

NAYS—10

Burton	Kaptur	Souder
Chenoweth	Pickett	Stockman
Funderburk	Scarborough	
Jones	Seastrand	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

DeFazio

NOT VOTING—7

Bachus	Moakley	Reynolds
Collins (MI)	Nadler	
Jefferson	Owens	

□ 1346

Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. JONES, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mrs. SEASTRAND changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall No. 536 on the Bereuter amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

□ 1345

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Chair to say the bill is passed? Was there not a further pending vote on the resolution of disapproval?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman that the bill has passed. There is an addition measure to be considered.

Mr. DEFAZIO. A separate resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Separate under the rule.

Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 193, it is now in order to consider House Joint Resolution 96.

DISAPPROVAL OF EXTENSION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO THE PRODUCTS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. ARCHER. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, I call up the Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 96), disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 96 is as follows:

H.R. RES. 96

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress does not approve the extension of the authority

contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 recommended by the President to the Congress on June 2, 1995, with respect to the People's Republic of China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such times as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to an agreement between the minority, the majority, and the interested parties, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], will each control 10 minutes to debate the motion to table, after which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will be recognized to move to table the motion of disapproval.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the procedure, and I will be happy to handle our time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the majority leader, he said on a nondebatable motion, there was some agreement to debate it, 10 minutes being allocated to two Members. I am wondering if that requires unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No, the allocation of debate time is in order under the rule.

Mr. DEFAZIO. The rule made specifically in order that a nondebatable motion to table be debatable, but not the resolution itself?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct that debate will precede the motion to table.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LANTOS. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANTOS. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, are both sides in control of the time in favor of tabling this motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would note that the rule, House Resolution 193, allocates debate time for consideration of the joint resolution and does not require that the time be divided between proponents and opponents.

Mr. LANTOS. If I may continue my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, I

believe House rules do. We have had precedent for that when there was both on the majority and minority side the determination to grant Most Favored Nation treatment to Romania. I objected on parliamentary grounds, and the Speaker at that time granted me part of the time to express the views of those who are opposed to the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the rule was adopted pursuant to the rules of the House, and the rule that was adopted by the House is the rule that is in effect for the consideration of this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. May I continue my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may continue.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, is there any rule of the House which mandates that a portion of the time be allocated to opponents of a proposed legislation if both the majority and the minority are on one side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the case of a specific rule, the specific rule controls, and a specific rule has been adopted.

Mr. LANTOS. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those of us who are opposed to tabling this motion be allocated half the time.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do feel constrained to object, because there has been agreement between the majority and the minority as to how this issue will be debated, so I am constrained to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Chair would state that the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] could ask anyone possessing time to yield to him.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me begin my comments by commending Members on both sides of the aisle for the professional manner in which they have worked together to write the resolution just passed by the House. Specifically, I would like to commend the minority leader, the chairman and ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], all of whom made great efforts to ensure passage of this important resolution that sends a strong signal to the Chinese Government about the need for human rights reforms, while encouraging them to become a responsible actor in the world economy.

I believe that continuing a trade relationship with China, including encouraging the Chinese to enter the World Trade Organization on a commercial basis, where they accept all the obligations as well as the benefits of membership, combined with other

diplomatic initiatives, is the best way to move China toward human rights and democracy.

I am concerned that escalating tensions between the two nations, if allowed to continue, and Mr. Speaker, if I may again, to emphasize this point, I am concerned that escalating tensions between the two countries, if allowed to continue, will further set back our ability to encourage the march of democracy and free market in China.

The message sent by the House resolution, combined with granting MFN treatment, strikes the right balance. Accordingly, I commend the House for its action today and strongly urge my colleagues to support the following motion to table the motion of disapproval.

Mr. Speaker, if I may just finish on a personal note, where I may dare speak for all the House in this action today, what we have done today, despite our many disappointments in the behavior with respect to human rights of the Chinese Government, is to express our hopes and dreams for the Chinese people. It is our belief that a world in which they are free to trade is a world in which they can find greater freedom, greater peace, greater prosperity.

