has become convinced that the annual MFN process is counterproductive and undermines United States foreign policy interests with respect to China. However, the United States has other points of leverage where we can encourage China's leaders to be responsible actors in the world community.

For example, China's leaders will be faced with many difficult economic reform decisions in the next several decades; Therefore, rather than devoting attention to MFN, the United States should focus on one of the most important foreign policy decisions for the United States: China's accession to the World Trade Organization [WTO]. A good way to maximize our trade leverage is embodied in legislation that this Member and the gentleman from Illinois, Representative TOM EWING recently introduced. That legislation, the China Market Access and Export Opportunities Act, requires China to pledge adherence to the world's trade rules and accede to the World Trade Organization or face ''snap-back'' tariffs on goods imported to the United States. It would induce China's leaders to join the WTO by eliminating our annual MFN review upon China's membership in the World Trade Organization. Alternatively however, the China Market Access and Export Opportunities Act would require the President to impose realistic, pre-Uruguay Round tariff increases—4–7 percent—on Chinese imports if the PRC continues to deny United States exporters adequate market access or if it does not make significant progress to become a member of the WTO.

The PRC's desire to get into the World Trade Organization represents a historic opportunity for the United States to level the playing field for United States companies and workers wanting to sell their products in China. But we should act now. Recent press reports indicate that the PRC's trade negotiators may be walking away from the currently unproductive negotiating table. This news is especially disturbing given that last year's U.S. trade deficit with China was nearly $40 billion and this year's imbalance has risen by 37 percent Secretary of Commerce, William Daley, recently said that ''China remains the only major market in the world where U.S. exports are not growing and this despite significant economic growth in China.''

The China Market Access and Export Opportunities Act is a tough but fair approach to China's WTO accession. The Congress should immediately consider this legislation to accelerate the forces of change that have been unleashed by the PRC's desire to become a part of the world trade community. Economic and trade liberalization reforms in China, which this legislation will promote, not only will reduce our enormous bilateral trade deficit and benefit United States workers and consumers, it will also continue to provide the most positive forces of political and social change in China.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to House Joint Resolution 79.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP].

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the resolution and in behalf of continuing normal trading relationships with China.

We are all here today for one reason, because we are very concerned about China. We are very concerned about human rights and civil rights, and we are wondering in what way we can best reach out and change China's current policy. The fact is that we recognize that China is a growing power, and there are some things, Mr. Speaker, that no matter what we do today in our vote, we are not going to change.

We are not going to change the fact that China is growing militarily. We are not going to change the fact that technologically China is advancing at a very rapid pace. We are not going to change the fact that China is going to have a profound impact on our world in the coming years.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the question before us is not how do we stop those things which we cannot stop, but how do we most influence them? Over the last 20 years, China has changed, China has grown, it has become more aware of civil and human rights, and their citizens have demanded more than they ever have before. Is it fast enough for us? No, it is not. But the fact is, it is that relationship, it is that continued relationship that gives us the most chance to affect China as it inevitably grows and advances.

Mr. Speaker, we can do a lot from the outside, demanding and asking for civil and human rights in China. But the way it will most change is when the Chinese people begin to be able to think, because of prosperity, about something more than where their next meal is coming from and how to meet their basic needs. When they begin realizing what is available in other countries in terms of their own civil rights and human rights, they will also demand more from within as we are demanding from without. Please, let us continue this relationship so that they will be able to enjoy the civil and human rights that we do.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], a champion for human rights throughout the world.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose cutting off relations with China, but I simply cannot accept the situation as it is with China today. We cannot stand by while innocent people in China and Tibet are fighting and dying for democracy. Thousands of innocent Christians, Muslims, and Buddhists are dying in Chinese gulags. Millions of Chinese women are not allowed to plan their own families. They are not allowed to make the most basic, the most private decisions. The Chinese Government intrudes on families, their beliefs, their lives. They are desperate for our help. Yet we do not help. We continue business as usual. The abuse of human rights continues. And the United States renews MFN. China will not work with the community of nations to stop nuclear proliferation. And the United States renews MFN. Business as usual. Trade as usual.

We cannot accept and we must not accept what is happening in China. To quote Gandhi, ''Noncooperation with evil is as much a duty as is cooperation with good.'' We can never forget Tiananmen Square. Those students bravely stood for democracy, and they were slaughtered. I was a student once, fighting for what I believed, I was fighting for a nation free of racism, free of segregation. During the 1960's, some among us were jailed and beaten during that struggle. Some even died. Schwerner. Goodman. Chaney. Three young men gave their lives so that others could register and vote, so that others could participate in the democratic process. They did not die in vain.

Now it is the 1990s and China is on the other side of the world from us but their struggle is just as important. Their lives and their struggle must not be in vain. In a real sense, Mr. Speaker, our foreign policy, our trade policy must be a reflection of our own ideals, our own shared values.

What does it profit a great nation, a compassionate and caring people, to close our eyes and look the other way? As Martin Luther King said, ''There comes a time when a Nation and a people must stand for something or we will fall for anything.'' I feel that the spirit of history is upon us. We must make a decision today and it should be on the right side of history. We must stand with the people who are struggling for freedom, struggling for democracy. If we fail to act, no one will act. They are our brothers and our sisters.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe in trade, free and fair trade, but I do not believe in trade at any price. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, how much are we prepared to pay? Are we prepared to sell our souls? Are we prepared to butcher our conscience? Are we prepared to deny our shared values of freedom, justice and democracy? Today I cast my lot with the people in the streets, with the students of Tiananmen Square, and with the people of this country who understand that a threat to justice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

I urge and I beg of my colleagues to oppose MFN for China. I thank the gentlewoman from California and the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). 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 is a violation of the House rules.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREEN].

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

Mr. GREEN. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the disapproval resolution and I reluctantly do so. In previous Congresses, I voted for the extension of MFN for China with the belief that more engagement on economic and diplomatic fronts would yield gradual but positive changes within China. But as our trade deficit has worsened, I know that has not been the case. I know things have changed in China. In fact, there are elections that are going on on the local level, so there has been progress. But the concern I have is the tariff disparity between the United States and the People's Republic of China, so I was seriously considering voting in favor of the disapproval resolution. But I am going to vote against it today, because I do not think it would improve our trade deficit if we pass this resolution. I do not think it would give us more access to the China market. I do not think it would improve the treatment of Christians in China, although I know we have heard today both people who said they are persecuted and people who have said, including Reverend Billy Graham, that it would be bad not to have most-favored-nation. I do not think it would prevent China from selling weapons to Iran if we disapprove most-favored-nation.

I think the best choice we have is to continue to work with China and respect their culture and respect their country, and to say we are two great nations and we need to work together. That is why China's desire for WTO membership requires more open markets. I hope we will see that in China. I hope we will see a lessening of the tariffs on our products going to China because then this will come up again next year. That is why I have cosponsored our Democratic leader's bill asking for China's accession to WTO be subject to a vote in Congress.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the New Republic we had this headline talking about persecution of Christians. It is in stark contrast to what we read about and hear about from apologists for China, whether it is in Wall Street, Washington, or in Hollywood.

The New Republic reported that persecution is real and by all reports getting worse. Attacks of Catholics and of Protestants continue, and the Far East Economic Review stated that police destroyed 15,000 religious sites in one province last year alone. Priests were sent to re-education camps for 2 years for simply saying mass, and 40 percent of all inmates in labor camps are members of the Christian underground. The New Republic went on to say that

> The methods used to re-educate Christians include starving and beating detainees, binding them in excruciating positions, hanging them from their limbs and torturing them with electronic cattle prods and drills. Sometimes, relatives are forced to watch the torture sessions.'

When I hear the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] speak about what happened in the 1960's in America, it reminds us too much of what is happening today even in a country that has killed 60 million of their own people in the past 50 years. We have to stop apologizing for China and stand up to this tyranny.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise all Members that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] has 24½ minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has 22 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] has 24 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] has 10½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 3 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ARCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 79 which would strip most-favored-nation trading status from China. At the outset, I want to make it clear, and I am sure it has been said before but it bears repeating, that the term most-favored-nation is a misnomer. It implies that we are somehow giving a country special treatment. Rather, when we provide MFN, we are only giving the same normal standard treatment that we give almost every country in the world; well over 100 countries. The only countries to whom we do not give MFN are Afghanistan, Cuba, Laos, North Korea, and Vietnam. We give better than MFN treatment to another very select group of countries, Canada, Israel, and Mexico. What we are considering today is whether we should continue giving China average treatment.

□ 1330

Now a move to the substance of the resolution. Quite apart from the benefits enjoyed by our companies by continuing to do business with China, our ability to win this vote affects whether United States values will continue to be of influence in China. Shutting down trade with China or making the terms of trade impossibly restrictive would put in place a policy of unilateral confrontation that would not change China's behavior. Maybe MFN for China is not a good policy until, as Churchill would have said about democracy, ''You consider all of the other alternatives.'' And those who oppose MFN for China do not really consider the other less attractive, by far, alternatives. If we remove MFN from China, we would disengage our government from a leadership role in the region and would remove the positive influence that our business community has in China.

At the same time, I hope that China will continue to pursue accession to the WTO and will be able to agree to take on the rights and obligations that make membership. At that point I believe that the United States should be in a position to provide China with full MFN treatment uncluttered by any conditions, a relationship identical to that which we have with almost all of the world. Once China becomes a WTO member we will be able to utilize the highly effective dispute settlement mechanism of the WTO to resolve our trade disputes with China.

As I understand it, China still has a long way to go in that accession bid. In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to vote a strong no on this disapproval resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], who in his capacity and his work on the Helsinki accords and Commission has been a champion of human rights throughout the world.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, one cannot discuss this issue in 1 minute. Everybody on this floor knows this, and in fact perhaps in 5 or 50 minutes.

For over a decade and a half as chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I was not for most-favored-nation status for the Soviet Union. Why? Because they did not meet international norms. America has been, is now and hopefully always will be the beacon of freedom and justice for all the world. I am for constructively engaging on those premises, but I am also for principled engagement, for an engagement that says we will not do business as normal with those who do not treat their own people as international norms would demand. And not only do international norms demand that, but the peace and security and stability of all the world demands that.

My colleagues, let us stand up, let us lift that torch high of liberty and justice and say not business as usual.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPS].

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution. I do so with profound respect for the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] and my good friends on the other side. I want to make two points briefly.

First, the very term ''most favored nation'' is inaccurate. MFN is not a privileged status according to close friends, but an ordinary tariff treatment extended to all but 11 countries. Today I will introduce a bill to replace MFN in our trade law with a more suitable and accurate term, ''normal trade relations.''

Second point: I have a heart full of thoughts on this issue, Mr. Speaker. I had the privilege of being in China in December and lecturing at Peking University. While I would not call myself an expert on this subject, I do recognize that the underlying subject here is about culture, about cultural difference, cultural clash, cultural change. United States culture is not Chinese culture.

We talk about human rights. China, with a cultural tradition of more than 5,000 years, talks more about stability. We are dedicated to Judeo-Christian values. They for their part owe more to Confucius, to Lao Tzu, to the I Ching. We talk proudly of democracy. China has had centuries of feudalism, of emperors and empresses and are moving toward democracy. Consequently, it is difficult to translate across cultural lines. It is impossible to read their history according to our vectors.

But we must live together in the 21st century, and we must strive together to find ways to do this. This is not the time to isolate China, this is not the time to isolate ourselves against China. I plead a no vote on the pending resolution.

During my recent visit to China, I witnessed the promise of leadership among the emerging generation of active, intelligent, responsible young people. I am confident that they want to be active participants in the 21st century, not as enemies of the United States but as partners. I don't want to close the door on them right now. I want to encourage them as I have been encouraged by them. Democracy is a very delicate plant in China today. But we can help nurture and strengthen it.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS].

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for an end to the many human rights abuses in the People's Republic of China, and I rise in support of renewing China's most-favored-nation trading status because, Mr. Speaker, these two goals are not mutually exclusive. In fact, renewing MFN for China will enable us to address the abuses we find so objectionable, first by keeping the lines of communication open with those leaders in China who have the power to change persecution and the climate there through private and tough diplomacy and, second, by allowing the many human rights, mission and Christian agencies in China to continue their work with the Chinese people.

Mr. Speaker, revoking China's MFN trade status and essentially declaring economic warfare on China is not the best way to achieve our goal of improving the human condition for the Chinese people. In fact, it would exacerbate the problem. Since this debate began I have spoken with many in the mission and Christian community who live and work in China, missionaries and Christian leaders whose whole lives are committed to the Chinese people. What they have told me is that if MFN status is revoked they feel that they would feel the effects of retribution on themselves and on Chinese Christians and on human rights activists. They told me that the hand of the hard liners would come down upon the people of China and especially anyone who is perceived as representing the West.

Rev. Daniel Su, a former member of the Chinese Red Guard who now works for China Outreach Mission Ministry, has said, quote:

> The Chinese people are better off if MFN status is maintained. People suffer when China becomes isolated and hostile. Isolating China will do nothing for human rights in China particularly the rights of Chinese Christians. Like Rev. Daniel Su has said, Cutting off ties with China is like setting your car on fire when it stalls.

Dr. Samuel Ling, the Institute for Chinese Studies said this:

> History has proven that as the United States engages China, a more pluralistic atmosphere develops, and both the standard of living and human rights and freedoms stand to improve.

Others have made other quotes, Mr. Speaker. I urge the Members to support MFN.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DELAHUNT], a member who has worked very hard on this issue.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, this vote is about American credibility.

Yesterday a bill was on the calendar which would have prohibited financial transactions with terrorist countries. It would have passed without debate. Yet China has sold chemical weapons to Iran and missile components to Syria, and what of human rights? Last year Congress enacted the Helms–Burton Act because of human rights abuses in Cuba. Yet when it comes to China we ignore our own State Department report that the human rights situation actually worsened in 1996.

Then of course there is trade. We criticize the unfair trade practices of the Japanese, yet according to the last Sunday's L.A. Times, China has developed barriers to United States goods and services that would make the Japanese blush.

This vote is fundamentally about American credibility. We cannot demand respect for our values from the rest of the world and set a different standard for China. Please vote yes on the resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. MCCARTHY].

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 79 and in support of the President's decision to extend normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China. Terminating our current trade relationship with China would undermine America's economic interests in those States such as my own. The American consumer would be burdened with dramatic price increases. Thousands of American trade and investment jobs would be lost.

Chinese retaliation would likely exclude companies from opportunities in one of the world's fastest grow economies. Last year Missouri companies alone exported over $80 million in goods to China, an increase of over 64 percent from the previous year. United States exports to China currently support over 200,000 American jobs. The jobs which have been created have been good, high paying jobs.

In my home State of Missouri employment by foreign subsidiaries has risen 165 percent since 1980. Manufacturing jobs created by foreign investment have risen 51 percent. In my district MFN for China means that agribusinesses, high technology, and avionics industries are able to export their goods to one of the world's largest markets. From national firms like Farmland Industries to regional companies like Hanna Rubber Co. and small family-owned businesses such as Sun Electronics in Raytown, MO, MFN for China means jobs, revenue and business.

I have grave concerns over China's human rights record, particularly the practice of female infanticide, which has no place in any society. I have a constituent, Mattie, who was born in China just 2 years ago. She was adopted by loving Missouri parents and is living the American dream of freedom unknown in her native land. I want to advance our values within China so that future Chinese baby girls like Mattie can live proud and free within China as well.

We cannot walk away from this or any other problem that China faces. We have a moral obligation to remain engaged with China so that they can learn our values of democracy. I urge this body to reject the resolution and extend normal trade relations to the People's Republic of China.

Revoking trade privileges will reverse the progress that the Chinese people have made in their struggle for basic political, religious, and economic freedoms.

The power of our democratic principles and ideals eventually led to the fall of communism in Eastern Europe. It is important that we continue to engage in debate with China until we achieve victory in Asia as well.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I support extending normal trade relations to the People's Republic of China, and I urge my colleagues to reject House Joint Resolution 79.

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], our distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 7 years this body has gone through the annual ritual of debating MFN status for China because the minority of our membership thinks that China needs to be taught a lesson. This may make some of my colleagues feel good, but I believe it is a misguided response that hinders the development of human rights and democracy in China.

Before rushing headlong into the mistake of adding China to the list of nations denied MFN, there are two points to consider. First of all, who would be penalized by denying China MFN? Our compassion for the suffering in China is useless if the policy has no effect other than to put our own people out of work. Indeed, then the compassion is misplaced. We have made no difference in the life of those suffering

overseas while only increasing the numbers of those suffering without jobs here at home. By terminating MFN to China, this is exactly what I believe will occur. The loss of MFN will not change China. It will, however, cost our Nation and Washington State billions of dollars in aircraft, lumber, software, and agricultural sales and tens of thousands of jobs to our European and our Asian competitors.

The second point to consider is will revoking MFN accomplish our goal of improved human rights and democracy. I do not believe it will. United States trade and investment teach the skills of free enterprise that are fundamental to any free society.

For instance, in my home State of Washington we export a number of United States products from aircraft to software, and every single airplane and every single CD carries with it the seeds of change.

It has already been noted that the Reverend Billy Graham recently observed that Christian love and integrity are now being delivered to millions of people in China who were denied this opportunity during the darkest days of China. This sentiment is shared not only by the Reverend Billy Graham, but by his son who is my constituent, Ned Graham. His organization, East Gate Ministries, is based in Sumner, WA, and it has shipped 1½ million Mandarin language Bibles to China and 4 million more will be delivered before the end of the century under an agreement with the Chinese Government.

Just last weekend I had the opportunity to meet with the younger Graham to discuss his organization's work in China and the current debate here in the United States Congress. He expressed concern about this debate and that the crusade against MFN may harm the ability of his ministry to get Bibles into the hands of the Chinese people.

□ 1345

The message was clear, Mr. Speaker. Revocation of China MFN is in the interests of no one, particularly the Chinese people themselves. If we want to affect Chinese behavior and trade policy in civil liberty areas we all care about, we should increase our mutual contact.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution of disapproval.

Mr. Speaker, for the past seven summers, this body has gone through the annual ritual of debating MFN status for China because a minority of our membership thinks that China needs to be taught a lesson.

This may make some of my colleagues feel good, but I believe it is a misguided response that hinders the development of human rights and democracy in China. Before rushing headlong into the mistake of adding China to the list of nations denied MFN, there are two points to consider.

Who would be penalized by denying China MFN? Our compassion for the suffering in China is useless if our policy has no effect other than to put our own people out of work. Indeed, then the compassion is misplaced; we've made no difference in the life of those suffering overseas while only increasing the numbers of those suffering here at home.

By terminating MFN to China, this is exactly what I believe would occur. The loss of MFN won't change China. It will, however, cost our Nation and Washington State billions of dollars in aircraft, lumber, software, and agriculture sales, and tens of thousands of jobs to our European and Asian competitors.

The second point to consider is—will revoking MFN accomplish our goal of improved human rights and democracy?

I do not believe it will. U.S. trade and investment teaches the skills of the free enterprise that are fundamental to a free society.

For instance, in my home State of Washington, we export a number of U.S. products, from aircraft to software. And every single airplane and every single CD carries with it the seeds of change.

It has already been noted that the Rev. Billy Graham recently observed that Christian love and integrity is now being delivered to millions of Chinese who were being denied this opportunity during the darkest days in China.

This sentiment is shared by not only the Rev. Billy Graham, but a constituent of mine—Ned Graham. His organization, East Gates Ministries, is based in Sumner, WA, and has shipped 1.5 million Mandarin-language Bibles to China. And 4 million more will be delivered before the end of the century under an agreement with the Chinese Government.

Just last weekend, I had the opportunity to meet with the younger Graham to discuss his organization's work in China and the current debate here in the Congress. He expressed concern about this debate and that the crusade against MFN may harm the ability of his ministry to get Bibles into the hands of the Chinese people. The message was clear, Mr. Chairman—revocation of China MFN is of interest to no one, particularly the Chinese people themselves.

If we want to affect Chinese behavior in the trade policy and civil liberties areas we care about, we should increase our mutual contact, make MFN status permanent, and eventually, bring China within the disciplines of the World Trade Organization.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution of disapproval.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise today in opposition of extending MFN to China because I believe the United States policy of constructive engagement has failed.

Mr. Speaker, selling goods into the United States market is not a right, it is a privilege, and it is a privilege that should be restricted to dictatorships like China. Despite the promises of the White House, big business, and the MFN supporters, the United States trade relationship with China has failed to move that nation toward democratic reform in order to reduce the threat China poses to world security.

China's Government continues to brutally repress all dissent in that country and violate religious freedoms. Meanwhile it exports to rogue nations like Iran, Iraq, Libya, and Burma the technology to make weapons of mass destruction. China continues to close its market to United States goods and services and allows American products to be pirated, costing us billions of dollars. Faced with the evidence that our current policy of engagement toward China has failed, supporters of MFN then argue that we should ignore all those problems and extend this privilege to save American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the extension of most-favored-nation status for China.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I stand for human rights progress and a secure Asian-Pacific region and against House Joint Resolution 79. This is fundamentally an issue which asks whether we want to engage in as normal relations as possible with an emerging world power in order to shape their future direction, in order to shape a safer and more secure Asian-Pacific world.

This is not a one-shot process, and there is no one-shot solution. Engaging, shaping, relating to China requires difficult decisions and fully understanding what is at stake, a secure Asian-Pacific world in which the forces of democracy arise from local experiences under our encouragement, and is not forced by well-intentioned but misguided foreign policies.

The issue is not human rights today but making it possible to have progress in human rights over the long haul. The issue is not Chinese hostility today, but whether we want to allow hostility to shape our and their policy. Some would have us believe that putting China on notice today through denial of MFN somehow brings their abuses to a halt.

I urge my colleagues to reject House Joint Resolution 79.

Mr. Speaker, many arguments have been offered from both sides of the issue: Supporters of House Joint Resolution 79 believe that withholding most-favored-nation status from China will send a strong, clear message that the United States will no longer kowtow to Chinese interests. Many cite purported Chinese meddling in America's election campaigns as further proof of just how far the Chinese lobby has extended its reach into our domestic affairs. There are also arguments relating to China's nuclear capabilities and its sales of equipment to Iran. The strongest contention so far in this debate over MFN status has been the human rights issue. China's curtailing of political and religious freedoms, sterilization, laogai institutions, and list goes on and on.

Despite these points, I adhere to the belief that extending MFN to China will be a wise policy decision for the United States. As we all

know, MFN is not a special status, it is one conferred to our regular economic partners throughout the world. According China MFN status will be the avenue through which we can influence China's discriminatory practices against some segments of its society. Political and religious freedom will follow greater economic freedom.

As part of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, I am knowledgeable of the various human rights abuses committed against political dissidents and jailed inmates in China. It is a deplorable situation, but I do not believe revoking MFN will be the solution. Increasing diplomatic contact and applying pressure through international organizations is a wiser decision that unilaterally isolating one quarter of the world's population. Democratic principles are transmitted through the free flow of ideas between nations in close interaction with one another. Isolating China is not the answer to curbing human rights abuse.

Those who support House Joint Resolution 79 have mainly focused on the human rights question, but I believe that MFN is an economic issue. Using trade as a tool of engagement is a mutually constructive way for us to improve relations with China. In 1996, United States exports to China totaled $14 billion, and exports to China generated some 200,000 American jobs.

I wish to emphasize that the MFN debate is ostensibly about trade and should be limited to a discussion about whether we want to engage in normal trade relations with the fastest growing economy in the world. This seems to be a no-brainer and the answer is yes. This is fundamentally an issue which asks whether we want to engage in as normal relations as possible with an emerging world power, in order to help shape their future direction; in order to help shape safer and more secure relations in the Asia-Pacific world. this is not a one-shot process and there is no one-shot solution. Engaging, shaping, relating to China requires difficult decisions and fully understanding what is at stake—a safer, more secure Asia-Pacific world in which the forces of democracy arise from local experiences under our encouragement and not forced by well-intentioned, but misguided foreign policies.

But many have added other issues to this debate to alleviate its focus as a trade issue, rather, they have converted it into a form of political theatre designed less to influence the eventual outcome which is well-known to everyone, but designed to assuage various constituencies in this country.

Contrast this with the reaction in the Asia-Pacific region. Nearly everyone in the region who is directly affected by China does not see the extension of MFN as weakness or a toleration of abuses inside China; but as a way to constructively engage China.

The issue is not human rights today, but making it possible to progress in human rights over the long haul; the issue is not Chinese hostility today, but whether we want to inadvertently allow hostility to shape our and their policy. There is implicit in the debate today the sentiment that failure to put China on notice today through denial of MFN somehow will bring their human rights abuses to a halt and stem their growth towards being a competitive and hostile world power.

It seems to me that the denial of MFN will bring help facilitate the very thing the opponents of MFN decry—moving China to rogue status as a state. Let us bring a little common sense and not emotion to this discussion and let us engage China within a system of trade and security in which we have primary influence rather than make China an outcast state intent on destabilizing the Asia-Pacific region.

As we approach the new millennium, we find that tools such as the Internet and monetary policies are helping draw the nations of the world in an ever tighter web. Events such as American normalization of ties with Vietnam, Burma and Laos's guaranteed admittance into ASEAN, NATO extension, and the future establishment of the Euro relate just how tight this version of the World Wide Web is contracting. The United States will take a great leap backward if it chooses to revoke MFN for China. At a time when competition is steep for the Chinese market, at a time when China's human rights situation is still problematic, the United States should be at the forefront of engaging China's political and economic policies.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my comments today are aimed at our newer Members.

I am unusual in this debate, because I have opposed MFN in the past. In fact I voted against NAFTA because I was not happy with the side agreements. In fact, I am concerned about China's human rights record. I am a member of the Human Rights Caucus and take great pride in my involvement there. And on missile proliferation, I probably spend as much time on that issue as any Member in this body as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of the Committee on National Security. As a matter of fact, I wish I had as much interest as demonstrated today by Members on both sides on missile proliferation on the debate on our defense bill as I have heard today in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind our colleagues when we heard about the attack on the *Stark*, the U.S.S. *Stark*, it was not a Chinese missile, it was a French-made Exocet missile. In fact, we have our own allies exporting missiles that are being used against our troops by rogue nations around the world.

Now, I am not happy with China's actions in many areas, but I do not want to isolate China; I think that is the worst thing we can do now. I fault this administration for a lack of enforcement of existing arms control agreements. The MCTR violations, the Garrett rocket engines that were sent to China, the M–11 missile transfers, the ring magnet transfers, the chem-bio transfers, they are all wrong; but we do not just talk about those on the MFN debate alone. We deal with those issues all year long, and I do that all year long, and all of us should do that all year long.

I am appalled by the statement that has been said numerous times here of Gen. Xian Guang-Kai, but I say to my colleagues, I confronted him personally. I went to Beijing and sat across the table from him, and I said, General, those statements are unacceptable. That is what we need to do, Mr. Speaker, is aggressively engage the Chinese leadership.

I spoke this past year twice at the National Defense University in Beijing, and I told Chinese military leaders what I am telling our Members today. We are not happy with China's policies in many areas, we are not happy with human rights improvements in China, and we are not happy with arms control violations; but we have to do that in an effective way and not isolate China and make it a demon. That is the wrong signal to be sending.

Oppose this resolution and support the status of trade relations normally with China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ].

