



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1997

No. 154

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GILLMOR].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 6, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable PAUL E. GILLMOR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Enable each person, O God, who labors in this place to sense more clearly the high honor and distinct privilege it is to have the opportunity of serving the people of our Nation. Give us, we pray, O God, a new spirit of responsibility to see how our deeds and our commitment can help strengthen our national heritage as we seek to be good stewards of the rich resources of the land. Let us build to make strong; let us work to heal our divisions; let us discover accord where we can; let us respect each other in all the great moments of life and let us work together to express our unity in heart and mind. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIMKUS]

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SHIMKUS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. McDevitt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2367. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 714. An act to extend and improve the Native American Veteran Housing Loan Pilot Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to extend certain authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to services for homeless veterans, to extend certain other authorities of the Secretary, and for other purposes;

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

S. 1378. An act to extend the authorization of use of official mail in the location and recovery of missing children, and for other purposes;

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing printing of a revised edition of the publication entitled "Our Flag";

S. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution authorizing printing of the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made"; and

S. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution authorizing printing of the pamphlet entitled "The Constitution of the United States of America".

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain ten 1-minutes on each side.

IN MEMORY OF ANDREW TAYLOR

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, last month Andrew Taylor, a 4-year-old boy from Springfield, IL, succumbed to a brain tumor and lost his life. Many Members may remember Andrew.

As a 3-year-old he received national attention when he became a hero by saving the life of his grandmother. Iva Taylor had fallen and lay in a pool of blood when Andrew called for help on a cellular phone. Andrew, 3 years old at the time, placed a pillow under his grandmother's head and told her, I am going to take care of you. Then the young boy waited until help arrived.

One year ago in July, when the Springfield community learned of Andrew's brain tumor, they rallied to help his family with the mounting medical expenses. Many community members and organizations came forward to help ease the burden of his mother Lisa, a single parent, and to make Andrew's life as comfortable as possible. On July 4 of this year, his brain tumor was diagnosed inoperable. In October, our little hero passed away. As a father of a 4-year-old myself, the story of Andrew touches me tremendously. My thoughts and prayers are with his mother and family.

PASS FAST TRACK AUTHORITY

(Mr. DAVIS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H110107

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House is scheduled to vote on fast track legislation to provide this President with the same negotiating authority that every President has had since 1974 in this country. Opponents argue that the debate is about jobs. That is exactly what the debate is about. This is a debate about whether we are going to continue as a country to enjoy the benefits of further exports that provide high-paying jobs in our country.

Fast track legislation has enabled the Congress and the President to work together since 1974 as the public expects us to do, to take advantages of opportunities around the world, to use our prowess as a country, our competitive spirit, our resources to prevail in the world economy. If we do not take advantage of the opportunity to renew fast track authority tomorrow, we will lose a very important opportunity.

Yesterday I met with a worker from my hometown who came up here to tell me that his job and the jobs of his sons were at stake unless we renewed fast track authority. He was speaking on behalf of countless workers around the country who expect us to do the right thing.

When we go to vote tomorrow, let us keep in mind the jobs around the country that are at risk and the future jobs we can provide for our children, and let us pass fast track authority.

REPEAL THE IRS CODE

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House did something that every single observer 2 weeks ago and a month ago said was impossible, we turned the tables on the IRS to where citizens are protected; where taxpayers will have new taxpayer rights; to where, if people lose an IRS case, they have to pay, but if they win that IRS case, the Government has to pay. The resources of the Government are no longer overwhelmingly on the side stacked against taxpayers.

But Mr. Speaker, the real villain is not the IRS. We want to change the IRS as we know it. The real problem is the IRS Code. We need to repeal that Code. We need to start over again. We need to give the American taxpayer a fair deal, a safe deal, a simple deal, something they understand. The only way to do that is to repeal the Code. We need to do that when we get back into this Congress next year.

VOTES ON QUESTIONS OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM NEXT SPRING

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recall to the Members of this body that last weekend the Speaker of this House indicated there would be a vote on campaign finance reform next spring. But that raises many questions. For example, when next spring? We need a vote as early as possible.

It raises the question of what kinds of bills. I urge all Members of this body to insist on a bipartisan bill and bipartisan bills to bring to the floor in order to vote on campaign finance reform.

We know where the Republican leadership has been on this issue. The leadership has said we need more money in politics. We do not need to ban soft money, we need to take off all the limits on contributions to individual candidates. That is the wrong approach. We need more controls on contributions in this country, we need less money in politics, and we need to do that by working together with the other side.

The people back home want less money in politics. The people back home know that every voter, every contributor, every person who wants to participate in this system is being discouraged by the very large sums of money given to the national parties. We need to ban soft money, we need tighter disclosure on issue ads, and we need a vote early next spring.

We will talk a lot less about campaign finance reform if the Republican leadership gives us a vote.

THE UNITED NATIONS SHOULD NOT BLAME THE UNITED STATES FOR CASTRO'S FAILURES

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the United Nations once again voted to condemn the United States embargo on Cuba, demonstrating that when it comes to standing for freedom and human rights on the island, the United Nations members are on the side of the oppressor, rather than in support of the victims of the Castro dictatorship.

The vote should come as no surprise, because for decades the U.N. has coddled the Cuban dictator, Fidel Castro. We must force Castro to lift the embargo that he has on freedom and democracy in Cuba. When will there be free elections? When will Cubans be free to express their opinions?

A serious problem also is the Clinton administration's unwillingness to lobby our allies to support our Cuba policy. Unfortunately, the administration's inaction should be expected, given its refusal to enforce the Helms-Burton law, which was overwhelmingly approved by this body just 2 years ago. An embargo to support democracy for Haiti, an embargo to support democracy for South Africa, but when it comes to Cuba, the United Nations pre-

fers to hypocritically flirt with Castro. Blame the United States for Castro's failure? Shame on the United Nations.

FAST TRACK IS A JOB LOSER FOR AMERICA'S WORKERS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, to pass fast track the President said he will expand job retraining and unemployment counseling by \$1.2 billion. Unbelievable. The reason is very simple: More Americans will lose their jobs on yet another fast track.

To be more specific here, fast track is a loser, a job loser for American workers. What are we retraining these workers to do? How many more pantyhose crotch closer jobs are really out there, Mr. Speaker? Beam me up.

It is time to stand up and stop this madness. American workers do not want unemployment compensation, they do not want retraining, they do not want trade adjustment assistance. They want to keep their jobs and take care of their families.

IRS REFORM AND THE BUREAUCRATIC TAX CODE

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the IRS reform bill passed yesterday, which is an important first step in the battle to overhaul the current tax collection system in this country. However, this victory must be viewed with a little cautious optimism.

Let us not forget that when the President of this country was confronted with the Senate finance hearings that last month exposed the incredible abuse of power, which seems, by the way, to be the way of business over at the IRS, his first reaction was to defend the IRS. Incredible, stupefying, the American people thought, that this President's first reaction was to say, things really are not that bad.

He criticized the Republican tax reform plan. Of course, that was until he saw the American taxpayers were having nothing to do with his shrill criticism, because they have known for years that the IRS operates through heavy-handed tactics, sloppiness, and a lack of accountability. Any agency that allows bureaucrats no accountability will, over time, abuse its power.

The IRS reform package passed yesterday 426 to 4. It will inject real accountability to the IRS. Let us get rid of this bureaucratic, selfish Tax Code.

NO MORE TAXPAYER DOLLARS FOR EXPENSIVE FISHING EXPEDITIONS

(Mr. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. The gentleman from Georgia Mr. BOB BARR now says we should spend taxpayers' dollars for an expensive fishing expedition. Why? To see if there might possibly, conceivably, maybe be a reason to consider impeaching President Clinton. Ridiculous.

First Republicans spent millions of taxpayers' hard-earned money to try to bring down President Clinton with Whitewater hearings. Strike 1. Then Republicans wasted taxpayers' money attacking Senator LANDRIEU's election in Louisiana. Strike 2. Now Republicans are trying to overturn the election of the gentlewoman from California Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, and after an entire year, there is no proof her election should be overturned. Strike 3.

Having struck out with taxpayers' money, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] is now flailing away at the Constitution. Some Republicans, including the gentleman from Georgia, seem to love democracy. They just hate elections that do not go their way. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] should accept that Mr. Clinton was elected by the American people. He may not like it, but it is time to get over it.

THE PRESIDENT'S REMARKS ON TAX CUTS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, just 3 days ago President Clinton told Virginia voters what he really thinks about Americans who favor tax cuts. He called them selfish, as this headline illustrates.

When I heard that, I realized that this is actually a part of a pattern, and that I really should not have been surprised. So I went back, did a little research, and discovered that many other prominent Members of his party do believe exactly that, that it is selfish of people to think that they should get to keep more of what they have worked so hard to earn.

The Deputy Secretary of the Treasury said, "There is no case other than selfishness," about those who want to reduce the death tax. A few days later he was forced to retract that statement, but only last month minority leader in the Senate TOM DASCHLE told Americans that he does not think many people are overtaxed, and now President Clinton goes on record with his vision of Americans and tax cuts.

Of course, he will soon go back on his words and clarify what he really meant to say. I think that that will not be necessary.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ADJOURN UNTIL COMPLETING INVESTIGATION REGARDING THE HONORABLE LORETTA SANCHEZ

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the House should not adjourn this weekend until it ends this witch-hunt of the election of the gentlewoman from California Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ. The Republican leadership plans to put forward this morning a so-called martial law rule that will limit Democratic Members' ability to bring up privileged resolutions that demand an end to the outrageously partisan and unprecedented 10-month investigation into the election of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ].

The gentlewoman from California won her election fair and square. After wasting more than \$500,000 in taxpayer money, Republicans have completely failed to prove that Bob Dornan's loss was the result of voter fraud. Republicans were trying to harass and intimidate Hispanic voters simply because in 1996 Hispanic Americans voted in larger numbers than ever before, and mostly supported Democratic candidates.

Let us free the gentlewoman from California Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, and let us put an end to this witch-hunt before we adjourn this weekend.

□ 1015

LET US GIVE PARENTS MORE CHOICE IN EDUCATION

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, there is a clear difference between the liberals' view of education and the initiatives of the Republicans in Congress. It is founded on our basic premise of our political rudder that steers us through the ocean of life. I think it is just a simple philosophical difference. The Republicans believe in people. We trust the common sense that people possess, and the liberals trust the big bureaucracy.

A good example is our effort to give parents more choice in selecting schools for their children. In a recent survey done by the American Viewpoint, 67 percent of the people agreed with the Republican initiatives who want to give parents more control over their children's education by allowing them to choose which schools their children attend and by giving them vouchers that will allow them to send their children to a private or religious school if they choose to do so, while only 28 percent agreed with the liberals who opposed the choice that parents would get.

Mr. Speaker, competition will make the education system stronger. It has

in our higher education system. We saw it after World War II with the bills that were available for soldiers to get higher education. So let us give parents more choice in education.

DORNAN-SANCHEZ CONTESTED ELECTION

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, last night I listened in interest as my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. EHLERS, discussed the investigation of the election of our colleague, the gentlewoman from California Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ. He explained that 6,000 voters in Orange County were noncitizens at the time of last year's election, not just in the 46th District, which the gentlewoman from California Ms. SANCHEZ represents, but in the entire county, which includes five other congressional districts.

We ought to be committed to weeding out voter fraud. And if our Republican colleagues are truly committed to weeding out voter fraud in this country, they would be investigating all of the congressional elections that took place in Orange County last year to find all of these ineligible voters.

But there have been no investigations of any of the other Orange County elections. And why? Because those seats were won by Republican Congressmen, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM], the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Republicans are only targeting one district, one Member, one community, the Hispanic community, clearly nothing more than a partisan political probe funded by U.S. taxpayers. Enough is enough. Call an end to the investigation.

TOP 10 REASONS MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OPPOSE FAST TRACK

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as intensity builds toward tomorrow's historic vote on fast track, I am gratified to stand here and inform my colleagues that, within the hour, they will have a suitable-for-framing "Dear Colleague" in their office which outlines the top 10 reasons Members of Congress oppose fast track. They come from our home office in Eugene, OR.

Reason No. 10 the Members oppose fast track: Trade must kill jobs. We still have 4.9 percent unemployment.

Reason No. 9: Smoot and Hawley got a bum wrap.

Reason No. 8, two words: Black helicopters.

Reason No. 7: Wall Street could use a total meltdown of Asian stock markets.

Reason No. 6: Ralph Nader and Pat Buchanan agree. Can they both be wrong?

Reason No. 5: Fast track does not let United States Congress set the minimum wage in Portugal.

Reason No. 4: 1998 Nobel Prize winner for economics, Ross Perot.

Reason No. 3: My vision for our 21st century economy, manual typewriters, rotary telephones, and black-and-white televisions.

Reason No. 2: John Sweeney told me to.

And reason No. 1: Mr. Speaker, I want a better fast track, a better balanced budget, a better tax cut, and better welfare reform.

END HARASSMENT OF MS.
SANCHEZ

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, when Abraham Lincoln formed the Republican Party, one of the groups that he had to deal with in putting his coalition together was the nativist movement in this country called the "Know Nothing Party." They hated two groups: The Irish, who spoke Gaelic and were Catholic; and the Germans, who spoke German and were Catholic.

That root has been in the Republican Party from the very start. It is what drove millions of immigrants into the Democratic Party. All the southern Europeans who came to this country became Democrats because they knew the Republicans did not want them. And now we are after the Asians and the Hispanics. A prime example of that is the harassment of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ].

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, on behalf of their party and this country, that they take the leadership in ending this harassment of a Member of this House, who was duly elected, certified by the State of California, and has been forced to spend \$300,000 or more defending that seat. End it, Mr. Speaker. You can lead us.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY, LET US
WORK FOR TAX RELIEF

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, sometimes on particular issues, the distinctions between the Democrat and Republican Party are blurred. But when it comes to taxes, there is absolutely no doubt.

What does the leading Democrat in the United States of America have to say about tax cuts? They are selfish. Good gracious, you might use the money to buy your child new braces.

What did he say? He said several issues here again. What does the deputy secretary of treasury under Clinton say? When it comes to estate taxes, there is no case other than selfishness necessary.

That means, if we work hard all our lives and we want to pass the family farm on to our son or daughter so he or she can continue to plow the fields that our grandparents walked in, that means we are selfish. And then what does the leading Senate Democrat say, TOM DASCHLE? "But certainly I don't think that many people are over-taxed."

Now, go tell that to the people who are working 60, 70 hours a week, working overtime, the man and woman passing like ships in the night trying to make ends meet, buying new tires, repairing the dryer, trying to pay the home mortgage. Tell them that they are being undertaxed and they are being selfish because they want more.

Please, Democratic Party, join the American people and let us work for tax relief.

DORNAN-SANCHEZ CONTESTED
ELECTION

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, 1 year after the election of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] to this House and her investigation continues by this House, we went from a witch hunt that started with a half a million questionable individuals, allegedly, to last night's revelation that we are down to 1,000 individuals and still counting downwards.

Democrats welcome the opportunity of the U.S. attorney's investigation in California into the broader questions. We welcome that. We want to see what he has got to say. And we welcome any broader voter fraud question. But what we do not welcome is the continuous use of hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars that our conservative friends on the Republican side are always wanting to save, and we agree with them.

Why do they not want to save it in this case? The reason they do not want to save it is because they want to use taxpayer dollars to do what their history has done in their own State of California where they were fined \$600,000 for voter suppression and voter intimidation.