We are willing to accommodate the Chinese people's right to participate in that world, and we again emphasize on behalf of the Chinese people, on behalf of freedom throughout the globe, our encouragement to their government to observe human rights.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. AREMY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my objections to my position on the last vote. If I would have known that the rule was set in such a way, and some of my colleagues over there, that we would not have the opportunity to debate House Joint Resolution 96, I would not have voted in the affirmative on H.R. 2058.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the minority leader, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a troubling moment for the House of Representatives. I would say that 95 percent of this House believed that we were going to have the opportunity to vote on an actual resolution of disapproval for MFN for China because of their human rights record, because of their unfair trade practices, because of their acting in concert with nuclear terrorists and in violation of the nonproliferation treaty.

For a whole host of reasons, a large number of Members of the House wanted to vote on a straight up-or-down resolution of disapproval. That will not be allowed, Mr. Speaker. A deal was cut, we were not informed of this deal, it was not explicit in the rule, but a deal was cut. I found out about it this morning in a meeting over on the Senate side. They knew about it, but it certainly was not provided to Members of this body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to vote on a motion to table. Vote "no" on the motion to table. If Members want to vote up or down on MFN for China, if Members want to send something other than a meaningless message, they can paper it over all they want, but what did the resolution we just adopted do? Intensify diplomatic initiatives, for the 10th year in a row; a report from the President for the 10th year in a row about the abuse in China; but there is one new significant act, we are going to broadcast Radio-Free America into China, while they continue all the same unfair trade practices, the same repression of human rights, arresting of United States citizens, dealing with nuclear proliferation. That is all going to continue.

All they want is the money. They do not care what we say. They do not care about empty words and gestures. They understand one thing: money and power. Did appeasement work in Bosnia? Do Members think appeasement is going to work any better with the oligarchy, the gerontocracy that runs China? No. We are going to get one vote. Vote against the motion to table. That is the only vote we will get on MFN.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the debate here today has testified, the United States bilateral relationship with China is deeply troubled. Frankly, I do not see a time in the immediate future when relations between our countries will not be marred by difficult disputes. They arise out of authoritarianism, government repression, and vast cultural differences.

My goal for the United States is to pursue democratic reforms in China by maintaining a strong United States presence. This is the only way to influence the turbulent change that is occurring there.

House Joint Resolution 96 is the wrong approach because it would sever trade ties between United States citizens and the people in China we want to help the most. The commercial opportunities set in motion by MFN trade status have given Chinese workers and firms a strong stake in the free-market reforms occurring in China. Business relationships make possible the transmission of our values and beliefs. They put U.S. citizens in a position to lead by example.

Denying MFN to China would inflict a high cost on United States firms. The

180,000 United States jobs which are supported by United States exports to China are at stake. More difficult to quantify is the damage we would do to the future competitiveness of United States companies. Shutting them out of the Chinese market will cripple their efforts to succeed in Asia over the long term.

China's economy is now ranked as the third largest in the world, behind only the United States and Japan. Continuing to embark on massive infrastructure programs, China is spending billions of dollars annually in sectors where the United States leads—sectors such as high-technology equipment, aerospace, petroleum technology and telecommunications. With per capita income doubling every 6 or 7 years, the Chinese economy is expanding at an astounding pace.

U.S. interests on questions of national security are also at stake in this debate. If the United States is to find common ground with China on issues such as North Korea, weapons proliferation and military expansion in the South China Sea, we need a functioning bilateral relationship.

American policy toward China must continue to rest on a clear view of our long term interests, both economic and strategic. We can and should denounce human rights abuses, but without the tools of engagement, we make ourselves powerless to ease the vise of state control in China.

I commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for their hard work in achieving a unified House position on the message we need to send to the Chinese and the mechanism by which we have dealt with the legislation today. We need a tough but flexible approach to China that intelligently balances United States interests in this strategically important region of the world.

□ 1400

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. I thank my good friend the distinguished leader for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, what is at stake now is something far more important than MFN for China. What is at stake is the integrity of the workings of this House.