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, we have a very important choice to make here today, but that choice is not between engagement or isolation. Certainly we will continue engagement with China, but that engagement must be constructive.

The debate over China MFN is an important one for Americans. Nothing less is at stake than our economic future, our national security, and our democratic principles.

Proponents of continuing MFN status for China say it merely normalizes trade in the same way that we have done so with many other countries. But trade relationships between the two countries is anything but normal. China does not play by the rules. China should not receive most-favored-nation status because it does not reciprocate the trade benefits that we grant them with MFN.

Besides not following trade rules, China violates international arms control treaties and protocols, but the most disturbing violations in China are the gross negligence of human rights in that nation. China persecutes millions of religious believers of the Christian, Muslim, Buddhist and Jewish faith. These appalling human rights must stop. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very important choice to make here today. But that choice is not between engagement or isolation. Certainly we will continue engagement with China. But that engagement must be constructive.

The debate over China MFN is an important one for the American people. Nothing less is at stake than our economic future, our national security and our democratic principles.

Proponents of continuing MFN status for China say it merely normalizes trade in the same way that is done with many other countries. But trade relations between the two countries is anything but normal.

China does not play by the rules. China should not receive most favored nation status

because it does not reciprocate the trade benefits that we grant them with MFN.

But the most disturbing violations in China are the gross negligence of human rights in that nation. China persecutes millions of religious believers of the Christian, Muslim, Buddist and Jewish faiths. The severity of this religious persecution has been well-documented by the international human rights community.

Chinese Christian women are hung by their thumbs from wires and beaten with heavy rods. They are denied food and water, and shocked with electric probes for simply seeking to openly practice Christianity.

Freedom House reports that there are more Christians imprisoned for religious activity in China than in any other nation in the world. Four Roman Catholic bishops have been imprisoned by the Chinese Government for celebrating mass without official authorization.

Evangelical Protestants are arrested and tortured for holding prayer meetings, preaching and distributing Bibles without state approval. Churches of all faiths have been officially banned and replaced by ''patriotic associations'' created by the Communist government.

These appalling human rights violations in combination with their arms control violations and high tariff barriers are very powerful reasons to deny MFN for China. I urge my colleagues to vote ''Yes'' on this resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of most-favored-nation status for China. Only last year, the U.S. Congress told the American farmer, we want you to compete in a free market situation. In the 1970's the American farmer was successfully doing that and the U.S. Government unilaterally embargoed its markets to the point that they destroyed those markets and precipitated the agriculture crisis of the 1980's.

I beg my colleagues not to allow this to happen again. China has 25 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of the arable lands. We sell them 4 billion dollars' worth of agricultural products each year. Even Rev. Billy Graham says, this is a good idea to trade with China and it will improve their country and ours. We must have access to the international marketplace if we expect our farmers to succeed. I urge my colleagues to vote for MFN for China and against the resolution.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], my very good friend and one of the hardest workers in the cause for MFN.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support normal trade relations for China. American workers benefit most from the trading status with China.

The facts I think are very clear. If we reject MFN, we do not improve the trade deficit, but we do lower or approve the loss of exports to China. In my State of Michigan alone, there is some $215 million in exports and over 5,000 jobs. If we translate that into the USA entirely, it is 228,000 jobs. China has been reported as the world's third largest economy, after the United States and Japan. It has, by far, the world's highest annual growth rate of 9 percent. We cannot exclude American companies, farmers, workers, goods, and services from this large market.

For the sake of our businesses, our jobs, and our workers, we must reject this resolution. We must not slam the door on one-fourth of the world's population. If we really want to promote human rights and civil rights, and I do, and we want to plant the seeds of mutual understanding, then continue normal trade relations. I urge opposition of this resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of the resolution denying MFN for China.

Those who argue against it say this is not the right vehicle. I would say to my colleagues, what is the right vehicle? If I had another vehicle, I would try it, but the Chinese Government has thumbed its nose. They do not even give us a hook to hang our hat on.

We talk to them about human rights. A recent report said that there is no dissident activity in China anymore. They have suppressed all of it. We know what they are doing with Hong Kong now. We know what they are doing with the trade deficit in selling weapons to Iran; what they did in Taiwan, what they have done in Tibet. The list goes on and on and on.

When does it end? When does our Government stand for something? When is the almighty dollar not the most important thing?

I think that we in this country say that we stand for human rights and democracy and self-determination. There are more than 1 billion Chinese people who are looking toward us, they are looking toward us, they are looking for us to stand for something. They are looking for us to help them throw off oppression of their Government. When does this end? No dissident activity? We cannot tolerate this. Support the resolution. Reject MFN for China.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to oppose this resolution. In my estimation, this debate boils down to a simple question. Will we choose to isolate China, or will we remain actively engaged?

I believe that a policy of engagement and not isolation is a powerful tool for change and will enhance our ability to positively influence China's policy. China is the world's most populous nation and has the potential to be the world's most dynamic economic power in the 21st century. Continuing MFN will further our national interests of helping China into the community of nations as a stable partner which respects human rights and contributes to our global economic trading system.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have raised valid and legitimate concerns about the unfair trade practices, but revoking MFN status is not the way to go about it. Enforcing existing international trade laws and targeting sanctions might be a more prudent course.

Mr. Speaker, the 20th century will be recorded as America's century. As we move into this next century to maintain our position of economic preeminence and economic dominance, it would be unwise and imprudent at this point for us to revoke MFN.

□ 1400

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN], a very valued member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have thought a lot about this issue. There are people on both sides of this issue who have struggled over it, people of faith, people that I respect immensely. There is not a right or wrong answer on this decision. Nobody knows what the right answer is, but I support MFN this year and I supported it last year because I believe that taking MFN status away is going to do more to harm than help for Christians in China.

This past week we had an opportunity to talk to some Wycliffe Bible translators. They said:

> Taking MFN away is going to cause every one of our Bible translators to be viewed as a suspect of the government, an agent of the State. You take MFN status away from China, you are going to cause real persecution upon all the Bible translators and missionaries in China.

So people of faith are in disagreement over this issue. Yes, everything that has been said is true about the persecution, about the human rights abuses. But the correct answer has not been resolved yet. Taking it away, taking MFN status away, is not clear and conclusive evidence that it is going to improve things over there. I believe what Billy Graham has said and other missionary organizations have said is, ''Stay engaged, keep the process going, stay involved, keep the dialogue open. We can bring them around to our way of thinking.''

When I was over in Hong Kong I talked to a man who said, JON, we are moving in the right direction. Yes, we are not moving as quickly as we want to move. But your culture is not any better. You have allowed abortions out of convenience. Yes, we have had them also, but you have allowed abortions out of convenience. You are the largest exporters of pornography. You have the largest murder rate, the highest percentage of murder rate and rate of teenage dropout in high school. Your culture is not any better than in China.

When we get over this debate and people of faith disagree on this issue, let us turn our focus back on America and start cleaning up our own backyard before we continue to look at China. Renewing MFN is the best way of solving the persecution over there; staying engaged, staying involved, and moving the ball forward. Vote for MFN.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking today near the end of this debate as a member of the Committee on National Security. I think that before we cast any vote we should think about the national security implications.

In today's Washington Post, to go no further than the most contemporary moment, Mr. Speaker, ''U.S. is big market for firms owned by the Chinese military.'' The People's Liberation Army is now being called in some quarters the People's Liberation Army, Incorporated. We find ourselves in circumstances where military-related firms now are working in our seaports, they are involved in shipping.

The military is pervasive throughout China. It is against our national security interests to go forward with most-favored-nation status for China at this point. It reminds me of the 1960's. We find ourselves walking down a path toward confrontation with China which need not occur if we are able to see today that we should not grant most-favored-nation status.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of extending MFN trading status with China and against the resolution. All of us are concerned about China and their actions, whether it be religious persecution, treatment of Taiwan, weapons proliferation, their human rights violations, or their questionable trade and copyright practices.

The fact is, do we really believe, if we pull out of normal trading relations with China, that our industrial allies and other trading allies that we just met with in Denver are going to follow our action and pull out as well? Of course not. What they are going to do is fill the void and turn a blind eye to the concerns we have as a Nation. What we will do is to cut off our nose to spite our face, and walk away from one of the largest markets at the expense of American jobs.

We have heard a lot about security concerns, and there are some things we should be concerned about. There is no question about that. But we also should consider some facts: that China has adhered to the Nonproliferation Treaty of 1992, and it supported the indefinite nonconditional extension in 1995. It ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention. It has signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Yes, there are problems with that, but we have other ways we deal with that. Time and again, the administration has taken actions to impose sanctions against the Chinese for proliferation activities. We have put the laws on the books to do that. We have the laws to deal with copyright and other trade violations. What this says is that we will have normal trading practices to open the doors to deal with the Chinese, and on individual cases we can impose laws to deal with them. Let us not shut the door. It will do nobody any good.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON], one of our greatest and hardest working champions and one of the initiators of the whole plan to deal with democracy and human rights in China.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, this has been a very tumultuous year, especially for our relations with China. As we go forward and have this debate yet one more time on whether or not we should extend most-favored-nation status with China, Members, look deep inside.

I have to say that those who are opposing the most-favored-nation status, people like the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH and the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. FRANK WOLF, to me are heroes by every stretch of the imagination. I have watched them before I came to Congress and since I have been here, and I have been amazed at their ability to articulate passionate beliefs which they care deeply about.

There are some, however, not necessarily just within this body but without, as well, who would like to have us believe that this issue is simply cut and dried, that those who support most-favored-nation trading status are profiteers, that they are out there working for the interests of corporate America, and that those who are against it care deeply about human rights and that is the end of the story. In fact, I have heard slogans that say something like profit over substance, or profit over principle.

The fact of the matter is, nothing could be further from the truth. When I served a mission for my church in that region of the world in the 1970's, I grew to love the Chinese people. I grew to love them deeply. When I saw the massacre at Tiananmen Square, part of me died that day, because people who cared deeply about freedom, people who cared deeply about their convictions, were wasted away. We want to do something. We want to thump China in the nose. We want to do the right thing.

But the answer is not to walk away from this relationship, because if we do nobody will be at the table articulating the things we care about so deeply. It will not be France, Germany, Japan. They will not be there. There will be a big silent spot. Does that mean we have been 100 percent accurate and good in everything we have done in our dealings with China? No. We have not. We should speak up. We should do some things. We crafted a bill which will do that. But the answer is not to throw the baby out with the bath water. The answer is not to walk away from this relationship.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], a cochair of the Human Rights Caucus of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, there are a dozen good reasons to deny most-favored-nation treatment for China, ranging from the persecution of Christians to the selling of weapons of high-technology to despicable countries, to the theft of our intellectual property, to discrimination against American exports. But we all know what is going to happen here. They will get MFN because even if this body should approve this resolution, the administration will veto it, and we do not have the votes to override it.

So my plea is to my undecided colleagues, the only thing we are dealing with is the sending of a message to the Communist totalitarian regime in Beijing. Let us send a strong message. Let us tell them that we can stand on principle.

When a year ago this body unanimously approved my resolution giving the right to the President of Taiwan to visit his alma mater in Cornell, we stood on principle. When we voted not to move the Olympics to Beijing, we stood on principle. Today at least we should stand on principle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair announces that when we get close to closing, we will go in this order of closing: The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will go first; the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] will go second; the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] will go third; the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] will go fourth; and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] will close the debate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong opposition to the motion of disapproval, and in support of continuing our normal trade status with China. Opponents of most-favored-nation status say we must send a statement to China, a message.

In some respects I agree with that. China must know as a nation we will be vigilant in our efforts to fight human rights abuses, and we will watch closely the transition of power with respect to Hong Kong, that we

will not tolerate acts of aggression toward their neighbors, and most importantly, we will continue to work to open their market to exporters.

But the real question today is whether MFN is the proper vehicle to send this message, and whether revoking MFN advances our interests on these issues. The answer to both these questions is no. MFN is not a referendum on China's policies. It is not a sense-of-the-Congress resolution that we have serious differences with China. It is not just a symbolic vote, allowing us to send a message to the Chinese that we are unhappy with their leadership. It is a real vote with real implications, both at home and abroad.

If we are concerned about Hong Kong, we must not undermine their economic stability at a point when that leverage is vital to protecting their freedoms. If we are concerned about religious persecution in China, let us listen to the missionaries who fear serious repercussions if we revoke MFN. If we are concerned about market access to our exports, we should not set off a trade war which could raise tariffs up to 70 percent and effectively cut off our economic relationship, estimated to cost consumers nearly $30 billion.

Indeed, if we want China to act in accordance with established international principles, let us not isolate them from commercial, cultural, and religious exchanges.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion for disapproval, and to support continued MFN status for China.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to deny most-favored-nation trading status.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to renewal of most-favored-nation trading status for China. I supported MFN renewal last year believing that I should try the theory of engagement for 12 months and see what happens.

Well, it's now 12 months later and what actions has the Chinese leadership undertaken. Allow me to read some headlines for some of our Nation's papers this year:

''U.S. Confirms China Missile Safe to Iran'',

''China called Obstinate over talks about Tibet'',

''China Buys U.S. Computers, Raising Arms Fears'',

''China joins forces with Iran on short-range missile''.

The United States has given the Chinese 8 years of warnings and demands for improved human rights and to stop selling weapons and advanced missile and nuclear weapons technology to rogue nations like Iran or Pakistan. It's time to act now and take decisive action. No more carrot and stick approach. Just as the United States brought pressure on the Soviet Union to allow Jews to emigrate and on South Africa to end apartheid, and on South Korea to become more democratic, we must keep up our pressure on China.

Conditioning MFN for China provides the United States with the best leverage to improve human rights and send a strong signal about its weapons sales because preferential access to the United States market is critical to China's authoritative regime. Societies based on democratic principles and respect for basic human rights and freedoms make the best neighbors and the best trading partners.

I'm aware that United States business exports to China in 1993 totalled $8.8 billion. In the meantime, China's trade surplus with the United States has grown from $6 billion in 1989 to $45 billion last year with many of the Chinese products being produced by forced labor.

While I recognize the importance of MFN renewal to my home State of Michigan and its businesses, this must be weighed with the overriding goal of trying to foster a more humane way of life for the Chinese people, particularly as it impacts the rest of the world.

Last week the Spence amendment restricting supercomputers to those countries that violate nonproliferation agreements passed by a 332 to 88 vote.

Last night, this House passed the Rohrabacher amendment restricting funds to Russia if they transfer certain missile systems.

Mr. Speaker, this is the people's House. We need to send a message to the people around this globe that human rights violations and the transfer of horrific technology-chemical and nuclear proliferation must end today.

China MFN will continue. The President has the votes, but we can send a message that this practice of so many bad things must end.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the last time this issue came before Congress I voted to extend MFN trading status to China. I felt that engagement was our best hope for getting China to act more responsibly on issues of human rights, international affairs, and international trade.

Since that vote, however, China has shown no progress on any of these issues. On human rights the State Department's 1996 report confirms that China continues to commit widespread human rights abuses, and in 1996 China actually stepped up efforts to cut off protest and criticism.

On international affairs, China is transferring dangerous weapons and technology to Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Pakistan, and Burma. On international trade, Chinese tariffs on our exports average 35 percent, while our tariffs on Chinese imports average 2 percent, and our 1996 trade deficit with China was $40 billion. In the face of this, Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot be in support of extending MFN status, and I urge a vote in support of that proposition.

□ 1415

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, often in this Congress we are faced, as we are today, with two imperfect choices. As a delegate to the U.N. conference in Beijing, China, I spoke out against China's human rights abuses, and I will continue to do so. I also know that, since beginning negotiations, changes have taken place. Normal trade relations are importing and exporting more products. They are exporting an understanding of our democratic standards.

In 1994, the state compensation law was passed allowing Chinese citizens to sue Government officials and collect damages. Similar laws have passed but they would not have occurred without U.S. influence. Denying normal trade status to China would do nothing more than transfer trade to our international competitors and give ammunition to anti-American hard liners within China who will use our denial as an excuse to reverse advances that have already been made. I urge a vote against the resolution.

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], our distinguished whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I understand the deep feelings of the opponents of MFN and I have deep sympathy with those feelings. But the question before us is very simple. Will revoking MFN lead to more freedom in China? In my view, the answer is a resounding no. I want to send the Communist Chinese Government a message regarding human rights and religious freedom. But I believe that cutting off MFN is a very ineffective way to send that message, and in sending that message, we are taking freedom away from Americans.

Mr. Speaker, free trade leads to freedom, and capitalism is a synonym for freedom.

Will revoking MFN help those Chinese who are being persecuted by their Government? Will revoking MFN stop the Chinese Government from selling dangerous weapons to unstable countries? Will revoking MFN end barbaric social practices within China? I fear that the answer to all those questions is a big no. Instead of closing the door on China, we should be forcing that door open to open even wider. Instead of taking away freedom from Americans, we should empower our citizens to fully engage China.

We should have congressional delegations going to China demanding that the Chinese Government free political and religious prisoners. We should disallow visas for any member of the Chinese Government who is a known human rights violator, and we should press on many different fronts to make our views known to the Chinese Government that we care how they treat their citizens. But we should not cut the strongest link we have with the people of China especially now that Hong Kong is falling under the control of the Beijing regime.

That link is trade. And the trade link is the lifeline for many Chinese who see America not as an adversary but as a friend. And this is not just my view. In

a statement supporting MFN for China, Dr. Samuel Ling, who happens to be program director of the Institute for Chinese Studies at Wheaton College's Billy Graham Center, said: History since 1979 has proved that as the United States engages China, a more open, pluralistic atmosphere develops, and both the standard of living and human rights and freedoms, including religious freedom, tend to improve. Washing our hands of China is simply irresponsible. Let us not impose a false isolation of China that diminishes our influence, hurts the very people we want to help and takes freedom away from American citizens.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this disapproval motion, and let us give a helping hand to those who are now being persecuted in China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, brutal efficiency, prison, torture, executions, these are the tools of the Chinese leaders. These are the tools they use to muffle the voice of anybody who dares speak out against basic liberties. Tariffs, regulations, piracy, these are the tools Chinese leaders use to keep American goods out of China. They are effective tools, tools that have been sharpened into economic and political weapons, weapons that cut at the very heart of our belief in fairness, freedom, and democracy.

As we speak today, every Chinese activist, every voice of dissent, every advocate of freedom and democracy in a country of 1 billion people is either in jail or in exile. According to the State Department, not a single dissident is free in all of China.

I want to talk briefly about one brave voice who languishes in Chinese prison. His name is Wei Jing Sheng. Because he spoke out for democracy, he has been forced to endure two decades of prison, labor camps, and solitary confinement. Mr. Wei's message, that China needs democracy, frightens the Government so much that his guards will not allow him to even have a pen and paper. To dictators who fear the truth, this humble electrician is a dangerous man. But Mr. Wei is not the first electrician to stand up to cruel corrupt regimes. In the early 1980's, Lech Walesa said enough is enough and launched a fight for freedom that spread across eastern Europe and eventually the Soviet Union itself.

Like Lech Walesa, Mr. Wei is a simple, direct man. He stands firm in his belief in democracy. But, for now, his voice has been silenced. So we must speak for him and for all the people in prison who have been speaking their conscience, just as we spoke for Lech Walesa a decade ago.

For 8 years we followed a policy of engagement with China, and the human rights situation has only gotten worst. The same is true for our trade deficit with China, which continues to soar out of control. In the past 5 years it has more than doubled. This year it is expected to hit about $53 billion.

Supporters of the status quo claim that revoking most-favored-nation status will hurt our exports to China. Let us take a look at the numbers. China exports about a third of their goods here, a third of what they produce comes here. What percentage of American exports make it to China? Less than 2 percent, 1.7 percent. We export more to Belgium.

What kind of things are we exporting to China? A lot of high technology equipment and machinery that China is using for questionable ends, ends like stealing intellectual property, building up their military and spreading weapons of mass destruction.

Is this the behavior we are supposed to reward with most-favored-nation status? Is this the behavior we take as evidence of a growing respect for human rights? Is this what we call engagement?

If America grants most-favored-nation status to China, we should call it what it is: It is looking the other way. Revoking most-favored-nation status will not signal disengagement from China or that China is the enemy, but revoking that status will send a strong message to China's leaders. If they want the best possible access to these markets which they have a third of their exports going to now, they have to uphold their end of the deal.

Looking the other way does not make the problem go away. Looking the other way only makes the problem worse, and looking the other way at injustice wherever it is undermines our credibility, our leadership and our moral authority in a world that needs it more than ever.

This is a vote about what our future is going to look like. If we do not stand up for the principles of democracy and human rights in China, we risk losing those principles here at home. If we do not stand up for decent wages and safe working conditions and environmental protections in China, we risk losing the quality of life we have worked so hard for here at home. We cannot designate China as one of our most favored nations without debasing our standards, damaging our credibility, and betraying the ideals on which America stands.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, there is a fundamental choice that we are making today. That is a choice of engagement versus nonengagement with China. It is unfortunate that most-favored-nation status is called most-favored-nation status. It would much more appropriately be called trading status. Among the countries today in the world that have most-favored-nation status with the United States of America are Syria, Iran, and Iraq. It is a choice that we are making to isolate ourselves. Into the next century there is no question that China will be, and is today, but will only continue in its status as a world power. And in that economy we will have a choice in terms of whether we want to be part of that growth and part of that synergy of the world economy or not.

I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution in terms of the opportunity to continue just the normal trading status, not really a most favored status at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would advise all Members that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] has 7 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] has 9 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] has 12 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] has 10½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 3 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, there is probably no bilateral relationship more important than that between China and the United States. The evolution of Sino-American relations over the next decade will be of profound import not only for stability in the Asia-Pacific region, but for the world.

In this regard it must be understood that most favored nation [MFN] trade status—that is, normal trade relations—is the linchpin of Sino-American economic relations. it is also a natural extension of the open door policy that hallmarked American involvement in China at the end of the 19th century. By contrast, revocation of MFN would effectively drive a stake through the heart of our economic ties with China and place in grave jeopardy our future relationship with one-fifth of the world's population.

Hence it is crucial that the issue of extending MFN be delinked from the aberrational issue of the moment, in this case ongoing campaign finance investigations.

These issues—MFN which is fundamentally about relations between two peoples, and campaign finance abuses which likely involve the foolish actions of a few—are distinct. While Congress has a profound obligation to review the allegations of illegal involvement by foreigners and perhaps their governments in the American political process, perspective must be maintained. Campaign indiscretions are about deal-making conflicts of interest; MFN is about the future of the planet.

In the context of the recent Presidential campaign, it must be understood that the most appropriate antidote to campaign finance violations is for the Justice Department to uphold vigorously current law and the Congress to work forthrightly on campaign finance reform.

As for the Chinese, Beijing would be well advised to conduct its own inquiry into this affair, encourage openness and full disclosure and not shield any potential witnesses from

the accountability required by United States law enforcement and congressional oversight.

By way of background, this Member has long believed that when confronted with the choice of high walls versus open doors in Sino-American relations, open doors are preferable. Hence my historically strong support for maintaining MFN. Though I favor unconditional MFN for China at this time, I do not favor MFN unconditionally for all countries at all times. MFN is all about reciprocity. The best way for countries to have good sustainable economic relations is to have reciprocal open markets, and the best way to achieve reciprocity in trade is to get politics out of economics into the market.

With this in mind, Congress should not hesitate to renew China's MFN status, preferably on a multiyear basis in conjunction with China's entrance into the World Trade Organization [WTO] on commercially acceptable terms. In this regard, it is my view that in the next century relations between states will relate more to the capacity of the business community to advance mutuality of interest than to the efforts of public officials to advance a civil dialog. Public policy is nonetheless crucial, for what is at stake is the advancement of the rule of law—whether it relates to U.N. Charter ideals, arms control, or rules of trade.

With regard to the latter issue, the obvious deserves repetition: Common rules of trade are in the vested interest of all countries which want to be part of the modern world. Those nations which want privileged status to protect their own industries, usually on grounds of the old infant industries argumentation, generally hurt themselves. As recently pointed out by perhaps the most erudite 20th century head of state, Vaclav Havel, there is little more counterproductive for developing economies than protectionism. Financial services is a classic example. While China has become dramatically more integrated into the international financial system over the last decade and a half, it has only taken modest steps to open up its banking, insurance, and financial service industries to foreign competition. Yet in my view China and its economy would be far better off to welcome United States and other foreign financial institutions and their panoply of low-cost commercial and investment banking products.

As for Hong Kong's return to China, this is clearly one of the seminal events of our time. For the West, it marks the end of a transition from colonial rule that began at the end of the Second World War and the end of an imperial presence in Asia. For China, in conjunction with the return of the Portuguese colony in Macao in 1999, Hong Kong's transfer marks the end of its traumatic colonial experience. In the short run, China has made its intentions clear. It intends to hold the reigns of freedom in Hong Kong rather more tightly than Gov. Chris Patten. In the long run, one's confidence in the future of Hong Kong depends on one's confidence in China and its ability to learn both from its own experience and the experience of others. Clearly, it's in China's interest to see the one country, two systems, concept successfully implemented. After all, Hong Kong's financial and managerial expertise is crucial to China's modernization drive and Hong Kong companies have accounted for over half of all outside investment in China, while Chinese concerns have invested over $60 billion in Hong Kong.

Will China honor its agreements with the British and allow a two-systems approach to internal government? We cannot know the answer to this question. But this Congress can certainly point out to Beijing the enormously destabilizing consequences of any substantial mishandling of the Hong Kong transition.

Clearly, the United States has important and financial as well as philosophical interests at stake in Hong Kong's smooth and successful transition to Chinese sovereignty on July 1. It is certainly the hope and expectation of the Congress that Hong Kong will remain one of the world's most vibrant and productive societies, that it will enjoy the substantial autonomy promised to it by the People's Republic of China, and that fundamental freedoms of its people will be fully protected and respected after 1997. In addition, it is self-evident that China's handling of the Hong Kong transition will powerfully affect attitudes toward the mainland in Taiwan.

In this regard, it is interesting to note that perhaps the only revolutionary leader held in high esteem by China, as well as Hong Kong and Taiwan, is Sun Yat-sen, whose principal contribution to Chinese political theory, beyond nationalism, is the precept of a three stage, guided evaluation to political democracy. Perhaps because it has a manageable population base, perhaps because it is located in the currents of trade and sits as a cultural and commercial island-bridge between China, Japan, and the Americas, Taiwan has led the way with political and economic democracy and the least divisions of wealth of any industrializing society. A generation ago its leading party, the Kuomintang, while rightist, resembled in organization the Communist Party of China. Today it looks more like Margaret Thatcher's Conservative Party. Tomorrow, who knows? The only thing that is certain is that the future of Hong Kong will have a bearing.

Deng Xiaoping underscored the new Chinese pragmatism with his cat and mice metaphor, and by promoting ''socialism with Chinese characteristics.'' That pragmatism has led to unprecedented social and economic change in China. Indeed, despite continued political repression, China may be changing more rapidly that any other country in the world. Not only is it looking outward to trade and establishing a market-oriented internal economy, but in terms of private discussion there is much more freedom of expression than existed two decades ago. Privately, one can criticize the Government without repercussion; it is public criticism that remains shackled. This latter circumstance is indefensible, but the looseness of controls on the farmer is not without significance. Nonetheless, China's social and economic transformation can't proceed in the long run without effecting political change. At some point Beijing's new leaders must recognize the incompatibility of free enterprise and an authoritarian political system, and must recognize as well that instability can be unleashed in society when governments fail to provide safeguards for individual rights and fail to erect political institutions adaptable to change and accountable to the people.