Stop abusing the taxpayers' money.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The Chair would observe that the rules provide for a 1-minute speech, and the Chair would ask Members to stay within that time limit.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 568-571 earlier this week. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 568 and 571 and "nay" on rollcall votes 569 and 570.

IT IS TIME TO CLEAN HOUSE AT
IRS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, just when we thought it could not get any worse, we find out about another outrage at the IRS. The deeper we dig, the more we find out that the IRS is a rogue agency that abuses its power.

Congress asks, who is responsible? And what kind of response do we get from this administration's Treasury Department and from this White House? The same responses we get from this administration whenever they get caught in other wrongdoing: Denials and attempts to change the subject or their favorite expression that "mistakes were made" whenever they wish to avoid holding anyone accountable.

The same administration that somehow ended up with 900 FBI files of Republicans and cannot seem to recall just how that happened is the same administration that has done absolutely nothing in 4½ years to rein in an agency that is out of control. Politically motivated tax audits, replacing justice with revenue quotas, intimidating settlements on ordinary citizens who cannot afford lawyers, irresponsible bureaucrats who abuse their power. The list goes on and on.

It is time to clean the house at the IRS.

CONGRESS SHOULD ENACT D.C.
APPROPRIATION

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, if this were a court, I would be forced to throw myself on the mercy of the court. Congress has an obligation to allow the Capital of the United States to spend its own money by enacting our appropriation.

Did my colleagues know that the District no longer gets a Federal payment under the rescue plan? Almost every dollar in the D.C. appropriation was raised in the District from the people I represent. Without an appropriation, there should be no appropriation subcommittee.

Did my colleagues know that there is no dispute over money? First there were vouchers. Now Republicans are fighting among themselves over an authorizing measure outside the jurisdiction of the appropriators. Ominously, the District's chief financial officer is

warned of \$100 million of fast cuts that will be necessary if the District of Columbia has to spend at last year's levels much longer. That will stop the city cold.

The majority has an obligation to get 13 appropriations passed every year. The majority speaks often of its special authority over the Nation's capital. Exercise that authority. Let the District spend its own money. Save the Nation's Capital.

□ 1030

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO PARTIES

(Mr. ROGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in American history, American families spend more in taxes than they do for food, clothing and shelter combined. Republicans in Congress are trying to do something about that. We are trying to fashion tax and spending policies that will return more money to working families that earned the money. We want them to keep more of what they earn rather than send their money to Washington for bureaucrats to spend.

Republicans prefer to work with our Democrat colleagues in a bipartisan fashion, but it becomes increasingly difficult when the President of the United States labels tax cuts for families as selfish and says that Americans should be satisfied with a revived economy and "happy to pay for government services."

Our frustration grows when Democrat policymakers in Washington all the way down the line echo this sentiment of selfishness.

For example, the administration's Deputy Treasury Secretary recently said that the Republican plan to reduce the death tax, which cripples family farms and businesses, is selfish.

Unbelievably, the leader of the Democrats in the U.S. Senate, TOM DASCHLE, said "I do not think that people are overtaxed."

Mr. Speaker, the next time someone says there is not a dime's worth of difference between Republicans and Democrats in Congress on tax policy, I would suggest there is a dime's worth of difference: It is the taxpayers' dime.

THE TIME HAS COME FOR THE REPUBLICANS TO DISMISS THE CHARGES AGAINST LORETTA SANCHEZ

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it has become clear to all that the case that the Republicans have been pursuing against the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ]

has failed. It has failed for the simple reason that they have been unable to provide us sufficient evidence to suggest that somehow she was improperly elected to her seat in the Congress. And yet in spite of that overwhelming evidence of a lack of evidence to voter fraud affecting her seat, they continue this investigation.

They have sent out subpoenas to people, improperly so; they have questioned the citizenship of individuals who have properly voted; they have questioned all sorts of voters, but what they have not been able to do is they have not been able to prove that she has been improperly elected.

The time has come for the Republicans to drop this case and to dismiss the charges against the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] and let her conduct herself on behalf of the citizens she was elected to represent in Orange County, CA. The time has come to stop this witch hunt against Hispanic voters and to let LORETTA SANCHEZ sit as an equal with the rest of us.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 85, nays 315, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 585]

YEAS—85

Andrews	Gejdenson	Millender-
Barrett (WI)	Hall (OH)	McDonald
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Miller (CA)
Berry	Hilleary	Nadler
Blumenauer	Hinchey	Oberstar
Boswell	Hinojosa	Obey
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Olver
Brown (OH)	Jackson-Lee	Owens
Clement	(TX)	Pallone
Clyburn	Johnson (WI)	Payne
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Coyne	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)
Cummings	Kennelly	Pomeroy
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Reyes
DeFazio	Kind (WI)	Rush
DeLauro	LaFalce	Sabo
Deutsch	Lantos	Sanchez
Dicks	Levin	Slaughter
Dingell	Markey	Smith, Adam
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)	Snyder
Engel	McDermott	Spratt
Eshoo	McGovern	Stabenow
Evans	McKeon	Stark
Farr	McNulty	Strickland
Fazio	Meek	Stupak
Filner	Menendez	Tauscher
Frank (MA)	Metcalf	
Furse		

Thompson	Torres	Wise
Thurman	Velazquez	Woolsey
NAYS—315		
Abercrombie	Franks (NJ)	McIntyre
Ackerman	Frelinghuysen	Meehan
Aderholt	Frost	Miller (FL)
Allen	Gallegly	Minge
Archer	Ganske	Moakley
Armey	Gekas	Mollohan
Bachus	Gibbons	Moran (KS)
Baesler	Gilcrest	Moran (VA)
Baker	Gillmor	Morella
Baldacci	Gilman	Murtha
Ballenger	Goode	Myrick
Barcia	Goodlatte	Neal
Barr	Goodling	Nethercutt
Barrett (NE)	Gordon	Neumann
Bartlett	Goss	Ney
Barton	Graham	Northup
Bass	Granger	Norwood
Bateman	Green	Nussle
Bentsen	Greenwood	Ortiz
Bereuter	Gutierrez	Packard
Berman	Gutknecht	Pappas
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Parker
Bilirakis	Hamilton	Pascrell
Blagojevich	Hansen	Pastor
Bliley	Harman	Paxon
Blunt	Hastert	Pease
Boehlert	Hastings (WA)	Peterson (PA)
Boehner	Hayworth	Petri
Bonilla	Hefley	Pickering
Borski	Hefner	Pickett
Boyd	Hill	Pitts
Brady	Hilliard	Pombo
Brown (CA)	Hobson	Porter
Bryant	Hoekstra	Poshard
Bunning	Holden	Price (NC)
Burr	Hoolley	Pryce (OH)
Burton	Horn	Quinn
Buyer	Hostettler	Radanovich
Callahan	Houghton	Rahall
Calvert	Hoyer	Ramstad
Camp	Hulshof	Redmond
Campbell	Hunter	Regula
Canady	Hutchinson	Riggs
Cannon	Hyde	Rivers
Cardin	Inglis	Rodriguez
Castle	Istook	Roemer
Chabot	Jenkins	Rogan
Chambliss	John	Rogers
Chenoweth	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Christensen	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Clay	Jones	Rothman
Clayton	Kanjorski	Roukema
Coble	Kaptur	Royce
Coburn	Kasich	Ryun
Combest	Kelly	Salmon
Condit	Kildee	Sanders
Cook	Kim	Sandlin
Cooksey	King (NY)	Sanford
Costello	Kingston	Sawyer
Cox	Kleczka	Saxton
Cramer	Klink	Schaefer, Dan
Crapo	Klug	Schaffer, Bob
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Schumer
Danner	Kolbe	Scott
Davis (FL)	Kucinich	Sensenbrenner
Davis (VA)	LaHood	Serrano
Deal	Lampson	Sessions
DeGette	Largent	Shadegg
Delahunt	Latham	Shaw
DeLay	LaTourette	Shays
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Sherman
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Dooley	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Doolittle	Linder	Sisisky
Doyle	Lipinski	Skaggs
Dreier	Livingston	Skeen
Duncan	LoBiondo	Skelton
Dunn	Lofgren	Smith (MI)
Edwards	Lowey	Smith (NJ)
Ehlers	Lucas	Smith (OR)
Ehrlich	Luther	Smith (TX)
Emerson	Maloney (CT)	Smith, Linda
English	Maloney (NY)	Snowbarger
Ensign	Manton	Solomon
Etheridge	Manzullo	Souder
Everett	Martinez	Spence
Ewing	Mascara	Stearns
Fattah	Matsui	Stenholm
Fawell	McCarthy (NY)	Stokes
Flake	McCollum	Stump
Foley	McDade	Sununu
Ford	McHale	Talent
Fossella	McHugh	Tanner
Fowler	McInnis	Tauzin
Fox	McIntosh	Taylor (MS)

Taylor (NC)	Visclosky	Weller
Thomas	Walsh	Wexler
Thornberry	Wamp	Weygand
Thune	Waters	White
Tiahrt	Watkins	Whitfield
Tierney	Watt (NC)	Wicker
Traficant	Watts (OK)	Wolf
Turner	Waxman	Wynn
Upton	Weldon (FL)	Yates
Vento	Weldon (PA)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—33

Bishop	Forbes	Mink
Bonior	Gephardt	Oxley
Bono	Gonzalez	Paul
Boucher	Hergert	Portman
Carson	Jefferson	Rangel
Collins	Kennedy (MA)	Riley
Crane	Leach	Roybal-Allard
Cubin	Lewis (GA)	Scarborough
Dellums	McCrery	Schiff
Dixon	McKinney	Towns
Foglietta	Mica	Young (AK)

□ 1053

Messrs. WICKER, GREENWOOD, LINDER and ISTOOK changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. TAUSCHER changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 305, WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 305 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 305

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported from that committee before November 10, 1997, providing for consideration or disposition of any of the following:

(1) A bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

(2) A bill or joint resolution that includes provisions making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1998, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time before November 10, 1997, for the Speaker, to entertain motions to suspend the rules, provided that the object of any such motion is announced from the floor at least one hour before the motion is offered. In scheduling the consideration of legislation under this authority, the Speaker or his designee shall consult with the minority leader or his designee.

SEC. 3. During the remainder of the first session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress—

(1) notwithstanding clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, a resolution noticed as a question of the privileges of the House during the period

from November 4, 1997, through the adoption of this resolution shall have precedence of all other questions except motions to adjourn only at a time designated by the Speaker; and

(2) the Speaker may not recognize a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader to offer from the floor, or to announce an intention to offer, a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 100, noes 309, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 586]

AYES—100

Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)
Andrews	Furse	Moakley
Barrett (WI)	Gejdenson	Nadler
Becerra	Gephardt	Neal
Berman	Harman	Oberstar
Berry	Hastings (FL)	Oberly
Bishop	Hefner	Olver
Blumenauer	Hilleary	Owens
Bonior	Hinchev	Pallone
Boucher	Hinojosa	Payne
Brady	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Brown (OH)	(TX)	Reyes
Chambliss	Jefferson	Sabo
Clayton	Johnson (WI)	Sanchez
Clement	Johnson, E. B.	Sawyer
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Skelton
Conyers	Kennelly	Slaughter
Coyne	Kilpatrick	Snyder
Cummings	LaFalce	Spratt
DeFazio	Lampson	Stabenow
DeGette	Lantos	Stark
DeLahunt	Levin	Strickland
DeLauro	Lowe	Stupak
Dellums	Markey	Thompson
Deutsch	Martinez	Thurman
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Tierney
Doggett	McDermott	Torres
Engel	McGovern	Towns
Eshoo	McNulty	Velazquez
Etheridge	Meek	Vento
Evans	Menendez	Waters
Farr	Millender	Wise
Filner	McDonald	Woolsey

NOES—309

Abercrombie	Blunt	Clay
Aderholt	Boehlert	Coble
Allen	Boehner	Coburn
Archer	Bonilla	Collins
Armey	Borski	Combest
Bachus	Boswell	Condit
Baesler	Boyd	Cook
Baker	Brown (CA)	Cooksey
Baldacci	Bryant	Costello
Ballenger	Bunning	Cox
Barcia	Burton	Cramer
Barr	Buyer	Crapo
Barrett (NE)	Callahan	Cunningham
Bartlett	Calvert	Danner
Barton	Camp	Davis (FL)
Bass	Campbell	Davis (IL)
Bateman	Canady	Davis (VA)
Bentsen	Cannon	Deal
Bereuter	Cardin	DeLay
Bilbray	Castle	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Chabot	Dickey
Blagojevich	Chenoweth	Dicks
Bliley	Christensen	Dixon

Dooley	Kingston	Rivers
Doolittle	Klecza	Rodriguez
Doyle	Klink	Roemer
Dreier	Klug	Rogan
Duncan	Knollenberg	Rogers
Dunn	Kolbe	Rohrabacher
Edwards	Kucinich	Ros-Lehtinen
Ehlers	LaHood	Rothman
Ehrlich	Largent	Roukema
Emerson	Latham	Royce
English	LaTourette	Rush
Ensign	Lazio	Ryun
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Salmon
Ewing	Lewis (KY)	Sanders
Fattah	Linder	Sandlin
Fawell	Lipinski	Sanford
Flake	Livingston	Saxton
Foley	LoBiondo	Scarborough
Ford	Lofgren	Schaefer, Dan
Fossella	Lucas	Schaefer, Bob
Fowler	Luther	Schumer
Fox	Maloney (CT)	Scott
Franks (NJ)	Maloney (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Frelinghuysen	Manton	Serrano
Frost	Manzullo	Sessions
Gallegly	Mascara	Shadegg
Ganske	Matsui	Shaw
Gekas	McCarthy (NY)	Shays
Gibbons	McCollum	Sherman
Gilchrest	McCrery	Shimkus
Gillmor	McDade	Shuster
Gilman	McHale	Sisisky
Goode	McHugh	Skaggs
Goodlatte	McInnis	Skeen
Goodling	McIntosh	Smith (MI)
Gordon	McIntyre	Smith (NJ)
Goss	McKeon	Smith (OR)
Graham	Meehan	Smith (TX)
Granger	Metcalfe	Smith, Adam
Green	Miller (FL)	Smith, Linda
Greenwood	Minge	Snowbarger
Gutierrez	Mollohan	Solomon
Moakley	Moran (KS)	Souder
Nadler	Moran (VA)	Spence
Neal	Morella	Stearns
Oberstar	Murtha	Stenholm
Oberly	Myrick	Stokes
Olver	Nethercutt	Stump
Owens	Neumann	Sununu
Pallone	Ney	Talent
Payne	Northup	Tanner
Pelosi	Norwood	Tauscher
Peterson (MN)	Nussle	Tauzin
Reyes	Ortiz	Taylor (MS)
Sabo	Oxley	Taylor (NC)
Sanchez	Packard	Thomas
Sawyer	Pappas	Thune
Skelton	Parker	Tiahrt
Slaughter	Pascrell	Traficant
Snyder	Pastor	Turner
Spratt	Paul	Upton
Stabenow	Paxon	Visclosky
Stark	Pease	Walsh
Strickland	Peterson (PA)	Wamp
Stupak	Pickering	Watkins
Thompson	Pickett	Watt (NC)
Thurman	Pitts	Watts (OK)
Tierney	Pombo	Waxman
Torres	Pomeroy	Weldon (FL)
Towns	Poshard	Weldon (PA)
Velazquez	Price (NC)	Weller
Vento	Pryce (OH)	Wexler
Waters	Quinn	Weygand
Wise	Radanovich	White
Woolsey	Rahall	Whitfield
	Ramstad	Wicker
	Redmond	Wolf
	Regula	Wynn
	Riggs	Young (AK)
		Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Bono	Gonzalez	Porter
Burr	Hunter	Portman
Carson	Kennedy (MA)	Rangel
Crane	Leach	Riley
Cubin	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Fazio	McKinney	Schiff
Foglietta	Mica	Thornberry
Forbes	Mink	Yates

□ 1119

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to the membership, giving credit to the Democrats that more Democrats voted to stay here and work than voted to go home. I wanted to make that point, and we thank them.

Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the very distinguished gentlewoman [Ms. SLAUGHTER], pending which I yield myself such time as I might consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow us to complete our work in a timely and expeditious manner and send us back to our districts this weekend. I would like to quote a very distinguished former Member of this House. His name was Tip O'Neill, and we all revered Tip. He was a great guy. But he said, quote, "If you stay in session, a lot of things can happen, and all of them are bad."

Well, I say to my colleagues, we are rushing to adjournment. We are going to get out of here this Sunday if we all cooperate with each other, and that is why we have this resolution before us today.

House Resolution 305 is a customary rule for considering legislation at the end of the legislative session. The first part of this rule waives provisions of clause 4(b) of rule XI, requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules, and it is waived against certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules before November 10, 1997, or rather between today and actually next Monday.

The waiver applies to any special rules providing for consideration of a bill or a joint resolution that makes appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon. This will enable the House to expeditiously conclude the remaining appropriation bills for fiscal year 1998, hopefully by this Sunday, and perhaps even sooner.

The waiver also applies to any special rule providing for consideration of a bill for a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon. As the current continuing resolution is scheduled to expire on Friday, tomorrow, November 7, this will allow the House to consider

any needed short-term extension as efficiently as possible so that the Government does not shut down and all of the agencies and bureaus and departments can continue to serve the American people.

Section 2 of the rule provides that the Speaker may entertain motions to suspend the rules at any time before Monday, November 10, 1997, provided that the object of the motion is announced from the floor at least 1 hour before the motion is offered, and that deals in layman's language for suspensions after the minority is given at least 1 hour's notice.

In order to accommodate the schedule in the interests of all Members, this rule also provides that the Speaker will consult with the minority leader regarding any bills scheduled under the authority to suspend the rules.

The final section of the rule provides that during the remainder of the 1st session of the 105th Congress, the Speaker may not recognize a Member, other than the majority leader or the minority leader, to offer from the floor or to announce an intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

This section of the rule further provides that the Speaker may postpone the consideration of any noticed resolution as a question of the privileges of the House prior to the adoption of this resolution during the remainder of the first session of the 105th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the procedures for calling up a rule on the same day that it is reported from the Committee on Rules are familiar to the House. It is customary for the appropriation measures at the end of the session. Also, providing for motions to suspend the rules on days other than Mondays or Tuesdays is very useful so that bipartisan, non-controversial legislation can move rapidly at the end of the session.

We have a particular problem in the borders with Canada where there are problems with people coming back and forth. There is some bipartisan legislation that we hope to move under this kind of a procedure. Adequate provision for notice to the minority are provided, as has been the case in the past.

Mr. Speaker, in the furtherance of our target adjournment date, this rule also addresses the dilatory tactics and abuse of the House rules we have seen in recent weeks on the floor. As the House is well aware, certain Members have utilized the procedure under House rule IX, questions of the privilege of the House, to force debate and votes on the contested election in the 46th Congressional District in California. Under that rule, Members may give notice of their intention to raise a question of privilege of the House and the Speaker then sets an appropriate time within 2 legislative days for the consideration of the question of the privilege. Certain minority Members' repeated and dilatory use of these questions of privilege to filibuster the legislative process I believe creates a privi-

lege in itself, and that is why we are here today with this rule.

The disposal of these near identical notices under rule IX consumes precious hours as well as requiring an astounding number of votes. The use of the rule relating to the questions of the privilege of the House in a frivolous and political manner is unbecoming, I think, to this institution, and that certainly is verified by the literally hundreds of phone calls that I have received because people know that I am chairman of the Committee on Rules, calls from all over the country, wanting to know why we are wasting our time with these repeated repetitious requests for questions of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, for several weeks the majority and the minority leadership have attempted to reach an accommodation regarding these dilatory questions of privilege. On October 23, the distinguished minority leader, who I have great respect for, rose to a question of privilege on this issue. Instead of simply tabling the matter with no debate, the House considered the resolution, debated it for an hour and defeated it, under regular order of this House. The majority leadership allowed it to be debated out of deference to the minority leader and voted on it. The House worked its will and defeated that resolution.

In exchange for allowing this issue to be debated and voted on, the minority provided the following: October 29, one question of privilege tabled. October 30, eight questions of privilege tabled. October 31, 21 questions of privilege noticed. November 4, 7 questions of privilege noticed, and yesterday, November 5, another 13 questions of privilege were noticed, delaying us bringing up very important matters dealing with the United States-China relationship by about an hour and a half, another hour and a half that we were delayed from working the will of this House.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, in efforts to mollify the situation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the majority leader, allowed yet another question of privilege on the same subject to be separately debated and voted on. It was a good debate, I think from both sides of the aisle, whether one agrees with it or does not. A unanimous-consent request was then propounded which would have considered the question of privileges as read and would have shortened the voting time on each, again in an effort to try to accommodate the minority. This reasonable request was objected to.

Mr. Speaker, in still another example of good faith, the Committee on Rules reported two rules last night, the rule I have just called up and we are debating now, which contains this limitation on questions of privilege, and another without this provision.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, the committee's intention was to empower the very serious legislators on both sides of the aisle and to marginalize the partisan obstructions. This has not happened, and

that is why I was forced today to rise with this unfortunate rule today.

I do not like to bring this rule before the House. I said so last night during the debate exchange in the Committee on Rules. But, Mr. Speaker, many Members on both sides of the aisle with a very strong interest in getting legislation considered by the House before we adjourn have approached me and asked for the Committee on Rules to intervene and to restore order on this floor, so we can expedite these very, very serious measures that we have to deal with before this Sunday.

Mr. Speaker, because the rule suffering such abuse has been rule IX, I have been reluctant, again, to intervene. The deliberate use of this fundamental House rule for a flagrant political and dilatory purpose has forced the majority to assert its right to set the legislative schedule.

On behalf of the overwhelming majority of both parties who are interested in serious legislating, we must insist that our friends will not filibuster the people's House with an abuse of these rules.

Having said that, I hope we can pass this rule and get on with the people's business. There is precious little time between now and Sunday to find the windows of opportunity on this floor to deal with the measures that are so important to Members on both sides of the aisle, as well as the other body, and as well as President Clinton himself, who has a number of requests pending before this body.

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

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

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose this tyrannical rule. For the first time in the 218-year history of the House of Representatives, we will be voting to deprive all but two Members of this body the right to assert their constitutional prerogatives as Representatives elected by their constituents. House rule IX gives each and every Member of this House the right to raise before the whole body questions of privilege affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.

The House adopted rule IX in 1880, defining what had been long established in the practice of the House before then. Thomas Jefferson begins his Manual on Parliamentary Procedure, which has governed the House procedures since 1837, with section 1, titled "The Importance of Adhering to Rules." It quotes a former Speaker of the House of Commons' views on the neglect of, or departure from, the rules of proceeding.

I quote:

That these forms, as instituted by our ancestors, operated as a check and control on the

actions of the majority, and that they were, in many instances, a shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power.

Jefferson then continues:

As it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed by their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which they have adopted as they have found necessary, from time to time, and are become the law of the House, by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses, which these forms were intended to check, which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities.

Mr. Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, surely would have opposed the wantonness of power displayed by the majority in offering this rule. Rule IX is the heart of Members' individual rights within our rules. It guarantees that each Member has the right to move to guarantee the integrity of House proceedings. That right is so central to our idea of representative government and liberty itself that in all of the 104 Congresses before today, the House has never voted to suspend this paramount right.

Even in the depths of the Depression and in the struggles against the tyranny of Nazi Germany, when the House's legislative decisions might truly have changed the course of the Nation and the world, they did not suspend this prerogative of the individual Member.

Yet, in this era of relative prosperity and world stability, the majority proposes to suspend this fundamental right guaranteed in our rules. This majority would give itself the power for the rest of this session to not recognize any Member except the majority or minority leader to offer a motion affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, its dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.

What is the national crisis that has brought about this unprecedented attempt by the majority to usurp Members' powers to protect the integrity of this House? Are we at war and a defense funding bill is urgent? Is there mob violence in the streets? Are we in the throes of a great economic depression? No. The interest this unprecedented attack on one of the fundamental checks and balances built into our House rules is getting Members out of town a day or two early.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say, shame. At last night's Committee on Rules, the chairman of the committee did indeed state that he hoped this rule would not come to the floor, and I joined him in that hope. I am appalled and saddened that this majority would seek to suspend this bulwark of Members' abilities to ensure full representation to their constituents.

What kind of issues are raised under rule IX, the rule that will be effectively suspended? The Annotated House Rules

gives us examples of the fundamental nature of issues that are raised under the rule. They are questions relating to the House's constitutional prerogatives in respect to revenue legislation and appropriations; impeachments; the constitutional prerogatives of this House with respect to bills pocket-vetoed during an intersession of adjournment; the House's power to punish for contempt, whether of its own Members, of witnesses who are summoned to give information, or of other purposes; questions relating to the House's organization and the title of its Members to their seats; questions relating to the conduct of officers and employees, in addition to that of Members; questions relating to the integrity of its proceedings, including the processes by which bills are considered.

Clearly, the rule IX procedure for making motions regarding the privileges of this House is the keystone of a Member's ability to bring to the House's attention the most serious and fundamental matters affecting the integrity of this House. Yet this rule, proposed by the majority for the first time in the House of Representatives' 218-year history, squelched that right, and for what historic, precedent-worthy reason? So that we might leave Washington a couple of days early.

Mr. Speaker, I have not yet touched on the second infamous and again unprecedented clause in this rule. It would allow the Speaker to postpone indefinitely the full House consideration of any question of the privileges of this House that he had deigned to allow.

Currently, rule IX gives the Speaker the authority to schedule consideration within the next 2 legislative days. I was responsible myself for drafting this rule change in the 103d Congress. It was done to ensure that privileged resolutions could not disrupt consideration of time-sensitive legislation, such as continuing resolutions. Prior to that rule change, a resolution raising questions of the privileges of this House had immediate precedence over all other questions except motions to adjourn. However, it was never within the contemplation of that rule change to prevent any Member from having the chance for the full House to vote on a privileged resolution.

As drafted, this part of the rule we are debating would essentially give the Speaker carte blanche to continue to indefinitely postpone consideration of any motion regarding privileges of the House until the end of the session. Unfortunately, last night we got a taste of the real world consequences of such postponements. The majority could merely move to adjourn sine die, and thereby prevent consideration of these fundamental motions to protect the House's safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, these two rules changes are a despotic attack on Members' constitutional rights to protect their constituents. This may be one of the most

important votes that we take as Members of Congress. As I mentioned earlier, Thomas Jefferson, who defined through the Declaration of Independence our notions of freedom and liberty, put the rules' protection against the tyranny of the majority as the very first section of Jefferson's rules which govern us today in the House of Representatives.

I will be ashamed for the House and afraid for its integrity should this misbegotten rule be adopted. The danger of this precedent cannot be overstated. I urge in the strongest possible terms that this attempt to restrict the fundamental rights and liberties of House Members be defeated.

In addition, I will urge Members to defeat the previous question, and if it is defeated, I will offer an amendment to strike the provisions of the rule pertaining to the privileged resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment will appear in the RECORD just prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from San Diego, CA, Mr. DUKE CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many of us heard about the harassment at the voter polls in California for the first time last night. At the time I was flying fighters for the U.S. Navy. I thought, if this is true, it is truly un-American for anyone to harass any ethnic group or any American or non-American at the polls, if they are here legally.

So I checked last night. Individuals wore brown shirts, INS shirts, at the polls carrying signs saying, noncitizens cannot vote here. The wearing of the brown shirts, I agree, would be mean-spirited, and they were fined for that. That should not be tolerated. But I agree with the idea that noncitizens should not vote.

Why did they carry those signs? It is because individual liberal activist Democrats were taking illegals to that particular precinct to vote. It was not an allegation; they were charged, they were arrested, and they were sent to jail. My colleagues do not tell us about that on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, who were these mean-spirited Republicans that wrote the signs in Spanish? Two Hispanic Americans, Carlos Rodriguez and Thomas Fuentes. What did they say? They said, we are proud of our ethnic backgrounds, and we are proud to be Americans, and we reject the blatant intentional abuse by Democrats to take away our basic rights that we worked hard for as American citizens and immigrants: first, our American citizenship, and then the right to vote as an American citizen.

I challenge my colleagues on the other side to spend one-tenth of the time looking at violations of voter fraud. It must be sad for them, after 3 years, because they have got nothing else to stymie and delay tactics on the House floor.

They fought against, many of them, the liberal Democrats, against a balanced budget, and we are now talking about a surplus in the deficit. They fought against tax relief for working families. They fought to save Medicare, and the President signed the same Medicare that they demonized in this balanced budget. They fought against welfare reform, when the average was 16 years, and they fought against anticrime measures.

It must really be sad that this is all they have left. It must be sad that the President said Americans are selfish for not wanting to pay taxes, and that a Member of the Senate said Americans are not paying enough taxes.

Over 400 Democrats have switched over to become Republicans. Do Members want to look at the future? Look at the races in Virginia. In Democratic districts, a clean sweep in New Jersey for Governor in a Democrat district; a clean sweep in New York, a targeted Democrat district; and now we have VITO FOSSELLA as a Member of Congress in the Molinari seat.

It must be really sad for them that the signs did not say, for some liberal Democrats, noncitizens vote here, and vote for me, or else they would be out there working just as hard to fight against illegal voting.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me commend the gentlewoman from New York for her fine statement and history of the rule that we are about, unfortunately, to overturn.

I just used the word "unfortunately." I think it fits my view, although that word that I take from my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, is too mild and too soft to really be used with any degree of accuracy in this situation.

□ 1145

I rise today to protest this rule, a rule which the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the committee, referred to as an unfortunate rule. Indeed, this is nothing less than a bold attempt by the Republican majority to silence, to muzzle, the elected representatives who speak for literally millions of people in this country. This is a gag rule. It is a rule that effectively denies every Member of Congress their right to free speech.

Over my right shoulder, etched above a door just to my right above the gallery, is ensconced the image of Thomas Jefferson, and which the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] eloquently quoted in her remarks earlier this morning. He must be looking down

upon the Republican majority with displeasure this morning, because what they are indeed about to do is squelch the free expression of Members of this House on issues of privilege for the first time in this Republic.

Mr. Speaker, this rule has one goal, to silence the criticism, the Republicans ugly campaign for harassment and intimidation against our colleague, the honorable gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ].

This gag rule is part of a pattern. It began when the Republicans decided they did not like the choice of the Orange County voters, many of them women and Hispanic, the choice that they made in electing the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] over Bob Dornan.