Many of us voted for the earlier resolution under the assumption, which was made very clear to us, that we will have an opportunity to vote up or down on MFN for China. Many of us spoke on the previous resolution, indicating our willingness to support the rhetoric of that resolution but demanding the opportunity of expressing ourselves vis-a-vis China in a way that China understands.

I earnestly plead with my colleagues under present circumstances to vote against the motion to table. We are not

dealing not just with the China issue. We are now dealing with the integrity of the procedures of this House.

Many of us came in here seeing that the previous resolution was verbiage, very little teeth in it, practically none. That is why we got a practically unanimous vote. The feeling of the House is divided on MFN for China, and we should have an opportunity to debate most-favored-nation treatment for China as we have had that opportunity every single year since I have served in this body.

There is no reason why the 104th Congress will decline a vote on most-favored-nation treatment for China. It will go ahead, anyway, even if we win, because the President will veto our vote and we will not have the numbers to override it. But it goes to the integrity of our procedures. I am making a sincere plea on both sides to reject the motion to table so we can have an up-or-down vote on MFN for China.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to any Member who felt that this procedure was wrong, and any part that we took in setting the procedure was not meant to knock anybody out of expressing their view.

I am going to vote to table. I am as troubled and frustrated as anyone in this country and in this body about what is happening in China. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], and the others who have talked on this issue and been vocal on this issue feel as strongly as anybody in this country.

The truth is none of us know what to do to get China to change. We do not want it to be another Soviet Union and we do not want a 40-year cold war with the largest country in the world. We are all horribly frustrated that this country does not seem to be able to change, to give its people human rights.

Whatever happens on this vote to table, and I believe we will have a vote, and probably we should have a vote, but whatever happens, China must get one message from this debate, and that is that this country will not stand by forever and have people's human rights violated to the extent this country is violating people's human rights. The day will come, if there is not change, when all 435 people in this body will say enough is enough, and we will not go forward with trading with people that will not give people basic human rights.

Time is running out for our patience. We say to China with one voice, Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative, and moderate, "Please, come into the world of nations, give people human rights, give people basic human decency."

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI]. I know of no one who is better qualified in this entire body to speak on this subject.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words and for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to say to my colleagues that I hope that you will take the lead of our Democratic leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], and of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] to let this motion to table pass. I think it is in the interest of promoting human rights in China, of addressing our concerns about unfair trade practices and the proliferation issue.

I want to commend once again the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for his leadership in working with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and with me to accommodate many of the provisions of our own Wolf-Pelosi bill into his bill.

God knows over the years the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I have fought the fight on MFN in China. I still think an appropriate route to go might have been to condition or to target certain products for revocation of MFN. But the options that we have before us are to send a very clear, unified message of support and concern about those issues.

Not only that, and I address my colleague the gentleman from Oregon because I know of his concern on these issues, the Bereuter bill has teeth. It has a reporting requirement for the President. We have not had that before.

Let us be frank with each other about this issue. Part of the time in this body we have been trying to get leverage with the Chinese, and part of the time we have been trying to get leverage with the President of the United States to use whatever means at his disposal to improve human rights, eliminate the unfair trade practices, and address the proliferation issues. This legislation gives us leverage with the President because of the reporting requirement.

I urge my colleagues to allow the motion to table to pass, I hope without a vote, because I think a small vote on the motion to table will send a wrong message to the Chinese Government that that is the measure of support for concern in China instead of the Bereuter bill. I urge our colleagues to do as our leader has requested.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to please follow the wise, enlightened, as

well as passionate, work of the gentlewoman from California on this subject. I know of no one in this body, and I have followed this issue for 20 years, who has worked harder and more diligently and more intelligently on the very difficult problem.

As she says, and let me reiterate it, let us not dilute the message to the Chinese Government and the Chinese people that is included in the bill that we just passed by an overwhelming vote here in the House. We do not want to dilute that. We want that message to get through very clearly.

