market and they are going to isolate us, not them, if my colleagues vote no.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that so many observers have gotten it wrong. The China trade vote is not

about protectionism versus free trade. It is not about business versus labor. It is not even about China haters versus China apologists.

No, it is a vision of the world trade worthy of America in the 21st century. It is about whether 21st century globalism will have any guiding principle or whether it will be an aimless trading frenzy with no consideration of workers' rights, of human rights, of religious rights, of environmental protection.

Yes, it is about engagement. This whole debate is about whether to bring China into a rule-based trade regime. The great irony of all of this is that the proponents of PNTR insist on the need for rule-based trade agreements, backed up with sanctions.

So, I ask, why do we need rule-based trade agreements in trade but we do not need rule-based agreements in any other area that we think is important?

Real engagement extends beyond trade. Trade in the 21st century will be and must be about more than how many widgets enter and leave a port.

A no vote is not a retreat. A no vote is a vote for engagement, if we have the wisdom to have real engagement.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, the book of Genesis tells the sad story of Esau, son of Isaac, who sold his birthright for a mess of pottage.

As Americans, our birthright is life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The tradition of our country has been the unfolding of those liberties, including freedom of speech, freedom of religion, including workers' rights and human rights. This is our birthright.

The Chinese people do not enjoy these freedoms. They suffer under slave labor, prison labor, no workers' rights, no human rights. They suffer from religious repression. They do not have, as we do, above their center of power, the words, "In God We Trust."

Those words, if we stand by our values, infuse us with powerful moral leadership. That is why we need to hold the moral high ground with annual review of human rights and labor practices of China. It is access to our market which enables us to hold the moral high ground.

The multinational corporations with their single-minded dedication to profit at all costs cannot be expected to defend workers rights anywhere, let alone in China. It is our duty to defend workers' rights and human rights, and we have no right to abdicate that responsibility ever.

□ 1815

Chinese workers are paid as little as 3 cents an hour. Whose values are those? The Chinese government which

uses slave labor; the global corporations which capitalize on slave labor.

How many hours do Chinese people have to work to account for a \$70 billion trade deficit with the United States? How many American manufacturing jobs will go to China's workers who are paid 3 cents an hour?

There is a myth that if one digs a hole deep enough, one will reach China. We have dug the hole deep with a \$70 billion trade deficit. We will learn tomorrow if we have reached China. If in that hole we put our jobs, decent wages, workers' rights, and human rights, will we cover up that hole and claim victory?

But, Mr. Chairman, peace and justice is already our birthright. Freedom of speech and freedom of religion are already our birthright. Workers' rights and human rights are already our birthright. Will we, like Esau in Genesis, sell our birthright for a mess of pottage which multinational corporations offer?

What is the price of freedom? Do we so little value freedom that we are prepared to sacrifice our lives, our fortunes, our sacred honor? Vote against PNTR.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I am going to bring my colleagues tonight a hypothetical bill. This bill has three parts: part one provides billions of dollars of aid to Beijing in order to stabilize the regime; part two provides support for the Chinese military infrastructure as it prepares to attack its neighbors; part three provides direct aid to the PLA. Now, that is my hypothetical bill I bring to my colleagues tonight. I ask my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, who would vote for this bill?

If we clear away everything else that we have talked about, it does boil down to this, because I will tell my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, I was, in fact, one of the Members that went to the CIA briefing. When one goes to the CIA briefing and when one asks specific questions about these issues, this is what one comes back with; that, in fact, doing what we are about to do will provide aid to the regime in order to stabilize it. It will provide aid to the military in order to attack its neighbors. It will provide direct aid to the PLA, to the People's Liberation Army.

How is this, my colleagues ask? It is simple. The PLA owns the business. When the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) talked about private businessmen doing private business with other private businessmen, Mr. Chairman, the PLA, they own 100 percent of the telecommunications business in China. They own most of the significant businesses, either surreptitiously or directly. Yet this is the bill I bring to my colleagues tonight.

If my colleagues could just escape all of the other things, erase all of the other thing we talk about, and how wonderful it would be to improve

human rights, how wonderful it would be to improve workers' rights, religious freedom, all those things would be great. But what is all of our primary responsibility as representatives of the people of the United States? Is it to, in fact, insure human rights across the world? As laudable as that goal is, no, that is not our prime responsibility. Is it to, in fact, insure workers' rights? No, that is not our primary responsibility. It is not even our primary responsibility to insure religious freedom.

We have one responsibility, the prime directive: protect and defend the people of the United States.

Vote no on this bill.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

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

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, this debate that we undertake today is about better, stronger, fairer trade with China, which in time will pave the way for social and political reforms. Some of these reforms are already evident today.

Pennsylvania has exported more than \$297 million in goods to China in 1998. Voting for this agreement forces China to take down tariff barriers and non-tariff barriers that have prevented even larger Pennsylvania exports. Increasing the amount of exports to China will only help in creating jobs, not only in Pennsylvania, but also throughout our country.

Last November, the U.S. Trade Representative Ambassador Barshefsky completed historic negotiations with the People's Republic of China and managed to craft an agreement that would provide access to the Chinese market while requiring no concessions by the U.S. Let us be clear about this. This is no NAFTA. We do not make a single job-killing concession in this legislation.