First they tried to silence these voters to deny them their choice. They did this by making wild allegations and launching into an 11-month investigation, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars, that has turned up no evidence to suggest that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] is anything but a duly elected Congresswoman.

Last night, the Republicans voted to adjourn specifically to vitiate, to kill, the privileged resolutions of 21 Members, all of whom were women or Hispanics, who are exercising their rights as the elected voice of their constituents. To silence the voice of their constituents, these 21 women who were denied the ability to speak about something that is not frivolous, as the majority referred to earlier in this debate, but is serious, it is about the election of a representative for 600,000 people.

In the House of Representatives, a body that is America's principal forum for debate, Republicans are trampling on the freedom of speech. I ask them, what are they afraid of? Are they afraid of free and open debate? Are they afraid of people who disagree with them? Are they afraid of the truth?

This gag rule effectively silences millions of Americans, and it runs against the very spirit of the Constitution that we were sworn to uphold. I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, as Ronald Reagan used to say, "Well, here we go again." Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman and the minority whip have made a point that this procedure has never been used before. And they are correct. But I would point out that no other small group of Members have ever, ever in the history of this Congress, ever abused the system by using rule IX.

The truth is, the group using these dilatory tactics admit that the repetitious offering, and I have got a whole list of them here, some 47 or 45, and I can assure my colleagues that the viewing audience agrees with us, because they are calling in and complaining about these repetitious offerings of the same resolution over and over, even to the point that one gentlewoman on the other side of the aisle

has now two pending, two of the same resolution. That is dilatory, my colleagues.

The truth is that this group using the dilatory tactics admit that these repetitious offerings of the same motions are dilatory and, in effect, are doing it to force their will on the House by using this repetitious system, which interrupts all of the other proceedings of the House.

Let me just read my colleagues the beginning of rule IX. And they ought to get it out, because they quoted Jefferson and Jefferson's Manual. Rule IX says, No. 1, "Questions of privilege shall be first those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety," and here comes the two important words, "its dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings."

Now, we are charged under the Constitution of the United States to operate under our rules. And this is the last thing we would want to do, but it is being forced on the vast majority of this body. We just had more Democrats vote to stay in session and work and deal with the proceedings of this House with the measures that are pending before this body than we did Democrats voting yes to adjourn. I think that speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I do not want to use up all our time over on this side of the aisle, but there is very important legislation which is pending before this body. We must get on with it. The majority leader has made every effort to recognize on any given day the right of any one of my colleagues, including the minority leader, to offer this resolution that they are interested in. But that is not satisfactory. They want to do it over and over and over again. And that just cannot be allowed, because we cannot accomplish the work of this House if we do that.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, if I might just take a moment to address my colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON.

It is the integrity of this House that we are fighting this morning to uphold. I believe that the majority of Americans would want us to do just that and that their elected representatives, sent here in their behalf, would have the opportunity to speak as they are given under the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, to my dear friend from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, who was obviously not here in the era of Mr. Bauman from Maryland, when he used every delaying tactic that we can imagine to call for votes and this sort of thing. But this is a right for any Member in this House. And I have been here longer than all the leadership in this House, both Republican and Democrat, and I represent 500 people in my district.

I have not offered a privileged resolution, but I have that right to offer that privileged resolution.

The gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], I wish he could have been here, because he made a point that some of the folks that were carrying these banners were Rodriguez and these sorts of names. But yet, on their investigation, they are assuming that all the bad votes and all the illegal votes are Hispanics.

Obviously, some of these people were Mr. Dornan's supporters over the years when the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] was not even running for office. Local people that were running for office got some of the same votes that she got, but they are not being contested.

But this is a gag rule. And it is unfair to me, as an American citizen and a representative of the people's House in the sovereign State of North Carolina, to say to me that the leadership of this House, both Democrat and Republican, can tell me that I am not allowed, under the privileges and the rules of this House, to offer a resolution.

That is against my privilege as a Member of this House, and I highly resent it. I would think that Members on this side that call themselves very conservative would resent this, also.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] for yielding me the time. I rise to oppose this intent to create martial law in the greatest democratic institution in the world.

Yesterday, unfortunately, history was made in a negative sense when the House, using the majority party's power to adjourn, ended all of the rights of those individuals of the Women's Caucus to seek to provoke a debate through privileged resolutions rising to the dignity and integrity of the House, and their rights were extinguished by having a motion to adjourn.

I would say to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, that the dignity and the integrity of the proceedings of the House are in question when they permit to spend hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars for an investigation that has yielded absolutely no fruit.

And 1 year later, democracy in this House is not protected unless the rights of the minority are protected. And what Republicans are doing today is nothing less than turning their back on this principle by denying the minority an important tool we have to represent our communities and our constituents.

The procedural tools of the House are not there to be used only so long as they are convenient for the majority's scheduling goals or that they benefit

the majority's agenda. They are there to be used when they benefit the minority as well.

The rights of Members are not here to be parcelled out and then abolished at the majority's whim. Make no mistake, by denying us justice and fairness today by taking away the protections afforded to the minority, my colleagues put in peril their own protections in the future.

This is an unprecedented denial of privileged resolutions by Members of the House, and that is outrageous. Several of the resolutions, I know my own that I introduced yesterday, are materially different, they have different aspects to it. And maybe my colleagues did not read them. But mine is materially different.

It is interesting to note, who do my colleagues seek to abolish the rights of, who presented the privileged resolutions yesterday? The members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. Is that not just a coincidence?

Those of us whose families fled from persecution, from dictatorship, view this as nothing more than gestapo tactics. When we take away the right to oppose those in power, when we abolish the rights of the minority, when we take away those protections, that is the beginning of tyranny. And when no one in the majority speaks up to defend them, that is when they put their own rights at risk.

Democracy is only safe when all views have a right to be heard. That is what the rules of the House are designed to allow. And they do not want any more privileged resolutions on the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ]. But what they are doing in the rule is, they are extinguishing the right of any Member to bring up a privileged resolution on any other matter, and that is outrageous.

If I had the incident with Mr. Dornan that this House voted to suspend his rights to be able to come in here, if that happened during this time period, I would not be able to introduce that privileged resolution because they have extinguished my right to do so. And that would be wrong.

My colleagues, do not turn your backs on the tradition of fairness, on the traditions of this institution, because you may find yourselves some day in the minority again. You are not just taking away a procedural tool, you are turning your back on a cherished principle of fairness. And while you may think you are just taking away our voices today, you are disenfranchising the voices of tens of millions of American citizens we represent.

This, if it is permitted, would be a shameful day for the House and a shameful day for your party.

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

Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to go get the previous speaker to tell us the significant difference between his two resolutions. But he did not want to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 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, I thank the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for yielding me this time.

Let me say that I am one who will acknowledge that that rule is clearly an extreme response. And it is an extreme response, unfortunately, for a very, very good reason. We have witnessed what I believe to be unprecedented and outrageous tactics over the last several weeks, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has said, jeopardizing the ability for this institution to do its work.

Clearly, what we want to do is, we want to bring about a resolution to this struggle that exists over who actually was elected, and we are trying to recognize the very precious franchise that every American citizen has, and that is the right to vote.

So, as we look at this, we have to look also at the pattern of elections that have been disputed over the past couple of decades, not one. Not one investigation that has taken place over the past couple of decades lasted less than 12 months. In fact, the average of those was 14 months.

□ 1200

But the precedent that has been set here is constantly the attempt to bottle up the work of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at what we are trying to do here, we know that we all have rights. The rights of the minority are something that I happen to treasure because I spent 14 years here as a member of the minority party. And in the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and I do our darnedest to recognize the rights of the minority. But something that we learned as members of the minority is that with rights come responsibility. We have a responsibility to do the work of the American people. Because of this dispute, which clearly, based on the arguments that were provided here last night, could be settled, and I think it could be settled reasonably and agreeably, but because there is disagreement among a very few extremists in the Democratic Party, and the reason I say that is that I have had more than one Democrat say to me, "My gosh, I wish that we would back off, let's get this thing over and done with, let's get it behind us." People do not like the idea of holding up the work of this institution. So with rights come responsibility. We are trying to recognize that, and we have been left with no alternative other than to pursue this rule. And so I urge strong support of it, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, a previous speaker here from California identified as Tom Fuentes a person

dressed in a brown shirt holding up signs in Spanish to intimidate voters. I think it is important for the record to show that Tom Fuentes is the chair of the Orange County, California Republican Party, and his party paid a \$400,000 fine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW].

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this House in January to get things done for my constituents. I have seen us when we worked together and respected the democratic process get positive things done. We have balanced the budget, we have provided tax relief, we have done positive work together. But we have done that respecting the democratic process and our rights to speak on behalf of our constituents.

I also came here believing that I had a right as a Member to present privileged resolutions to this House. One of the resolutions under question is one that I introduced. I know that my constituents expect that I have the right to speak and to offer privileged resolutions and to have them debated with respect. What we have today is an effort to take away the democratic process. We have a proposal in this rule for martial law. I would suggest what we need instead is a Marshall plan, a plan that respects democracy, allows us to work together to solve these issues and move forward in a way that respects everyone's rights. Martial law does not work in a democracy. The Marshall plan worked in its time. I would suggest to Members, we would be better off working in that direction, rather than taking away the rights of those of us who came understanding that we had the full rights and privileges of every Member of this House to speak on behalf of our constituents. I strongly urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we have another new Member here. He comes from the State of a man I used to admire. I was a Marine guard when Harry Truman was President of the United States, and he was a good President. President Truman would not put up with these shenanigans either. He said, "The buck stops here," and he would stop the buck from these dilatory tactics.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Strafford, MO [Mr. BLUNT].

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be yielded time by the distinguished gentleman and to speak after he referred to Harry Truman, a Missouri President who understood responsibility. The responsibility of the House today and tomorrow and however many days it takes is to get our job done. The responsibility of the House is to do the work of the people of the country. We have heard these motions over and over again.

I heard this morning that what the rule proposes to do is squelch the free

expression of the Members of the House. I advance the idea that the free expression of the Members of the House is more squelched by consistently delaying the process of the real debate that needs to go on here. As the former chief election official of our State, I have looked at some of these motions that have been filed, and I think any reasonable person would be hard-pressed to argue that we are not debating and reading and seeing introduced the same motion over and over again while the real work of the country stands undone.

This week should not be about dilatory tactics. This week should not be about motions to adjourn. This week should be about doing the job we need to do to direct the foreign policy of America, to have a defense bill that puts our defense in place, to decide the debate on national testing that 295 Members of the House said they did not want in the Labor-HHS bill.

Certainly there was a motion last night at 11 o'clock to adjourn. The people in my district and I daresay the people all over America understand that there is a difference in 11 o'clock at night motions to adjourn and two motions to adjourn before 11 o'clock this morning.

We need to do the work of the people of the country. It needs to happen. Obviously it is going to take this rule to make it happen. The people that sent me here sent me here to solve the big issues of the country, not to slow down the progress and change that is being made here.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I must say I was a little surprised to hear my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, say that one of the reasons we have to do this is that it makes for bad television. He said we have people calling up and complaining. I can think of some reasons to change the rules of the House, but ratings is not one of them. It does seem to me a grave error to say that because people are calling up and complaining that this has gotten boring, that we should change things.

I also have to reject the notion that this is necessary because we cannot get the business of the House done. The House has been working at a very leisurely pace. We took off a week in the middle of October, an unscheduled recess, unscheduled from the beginning. We have on the majority side a preference for about a 2-day workweek as far as the House is concerned. We come in on Tuesday night and we go home on Thursday night. There are other things besides being in session that count, but the fact is we have run things at a very slow pace. We have adjourned early for Republican fundraisers.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will yield if the gentleman promises to be

good television, because I do not want to be responsible for driving away the viewers.

Mr. SOLOMON. I want to expand on the gentleman's statement. Yes, we have, and we have adjourned for Democratic fundraisers, too.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for helping. This shows how dedicated we are to getting the work done. Under the Republican leadership control of the schedule, we have adjourned early for Republican fundraisers, we have adjourned early for Democratic fundraisers. We adjourned early, according to one leadership Member, for a Rolling Stones concert. And of course those are separate because, as everyone knows, the Rolling Stones gather no cash. But what we have here is on the one hand an argument that, "Oh, my God, you've got to stop these privileged motions, we're not getting our work done." But if we had not adjourned for Democratic fundraisers and if we had not adjourned for Republican fundraisers and if we had not adjourned for the Rolling Stones concert and we had not taken a week off in October and if we worked on Tuesdays during the day and if we worked a little on Monday, we would not be in this spot.

The point I want to make is that the assertion that we do not have time to get our work done is nonsensical. The reason for shutting off the privileged resolutions is that the majority understandably does not want to discuss what is being done to LORETTA SANCHEZ. I want to say that cutting off the privileged resolutions is clearly not necessary. The rule is not necessary to get the House business done.

By the way, there is no rule that says we have to adjourn this weekend. We could go another week or two. The notion that we are running out of time when we have time to adjourn for fundraisers, concerts and other things obviously does not wash. What you are trying to do is divert attention from the Loretta Sanchez issue. Yes, they are repetitive privileged motions. They are, however, aiming at one of the most fundamental privileges of the House, a partisan decision by the majority to impeach election results without having a basis to do so. There has been a year in which all of the resources have been available to show that there was a problem. You have not been able to show that.

Of course people should investigate. People have said, "Don't you want to know if people who voted were illegal?" I would love to know that. I also want to know why after a year of investigating you have not been able to come up with enough numbers to invalidate the election. No one has stopped you from investigating it. That is the phoniest of all arguments, that someone is trying to stop you from finding out if people voted illegally. Of course no one tried to stop that. No one tried to stop it when it was initiated. But a year after the election, if you have not come up

with enough evidence, the time has come to stop.

I want to say, I know there are partisan pressures here. In 1985, and people keep talking about the 1985 election that was brought up the other day when a Republican was unseated, I disagreed with my party in that regard. I thought it was impossible to tell after they counted. I voted for the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Frenzel, to declare a new election. I did not vote to seat the Democrat and I did not vote to seat the Republican. I did not think you could tell. I was in the minority. I was asked how did the Speaker respond; I told people the Speaker was mad at me until I explained my position. Then he got furious.

Yes, I understand partisan pressures. I think it is unworthy of Members to give in to them. I understand the impulse to say, OK, there is reason to look at this, even though a 984 majority is the largest majority I could ever remember being called into question. But after a year, after a year, give it up. After a year of using all of your powers to try to find a basis for overturning the election, you ought to give it up. You do not want to have that acknowledged, so that is why you are bringing in this rule.

This rule is not necessary, this cutting off of privileged resolutions, to have the House function. Again, we have adjourned for all kinds of reasons. We have not worked very hard. We have taken October breaks for a week. We are going to get out earlier than anyone expected. The reason you are doing this is you do not want to have to try to defend in public what is happening to LORETTA SANCHEZ. I think there is a dilemma. There is a wing of the Republican Party graphically represented by Mr. Dornan that says to you, "Don't you dare let loose of this." It is a very important wing of the party. They do not want this dismissed. So there is a dilemma. Obviously, you do not have the evidence to overturn the election or you would have done it. On the other hand, there is not the political will to dismiss the challenge and let the elected Representative of the people serve. And then given this dilemma, you do not want it discussed. So that is what we are talking about today, a change in the rules of the House striking at a fundamental issue, a question of privilege, not just on LORETTA SANCHEZ but in general because you do not want attention called to the fact that you are playing political games with an election. You do not want attention called to the fact that there is a challenge going on to an election that you have been unable to sustain after a year, a 984 majority. Yet you do not have the political will to dismiss.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this rule is defeated so we can continue to discuss the Sanchez election.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colo-

rado [Mr. McINNIS], another valuable member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, two points here. Point No. 1, already by 10 o'clock this morning your side put up two motions to adjourn. I realize that there are some tempers that have gotten high over there because they do not get to take the day off to go attend those events that you wanted to go to. Folks, we have got to do work. I am sorry you had to cancel your golf game, I am sorry you could not go to the event. We have work to do here. People expect us to work. It is Thursday, not Saturday. It is Thursday. Let us do the work. Quit giving those motions to adjourn. You are not going to get the day off.