Please lay the motion to cut off MFN on the table, which is not going anywhere, will not pass, all of us know it is not going to ever become law, and let us act realistically on this. Let us act together, and follow the lead of the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the motion to revoke would not pass. It may not become law. But I will not concede that we did not have that leverage with this body.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I echo the remarks of the minority leader. Let us just tell everybody on this floor right now, this is the last time. Next year there is going to be a vote on a resolution of disapproval, and we are going to revoke most-favored-nation treatment for China unless that regime becomes a decent government in this world of ours.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, when President Clinton severed the link between human rights and the annual renewal of China's MFN status, and the Chinese communist regime responded by issuing an official statement through its Foreign Ministry that called upon the United States to show sincerity and to take concrete action toward improving United States/China relations.

Can you imagine that? We hand them a \$29 billion trade surplus in 1994 alone and softpedal our other concerns, and still the dictators in Beijing call on us to demonstrate sincerity and to take concrete action.

That is what they said. Here is what I said. On August 9, 1994, when the House debated whether or not to renew China's MFN, I listed all of the abuses that have taken place in China "in the context of 14 straight years of MFN treatment."

And I concluded, "No, Mr. Speaker, appeasing China does not earn us their respect and their cooperation. It earns us their contempt."

Now listen to these words: "Frankly, on the human rights front, the situation had deteriorated." That was Assistant Secretary of State Winston Lord last January 11—some 7 months after human rights considerations were delinked from MFN.

What a shocker. "On the human rights front, the situation has deteriorated."

But then Lord went on to say, "China is a somewhat difficult partner these days." Well, hello?

Few things in life are more unsettling than the sight of a crestfallen U.S. diplomat expressing his disappointment at the intransigent behavior of a communist regime.

My only question is: Partner in what?

Mr. Chairman, and Members, I actually do fear that we have entered into a kind of partnership with China, but certainly not the kind of partnership that Winston Lord had in mind.

It is a partnership that reveals that some elements in the American business community are so anxious to make a quick buck in China, and their supporters in government are so anxious to curry favor with the dictators in Beijing, that there is no policy or practice carried out by the Chinese Communist regime that we are not prepared to tolerate in the interest of preserving business as usual.

United States exports to China—which were already low to start with because China does not give MFN treatment to us—rose by 60 percent in the 5 years between 1989 and 1994.

During that same period, since the Tiananmen Square massacre, Chinese exports to the United States rose by 223 percent. And our trade deficit with China has gone up by a staggering 377 percent—to a level of \$29.5 billion in 1994 alone.

In 1989, about 23 percent of China's total exports came to the United States. By 1994, that figure had risen to nearly 37 percent.

The trade deficit we are running with China will approach \$40 billion this year and, within 2 years, it will be larger than the one we have with Japan.

And what do we have to show for all this? More specifically, what progress can be pointed to by those who advocate trade or commercial engagement—to use the administration's term—as the means for getting the Chinese regime to modify and reform its course?

The answer is already in as far as human rights are concerned.

Things have gone from horrible to worse, if that was even possible.

One effort after another to try to get China to open up has failed. That isn't me saying it—the State Department is saying it.

Yes, China loves our money. China loves its access to American markets. It's our ideas that have made America so successful a democracy that the Chinese dictatorship cannot stand.

But, today, I want to discuss a vitally important issue that is only now starting to get the international attention it deserves.

China's defiance of the nuclear nonproliferation regime is well known.

But only now is notice being taken of the rapid and unwarranted buildup of military power that China has been pursuing since 1989.

As long ago as 1980, China successfully test-fired an ICBM capable of delivering a nuclear warhead to a target up to 8,000 miles away.

But until 1989, most credible outside observers regarded the Chinese armed forces as being a rather cumbersome, bloated, politicized, and somewhat antiquated operation that might prove to be more of a hindrance to China's superpower ambitions than anything else.

All of that has changed since 1989. The gradual decline in military spending that had

been seen since the late 1970's was reversed decisively in the aftermath of Tiananmen Square.

In 1994 alone, military spending in China rose by 22 percent over the previous year, which itself had seen a 13 percent increase over the year before that. All told, military spending has more than doubled since 1989.

And these figures I have cited represent only the tip of the iceberg—they are the figures which the Chinese regime publishes officially.