The bill we consider today would allow the U.S. to benefit from those negotiations. The bill will not determine whether or not China enters the WTO. China is entering the World Trade Organization with or without this legislation.

I must admit, Mr. Chairman, that I entertained serious concerns when this issue was first raised. I was concerned about human rights and fair trade, which are critical to building a long-term stable relationship with China. Luckily, through the bipartisan leadership of my friends and colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), many of these issues have been addressed convincingly.

Let us look at the facts. The Levin-Bereuter plan provides better oversight for human rights and protections than exist under current law. It provides strong and enforceable anti-surge protections, which are part of the original

agreement with the Chinese Government and will now be codified. The Levin-Bereuter provisions, not only ensure that Chinese play by the rules in trade; but, more importantly, they strengthen U.S. law to provide quick and effective weapons if there is a violation. The bill includes language from Levin-Bereuter, urging that the WTO approve both the PRC's and Taiwan's accession in the same General Council session.

All of these provisions are major improvements that make this overall package a good bill. We are entering into a trade agreement with China that will create a more balanced relationship than any initiative to date. This debate should be about ensuring that China plays by the rules in trade, and that they honor commitments made in this agreement.

Mr. Chairman, a China disengaged is more likely to be a rogue country in the new century. A China engaged is more likely to move down the sunlit path of human rights. I challenge every one of my colleagues to vote to engage China, a China to which we can export our goods along with our values.

Mr. Chairman, I include two editorials from my district in favor of normal trade relations, as follows:

[Editorial Column—The Erie Morning News, May 21, 2000]

If we can believe the American business community, windfalls will follow if the Congress goes along with President Clinton and approves permanent normal trade relations with China. American labor—which has never met a free trade measure it liked—sees PNTR as another job-killer. As usual, neither forecast tells the full truth.

Opening the huge China market by allowing the Communist nation to join the World Trade Organization will undoubtedly be lucrative—in time. No windfalls.

As with the equally contested North American Free Trade Agreement with Canada and Mexico, some American jobs will vanish with free and open trade with China. But no one will hear giant sucking sounds as American jobs are lost to China, as labor preaches.

Similar divisions afflict Congress as it prepares to vote on PNTR later this week. The U.S. Senate is expected to back PNTR with little fuss, but war has begun in the always fractious House of Representatives.

The Republican leadership is guiding PNTR despite loud opposition from some GOP members who seek leverage to force China to end human rights abuses.

House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt is against PNTR, as is the bulk of the Democratic caucus. So labor still threatens passage.

We find China's recent behavior offensive. We also realize the 20-year Most Favored Nation Status charade did nothing to moderate Beijing's repeated rights abuses.

Our support for PNTR is based on simple reality. China is not Cuba. It is the most populous nation in the world, with the globe's fastest growing economy. It is senseless for the United States to treat the Asian colossus as anything else than a superpower likely to emerge later this century.

With China's markets open, with American goods—and American popular culture—flowing throughout this giant nation, dramatic reforms will eventually follow. The old Communist leadership will be just as powerless to stop these forces as its decreased former

Soviet and Eastern block comrades (and as Fidel Castro would be in Cuba if American policy weren't based on Cold War myths).

We understand these are difficult votes for many in Congress, who despise the Chinese Communists or who fear labor. But then, Congressman didn't seek office merely to vote on popular, easy issues.

Side legislation creating a commission to monitor China's performance offers political cover for nervous Democrats. Even Erie's 21st District Republican Congressman Phil English "emphasized the importance of the proposal" to the Wall Street Journal after voting with the Ways and Means Committee to approve PNTR and send it to the House floor last week.

English will vote for PNTR because he understands the stakes China has agreed to join the world community and play by its trade rules with entry into the WTO.

That is where America's influence is, with China as a full trading partner—not some junior member of the world community who must be monitored like a troubled child.

The United States tried that approach with China and Most Favored Nation Status the last 20 years. It's time to join the real world.

[Our View—The Herald, Sharon, Pa., May 21, 2000]

#### CONGRESS SHOULDN'T LET ORGANIZED LABOR DERAIL U.S.-CHINA TRADE VOTE

Approval of the China trade bill Wednesday by two key legislative panels, the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance committees, bodes well for next week when the House is expected to take up the thorny issue of permanent normal trade relations for China.

Bipartisan support for the historic measure has been building although the final vote, by all accounts, will be close. Most House Democrats, particularly those most closely allied with organized labor in industrial states, are stubbornly resisting pleas for their votes from both Republican leaders and the Clinton Administration.

Congressmen still opposed or sitting on the fence should vote for the historic measure that rightfully should be seen as having as many benefits for workers as for businesses, manufacturers, farmers, consumers and lovers of personal freedom.

Passage of the bill into law—it's expected to have an easier time in the Senate—would end the annual exercise of renewing China's trade status and grant the world's most populous nation the same normal trade relations and lower tariffs that the United States extends routinely to nearly every other country. The bill also would assure China's entry into the Geneva-based World Trade Organization which oversees world trade and provides mechanisms to resolve disputes among members.

Organized labor, desperate to defeat the bill, has trumpeted such already well known criticisms of China as its poor record on human rights and denial of religious freedom as well as its history of economic piracy and disregard for environmental standards.