Whether the 21st century is peaceful and whether it is prosperous will most of all depend on whether the world's most populous country can live with itself and become open to the world in a fair and respectful manner. How the United States, its allies, and the international system responds to the complexities and challenges of modern China is also one of the central foreign policy challenges of our time.

Revocation of MFN would not be responsive to that challenge. It would not effectively address our legitimate concerns on human rights, nonproliferation, Taiwan, or trade. On the contrary, it would constitute a supremely self-destructive act.

The United States would be far better to develop a bipartisan and biinstitutional approach that maintains the open door to China and with it a relationship that could be key to peace, stability, and prosperity in the 21st century than to annually threaten this political brinksmanship on the House floor. I urge the defeat of this self-defeating legislation.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, this is not a vote about who is more against religious persecution in China. We all deplore violations of human rights not just in China but in the entire world. Defeating MFN will not stop human rights abuses in China. Many Christian ministries with an outreach to China believe that religious persecution will get worse in China if MFN is defeated. For these Christian missionaries it is their life's work. They are the experts on religious freedom. The Rev. Billy Graham, his son Ned, the president of the National Association of Evangelicals, the President of Moody Bible Institute, Fr. Robert Sirico, president of the Acton Institute, and Bob Grant of Christian Voice, they all encourage us to remain engaged with China.

MFN is at the heart of America's engagement policy with China. MFN, if it is revoked, is the wrong vehicle to protest China's behavior. If Chinese goods are being illegally dumped here, we have laws against that and the same with goods that may be made in slave labor camps. We can stop that here with existing laws.

□ 1430

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to renewal of most-favored-nation status for the People's Republic of China. This is, basically, a question of fairness and of common sense. The fact of the matter is that we have a tremendous trade deficit with China. China does not allow U.S. products in. China imposes tremendously high and unfair tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply a question of common sense. Our choice is not either isolate or engage. We also have the choice to negotiate, to say to China, ''We want to trade but on fair terms. You should not have such a trade imbalance. You should not block our products. You should not pirate our intellectual property. You should not trade arms to our enemies.'' These are things that we can negotiate while maintaining a relationship.

People say, well, MFN will give us a better situation in all these areas. The

fact of the matter is, we granted MFN last year and the situation got worse. In fact, our trade deficit this year is 41 percent worse than it was last year. So there is no empirical evidence that MFN has yielded results. We need trade, but we need fair trade and a measure of common sense.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from America Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the House Committee on International Relations now for about 9 years, and I have long been a strong supporter of maintaining broad, comprehensive ties with the People's Republic of China.

This policy of engagement has been upheld in a bipartisan fashion by five previous administrations, and I support President Clinton in his efforts now for continued engagement with China. We cannot allow America's broad range, multi-faceted relationship with China to be held hostage to any particular interest or issue.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if my colleagues realize that when the People's Republic of China was founded in 1949, this government had to provide for some 400 million people living in China in 1949. Now we have got enough problems already on our own. Two hundred years it has taken us to provide for the needs of 264 million Americans. I think we need to leave a little slack here in realizing that this is not whether it is a dogma, it is a Communist, or what, but to provide for the needs of 1.2 billion people.

Mr. Speaker, we need engagement. We need MFN with China.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, whatever decision we make today, the American people will see it as a decision about the role of morality in U.S. foreign policy, and they will be right. Mr. Speaker, this is a vote about whether a government which practices forced abortion and forced sterilization on a massive scale should be rewarded or punished. It is a vote about how a government treats its own people, especially people of faith, Catholic bishops, priests and Protestant ministers and Tibetan monks and nuns. This is a vote about a government that routinely uses slave labor and does so with impunity.

I have held six hearings in my Subcommittee on International Relations and Human Rights on various aspects of human rights in China. We heard from people who survived the Laogai, the gulag system, people like Harry Wu. And I can tell my colleagues, the victims are not in favor of continuing most-favored-nation status with China because they know a butcher when they see one.

Today's vote is about dying rooms and inhumane orphanages, where baby girls and handicapped children are left to die simply because they are unwanted by the dictatorship. Today's vote is about what happened in Tiananmen Square—because what was overt in 1989—the silence of dissent—is more covert and sophisticated today. But the repression remains pervasive and brutal.

Last December, Mr. Speaker, the President coddled the dictatorship's hit man General Chi Haotian, the Defense Minister for the People's Republic of China, and gave him the red carpet treatment. The man who ordered the massacre at Tiananmen Square was the President's honored guest and during his visit to the U.S. said ''nobody died'' at Tiananmen Square. Does anybody in this room believe that? Of course not. It is utter nonsense, an unmitigated lie; but that is what the Beijing dictatorship is all about—lies.

Let me just ask my friends and colleagues, how long are we going to continue this misguided strategy of constructive engagement? As the previous speaker pointed out, things have gone from bad to worse. During the China human rights period of time when President Clinton had his executive order in place, we saw a significant regression, not progress but regression in every category of human rights.

As a matter of fact, one of three human rights missions to the PRC, I was there at the halfway point during the life of the executive order. During the trip I met with Wei Jingsheng, the father of the democracy movement in the People's Republic of China. A couple of weeks later, he met with John Shattuck, Assistant Secretary of Democrat and Human Rights—Bill Clinton's point man on human rights. How did the Chinese Government respond to those meetings, especially to the one with Secretary Shattuck? They arrested Wei, the dictatorship put him in prison where he is today—another victim of this brutal dictatorship.

Let me also remind my colleagues that if they think trade will trigger democracy and respect for human rights—they are sadly mistaken. The government of China has gone from communism to fascism. And respect for human rights have deteriorated. Who is making big profits in the PRC? The generals and officers affiliated with the People's Liberation Army and those who are connected to the power structure of the dictatorship. And again, we have seen significant regression in the area of human rights.

On religious freedom, I beg to differ vehemently with Billy Graham and others and especially with his son Ned Graham, who have suggested we should continue most-favored-nation status as a way of assisting religious liberty. Nothing could be further from the truth. The only people that can practice their religion in the PRC today are those who are part of the official Communist controlled church, and that is it. Step outside the boundaries of the government church and the full weight of the totalitarian state is visited upon you.

If you're a pastor in the underground church—you go to prison. If you meet for Bible study in a setting not approved by Beijing, you are harassed—and you may go to a concentration camp. I met with Bishop Su of the Baoding Province. Bishop Su—who is part of the ''illegal'' Roman Catholic Church aligned with Pope John Paul II—celebrated mass for our delegation. What happened to him? He was arrested by the secret police and is now back in prison for meetings with us. Bishop Su is no stranger to persecution, having suffered more than 12 years for his faith. Now the bully boys have sent this good man back to the gulag. There is no religious freedom in the PRC. Let us stop kidding ourselves.

To those who think trade equals progress in human rights, can you at least provide some evidence of that? Let me remind members that there were business men during the Nazi years, in the 1930's, who went and traded with the Nazis. But at least they did not have the temerity to stand up and say somehow that human rights were going to break out because the trains were running on time..

MFN is empowering a brutal dictatorship. The oppressor is getting bolder and stronger. And meaner. The dictator will soon begin to project its power to its neighbors—the signs are all there. The dictatorship will soon leave a bristling blue water navy to project power and influence and to intimidate.

Let me just note at this point that my business friends are not adverse to using sanctions when intellectual property rights are involved. Hollywood will go to war to protect pirated movies and CD's. But they shrink like violets when people's lives are on the line. When people, when torture, when forced abortion and religious freedom are the issue—they walk away and spout ''constructive engagement.'' Vote for the Solomon resolution and against MFN for this dictatorship.

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

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD].

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, this MFN status, as it is called, is nothing more than according normal trading status to China to facilitate commerce between the two nations. It is in no way preferential to China. MFN keeps tariffs from skyrocketing, and it retains a working relationship between our two countries.

However, some Members of Congress want to take MFN status away from China, citing human rights violations as an excuse to deny them the equal trading status that we provide most countries in the world. I understand

these Members' concerns and want to see improvements in China's human rights record myself. However, only through continuous engagement in dialogue will we have an opportunity to effect change.

It is important to note, however, that from 1990 to 1996, United States exports to China rose by 90 percent, the fastest growing rate of any major export market. This has been a direct benefit to southern California, given its recovery from a recession. One quarter of all cargo entering the United States comes from China.

I urge my colleagues to support MFN and to reject this resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members of this body that three of the four former Presidents have endorsed most-favored-nation status for China: George Bush, Jimmy Carter, and Gerald Ford. All three of them have for this vote today.

In addition, every former Secretary of Defense, Democrat and Republican, over the last 12 years has supported MFN for China. We have every Secretary of the Treasury over the last 16 years supporting most-favored-nation status for China. We have every Secretary of Agriculture and every Secretary of Commerce also supporting MFN for China, as well as every Secretary of State and every USTR, United States Trade Representative, that currently is alive.

I might also mention, in terms of the issue of the trade deficit, many are making much out of the $40 billion trade deficit. One needs to look at the entire region, however. Because if we look at Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong, and South Korea, what we have seen is a commensurate reduction in their trade surplus with the United States as the trade deficit with China has gone up. So it is not a loss of United States jobs, it is a transfer of jobs from these four countries to China. That is exactly what is happening in that particular area.

In addition, I might say that this really is not any longer an issue of trade, this is an issue of diplomacy. If we cut off most-favored-nation status with the Chinese, we will, in essence, cut off diplomatic relationship with the Chinese. What we are really talking about is what the United States-China relationship will be 10, 15, 20 years from now. I think that is what we should be focusing on.

China has 21 percent of the world's population. As a result of that, that relationship will be the most critical relationship the United States will have. I urge a rejection of the resolution by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. Our goal must be to strengthen our engagement with China to bring her into the international trading system, whose rules seek to assure mutual benefit for all trading nations, to bring her into the international web of agreements, whose goal it is to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and create the maximum opportunity to resolve conflicts without war.

As to the important issue of human rights, we know more about today's problems in China then we did during the terror of the cultural revolution precisely because China is far more open and allows far more personal freedoms than in the past. Greater individual economic opportunity has always fostered over time greater individual freedom and respect for human rights.

We should continue to press China toward international human rights standards. But engagement, not disengagement, will achieve these goals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] has 5 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] has 8 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] has 8 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] has 6½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, today we will decide whether to maintain the normal trading relations we have had with China since 1980. This vote is critical to agriculture in the rural areas of our country that have made us the No. 1 exporter of agricultural products in the world.

In 1996 alone, we exported over $60 billion in agricultural products. Last year we had a $1.4 billion trade surplus with China in agricultural trade. We sold over $2 billion of agricultural products to China. Ending normal trading relations will jeopardize this trade.

As China reaches out to the rest of the world to meet more of its food needs, the last thing we should do is pull out of the market. While we clearly lead the world in agricultural exports today, many of our friends in Europe and Central and South America would relish the opportunity to supply the Chinese market. Agriculture is one of those things we Americans do best. And the jobs that it provides in rural areas are good jobs that are performed with pride by the American farmer and the workers who supply them; and that is why it is so critical that we maintain the markets that we have worked so hard to create.

China has opened its markets to live cattle, cherries and apples from Washington and grapes from California. Because we remain engaged in trade with China, we are closer to gaining access for other important commodities. If we vote to end normal trading relations today, China will see us as an unreliable supplier of a very important commodity, the food it needs to feed its people.

And finally, if we vote against normal trading relations with China today, we can forget about China's accession to the World Trading Organization. We have only begun to gain marketing access to China's agricultural markets.

□ 1445

With accession to the WTO based on a commercially viable package, China's state trading enterprises which control imports of agricultural commodities will fall.

In the brief time allotted to me, I cannot address all of the reasons we should continue normalized trade relations with China. There are certainly legitimate concerns about human rights, religious freedom, international cooperation, U.S. jobs, Hong Kong and Taiwan. I believe, however, that progress in all of these areas will best be made, particularly in the area of human rights and religious freedom, by pursuing ever-increasing dialog and constructive engagement rather than reverting to isolationism.

The choices are clear. We can do what America does best or we can revert to those things that have been tried and proven to be wrong for America and wrong for those that we perceive to be helping.

I ask that we vote to continue normal trading relations. Vote against this resolution before us today.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest for those of us who live in such grandeur and have the most productive Nation in the world, why not risk? Why not risk ending slave labor?

Why not? Because the other side will say that we cannot offend Boeing who wants to sell jets to China, and Motorola their cell phones. Why do we not risk stopping the murder of female babies? No way. Wal-Mart needs those cheap T-shirts and sneakers. Or why not encourage religious freedom? Forget it. Agriculture needs to sell grain and cotton to China, those small family farmers like Archer and Daniels and Midland.

Why did it work in South Africa? They tell us we were not alone in South Africa. We were all alone when we voted the Helms–Burton bill, were we not? And why is it that Cuba is treated real tough and China is not? Maybe it is because Cuba did not make big political contributions to Clinton-Gore and other campaigns. Maybe that is why. And maybe that, Mr. Speaker, is why we are seeing human decency sell out to big money.

If Members believe that they can stand up for human decency, and if

Members believe that this country is strong enough to compete with anyone based on its human values, then they will vote for this resolution and send a message to China that may get them to change.

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

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it has been 8 years since the Tiananmen Square massacre. Every year at this time the President gives the regime an anniversary present requesting a special waiver to grant most-favored-nation status to China. No wonder the former Presidents and Secretaries of State support renewing MFN. They are the ones who brought us this failed policy in the first place.

What do we have to show for it? Lost jobs, lost freedom, and a more dangerous world. The American people know it. That is why in a poll yesterday, a Business Week poll, the American people support, 67 to 18 percent, revoking MFN for China.

The President and the regime in Beijing should take no comfort from this vote on the floor today. The American people want a change in policy. Our colleagues have thoughtfully spoken out to say that if they vote for MFN, they still want to see stronger actions taken by the Clinton administration. But in order for the Administration to do that, we need a strong vote in support of the Solomon resolution today.

I urge my colleagues to oppose most-favored-nation status for China by supporting the Solomon resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the resolution to disapprove most-favored-nation status and in support of normalized trade relations with China.

Like many of my colleagues, I am concerned and often as outraged as many here on the floor have been about China's continued unfair trade practices, proliferation of nuclear and chemical arms, and human rights abuses. But unlike my colleagues who support this resolution, I believe that cutting normal trade relations will not change China for the better, but will, in fact, slow the pace of democratic and economic reforms in that country while penalizing the United States in the process.

Rather than restricting trade, we should be concentrated on opening China's markets. We can do this by using targeted trade sanctions to persuade China to lower import barriers and end unfair trade practices. Last June, the United States and China reached an agreement that has shown how we can shut down illegal factories; 39 of them were done so. They were producing pirated software and computer disks. We need to take more of this kind of tough action.

Since we have begun our policy of engagement, China has made progress toward halting the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons technology, and China just recently ratified the chemical weapons treaty. In addition, China has agreed to a moratorium on nuclear testing and signed the comprehensive test ban treaty.

Progress will continue to be made if we use diplomatic pressure and the prospect of economic sanctions to secure commitments by China. Revoking normalized trade relations will not achieve our human rights goals.

Two nations in the region that once had authoritarian regimes, South Korea and Taiwan, now are among our strongest allies. Why? Because we built our relationships on trade and thereby had direct influence in improving human rights.

Let us build on our relationships, let us not tear them apart. Keeping China as a strong trading partner is the most effective way of preserving our interest in a nation that has undergone massive change during the last 25 years. Please support the position the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] has advocated so effectively today.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, being the foremost authority on foreign aid in the entire House, I rise in opposition to the proposal today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for allowing me this opportunity to address the House.

I rise today in opposition to the resolution under consideration and in favor of normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China.

Let me begin by stating that I have many problems with the recent conduct of the People's Republic of China.

From their abysmal human rights record, to nonadherence on nuclear nonproliferation, to its engagement in discriminatory and unfair trading practices, and China has a long way to go before this conduct earns the respect of the United States.

That said, however, I am also concerned that disapproving a trade agreement which simply extends to China the same privileges granted to all other nations with the exception of only seven rogue terrorist nations is not the most effective way for the United States to influence policy in China.

While I understand and share the concerns of conservative Christians regarding religious persecution in China, I believe a policy of disengagement could potentially worsen the situation for religious minorities there, resulting in more, rather than less, persecution, and human rights violations.

Passage of this resolution will have a seriously damaging effect on American business interests both here and abroad. Enacting a policy of trade isolationism with China would roll back the progress which has been made to this point, and would further undermine our diplomatic and economic influence in the region.

By engaging China to open markets and supporting progressive democratic reforms, the United States foreign policy regarding China has had an impact.

The people of China will only realize full democratization and liberalization of rights with the long-term, consistent involvement and encouragement of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this resolution and support our continued engagement with China.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, China is one of the world's major human rights abusers. It ranks right up there with Nigeria, Burma, Turkey, and the Sudan. There is no doubt whatsoever about this. Each year we debate MFN, we vent our anger and frustration with China and we send messages. I have consistently, Mr. Speaker, voted to cut off MFN. But nothing ever happens. And nothing will happen this year. The MFN approach is a legislative and policy dead end. If MFN were eliminated, surely it would cut off American influence in China. It might well slow the pace of economic freedom in China that ultimately, I believe, will lead to political freedom. And clearly it would hurt the common people of Hong Kong who have lived in freedom and under the rule of law and face an uncertain future under Chinese sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, we must move beyond the MFN exercise to a positive agenda for the values we believe in for all people. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] and I have joined together with a number of our colleagues and will introduce later this week the China Human Rights and Democracy Act of 1997. It will focus on increasing our broadcasts through Voice of America and Radio Free Asia to China to 24 hours a day. It will bring the truth to the Chinese people about their own country and about ours and about the world. It will build democracy in China through the National Endowment for Democracy. It will provide a voluntary code of conduct for U.S. businesses. It will cut off visas for human rights abusers and proliferators. It will provide new reports on human rights; a prisoner information registry; more human rights officers in our embassy in Beijing; a report on Chinese intelligence activities; and a disclosure regarding the People's Liberation Army and its commercial activities.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues who are so passionately for the rights of the Chinese people. I am still very much with them. I believe this exercise, however, leads nowhere and hope they will join us all in an effort that will really impact Chinese society and advance the cause of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law.

Human rights, democracy, freedom and equality of opportunity are the values that define us as Americans and they should be reflected in our foreign policy.

Unfortunately, the MFN debate, as well as the administration's policy, pits these principles against one another, dividing Congress and the American people, and sending a mixed message to the Chinese.

As cochairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, I have been a consistent and outspoken critic of the Chinese Government and its horrendous human rights record.

I have always used my MFN vote to protest China's treatment of its citizens and its renegade foreign policy of market exploitation and weapons proliferation.

Since 1994 when President Clinton formally de-linked human rights and MFN, the MFN debate has been an empty threat and has ceased to be an effective means of advancing our values within China.

Today, we have again engaged in a heated debate that allows Members to vent their anger at Beijing, but does little to change Chinese society for the better.

I believe that we must move beyond this annual exercise in futility toward a real policy which more accurately reflects and more vigorously promotes American ideals within China.

For this reason, my colleague DAVID DREIER and I have sought out positive and pro-active ideas from many of the leading voices on all sides of this issue on how we can move our China policy in a more productive direction.

The legislation that has resulted from this consultation—the China Human Rights and Democracy Act of 1997—includes funding for 24-hour broadcasts into China by Radio Free Asia and the Voice of America in multiple languages.

It would promote democracy-building activities in China, such as legal and judicial training, and expand reporting on human rights by the administration. Our legislation prohibits visas for human rights abusers and those who carry out China's irresponsible policies of weapons proliferation. The bill also includes a voluntary code of conduct for United States businesses operating in China. We would require expanded reporting on human rights and other important concerns that Members of this body have enunciated today, and increase public and private exchanges between the United States and China. Finally, we would begin the process of creating a Commission on Security and Cooperation in Asia—based on the successful model of the Helsinki Commission.

The premise behind all these initiatives is that we can best promote our values by increasing our contact with the Chinese people, and concerns about human rights and democracy should be dealt with in a way that responds directly to those issues.

The China Human Rights and Democracy Act attacks China's abusive policies at their roots by giving the Chinese people the tools to build a civil society and decrease their dependence on the Chinese Government.

Economic freedom and opportunity can provide a catalyst to increased political freedoms, but we must not just sit around waiting for this to happen. We must take positive steps to bring these changes along, such as the China Human Rights and Democracy Act.

Revoking MFN, however, would do nothing to accomplish this goal, and would make it difficult to take the kinds of actions which will bring China into the community of nations as a responsible member.

Moreover, MFN revocation would devastate one of our best chances at changing China from within—Hong Kong, which will come under Chinese control this time next week. I firmly believe that Hong Kong—a place of freedom, the rule of law and a nascent democracy—has the potential to change China far more than China will change Hong Kong. If we take away MFN, Hong Kong will be the first casualty.

If we want to improve the lives of the Chinese people and improve the human rights situation in China, we cannot promote our values selectively.

Members of Congress have spoken forcefully against MFN today from their hearts—I respect no one in this Congress more than my colleagues from California, Virginia, New York, and New Jersey who have passionately addressed this issue today, and we have worked on these issues together for many years.

I know that I will not change their minds today, but I ask that after this vote ends today, that we work together to end this annual debate and promote a more realistic approach.

MFN revocation is a dead-end for Congress, and we have to move beyond sending messages to move China in the right direction. I will support MFN today and continue to work with all my colleagues to build a better approach to China. I hope that I can count on their support.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following op-ed from the Wall Street Journal for the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 24, 1997]

WHY I CHANGED MY MIND ON MFN

(By John Edward Porter)

Human rights, freedom, democracy, free-market economics and the rule of law are the values that define America and that must be reflected in our foreign policy. Unfortunately, the current MFN debate pits these principles against one another, dividing Congress and the American people and sending a mixed message to the Chinese leadership.

I have been a consistent and outspoken critic of the Chinese government and its deplorable human rights record. China's egregious behavior is clear, and I have voted repeatedly to revoke most-favored-nation trade status for China to convey America's outrage over Beijing's abuses and to pressure China to mend its ways. What's also become clear to me, however, is that the threat of MFN withdrawal is not the most effective way to advance our values within China.

With support from successive U.S. presidents for MFN renewal, the Chinese have concluded that our trade threat is an empty one. Nonetheless, we continue to pursue an annual debate that allows Congress to vent its anger against Beijing but that does nothing to change Chinese society and move it toward basic freedoms.

Yes, a vote for MFN withdrawal sends a message. But with a president committed to vetoing such a resolution, it is a pointless exercise that cannot affect China's conduct. Clearly, we need a new, active policy toward China and should drop this annual debate.

With this in mind, I began working six months ago to develop a list of policy initiatives that could make a difference within China, primarily expanded broadcasts through the Voice of America and Radio Free Asia, a new radio service that brings uncensored news directly to the Chinese people. For the past 10 years, I've also worked closely with Martin Lee and other domestic leaders in Hong Kong to ensure that basic rights are protected there after June 30. I've voted for legislation to establish direct U.S. ties with Hong Kong in those areas where it maintains autonomy and have introduced a bill to help protect Hong Kong journalists, who are the first line of defense against erosion of the freedoms enumerated in the Sino-British Joint Declaration.

When Speaker Newt Gingrich returned from his recent trip to China, he addressed the Congressional Human Rights Caucus and emphasized his support for this kind of initiative. My discussions with the speaker led to formation of an MFN Working Group, which has brought together a group of House members who share a strong commitment to human rights but who have divergent views on MFN. Our goal was to come up with legislative proposals that would help define an effective U.S. policy toward China.

The group is planning to introduce legislation—the China Human Rights and Democracy Act—that we believe will be more effective than the annual MFN debate in moving China toward democracy. Passing this measure would make Congress a more forceful player in the U.S.-China policy debate and encourage the administration to integrate concerns about human rights and democratic development into all our dealings with China.

Our bill would increase funding for broadcasting by Radio Free Asia and Voice of America, with a goal of 24-hour broadcasts into China in Mandarin, Cantonese, Tibetan and other Chinese dialects; increase funding for democracy-building activities, such as legal and judicial training, in China through the National Endowment for Democracy; expand State Department reporting on human rights violations and political prisoners; and require disclosure of Chinese companies' ties to the People's Liberation Army. Our initiative also suggests the formation of a congressional commission on human rights abuses in China and in other repressive societies, including Vietnam, Laos, Burma and North Korea.

Furthermore, our legislation would increase both public and private exchanges between the American and Chinese peoples, but it would deny visas for U.S. travel to those whom the State Department determines to have committed human rights violations or who are involved in proliferation of weapons or other sensitive technologies. Also, U.S. companies would be encouraged to adopt a voluntary code of conduct, to show how they treat Chinese workers and foster our values.

The premise of these initiatives is that we can best advance our values through continued contact with China. This is especially true as China is about to regain sovereignty over Hong Kong, a center of robust economic freedom that would be devasted by MFN revocation. As we have seen in Taiwan and South Korea, economic freedom ultimately leads to political freedom. I believe that Hong Kong, a place of freedom and the rule of law and, more recently, a place of democracy, will ultimately change China much more than China will change Hong Kong.

If we want to bring China into the community of nations, we cannot promote our values selectively. It is time to recognize that revoking MFN is a dead-end policy that cannot succeed in bringing us closer to our hopes for China. Members of Congress have in past years spoken forcefully from their hearts in voting to deny MFN for China. But now our minds tell us that we must go beyond sending messages to move China in the right direction.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, there has been an awful lot of talk throughout this debate over the issue of sending a signal. ''Let's send a signal.'' They are absolutely right. There are several very important signals that we should be sending. For starters, in just a few days, we are going to see Hong Kong revert to China. We need to send a signal to the freedom-loving people in China that we want to maintain United States-China relations. In fact, the greatest apostle for freedom there, Martin Lee, has made it very clear in his statement that the nonrenewal of MFN would hurt us badly. We also need to send a signal to the international community, especially our closest allies in Asia.

Bob Dole made it very clear in a piece that he wrote today in the Washington Times:

> Revoking MFN would engender grave doubts in all Asian capitals about the wisdom of American policymakers and undermine their respect for us as the guarantor of Asian stability.

We also, Mr. Speaker, need to send a very important signal to American citizens, American private citizens who are in China, American citizens there who are spreading the gospel, American business men and women who are on the front line pursuing capitalism and pushing our western values into China, and also to democratic activists, like our International Republican Institute, out there encouraging democratization at the village level. It is very important that these signals be sent, and the most important signal is to the people of China, the 1.2 billion people of China who should know that we stand with them. The single most powerful force in the 5,000-year history of China has been the economic reforms. We need to stand for MFN and in opposition to this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] has 1½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] has 5 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] has 3 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] has 6½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 3 minutes remaining.

The first Member to close will be the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], followed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], followed by the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], followed by the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK]. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] will close the debate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

Mr. Speaker, we need to send signals all right, but we do not need to send do-gooder signals and we do not need to send feel-good signals. We need to send signals that the Chinese Government understands.