Point No. 2. Somebody says it is within our rules for us to be heard, the minority. You are absolutely correct. The minority has the right to be heard but the majority has the obligation to rule. We have an obligation to move this House forward. What we are doing today is within the rules, and it is. Well, quit trying to do your stall tactics. Read the rules. My guess is that most of you have not even opened this book. I can point out those rules for you. You have been heard and heard and heard, and that is fine. I think you bring up, sometimes, some valid points. But the point has been made. Let us move on with our business.

□ 1215

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], a gentleman that came with me to this body almost 20 years ago and is one of its most respected Members.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for the time, and I would like to spend a portion of the time to briefly respond to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] because I do enjoy not only the content but the delivery of the information that he provides us, and I would like to point out just a couple of items within that delivery. He repeated several times that what we are doing is cutting off people in this particular resolution.

Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the resolution is that it focuses, it in channels; that is, it does not cut off the right to offer privileged resolutions, it focuses the opportunity to offer a privileged resolution. And as a matter of fact, the focal point for the minority would be the minority leader. As I recall the debate on the contested election in California's 46th District, the first resolution that was fully debated for an hour and voted on, was offered by the minority leader.

I understand, and I was not on the floor, but it has been represented to me, that there has been some criticism over this rule because we are attempting to cut off females and minorities from offering privileged resolutions. I find it interesting that the gentleman from Massachusetts is able to divine

the motives of those on this side who want to perpetuate the contested election, as he divines, somehow based upon pressure from people who are supportive of the candidate who lost, and that we are not pursuing trying to get to the bottom line, but carrying out some other group's motives which are not of the highest intentions. I find it interesting he is able to divine those motives, but made no comment whatsoever about people who have picked particular people to offer those resolutions so that it would have the appearance of cutting off female Members and minorities.

It seems to me that motives ought to go to both sides, and that if he is able to divine the motives on this side, yet unable to divine the motives on the other side that he is creating a false issue, that this somehow involves race or gender, I would tell the gentleman that there is either an overabundance of motives or an underabundance of motives on both sides, and I will yield to the gentleman with the final comment that it is not this gentleman who voted for a white male to be the minority leader.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would simply differ when he said why did I not talk about our decision to pick certain people to offer these resolutions. I must tell the gentleman people do not pick people on this side. When the women or members of the Hispanic Caucus decided those resolutions, I must tell him that that was their own voluntary choice. No one had to tell them to get angry at what was happening to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ].

Mr. THOMAS. I would guess then the gentleman would also say that the minority leader was not picked or was not self-chosen to begin the process, and I would end only by saying no one is cut off totally. The leadership is focused. It is the majority's responsibility to govern.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. If my colleagues do not mind, Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak from this side of the aisle. It seems to me sometimes we spend more time talking to those that agree with us than those that disagree with us. Let me just make two points in my 1 minute as a new Member here.

First of all, last night when the privileged resolution came up and the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] said it is an opportunity to present proof, I came down here in the front row to see the proof. I did not see proof. What I saw was accusations, heartfelt accusations, but there were numbers on a chart. I thought we were going to see blowups of voter registration cards; that is why I came down close.

Seeing a number, 1,000 or 4,000 or 305, is not proof, and we need to be laying out in these resolutions proof that we can look at, the L.A. Times can look at, the people of the 46th District can look at and not just have a card with Magic Marker ink on it and say, this is proof; that was an accusation.

Now, last point I would like to make, the reason we are so intent on bringing this to an end, it is Campaign 1998 is well underway. Mr. Dornan has announced for reelection, he is raising money for reelection, and the fear of us on this side of the aisle, on that side of the aisle, is that this whole process becomes part of the campaign, and that is wrong.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman like a little more time? I will yield the gentleman from North Carolina 15 seconds as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for three-quarters of a minute.

Mr. HEFNER. Wow. I thank the gentleman from New York very much for the time; I am indebted to him.

The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], my good friend, I guess it was a slip of the tongue, he said the gentleman who lost, so they know who lost the election there.

But as my colleagues know, I got a letter a couple of weeks ago from the Speaker, and he sent me a card that I could wear. It is called Friends of NEWT GINGRICH, and since they are going to try to put a damper on our ability to offer these motions, I just may not send my check in now. And, of course, I do appreciate them addressing it to W.G. Hefner, U.S. Senator, Washington, DC, but I am just going to reconsider sending in my contribution since they are going to offer this kind of gag legislation. But I certainly want the Speaker to know that I have considered it very sincerely, but right now I am leaning toward not sending the check.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, two issues. First of all, to those who said we want to work from this side of the aisle, some of the previous speakers, we want to work, too. The trouble is we have not been working all the way up to here. Today's Wall Street Journal opinion by Al Hunt: A mediocre congressional session; points out that if this Congress adjourns this weekend, it will be the earliest in 32 years.

The schedule that the Republican Party has just released to the Democrats for next year, all the ones in type are no votes. That means that the House does not come back until January 26 of next year, takes a week off in February, seems to work pretty much through March. We take this amount of period, about 2½ weeks, off in April;

skip through to July, where the House then takes off from the 1st to the 13th, one of the longest Fourth of July breaks I have seen; does take the traditional August 3-week period, that is traditional; and then takes another week and a half in September.

So not a whole lot of work is being scheduled, and this House is adjourning this weekend without doing campaign finance reform, without doing a major highway bill and without doing a lot of significant legislation.

Second point. I was one of the five who is still a remaining Democrat who also voted not to seat the Democrat in the McIntyre-McCloskey contest. It was the longest, most painful period in my legislative history. It was no fun, and so let me speak, Mr. Speaker, to those Republicans who are in trouble right now, too. They have got to do what is right.

Mr. Speaker, what is right is to bring this contest to a close because it has been a year, the investigation has proven nothing, and it was not much fun back in the days of McIntyre-McCloskey for those of us who said we should go ahead and hold another election, and I know it is not much fun for them, but they have to do what is right.

And let me say in that case there was four votes difference, not 984 votes, and because of that uncertainty, a number of us said we should proceed with a special election. That is not the case in this election.

I urge my Members to do what we had to do a few years ago, do what is right.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just urge Members to defeat the previous question, and if it is defeated, I will offer an amendment to strike the provisions in the rule pertaining to the privileged resolutions, and if the rule is adopted, it will strip the fundamental constitutional rights of each Member with regard to the integrity, the proceedings of the House, and I urge Members to vote no on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

Text of Previous Question Amendment to H. Res. 305: Strike section 3 of the resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time and would just recall several notes I made during the debate.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] complains that we are too accommodating to groups of Members by adjusting the evening schedule. He complained about it. But as my colleagues know, all speakers, whether they be Democrat or Republican, have always tried to be accommodating. This Speaker, Speaker GINGRICH, in the past 3 years has tried to accommodate the Women's Caucus for a dinner that they had, the Hispanic Caucus, the Black Caucus and any number of different caucuses. So I would just hope

he would not protest too much on that subject.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] have also said give it up, give it up, give up this investigation. Well, my colleagues, if we had given up over the years, we would still have Tammany Hall rigging elections in New York City, we would still have dead people voting and rigging elections in Chicago. If we gave it up, my colleagues, this democratic electoral process would literally fall apart.

As my colleagues know, we have such important legislation. There is a conference report that deals with the education of our children; it deals with labor issues, with health issues, with human services issues. That bill is out there. We have come to an agreement with the President of the United States. We want to bring the bill to the floor, but we cannot when these dilatory tactics continue here.

As my colleagues know, it is about time we got on with the business of the House. The gentlewoman had said defeat the previous question, and that would actually repeal section 3 of this bill. Well, I have heard people stand up here and talk about a martial law rule. That would not repeal this so-called martial law rule. The other part, section 1 and 2, deal with the expedited procedures to allow that very important conference report on our children to come to this floor on this same day. So the gentlewoman does not repeal the martial law part, she repeals section 3.

Now, having said that, let me tell my colleagues what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has said so many times on this floor. He says, no man's life, liberty or property are safe when this legislature is in session. Well, I plagiarized that. That was said 1866 by someone, and nobody in this room knows who it was. My colleagues probably think it was Patrick Henry or Thomas Jefferson. Do my colleagues know who it was? A good New Yorker. He was not very famous, he was just a simple man. He was a surrogate by the name of Gideon Tucker, believe it or not. We all thought that was somebody really important; that is who said that. So I like plagiarizing him.

Let us get out of here and do the people's business.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV the Chair 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 agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 198, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 587]

YEAS—224

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

NAYS—198

Abercrombie	Barrett (WI)	Blumenauer
Ackerman	Becerra	Bonior
Allen	Bentsen	Borski
Andrews	Berman	Boswell
Baesler	Berry	Boucher
Baldacci	Bishop	Boyd
Barcia	Blagojevich	Brown (CA)

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

NOT VOTING—11

Carson	Gonzalez	Portman
Cubin	McKinney	Riley
Dellums	Mica	Schiff
Forbes	Moran (VA)	

□ 1252

Mr. WISE and Mr. GUTKNECHT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MR. WISE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote just taken.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] to reconsider the vote.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 200, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 588]

AYES—222

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

NOES—200

Abercrombie	Berry	Brown (OH)
Ackerman	Bishop	Cardin
Allen	Blagojevich	Clay
Andrews	Blumenauer	Clayton
Baesler	Bonior	Clement
Baldacci	Borski	Clyburn
Barcia	Boswell	Condit
Barrett (WI)	Boucher	Conyers
Becerra	Boyd	Costello
Bentsen	Brown (CA)	Coyne
Berman	Brown (FL)	Cramer

Cummings	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Danner	Kennedy (MA)	Poshard
Davis (FL)	Kennedy (RI)	Price (NC)
Davis (IL)	Kennelly	Rahall
DeFazio	Kildee	Rangel
DeGette	Kilpatrick	Reyes
Delahunt	Kind (WI)	Rivers
DeLauro	Kleczka	Rodriguez
Dellums	Klink	Roemer
Deutsch	Kucinich	Rothman
Dicks	LaFalce	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Lampson	Rush
Dixon	Lantos	Sabo
Doggett	Levin	Sanchez
Dooley	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Doyle	Lipinski	Sandlin
Edwards	Lofgren	Sawyer
Engel	Lowey	Schumer
Eshoo	Luther	Scott
Etheridge	Maloney (CT)	Serrano
Evans	Maloney (NY)	Sherman
Farr	Manton	Sisisky
Fattah	Markey	Skaggs
Fazio	Martinez	Skelton
Filner	Mascara	Slaughter
Flake	Matsui	Smith, Adam
Foglietta	McCarthy (MO)	Snyder
Ford	McCarthy (NY)	Spratt
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Stabenow
Frost	McGovern	Stark
Furse	McHale	Stenholm
Gejdenson	McIntyre	Stokes
Gephardt	McNulty	Strickland
Goode	McNulty	Stupak
Gordon	Menendez	Tanner
Green	Millender-	Tauscher
Gutierrez	McDonald	Taylor (MS)
Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)	Thompson
Hall (TX)	Minge	Thurman
Hamilton	Mink	Tierney
Harman	Moakley	Torres
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Towns
Hefner	Murtha	Turner
Hilliard	Nadler	Velazquez
Hinchee	Neal	Vento
Hinojosa	Neberstar	Visclosky
Holden	Obey	Waters
Hooley	Olver	Watt (NC)
Hoyer	Ortiz	Waxman
Jackson (IL)	Owens	Wexler
Jackson-Lee	Pallone	Weygand
(TX)	Pascrell	Wise
Jefferson	Pastor	Woolsey
John	Payne	Wynn
Johnson (WI)	Pelosi	Yates
Johnson, E.B.	Peterson (MN)	
Kanjorski	Pickett	

NOT VOTING—11

Carson	McKinney	Portman
Cubin	Meehan	Riley
Forbes	Mica	Schiff
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	

□ 1309

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Madam 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 219, noes 195, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 589]

AYES—219

Aderholt	Barr	Bereuter
Archer	Barrett (NE)	Bilbray
Armey	Bartlett	Bilirakis
Bachus	Barton	Bliley
Baker	Bass	Blunt
Ballenger	Bateman	Boehlert

Boehner	Hansen	Peterson (PA)
Bonilla	Hastert	Petri
Bono	Hastings (WA)	Pickering
Brady	Hayworth	Pitts
Bryant	Hefley	Pombo
Bunning	Herger	Porter
Burr	Hill	Pryce (OH)
Burton	Hilleary	Quinn
Buyer	Hobson	Radanovich
Callahan	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Calvert	Horn	Redmond
Camp	Hostettler	Regula
Campbell	Houghton	Riggs
Canady	Hulshof	Rogan
Cannon	Hunter	Rogers
Castle	Hutchinson	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Chambliss	Inglis	Roukema
Chenoweth	Istook	Royce
Christensen	Jenkins	Ryun
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Salmon
Coburn	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Collins	Jones	Saxton
Combest	Kasich	Scarborough
Cook	Kelly	Schaefer, Dan
Cooksey	Kim	Schaffer, Bob
Cox	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Crane	Kingston	Sessions
Crapo	Klug	Shadegg
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Shaw
Davis (VA)	Kolbe	Shays
Deal	LaHood	Shimkus
DeLay	Largent	Shuster
Diaz-Balart	Latham	Skeen
Dickey	LaTourette	Smith (MI)
Doolittle	Lazio	Smith (NJ)
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Smith (OR)
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Dunn	Linder	Smith, Linda
Ehlers	Livingston	Snowbarger
Ehrlich	LoBiondo	Solomon
Emerson	Lucas	Souder
English	Manzullo	Spence
Ensign	McCollum	Stearns
Everett	McCrery	Stump
Ewing	McDade	Sununu
Fawell	McHugh	Talent
Foley	McInnis	Tauzin
Fossella	McIntosh	Taylor (NC)
Fowler	McKeon	Thomas
Fox	McKeon	Thornberry
Franks (NJ)	Frank (MA)	Thune
Frelinghuysen	Franks (NJ)	Tiahrt
Gallely	Frelinghuysen	Trafficant
Ganske	Gallely	Upton
Gekas	Ganske	Walsh
	Gekas	Wamp
	Gibbons	Watkins
	Gilchrest	Watts (OK)
	Gillmor	Weldon (FL)
	Gilman	Weldon (PA)
	Goodlatte	Weller
	Goodling	White
	Goss	Whitfield
	Graham	Wicker
	Granger	Wolf
	Greenwood	Young (AK)
	Gutknecht	Young (FL)

NOES—195

Abercrombie	Cummings	Gephardt
Ackerman	Danner	Goode
Allen	Davis (FL)	Gordon
Andrews	Davis (IL)	Green
Baesler	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Barcia	DeGette	Hall (OH)
Barrett (WI)	Delahunt	Hall (TX)
Becerra	DeLauro	Hamilton
Bentsen	Dellums	Harman
Berman	Deutsch	Hastings (FL)
Berry	Dicks	Hefner
Bishop	Dingell	Hilliard
Blagojevich	Dixon	Hinchee
Blumenuauer	Doggett	Hinojosa
Bonior	Doolley	Holden
Borski	Doyle	Hooley
Boswell	Edwards	Hoyer
Boucher	Engel	Jackson (IL)
Boyd	Eshoo	Jackson-Lee
Brown (FL)	Etheridge	(TX)
Brown (OH)	Evans	Jefferson
Cardin	Farr	John
Clay	Fattah	Johnson (WI)
Clayton	Fazio	Johnson, E. B.
Clement	Filner	Kanjorski
Clyburn	Flake	Kaptur
Condit	Ford	Kennedy (MA)
Conyers	Frost	Kennedy (RI)
Costello	Furse	Kennelly
Coyne	Gejdenson	Kildee

Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink

NOT VOTING—19

Baldacci
Brown (CA)
Carson
Conyers
Cubin
Foglietta
Foley

□ 1321

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Riley for, with Ms. McKinney against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 589, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted, "aye."