However, labor and other opponents should take another look at what the record shows and stop refusing to accept that easier trade—and the growing prosperity it brings—is the most effective cure for the repression and other ills of communism. The higher standard of living increased trade can provide for China's 1.2 billion people is the most powerful tool to promote democracy there and continued prosperity for American working families.

More trade would add to the 1.3 million new American jobs attributed to growth in imports and exports since 1993. International

commerce is responsible for nearly one-fourth of America's gross national product.

American labor leaders, fearful as they are about the effects of the trade bill, also should recognize that Chinese leaders are just as worried although for different reasons.

As pointed out in the New York Times by Beijing reporter Elisabeth Rosenthal, private enterprise that has grown in China over the last decade has taught ever greater numbers of Chinese that they can live independent of the government. Nurturing that growing sense of confidence is the Internet, with its promise of unfettered worldwide communication, which carries voices of opposition and democracy in China out to the rest of the world despite the communists' determination to hold onto power. Such steps toward prosperity, confidence and freedom deserve as much support as possible.

Instead of opposing the China trade bill, labor leaders should see exciting possibilities in the opportunity to compete for the business of 1.2 billion potential buyers for every kind of American product from grain, meat, livestock, fruits and vegetables to computer hardware and software, medicine, machinery and construction equipment and consumer goods of every description.

Seeking to boost trade with China won't, as labor leaders fear, diminish America's willingness to fight for its interests, as we have seen over and over. The most recent example came Tuesday when the U.S. International Trade Commission levied punitive duties on apple juice concentrate following a determination that China was dumping the product here at prices below the cost of production. There's no reason to think that after normalization of trade with China that American business interests and officials will be any less insistent on fair trade of steel, pipe, machinery or other industrial goods as for agricultural products.

It's been three decades since Richard Nixon visited Beijing in 1972 and established cordial relations with China. Since then, each succeeding administration has worked toward a closer partnership between the two countries and it's time to take the next big step.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, today our Nation, and I believe this Congress, stand at the beginning of a new century; and with it comes the new opportunity to export our products to the largest emerging market in the world.

America today is enjoying unparalleled economic successes. We are the envy of the world. Economic growth is sustained. Unemployment is low. Inflation has been kept at bay. The new economy has brought new wealth and new opportunities to our Nation and its workers. I am proud to represent a district which is home to Silicon Valley and where the high technology industries are the primary contributors to the economic engine of our new economy.

But this issue is larger than any one industry or any one congressional district. President Kennedy said, "Economic isolation and political leadership are wholly incompatible. The United States has encouraged sweeping changes in free world economic patterns in order to strengthen the forces of freedom, but we cannot ourselves stand still. We must adapt our own

economy to the imperatives of a changing world and once more assert our leadership." These words hold truth for us today.

This legislation, I believe, is good for the American worker; and it opens the greatest market for the products they make to a much greater market.

This House and our Nation, I think, really owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Bereuter). Refusing to turn their backs on history, they, instead, chose to make history by writing legislation that brings the framework of the famous Helsinki courts to our relationship with China.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I believe that we will seize a historic opportunity, not only for our country and its workers, but that future generations will say that we took an important step, seized the opportunity for our people.

So I thank my colleagues for this opportunity, and I thank especially the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for the work that he has done.

Mr. Speaker, today our nation—and this Congress—stand at the beginning of a new century and with it comes a new opportunity to export our products to the largest emerging market in the world.

Today America is enjoying unparalleled economic success. We're the envy of the world. Economic growth is sustained. Unemployment is low. Inflation has been kept at bay. The New Economy has brought new wealth and new opportunities to our nation and its workers.

I'm proud to represent a district which is home to Silicon Valley and where the high technology industries are the primary contributors to the economic engine of our New Economy.

But this issue is larger than any one industry or any one Congressional District. President Kennedy said,

Economic isolation and political leadership are wholly incompatible. The United States has encouraged sweeping changes in free world economic patterns in order to strengthen the forces of freedom. But we cannot ourselves stand still. We must adapt our own economy to the imperatives of a changing world and once more assert our leadership.

These words hold true for us today. This legislation is good for the American worker. It opens the greatest market of this new century to American products and American values.

I want to salute our colleagues, Congressional LEVIN and BEREUTER for refusing to turn their backs on history and instead choosing to make history by writing legislation that brings the framework of the famous Helsinki Accords to our relationship with China.

Mr. Speaker, China's outdated politically-decrept political system has shown over fifty years that it can repress its people by keeping them closed off from the rest of the world. I doubt they can succeed with this economic and political repression in the face of an Internet society where millions of computers and wireless telephones will connect China to the rest of the world. An Internet society punches a thousand holes in the dike of political repression. China not only will be exposed to

American values, but it will become part of the community of nations.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes to extend permanent normal trade relations to China and thus seize this historic opportunity.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I believe in free trade. But to me, free trade is not just about the products we are trading. It is also about the people who make them. If after more than a quarter century of engagement, the success of our human rights and democracy efforts in China can be measured in forced abortions, arrest of dissidents, Tiananmen Square, religious persecution, ethnic cleansing in Tibet, child labor, slave labor, aggression against Taiwan, and the arrests of the Falun Gong, then our record is not a success at all but a dismal failure.