Let us get one thing straight. It is important to note right now that nobody is talking about severing relations with China. Nobody. Nobody is talking about severing trade relations with China. Nobody. In fact, we are not even advocating permanent revocation of MFN. If we pass this resolution into law, there is nothing whatsoever to stop this Congress from renewing MFN, and I would be one of the first to help do it at a later date, maybe 3 months from now, 6 months from now, 7 months from now. That is why there is really no good reason for us to oppose this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the status quo is simply unacceptable. As I think our side has outlined very forcefully here today, China's behavior remains repugnant, it remains dangerous to this country, and it is certainly unacceptable. Our current policies simply are not working.

To recap, even the State Department says that human rights abuses are getting worse in China, not better. Let us not fool ourselves. A new round of religious persecutions is under way. That is unforgivable.

China itself announced that its military spending will increase 15 percent this year, and that is 50 percent over the last 4 or 5 years. It was just 6 months ago that China concluded a deal with Russia to purchase a missile which is specifically designed to kill American sailors.

Mr. Speaker, would it not be worth it to delay renewing MFN for China for 3 months if China decided to stop buying deadly missiles from Russia? Would it not be worth it if China stopped religious persecution, even made a step in that direction? Would it not be worth it if a 3-month delay saved a few hundred lives? Would it not be worth it? Lives are precious.

I would ask my colleagues to come over here and vote, not to cut off MFN for China but to delay it, so that we can sit down. The Chinese are the smartest people in the world. Let me tell my colleagues, we send this temporary measure to them, and they will sit down and we will see a difference. My God, would we not have a great feeling in our conscience if that happened?

□ 1500

Please come over and vote for this resolution.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, to close the debate I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I feel more strongly about this issue than any vote I have cast since I have been in this body. I want to thank all of the groups. I wish I can mention all of the names, but I want to thank the Family Research Council, I want to thank the Catholic bishops and the Catholic conference, I want to thank the Christian Coalition, and I want to thank the AFL–CIO for coming together and making this point. I will tell them we have won this debate, we have won it outside of this Chamber, and next year we will win it inside of this Chamber. The American people are with us. The Congress may not be with us, but the people are with us.

Why should we support the Solomon resolution? The administration's policy is fundamentally failed. It is not true to American values. I will tell my colleagues it is amoral, and I personally believe that it is immoral.

Why? The Catholic priests and bishops that are in jail, some for saying holy communion. The next time my colleagues approach the rail and when the pastor or the priest says we break the bread of the body of Christ, he remembers us and the wine for the blood of the Christ, think of the bishops and the priests that are in jail for doing this, for this very, very thing. There are Protestant pastors that are in jail. None of my colleagues go to house churches when they go there, none of my colleagues visit the prisons. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I were in Beijing Prison No. 1. We met with the underground church. If we can be with a church, my colleagues can be with a church, too.

And what about the Buddhists, the Buddhists who have been raped, the nuns? Raped with a cattle prod and tortured? And what about the Moslems? We are a diverse country. There are 80 million Moslems in that country that are being persecuted, and they have more slave labor camps in China then thay had in the Soviet Union when Gulag Archipelago was written by Solzhenitsyn.

And they have programs where they shoot prisoners and when they drop they cut their kidneys out and they sell them for 35 to $50,000.

They have forced abortions. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I can tell our colleagues we talked to the people where they were told that they were tracked down and women were forced to have abortions.

So why is this an immoral policy or at least an amoral policy? Because of those things.

Second, the long arm of the Chinese Government has reached into our Government. Charlie Trie, a friend of the President has influenced this policy. Charlie Trie is in Beijing, probably watching this debate as the foreign ministry is watching this debate in Beijing. Where are the Riady family? They have had an influence on this policy. They have with money attempted and have been successful, successful in influencing this Government and, indirectly, this body.

And where is John Huang? He will not come forward, and he will not come forward, but after my colleagues cast their vote 6 or 7 months from now the story will come out with regard to the influence of John Huang when he worked for the Government and then when he raised money for the Democratic National Committee.

And major companies, read today's Wall Street Journal. Major companies, and I am not going to mention them, I do not want to embarrass anybody or mention any names, have been pressured, pressured with fear of losing business.

So this Government has been directly influenced and this Congress has been indirectly influenced by the Chinese Government.

I fear what would have happened if the same thing had been done during the 1970's and the 1980's with regard to the Soviet Union. What? Are we giving the Soviet Union MFN?

Third, third, in the light of the military buildup the administration's policy is one of appeasement. It is a policy of appeasement that I believe with every fiber of my body. Now the Secretary of State will not like that because she knows better because she lived in Eastern Europe, she saw what communism can do. But let there be no mistake. This Clinton policy is a policy of appeasement.

Now do my colleagues remember the debates in the House of Commons when Winston Churchill got up in the 1930's and talked about what was taking place in Nazi Germany. Chamberlain never listened to him, and the House of Commons never listened to him, and finally it was too late and millions of Americans and millions of British died. The same thing is happening with regard to this. We are going through the same policies that Winston Churchill went through.

I had a briefing, and not many of my colleagues have had it. I had the briefing from the CIA, I have had the briefing from the DIA, and I have had the briefing from the Office of Naval Intelligence, and I will not say what one, but I said, ''Sir, can you tell me how many Members have had this briefing?'' I wanted him to tell me 25 or 40.

He said, ''There were three, and you are the third.'' One is sitting in this Chamber now, and the other one is in the other body.

If my colleagues have not had the DIA briefing and the CIA briefing and Office of Naval Intelligence, frankly those colleagues are voting in ignorance because all the material that they told me, and much of what was said on the floor, that I cannot say, really is true with regard to sales, the missiles, with regard to Iran and many of the other things. They are endangering our country, they are endangering our men.

Imagine for just 1 minute being a priest, a minister or dissident in jail and having heard that tomorrow morning that the House of Representatives, the people's House, had voted to grant MFN. Can my colleagues imagine how demoralized they would be? The guard will probably come by, and I was in Beijing prison to see the conditions, and I was with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in Perm Camp 35. There are terrible conditions. Very few people have gone to those places. The guard will probably mock. The guard will say to the four bishops, ''Your American friends forgot you.'' Imagine how it would feel.

But on the other hand, imagine hearing the U.S. Congress had voted to deny MFN, and we are not denying MFN, we are sending a message. Can my colleagues imagine how encouraged they would feel? Natan Shcharansky has said he knew that the U.S. people and the Congress and the Government stood with him.

Let me just end by turning to my side. They can take care of their problem. We ought not be bailing out this fundamentally corrupt policy of this fundamentally corrupt administration. Vote to send a message to this administration, vote to send a message to the Chinese people, vote to send a message to the dissidents. Be true to American values. Ask, my colleagues, does this policy fit into American values? Be with the American people, 67 to 18. Be on the side of freedom.

Do my colleagues remember, those who were here when Ronald Reagan gave the Evil Empire speech? In Orlando, FL, he was criticized by many on that side and many in the press, but it was the right speech, where he stood out with regard to religious freedom and evangelicals. And do my colleagues remember when Ronald Reagan gave his speech at the Berlin Wall? The State Department said, ''Mr. Reagan, don't mention the Berlin Wall,'' and Ronald Reagan said in that speech because he knew what he believed in and he knew the values; Ronald Reagan said:

''Mr. Gorbachev, tear down the wall.''

And the wall came down.

When Thomas Jefferson wrote the words in the Declaration of Independence, he said,

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men and women are created equal and endowed by their Creator, by God, with certain inalienable rights: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Those words were not only meant for Virginians, they were not only meant for Americans, they were meant for people in the gulags of China, they were meant for the dissidents, they were meant for the entire world.

I beg of my colleagues if they are undecided, I plead with them, support the Solomon amendment so when the priests tomorrow hear, when the bishops tomorrow hear, when the dissidents tomorrow hear, they will know that the people's House has sent a message to the Chinese Government: We will no longer permit this to take place, and I strongly urge the support of the Solomon amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 79 to revoke most-favored-nation status for China. Unconditional MFN forms the backbone of the President Clinton's China policy—a policy which I believe has been a failure. The administration's policy is fundamentally amoral and not true to American values.

Why?

First, human rights abuses continue and are worsening. They have not improved despite our so-called policy of engagement * * * not that there has been much engagement.

Catholic priests and bishops are in jail—more and more go in each day for practicing their faith outside of Government control. Many have been arrested just for giving mass or administering the sacraments. In April, just before the visit to China of the congressional delegation headed by the Speaker and the visit by Vice President AL GORE, the Chinese arrested the bishop of Shanghai, ransacked his house and confiscated all his religious material.

Protestant pastors and house church leaders are still being thrown in jail in record numbers. Beatings and torture are routine. Some reports indicate that Christians are being tortured in a prayerful position—they are forced to kneel in a praying position which they are viciously beaten and their feet are crushed.

Buddhist monks and nuns are tortured and killed. Tibet has been plundered. The Panchen Lama has been kidnapped and replaced by a puppet from Beijing.

Muslims in the northwest corner of China are being persecuted.

All dissidents are behind bars, in exile, in labor camps or under house arrest. The Chinese Government has stifled all dissent.

There are more slave labor camps in China than in the Soviet Union when Alexander Solzehnitsyn wrote his famous book ''The Gulag Archipelago.''

The Chinese Government shoots prisoners and takes their kidneys and corneas for transplantation.

Forced abortions and sterilizations continue.

There is more.

The long arm of the Chinese Government has directly influenced the Clinton administration and has indirectly influenced this Congress.

Charlie Trie is an Arkansas friend of President Clinton's. He is now in Beijing and doesn't seem to be coming back. He helped raise political contributions and sway policy. Big time.

The Riady family left the country after allegations of campaign finance improprieties. They attempted to sway policy. Maybe they did sway it. They surely spent enough money trying.

John Huang worked in the Clinton administration and raised money for President Clinton's 1996 campaign. Many think he passed information on to those closest to the Chinese Government. He helped sway policy.

Big companies have been silent on human rights, religious freedom and democracy and are being directly pressured by the Chinese Government. These companies are afraid to lose business so they exert pressure on the U.S. political process in favor of American silence on human rights.

The Chinese Government bought the world's silence at the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva by doling out lucrative contracts to countries that refuse to support an EU-sponsored resolution condemning China's human rights practices.

Imagine if the Soviet Union had tried to exert this kind of influence on our Government. Would we have turned around and given them MFN?

Third, the policy the United States is pursuing toward China, in light of China's massive

military buildup and weapons proliferation, is one of appeasement. We are closing our eyes just as Neville Chamberlain did in England in the 1930's when faced with another aggressive power.

Winston Churchill spoke up in the Parliament, but the Chamberlain government did not listen. Now there is a new bully in town.

The Chinese Government is building up its military—some say United States trade and technology are helping provide needed resources. China is selling chemical weapons, missiles, and nuclear technology which could pose a future threat to the United States and its allies.

If you did not get the briefing by the Defense Intelligence Agency and the Office of Naval Intelligence—you don't have all the information. I strongly urge all my colleagues to get these briefings. You owe it to yourself and your country to know exactly what China is doing.

China sold chemical weapons and cruise missiles to Iran. China sold nuclear technology to Pakistan.

China is engaged in a military buildup and becoming a threat to our future security. It is developing ICBM missiles capable of hitting the United States, our allies in Asia, or our military installations in the Pacific. China also purchased 46 American supercomputers which intelligence experts say can be used to design nuclear warheads to put on the long-range missiles.

I believe that American men and women may soon be in danger because of our current policy of appeasement toward the Beijing regime. Appeasement didn't work for Neville Chamberlain in the 1930's and it will not work for the United States in the 1990's.

MFN is the backbone of a failed policy. A policy of appeasement. A policy that is amoral because it suggests engagement and yet, does not engage. And a policy that is, and will continue to be, dangerous to our national security.

What is needed is real backbone, not appeasement.

Imagine if you were a priest or pastor who was in jail. You had been beaten or tortured or starved. You had been forced to endure backbreaking labor. Imagine you heard that the United States Congress had again granted MFN to China—imagine how discouraged you would feel.

But what if you, a jailed pastor or priest, hear tomorrow on your crystal radio set that the United States House of Representatives, the People's House, voted to deny MFN to China. Wouldn't you feel encouraged? I would and that's why I'm voting for the Solomon resolution.

To my colleagues on my side of the aisle. I hope you will vote to deny MFN to China.

It is important to be true to American values.

It is important to be with the American people who overwhelmingly, in poll after poll, support linking trade to human rights improvements. The most recent poll, a Harris poll released yesterday in Business Week magazine, found that 67 percent of Americans oppose MFN for China. Only 18 percent favor it. A vote against MFN is a vote on the side of the American people.

I encourage those on my side of the aisle to be with the legacy of Ronald Reagan who refused to grant MFN to the Soviet Union while it persecuted people of faith. He engaged but he didn't appease. He spoke out for American values and stood with the persecuted when he called the Soviet Union the evil empire and demanded Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.

Be on the side of history. Vote to deny MFN to China and send a message to the Chinese Government, to the Chinese people, and to all persecuted people around the world that the words of Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence are for them.

These principles of freedom, ''We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights among them life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness'' apply to all people. Not just Virginians or Americans or Westerners. These rights are for all people, including the people of China. That's the message we would send by voting to deny MFN in the House.

Vote ''no'' on MFN for China.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes, the balance of our time, to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding this time to me.

I rise in opposition to the Solomon resolution of disapproval. The resolution before us today presents a fundamental choice about our relationship with China. Do we choose a policy of engagement, or do we choose a policy of isolation?

Now some have argued in this Chamber today to end normal trade relations with China and still pursue a relationship with China. I do not think that argument can be sustained. To withdraw normal trade relations is to declare economic warfare against China. We cannot declare economic war against China and then expect China to play by our rules on political security and proliferation and human rights matters. Political engagement and economic cooperation with China go hand in hand. We cannot separate them.

Now I support an engagement policy because I think it is in the American national interests, and I yield to no person in this Chamber in my concern for human rights. Engagement is not appeasement. It does not mean ignoring our differences with China. It means actively engaging China to resolve the differences. It means hard bargaining. It means, as the administration did, sending two aircraft carrier groups into the Taiwan Straits last year. It means threatening to impose sanctions because of Chinese violations of intellectual property rights. It means imposing sanctions on Chinese companies because of their violation of nonproliferation laws.

Engagement works. Engagement has produced a number of successes in the nonproliferation area. They have been identified here during the afternoon.

Engagement works. China was instrumental in convincing North Korea to sign the agreed framework freezing North Korea's nuclear program.

Engagement works. Every Member of this Chamber is proud of what happened in the gulf war and how this body conducted itself. Without China's cooperation in the U.N. Security Council, it would not have been possible to fashion the international coalition that defeated Iraq in that war.

Engagement works. Millions of Chinese have had their lives improved because of this engagement. Exposure to the outside world and the accompanying exchange of goods and ideas and people have brought increased openness, social mobility and personal opportunities to the Chinese. It is not a perfect country, it is far from it, we got plenty of concerns about their human rights, and they are valid concerns. But we got to get a perspective of a couple of decades here and see how China has evolved. Four hundred million new people in China since Nixon went to China in 1972.

Engagement works. It is meant that we use our trade laws to attack Chinese trade barriers and to help American enterprises export.

Engagement works. Our law enforcement authorities work together to combat terrorism and alien smuggling and illegal narcotics, trafficking.

Engagement works on environmental and public health issues.

Engagement has not solved all the problems, of course not. We got plenty of concerns left with China, but it has a proven record of bringing China, moving China, toward international norms. It offers a better prospect of achieving our policy objectives, including a respect for human rights, than isolation or containment. If we vote today to revoke China's normal trading status, we will undermine our ability to work with China in the future and we will damage a broad range of interests that this country has at home, in China, in the region and around the world. Revoking MFN will almost certainly make the human rights situation in China worse, not better. It will undermine the reformers. It will strengthen the hard liners. It will slow the flow of Western culture and ideas.

□ 1515

Our influence would be reduced. If we revoke MFN, we undermine our stature throughout Asia; Hong Kong's transition will be more difficult. Let us, my friends in this Chamber, follow the advice of three former Presidents, six former Secretaries of State, 10 former Secretaries of Defense, and support normal trading status for China. I urge the defeat of the Solomon resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes, the remaining time, to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, this is a debate today that is not simply about economics and trade, it is a debate about principle and value and belief. This country was founded not on economic principles and not on economic

ideas, but on moral beliefs that have for over 200 years radiated out of this country. As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] said a moment ago, the revolutionary words that appear in our Declaration of Independence was the starting place of this country, which is an idea for all people.

We said, ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'' When we made those words, we did not say they were American rights, we said they were universal rights.

And almost 50 years from the date those words were signed, Thomas Jefferson said this: ''May it be to the world what I believe it will be to some parts sooner, to others later, but finally, to all, the signal of arousing men to burst their chains.''

In 1986 on the floor of this House a Member who is on the floor today said these words: ''I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, Members of this body, human beings do not live by bread alone, that there are spiritual values, the right to stand as a dignified human being, the right to stand as an equal person. I would suggest that wherever you are on the political spectrum you should join me in this effort, not to make a statement that is measured, not to make an incremental step, not to make a step that is a political step, but to make the statement at this point based upon what is right.''

He said, ''I am simply saying that every human being on this planet should have control over their human destiny.''

The Member who said those words is the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and he was not saying those words about China, he said them about South Africa. The freedom movement in South Africa started on this floor, and Members of this House of Representatives stood in this well time and time again and argued for the end of apartheid and the beginning of freedom in South Africa. I dare say had they not stood in this place and made that argument over and over again, Nelson Mandela would be in prison today. And all the arguments we are hearing now were made then.

The policy we had with South Africa was called constructive engagement. People said we would lose contracts; people said other countries would never follow; people said it would hurt the good people in South Africa who were trying to break free; people said our businesses would not be there to change that government. But the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and Bill Gray and other Members of this body stood tall and fought for sanctions against South Africa, and Nelson Mandela stood at that podium, the president of the country, and talked about freedom.

I say to my colleagues, the policy that we are following is not working. We need firm engagement, not constructive engagement. I know all of the good arguments that are made, and I respect the people who make them very much. First of all they say, well, trade helps us with human rights.

Listen to what our own State Department says about what is happening in China. They say, ''All public dissent against the party and the government was effectively silenced by intimidation, exile, the imposition of prison terms, administrative detention or house arrest. No dissidents were known to be active at year's end.'' This is at the end of last year.

''Even those released from prison were kept under tight surveillance and often prevented from taking employment or otherwise resuming a normal life.'' That is our own government, our own State Department saying whether or not the policy is working.

Then they say human rights and trade should be separated. They are different issues. We have to trade, and then we can talk about human rights. Does anybody argue that we should separate intellectual property protection from trade? Has any businessperson stood up and said, forget about my intellectual property rights, let us just go ahead and trade. Of course they do not.

Mr. Speaker, do we not understand trade issues are human rights issues? What are we trying to do? We are trying to build a world trading system. How can we ever do that if people do not have human rights? Who is going to ever be in China to buy any of our products? They will never have enough money to do it. And we expose our businesses and our people to this unfair competition. You bet human rights is a trade issue.

Then we hear, do not make China an enemy. What a crazy argument. I do not want China to be our enemy, that is the last thing in the world we want. But we are saying. By arguing that if we do not give MFN, most-favored-nation treatment, the treatment we give to the most favored nations, that somehow we have made them an enemy. That is ridiculous. We can trade with China.

Do my colleagues think China is not going to trade with the United States? They have a $40 billion trade surplus with us. We are carrying China. They have a trade deficit with every other country in the world. We are literally financing their form of government by our insistence on giving them most-favored-nation treatment.

Finally, we say we will lose business. We will lose business. Let me end where I started. This country is not just about business. This country is about an idea, a moral belief that every human being in the world is created with liberty and freedom. If we do not stand for freedom in China, who will? If we do not lead for freedom in China, who will follow? When will we start this fight as we started it with South Africa? Maybe we start it today.

Listen to this letter that was sent by the parents of a third grade young girl, near here in Baltimore, Maryland. She was writing about Wei Jingsheng. As you know, Wei Jingsheng has been in jail for 14 years in China because he dared to speak out. He spoke in the universal language of the Declaration of Independence and said human rights, like freedom of speech, press, assembly, and appeal to the government, are inalienable rights belonging to the people, the masters of the country. For saying that he was put in jail and he has been in jail for 14 years, like Nelson Mandela was in jail.

Mr. Speaker, this girl said, ''I wish all American citizens would help in this struggle for what is right. I want him to get out of prison and return to his family and get healthy soon.'' A third grader speaking of the moral beliefs and ideas that are the founding wellspring of this greatest country that has ever existed on earth.

Six days after the Berlin Wall fell in 1989, Lech Walesa spoke here to a joint session and he said, ''We, the people. I do need not remind anyone here where those words come from. And I do not need to explain that I, an electrician from Gdansk, am also entitled to invoke them.''

I say to my colleagues there is as an electrician this afternoon in a jail in Beijing, and his name is Wei Jingsheng, and he wants to get out and be free just like Lech Walesa did and just like Nelson Mandela did. De Toqueville said America is great because America is good, and if we cease being good, he said we will cease being great.

Representatives of the people of this country, stand today and be good, and stand for what is right and stand for the founding principle of this country, and we will bring freedom to China as we brought it to Lech Walesa and Nelson Mandela. Stand against most-favored-nation treatment. Stand to send a message to the leaders in Beijing. I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

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

We have listened to some very eloquent testimony on both sides, and I think this Chamber has represented that today more than maybe most days, evidence of what our system is all about in terms of our exchanges on a bipartisan basis. But let me focus very briefly on why I think extension of normal trade relations with China is so important.

If we go back to the Great Leap Forward, and that was with total government-managed control of that economy, there were 60 million Chinese that starved to death. We can condemn Deng Xiaoping for a lot of things, but one thing that he will be most remembered for is as the initiator of what he called Leninist capitalism, the ultimate oxymoron. But he did advance free enterprise in mainland China, and free enterprise has expanded so dramatically that our concern as a people,

which is not the government, it is the Chinese people over there, and bear in mind that of 1.2 billion, only 40 million of them are allegedly Communists, and I think they are too bright even to be Communists, I think they are just bright pragmatists that have got a good thing going for themselves.

But the fact of the matter is, more Chinese people today are enjoying a higher standard of living than ever before in the history of China, in its 5,000 years, and that is continuing to expand dramatically, and it is because of their commitment to free enterprise.

Now, we want to aid and abet and help them in that effort, to be sure, and that is why maintaining our contacts and our business contacts is a good idea. As Ben Franklin said, a good example is the best sermon. We are providing the best sermon by our presence over there in mainland China, and that is continuing to improve the lot for all of the Chinese people.

I would urge my colleagues to recognize that there are alternative ways to address legitimate questions that have come up about arms transfers, legitimate questions that come up about human rights violations, but harking back to the original reference to our inalienable rights to life, liberty and property, Thomas Jefferson was absolutely correct. I mean he used that phrase, ''pursuit of happiness,'' but it was property.

□ 1530

The fact of the matter is, how do you enjoy life if you do not eat? That means having access to property and expanding and improving that access, especially in terms of food, shelter, and clothing. That is happening at an unprecedented rate over there.

The last remaining issue to be addressed through that is liberty, but that is where our presence can set that good example. I would urge my colleagues to vote down the well-intentioned resolution of disapproval, and to guarantee that we continue what is sound policy into the future, and holds the greatest hope we have ever had in our post-World War II relations with mainland China; namely, normal trade relations.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 79, the resolution to disapprove extension of MFN for China. I have serious concerns about China's overall human rights record. However, if we do not have engagement we will be doing more harm than good—how do we isolate 1.2 billion people? We have tried isolation and it did not work. In arriving at this decision, I found particularly compelling the words of Rev. Billy Graham who said ''we must do all we can to strengthen our relationship with China. It is far better to treat it as a friend, than to treat it as an adversary.'' I believe it is in North Carolina's best interest to engage China and build on our strengths rather than damage a trade relationship which other nations will vigorously pursue in our absence.

Exports, especially in the agriculture sector, are essential to North Carolina's economy. China represents a large and growing market for our goods and services. This market supports thousands of jobs here at home. Agricultural exports to China from the United States have grown from $333 million in 1993 to $2 billion in 1996 and the prospect of future growth is tremendous. Every $1 billion in additional exports creates nearly 20,000 new, high-wage jobs in the United States. For North Carolina, which exports $544 million—ninth among U.S. States—in goods a year to China—$297 million—and Hong Kong—$247 million—engaging China through trade will provide jobs for North Carolina's workers and help ensure our economic success into the next century. I also believe it will allow us to press for better human rights policies as we increase our economic involvement.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 79, China, disapproval of most-favored-nation [MFN] trade treatment for China.

My vote against this resolution—a vote to continue MFN for China—is not without deliberation.

I am deeply concerned about the continuing allegations that China has not made sufficient progress in their human rights and democracy reform efforts. Both the State Department and prominent international organizations such as Amnesty International cite the persistence of jailed and exiled Chinese dissidents. However, I believe that the human rights issues must be approached independently of our trade relationship with China.

MFN is not foreign aid. The United States grants MFN—which is normal trade status—to nearly 100 countries, and every President since 1980 has annually renewed MFN for China. MFN to China means that we grant them normal tariff status. This is a policy that the United States grants to all but a handful of countries—Cuba, North Korea, Afghanistan, Laos, and Vietnam. In fact, countries such as Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria, and Burma—where many believe there continues to be abuse of human rights—receive MFN treatment.

I want to see the administration work more aggressively to encourage human rights and religious freedom in China. But I do not believe that denying MFN to China will achieve that goal. Cutting off normal trade relations with China will only further isolate a country with one-quarter of the world's population.

China continues to grow as one of the United States' main trading partners. U.S. exports to China have almost quadrupled in the last 10 years. Exports to China support more than 17,000 jobs in the United States that, on average, pay 13 to 16 percent more than non-export jobs. As key industries in the United States, such as telecommunications, grow, we need to maintain trade policy that will increase market access and ensure that U.S. companies have opportunities in those emerging markets. Illinois, for example, has benefited from trade with China. Over the last 2 years, exports from Illinois to China have increased 9 percent to $1.6 billion. And this trade growth contributes to nearly 600,000 export-related jobs in the State.

And while these benefits are significant, I continue to be concerned about the data regarding China's reliance on prison labor to manufacture many of its exports. Since the early 1990's, in responses to charges that Chinese political prisoners were used to manufacture goods for export to the United States, the administration—through the Customs and State Department—began investigating these charges. Our Government signed a memorandum of understanding [MOU] with China in 1992 to facilitate inspection of Chinese prisons. And continued allegations of using prison labor led the administration to tighten procedures for investigations and visits under the memorandum. I am aware that Chinese cooperation in implementing the memorandum falls short of being satisfactory. But the administration is committed to fully enforce the terms of the agreement. Since the MOU took effect, U.S. Customs officials have made 58 referrals to the Chinese Ministry of Justice for further investigation. And according to the administration, Customs has obtained two prison labor-related convictions. I believe that continuing normal MFN for China will facilitate the enforcement of the MOU.