The true costs of research and development, procurement, and subsidies to the defense industry are evidently spread—and hidden—throughout China's national budget.

Along with this dramatic acceleration in military spending, China has totally revised its military doctrine since 1989.

The historic reliance on a huge, land-based army has been replaced by new emphases on the building of an expanded and survivable nuclear strike capability and the development of a modern navy.

Since the late 1980's, and aside from the rapid expansion in its fleet of surface ships, China has launched 11 submarines, each to be armed with 12 short-to-intermediate range missiles capable of delivering a nuclear warhead to a target up to 3,500 miles away.

In preparing for this debate, I was astonished to learn that the authoritative Jane's Information Group, based in London, has estimated that if present economic trends in China continue, and if military spending continues to grow at its present rate, by the year 2000 China will have the second largest defense budget in the world—and it could total well over \$100 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, all of this is taking place at a time when virtually every other country on earth is reducing its military spending.

Moreover, it is coming at a time when China's borders have been more secure than at any time in at least the last 150 years.

I sadly fear that the current sabre-rattling in the Spratly Islands, which are 900 miles from China and well within the territorial waters of the Philippines, is only a small taste of what it is to come.

Mr. Speaker, I believe United States policy toward China is wrong-headed and leading us to disaster. I believed this under President Bush and I believe it under President Clinton.

When are we going to see the Chinese regime for what it truly is?

A remorseless, ambitious, amoral, self-confident, even cocky, communist dictatorship that is bent on achieving regional dominance throughout the Far East—that's what it is.

And the Far East isn't where China's ambitions stop. Believe me, a China which is not at peace with its own people will not be at peace with America.

During the cold war, there were Members of Congress who criticized—and rightly so, in certain instances—some of the unsavory characters and regimes with which our Government was pursuing a relationship in the interest of containing communism.

But what is our excuse now? Now that the Soviet Union has collapsed, what is the urgency of maintaining business-as-usual with the likes of Beijing?

From 1945 on, we were faced with the reality of Soviet power and ambition. It was there—we had no choice but to try to contain it.

But in the 1990's, we seem bound and determined to do what ever we can to help give the Chinese Communist regime the means to realize its national ambitions.

Not that the people of China will benefit. They will suffer the consequences of this folly just as surely as we will.

That is why, Mr. Speaker and Members, I believe human rights and American values have to be put back into the central focus of the United States-China relationship.

Mr. Speaker, I implore all Members to vote for the temporary cutoff of most-favored-nations-status to China until they abandon their rogue status that has no respect for human rights or human life itself.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I despise the Chinese Government as much as anybody in this body. Let me just back up before I say that and say, if there is any blame for the procedure today, it is my fault. If you blame, blame me.

We met with the dissidents, we met with those who have family members in jail, we met with the Christians in China, and they said this would be the best procedure for them. They said if we could get a good, strong vote, and in the resolution that many of you maybe did not even read, do not denigrate the resolution. It for the first time puts the Congress on record in support of the democracy movement.

Let me tell you, those of you who love MFN, it has put you on a spot, because next year if the Chinese have not stopped all they are doing, many of you are going to be morally obligated to take it away. This is good and this is what the dissidents in China said. This is what the people who are students have come and said. This helps them. And I wanted to do it.

Second of all, Harry Wu is a friend of mine. I helped bring Harry to town. I feel responsible in some respects for Harry being in jail. I have been in touch with Harry's wife for the last few weeks. She has been by my office. We have set up all the meetings. I care about Harry. What happens to Harry is partially my responsibility.

□ 1415

My colleagues are men and women who are absolved from it. They did not bring him to town. They did not hold the hearings. They did not push Harry's organ transplant video out. I did, and he is my responsibility. And if I offended anybody, I apologize, but I take the full and complete responsibility for the procedure that we are doing.

Go back into China. They are killing people in China 25 and under and using their kidneys for transplant. We know that. We know that because of Harry. We have been trying to get many of our colleagues to come and see the film; not many have come and seen the film.