The victims of this failure are not just the Chinese people. The administration and American companies continue to accept displaced American workers as inevitable casualties of economic war for which there is virtually no assistance. I know I will not.

Our trade deficit with China continues to grow, from a \$6 billion deficit a decade ago to an almost \$70 billion deficit today, all while the Chinese Government continues to break promise after promise, agreement after agreement. That \$70 billion benefit to China is what they have, in essence, been investing in their military budget.

Free trade exists when two countries open up their doors to compete on a level playing field, not when one country, the United States, opens its doors wide while the other, China, cracks its door open an inch while reserving the right to slam it shut if we ever dare ask for what they consider to be too much.

Have we gotten to the point where we will throw all of our values out the window, even protecting children from forced labor, in order to maximize corporate profits?

Our leadership, our international leadership, comes from these values, not just our profits. That is the America I believe in. That would be the kind of true free trade bill that would be worth fighting for. This is a bill that needs to be soundly defeated.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring two new developments to the attention of this House, developments

that show that we need to negotiate a better deal.

First, the International Trade Commission and the official authoritative body of the Federal Government issued a report. It says this deal will increase our \$70 billion trade deficit and cost America 872,000 jobs over the next 10 years. That is right. Permanent NTR does not just make the trade deficit permanent, it makes it bigger.

Second, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) presented an amendment to the Committee on Rules this afternoon which would simply state that China will lose its access to our markets if it invades or blockades Taiwan. This amendment is consistent with GATT. But I expect that the Committee on Rules will reject it because the administration will reject it because China will not accept it.

Now, who is to blame? China? If it interprets the proceedings of this House as a green light to blockade or invade Taiwan, and if this House is willing to grant permanent NTR, even if China blockades or invades Taiwan, what would the other body do? What would the proponents of trade suggest?

We must insist that the Berman-Weldon language is included in this statute. If it is not, then we are being vague when clarity is called for. We will be at fault if China is misinterpreting our mood, and we will be the precipitators of those in China who say they are free to invade Taiwan or blockade Taiwan.

Keep in mind how easy it is to blockade Taiwan. It just takes a press release saying that the next freighter into Taipei or into Taiwanese ports will be hit by a Chinese missile, and that economy shuts down. We cannot allow misinterpretation. We need the Berman-Weldon language. Otherwise, this bill becomes the Taiwan blockade authorization act.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

□ 1830

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, in trade agreement after trade agreement the U.S. negotiators have allowed themselves to be swindled before. Now we are dealing with a very different kind of animal. China does not have a market economy. It has an economy that has no name. It is a complex situation where we are about to be swindled again.

Without a doubt, the totalitarian government of China has the world's largest workforce. China also has the most oppressed and most thoroughly manipulated urban workforce on the face of this Earth. In the country that promised to be the paradise for the proletariat, there are no free unions. Workers cannot organize.

China's size makes China special. It is a monster that can greatly distort the economics of world trade. But more importantly, with China's centralized authority, the totalitarian control of both the consumers and the workers and the means of production, everything is under control, and that also is a danger to world trade.

No one in this government is willing to give us an honest study and an honest assessment of the damage that has already been done by NAFTA with its monstrous drain on manufacturing jobs on this country's economy. But China has the capacity to do 100 times more damage than Mexico did with the NAFTA blunder.

China's trade is great for our retail establishment. Yes, they like to go and purchase items for a few pennies and sell them for many dollars at a tremendous profit in our retail stores. China's trade is great for our manufacturing concerns, to take their plants and pick them up and have products manufactured in China and brought back here and sold in a standard in line with our quality of life.

For the managers, the executives, and the investors profits leap upward forever in this China deal. But for ordinary Americans, the statistics and the records tell the tragic side of the story. Already world trade has cost us a great deal. The gap between workers and the people on the top keeps growing. China is a disaster. Vote "no" on this trade bill.

Mr. Chairman. I am strongly opposed to granting permanent normal trade relations to China and, knowing the strong feelings on both sides of the issue, will explain the reasons for my objection.

Permanent normal trade relations with China will increase America's trade deficit, contrary to what many believe. In 1999, America exported one-third less of agricultural products to China than in the previous year and the resulting deficit affected two-thirds of all agricultural commodities exported to China. In fact, America's 1998 cotton export surplus to China of \$118 million turned to a \$12 million trade deficit in 1999. From 1995 to 1999, American export of fresh apples to China fell by 79 percent, while we imported twice the dollar amount of dried apples from China than we exported in fresh apples. While we exported no peanuts to China in 1999, we imported peanuts from China for the first time in 1998 and exported only \$14,000. This was a drop from \$60,000 worth of peanuts exported to China in 1994.

How can we believe that simply giving China permanent normal trade relations status will reverse this very clear trend? This increase in agricultural imports from China to the United States has occurred simultaneously while overall United States exports to China has steadily decreased. The result is a significant agricultural trade deficit for the United States. Granting permanent normal trade relations status to China will not automatically recalibrate the balance of trade between our two countries. And historically, China has failed to honor trade agreements with the United States. What makes proponents of permanent normal trade relations believe that it will be any different after approval than it is now?