As a Member of Congress, I will vigilantly monitor the progress of human rights, workers' rights, and political democracy in China. I am deeply committed to these values. However, I do not believe that the resolution we are voting on today, is the proper arena to debate these issues; nor is revocation of MFN the most effective way to influencing internal Chinese policies. I believe that a more comprehensive approach will serve as a better means to bringing about a change in Chinese policy, particularly in terms of human rights. In America's dealings with China, history has shown that a more moderate approach is most effective.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, fellow colleagues, I rise in opposition to the resolution and in support of extending MFN treatment to China. The term MFN refers to the normal, nondiscriminatory tariff treatment that the United States provides to all its trading partners. It is the cornerstone of commercial relations between the United States and any foreign country. MFN status is not a concession and does not mean that China is getting preferable treatment. Rather, MFN status means that China and the United States grant each other the same—no less favorable—tariff treatment that they provide to other countries with MFN status. The United States provides special tariff preferences to a few selected trading partners under the NAFTA, United States-Israel Free Trade Agreement, Caribbean Basin Initiative, Andean Pact, and the Generalized System of Preferences program. Eligible imports from these countries enter the United States duty-free or are subject to duties lower than the MFN rate. China is not eligible for any form of preferential or special treatment. It is only getting the same type of treatment that we extend to other countries.

Terminating China's MFN status would seriously affect virtually all trade between the two countries, eliminate some of it, and result in higher prices for U.S. consumers and possible losses for U.S. exporters and lead to a significant downgrading of bilateral relations. Hence, carrying out a threat to terminate China's MFN status could significantly damage United States-China economic as well as political relations. The United States is the only country that conditions MFN status for China. If the United States terminated China's MFN status, it is highly doubtful United States allies would follow suit. Furthermore, American workers benefit most from an extension of most-favored-nation status for China. In 1996, United States exports to China were valued at $12

billion, and of almost 200 United States trading partners, China ranked 15th as an export market for American goods. If MFN were conditioned or withdrawn, the United States would unilaterally impose higher tariffs on Chinese goods, and Beijing would almost likely take its business elsewhere. Thus, because every 1 billion dollars' worth of exports creates approximately 19,000 jobs in the U.S., the loss of exports to China would put 228,000 American jobs directly at risk. Also, MFN revocation would increase tariffs on imports from China trade-weighted average of about 6 percent to an estimated 44 percent. MFN revocation, even accounting for changes in trade flows, will require U.S. consumers to pay upward of half-a-billion dollars more each year for goods such as shoes, clothing, and small appliances subject to increased tariffs. In addition, the costs of goods manufactured in the United States with Chinese components could increase, reducing the competitiveness of the finished goods.

I sympathize with the victims of the many atrocious practices that China has engaged with in the past. I also agree with the rationale of many of my colleagues who seek to revoke China's MFN status due to its human rights violations. However, revoking China's MFN status is too drastic and most likely would prove to be counterproductive.

I would like to remind my colleagues of an old maxim, ''Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measured ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.''

If we want a more humane, China that shows respect for her own people, who are some of the most creative, artistic, brilliant people on this Earth, we had better be prepared to lead by first showing China what it takes to be a superpower. Power is not dictated by the ability to say no, most often it is the ability to say yes under the most difficult circumstances. We must pause to consider that the measure of the right of our social, political, and economic systems are far greater than the sum of all of our arguments regarding the atrocities in that distant land. By the sheer force of this country united under God we will teach, preach, and reach every corner of China with the messages and symbols that translate into over 200 years of success that the American experience has been.

MFN is not a reward; nor is it a special treatment that results in special trade privileges. MFN simply refers to the nondiscriminatory treatment of trading partners, which has long been a basic principle of international trade. While China clearly has violated numerous trade agreements in the past, the best way to secure Chinese compliance is to engage the Chinese Government, not isolate it.

Furthermore, the strongest case for keeping United States trade relations with China is made by Hong Kong and Taiwan's political and business leadership. They argue, if the United States breaks the trade tether to Beijing, it will undermine future economic and human rights for the Chinese people for years to come. Hong Kong's British Governor Chris Patten and prodemocracy leader Martin Lee have come out forcefully against using China's trade status as a way of showing United States displeasure with its human rights abuses. Chinese human rights leaders elsewhere are opposed to using trade as leverage against their country because they believe; First, it will not work, and second, stronger economic ties to the West and private-sector expansion will lead to an expanded middle class, greater political freedoms, and eventually a democratic system of government.

MFN status for China cannot be compared to the decision by the Congress to place sanctions on South Africa. South Africa's regime was based on a policy of discrimination based on race and race alone. In China the battle is of tolerance of thoughts and ideas, not of skin color or complexion.

We must consider that Hong Kong and Taiwan have been investing heavily in China's emerging capitalist system and they see increased United States trade ties as the linchpin in the dramatic economic changes going throughout the mainland. Now that historic transfer is at hand we should not abandon the people of Taiwan during this critical transition period.

Extension of MFN is an importnt step in preserving Hong Kong's prosperity and freedom. Today, the Chinese economy is the fastest growing in the world. While many Chinese remain poor peasants, few go hungry and hundreds of millions of Chinese have seen their lives substantially improved through economic reform. Many Chinese people enjoy greater material wealth and a greater degree of personal economic freedom. Market reform is the single most powerful force for positive change in China in this century and possibly in the country's long history. In fact, economic reform has helped to lift hundreds of millions of hardworking people from desperate poverty, giving them choices and opportunities never available before. Thus, hundred of millions of hardworking people have access to information and contact with Western values through technologies spreading across the country, thanks to economic reform and the growth it created.

China has made good faith efforts to comply with the concerns of the United States. For example, in 1995, the United States reached a historic agreement with China on the enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights, particularly copyrights, trademarks, and improved market access for United States copyright industries ranging from computer software and motion pictures to publishing and sound recordings. China has also made commitments to strengthen the enforcement at its borders and to close plants engaged in piracy.

The people of Hong Kong strongly support a full one-year extension of MFN. If China loses MFN, Hong Kong would lose a colossal amount of business. United States economic growth in international trade would be halved and our unemployment would be doubled. Also, business confidence would be hit hard. If the United States is concerned about the handover, then the best thing is to assure the community by making sure that nothing happens to Hong Kong. The fundamental question for renewing MFN treatment to China is, if China's trade status were denied, would the impact in the long run be good or harmful for the Chinese and American people and, in particular, for improving China's human rights?

My fellow colleagues, I have debated long and hard over this issue, and while I do have reservations about providing MFN treatment to China while they continue to engage in abusive actions, I believe that the most efficient way to combat these abuses is to ensure that the grassroots of the Chinese population is exposed to Western ideals and financial stability. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of extending MFN treatment to China.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 79, and in opposition to the extension of most-favored-nation [MFN] status to China. The failure of current policies to yield significant improvements in Chinese behavior, both at home and abroad, signals the need for Congress to chart a new course. MFN may not be the ideal vehicle but it is the most powerful mechanism we have to move China into compliance with internationally accepted norms. The United States represents 40 percent of China's export market, an amount equal to 2 or 3 percent of its gross domestic product. U.S. markets and purchasing power are irreplaceable. Because trade is the only weapon in our arsenal that China still pays attention to, we must use our economic power and influence as leverage to positively impact Chinese behavior and to advance fundamental United States interests in China.

As the world's most populous country, China boasts one of the most rapidly growing markets in the entire world. Yet despite MFN status, China remains a dictatorial society governed by a Communist oligarchy hardly a monolith but China uniformly continues to deny market access to the majority of American goods and products. Countries that do not abide by universally accepted rules and regulations forfeit privileges and rights in the global trading arena. MFN would grant Chinese goods the normal level of access and protection afforded to members of the World Trade Organization [WTO]. With rights and privileges come responsibilities, particularly the need to abide by international norms. China's behavior—whether through the abuse of human rights or worker protections or through the erection of trade barriers—has indicated that it fails to merit a normal trading relationship with other members of the WTO. Regular trade with the United States is not the right of a nation that violates basic economic and human rights standards.

However, the numbers bear witness to the fact that our trading relationship with China is anything but normal or reciprocal. The average United States MFN tariff on Chinese goods is 3 percent while the average Chinese MFN tariff on United States goods is a staggering 35 percent. Granting MFN year after year has unfortunately produced no reciprocity in trade policy. It has however, produced an enormous trade deficit, that is on target to surpass our trade deficit with Japan sometime this year. China has argued that as a developing country it should be granted special exemptions and allowances; however, a developing country that registered a $40 billion trade surplus with the United States in 1996, should not be the recipient of such markedly underserved charity, especially in consideration of their total behavior.

China's one-way trade policy and the accelerating trade deficit highlight that the promise of future massive payoffs is a mirage. In 1996, the United States exported fewer goods to China than it did to relatively small markets such as Belgium and the Netherlands. Our exports are increasing at a more rapid rate in the stagnant economies of the European Union than they are in the dynamic Chinese economy. The situation in Japan has shown how difficult overcoming protectionist policies and reducing trade deficits can be. It is in our interest to avoid similar problems with China,

which potentially will represent a far larger market than Japan.

America businesses are being forced to offer major concessions to Chinese state planners, often technology and investment, in order to gain access to potential Chinese customers. By supplying China with state-of-the-art technology, United States firms are shipping jobs overseas that would otherwise remain at home if China were to allow the unfettered entry of foreign goods. Through the extension of MFN we are exporting to China the capability to develop domestic industries establishing export platforms of what are today United States products will be sent around the world.

The technologies of American business partners, means that even the limited United States goods and products will be abandoned in favor of indigenous enterprises that are being made in China. Trade policy should be facilitating the export of goods, not jobs, and a fundamental message policymakers must bear in mind, is that the current trade phenomena threatens the job security of American workers and means that United States investment in China receive the safe harbor treatment, positive trade status insures and encourages yet more United States investment to the point that action to counter isn't possible.

All workers and members of Chinese society should equally share in the profits of economic growth in China. However, the reality is that the benefits are reserved for the few in order to suppress the freedoms of the many. Accordingly, human rights violations have actually increased—not decreased—since we have adopted the policy of constructive engagement. China continues to deliberately and consciously deny its citizens basic human rights. Virtually all dissidents are either in exile, in jail, or under house arrest. Workers still cannot form an employee union of their own choosing, nor undertake any legal action to challenge abysmal working conditions. Instead of investing in its people, the Chinese Government is using the added income from the burgeoning United States-China trade surplus to consolidate its stronghold on the diverse cultures of the Chinese people. China's $40 billion trade surplus has enabled the Government to increase national defense spending by 40 percent since 1990. As the United States and Russia are cutting military expenditures, China is pursuing efforts to purchase new generations of high-technology weaponry and exporting outside their borders to terrorist countries helping such as Iran to realize its dreams of nuclear capabilities. Only China has nuclear missiles aimed toward the United States, yet we continue to reward the Chinese Government committed to building military capabilities rather than individual liberties with MFN status.

In the race for the fabled profits of the Chinese market, we have cast away both United States national interests and principles. Trade policy without conscience has not satisfied the Chinese population's hunger for personal and civil liberties. There is no question that granting China MFN status will benefit larger American companies; however, it will adversely impact small businesses and accelerate the decline of the United States manufacturing base. United States economic and trade policy clearly is the ugly American theme revisited in China. And at home no amount of profit can replace a job lost or restore the damage done to U.S. communities. We need a trade strategy with China that balances the interests and values of companies, workers, families, and communities. We must solidify our commitment to upholding democracy and human rights and abandon policies that assume the interests of international corporations are identical to the U.S. national interest as a whole.

Many lament that trade policy alone will not bring about the changes sought that it is inadequate, but we must try to isolate and lead, unless the United States of America. The global leader is ready to led others will fall into our economic shadow of indifference.

Trade relations with China are so complex that they understandably defy easy solutions. In order to craft an effective and comprehensive trade policy with China, we need more options and flexibility than the yes/no decision being made today. Extending MFN for a year sends to China the dangerous signal of business as usual: That there are no consequences for irresponsible, inhumane, and unfair behavior. Denial of MFN trade status is a dramatic step, on the other hand, could result in the reciprocal and humane treatment that past policies have failed to produce. The most effective way to forcefully advance United States interests and to embark upon a new era of United States-China relations is to vote ''yes'' on this resolution and not extend normal trade status to China and then back that up with action not rhetoric.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to see China change. I am tired of waiting for China to improve its human rights record, to stop repressing the people of Tibet, to allow civil liberties and public dissent, and to stop persecuting religious minorities. I'm deeply disturbed by China's arms sales to Pakistan and Iran. If I could, I would push a button, cast my vote, and make the Chinese Government change its ways.

So I understand the appeal of voting for this resolution. It would be very satisfying, for a few minutes, to feel that I did something, that the Congress did something, to make China change.

But I have to step back and ask whether revoking most-favored-nation [MFN] trading status to China would have the desired effect, and if not, what will. I don't think passing this resolution will make China change.

This cannot be just a one-sided debate. We must consider not only the areas where we have real and heartfelt disagreement with the Chinese Government's actions and policies, but also those often complex areas where Chinese cooperation with the United States has had and will have enormous consequences. And there are important areas where China has cooperated with us: Working with us to stop North Korea's nuclear weapons development; helping us in the U.N. Security Council on the war against Iraq and subsequent sanctions; and assisting United States efforts to implement the nuclear test ban and extend the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. In these areas, cooperation and engagement with China made all the difference in policies that are vital to our national security.

In just 1 week, Hong Kong will be transferred from British to Chinese sovereignty. We in the Congress have pressed China to live up to its promise of ''one country, two systems'' for Hong Kong. I have joined with other Members of Congress in calling on the Chinese Government to respect the political and economic freedom of the citizens of Hong Kong. Yet, once Hong Kong is under Chinese rule, trade with Hong Kong would also be subject to stiff tariff increases if MFN trading status is revoked. So, at the very time the Congress is pushing China to safeguard freedoms in Hong Kong, Congress would be undermining Hong Kong's independence and autonomy by severely damaging its economy. It's estimated that revoking MFN would cut Hong Kong's economic growth in half, reduce trade by $30 billion, and cost 85,000 Hong Kong workers their jobs—making Hong Kong dependent on the Chinese regime during this critical transition period.

I have long advocated improved human rights in China. After the 1989 massacre in Tiananmen Square, I organized a protest march of more than two dozen Members of Congress who walked across Washington from the United States Capitol to the Chinese Embassy, where we met with the Chinese Ambassador and presented in the strongest possible terms our views that the Chinese Government needed to change its ways.

I have also been very concerned about the persecution of Christians, and other religious minorities in China. Yet activists working to stop the persecution of Christians are of two minds on this issue. Many, including Rev. Billy Graham and a number of Chinese Christians, have said that they feel engagement with China is the better course.

Revoking MFN trading status means in effect that the United States would be imposing a huge unilateral increase in tariffs on Chinese goods. No other country is expected or likely to join us in raising tariffs, and that means revocation of MFN would be a unilateral economic sanction. Given the particular culture of the Chinese, I do not believe that this kind of sanction will be any more successful against China than unilateral trade sanctions have been against any other country. And many of our international competitors are quite ready to take over the United States share of the Chinese market.

The debate suffers from semantics, the misunderstandings of ''most favored nation'' as implying something special and concessionary. Actually, of course, ''most favored nation'' trading status is just ''normal'' trading status—it is the tariff schedule that applies to almost every other nation we trade with, even countries with human rights records far from our liking. There are only five countries to which we deny MFN status: Afghanistan, Cuba, Laos, North Korea, and Vietnam. Even the ''rogue states'' of Iran, Iraq, and Libya, although subject to other economic sanctions, are technically eligible for MFN. Countries like Syria or Indonesia, whose human rights records we often decry in the Congress, have MFN trading status.

Cutting off MFN status would mean that we would lose the opportunity to expose China to free market principles and values. I spoke recently with a constituent who has worked with Chinese mining companies. He told me that China has averaged 10,000 deaths per year in mining accidents. Yet to work with this American company meant that the Chinese had to accept American standards of worker safety that tolerate virtually no worker fatalities. This seems a most basic lesson—that workers should not have to risk their lives to earn a living. American business men and women,

interacting with their Chinese counterparts, will be able to expose the Chinese to many such standards and principles. Over time, it will make a difference, not just in economics, but in human dignity and human rights.

The globalizing world economy and the revolution in information exchange and technology offers an unprecedented set of circumstances that will tend to push all but the most isolated of nations toward integration with the international community. To finance expanding trade, China needs foreign capital and investment. With that investment comes exposure to internationally recognized values and freedoms. With advances in information technology, such as the Internet, electronic mail, and fax machines—most of which are essential for doing business today—repressive governments like China's are fast losing their ability to control what people can read, learn, and think.

There are other, more positive, levers we can use to encourage China to loosen its repressive policies. One of those levers is Chinese accession to the World Trade Organization [WTO]. I expect our negotiators to drive a hard bargain for market access and improved business practices before we can agree to China joining the WTO, a body China feels is essential for its trade expansion policies.

Engagement will take time, and it is hard to be patient. It will take time for trade, investment, and foreign enterprise to break the iron grip the Chinese regime has over its people. But American trade, products, and most importantly exposure to American values and people carry the seeds of change. Ultimately, China cannot sustain the economic liberalization supporting its trade with the United States without seeing an inevitable erosion of its political isolation and its authoritarian regime.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of renewing most-favored-nation [MFN] trading status to China. MFN status is extended to virtually every country in the world and permits a normal trading relationship with China. There's nothing ''special'' or ''favored'' about MFN.

I believe that continuing this normal trading relationship is critical to advancing U.S. interests. First, of course, revoking MFN, would significantly raise tariffs on Chinese imports—costing United States consumers more of their hard earned money. Failure to extend MFN would also hurt our exports which has been steadily growing every year and support thousands of U.S. jobs. The Chinese would undoubtedly retaliate, putting our jobs and exports at risk. We would be giving our global competitors an open shot at the one of the world's biggest markets.

But even more important, if we are to disengage from China and walk away from the table, the very problems we have with China will worsen—especially in the important area of human rights.

Because we engage with China does not mean that we approve of its practices. As an example, I have grave concerns about its human rights record. But the question is how disengaging will help. Instead, we should want the Chinese to become increasingly familiar with American ideals through our contact with them.

Mr. Speaker, renewal of MFN has been supported by every President who has faced this issue, and is supported throughout Asia, including in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Japan. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the disapproval resolution and support renewing most-favored-nation trading status to China. Simply put, continued engagement with China is the only way to help China become a constructive force for stability and prosperity in Asia, and advance important American interests.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support House Joint Resolution 79, disapproving most-favored-nation status for China. While I am an ardent supporter of free trade, and have voted consistently for continuation of MFN for China, my recent trip there has changed my position on this issue as it provided me with first-hand information on what is really going on in China. I left that country with the overwhelming impression that the Chinese do not care what the United States thinks about their behavior. I have voted on four previous occasions to give China the benefit of the doubt about its intention to open its markets to United States businesses and farmers but the Chinese continue to thumb their noses at the United States. While I would like to support a policy aimed at opening markets and expanding trade, there has to be a level playing field for such a policy to work. Instead, China continues to raise artificial barriers and place high tariffs on American goods and commodities, including United States-grown peanuts. The trade deficit last year alone with China was $40 billion.

In addition, China's human rights record, particularly against Tibet and Taiwan, is abysmal. Along with its disregard for human rights, the Chinese strategically ignore numerous international treaties they have signed on arms proliferation. We have seen numerous well documented reports where China is selling highly sophisticated nuclear technology to Iran. Additionally, it continues to transfer advanced ballistic missile technology to Syria and Pakistan.

The business community genuinely hopes to influence positive change in China but I did not see that during my visit. There is no American-style democracy, free enterprise, or human rights. Rather, I saw a government that controlled every aspect of life. The Chinese consistently violate workers' rights with many workers laboring under slave-like conditions. American companies that wish to sell their products in China must locate production in that country and share ownership with the Chinese Government. We are currently transferring very sophisticated technology to China who hen turn around and use our technology against us.

It's time to send China a message by withholding MFN status for China. I would be derelict in my duty to ignore neglect, which I do not believe is benign neglect.

Each year when I voted for MFN for China I did it with the hope that this is the year the Chinese will pay some attention to our concerns more specifically, stop violating the provisions of the general agreement on tariffs and trade, and be shamed into improving its human rights record. Sadly, this has not been the case and I have no choice but in clear conscience to vote NO for MFN for China.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, as a physician, I know that what, at first, might seem to be a cure for a particular ailment is, in actuality, not a cure at all. In fact, going with a gut reaction to prescribe a treatment can do more harm than the original ailment may have. The same can be true for matters of government. The initial reaction to a problem in society, or the world will often lead us to make a conclusion about a course of action. Unfortunately, that first reaction can be wrong, even though guided by the best of intentions.

We have such a case before us now. It is the dilemma of whether or not China should be granted the same trade relationship granted to almost every other nation of the world, a status misleadingly referred to as most favored nation, or MFN. We all know the charges: The Chinese Government violates basic human rights of its citizens, it is hostile towards Christianity, and its system of government runs contrary to our most fundamental beliefs, therefore MFN status should be denied. The initial reaction of our collective national psyche is to oppose MFN, to be tough, and say, ''No way, no special deals for China.'' But is this the proper solution?

To clear up a misconception, MFN is not a special status at all. In fact, MFN status granted to a country simply means that U.S. citizens can trade with citizens of that nation without erection of extraordinary government barriers to entering our marketplace. Free trade is not something to be lightly dismissed. And MFN is nothing more than an attempt, albeit imperfect, to move towards free trade by lowering tariffs.

Eliminating MFN status for China does not hurt the Chinese Government. But it does hurt Americans in two ways. First, by imposing what is essentially a tax on our people. It is a tax because it is the American consumer who will pay higher prices on goods coming from China. This means higher prices on many items and not just items which come directly from China. If the tariffs on Chinese goods increase, people will be forced to find replacement products. As the demand for those products increase, so will prices of those goods.

The second means by which eliminating MFN status hurts Americans can be found in the reciprocal barriers China will likely erect. It will become much more difficult for farmers and businessmen in the United States to sell their products in China. Nearly every farmer and every agricultural group I have heard from supports MFN status for China.

But the critics of MFN for China do not address the free-trade aspect of the debate, or the very real cost eliminating MFN would impose upon the American people. Instead, they focus on the real persecution of religious minorities' often practiced by the government in China. And for that I defer to those who are on the ground in China: the missionaries.

According to Father Robert Sirico, a Paulist priest who recently discussed this topic on the Wall Street Journal's opinion page, Americans in China working to help the Chinese people are very frightened of what ending MFN might do to their efforts and the people to whom they minister. After all, ending MFN will not bring about the freedoms we hope China may confer upon its people, nor will ending MFN mean more religious freedom or fewer human rights violations. In fact, those working in China to bring about positive change fear only the worst if MFN is withdrawn.

''As commercial networks develop, Chinese business people are able to travel freely, and Chinese believers have more disposable income with which to support evangelistic endeavors,'' Sirico writes. Even worse, the missionaries have been reporting that ''such action would endanger their status there, and

possibly lead China to revoke their visas. It would severely limit opportunities to bring in * * * religious materials. These missionaries understand that commercial relations are a wonderfully liberating force that allow not only mutually beneficial trade but also cultural and religious exchanges.''

And so the critical question remains: MFN, or no MFN? Idealogically, revoking MFN is a step in the wrong direction, a step away from free trade. It is equally clear that revoking MFN is harmful to our people, and likely to be harmful to the Chinese. The ones to suffer will be the very individuals we seek to help, not the powerful elite in Beijing.

I have long held that governments do not solve problems. Rather, governmental action often creates more problems than existed previously. It is the individual people who are able to bring about positive change in this world; it is individuals who solve problems. China's government is indeed a concern: for us and its people. But it is a problem we can only resolve by changing the hearts of the Chinese leaders. And whether we like it or not, the way we can do that is through trade with China.

By rushing quickly for the ''pills'' of government-enforced sanctions, we may have the best of intentions to cure the Chinese Government of its persecution of human rights. But unfortunately, those pills will only harm the patient. We must swallow our pride and admit that perhaps the best remedy is not the first solution.

It is only through the open dialogue of individuals that the Chinese Government will ever be convinced it is wrong. By closing the door now, when we have the opportunity to allow to grow the seeds of change which have been so firmly planted in China, we will be damning that nation's people to a return to their darker days.

We will lose the patient if we act hastily or imprudently and that cannot be the correct option. It is never an option when I have a patient on the operating table, and it cannot be an option when dealing with the situation in China.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, China is a rogue nation, ruled by totalitarians and Communists. It oppresses its people, and denies them basic freedoms and religious liberty. It fails to abide by standards of good citizenship in the community of nations. Its officials have been tied with attempts to influence the 1996 elections in the United States through contributions to the Democratic National Committee.

In this environment, now Congress must decide whether continuing or essentially canceling regular American commerce with China will advance or damage America's national interests. These interests include national security, human rights and religious liberty, and commerce and American jobs.

I take a back seat to no one as a defender of liberty, and as an opponent of communism and tyranny. I understand that this issue generates well-considered and strongly held opinions on all sides. I believe that the Clinton administration has badly mishandled our relationship with China, and that Congress has no choice but to fill the vacuum of leadership left by the President.

With very few measures have I so deeply struggled with determining the best course of action, and with identifying what is right and wrong for America. After having carefully considered all of the facts, and reviewed all of the notes and letters and calls from my constituents, I conclude that our best hope for progress of American national interests in China is best fulfilled by extending China's regular trade status, and taking further actions that demonstrate a more robust American policy in that part of the world. I further conclude that blocking the renewal of MFN for China would damage America's national interests, in national security, human rights and religious freedoms, and American commerce and jobs.

History and recent experience tells us that MFN gives the United States some leverage to advance our interests in China—but not a great deal of leverage. But if we cancel MFN, America's small leverage will become zero leverage. And China will turn away from America, and have no incentive to heed any of America's desires and interests.

Let me first address the matter of American national security. Beijing has exhibited poor citizenship in the world. It tested missiles in the Taiwan Straits on the eve of free elections in Taiwan in 1996. It sold weapons and nuclear and other weapons materials to rogue terrorist nations. It attempted to expand its maritime presence in former United States military facilities, as in the case of COSCO at Long Beach Naval Station, and has effectively established beachheads at both ends of the strategically important Panama Canal through governmental industry subsidiaries. It smuggled AK–47 rifles into the United States, bound for Los Angeles street gangs. It increased its defense budget 40 percent over the past couple of years. In light of this current and emerging national security interest, it becomes clear that only by extending MFN for China can we hope to preserve the American interest and the American presence in China and East Asia. For this reason, several of our recent United States Secretaries of Defense have agreed to support continuing China's MFN status.

Having nearly lost my life fighting communism in Vietnam, this matter of what action best represents America's national security interests is a matter I take very seriously. I assure you that I am under no illusion that extending MFN for China will work miracles in the advancement of our national security. It will not.

But the penalty for terminating MFN for China is slightly greater than its reward. Terminating MFN with China simply drives the Beijing regime away from the United States, away from the community of law-abiding countries, into the arms of the world's terrorist nations.

Let me address the matter of human rights and religious liberty in China. Again, Beijing's record in this field is repugnant to the cause of freedom. The bill of particulars goes on and on. Beijing oppresses the Buddhist people of Tibet, and the Muslims of Xinjiang. It practices a population policy that includes forced abortions. It has detained, jailed, and killed its dissidents. It severely restricts the activities of Christians and other people of faith, and imprisons priests and ministers, and closes house churches that attempt to teach the Gospel free from the reach of the Beijing regime.