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote just taken.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] to reconsider the vote.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 201, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 590]
AYES—218

Aderholt
Arney
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons

NOES—201

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)

Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Ortiz
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)

NOT VOTING—14

Archer
Carson
Coburn
Cubin
Forbes

□ 1339

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2198

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 2198.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 79, noes 333, not voting 21, as follows:

Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost

[Roll No. 591]

AYES—79

Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berry
Bonior
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyne
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt

Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
LaFalce
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Markey
Martinez
McDermott
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Mink
Oberstar

Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Schlahter
Stark
Stupak
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Waters
Waxman
Wise
Woolsey

NOES—333

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo

Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Flake
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger

Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowe
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCreery
McDade
McGovern
McHale

McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalfe
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall

Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Salmon
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda

Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Brown (CA)
Carson
Cubin
Dellums
Foglietta
Forbes
Gonzalez
Hunter

Leach
McKinney
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Moakley
Northup
Portman

□ 1359

Mr. HASTERT and Mr. HOEKSTRA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1400

URGING EXECUTIVE BRANCH TO TAKE ACTION REGARDING ACQUISITION BY IRAN OF C-802 CRUISE MISSILES

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 302, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 188) urging the executive branch to take action regarding the acquisition by Iran of C-802 cruise missiles, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The resolution is considered read for amendment.

The text of House Resolution 188 is as follows:

H. RES. 188

Whereas the United States escort vessel U.S.S. Stark was struck by a cruise missile in the Persian Gulf, causing the death of 37 United States sailors;

Whereas the China National Precision Machinery Import-Export Corporation is mar-

keting the C-802 model cruise missile for use against escort vessels such as the U.S.S. Stark;

Whereas the China National Precision Machinery Import-Export Corporation delivered 60 C-802 cruise missiles to Iran for use by vessels of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Navy;

Whereas Iran is constructing sites and equipment to launch C-802 cruise missiles which will provide its armed forces with a weapon of greater range, reliability, accuracy, and mobility than before;

Whereas 15,000 members of the United States Armed Forces are stationed within the range of the C-802 cruise missiles acquired by Iran;

Whereas the Department of State believes that "[t]hese cruise missiles pose new, direct threats to deployed United States forces";

Whereas the delivery of cruise missiles to Iran is a violation of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note); and

Whereas the executive branch has concluded at present that the known types (of C-802 cruise missiles) are not of a "destabilizing number and type": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) finds that the delivery of cruise missiles to Iran is of a destabilizing number and type and, therefore, is a violation of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note); and

(2) urges the executive branch to enforce the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) with respect to the acquisition by Iran of C-802 model cruise missiles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the amendments printed in part 2 of House Report 105-379 are adopted.

The text of House Resolution 188, as amended by the amendments printed in part 2 of House Report 105-379, is as follows:

H. RES. 188

Whereas the United States escort vessel U.S.S. Stark was struck by a cruise missile in the Persian Gulf, causing the death of 37 United States sailors;

Whereas the China National Precision Machinery Import-Export Corporation is marketing the C-802 model cruise missile for use against escort vessels such as the U.S.S. Stark;

Whereas the China National Precision Machinery Import-Export Corporation delivered 60 C-802 cruise missiles to Iran for use by vessels of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Navy;

Whereas Iran is constructing sites and equipment to launch C-802 cruise missiles which will provide its armed forces with a weapon of greater range, reliability, accuracy, and mobility than before;

Whereas 15,000 members of the United States Armed Forces are stationed within the range of the C-802 cruise missiles acquired by Iran;

Whereas the Department of State believes that "[t]hese cruise missiles pose new, direct threats to deployed United States forces";

Whereas the delivery of cruise missiles to Iran is a violation of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note);

Whereas the executive branch has concluded at present that the known types (of C-802 cruise missiles) are not of a "destabilizing number and type";

Whereas there is substantial evidence that missile technology and technical advice have been provided from Russia to Iran, in violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime;

Whereas these violations include providing assistance to Iran in developing ballistic missiles, including the transfer of wind tunnel and rocket engine testing equipment;

Whereas these technologies give Iran the capability to deploy a missile of sufficient range to threaten United States military installations in the Middle East and Persian Gulf, as well as the territory of Israel, and our North Atlantic Treaty Organization ally Turkey; and

Whereas President Clinton has raised with Russian President Boris Yeltsin United States concerns about these activities and the Russian response has to date been inadequate; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) finds that the delivery of cruise missiles to Iran is of a destabilizing number and type and, therefore, is a violation of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note);

(2) urges the executive branch to enforce the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) with respect to the acquisition by Iran of C-802 model cruise missiles; and

(3) recommends that the Secretary of State should not issue any visa to, and the Attorney General should not admit to the United States, any national of the People's Republic of China where a consular officer or the Attorney General knows or has reasonable grounds to believe that the applicant has been materially involved in the proliferation of advanced conventional weapons; nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons or technology; or other sensitive or dual-use technologies, in contravention of United States interests.

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the President should demand that the Government of Russia take concrete actions to stop governmental and nongovernmental entities in the Russian Federation from providing missile technology and technical advice to Iran, in violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime;

(2) if the Russian response is inadequate, the United States should impose sanctions on the responsible Russian entities in accordance with Executive Order 12938 on the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, and reassess cooperative activities with Russia;

(3) the threshold under current law allowing for the waiver of the prohibition on the release of foreign assistance to Russia should be raised; and

(4) the European allies of the United States should be encouraged to take steps in accordance with their own laws to stop such proliferation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will each control 30 minutes.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 188.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to bring this resolution, House Resolution 188, to the floor today for consideration. This measure, which has support on both sides of the aisle, is an expression of the House that the administration is not doing all that it can to protect our dedicated service men and women who are, at this very moment, far from home, protecting our national interests.

This resolution was initially directed toward China's irresponsible transfer of cruise missiles to Iran. We have improved this measure by adding the resolution of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] on the Russian transfer of missile technology to Iran.

We further improved the resolution by incorporating proposals by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] on restricting the issuance of visas to known weapons proliferators whose actions are inimicable to U.S. interests.

We must do all we can to stop the proliferation of advanced conventional, chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. The acquisition by Iran of a large number of advanced cruise missiles from China and ballistic missile technology and knowhow from Russia clearly is a dangerous and destabilizing development.

In the arsenal of a rogue regime like Iran, these weapons pose a significant threat to the security of the United States forces in the area, the safety of all ships passing through the Straits of Hormuz, and the stability of the entire Persian Gulf region and beyond.

Concerning the transfer of cruise missiles, the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-proliferation Act of 1992 requires the President to impose sanctions on any Nation that transfers "destabilizing numbers and types" of advanced conventional weapons to Iran.

Inexplicably, the Clinton administration determined that the transfer of these state-of-the-art nearly supersonic sea-skimming Chinese-made C-802 cruise missiles in the hands of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard forces are not "destabilizing."

Based on that determination, the White House has regrettably failed to levy sanctions on either the company which transferred the missiles or against China, as called for in the Iran-Iraq Nonproliferation Act.

I strongly disagree with the administration's failure to act, and have introduced this resolution in response. House Resolution 188 finds that the delivery of C-802 cruise missiles to Iran violates the Gore-McCain Act and urges the administration to take firm action against those responsible for transferring these dangerous weapons.

Iran has threatened to use its military power to close the Straits of Hormuz, to disrupt international shipping and to forcefully expel American forces from the Persian Gulf.

The acquisition of C-802 cruise missiles by Iran, weapons which can be launched from sea, the air or land, must be considered a serious threat to regional stability, and, most important, our forces deployed to the region.

Today, some 15,000 American service men and women are stationed in the Persian Gulf region, well within the range of these mobile C-802 cruise missiles. We all remember the tragic and deadly attack against the U.S.S. *Stark* that occurred in the gulf in May of 1987. A single cruise missile slammed into that frigate and killed 37 of our American sailors.

Likewise, we must pressure the Government of Russia to halt similar irresponsible transfers of ballistic missile technology to Iran in violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime.

If we are not able to accomplish this, it is incumbent upon the administration to impose sanctions and to reconsider the aid we provide to the Russian Government.

We owe it to our troops to minimize the threat they face as they carry out their selfless mission in support of our national security. Prohibiting Iran from acquiring advanced conventional weapons and penalizing those nations that provide those weapons must be a high foreign policy objective of our Nation. To my mind, these transfers should be unacceptable to the Congress, to the American people, and to our U.S. military. I say it is time to do something about it.

Accordingly, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 188 and we call upon the Clinton administration to take appropriate action.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], one of the chief sponsors of a portion of this resolution.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding time to me as the first speaker on our side and speak in enthusiastic support of House Resolution 188, as amended.

I would also like to commend Chairman GILMAN for highlighting the serious national security threat posed by the acquisition of cruise missiles by Iran. I agree with the gentleman that the acquisition of missile technology by Iran threatens our troops in the area, poses the highest security threat to Israel, our democratic ally in the region; to Turkey, our NATO ally; and is in general profoundly destabilizing in a highly volatile region.

An equally if not more destabilizing development than Chinese proliferation to Iran is Iran's acquisition of long-range ballistic missile technology from Russia. This pattern of Russian-Iranian cooperation is well documented through press reports that cite Israeli and U.S. intelligence sources. These reports say Russian entities have provided assistance to Iran that includes

wind-tunnel testing of missile nose cones, guidance and propulsion systems design, metal alloys used to build long-range missiles, and the presence in Iran of high-level Russian advisers.

The U.S. Director of Central Intelligence, in an unclassified report released in June, confirmed a Russian role in helping the Iranian missile program. The DCI's report stated that, "Russia had supplied a variety of ballistic missile-related goods to foreign countries during the reporting period," which was 1996, "especially to Iran."

Significantly, the Russian internal security service admitted last month that it had thwarted an effort by Iran to acquire missile technology from a Russian firm, this only a week after Russian President Yeltsin denied the possibility of such transfers.

Madam Speaker, these Russian transfers to Iran are particularly troubling. First, they will allow Iran to develop in a maximum of 3 years, and possibly within 1 year, a missile of a range capable of striking as far away as Central Europe, as well as Israel and U.S. troops in the region. That range is 800 to 1,200 miles.

One of the ironies, of course, is that is the distance between Iran and Russia. So Russia may be feeding a system that may then in the end threaten Russia.

Second, the Russian transfers provide Iran with technology and technical advice that would allow Iran to indigenously produce long-range ballistic missiles. And this is Iran's stated intention.

Let me underscore this point, Madam Speaker. We are not talking about a one-time transfer of weapons. We are talking about the transfer of knowhow that would allow Iran to build up an arsenal of its own, an arsenal that could be equipped with chemical, biological, and nuclear warheads, and very likely would be equipped with those warheads.

My amendment, now included in House Resolution 188, which I introduced in the House and which Senator KYL has introduced in the other body, directs the President to impose sanctions on those entities that are found to be responsible for these dangerous transfers of technology in accordance with current law and current policy.

It is a simple and direct signal to the administration that it must act now to seek a halt by the Russian Government of its policy, one of complacency at best, proliferation at worst.

Let us pass House Resolution 188, as amended, and put the House on record in strong support of taking immediate steps to halt this dangerous situation.

Madam Speaker, diplomacy to date has failed to achieve the desired results. Imposing sanctions is the next step required.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT], a member of our committee.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this important

measure. I appreciate the leadership of the chairman on this issue.

Fifteen thousand members of the U.S. Armed Forces are currently stationed in the Persian Gulf to maintain peace in that vulnerable region of the world. We owe these young men and young women the safety that we can provide in a dangerous occupation and in a dangerous world. We need to minimize the threat to their lives that these actions that are being discussed here on the floor today create. We also need to minimize the threat to our ally, Israel, and to our allies in Europe, and to the stability of the Middle East.

The acquisition by Iran of advanced cruise missiles like the C-802 model is a serious threat to the stability of the entire gulf and to the safety of our troops. Iran is clearly challenging the United States for control of the gulf, and I doubt if it would hesitate to utilize the 60 or more lethal cruise missiles pointed at our troops if the opportunity presented itself.

The sale of these missiles and of missile technology by the Russians to Iran and by China constitutes a clear violation of the Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act and of our missile technology accords.

The President must use his authority and the Congress has to give direction, apparently, that that authority be used to impose sanctions on China and on Russia. His continued failure to do so represents a clear abdication of his duties as Americans are under serious threat, our allies are under serious threat.

Surely the 1987 example of the attack on the U.S.S. *Stark* gave us all the evidence we need; the loss of 37 American sailors should be enough. I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution and protect the lives of young Americans.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] as well.

Madam Speaker, now that Chinese President Jiang's visit to the United States is over, I am glad we can focus on the real issue at hand, and that is the future of United States policy toward China. I hope the President, after rolling up the red carpet and putting away the champagne glasses, remembers that China has sold deadly military hardware to a terrorist nation. This includes a direct transfer of both chemical technology and cruise missiles to Iran. And what was this administration's response? Silence. Even though this was in direct violation of U.S. law, which was written by none other than Vice President AL GORE.

Correct me if I am wrong, Madam Speaker, but wasn't it this President who in 1993 said, "The United States would not cater to nations that violated peace and weapons agreements

and restricted the freedoms of their people?"

The last time I checked, China was still a Communist nation with a leadership that restricted the most basic of human rights, and Iran was still a dangerous rogue nation, which even today has proven ill will toward the United States. But most hypocritical of all, the original author of the Senate bill to stop arms sales to terrorist nations and impose sanctions if violations occur was none other than AL GORE, our own Vice President.

Yet last week, during the discussions with Jiang, our President was touting a new agreement he had reached with President Jiang. Well, that is nice, but what about upholding current law? If I was the Vice President, I would be outraged. I guess the law just does not matter to some.

I hope the President remembers, as Mr. GILMAN has noted, that 15,000 United States troops are stationed right there in direct line of the cruise missiles which China transferred to Iran. The transfer of these weapons and technology from China is in direct violation of United States law, and our refusal to call China to the mat for their actions is an embarrassment to this country.

□ 1415

This bill will rectify this situation and force the administration to take the very action which the Vice President called for in 1993. This Congress must live up to our responsibility to protect the safety and security of America. I urge my colleagues' vote.