But of equal concern to me is the well-known record of China in human rights violations. This extends to the workers in China who will be the recipients of American jobs exported there under the misguided belief that permanent normal trade relations with China will be a positive thing. At the current 25 cents an hour in manufacturing wages for the average worker in China, the temptation for multinational corporations to move business from America to China will only be exacerbated by granting it permanent normal trade relations status. Right now, a few multinational corporations are draining away assets from Federal, state and local coffers and taking their business to other countries that have less ethical and stringent standards under which their citizens earn a living. Are we to condone and support this trend by making it easier for those multinational corporations to export jobs away from America?

This negative trend for American trade will not be helped by granting China permanent normal trade relations status. It will simply increase our dependency on foreign imports and set in motion a dangerous precedent that could see the eventual disappearance of the prosperity and productivity that America has built to an incredible degree over the last 8 years.

International concerns that should give proponents of permanent normal trade relations with China pause is China's unchanged reputation for support of radical factions; like Iran, Iraq, and Libya and for bullying Taiwan.

By granting permanent normal trade relations status to China, we send a message to multinational corporations that it is OK to siphon money from American communities and move assets abroad with impunity. We say to China: "It is OK to practice human rights violations and aid and abet rogue nations in the international arena.

The proper course of action for the United States Congress is to deny permanent normal trade relations to China. We must not allow American jobs to disappear and resurface abroad. We must not turn a blind eye to China's intransigence on world security issues. Let us not turn back the clock on what we have been able to accomplish over the last eight years. We must say no to permanent normal trade relations for China. We must say no to the betrayal of slave-wage workers in China and to workers in America.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the question before the House is permanent normal trade relations for China. But the previous question, the larger question, the larger issue is fairness for domestic industries and our workers, equity for American workers.

When subsidized goods from foreign sources flood our markets, not protection but prompt, vigorous, efficient enforcement of our existing trade laws, has not happened in the steel industry in the United States. We have lost 350,000 jobs in basic steel and 10,000 jobs in the iron ore mining country of my district.

For the past 4 months, I have asked the administration and backers of this

legislation to fix two problems with legislation that I have prepared on the Trade Act of 1934 and the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act of 1974 to provide that equity and that fairness that I am asking for in international trade. It has not been forthcoming in this legislation.

I have not been uncommitted but very clear about my position. If we can fix the problem and help the workers face an uncertain future, I would vote for this. But if not, I will vote against it.

Symptomatic of what lies ahead are the defective issues in the U.S. agreement with China that are reflective of the broader pattern of international trade where we have failed to enforce existing law. What hope do workers in American industry have about the future of a broader trade agreement when existing law is not vigorously, effectively enforced? We ask only for that. It has not been forthcoming. I see no hope that it will. I am voting no.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), a human rights advocate who has earned that reputation through many years of human rights work in this body.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong opposition to PNTR, and tonight I especially urge the remaining undecided Members to look at China's ever-worsening human rights record and look long and hard at the compelling threat that PRC poses to Taiwan on both the short and intermediate term as they build up with U.S. missile and computer technology and Russian ships, and the threat to the U.S. itself. The VFW and the American Legion have taken a long look at this issue and they have urged a "no" vote on PNTR.

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), who takes the view that is contrary to my own, rightly called China a dictatorship. Our business partners, Mr. Chairman, in Beijing indeed are dictators, and they are directly responsible for heinous crimes against humanity, including the systematic use of torture, the laogai or slave labor, where hundreds of thousands of people, thousands of gulags or laogai are used to make goods that are then exported to the United States. And the MOU that we have with them is not even worth the paper it is printed on.

They have given new meaning to the word union busting. Those brave Chinese who speak up and try to organize are thrown into jail and they too are beaten. As a result of the one child per couple policy, brothers and sisters are illegal. Forced abortion, properly construed as a crime against humanity by the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal are going on in China on a massive scale today. There is no toleration of dissent in the PRC.

I have had 18 hearings, Mr. Chairman, in my Subcommittee on Inter-

national Operations and Human Rights of the Committee on International Relations. We have looked at this at every angle. Another commission is nice, but it should not be done in lieu of substantive action.

Let me also point out that I too chair the Helsinki Commission. This does not look like the Helsinki Commission. Let me just remind Members that the U.S.S.R. and the Warsaw Pact nations all signed the Helsinki Final Act in 1975. It was a process. China is not going to be signing this pact. Let me also point out that MFN was denied to the U.S.S.R. while we had this accord called the Helsinki Final Act.

And, finally, we have commissions. The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom has come out unanimously admonishing Members of Congress to vote "no" on PNTR because of the deteriorating situation on religious freedom.

Let me just conclude, Mr. Chairman. My colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), said nothing is permanent. If they misbehave, he said, maybe something could be done. Let me just point out the fact is that this dictatorship is misbehaving on a grand scale. It does beg the question, is there anything that they can do, any abuse they can perpetrate that does not lead to the loss of PNTR? I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Brent Scowcroft, U.S. Air Force lieutenant general, retired, and former National Security Adviser, said of this vote, "Denying permanent normal trade relations will remove none of the blemishes that China's opponents have identified."

Denying PNTR will not fix the problem in China. None of us is here to defend the abysmal human rights record of the Chinese, but, frankly, it is better today than it was during the cultural revolution. Things are improving. Ren Wanding, leader of the 1978 Democracy Wall Movement in China said, "Before the sky was black. Now there is a light. This can be a new beginning."