What action advances America's national interest in this area? Extending MFN continues the reach of Americans, through commerce and other outreach, into the lives of Chinese citizens. I recognize that the Christian Coalition and other United States family organizations strongly oppose extending MFN for China. But United States organizations that support Christian missionaries in China are supporting MFN for China. One of the titans of the Christian faith supports extending MFN trade status: Rev. Billy Graham. He says that ''I am in favor of doing all we can to strengthen our relationship with China and its people. China is rapidly becoming one of the dominant economic and political powers in the world, and I believe it is far better for us to keep China as a friend than to treat it as an adversary.''

Continuing MFN for China, again, does not work miracles for the people of China. Continuing it thus far has not freed opponents of China's communist government from prisons, according to the United States State Department. However, American commerce with China has given the Chinese people a taste of economic freedom, and economic freedom may pave a path toward more political and religious freedom.

Again, the penalty for terminating MFN for China exceeds its reward—particularly for China's oppressed people. If we terminate MFN for China, China will have no reason whatsoever to improve the human rights and religious freedom of its people, or to accommodate American visiting missionaries to China.

Last, I would like to address the matter of commerce and American jobs. Extending China's MFN status simply continues regular commerce with the world's most populous nation. Companies in San Diego engage in significant exports in China. Among these are Solar Turbines, power plants, Cubic, mass transit systems, Jet Products, manufacturing, and many others. Furthermore, many American jobs are dependent on imports from China. These include hundreds of thousands of retailers. And American consumers regularly purchase goods made in China.

Once again, the risks associated with terminating China's MFN status exceed their reward. If we terminate MFN for China, American jobs are endangered, and China will simply approach the employers of other nations to fulfill its market of 1.3 billion people.

Following the continuation of MFN for China, and the failures and vacillations of the Clinton administration's China policy, I believe Congress has a responsibility to exercise leadership in the United States relationship with the world's most populous country.

We can begin this by enacting the China Human Rights and Democracy Act, a measure soon to be introduced by Rep. JOHN EDWARD PORTER and others. Chairman PORTER formerly opposed China's MFN status, but is supporting it this year in hopes that we can make real progress in other areas. Chairman PORTER described this measure in today's Wall Street Journal to increase funding for Radio Free Asia and the Voice of America, expand democracy-building activities through the National Endowment for Democracy, require additional United States State Department report on human rights violations and political prisoners in China, and greater disclosure of Chinese companies' ties to the People's Liberation Army.

As we did with the USSR and Eastern Europe, we can blanket the Chinese people, and all freedom-loving peoples of Southeast Asia, with broadcasts about freedom and democracy in the outside World. We can also pursue

other aggressive initiatives to stand tall and strong for freedom in East Asia—initiatives which thus far have not been part of the Clinton administration's weak American policy toward China.

Congress can and should take further action to send China powerful signals of our intention to advance our interests. The fiscal year 1998 national defense authorization includes the Hunter-Cunningham language from H.R. 1138, prohibiting the leasing of former U.S. military facilities to foreign state-owned enterprises. Specifically, this will block COSCO, the maritime arm of the communist Chinese regime in Beijing, from leasing a large beachhead at the former Long Beach Naval Station.

And the House has already voted to establish direct United States ties with Hong Kong, which reverts from British to Chinese control in just a few days.

Extending China's regular MFN trade status does not work miracles. We should extend MFN because it helps advance our national interests in China in freedom and religious liberty, in national security, and in commerce and jobs. We should extend China's MFN status because blocking MFN would hurt, not help, our national interests in China.

But we cannot stop there. Congress has a responsibility to take the sure and strong actions that implant backbone into United States-China relations, a spine that is thus far missing from the Clinton administration's own policy. We can act. And we will.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 79, a resolution to disapprove most-favored-nation [MFN] treatment to the People's Republic of China.

Our trade deficit with China in 1996 was $40 billion. By the end of 1997, the trade deficit is projected to be $53 billion, which averages out to the staggering sum of $1 billion a week. A large part of this is due to the fact that China charges American products with extremely high tariffs. For instance, China levies a 50 to 120 percent tariff on imported cars, a 50 percent tariff on imported athletic shoes, a 60 percent tariff on imported leather shoes, and a 40 percent tariff on imported toys. In all instances, United States tariffs on Chinese imports are substantially lower. China sells millions and millions of bikes in the United States, because we only levy a 11 percent tariff, while China charges us 50 percent. On average, the United States levies a tariff rate of 2 percent on Chinese goods. The Chinese have levies a 35 percent tariff rate on United States goods. We hear so much about free trade, but our trade relationship with China certainly isn't free, and it certainly isn't fair. It costs American jobs. It's just plain wrong for the American working men and women.

We constantly hear from China and the administration that trade and foreign policy should be separate issues. They should not be linked. That is a very interesting argument coming from China considering they are one of the most skilled practitioners of such a policy. They reward friends and punish enemies with economic carrots and sticks in the form of huge government contracts.

Moreover, the use of trade sanctions is not without precedent. It has been a vital component of U.S. foreign policy. We sanctioned the Soviet Union by the restriction of technology transfers, denial of MFN under the Jackson-Vanik amendment, and embargoes on Soviet purchases of American wheat. We maintain a trade embargo against Cuba. We deny MFN to North Korea and Afghanistan. We will soon impose sanctions on Burma. Why should we treat China and different? The answer is that we shouldn't. We should treat China a totalitarian regime in every sense, as we have treated totalitarian regimes in the past. We must not coddle them. We must not appease them. We must not assist them.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for this resolution will be a vote for democracy it will be a vote for the ideals that founded this Republic. The ideals that make this Nation truly great. As the sole remaining superpower in the world, we must send a strong message to the totalitarian regime in Beijing that her actions will not be tolerated any longer. Enough is enough. I strongly urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 79.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD an article by Frank Gaffney, executive director of the Center for Security Policy, that appeared in today's Washington Times, titled "Dealing with China." I believe that this insightful article should be read by all Members of Congress and American citizens who are concerned that the United States Government develop a comprehensive strategy to deter aggression by Communist China.

[From the Washington Times, June 24, 1997]

DEALING WITH CHINA

(By Frank Gaffney, Jr.)

As the House of Representatives prepares to vote on President Clinton's decision to renew Most Favored Nation (MFN) status for China, it is being flooded with free advice. Lobbyists representing firms doing business with the People's Republic—or hoping to do so—are aggressively warning Congress of the economic costs of failing to "re-up"; human rights and religious groups are emphasizing the costs in terms of freedom and religious tolerance for the Chinese people if the United States continues to turn a blind eye to Beijing's repressive policies.

Yesterday, five of the finest public servants I have had the privilege of knowing—Jeane Kirkpatrick, Jack Kemp, Lamar Alexander, Steve Forbes and Donald Rumsfeld—weighed in with their own take. Much of what they say should be done with respect to U.S. policy apart from the question of MFN I find compelling, as I am sure, will many members of Congress. I think we could agree, for example, that the following sorts of steps should be taken irrespective of one's views about renewing China's Most Favored Nation status:

Intensify efforts to provide truthful information and encouragement of those resisting communist repressing (including greatly expanding the operations of Radio Free Asia; enforcing the existing bans on importing slave-labor-produced goods; imposing penalties for religious intolerance, etc.). After all, how a nation treats its own people is a good indicator of how it is likely to deal with those of other states.

Such steps can help make clear that the United States is not an enemy of the Chinese people, but that it steadfastly opposes the totalitarian government that brutally rules them. It can also help undercut the nationalist xenophobia that the Chinese leadership promotes in its bid to retain power.

Deny front companies and banks associated with the People's Liberation Army and other inappropriate Chinese borrowing entities the opportunity to sell bonds in the U.S. market. This step can be taken in a non-disruptive fashion (for example, by creating a security-minded screening mechanism for these prospective bond issues) without fear of jeopardizing U.S. exports, jobs or "people-to-people" contacts unaffected by such cash transactions.

Block Chinese access to strategic facilities—in the United States and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, notably at the eastern and western ends of the Panama Canal.

Prohibit the sale of American military production facilities and equipment to China.

Terminate the "anything goes" policy with respect to the export of dual-use technology to Chinese end-users. In the interest of obtaining maximum pressure for change in China, U.S. allies should be offered the same choice they are currently given under the D'Amato legislation on Iran and Libya—foreign companies and nationals must decide whether to export militarily-sensitive equipment and technology to China or risk losing their unfettered access to the American marketplace.

Develop and deploy effective global missile defenses to counter China's own growing ballistic missile capabilities and those Beijing is transferring to rogue states like North Korea, Iran and Syria.

Rigorously enforce existing U.S. laws penalizing those who engage—as the Chinese government and its ostensibly private companies have been doing—in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and various menacing conventional arms.

And increase significantly the resources dedicated to uncovering and thwarting Chinese espionage, technology theft and influence operations in the United States.

Where I must respectfully disagree with my friends from Empower America, however, is about the reason why such steps are needed. They declare we "should not demonize China" and assert "there is no new Cold War, and China is not a new Cold War enemy." The truth is that the reversion of Hong Kong next week to communist control may prove to be the first battle lost by the force of freedom in a new and far more difficult phase of what Winston Churchill once called "the Twilight Struggle."

In any event, as noted in this space two weeks ago, it is not entirely up to us whether China becomes an enemy. The critically acclaimed book "The Coming Conflict with China" observes: "Before, Beijing saw American power as a strategic advantage for the PRC; now it has decided that American power represents a threat, not just to China's security but to China's plans to grow stronger and to play a paramount role in the affairs of Asia."

What is more, if it is true, strictly speaking, that "China is not a new Cold War enemy," it may not be good news. The level of engagement with China—the many billions of dollars in bilateral trade, the hundreds of PLA companies operating in this country, the tens of thousands of Chinese students and unknown numbers of Overseas Chinese with families still subject to Beijing's control—make the challenge of countering, let alone containing, the PRC infinitely more difficult that any we faced in dealing with the Soviet Union during the Cold War. We disregard or discount this problem at our peril.

The bottom line is the bottom line: The massive trade surpluses that MFN status is allowing the PRC to accrue are directly underwriting activities that will enable Beijing to become an even more formidable threat to the United States and American interests down the road. Despite its drawbacks, revoking China's Most Favored Nation status is the only measure now on the table that is fully responsive to this reality—and proportionate to the magnitude of the problem it presents.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, attached is a letter from the Business Council for United States-China Trade which I would like included in its entirety in the appropriate section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

BUSINESS COALITION FOR
U.S.-CHINA TRADE,
Washington, DC, June 23, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We urge Congress and the President to work together on a bipartisan basis to renew China's MFN status for one-year without conditions. We strongly oppose legislation which would impose new conditions on MFN, impose targeted trade sanctions, or result in anything less than a full one-year extension of MFN, or otherwise disrupt U.S.-China commercial ties.

Unconditional renewal of China's MFN trading status is in America's interest. MFN is the cornerstone of stable U.S.-China commercial relations. It is also the foundation for continued dialogue and cooperation between the United States and China over such vital concerns as security, human rights, and Hong Kong's transition.

In the next century, America's prosperity will be even more closely tied to our leadership in international trade and the Asia-Pacific region.

China is the world's largest emerging market. It is at the center of a vibrant Asia-Pacific regional economy, which will support continued growth of American trade and jobs for decades to come.

In 1996, the United States sold over $14 billion of goods and services to China. U.S.-China trade already supports over 200,000 export-related jobs, as well as tens of thousands of jobs in American retail establishments, ports, services companies, and transportation firms. It ensures American consumers a wide choice of quality goods.

China is the sixth-largest market in the world for American agriculture, and has by far the most potential. in 1996, China bought over $3.6 billion of U.S. farm products, such as wheat, grains, vegetable oil, poultry, corn, soybeans, and meat.

American trade with China helps to promote values we cherish. Ending MFN would harm the very Chinese entrepreneurs and workers whose prosperity and jobs depend on trade and access to the outside world. China's private enterprises and joint ventures are beachheads of free enterprise, which have driven the sweeping economic and political reforms of the last decade. We should support, not isolate, the segments of Chinese society which offer the best hope for further progress toward greater freedom and the rule of law for all of China.

Revoking or conditioning MFN would be a devastating blow to Hong Kong, whose economy depends on its role as the economic gateway to China and as a financial and commercial center for companies doing business in Asia. The United States should strive to bolster confidence in Hong Kong and to maintain it as a vibrant model of entrepreneurial capitalism and political freedom, as it faces an historic reversion to Chinese sovereignty.

While renewal of MFN is an important task, an equally important challenge is continuing a fundamental restructuring of U.S-China commercial relations that is essential to open new markets for American products, subject China to the rules and disciplines of the World Trade Organization (WTO), and end the destructive annual battles over MFN renewal. We urge the Administration, in close consultation with Congress, to push ahead with negotiations over China's accession to the WTO under a commercially sound market access protocol which expands sales of American goods, services, and farm products; locks in free market reforms, and advances long-term economic and political change. We look forward to working with the Congressional leadership and the Administration to achieve all of these vital goals.

Sincerely,

A & C Trade Consultants, Inc., A & D Precision Manufacturing, Inc., A. Eddy Goldfarb & Associates, A.A.A. Aircraft Supply Co., Inc., A.N. Deringer, Inc., A.O. Smith Corporation, A–1 Signal Division, ABB, Inc., Abbotec Inc., Abbott Laboratories, ABC Companies, Inc., The, ACCEL Graphics, Inc., ACCEL Technologies, Inc., ACI Int'l, Acme Foundry, Acme-Monaco Corporation, Action Instruments Inc., Action Products International Inc., ACTS Testing Labs, Inc.

Adams Air & Hydraulics, Inc., Adaptec, Inc., ADC Technologies, Inc., Adidas America, Advanced Data Management, Inc., Advanced Hardware Architectures, AEA Credit Union, AEA International, Aerex Manufacturing Inc., Aero Comm Machining, Aero Gear Inc., Aero Machine Co., Inc., Aerochem, Inc., Aeroelectronics Incorporated, Aerospace Dynamics International, Inc., Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., Aerospace Manufacturing Corp., Aerospace Products, Aerospace Services & Products, AETNA, Inc., Agrifos, L.L.C., AIMCO, Air Capitol Plating Inc., Air Conditioning & Refrigeration Institute, Air Industries Corporation, Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., Air Structures, Inc., Aircraft Tool Inc., AirNet Communications Corp., AirSep Corporation, Akro Fire Guard, Albany International Corp., Albemarle China Corporation, ALCOA, Alcone Marketing Group, Alexander Doll Company, Inc., ALJO Precision Prod., Allen's Concrete, AlliedSignal Inc., AlliedSignal-General Aviation Avionics, AMCO Brokers & Forwarders, Inc., Amer-China Partners, Ltd., American Association of Exporters and Importers, American Association of Port Authorities, American Automobile Manufacturers Association.

American Building System Inc., The American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong, The American Chamber of Commerce in New Zealand, The American Chamber of Commerce in Singapore, The American Chamber of Commerce PRC in Beijing, American Commercial Lines, Inc., American Crop Protection Association, American Electronics Association, American Electronics Association—Texas Council, American Electronics Group, Inc., American Express Company, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Feed Industry Association, American Forest & Paper Association, American Home Products Corporation, The American Import Co./Taico Trading Corp., American International Foods, American International Group, Inc., American League for Exports and Security Assistance, American Pacific Enterprises, American Racing Custom Wheels, American River International, American Seed Trade Association, American Standard Companies, Inc., Ameritech International, Amersham Corporation, Ames Department Stores, Inc., AMF Bowling Products, AMI Metals Inc., Amicale Industries, Inc., AMOCO, Amoco Chemical, AMP Incorporated, AmPro Corp., AMS Industries Inc., AMT—The Association for Manufacturing Technology, Amway Corporation, Andreae, Vick & Associates, Anheuser-Busch Companies, Inc., Anjar Co., Anwo Machine and Tool Co. Inc., APL Limited, Apparel Unlimited, Inc., Apple Computer, Inc., Applied Materials, Inc.

Applix, Aquafine Corporation, Arcadia Supply Inc., ARCO, ARCO Chemical Company, Arizona Coalition for US/China Trade, Armstrong Global, Armstrong Holdings, Armstrong World Industries, Inc., ARR–MAZ Products, Arrow Electric, Inc, Arthur Andersen LLP, ASI Aerospace Group, Asian Strategies Group, Asset Intertech, Inc., Associated Company, Inc., Associated General Contractors of America, Associated Industries, Associated Industries of Missouri, Associated Merchandising Corporation, Association of American Railroads, Association of National Advertisers, Inc., AT & T, Athens Industries, Atlas Aero Corporation, Atsco Footwear Inc., Autozone, Avco Financial Services, Inc, AVO International, Avon Products Inc., Award Software International, Inc., B & B Machine & Tooling, B & F Sales Corp., B & J International Supply, B & S Steel of Kansas, Inc., B.G. Imaging Specialties, Inc., B.J. Rocca Jr. and Co., Babcock Mfg. Co., Bachmann Industries, Inc., Baker & Daniels, Bakery Crafts, BalcoMetalines, Ball Hortculture Company, Bank of America NT & SA, Bank of New York.

Bank of Oklahoma, Barbara Franklin Enterprises, Barbis International, Barringer Technologies, Inc., Barron Transworld Trading Ltd, Barton Solvents, Inc., Bartow Chamber of Commerce, Bartow Steel, Inc., BCI Engineering Group, Inc., BCI Engineers & Scientists, Bechtel Corp., Bedford Sportswear, Inc., Beijing Development Area (USA) Inc., Belkin Components, BellSouth Corporation, Benecor Honeycomb Corp., Benner China & Glassware, Inc., Bennett Importing, Inc., Berger & Eiss, Berger Company, Beta Shim Company, BFGoodrich Company, BGW Systems, Inc., Bien Internationale Corp., Bindicator Company, Bivar, Inc., BJG Electronics, Black & Veatch, The Blackstone Group, Blistex Inc., Blue Box Toys Inc., Boca Research, Inc, The Boeing Company, Boston Technologies, Inc., Boullian Aviation Services, BP America, BP Chemicals Inc., Bradbury Co., Inc., Bradford Novelty Co., Inc., Bradlees, Inc., Bradley Machine, Inc., Brass Key, Inc., Braun Intertec Corporation, Breslow Morrison Terzian & Assoc., Brimms Inc.

Brisa, Inc., Bristol-Myers Squibb Company, Brooklyn Chinese-American Association, Brooklyn Goes Global, Brown Group, Inc., Budd Company, The, Budney Industries, Inc., Bunge Corporation, Burlington Northern & Santa Fe Railway, Burnett Contracting & Drilling Co., Inc., Burnham Products, Burson-Marsteller, Burton Co., Business Research Institute, Inc., Buxton Co., C.J. Bridges Railroad Contractor, Inc., Cactus Mat Manufacturing, Co., Cadaco, Inc., Caleb Corporation, California Chamber of Commerce, California Instruments Corp., California Mop Mfg. Co., California Portland Cement Company, California R&D Center, California Sunshine Inc., Caltex Petroleum Corp., Cambridge Specialty Company, Cange & Associates International, Capital Region World Trade Council, Capps Machines, Inc., Capstone Electronics Corp., Carco Electronics, Cardinal Industries, Inc., Career Explorers, Inc., Cargill Fertilizer,

Inc., Cargill Flour Milling, Cargill, Inc., Carl Cox & Associates, Inc., Carrier Corporation, Catalina Lighting, Inc., Caterpillar Inc., CBIA, CDI Corporation Midwest, Cedar Rapids Chamber of Commerce, Celestaire, Inc.

CENEX, Inc., Center Industries Corp., Centigram Communications, Central Purchasing Inc., Century Bank, Cerion Technologies, Cessna Aircraft Company, CF Industries, Inc., Chaco International, Chance Industries, Charles Engineering, Inc., Charming Shoppes, Inc., The Chase Manhattan Corporation, Chemical Manufacturers Association, Chemifax, Division of Namico, Inc., Chevron Corporation, Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, China Books & Periodicals, Inc., China Human Resources Group, China Products North America, Inc., China Trade Development Corp., Chrysler Corporation, Chubb & Son, Inc., Chubb Corporation, The, CIGNA Corporation, CIT Group/Commercial Services, Inc., Citicorp/Citibank, Citifor Inc., Citizens for a Sound Economy, Claire's Stores Inc., CLARCOR, Clark Companies, N.A., The, Clark Manufacturing, Claude Mann & Associates, Inc., Cliffstar Associates, Inc., Coastal Corporation, The, Coastal Power Company, Coastcom, Cobra Electronics Corporation, Coca-Cola Company, The, Coffeyville Sektam, Inc., Coiltronics, Inc., Cole Haan, Coleman Company, Inc.

Collum International, Inc., Colorworks, Columbia 300 Incorporated, Columbus McKinnon Corporation, COMET INT'L, Commercial Bank of San Francisco, Commonwealth Toy & Novelty, Compaq Computer Corporation, Compressed Air Products, Inc., Computalog, Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA), Computing Devices International, Comtech Communications, ConAgra, Inc., Concept Resources, Inc., Concurrent Computer Corp., Conductive Rubber Technology, Inc., CONECT-Coalition of New England Companies, CONMED Corporation, Connections International, Conoco, Consolidated Industries Inc., Consumers for World Trade, Continental Grain Company, Continental Machine Inc., Continental-Agra Equipment, Inc., Contour Aerospace Inc., Coopers & Lybrand L.L.P., Corning Incorporated, Corporation for International Trade, Cox Machine, Inc., CPC International Inc., Creative Computer Solutions, Inc., Creative Production Resources, Crowley Sales & Export Inc., Crown Cork & Seal Co., Inc., CSX Corporation, CTL Distribution, Inc., Cubic Corp., Cutter & Buck, Cyberkom, Dale C. Rossman, Inc., Darling Abrasive & Tool Co., Data Instruments, Inc., Dataforth Corp.

Davis Wright Tremaine, De La Rue Giori, Decora Industries Inc., Deere & Company, DEKALB Genetics, Delagar Division Belcam, Inc., Delson International, Inc., Des Moines Chamber of Commerce, Dexter Aerospace Materials Division, DeYoung Mfg., Inc., DF Corporation, Diamond V Mills, Digital Equipment Corporation, Digital Recorders, Digital Transmission Systems, Inc., DIGIVISION, Diversified Computer Remarketing, Dixon Area Chamber of Commerce, D-J Engineering, Dodge City Chamber of Commerce, Don's Leather Cleaning, Inc., Doron Precision Systems, Inc., Dover Technologies, Dow Chemical Co., The Dow Corning Corporation, Dowty Aerospace, Dresser Industries, Inc., DS Technologies, Inc., DSC Communications Corp., DSP Technology, Inc., DuPont, Duracell, Dynamic Systems, Inc., E & O Mari, Inc., E.E. International, E.S.T. International, Easter Unlimited/Fun World, Eastern Sea Consulting, Eastman Chemical Company, Eastman Export Corporation, Eastman Kodak Company, EBM Tours, Eck & Eck Machine Co., Inc., Ecology and Environment, Inc., Economy Forms Corp.

Econo-Power International Corp., EDAWN, Edelman Public Relations, Eden, LLC, Edison Electric Institute, EDS, Educational Design, Inc., Educational Hindsights, Inc., Edutainment for Kids, Inc., Efratom Time & Frequency Products, Inc., Eikon Strategies, Inc., Elan-Polo, Inc., Electro Scientific Industries, Inc., Electromedical Products International, Inc., Electronic Industries Association, Elkay Plastics Co., Inc., Ellanef Manufacturing Corporation, Ellicott International, Elliot Kastle, Inc., Ellsworth Adhesive Systems, Emergency Committee for American Trade, Emerson Electric (Asia) Ltd., Emerson Electric Co., Empire Industries, Inc., Endgate Corp., Endicott Johnson Corporation, Energy-Onix Broadcast Equipment Co., Enertech, Engineered Machine Tool Co., Enron Corp., Enron Oil & Gas, Inc., Epperson & Company, Essex Group, Inc., ETEC Systems, Inc., Excel Manufacturing, Inc., Executive Aircraft, Expeditors International, The Exporter, EXXESS Electronics, Exxon Corporation, F.H Kaysing, Family Dollar Stores Incorporated, Farmland Hydro, L.P., Farmland Industries, Inc., Fastenair Corporation.

FaxTrieve, Inc., Federal-Mogul Corporation, The Fertilizer Institute, Feuz MFG, Inc., Fiberite Inc., Fieldcrest Cannon, Inc., Fiesta, Fife Florida Electric Supply, Inc., Fila-USA Inc., Firstar Banks, Fisher-Price, Inc., Fleet Bank, Fleet Street Ltd., Flight Safety International—Cessna, Flight Safety International—Raytheon, Flight Safety International—Learjet, Florida Handling Systems, Inc., Florida Phosphate Council, Florida-China Trade Task Force, Fluke Corporation, Fluor Corporation, FMC Corporation, FMI, Inc., Footstar, Inc., Ford Motor Company, Forte Cashmere Co., Inc., ForTrade International, Foster Design, Foster Pepper & Shfelman, Foster Wheeler Energy International, Inc., Four Dimensions, Inc., Four Star Distribution, The Foxboro Company, FPA Customs Brokers, Inc., Frank Russell Company, Freeport-McMoRan, Inc., Fulfillment Systems International, Funopolis, Gaines Metzler Kriner & Co., Galamba Metals, Galoob Toys, Inc., GAYLA Industries, Inc., Gaymar Industries, Inc., GEC Precision Corporation, Genecar International, Inc.

Genemed Biotechnologies, Inc., Genemed Synthesis, Inc., General DataComm Industries, Inc., General Electric Company, General Motors Corporation, Genesco Inc., Georgia-Pacific Corporation, Gillette Company, The, Global Business Systems, Global Group, Globe Engineering, GM Nameplate, Inc., Goldsmiths, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, The, Grand Imports, Inc., Granny's Kitchens, LTD., Grant Thorton, Granton Shoo Imports, Graphic Controls Corporation, Graybar Electric, Great American Incentives, Great Lake Group, The, Great Plains Industries, Great Plains Manufacturing, Great Plains Ventures, Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce, Greater Bristol Chamber of Commerce, Greater Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce, Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, Greater North Dakota Association, Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, Greater Plant City Chamber of Commerce, Greater Topeka Chamber of Commerce, Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce, Greenfield Industries, Greer Auto, Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., GT Sales & Manufacturing, GTE Corporation, Guardian Industries Corp., Guerra Press, The, Guess Leather—Jones New York Leather—Avanti, Gund, Inc., H&H Tool.

H.O. Mohr Research & Engineering, Inc., Haight, Gardner, Poor and Havens, Halliburton Co., Halliburton Energy Services, Hallmark Cards, Inc., Hallum Tooling, Inc., Hamilton Standard, Hannay Reels, Inc., Hard Manufacturing Co., Inc., Harlow Aircraft Manufacturing, Harris Corporation, Harry B. Gudsley & Associates, Harry Sello & Associates, Harsco Corporation, Hartford Despatch Int'l, Harwood Capital Incorporated, Hasbro Interactive, Hasbro, Inc., Havens Steel Company, Heart to Heart International, Hedstrom Corporation, HEICO Corporation, Heilig-Meyers Company, Hermach Machine, Inc., Hewlett-Packard Company, Hill's Pet Nutrition, Inc., Hills & Company, HiRel Labs, Hirsch Pipe & Supply, HMS Productions, Inc., Hoechst Corporation, Holland Pump Manufacturing, Inc., Honeywell Asia Pacific, Honeywell Inc., Hong Kong City Toys, The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Limited, Horton International Inc., Howden Fan Company, The, HSQ Technology, Hub Tool & Supply, Hudson Pump and Equipment Associates, Inc., Hughes Electronics, Hydroform USA, Inc., HYI, I&J Machine Tool Company.