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

Madam Speaker, first of all, the resolution finds that the delivery of cruise missiles to Iran is of a destabilizing type and is, therefore, in violation of the Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act of 1992. The resolution also urges the President to enforce the Iran-Iraq Nonproliferation Act of 1992, basically calling for the application of sanctions, with respect to the acquisition of Iran, by Iran, of C-802 model cruise missiles.

The Committee on Rules added 2 clauses, one recommending a visa denial for anyone from China who has been materially involved in weapons proliferation; and second, the text of the resolution of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], House Concurrent Resolution 121, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the proliferation of missile technology from Russia to Iran.

I am troubled by this resolution. I understand the popularity of it. I certainly share with my colleagues in their concern about the transfer of dangerous technology to Iran by either China or Russia. I think we all agree on the objective that it is very, very much in the interests of the United States to stop the transfer of that technology to Iran.

Now, in the Iran-Iraq Nonproliferation Act, the Congress of the United

States gave to the President the power, the authority to make a determination whether China or any other country has violated the law. We did not give that authority to ourselves; we gave it to the President. The reason we gave it to the President was because it is a very tough question, a question of great sensitivity and complexity, and any finding that the delivery of cruise missiles to Iran is of a destabilizing number and type, and therefore a violation of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-proliferation Act, is a judgment that calls for the input of the political leaders of the country, but also intelligence, policy, regional experts.

I have complained about the process. I do it in this instance. To my knowledge, we heard, with respect to this question of violation, from one intelligence official for about 5 minutes. I am speaking now about Members. I think the staff may have been briefed further. At the time the intelligence official made the briefing, there were three Members of Congress in the room.

Now, we have then a situation where some years ago we made the judgment that this is a very, very tough call; it should be made by the President because of the resources available to the executive branch, and now we are saying we are going to make that call in this resolution, and we are doing so with very thin consultation and preparation.

The staff has had briefings on the topic of C-802 missile transfers from China to Iran. It is my very clear impression that those missiles from China do, indeed, make the task of the United States Navy in the gulf more complicated. I do not think there is any doubt about that. But it is also clear from these briefings that the missiles do not shift the military balance in the gulf. The United States clearly retains strong air and naval superiority.

Another point I want to make here is that the comment has been made several times that diplomacy has failed. I can understand how that conclusion may have been reached, but I really do not agree with it. I do not think it is fair to say that diplomacy has succeeded, but I do think it is fair to say that as a result of diplomacy, the Chinese now appear to be heading in the right direction on this issue, although they are not yet prepared to give a public pledge to stop all transfers. I think the goal of U.S. diplomacy now has to be to confirm and to clarify and to get the most authoritative statement we can from China about the termination of missile shipments.

In a sense, our problem on the floor, the difference between the majority and myself here, is one of a failure of consultation between the executive branch and the legislative branch. The negotiations have been going on. Those negotiations have been in secret. There has not been, I think, adequate consultation with Members of Congress about the progress that has been made.

Members of Congress have read a lot of press reports. They are rightly concerned about this transfer, and so they decide that more vigorous action has to be taken. What bothers me is that I think the resolution is not going to be helpful to the diplomatic process. This problem is going to be solved eventually through diplomacy I think, I hope, and our goal should be to help the President and not make his job more difficult on the very tough questions of nonproliferation, where we all share the same goals.

With respect to the resolution of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] concerning the transfer not of Chinese, but of Russian missile technology to Iran, which was added to this resolution, may I simply say to her that I think she deserves a lot of credit for focusing the attention of the House on a very important question. If her resolution stood by itself, I would have no trouble at all voting for it as a free-standing resolution, because I think it is quite commendable.

I understand that the argument I am making here is probably one that will not be agreed with by most of my colleagues, but I do think it is important that we point out that diplomacy here has made some progress, and that progress may not be fully known to all Members of the House. We think the Chinese are heading in the right direction now. We cannot be absolutely sure of that, but I am sure none of us want to take steps here that would make that diplomacy, and a successful result from it, more difficult.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's nice comments about my role and I thank him for them.

On the subject of diplomacy, though, as the gentleman does, I commend the Vice President and the President for raising this issue, certainly the issue of Russian proliferation, with senior Russians in the delegation at every summit meeting and every possible event during the year. However, published reports show that the proliferation between Russia and Iran is not stopping, despite our urging and despite the fact that President Clinton has raised this with President Yeltsin personally twice.

So my question to the gentleman is, if it is true that Iran will get indigenous capability in terms of developing missiles and the means to deploy them within a year to 3 years, can we wait any longer for this diplomatic course to work, or should we not, as responsible Members of Congress, exert maximum pressure, as we are trying to do today, to force the stopping of the proliferation?

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, the difficulty in my mind, and I fully appreciate the gentlewoman's deep concern about it, is

whether the actions we take today and the threat of the sanctions will in fact help our diplomacy. I think it is the Vice President's position, and I do not want to try to speak for him, but that this kind of action at this particular juncture is counterproductive.

I understand that we do not have firm results in diplomacy now, so I understand the unease that many Members have here. I think, from my standpoint, we have several months, at least, to see that diplomacy work. And if the steps we take today make the diplomacy more difficult, I do not think any of us want to do it. Now, the gentlewoman and I may have a difference in judgment about whether these steps are helpful or not.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield for another 10 seconds, I would comment that we have been trying to do this at least since April, and the subject was raised at the Helsinki summit and it was raised in Denver, and it was raised in Moscow more recently by the Vice President, and it has been raised at other senior level meetings between us and the Russians; in addition to which we have an ambassador, Mr. Wisner, who is in Russia at this moment negotiating on this, but the results are not there, and the clock is ticking, and I think that we have to push harder.

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me emphasize to the gentlewoman that I am not opposing her part of the bill. My objection really runs to the other part of it. The gentlewoman's resolution is a sense of the House, as I recall, and I think it is worthy, and I do not want to suggest that I am opposed to it. My objection goes to the China part of it.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, my final comment, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think the point of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], is that missile technology from any source in Iran is destabilizing and that is why he is trying to shut down the Chinese proliferation, and that is why I agree with him.

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Speaker, we have no argument about wanting to shut down the transfer of technology. Everybody agrees to that. I am not urging the transfer of technology from China and Russia to Iran. Please do not attribute that to me.

The question here is how best do we stop it? I am simply raising the question that at this point intervention on the transfer of China to Iran, when diplomacy appears to be, and I have to emphasize the "appears," to be making progress, I am not sure it is the best thing to do.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation. I want to particularly focus on the language put into this bill by the adoption of the rule dealing with the Russian sale of

missile technology to Iran. This is a critical issue. In fact, both aspects of this bill involve a critical issue: The delivery of enhanced missile capability, and in the case of the Russian transfers, very specifically technology, which violates commitments made by the Russian promise to adhere to the missile technology control regime.

□ 1430

I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] for being probably the leader on this side of the Congress, the House side of the Congress, in raising this issue now for many, many months. The administration has now clearly become focused on this issue. They have appointed a special emissary to negotiate on this. It is receiving attention at the highest levels of our Government. The gentlewoman deserves congratulations for bringing this resolution to this point and to the attention of this body.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Rules, for a closing statement.

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

Madam Speaker, let me sing the gentleman's praises, because let me tell the Members, the gentleman from New York, Mr. BEN GILMAN, does an outstanding job as the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, my old committee. We just cannot tell the gentleman how important it is for the foreign policy of this Nation.

I also see across the aisle the gentlewoman from California, Ms. JANE HARMAN. Let me also sing her praises, because she has been a leader on this issue, and we have to give her full credit for it. We are glad that her amendment is part of the bill.

Madam Speaker, let me say something about the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. LEE HAMILTON, the ranking member and former chairman of the committee that I used to serve on. The gentleman from Indiana, Mr. LEE HAMILTON, is one of the men that I most respect in this body. He has always been a man who speaks from his heart, he speaks with sincerity, and he tells it like it is.

We do not always agree. We certainly do not agree on this issue here. He talks about how best to handle our relationships with China. He talks about thinking that China is moving in the right direction, and I would just say to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana, thinking that they are moving in the right direction is not good enough.

Nothing has changed. Everything is worse in China. They have a deplorable human rights record, just read the gentleman's own State Department report. Religious persecution is so, so terrible.

They have huge military buildups taking place over the last 4 or 5 years that have almost doubled the entire military budget for China, the only nation of any significance at all, any size, that has any increase in their military budget at all.

Why are they doing those things? They are selling missiles to unstable countries. They are allowing Third World despots like Iran, our sworn enemy, to obtain nuclear technology, not to mention chemical and biological factories that are actually being sold to Iran at this very moment.

Let me just read the Members an AP story. I think we can probably believe this. It is by Barry Schweid. I do not see the date here.

It says,

Even while the Clinton administration celebrates new assurances that China will refrain from selling nuclear missile technology to Iran, it is investigating recent delivery of nonnuclear cruise missiles to Tehran, to Iran.

Madam Speaker, let me tell the Members that this bill offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. BEN GILMAN, is an excellent piece of legislation. It brings to the floor a ridiculous situation that the Clinton administration has put itself in.

In 1992 Senator GORE, at that time, now our Vice President, offered legislation that would impose sanctions on nations that sell advanced conventional or weapons of mass destruction technology to Iran or Iraq. That is the law of the land.

Guess what? Communist China has been selling the C-802 antiship missiles to Iran. Everybody knows it. Everybody in this Chamber here knows it. Everybody, including the Clinton administration, admits it. But no sanctions of any kind have been levied against China, as provided for in Vice President's GORE's own legislation.

Cruise missile shipments from China to Iran were publicly reported in Defense News, the Washington Post, and the New York Times as early as the summer of 1995 and continue to go on; 2 years of public knowledge and still today there has been no acknowledgment from our administration of the significance of the deadly capabilities that have been passed on to Iran, again, I say, our avowed enemy. Iran says that they are our avowed enemy.

It is high time, Madam Speaker, that our President stop looking the other way, stop ignoring the Gore-McCain law, ignoring the danger facing our 15,000 U.S. troops that are stationed within range of these deadly cruise missiles provided to Iran by this China that we seem to want to appease here on this floor, the danger that was witnessed firsthand by the men and women of our Armed Forces during Desert Storm.

I was over there and the Members were over there, we saw them, when the USS Stark was struck by a cruise missile resulting in the loss of 37 American sailors. Do we want to increase

that danger? What will it take to convince the administration of the significance of the Chinese arms sponsorship of outlawed nations like Iran?

The Congress must take the opportunity presented to us here today in this resolution to make a clear statement to the President, and in turn to the Communist Chinese Government, that the United States people will not stand for further proliferation, will not stand for dangerous and extensive weapon capabilities that threaten United States Armed Forces and endanger the welfare of United States allies in the Mideast.

Mr. Speaker, everybody says, oh, you must never appease, we always have to cooperate and work with the Chinese. Let me tell the Members something. We have a \$50 million trade deficit with China. They lick their chops to do business with the United States of America, with 260 million Americans, with the highest standard of living in the world. Everybody wants to sell America. We use that as a bargaining chip to stop this rogue regime, these outlaw activities.

That is why we need to pass this bill before us today. It will send the right message. China is not going to say, the heck with the United States. They are going to come licking their chops and doing business with us, and they will cooperate, and we will save American lives in doing it.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to point out that I agree with gentleman's analysis about the dangerous nature of these transfers, about the destabilizing impact, about the need to do everything we can to stop it. But I just want to say, in all fairness, the administration has been intensely focused on trying to get these transfers stopped. We have reason to believe as a result of their efforts that things will change, so I just think the administration on this one is not the enemy, they are the gentleman's and my ally.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, my good friend is a member of the Select Committee on Intelligence. He is aware of all of the information that I am aware of. Let me assure the gentleman, it is still going on, and we need to put a stop to it. Let us do it by sending this signal, a very light signal to the Chinese Government.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the

point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 8, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 592]
YEAS—414

Abercrombie	Davis (VA)	Hinojosa
Ackerman	Deal	Hobson
Aderholt	DeFazio	Hoekstra
Allen	DeGette	Holden
Andrews	Delahunt	Hoolley
Archer	DeLauro	Horn
Armey	DeLay	Hostettler
Bachus	Dellums	Hoyer
Baesler	Deutsch	Hulshof
Baker	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Baldacci	Dickey	Hutchinson
Ballenger	Dicks	Hyde
Barcia	Dingell	Inglis
Barr	Dixon	Istook
Barrett (NE)	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Barrett (WI)	Dooley	Jackson-Lee
Bartlett	Doolittle	(TX)
Barton	Doyle	Jefferson
Bass	Dreier	Jenkins
Bateman	Duncan	John
Becerra	Dunn	Johnson (CT)
Bentsen	Edwards	Johnson (WI)
Bereuter	Ehlers	Johnson, Sam
Berman	Ehrlich	Jones
Berry	Emerson	Kanjorski
Bilbray	Engel	Kaptur
Bilirakis	English	Kasich
Bishop	Ensign	Kelly
Blagojevich	Eshoo	Kennedy (MA)
Bliley	Etheridge	Kennedy (RI)
Blumenauer	Evans	Kennelly
Blunt	Everett	Kildee
Boehlert	Ewing	Kilpatrick
Boehner	Farr	Kim
Bonilla	Fattah	Kind (WI)
Bonior	Fawell	King (NY)
Bono	Fazio	Kingston
Borski	Filner	Kleczka
Boswell	Flake	Klink
Boucher	Foley	Klug
Boyd	Ford	Knollenberg
Brady	Fossella	Kolbe
Brown (FL)	Fowler	Kucinich
Brown (OH)	Fox	LaHood
Bryant	Frank (MA)	Lampson
Bunning	Franks (NJ)	Lantos
Burr	Frelinghuysen	Largent
Burton	Frost	Latham
Buyer	Furse	LaTourette
Callahan	Gallegly	Lazio
Calvert	Ganske	Leach
Camp	Gejdenson	Levin
Campbell	Gekas	Lewis (CA)
Canady	Gephardt	Lewis (GA)
Cannon	Gibbons	Lewis (KY)
Cardin	Gilchrest	Linder
Castle	Gillmor	Lipinski
Chabot	Gilman	Livingston
Chambliss	Goode	LoBiondo
Chenoweth	Goodlatte	Lofgren
Christensen	Goodling	Lowe
Clay	Gordon	Lucas
Clayton	Goss	Luther
Clement	Graham	Maloney (CT)
Clyburn	Granger	Maloney (NY)
Coble	Green	Manton
Coburn	Greenwood	Manzullo
Collins	Gutierrez	Markey
Combest	Gutknecht	Martinez
Condit	Hall (OH)	Mascara
Conyers	Hall (TX)	Matsui
Cook	Hansen	McCarthy (MO)
Cooksey	Harman	McCarthy (NY)
Costello	Hastert	McColum
Cox	Hastings (FL)	McCreery
Coyne	Hastings (WA)	McDade
Cramer	Hayworth	McDermott
Crane	Hefley	McGovern
Crapo	Hefner	McHale
Cummings	Herger	McHugh
Cunningham	Hill	McInnis
Danner	Hilleary	McIntosh
Davis (FL)	Hilliard	McIntyre
Davis (IL)	Hinchee	McKeon