I was in China at the beginning of this month with the Secretary of Agriculture and several Members of this Congress, two of whom just today finally made up their minds to support PNTR after much serious discussion. PNTR vote is a vote about what happens here in this country as much as it is the hopes of some of us to change that country.

Today, in my home State of Oregon, they are preparing the first shipment of wheat to go to China in 26 years, because until this bilateral agreement

came along, China used one of those nontariff barriers, called TCK SMUT, with a zero tolerance to preclude us from ever selling wheat into China. And they were successful for 26 years. That changes tomorrow when the ships leave Portland, Oregon, with 50,000 metric tons of wheat.

That is important. My farmers are suffering. If there is one thing I have heard over and over again as I have gone around my district is about bad past trade agreements that left us on the wrong side. This one forces China to open its markets, reduce its tariffs, and puts us on a better playing field when it comes to trade. And that is so important to people who are facing bankruptcy and disruption of their markets.

And, my colleagues, if we do not pass PNTR, we give the European Union, who we know subsidizes their farmers and ranchers to an extraordinary amount, our bilateral agreement, and we stick it to American farmers. And that is wrong, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

I acknowledge the hard work and passion of good friends on both sides of the issue; leaders on one side eloquently stating the challenges that remain in our relationship with China, others highlighting the opportunities this agreement presents for Americans and the China people. I believe we share the same goals.

We all want to expand our economy and to increase opportunities for all Americans. And we all want to encourage reform in China, nurturing freedom for over 1 billion people, making the world a safer place for everyone. This debate has shown that people of good intentions can strongly disagree on a means to achieving the same ends.

I am convinced that passing permanent normal trade relations and engaging with China is the best course for our economy, our national security, and the Chinese people. I know that increased exports of wine, citrus, beef, and other farm products will benefit the families of my central coast district in California. And I know the high-tech industry, so critical to our economic future, will gain critical access to Chinese markets. But I also strongly believe the Chinese people will, in the long run, win as well.

I note the recent statements by the Dalai Lama endorsing China's entry into the World Trade Organization and by Taiwan's new president in support of PNTR. These are calls for continued engagement with China, and they are calls we should heed.

But passing PNTR is only the first step. The real work now lies before us.

We must ensure China lives up to its commitments in this agreement. We must encourage American companies to uphold the very best of our values in China. We should not shrink from this challenge and this opportunity by refusing to engage with China. We must continue to highlight China's human rights shortages and encourage the voices of progressive change in that country.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. KLECZKA. Could the Chairman inform the sides how much time is remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) has 7 minutes remaining, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) has 2½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to granting permanent normal trade relations to China.

Entering into a trade agreement with China, given their current record on human rights and workers' rights, to me, is like marrying someone we hope to change. After the vows are taken, we then tell that person what is not right with the relationship and what needs to be done differently. It does not work.

Today, the U.S. imports 36 percent of all Chinese exports, but working conditions remain horrible. They are bad in the factories, where the sneakers are made, where the TVs are made. Yet we buy those products, and U.S. companies in China and the Chinese manufacturers have done nothing to improve workers' rights.

What is most alarming is that many of these products are made by very, very young children, who work more than 12 hours a day for very small wages; and they work 7 days a week.

□ 1845

It is pitiful that the U.S. is ignoring the awful conditions that these children face. PNTR with China would be a bad marriage. After the honeymoon hype fades away, we would be left with nothing except the same old China, where children work in virtual slavery.

The United States must not say "I do" to China until the Chinese people have freedom and the American people have responsible trade policy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" tomorrow.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this trade agreement. When people talk about this, the first thing they say is, we ought to have a trade agreement so we can engage with China. Well, if this theory is so smart, why do we not try with Cuba first? Because some of the same people who have dramatic opposition to engagement with Cuba, our neighbor 90 miles away, think that this is the greatest thing since sliced bread.

I have severe questions about this agreement. It seems to me we have come to a point in our history where we worship at the altar of new markets to the total exclusion of all other foreign policy objectives, and I do not think that makes good sense.

Let us talk about engagement. We have been engaged with China, and the report card is abysmal. They have not complied with the provisions of GATT, something that is already in place. We annually renew our trade relations with China. Let us see the results.

Human rights violations continue to proliferate. They have not been reduced.

We look at our trade deficit. It is the worst in the history of the United States. They outnumber us six to one in terms of our trade relationship. They have a distinct advantage in our relationship with them; our engagement with them certainly has not helped.

When we look at piracy of intellectual property and when we look at every element of our relationship, we see we have not benefited from this so-called engagement.

I urge rejection of the trade agreement.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, today we are deciding United States trade policy with the People's Republic of China. Given the fact that China is a communist nation and that it regularly violates the human rights of its own citizens, the United States Congress, rightfully, every year decides whether to treat China that year with restrictive or normal trade relations.

This year Congress is being asked to give up this annual review. And the question is, should we do so?

While I believe in free trade because it can be in America's national security and economic interest, and while China's leaders have made some progress from their days as an inward-looking regime, China has broken every one of the six trade agreements it has signed with the United States since 1992.

It is clear to me that not enough progress has been made or even attempted in the important areas of

human and worker rights and in protecting the environment in China.