Ibberson Inc., IBM Corporation, Ice Holdings, Inc., IES Industries, Inc., Illinois Beef Association, Illinois Coalition to Support US-China Commercial Relations, Illinois Farm Bureau, Illinois Manufacturer's Association, Illinois Pork Producers, Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, Imaging and Sensing Technology, Inc., IMC Global Inc., IMC Global Operations Inc., IMC Kalium, IMC-Agrico Company, IMCO Recycling Inc., IMPAC International, Imperial Toy Corporation, Indoor Air Professionals, Inc., Inductor Supply, Inc., INET Corporation, Infinity Financial Technology, Inc,. Ingersoll-Rand Company, Innotec Group Inc., Innovative USA, Inc., Integrity Technology Corporation, Intel Corporation, Intelidata, Interex, Inc., Interface Consulting International, Inc., Inter-Global Inc., Intermetrics, Inc., International Business Development, International Components Corp., International Dairy Foods Association, International Development Planners, International Mass Retail Association, International Paper, International Trade Services, Inc., Inter-Pacific Corporation, Intertrade Ltd., Intool Incorporated, Intrust Bank, Iowa Association of Business & Industry, Iowa Beef Packers.

Iowa Business Council, Iowa Department of Economic Development, ITT Corporation, ITT Industries, J.F. Fredericks Tool Co., Inc., J.H. Ham Engineering, Inc., J.R. Custom Metal Products, Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.,

Jacobs Vehicle Systems, Jade Enterprises, Inc., Jamestown Container Companies, Jamie Brooke, Inc., Janco Corp., Janex Corporation, JBC International, Jenoptik Infab InTrak, Inc., Jensen Technology Development, Inc., Jerry Eisner Co., Inc., Jewett Refrigerator Co., Inc., John Hancock Financial Services, John Weitzel, Inc., Johnson & Johnson, Johnson and Higgins, Jones and Company, Inc., Joseph Krow Fur and Leather Co., J-Tec Associates, Juans (USA) Corp., Juno Industries, Inc., K.Swiss, Kagie/Newell Inc., Kaifa Technology, Inc., Kairos Consultants, Kaman Aerospace Corporation, Kamen Wiping Materials, Kane Industries Corp., Kansas Association for Small Business, Kansas Chamber of Commerce & Industry, Kansas City, KS Chamber of Commerce, Kansas Dry Stripping, Inc., Kansas Farm Bureau, Kansas Livestock Association, Kansas Plating, Inc., Kansas World Trade Center, Kasper Machine Company, Kavinoky & Cook, LLP.

Kent Audio Visual, Kimoto & Company, Custom Brokers, Kingsbury, Inc., Kirk's Suede Life, Inc., Kmart Corporation, KMG Too & Machine Company, Knipp Equipment, Knowledge Universe, L.L. C., KOA Speer Electronics, Inc., Koch Industries, Koch Materials, Kohler Co., Koogier & Assoc. Environmental Services, KPI/Heurikon Corp., Kraft Foods, Inc., K-Sport, Ltd., L & M Enterprises, L & S Machine Co., LD Supply, Inc., LA Gear, Inc., Laird Ltd., Lamar Electro-Air, Lampton Welding Supply Company, Latin American Pacific Trade Association, Leach International Corporation, Leading Edge Concepts Inc., Learjet, Learning Curve International, Leather Apparel Association, Inc., Leathercraft Process, Leawood Export Finance, Inc., Ledford Machine-Gage Labz, LeFebure Corp., Leon Cohen Sales, Inc., Leonard's Metal, Inc., LGB of America, Liberty Classics, Inc., Liberty International, Licata Associates, Inc., Liquidynamics, Inc., Liz Claiborne, Inc., LJO, Inc., L–M International, LOBOB LABORATORIES, Inc., Lockheed Martin.

Logical Services, Inc., Louis Dreyfus Corporation, Louis Lau AsianInfo Holdings, Lucent Technologies, Lucid Corp., Luis Alvear, Lyons Manufacturing Co., M. Hidary & Co., Inc., M.A. Hanna Company, Maersk Inc., Maisto International, Inc., Malichi International, Ltd., Mallinckrodt Inc., Mans & Mans Machine & Tool Co., Manufacturing Development, Inc., Manufacturing Tool & Supply, Manzella Productions, Inc., Marco Polo, MarketSource Direct, Mary Kay Inc., Matrix Integrated Systems, Mattel, Inc., Maurer Metalcraft Inc., Maury Microwave Corporation, Maytag Corporation, McDermott, Inc./Babcock & Wilcox, McDonald Construction Corporation, McDonnell Douglas Corporation, McFerrin Engineering & Manufacturing Company, McGinty Machine Company, The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., MCI, McStarlite Co., McWilliams Forge Company, Measurement Specialties, Inc., Medexel, Inc., Medtronic, Inc., Meeks & Sheppard, Meldisco A. Footstar Company, Melloor-Puritan-Bennett Corporation, Memorial Health System, Merck & Co., Inc., Meredith Corporation, Meritus Industries, Inc., Metal Forming, Inc.

Methode Electronics, Metholatum Company, The, Metratek, MetroBank, Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce, Metropolitan Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, Mezzullo & McCandlish, Miami Valley Marketing Group, Inc., Michigan-China Coalition, Michigan Retailers Association, Microscan Systems, Inc., Microscript Corp., Mid-America International Trade Services, Mid-America Overseas, Mid-America, International Agri-Trade Council, MidAmerican Energy Corp., Mid-Central Manufacturing, Inc., Mid-Continent Fire & Safety, Middle East Rug Corporation, Midwest of Cannon Falls, Inc., Midwest Plastic Supply, Inc., Mighty Star, Inc., Milford Fabricating Company, Inc., Milling Precision Tool, Inc., Mine & Mill Supply Co., Minnesota Agri-Growth Council, Inc., Mires Machine Company, Mize & Company, Mobil Corporation, Monde Group, L.L.C., Monitor Aerospace Corporation, Monogram Aerospace Fasteners, Monogram Sanitation, Monsanto, Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, Motorola, Inc., Moy, Cheung and Company, MRS Technology, Inc., MTS Systems Corp., Mulberry Corporation, Mulberry Motor Parts, Inc., Mulberry Railcar Repair Co., Multipoint Networks, Inc., Mustang International Groups, Inc., Mutual Travel.

MVE, Inc., Nadel & Sons Toy Corp., Naico, Nantucket Distributing Co., Inc., National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Purchasing Managers, National Concrete Masonry Association, National Foreign Trade Council, National Grain and Feed Association, National Institute for World Trade, National Marine Manufacturers Association, National Oilseed Processors Association, National Plastics Color, National Retail Federation, Nations Bank, Natural Science Industries, NBBJ, NCAI, NDE, Inc., Network Computing Devices, Inc., New England Financial Group, New Planet Sourcing, New York City Partnership and Chamber of Commerce, New York for US-China Trade, Newman Government Services, NextWave Design Automation, Niagara Lubricant, Nike, Inc., Nikko America, Inc., Nimbus Water Systems Inc., Nintendo of America Inc., Noon International, Norand Corporation, NORBIC, Nordstrom, Inc., Norman Krieger, Inc., Norris Education Innovations, Inc., Nortel, North American Export Grain Association, Inc., Northrop Grumman Corporation, Northwest Horticultural Council, Norwest Banks, Nottingham Co., Nuclear Energy Institute, NuDimensions.

Number Nine Visual Technology, Nylint Corporation, O'Keefe's Incorporated, Occidental Chemical Corporation, Octel Communications, Octus, Inc., ODS Networks, Inc., Off Shore Consulting, Ohio Alliance for U.S.-China Trade, The Ohio Art Company, Olem Shoe Corp., Open Engineering, Inc., Optek Technology, Inc., Optical Coating Lab, Optima Technologies Group, Inc., Oracle Corporation, OrCAD, Inc., The Oriental Rug Importers Association, Inc., Oshman & Sons, Otis Elevator Company, Otis McAllistar, Inc., Outboard Marine Corporation, Overhead Door Company, Overland Park Chamber of Commerce P.T. Express International Inc., PAC AM INTERNATIONAL, PACCAR Inc., The Pacific Basin Economic Council, U.S. Member Committee, Pacific Market International, Pacific Northwest Advisors, Pacific Rim Resources, Inc. PackAir AirFreight, Inc. PASCO scientific, Paul Davril Inc., Payless ShoeSource, Inc., PCI Newco, PCS Phosphate—White Springs, Pella Corporation, PEPBOYS, PepsiCo, Inc., J.C. Penney Co., Inc., Petroleum Equipment Suppliers Association, Pfizer Inc, Pharmacia & Upjohn, Philip Morris International Inc.

Philips Electronics, Phillips Petroleum Company, Phoschem Supply Co., PhRMA, Phsio-Control Corp. Pic'n Pay Stores, Inc., Pico Design Inc./Motorola, Pillowtex Corporation, Pioneer Balloon Company, Pioneer Hi-bred International, Inc., Pizza Hut, Plastic Fabricating Co., Plastic-View A.T.C., Playing Mantis,Play-Tech Inc., Plesh Industries, Inc., Polaroid Corporation, Polk Equipment Company, Inc., Polk Pump and Irrigation Co., Inc., Pollard Dental products, Inc., Polotec, Inc., Poolmaster Inc., Port of Houston Authority, Port of Seattle, Port of Tacoma, Portman Holdings, Portman Overseas, Post Glover Resistors, Power Link, Inc., Power Process Controls, PPG Industries Asia/Pacific Ltd., PPG Industries, Inc., Praegitzer Industries, Inc., Pratt & Whitney, Precious Kinds/Activatoys, Precision Filters, Inc., Precision Machining, Inc., Precision Products, Inc., Precision Profiling, Inc., Preco Industries, Pressman Toy Corp., Price Brothers Company, Price Waterhouse LLP, The Principal Financial Group, Printronix, Inc.

The Pro Trade Group, Processed Plastic Company, The Procter & Gamble Company, Professional Machine & Tool, Progressive, Inc., Pro-Mill Company, PTX-Petronix, Inc., Pulizzi Engineering, Inc., Puritan Industries, Inc., Puritan-Bennett Aerospace Systems, Quaker Oats Company, Quality Petroleum Corporation, Quality Tech Metals, QUANTUM DYNAMICS, Inc., QuickLogic Corp., Quinnipiac Chamber of Commerce, R. Dennis & Associates, R.A. Hanson Company, Inc., R.A. Lalli Company, Raco Machine, Inc., Rae Manufacturing Inc., Ragen & Cromwell, P.S., Rainfairn, Inc., Ralee Eng. Co., Ray World Trading, Ltd., Raytek Corp., Raytheon Aircraft Company, RB International, The Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Recognition Systems, Inc., Recoton Corporation, Recreation Vehicle Products, Reebok International, Reed Sportswear Manufacturing Co., Reeves International, Inc., Regal Plastics Company, Reliable Manufacturing Inc., Reliance Metalcenter, RENDER, Revell-Monogram, Inc., RF Group, Inc., Richard Manufacturing Company Inc., Richmont, Riggs Tool Company, Inc., Right Stuff, Inc.

RJM2 LTD, RNS Healthcare Consultants, Inc., Roanoke Companies, Inc., The, Robinson Fans Florida, Inc., ROCKPORT, Rockwell, Rockwell Collins, Inc., Rohm and Haas Company, Rolls-Royce North America Inc., Roof Coatings Manufacturers Association, Roundhouse Products, Inc., RRE Investors, LLC, RSI, Inc., Rubber & Accessories, Inc., Russ Berrie & Co., Inc., RxL Pulitzer, Ryan International Airplines, S.M.S. Group Incorporated, S.R.M. Co., Inc., S.R.M. Toys, Ltd., Saitek Industries, Salant Corporation, Saline Area Chamber of Commerce, Samsonite, Santana Ltd., Sauder Custom Fabrication, Inc., The Savings Bank of Rockville, Saxony Sportswear Co., Scarbroughs, Schenker International, Schottenstein Stores Corporation, Scientific Technologies, Inc., Scope Imports, Seafirst Bank, Sea-Land Service, Inc., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Securities Industry Association,

Security Chain Co., Sellers Tractor Co., Semiconductor Industry Association, Sensormatic Electronic Corp., Separation & Recovery Systems, Integration, Service Merchandise Co., Inc., Shamash and Sons, Inc., Shanghai Industrial Consultant, Inc.

Shelcore Toys, Shelter Bay Leathers, Inc., Shoe Corporation of America, Shonac Corporation, Shultz Steel Company, Siebe Environment Controls, Siemans Corporation, Siemens Medical Systems, Inc., Sierra Machinery, Inc., Sierra Semiconductor Corp., SIFCO Industries, Inc., SigmsTron International, Inc., Sijo Enterprises, Inc., Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation, Silicon Graphics, Simco Electronics, Simmons and Simmons, Simmons Machine Tool Corporation, Skarda Equipment Co., Skyway Luggage Company, SLJ Retail LLC, SmarTrunk Systems, Inc., Soletek, Corp., Solid State Measurements, Inc., Soundprints (TMC), Southern Tier World Commerce Association, Southwest Manufacturing, Southwest Paper Co., Specialty Tool Company, Spectrum Associates Inc., SpeedFarm International Inc., Sperry Sun Drilling Services, Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association, Standard Parts & Equipment, Star Cutter Company, StarBase, Starbucks Coffee International, Starter-Galt Sand Co., State Fish Co., Stearman Aircraft Products Corporation, Sterling International, Sterling Machine Company Inc., Stern International, Inc., Stetron International, Inc., Stratedge Corp.

Stride Rite Corporation, The, Stride Tool, Inc., Strippit, Inc., Strombecker Corporation, Summit Financial Strategies, Sun Microsystems, Inc., Sundstrand Corporation, Sundstrand Fluid Handling Corp., Sunkist Growers, Sunshine Metals, Superior Boiler Works, Inc., Superior Coatings, Inc., Sutlu Imports Int'l Inc., Sweepster Inc., Sy Quest Technology, Inc., Symbios Logic, T.L.I. International Corporation, Talarian, Tampa Armature Works Inc., Tampa Electric, Tampa Port Authority, Taplin Design Group, Inc., Target Stores, TD Materials, Inc., Team Concepts North America, Ltd., Technitrol, Inc., Ted L. Rausch Co., Tegal Corp., Tektronix, Inc., Teleglobe International, Telemind Capital Corporation, TeleProcessing Products Inc., Temcor, TENNECO, Tennessee Association of Business, Tens Machine Co., Inc., Terra-Mar Resource Information Service, Texaco, Texas Association of Business & Chambers of Commerce, Texas Coalition for U.S.-China Commercial Relations, Texas Farm Bureau, Texas instruments Incorporated, Textron Inc., 3–G Inernational, Inc., 3M Company

Thornley & Pitt, Inc., Three Way Pattern, Inc., Tierney Metals, Time Warner Inc., The Timken Company, TMR Materials Co., Inc., Toledo Area International Trade Association (TAITA), Tomy America, Inc., Tone Commander Systems, Topline Imports, Inc., Toy Manufacturers of America, Toys 'R' Us, Inc., Tradehome Shoe Stores, Inc., Tramco, Inc., Transammonia, Inc., Trans-Ocean Import Co., Inc., Trans-Phos, Inc., Triangle Coatings, Inc., Trident Microsystems, TRIG, Trio Machine, TRW Inc., TSC Engineering Co., TSI, Inc., Tube Sales, Inc., Tucker MFG., Turner Electric Works, Twin Cities Airports Task Force, Tyco Preschool Inc., U.S. Agri-Chemicals Corp., U.S. Association of Importers of Textiles and Apparel (USA–ITA), U.S. Bank, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, U.S. Council for International Business, U.S.-China Industrial Exchange, Inc., U.S.-China People's Friendship Association, UNC Aerostructures, Uncle Milton Industries, Inc., UNIAX Corp., Union Camp Corporation, Union Carbide Asia Ltd., Unirex, Inc., Unisource, Unisys Corporation, United Airlines, United Machine Co., United Parcel Service, United Silicon, Inc., United States Council for International Business, United Technologies Corporation, Unitek Miyachi Corp., Universal Marketing Group, Unocal Corporation, US Export, Inc., US Trade Center, US Trading and Investment Company, US West, Inc., US-China Business Council, V7S Corporation, Valve Manufacturers Association, Varian Associates, Vector Corp., Vector Products Inc., Venture Search, Vermillion, Inc., Viewlogic Systems, Inc., Virco Mfg. Inc., Vtech (OEM), Inc., Vtech Industries, LLC, VXI Electronics, WACCO, Wacker Sitronic Corp., Wagman Construction, Inc., Warner-Lambert Corporation, Washington Council on International Trade, Washington Public Ports Association, Washington State China Relations Council, Water Magic International, Watkins-Johnson Company, The Weathervane, Weaver Manufacturing, The Westchester City, NY County Chamber of Commerce, Western Bank/Bellevue, Western Resources, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Westvaco, Weyerhaeuser Company, Whirlpool Asia, Inc., Whirlpool Corporation, White Cap International, Whittaker Aerospace, Wichita Area Chamber of Commerce, Wichita Machine Products, Wichita Tool, Wichita Wranglers, Wicon International Ltd., Wilcox Brothers Sign Co., William Kent International, Wind River Systems, Inc., Windmere-Durable Holdings, Inc., Wm. F. Hurst Co., Inc., Wm. Wrigley Jr. Company, Woolworth Overseas Corp., World Association of Children and Parents (WACAP), World Trade Center Denver, World Trade Council, Worldports Inc., Worldwide Contacts Connections Contracts, Xerox Corporation, XILINX, Inc., YES! Entertainment Corporation, Zak, Incorporated, ZB Industries, Inc., Zellweger Analytics, Inc., Zycad Corp., Zymed Laboratories, Inc.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we are considering the important matter of whether the United States should extend China's most-favored-nation trading status.

I want to build a strong relationship between the United States and China—a relationship under which American businesses and workers can prosper, a relationship which will encourage China to embrace international norms and human rights. But the MFN status China enjoys has done little to build a strong mutually beneficial relationship between our two nations.

Under MFN, China has engaged in unfair trade practices, pirated intellectual property, spread weapons and dangerous technology to rogue nations, suppressed democracy, encroached on democratic reforms in Hong Kong, and engaged in human rights abuses. Many sing the praises of MFN, but as we consider this issue, we must focus on the facts.

China has gladly profited from MFN while continually flaunting international agreements and standards of conduct. China sends one-third of its exports to the United States while only 1.7 percent of American exports can crack the Chinese market. The result: We now have a $40 billion trade deficit with China which is expected to reach a staggering $50 billion by the end of this year.

And this trade deficit will not go away as long as China rigs its laws to block goods from the United States. Chinese goods enter our country at an average tariff rate of 2 percent while our exports face an average tariff of 35 percent. Worse, China extorts technology and expertise from American firms as the price of doing business in China.

Congress has limited means to address our many and serious concerns regarding China. But China's exports to the United States of more than $50 billion per year give us leverage that we must use to further American interests—interests affecting trade, foreign policy, and American workers.

The United States must not give China a pass on the tough issues. We need to use our trade laws to pressure China for greater access for American companies and goods. We need to take action when China knowingly aids in the proliferation of weapons and weapons technology. And we need to take steps to shield American workers from unfair and inhumane prison labor.

I am voting against MFN for China because we need to let China and our trade leaders know that more of the same from China is not acceptable. If our Government wants support for free trade, then it must insist on fair and equal standards and compliance with our trade laws. When that happens there will be broader support for MFN.

Mr. BALLENGER. Once again, Mr. Speaker we find ourselves debating the renewal of most-favored-nation status for the People's Republic of China. It has become an annual exercise, one that exposes the deep division in our Nation over our relationship with the most populous nation in the world.

I am reluctantly going to vote against the resolution of disapproval, House Joint Resolution 79, authored by my esteemed colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON. I am reluctant because China is governed by an authoritarian regime which represses its people and brutally cracks down on dissent. I, like so many of my colleagues, want to take action to force China to change, to become democratic and to ensure that all the people of that nation have the opportunity to participate fully in economic social, political, and religious freedom. But, how do we accomplish this? Will terminating MFN status achieve these ends? I must reluctantly conclude that it will not.

I believe that the United States can do more to advance the cause of human rights and foster religious, economic and political freedom if we continue to engage the Chinese in economic cooperation. Social freedoms—like freedom of religion—are a direct result of economic liberalization. If we remove all of China's trade privileges, we are not only isolating that country, but we are losing any opportunity to improve human rights there. Let's not forget that many of the students that took to Tiennamen Square to protest against their Government were educated in the United States. Termination of MFN status would curtail the education of Chinese students in the United States and thus hinder future democratization in China.

I also believe that by terminating MFN we will hurt the American worker and consumer.

Perhaps as much as $9 billion in United States exports to China might be affected by removing MFN privileges. In one company alone in my congressional district, 500 jobs would be at risk.

However, we must continue to pursue human rights in China and around the globe as an important foreign policy objective. Currently, some of my colleagues are drafting positive steps to influence more directly the domestic situation in China. An expansion of Radio Free Asia and other democracy-building efforts in China are among United States policy options. In addition, Congress is discussing the restriction of visas for Chinese nationals involved in Human rights violations and/or arms proliferation. It is my believe that these aggressive efforts to promote human rights are more likely to encourage constructive change in China.

Mr. Speaker, we must stay engaged with China to effect the economic and political situation there. Terminating MFN status will only be a useless gesture that will hurt the American worker. I urge my colleagues to vote down House Joint Resolution 79.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of an issue that is of grave importance to me and to our Nation as a whole—most-favored-nation [MFN] status for China. Continuing normalized relations with China is not an affirmation of their record on human rights. It is, however, our best hope of maintaining a channel of democratic ideals and principles of freedom to China's citizens. Ending MFN would be a terrible loss for those fighting for freedoms in China.

If MFN were revoked, manufactured goods from China would be subject to high tariffs upon entering the United States, possibly triggering a retaliatory response. If we close our door, they will close theirs. That means American farmers and manufacturers will pay the price. For every product we sell, there is a supplier in Europe or Asia that can quickly pick up our discarded opportunities. We would literally be handing our global markets to our competitors.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of speculation concerning the possible repression of freedom in Hong Kong when China reclaims its authority. I too am concerned and will be watching closely. But I am hopeful that Hong Kong's free and prosperous economy will actually further market reforms in mainland China. Revoking MFN now would be tragic for Hong Kong and would destroy any hopes for positive results.

Democratic and Western values often ride on the heels of American goods and products. Cutting our economic ties with China would turn the clock back and strengthen the hands of extreme nationalists and those who wish to repress freedoms. I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to support the continuation of MFN status for China.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the renewal of the most-favored-nation [MFN] trade status of the People's Republic of China because China continues to deny the greater part of its citizenry the most basic human rights; engages in the worst kinds of religious, political, and ethnic persecution; bully neighboring countries; and undermines international stability by exporting missiles and nuclear technology to some of the world's leading rogue nations.

Every year, we are told that MFN promotes continued economic growth and human rights in the People's Republic of China. While MFN has helped China expand its economy, and improve the living standards of a relatively small number of its citizens, I believe it is an absolute leap of faith to argue that China's economic growth has benefited the vast majority of its 1.4 billion citizens who continue to be denied—sometimes forcibly—the freedom to think, speak, read, worship, and vote as they wish.

I simply cannot agree with those who argue that MFN will one day—some day—result in improved human rights in China as the Government of that vast nation continues to violate human rights on a massive scale.

For example, the people of Tibet have been subject to especially harsh treatment by the Chinese Government. Why? Because their culture and religion are inseparable from the movement that seeks full Tibetan freedom from China—a movement that has been brutally suppressed by the Chinese Government since the late 1940's, when armed Chinese forces drove the Dalai Lama, the head of Tibet's ancient theocracy, into exile.

Since then, the Chinese Government has stepped up its efforts to discredit the Dalai Lama as well as its campaign to eradicate the ancient culture and traditions of Tibet. In May 1994, a new ban on the possession and display of photographs of the Dalai Lama, resulted in a raid of monasteries in which Buddhists priests were brutally beaten by Chinese military personnel.

The child recognized by the Dalai Lama, but rejected by the Chinese Government, as the Pansen Lama, the second highest individual in the Tibetan Buddhist hierarchy, is currently being held in ''protective custody'' by Chinese authorities.

Since 1996, all religious institutions in China must register with the state. The failure to do so results in the closure of such institutions—or worse. For example, Human Rights Watch—Asia reports that unofficial Protestant and Catholic communities have been harassed, with congregants arrested, fined, sentenced, and beaten.

The sad fact is that after two decades after the United States and China normalized relations, China has persisted—no, insisted—on following policies that threaten to make it an increasingly disruptive force among the family of nations. China's continuing and growing practice of selling advanced weapons and nuclear technology to Iran, Iraq, and other rogue nations is already a threat to world peace.

Supporters of continued MFN for China argue that continued economic development in China will lead inevitably to a more open Chinese society and polity. Unfortunately, the current Chinese leadership seems willing and able to delay what MFN proponents insist is the inevitable.

It should be remembered that like China today, the old South Africa had a growing economy, a growing—albeit racially limited—middle class, a significant United States business presence, and a repressive government. And, just like the arguments supporting continued and increased trade with China, it was argued that continued and increased United States trade with the old South Africa would bring about the economic, social, and political reforms that would inevitably force the South African Government to dismantle apartheid—the policy of segregation and economic and political discrimination against non-European groups.

As we all know, the Government of the old South Africa continued—in fact, stepped up—its campaign of repression and terror, including kidnaping, torture, jailing, and murder, to maintain apartheid until 1987—that is, the year the Western World finally lost patience with the promises of progress made by the South African Government.

Just as constructive engagement failed to reform the old South Africa, continued MFN will fail to reform China. Because I believe only the strongest trade sanctions, including a worldwide trade embargo on China, will encourage China's leaders to change the policies that promise to transform China into the world's leading rogue nation, I will continue to work to suspend China's MFN status.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 79, the resolution of disapproval and against most-favored-nation status for China.

The Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1996 issued by the Department of State states that: ''The Government—of China—continues to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in violation of internationally accepted norms, stemming,'' among other reasons from ''* * * the absence or inadequacy of laws protecting basic freedoms.'' And the report continues: ''No dissidents were known to be active at year's end.''

Every year when MFN is before the Congress for renewal we are told that it is only through engagement with China that conditions will improve and every year the State Department's report seems to indicate that conditions, engagement to the contrary notwithstanding, have changed little.

Further, the United States' trade deficit with China was close to $40 billion in 1996. And it is only recently and with an absence of enthusiasm that the Government of China has moved to protect the intellectual property rights of United States citizens. Also, the Chinese markets are not entirely open to United States exports and trade barriers prohibit the full flow of trade.

In summary, continued human rights violations, failure to protect intellectual property rights, and failure to permit United States goods greater access to China's markets leads me to conclude that renewal of MFN for China at this time is not warranted.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 79, a resolution to revoke most-favored-nation [MFN] for the People's Republic of China.

First, it is important to be clear about the terms of this debate so it is well understood what is proposed by this resolution. Most-favored-nation is not preferential treatment, rather, it is the normal trade status that the United States extends to all but eight nations in the world. Revocation of MFN, on the other hand, is not the withdrawal of special trade concessions but the imposition of economic sanctions that would potentially sever our ties with the world's most populous nation.