We also know that they have a forced population policy. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has been a leader in that. We have a video, that we could not get many of our colleagues to come to see, that we showed

the other day where there are dying rooms. They put baby girls in these rooms and they die. They die. They do not feed them.

My colleagues say, "What are you talking about?" Come to my office. I will show you the video. That is what they do. We know they sold weapons. They sold weapons to Iraq that killed American men and women. We know that. We know they are selling chemical weapons. We know what they are doing with regard to their nuclear technology. They are selling weapons to the Khartoum Government in Sudan that are being used to kill black Africans in the Sudan.

I know how bad they are. I know they are worse than many of my colleagues even think they are. Do I believe that business is necessarily going to change them? I don't believe it. I am not a mercantile Republican Cato libertarian. I don't believe business necessarily changes it.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to the Holocaust Museum and I saw the people that made the same argument with Nazi Germany in 1933 and 1935 and 1937. Do a little more business and maybe it will change them. I do not believe it will.

I have met with Li Peng, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I. He is a butcher. He has blood on his hands. The blood drips from his hands. And some day when Li Peng stands before the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords, he is going to have to explain what he did and how he killed all of those people.

But what does that get us now? We can put our frustration and offer it, and I apologize and ask my colleagues' forgiveness. I beg their forgiveness if I offended anybody. But if we get a vote with 35 or 38, we will confuse the Chinese. They do not know what that means; they know what this means.

And many of my colleagues, many of them voted for this really without reading it. This is tough. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] did a great job. And I take my hat off to the Speaker. The Speaker was involved in working this out. I do not think we could have done it if he had not put his personal prestige on the line. This was not some fly by night thing we did. This will help the democracy movement in China.

As I made a note, as I commented the first time I debated it, I said every night I pray for China. I pray that China is free. I remember once I was at a town meeting several years ago and a lady asked me, "What happened? Why did communism fall?" And you know what I said to her? I said what any Republican would say. I said, "It fell because we had the B-1 and Ronald Reagan was tough and all."

And you know what she said? She said, "Young man that is not why it fell. Maybe that helped, but" she said, "communism fell because many of us as little girls and boys have been praying for the defeat of communism."

Mr. Speaker, we should pray and we can pray for the defeat of communism in China and I believe it will come. We will all live to see it. We will live to see the day when they can sell Popsicles in Tiananmen Square and laugh and run and do all those things. Do my colleagues want that to happen? The resolution you passed is the right thing. Do not even have a vote to table, because it will confuse people.

Mr. Speaker, my last comment is the Congress has been on record and my colleagues are going to have to deal with this next year. Unless the Good Lord takes me, I am coming back next year and if there has been no change, we are going to put in a motion to disapprove.

The last thing I say to the business community, if they happen to be listening, I would have hoped that the business community would have taken the same attitude that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and many Republicans and Democrats who have come together. The business community has been silent. They have been silent.

It reminds me of the statement about selling the rope to hang themselves. They have been silent and that has been disappointing. I would have hoped that Boeing would have spoken out and I would have hoped that TRW would have spoken out, but they went silent.

But the Congress did not go silent. We have a lot to be proud of. The message that I want the Chinese peasants to hear tomorrow morning when they listen to the little crystal set and they pick up the TV station or radio show, the United States Congress, the people's Congress, the Congress that the American people elect here, will send a message that we care deeply; that we commend, not condemn, the freedom movement; that we condemn slave labor; that we condemn the organ transplants; we condemn the forced population policy. We condemn all of them.

Mr. Speaker, we require this administration, which has been equally bad as the Bush administration on this, to make reports, so next year when this comes out we have the reports that are due.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, Radio Free Asia whereby when we go to Eastern Europe they would say that the Radio Free Europe made a difference.

I want to thank those who were involved in this. Again, it is my fault for messing up, if we messed up. It was a mistake of the heart and not of the mind, if you will.