I hope the time will come when the great nation of China will earn the right to permanent normal trade relations with the great Nation of the United States. They have not done so yet.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on PNTR for China.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I can understand the trends within this country. They are historic towards protectionism and isolationism. But they have not prevailed. And we have benefited as a result of our confidence in the future, our ability to compete.

But if we look at who in China is opposed to this treaty, who wants us to reject it tomorrow, certainly the military wants us to reject it, because they want their people to believe that they should be putting their resources into gearing up for a military confrontation with the United States. So they want us to reject it.

The people who run the state-owned enterprises want us to reject this treaty because they are afraid of competition with the United States. They do not want to have to worry about providing better working conditions for their people, worrying about the environment, providing the kinds of benefits that we provide in higher standard of living to the people who work for American corporations.

And certainly the Communist Party wants a no vote. They want a no vote because they know if they are put under the international rule of law and if they have almost unfettered Internet access to their people, if they cannot control what their people read and see and believe, they, the Communist Party, lose control over their people; the people of China will be liberated; the people of China will be able to deal with us. That free enterprise will prevail, that democracy will prevail, that human rights will prevail.

All of these hardliners in China want a no vote. But America needs a yes vote. This may be the most important thing we can do for our children's children, from a military standpoint, from an economic standpoint, and from a moral standpoint.

China needs to be an economically independent ally, not an isolated military threat. They need to be an economic opportunity, not someone who is closed off. And certainly, the people of China need an opportunity to understand that we have it right, that individual freedoms is what the human condition is all about.

Give the Chinese people a chance. Vote "yes."

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, over the last couple hours we are told about slave labor, child labor, human rights abuses,

forced abortion in China. So one could ask, well, why are we here giving permanent trade status to China? What is this issue all about?

My colleagues, the issue is all about money. The issue tonight is money, corporate profits for our industry and corporate boards. That is what it is all about.

Now, we have heard from the proponents that, gosh, we cannot isolate China, we cannot refuse to trade with them, we should not be protectionist. And it is all nonsense. Because everyone talking on the floor, be they for or against this resolution, know that we are going to continue, like today, trading with China.

So what is the big deal? The big deal is do we give China tomorrow permanent trading status with our country? Do we throw open the doors to promises of hundreds of thousands of new jobs? Or should we, like we have for almost the past 20 years, review this country and their abuses on an annual basis and then on this floor make a decision?

That is the question. It is not protectionism. It is whether or not Congress, the elected officials, will continue to review this.

I was told about the hundreds of thousands of jobs when NAFTA was passed, the trading agreement with Mexico. My colleagues, I come from Milwaukee, Wisconsin. A short time ago, Master Lock, little bicycle locks and big locks, small locks, they announced that they were going to close the plant, lay off 400 workers in the Milwaukee area, and move that to Mexico where the average wage we are told is about 50 cents an hour.

We cannot compete with that. Well, that is not going to happen in China. Baloney. The average wage in China is 13 cents. Master Lock should have waited for this and then ran to China.

Well, but we are going to have trade and they are going to buy American goods. The per capita income in China is about \$750 a year, \$750 a year. How many Jeep Cherokees can the Chinese buy from us? How many refrigerators? How many computers?

My colleagues, the issue here is money, money, money.

We were told when we had a hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means that, under this agreement, investment in China is going to become more secure and more profitable. And that sent up a red flag for this fellow because that means American capital is going to go over there in droves and instead of shipping products, they are going to be made there; and we are going to be shipping machine tools and production equipment, only to have the widgets and the tires and the auto parts come back here displacing American workers.

All we are asking today is let us review this and see if China is worthy of permanent. Let us look at it year to year. Congress comes back every year like the swallows to Capistrano.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, the annual review process has been, basically, a failure. We need both to gain the benefits from what we negotiated and find a better way to impact China.

The Helsinki Commission worked not because the USSR agreed; but because we, the U.S., persevered. If we persevere with the provisions in the bill that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and I and many others have put together, the best interests of our workers and our producers will prevail.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, today we have heard many things that do not really represent a real analysis of what PNTR is all about. We have been told that PNTR means there are no concessions on our part. Give me a break. I mean, no concessions? We have frozen into our reality unfair trade tariffs from now to forever.

Let me give my colleagues an example of PNTR. Car tariffs are going to be 25 percent. They are going to say, oh, well they are higher now. Yeah, they are higher now, but then they are going to bring them down and freeze them forever at an unfair level. Car tariffs 25 percent. Motorcycles 35 percent. VCRs 30 percent. Color TVs 30 percent. Corn 65 percent. Rice 65 percent. Sugar 65 percent.

These are the tariffs that they are going to have on our goods while our tariffs are just going to, again, as we have had for these last 10 years, almost down to nothing. This freezes us into an unfair economic relationship with the world's worst human rights abuser.

The Levin-Bereuter proposal that in some way just eliminates our review is going to do some good for the people of China; we are eliminating the review that we have. Their only restraint on their violations of human rights we are taking away by permanent normal trade relations.

What is this again? As I started out, this whole debate is about what? It is about whether or not we are going to continue the subsidies of American businessmen through the Export-Import Bank who are making their investments in Communist China to take advantage of that slave labor at the taxpayers' expense by the taxpayers guaranteeing that investment. That is what is fueling this whole debate today. Nobody wants to recognize it.