With that understanding, we can have an honest debate about whether employing unilateral sanctions and ending our trade relationship with China will bring about the changes in Chinese behavior that we all wish to see—greater respect for human rights, adherence to trade agreements, and support for nonproliferation controls. In my view, revoking MFN in an attempt to isolate China is highly

unlikely to induce positive change in China and is certain to harm United States economic and strategic interests.

Since China's opening to the West in the late 1970's, the political and economic conditions of the Chinese people have improved significantly. Through trade and contact with American business partners, individuals and communities in China, especially in the coastal regions, have gained substantial freedom from central government planners in Beijing. Severing those contacts would reverse that progress and have the effect of increasing Beijing's authority over the lives of the Chinese people.

Mr. Speaker, not only would revoking MFN fail to advance human rights in China, it would seriously injure United States economic interests. I am especially concerned about the effect revoking MFN would have American agriculture. China is expected to account for 37 percent of future growth in United States agriculture exports, making it the most important growth market for United States commodities. In last year's farm bill, Congress eliminated the safety net and told family farmers they would have to earn their income solely from the marketplace. It would be unfair to the farmers in my State and around the country to now close down perhaps their most important export market.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in advancing the interest of both the people of the United States and the people of China by opposing the resolution and continuing normal trade relations with China.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution which would end normal trade relations with China.

Trade with China is about trading goods and trading ideas—ideas of religious freedom, free speech, and a free-market economy. Ending trade means an end to this exchange of ideas, and an end to the freedoms we hope the Chinese people may one day have.

While the biggest losers of ending trade with China may be the Chinese people, we here at home also stand to lose. And this is so clearly illustrated in agriculture trade.

We will lose our sixth biggest agriculture export market and $2.6 billion in annual trade. Our farmers here at home would lose more than $4 billion in income in the next 3 years. While we would have to work doubly hard to expand our markets elsewhere, the average Chinese citzens would end up having to pay a higher price at the store for food.

And that's what this debate is about today—how can we help improve the living conditions of the average Chinese citizen. We can cease trade, cease our exchange of ideas and know that the practioners of abhorrent human rights abuses will use this vote as an excuse to further punish supporters of trade with America.

Or we can stand tall and know that trade with China is the biggest opportunity we have to move China in the direction we want. I encourage my colleagues to vote against this misguided resolution.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to convey my strong support for the disapproval of most-favored-nation status for China.

Six days from now, China will gain considerable strength nationally and internationally with the inclusion of Hong Kong. By approving most-favored-nation status, we will be using the power of the United States of America to condone their misbehavior not only in China, but its extension into Hong Kong as well. Let's just review China's record.

First on nonproliferation, in the 1980's, we received information that China was covertly assisting Pakistan's shadowy nuclear program. China promised it would mend its ways, and in return we signed a Nuclear Cooperation Agreement in 1985—an agreement which has never been implemented throughout its 12 year existence because no U.S. President has ever been able to certify that China is being a responsible member of the international nonproliferation community.

In the 1980's, the Chinese National Nuclear Corporation secretly built a nuclear reactor in Algeria. After a multitude of denials, China finally admitted its involvement in the reactor construction—only after aerial photographs identified it in 1991. Another lie exposed.

In 1994, after China had signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, press reports indicated that the Chinese National Nuclear Corporation was building a secret military reactor in Pakistan, as well as two reactors and a uranium facility in Iran. More promises broken.

In 1996, the transfer of 5,000 ring magnets from the Chinese National Nuclear Cooperation to Pakistan for use in a uranium enrichment facility was leaked to the press. China promised that it wouldn't do it again, and the Clinton adminsitration chose to believe those promises, despite the years of deception that should have called the nature of China's assurances into question.

In the area of missile proliferation, a press report published just last week described a new short-range missile being developed by Iran with the help of technology and assistance from the China Precision Engineering Institute New Technology Corporation. China has been selling M–11 missiles to Pakistan for 5 years, according to a June 30 article in Time magazine, and recent satellite photos indicate that not only are missiles being transferred, but that an entire missile factory is being built. This latest information comes after the all too familiar series of promises Beijing made in 1994 not to do it anymore.

Years of lies, years of broken promises—what we have here is a proliferation pathology. China is as hooked on selling weapons of mass destruction as an alcoholic is to his scotch. We need to prescribe the appropriate therapy, and as with alcoholism, it will take more than a 12-step self-help program at a proliferators anonymous group. The alcoholic will first promise to cut down on his drinking. When he gets caught, he'll make the same promise. If he keeps getting caught, he'll up the ante and promise to stop cold turkey. When does the alcoholic really stop drinking? When an intervention take place. When his family and friends tell him that they will no longer support, accept, or tolerate his behavior, and he is forced to confront his addiction honestly in order to regain their love and trust. Mr. Speaker, what we need to do with China is undertake a proliferation intervention.

On trade, every year we are told that renewing China's most-favored-nation status would help reduce our trade deficit with China; however, we have seen that trade deficit rise from $2.8 billion in 1987 to $39.5 billion in 1997.

Supporters claim that MFN is normal trade relations. These so-called normal relations produce a 2-percent tariff on Chinese goods, but the Chinese levy a 35-percent average tariff rate on United States goods.

In 1996, Chinese piracy of United States intellectual property cost our economy over $2.3 billion.

The Chinese have continually used this status to their advantage, including the most recent development of Chinese military owned business' selling enormous amounts of goods to the United States, all because we allow it.

These normal trade relations produce nothing but negative effects on our economy, and we can no longer stand idly by and let our country move further into debt.

Finally on human rights, we have an obligation to promote human rights throughout the world. To support China in its practice of suppressing democracy, and encouraging slave labor would be a contradiction of everything our country stands for.

The State Department Country Report on Human Rights from this year states that the Chinese Government continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses, in violation of internationally accepted norms, stemming from the authorities' intolerance of dissent, fear of unrest, and the absence or inadequacy of laws protecting basic freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, we can not continue to support the abhorrent practices in China, economically or abstractly.

We are told to wait and see what happens when Hong Kong changes hands, but the players have already moved to centerfield. Already the hand picked legislature for Hong Kong has given the police broad new powers to ban even peaceful demonstrations, and any group wishing to hold a protest march or rally must get prior approval from the police.

Granting MFN status to China now would be like buying your 16-year-old a Porshe for flunking out of high school. It only reinforces bad behavior and leads to big trouble down the road.

China is speeding up down the runway, ready to take off with Hong Kong. There is no justification for renewing China's most-favored-nation status until they have proven to abide by international standards and practices. We should not be handing them MFN on a silver platter, they must earn it.

Every year on the day after we grant China MFN status, the Chinese Government votes to grant the United States MFN for most-foolish-nation status for being duped again on nonproliferation, trade, and human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to granting China most-favored-nation status.

Back in the 1980's, we received information that China was covertly assisting Pakistan's shadowy nuclear program. China promised it would mend its ways, and in return we signed a nuclear cooperation agreement in 1985—an agreement which has never been implemented throughout its 12 years existence because no United States President has ever been able to certify that China is being a responsible member of the international nonproliferation community.

In the 1980's, the Chinese National Nuclear Corporation secretly built a nuclear reactor in Algeria. After a multitude of denials, China finally admitted its involvement in the reactor construction—only after aerial photographs identified it in 1991. Another lie exposed.

In 1994, after China had signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, press reports indicated that the Chinese National Nuclear Corporation was building a secret military reactor

in Pakistan, as well as two reactors and a uranium facility in Iran. More promises broken.

In 1996, the transfer of 5,000 ring magnets from the Chinese National Nuclear Cooperation to Pakistan for use in a uranium enrichment facility was leaked to the press. China promised that it wouldn't do it again, and the Clinton administration chose to believe those promises, despite the years of deception that should have called the nature of China's assurances into question.

In the area of missile proliferation, a press report published just last week described a new short-range missile being developed by Iran with the help of technology and assistance from the China Precision Engineering Institute New Technology Corporation. China has been selling M–11 missiles to Pakistan for 5 years, according to a June 30 article in Time magazine, and recent satellite photos indicate that not only are missiles being transferred, but that an entire missile factory is being built. This latest information comes after the all too familiar series of promises Beijing made in 1994 not to do it anymore.

Years of lies, years of broken promises—what we have here is a proliferation pathology. China is as hooked on selling weapons of mass destruction as an alcoholic is to his scotch. We need to prescribe the appropriate therapy, and as with alcoholism, it will take more than a 12 step self-help program at a proliferators anonymous group. The alcoholic will first promise to cut down on his drinking. When he gets caught, he'll make the same promise. If he keeps getting caught, he'll up the ante and promise to stop cold turkey. When does the alcoholic really stop drinking? When an intervention takes place. When his family and friends tell him that they will no longer support, accept, or tolerate his behavior, and he is forced to confront his addiction honestly in order to regain their love and trust.

Mr. Speaker, what we need to do with China is undertake a proliferation intervention. We need to exercise some tough love, and tell China that we have had enough of the empty assurances and broken promises. Let's get China onto the nonproliferation wagon—vote to revoke MFN status.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution to disapprove most-favored-nation status for China. Last year, I opposed efforts to grant this privilege to China, and following a trip I made to China earlier this year, I continue to have reservations about extending this status.

Since the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre, concern in Congress about the United States-China relationship has focused on three areas: China's violations of our trade agreements, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and human rights abuses. During last year's debates on China MFN status, a resolution was passed urging the appropriate House committees to hold hearings and offer recommendations on these areas. While congressional hearings and commissions have met and many reports been issued, in each of these areas where Chinese violations have occurred, it is clear that our national policies of constructive engagement have failed. In fact, there has been marked deterioration, not improvement, under recent policies.

Looking from the economic perspective, the United States deficit with China has steeply climbed from $3 billion at the time of the Tiananmen Square massacre in 1989 to over $50 billion projected for 1997. Less than 2 percent of United States exports are allowed into China, while over 33 percent of China's exports come into the United States. China's high tariffs and nontariff barriers limit access to the Chinese market for most United States goods and services and violate the GATT agreement. We must take action to assure that from the economic standpoint we have a level playing field.

Second, I am concerned about Chinese efforts to transfer nuclear, advance missile, chemical, and biological weapons technology to nations like Iran and nonsafeguarded nations like Pakistan. China is the largest nuclear power in the world and the only nation which produces long-range nuclear missiles. The United States spends billions to promote Middle East peace, and Iran is a threat to that peace. We cannot continue to ignore China's transfer of dangerous technology to that region. Such activity threatens to destabilize not only our Nation but other regions of the world.

Most importantly, human rights issues continue to concern me. The State Department's most recent issue of the Country Reports on Human Rights reveal that Chinese authorities have increased efforts to curtail public protests or criticism of the government. There has been increased persecution of evangelical Protestants and Roman Catholics in China who choose to worship independently of the government-controlled church. In addition, officials there ruthlessly enforce laws limiting families to having one child. It is well-documented that individuals who gave birth to a second child there experienced loss of job or government benefits, fines and in some cases forced sterilization. The freedoms we often take for granted in America are what makes this Nation such a wonderful place to live. As a national policy, I do not support offering economic incentives to a nation which discourages and disallows the freedom for individuals to express themselves.

Our Nation has a responsibility to use its leverage to act on behalf of fairness and must insist on a reciprocal relationship with China. It is my strong desire that once and for all these three issues can be addressed so that both countries can have a satisfactory trade relationship. However, this will not happen by once again overlooking the serious problems that are occurring in China. A recent poll by *Business Week* magazine shows that 67 percent of the American people oppose MFN for China. Let's do what the American people want and deny MFN status for China.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, today I will cast one of the most difficult votes during my tenure in Congress when I vote to grant most-favored-nation status to China. ''Most-favored-nation status'' is a misnomer, the vote is actually whether or not to continue a normal trading relationship with China.

There are many reasons to deny even a normal trading relationship with China. The lack of respect for the sanctity of human life, the lack of free speech or assembly, and the targeting and persecution of Christians are all good reasons to deny a normal trading status.

But there is another side. To stop trade with China will further isolate and remove any pressure the United States has to improve their system. The vote on a normal trading status with China is a decision that will dictate how the United States chooses to support and help bring the citizens of China out of the oppressive world they are born into and show them the light of democracy. It is a decision that will affect the stability of Asia for the foreseeable future. This decision is a choice between supporting the economic miracles in Taiwan and Hong Kong or walk away from the situation entirely. It is a decision to protect American jobs in Puget Sound or threaten their very existence.

I will cast my vote in favor of a normal trade relationship with China for many reasons including the ones detailed below.

WASHINGTON STATE

Washington State is the most trade dependent State in the United States. Recent studies have concluded that 1 out of every 4 jobs in Washington State are dependent on trade. In fact, trade between Washington State and China represented over 20 percent of the total trade between the two countries. The economic well being and continued growth of the State economy are closely linked to a continuation of trade with China.

Mr. Speaker, over 30,000 employees work in my district for the Boeing Co. Many on this floor have targeted the Boeing Co. as a reason to deny MFN from China. In a letter that I requested from Boeing asking the hard questions about the welfare of American workers in Puget Sound, I was informed that in this year alone over $1 billion in contracts for American-made Boeing aircraft have been solidified with China. Further, 70 percent of all commercial sales of Boeing aircraft are sold overseas.

However, impressively over 85 percent on average of the contents of these aircraft are from the United States and they are all assembled in the Puget Sound region. These are impressive statistics and I intend to follow through on these numbers—and Mr. Speaker, I include the letter for the RECORD.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Finally, religious freedom demands the continuation of a normal trade relationship. China is guilty of the persecution of Christians and I condemn their behavior. However, to walk away from the success that Christian missions have enjoyed in China will not help curb this practice. The Reverend Billy Graham has stated that he is ''in favor of doing all we can to strengthen our relationship with China and its people.'' He continues, ''nations respond to friendship just as much as people do.''

The China Service Coordinating Office, an organization that represents more than one hundred Christian organizations in China believes that the revocation of MFN will threaten Christian outreach to the mainland. I must look to those missionaries who are carrying out their Christian ministry every day on the ground, in the trenches and trust they understand what is best for the persecuted Christian minority in China. They support the continuation of a normal trading relationship with China.

OUR FUTURE RELATIONSHIP WITH CHINA

The United States of America must pursue a new policy with China. In order to effect real change, we must end this yearly debate on a normal trading relationship and pursue a pragmatic policy that reacts swiftly and certainly against Chinese infractions against its citizens and the global community.

We must enact legislation to prohibit business with Chinese companies tied to the Chinese Red Army. We must deny visas to human rights abusers in China to enter the

United States. We must increase funding to democratic institutions dedicated to bringing the message of democracy to the Chinese people. We must react swiftly to any violation of trade agreements by enacting targeted sanctions against China. Only through bringing about change such as these will we support real change in China.

THE BOEING COMPANY,
Arlington, VA, June 20, 1997.

Hon. JACK METCALF,
Longworth House Office Building, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN METCALF: I want to take the opportunity to respond to your recent inquiry concerning the Boeing Company and how our relationship with China affects jobs at our Everett, Washington facility.

We are an American company with a global presence competing in a global market. We sell our products worldwide and support hundreds of thousands of American aerospace jobs. Today, about 70% of our sales are international. In the future, $3 out of every $4 we make will be from customers outside the United States.

The Boeing Company considers China to be the single most important international market for commercial airplane sales in the next 20 years. China has need for about 1,900 new airplanes, valued at $124 billion. This year alone we've signed orders for over a billion dollars worth of airplanes to China, including five 777s and two 747s—all made at our Everett facility.

We have 32,000 employees working in Everett, including engineers, machinists, pilots and technicians. Their jobs are dependent on our ability to sell airplanes. The Boeing Commercial Airplane Group also has approximately 5,000 U.S. suppliers who help contribute to building our airplanes. A small percentage of our suppliers are located outside the United States, including six in China.

While Chinese suppliers are responsible for a portion of the work done by our international suppliers, the majority of the work on our airplanes occurs here in the United States. In fact, 86% of the dollar value (parts, tools and labor) of Boeing commercial aircraft in 1996 was provided by Boeing and U.S. aerospace suppliers.

It is important to note that Boeing will retain the key engineering, design and product-integration expertise that has made us the world's leading producer of commercial jetliners. We will not transfer any technologies or core competencies that would help a supplier become a competitor.

A stable relationship between China and the United States will directly affect our ability to sell airplanes in China—which in turn affects jobs at Boeing.

Beyond jobs, trade is a powerful force for human progress, representing the free exchange of goods, services and ideas. MFN extension will help to assure that we can remain engaged and competitive in China, and will also lay the groundwork for concluding World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiations that will help lock in China's economic reform process, improve the rule of law and improve market access for U.S. workers and farmers. In our view, trade is the best tool we have for promoting American values in China.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to address some of your questions, and your continued interest and efforts on behalf of the Boeing Company and its employees.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER W. HANSEN,
Vice President,
U.S. Government Affairs.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to cast my vote against most-favored-nation trade status for China. We have hoped that a policy of trade engagement with China would lend to greater democracy in China and greater responsibility from the Chinese government. It has not.

China's human rights record leaves much to be desired. There is clear evidence of persecution of religious belief, persecution of the people of Tibet, use of prison labor, and a restricted press. Additionally, our dialogue and willingness to engage China in trade has made no discernible impact in the area of human rights.

China continues to engage in predatory trade practices that have led to our $40 billion trade deficit with China. China refuses to enforce laws against the piracy of intellectual property and patents, continues to ship products made with prison labor, evades United States restrictions on China textile exports by transshiping pieces through Hong Kong, and effectively prohibits thousands of foreign products from entering the Chinese market through a maze of regulations which run counter to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Our trade deficit with China has been rising at a faster rate than that of any other major trading partner. How many more American jobs are we going to let China's repressive government destroy?

It is clear that countless extensions of the MFN trading privilege—a privilege China needs more than we do—have not worked. Our yearning for friendship and our attempts to persuade Beijing to conform to international norms have been met with failure.

China continues to increase spending on the military, and seems intent on developing an offensive military capability—financed by billions of dollars the regime makes through its managed trade with us. Beijing refuses to join international efforts to stem the proliferation of nuclear arms, continues to transfer advanced ballistic missile technology to Syria and Pakistan, provides nuclear and chemical weapons technology to Iran, and refuses to comply with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The United States has a responsibility to use whatever leverage it has—military, diplomatic, or economic—to send this message. We have a responsibility to speak out for democracy wherever possible. For in the end, the argument over MFN is not just about what kind of country China is, it is about what kind of nation we are. China needs to be sent a loud, unequivocal message—a message that can only be delivered by revoking Beijing's MFN status.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of MFN for China. I rise in support of the common sense proposition that we continue to normalize trade relations with the People's Republic of China.

We live in a global economy and it simply makes no sense to turn our back on a nation of 1 billion people. It is in our national security interests as well as our economic interest that we have normal relations.

We are all concerned about human rights and individual freedom, but the best way to promote those causes is to be present in China with our values and our products.

In my district alone, I have heard from large and small companies whose future for products and jobs largely depends on new markets.

I can think of no more important export to China than each and every example of the American success story.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statements of the President in his letter to Congress of June 11, 1997:

Our engagement with China does not mean that we endorse all of its policies. Where China has acted contrary to our interests and the standards of international behavior, we have made clear our differences. We successfully pressed China to end its assistance to unsafeguarded nuclear facilities in third countries. We insisted that it take strong steps to protect the intellectual property rights of American videotape and compact disc makers from piracy. When China carried out provocative military exercises in the Strait of Taiwan, we sent our aircraft carriers to the region as a reminder of our commitment to stability and a peaceful resolution to the Taiwan issue. And repeatedly, we have stood up for human rights in China—at the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva; through the State Department's unvarnished annual human rights reports; in our meetings with China's leaders. We will continue to use all the tools at our disposal—cooperation, diplomacy, targeted sanctions, when appropriate—to narrow our differences.

Ending normal trade treatment for China would end our strategic dialogue—blocking cooperation on issues important to America's interests and destroying our ability to promote China's fuller observation of international norms. Rather than advancing human rights, revocation would cut off our contact with the Chinese people. It would eliminate, not facilitate, further cooperation on preventing weapons proliferation, promoting stability on the Korean peninsula, and combating transnational threats to both our countries. It would close one of the world's emerging markets to our exports and endanger an estimated 170,000 American jobs. It would make China more isolated and less likely to play by the rules of international conduct.

Most of the opponents of normal trade treatment for China seek goals that I share—respect for human rights and religious freedom in China; fair and open trade; responsible policies on weapons proliferation. But I am convinced the path they have chosen to advance those goals is the wrong path. Further change in China is necessary and inevitable, but it will not come overnight. It most assuredly will not come if we isolate ourselves and cut off our relationship with one quarter of the world's population.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution and support MFN for China.

Mr. RYUN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a very difficult issue that we've been wrestling with for some months now. As a freshman, this is my first vote on most-favored-nation status for China. And I have listened very carefully to both sides on this matter.

This has been a very healthy debate. It is a debate about religious freedom and human rights in China as well as about how to promote democracy and economic freedom throughout the world.

I agree with the many missionaries in China who have told me personally that denying MFN status to China would only isolate that country, pushing it further from our ideals of religious freedom and democracy. I do not believe that slamming the door to freedom and trade would improve human rights in China. Instead, it would close off the avenues of greater Western influence.

In a recent memo, a group opposing the renewal of MFN to China quoted an editorial from the Economist which stated:

If you hear your neighbor beating up his children, do you give a shrug and say it is none of your business?

My answer is absolutely no. And I hope that all of us here would go next door and try to stop the abuse. That's how the United States should deal with China. To deny MFN would be to shrug and say that the human rights abuses are not our problem. Some have argued that we should ignore the violations, pull up our drawbridge, put on our blinders and turn inward, leaving China to continue its policies of persecution and population control. We have been down that road. And what did it produce? A decade-long terror called the Cultural Revolution.

I believe the best way to affect change in China—morally, economically and politically—is through interaction with the Chinese. We should demonstrate the American way of integrity, honesty, and openness.

Today, United States exports of goods and services to China total about $14.4 billion and support over 200,000 jobs. Kansas exports to China in 1996 were $53.2 million, up from $6 million in 1990. And China is my State's 13th largest trading partner.

Let's make sure that in our zeal to rap the knuckles of the Chinese Government, that we do not slam the American farmer and manufacturer with a 2 by 4 and cause the loss of thousands of American jobs. We need only be reminded of the Soviet grain embargo imposed by President Carter in the 1980's. I can assure you that Kansas wheat farmers have not forgotten it.

I believe there are more effective ways to foster freedom and curb human rights abuses in China. We should: First, ban companies controlled by the Chinese military from commercial activity in the United States; second, deny visas to Chinese officials involved in human rights abuses, religious repression or population control or who engage in selling high-tech weaponry; and third, increase exchange programs for Chinese students to come to the United States.

So, by renewing MFN status, we choose to go next door and persuade our neighbor to treat his children lovingly. The United States should remain a positive influence on its neighbor by keeping our doors open to demonstrate how families in a free and prosperous nation live together in peace.

Let us remember the words of President Reagan in his last State of the Union Address:

One of the greatest contributions the United States can make to the world is to promote freedom as the key to economic growth. A creative, competitive America is the answer to a changing world, not trade wars that would close doors, create great barriers, and destroy millions of jobs . . . Where others fear trade and economic growth, we see opportunities for creating new wealth and undreamed-of opportunities for millions in our own land and beyond. Where others seek to throw up barriers, we seek to bring them down; where others take counsel of their fears, we follow our hopes.

After much prayerful thought, I will vote in favor of extending most-favored-nation status to China.

I urge my colleagues to support normal trade relations with China in hopes of continuing our influence of religious and economic freedom.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of House Joint Resolution 79, a resolution of disapproval of most-favored-nation [MFN] status for products from China. I believe that it is in the best interest of United States agriculture to continue, and eventually expand, the current trading relationship with China.

United States agriculture exports to China were $2 billion last year, a significant increase over 1993 United States exports of less than one-half of $1 billion. China represents an agriculture market that is vital to the success of our farmers and ranchers. Our agriculture trade with China can strengthen development of private enterprise in that country and bring China more fully into world trade membership.

There are few countries that do not have unconditional MFN status with the United States. MFN status allows a country's products to enter into the United States at the same tariff rates that apply to other trading partners. In fact, MFN provides no special treatment. It allows us to treat all countries' imports in the same manner. Failure to do so often has a serious negative impact on American agriculture, the first to feel the impact of embargoes and retaliation.

It is my intention to work toward the goal of ensuring regular and ongoing trade with China. In fact, the committee has been working closely with the Secretary of Agriculture and the United States Trade Representative on matters related to China's accession to the World Trade Organization. Several issues related to nontariff trade barriers must be resolved prior to any accession.

International trade is important for American agriculture and for the success and prosperity of American farmers and ranchers. I urge my colleagues to reject House Joint Resolution 79.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution.

Earlier this year, I traveled to China, Hong Kong and Taiwan with Speaker GINGRICH and a dozen of my colleagues. At each stop, it was impressed on us how important MFN for China is. People in both Taiwan and Hong Kong pleaded with us not to cut off trade with China. It is extremely important to them.

Why? Because they have billions of dollars worth of investment in China and Hong Kong. So do we.

What do we gain by denying trade with China? Yes, some countries don't have MFN—such as Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea and Cuba—countries that the State Department has listed as sponsors of international terrorism.

Do we want to include China in the same category? Maintaining strong relations with China is of great importance to providing long-term stability to the Asia-Pacific region. MFN is not a privilege, it is to maintain normal trade relations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if proceedings on the Journal resume immediately after an electronic vote on another question, then the minimum time for any electronic vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal may be 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of earlier today, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 259, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

AYES—173

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Barcia
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Berman
Bishop
Blunt
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Cardin
Carson
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coburn
Collins
Condit
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Duncan
Ehrlich
Engel
Ensign
Evans
Everett
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hefner
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Kucinich
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Maloney (CT)
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy (NY)
McInnis
McIntyre
McKinney
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Myrick
Nadler
Norwood
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paxon
Payne
Pelosi
Pickering
Pombo
Rahall
Riley
Rivers
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer, Bob
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sisisky
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Linda
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman

Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Weygand
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—259

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Castle
Chabot
Christensen
Clement
Coble
Combest
Conyers
Cooksey
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
DeGette
DeLay
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Houghton
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennelly
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rodriguez
Roemer
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Salmon
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schumer
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Snyder
Stabenow
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Towns
Turner
Walsh
Watkins
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Cox
Schiff
Yates

□ 1550

Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Messrs. SUNUNU, LARGENT, TAUZIN, LEWIS of California, and BECERRA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. TORRES changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to speak out of order. On rollcall vote 231, House Resolution 79, to disapprove most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China, I was recorded as voting ''no'', it was my intention to vote ''yes'', to deny MFN to China. I ask that this statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately after rollcall vote 231.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 369, noes 59, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

AYES—369

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Vento
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—59

Abercrombie
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Clay
Clayton
Costello
Cummings
DeFazio
English
Ensign
Everett
Fazio
Filner
Foglietta
Fox
Gephardt
Gibbons
Green
Gutknecht
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hulshof
Johnson, E. B.
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Maloney (NY)
McDermott
McNulty
Moran (KS)
Oberstar
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pickett