Now, I would hope and pray that there be no vote, but I understand that Members would do it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, and sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question is ordered.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 193, I offer a motion.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Pursuant to House Resolution 193, Mr. WOLF moves to lay the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 96, on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] to lay the joint resolution on the table.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 321, nays 107, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

YEAS—321

Ackerman	Cramer	Greenwood
Allard	Crane	Gunderson
Archer	Crapo	Gutknecht
Armey	Cremeans	Hall (OH)
Baesler	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Baker (LA)	Cunningham	Hamilton
Baldacci	Danner	Hancock
Barcia	Davis	Hansen
Barrett (NE)	de la Garza	Harman
Barrett (WI)	Deal	Hastert
Bartlett	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Barton	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Bass	Deutsch	Hayes
Bateman	Dickey	Hayworth
Becerra	Dicks	Herger
Beilenson	Dingell	Hilleary
Bentsen	Dixon	Hinchey
Bereuter	Doggett	Hoke
Berman	Dooley	Hottel
Bevill	Doyle	Houghton
Bilbray	Dreier	Hyde
Bilirakis	Dunn	Istook
Bishop	Durbin	Jackson-Lee
Bliley	Edwards	Jacobs
Blute	Ehlers	Johnson (CT)
Boehlert	Emerson	Johnson (SD)
Boehner	English	Johnson, E. B.
Bonilla	Ensign	Johnson, Sam
Bonior	Eshoo	Johnston
Bono	Everett	Kanjorski
Borski	Ewing	Kasich
Boucher	Farr	Kelly
Brewster	Fattah	Kennedy (RI)
Browder	Fawell	Kennelly
Brown (CA)	Fazio	Kim
Brown (FL)	Fields (TX)	Kingston
Brownback	Filner	Klecza
Bryant (TN)	Flake	Klink
Bryant (TX)	Flanagan	Klug
Bunn	Foglietta	Knollenberg
Buyer	Foley	Kolbe
Callahan	Fowler	LaFalce
Calvert	Fox	LaHood
Camp	Franks (CT)	Largent
Canady	Franks (NJ)	Latham
Castle	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Chabot	Frisa	Laughlin
Chambliss	Frost	Lazio
Christensen	Furse	Leach
Chrysler	Galleghy	Levin
Clayton	Ganske	Lewis (CA)
Clement	Gekas	Lightfoot
Clinger	Gephardt	Lincoln
Clyburn	Geren	Linder
Coleman	Gibbons	Livingston
Collins (GA)	Gilchrest	LoBiondo
Collins (IL)	Gillmor	Lofgren
Combest	Gilman	Longley
Condit	Gonzalez	Lowe
Conyers	Goodlatte	Lucas
Costello	Gordon	Luther
Coyne	Green	Maloney

Manton	Peterson (FL)	Smith (WA)
Manzullo	Peterson (MN)	Stenholm
Martinez	Petri	Stokes
Martini	Pickett	Studds
Mascara	Pomeroy	Stump
Matsui	Portman	Stupak
McCarthy	Poshard	Talent
McCollum	Pryce	Tanner
McCrary	Quillen	Tate
McDade	Taudin	Quinn
McHale	Radanovich	Tejeda
McHugh	Rahall	Thomas
McIntosh	Ramstad	Thornberry
McKeon	Rangel	Thornton
McNulty	Reed	Thurman
Meehan	Regula	Tiaht
Meek	Richardson	Torkildsen
Meyers	Riggs	Torres
Mica	Rivers	Towns
Miller (FL)	Roberts	Tucker
Mineta	Roemer	Upton
Minge	Rogers	Visclosky
Molinari	Roth	Volkmer
Mollohan	Roukema	Vucanovich
Montgomery	Roybal-Allard	Walker
Moorhead	Rush	Walsh
Moran	Sabo	Ward
Morella	Salmon	Watts (OK)
Murtha	Sanford	Waxman
Myers	Sawyer	Weldon (FL)
Myrick	Saxton	Weller
Neal	Schaefer	White
Nethercutt	Schiff	Whitfield
Neumann	Schumer	Wicker
Ney	Serrano	Williams
Norwood	Shadegg	Wilson
Nussle	Shaw	Wise
Obey	Shays	Wolf
Ortiz	Shuster	Woolsey
Oxley	Sisisky	Wyden
Packard	Skaggs	Yates
Pastor	Skeen	Young (AK)
Paxon	Skelton	Young (FL)
Payne (VA)	Smith (MI)	Zeliff
Pelosi	Smith (TX)	Zimmer