What we are doing is building the infrastructure, the technological and manufacturing infrastructure, of the world's worst human rights abuser and the country that poses the greatest threat to us militarily in the future.

We are creating a monster with blood on its hands. The blood on its hands is dripping from the hands of this terrible totalitarian regime. They have been repressing their religious believers and people who believe in democracy. And

we want to have a permanent normal trade relationship with them to help them build up their technological capabilities.

Such immoral policy-making will come back and hurt the United States. This is Neville Chamberlain's strategy with Adolph Hitler, build up his economy that he will not dare to commit aggression.

We will be hurt very badly if we pass this. Oppose PNTR.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a quote of President Chen Shui-bian, the newly inaugurated President of Taiwan: "We would welcome the normalization of U.S.-China trade relations, just like we hope the Cross Strait relations between Taiwan and China can also be normalized. We look forward to both the People's Republic of China's and Taiwan's accession to the WTO."

The next quote is from the EU Trade Commissioner Pascal Lamy, who said, "WTO entry has benefits for China, as it has benefits for EU companies, and it will enhance EU-China relations and that has just been concluded."

And finally, "American businesses and religious leaders need to remain engaged in China as an example and as a voice for our values. Rejecting the constructive bilateral trade agreements offered by the Chinese and denying normal trade relations would mean severing ties that would take generations to repair."

I would remind colleagues, this may be the most critically important vote they will cast in their entire career in the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, American business men and women have eyed China for years, knowing that the sky is the limit when it comes to selling American made goods and services to the world's largest market. But Americans have found it difficult to trade with China since complete access to this vast market has been restricted.

In today's global market, we can no longer afford any restrictions on trade with the world's largest population. We must engage China, and ensure that American companies and American workers have the tools to compete with other nations in Chinese markets. Remember, when America competes, we win. That's why I voted for a permanent trading relationship between the United States and China.

In fact, over the past year I have taken an active role in promoting America's free trade with China. Specifically, in Washington, as a member of the House Leadership's China Trade Team, I have worked with House Rules Chairman DAVID DREIER and my colleagues in support of extending permanent normal trade relations, PNTR, with China.

Back at home, I have met with hundreds of people in New Jersey's business community to encourage them to organize and help spread the word about the benefits increased trade with China will bring home to the Garden State. In fact, Chairman DREIER and I assembled a group of New Jersey's business lead-

ers in April to "rally the troops," so to speak. Joined by the CEO of Honeywell, Michael Bonsignore, we articulated five main points that are deciding factors in my support of trade with China.

First, extending permanent normal trading relations with China is a win for fairness—this agreement forces China to adhere to our rules-based trading system. Without an agreement, there are no rules, and we have no say whatsoever in how China conducts its business with the rest of the world.

Second, it's a win for U.S. workers and businesses—China is an incredibly important emerging market with more than a billion consumers. America's world class businesses, large and small—manufacturers, high tech/biotech companies, entertainers, farmers, financial institutions—know that being shut out of China, especially as China opens its doors to the rest of the world, is a very big mistake.

Third, trade with China is a win for American values inside China—through free and fair trade, America will not only export many products and services, but we will deliver a good old fashioned dose of our democratic values and free-market ideas. These ideals are already percolating in China—interestingly, today there are more Chinese shareholders in private companies in China than there are members of the Chinese Communist Party!

Fourth, international trade, whether with China or any other nation, means jobs for New Jerseyans, and continued prosperity for our state. That's the bottom line. Out of New Jersey's 4.1 million-member workforce, almost 600,000 people statewide—from Main Street to Fortune 500 companies—are employed because of exports, imports and foreign direct investment.

China ranked as New Jersey's 9th largest export destination in 1998, an increase from 13th in 1993. Our Garden State exported \$668 million in merchandise to China in 1998, more than double what was exported five years earlier. With a formal trade agreement in place, imagine the potential as access to China's vast market is improved! Enormous opportunities exist for New Jersey's telecommunications, environmental technology, healthcare, agriculture and food processing industries.

Fifth and finally, in the interests of world peace, it is absolutely a mistake to isolate China, a nation with the world's largest standing army, an estimated 2.6 million-member force. America's democratic allies in Asia support China's entry into the World Trade Organization because they know that a constructive relationship with China in a stable Asia offers the best chance for reducing regional tensions along the Taiwan Strait, and for avoiding a new arms race elsewhere in Asia.

I am fully aware of the controversy surrounding my vote. Indeed, humanitarian and environmental issues remain important to me in our dealings with China. But I refuse to believe that if we walk away from China our national interests would be better served. In fact, I am positive to do so would deter from our ability, and our credibility, to push reform in China and around the globe.

As General Colin Powell said, "From every standpoint—from a strategic standpoint, from the standpoint of our national interests, from the standpoint of our trading interests and our economic interests—it serves all of our purposes to grant permanent normal trading relations with China."

My vote ensures we give American workers the tools to compete with the world, and win. Moreover, by extending a permanent trading relationship with China, we ensure that China adheres to our rules in the global marketplace, and that along with our goods and services, we export American values and democratic ideals.

□ 1900

The CHAIRMAN. All time allotted for general debate has expired.

Under the order of the House of today, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4444) to authorize extension of non-discriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People's Republic of China, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. VELAZQUEZ addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. NETHERCUTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.