NAYS—107

Abercrombie	Hefner	Payne (NJ)
Andrews	Heineman	Pombo
Baker (CA)	Hilliard	Porter
Ballenger	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Barr	Hoekstra	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (OH)	Holden	Rose
Bunning	Horn	Royce
Burr	Hoyer	Sanders
Burton	Hunter	Scarborough
Cardin	Hutchinson	Schroeder
Chapman	Inglis	Scott
Chenoweth	Jones	Seastrand
Coble	Kaptur	Sensenbrenner
Coburn	Kennedy (MA)	Slaughter
Cooley	Kildee	Smith (NJ)
Cox	King	Solomon
DeFazio	Lantos	Souder
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Spence
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Spratt
Doolittle	Lipinski	Stark
Dornan	Markey	Stearns
Duncan	McDermott	Stockman
Ehrlich	McInnis	Taylor (MS)
Engel	McKinney	Taylor (NC)
Evans	Menendez	Thompson
Fields (LA)	Metcalf	Toricelli
Forbes	Mfume	Traficant
Ford	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Frank (MA)	Mink	Vento
Funderburk	Nadler	Waldholtz
Gejdenson	Oberstar	Wamp
Goodling	Olver	Waters
Goss	Orton	Watt (NC)
Graham	Owens	Weldon (PA)
Gutierrez	Pallone	Wynn
Hefley	Parker	

NOT VOTING—6

Bachus	Collins (MI)	Moakley
Clay	Jefferson	Reynolds

□ 1444

Messrs. DOOLITTLE, WAMP, WYNN, COBLE, LEWIS of Kentucky, Ms. WATERS, and Messrs. MEEHAN, SPENCE, PORTER, HEFNER, and GRAHAM changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. SMITH of Michigan, WISE, ACKERMAN, CUNNINGHAM,

BECERRA, RANGEL, RAHALL, REED, DICKEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. MEEHAN changed their vote from "nay" to yea."

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 19, I missed two rollcall votes during consideration of H.R. 2020, the Treasury, Postal Service, general Government appropriations for fiscal year 1996, and one rollcall vote during consideration of H.R. 1976, the Agriculture appropriation for fiscal year 1996. On rollcall vote No. 527 I would have voted "aye." On rollcall No. 528 I would have voted "nay." On rollcall No. 535 I would have voted "nay."

□ 1545

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1976, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 188 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1976.

□ 1445

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes with Mr. KLUG in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 9, 1995, the amendments en bloc printed in House Report 104-185 offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] had been disposed of.

The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

H.R. 1976

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

Congress assembled. That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, and not to exceed \$75,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$10,227,000, of which \$7,500,000 shall be available for InfoShare: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$11,000 of this amount, along with any unobligated balances of representation funds in the Foreign Agricultural Service shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary.

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

CHIEF ECONOMIST

For necessary expenses of the Chief Economist, including economic analysis, risk assessment, cost benefit analysis, and the functions of the World Agricultural Outlook Board, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622g), and including employment pursuant to the second sentence of the section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$3,748,000.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

For necessary expenses of the National Appeals Division, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$25,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$11,846,000.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$5,899,000.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$4,133,000: *Provided further*, That the Chief Financial Officer shall reinstate and market cross-servicing activities of the National Finance Center: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to obtain, modify, re-engineer, license, operate, implement, or expand commercial off-the-shelf financial management software systems or existing commercial off-the-shelf system financial management contracts, beyond general ledger systems and accounting support software, at the National Finance Center until thirty legislative days after the Secretary of Agriculture submits to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a complete and thorough cost-benefit analysis and a certification by the Secretary of Agriculture that this analysis provides a detailed and accurate cost-benefit analysis comparison between obtaining or expanding commercial off-the-shelf software systems and conducting identical or comparable software systems acquisitions, re-engineering, or modifications in-house.