McNulty	Rahall	Souder
Meehan	Ramstad	Spence
Meek	Rangel	Spratt
Menendez	Redmond	Stabenow
Metcalf	Regula	Stark
Millender-	Reyes	Stearns
McDonald	Riggs	Stenholm
Miller (CA)	Rivers	Stokes
Miller (FL)	Rodriguez	Strickland
Minge	Roemer	Stump
Mink	Rogan	Stupak
Moakley	Rogers	Sununu
Mollohan	Rohrabacher	Talent
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tanner
Morella	Rothman	Tauscher
Myrick	Roukema	Tauzin
Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Taylor (MS)
Neal	Royce	Taylor (NC)
Nethercutt	Rush	Thomas
Neumann	Ryun	Thompson
Ney	Sabo	Thornberry
Northup	Salmon	Thune
Norwood	Sanchez	Thurman
Nussle	Sanders	Tiahrt
Oberstar	Sandlin	Tierney
Obey	Sanford	Torres
Olver	Sawyer	Towns
Ortiz	Saxton	Trafficant
Owens	Scarborough	Turner
Oxley	Schaefer, Dan	Upton
Packard	Schaffer, Bob	Velazquez
Pallone	Schumer	Vento
Pappas	Scott	Visclosky
Parker	Sensenbrenner	Walsh
Pascrell	Serrano	Wamp
John	Sessions	Waters
Paul	Shadegg	Watkins
Paxon	Shaw	Watt (NC)
Payne	Shays	Watts (OK)
Pease	Sherman	Waxman
Pelosi	Shimkus	Weldon (FL)
Peterson (MN)	Shuster	Weldon (PA)
Peterson (PA)	Sisisky	Weller
Petri	Skeen	Wexler
Pickering	Skelton	Weygand
Pickett	Slaughter	White
Pitts	Smith (MI)	Whitfield
Pombo	Smith (NJ)	Wicker
Pomeroy	Smith (OR)	Wise
Porter	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Poshard	Smith, Adam	Woolsey
Price (NC)	Smith, Linda	Wynn
Pryce (OH)	Snowbarger	Young (AK)
Quinn	Snyder	Young (FL)
Radanovich	Solomon	

NAYS—8

Hamilton	LaFalce	Skaggs
Houghton	Moran (VA)	Yates
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	

NOT VOTING—11

Brown (CA)	Forbes	Portman
Carson	Gonzalez	Riley
Cubin	McKinney	Schiff
Foglietta	Mica	

□ 1459

Mr. YATES changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SANFORD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1500

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I move to reconsider the vote, Madam Speaker.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. LATHAM

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 176, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No 593]

AYES—240

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

NOES—176

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

NOT VOTING—17

Bereuter	Forbes	Riley
Brown (CA)	Gonzalez	Schiff
Burr	McKinney	Slaughter
Carson	Mica	Stabenow
Cubin	Nadler	Stenholm
Foglietta	Portman	

□ 1518

Mr. ROEMER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Resolution urging the executive branch to take action regarding the acquisition by Iran of C-802 cruise missiles, and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding proliferation of missile technology from Russia to Iran."

MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REGULA). The question is on the mo-

tion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 74, noes 336, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 594]

AYES—74

Andrews	Harman	Olver
Berry	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Bishop	Hefner	Pallone
Bonior	Hinchey	Payne
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Pelosi
Clayton	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Clement	Jefferson	Reyes
Clyburn	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Conyers	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Coyne	Kennelly	Sabo
Davis (FL)	LaFalce	Sanchez
DeLauro	Lantos	Skelton
Delahunt	Lauro	Slaughter
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
Doggett	Markey	Stark
Engel	McDermott	Strickland
Eshoo	McNulty	Stupak
Evans	Meehan	Thurman
Fazio	Meek	Torres
Filner	Menendez	Towns
Frank (MA)	Millender-	Vento
Furse	McDonald	Waters
Gejdenson	Miller (CA)	Waxman
Gephardt	Mink	Wise
	Nadler	Woolsey
	Obey	

NOES—336

Abercrombie	Clay	Ganske
Ackerman	Coble	Gekas
Aderholt	Collins	Gibbons
Allen	Combest	Gilchrest
Archer	Condit	Gillmor
Army	Cook	Gilman
Bachus	Cooksey	Goode
Baesler	Costello	Goodlatte
Baker	Cox	Goodling
Ballenger	Cramer	Gordon
Barcia	Crane	Goss
Barr	Crapo	Graham
Barrett (NE)	Cummings	Granger
Barrett (WI)	Cunningham	Green
Bartlett	Danner	Greenwood
Barton	Davis (IL)	Gutknecht
Bass	Davis (VA)	Hall (OH)
Bateman	Deal	Hall (TX)
Bentsen	DeFazio	Hamilton
Berman	DeGette	Hansen
Bilbray	DeLay	Hastert
Bilirakis	Dellums	Hastings (WA)
Blagojevich	Diaz-Balart	Hayworth
Bliley	Dickey	Hefley
Blumenauer	Dicks	Heger
Blunt	Dixon	Hill
Boehler	Dooley	Hilleary
Boehner	Doolittle	Hilliard
Bonilla	Doyle	Hinojosa
Bono	Dreier	Hobson
Borski	Dunn	Hoekstra
Boswell	Edwards	Holden
Boucher	Ehlers	Hookey
Boyd	Ehrlich	Horn
Brady	Emerson	Hostettler
Brown (OH)	English	Houghton
Bryant	Ensign	Hulshof
Bunning	Etheridge	Hunter
Burr	Everett	Hutchinson
Burton	Ewing	Hyde
Buyer	Farr	Inglis
Callahan	Fattah	Istook
Calvert	Fawell	Jackson-Lee
Camp	Flake	(TX)
Campbell	Foley	Jenkins
Canady	Ford	John
Cannon	Fossella	Johnson (CT)
Cardin	Fowler	Johnson (WI)
Castle	Fox	Johnson, E. B.
Chabot	Franks (NJ)	Johnson, Sam
Chambliss	Frelinghuysen	Jones
Chenoweth	Frost	Kanjorski
Christensen	Gallegly	Kaptur

Kasich	Neumann	Shays
Kelly	Ney	Sherman
Kildee	Northup	Shimkus
Kim	Norwood	Shuster
Kind (WI)	Oberstar	Sisisky
King (NY)	Ortiz	Skaggs
Kingston	Oxley	Skeen
Kleczka	Packard	Smith (MI)
Klink	Pappas	Smith (NJ)
Klug	Parker	Smith (OR)
Knollenberg	Pascarell	Smith (TX)
Kolbe	Pastor	Smith, Adam
Kucinich	Paul	Smith, Linda
LaHood	Paxon	Snowbarger
Lampson	Pease	Snyder
Largent	Peterson (PA)	Solomon
Latham	Petri	Souder
LaTourette	Pickering	Spence
Lazio	Pickett	Stabenow
Leach	Pitts	Stearns
Levin	Pombo	Stenholm
Lewis (KY)	Pomeroy	Stokes
Linder	Porter	Stump
Lipinski	Poshard	Sununu
Livingston	Price (NC)	Talent
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Tanner
Lofgren	Quinn	Tauscher
Lowey	Radanovich	Tauzin
Lucas	Rahall	Taylor (MS)
Luther	Ramstad	Taylor (NC)
Maloney (CT)	Redmond	Thompson
Maloney (NY)	Regula	Thornberry
Manton	Riggs	Thune
Manzullo	Rivers	Tiahrt
Mascara	Rodriguez	Tierney
Matsui	Roemer	Traficant
McCarthy (MO)	Rogan	Turner
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers	Upton
McCollum	Rohrabacher	Velazquez
McCrery	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
McDade	Rothman	Walsh
McGovern	Roukema	Wamp
McHale	Royce	Watkins
McHugh	Ryun	Watt (NC)
McInnis	Salmon	Watts (OK)
McIntosh	Sanders	Weldon (FL)
McIntyre	Sandlin	Weldon (PA)
McKeon	Sanford	Weller
Metcalfe	Sawyer	Wexler
Miller (FL)	Saxton	Weygand
Minge	Scarborough	White
Moakley	Schaefer, Dan	Whitfield
Mollohan	Schaffer, Bob	Wicker
Moran (KS)	Schumer	Wolf
Moran (VA)	Scott	Wynn
Morella	Sensenbrenner	Yates
Murtha	Serrano	Young (AK)
Myrick	Sessions	Young (FL)
Neal	Shadegg	
Nethercutt	Shaw	

NOT VOTING—23

Baldacci	Foglietta	Mica
Becerra	Forbes	Nussle
Bereuter	Gonzalez	Portman
Brown (CA)	Gutierrez	Rangel
Carson	Kilpatrick	Riley
Coburn	Lewis (CA)	Schiff
Cubin	Martinez	Thomas
Duncan	McKinney	

□ 1539

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF ANY MEASURE MADE IN ORDER UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 302

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of any measure made in order under House Resolution 302, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering, and cross-referencing, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be required to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

PROHIBITION OF UNITED STATES FUNDS TO CERTAIN CHINESE OFFICIALS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 302, I call up the bill (H.R. 967) to prohibit the use of United States funds to provide for the participation of certain Chinese officials in international conferences, programs, and activities, and to provide that certain Chinese officials shall be ineligible to receive visas and excluded from admission to the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 967 is as follows:

H.R. 967

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Despite public assurances by the Government of the People's Republic of China that it would abide by the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and despite the United Nations Charter requirement that all members promote respect for and observance of basic human rights, including freedom of religion, the Chinese Government continues to place severe restrictions on religious expression and practice.

(2) It has been reported that at an internal Central Communist Party meeting in 1994, President Jiang Zemin asserted that religion is one of the biggest threats to Communist Party rule in China and Tibet.

(3) On January 31, 1994, Premier Li Peng signed decrees number 144 and 145 which restrict worship, religious education, distribution of Bibles and other religious literature, and contact with foreign coreligionists.

(4) The Chinese Government has created official religious organizations that control all religious worship, activity, and association in China and Tibet and supplant the independent authority of the Roman Catholic Church, independent Protestant churches, and independent Buddhist, Taoist, and Islamic associations.

(5) In July 1995, Ye Xiaowen, a rigid communist hostile to religion, was appointed to head the Bureau of Religious Affairs, a Chinese Government agency controlled by the United Front Work Department of the Chinese Communist Party. The Bureau of Religious Affairs has administrative control over all religious worship and activity in China and Tibet through a system of granting or denying rights through an official registration system. Those who fail to or are not allowed to register are subject to punitive measures.

(6) In the past year, the Chinese Government has expressed great concern over the spread of Christianity and particularly over the rapid growth of Christian religious institutions other than those controlled by the Chinese Government, including the Roman Catholic Church and the evangelical Christian "house churches".

(7) Soon after the establishment of the People's Republic of China in 1949, the Chi-

nese Government imprisoned Christians who refused to relinquish their faith to become servants of communism, charging them as "counter revolutionaries" and sentencing them to 20 years or more in "reeducation through labor camps".

(8) Hundreds of Chinese Protestants and Catholics are among those now imprisoned, detained, or continuously harassed because of their religious beliefs or activities.

(9) The prisons and labor camps which hold these religious prisoners are run by the Ministry of Public Security and the Ministry of Justice of the Chinese Government.

(10) Although some negotiations have taken place, the Chinese Government refuses to permit the appointment by the Vatican of Catholic bishops and the ordination of priests not approved by the Government and insists on appointing its own "Catholic bishops".

(11) The Tenth Panchen Lama died in January 1989 at Tashilhunpo Monastery, his traditional spiritual seat in Shigatze, Tibet's second largest city.

(12) It has always been the right and the role of the Dalai Lama to recognize the successor to the Panchen Lama. On May 14, 1995, His Holiness the Dalai Lama announced recognition of a six-year-old boy, Gedhun Chockyi Nyima, as the Eleventh Panchen Lama, according to Tibetan tradition.

(13) The young boy recognized by the Dalai Lama and his family have been brought to Beijing by Chinese authorities and have not been seen for months. The Chinese authorities announced publicly in June 1996 that they are holding Gedhun Chockyi Nyima.

(14) Chadrel Rimpoche, abbot of Tashilhunpo Monastery and head of the original search committee for the Eleventh Panchen Lama, and his assistant, Champa Chung, are believed to have been seized and detained by Chinese authorities in May of 1995.

(15) Chinese Government authorities subsequently detained other Tibetan Buddhists in connection with the selection of the Eleventh Panchen Lama, including Gyatrol Rimposhe, Shepa Kelsang, Lhakpa Tsering, and Ringkar Ngawang.

(16) The Chinese Government convened a conference in Beijing where Tibetan monks were coerced to select a rival candidate to the child recognized by the Dalai Lama as the Eleventh Panchen Lama.

(17) On November 29, 1995, officials of the Chinese Government orchestrated an elaborate ceremony designating a six-year-old boy selected by the Chinese Government as the Eleventh Panchen Lama and on December 8, 1995, a Government-sponsored ceremony was held in Shigatze, Tibet, where the boy selected by the Government was enthroned as the Eleventh Panchen Lama.

(18) By seeking to impose its own candidate as the Eleventh Panchen Lama and detaining the six-year-old boy recognized for that position in accordance with Tibetan tradition, the Chinese Government is infringing on a purely Tibetan religious matter, in blatant violation of the fundamental human rights of the Tibetan people.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President should make freedom of religion one of the major objectives of United States foreign policy with respect to China. As part of this policy, the Department of State should raise in every relevant bilateral and multilateral forum the issue of individuals imprisoned, detained, confined, or otherwise harassed by the Chinese Government on religious grounds. In its communications with the Chinese Government, the Department of State should provide specific names of individuals of concern and request a complete

and timely response from the Chinese Government regarding the individuals' whereabouts and condition, the charges against them, and sentence imposed. The goal of these official communications should be the expeditious release of all religious prisoners in China and Tibet and the end of the Chinese Government's policy and practice of harassing and repressing religious believers.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR THE PARTICIPATION OF CERTAIN CHINESE OFFICIALS IN CONFERENCES, EXCHANGES, PROGRAMS, AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal years after fiscal year 1997, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and the United States Agency for International Development may be used for the purpose of providing travel expenses and per diem for the participation of nationals of the People's Republic of China described in paragraphs (1) and (2) in conferences, exchanges, programs, and activities:

(1) The head of political secretary of any of the following Chinese Government-created or approved organizations:

(A) The Chinese Buddhist Association.

(B) The Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association.

(C) The National Congress of Catholic Representatives.

(D) The Chinese Catholic Bishops' Conference.

(E) The Chinese Protestant "Three Self" Patriotic Movement.

(F) The China Christian Council.

(G) The Chinese Taoist Association.

(H) The Chinese Islamic Association.

(2) Any military or civilian official or employee of the Government of the People's Republic of China who of any of the following policies or practices:

(A) Formulating, drafting, or implementing repressive religious policies.

(B) Imprisoning, detaining, or harassing individuals on religious grounds.

(C) Promoting or participating in policies or practices which hinder religious activities or the free expression of religious beliefs.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—

(1) Each Federal agency subject to the prohibition of subsection (a) shall certify in writing to the appropriate congressional committees no later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, that it did not pay, either directly or through a contractor or grantee, for travel expenses or per diem of any national of the People's Republic of China described in subsection (a).

(2) Each certification under paragraph (1) shall be supported by the following information:

(A) The name of each employee of any agency of the Government of the People's Republic of China whose travel expenses or per diem were paid by funds of the reporting agency of the United States Government.

(B) The procedures employed by the reporting agency of the United States Government to ascertain whether each individual under subparagraph (A) did or did not participate in activities described in subsection (a)(2).

(C) The reporting agency's basis for concluding that each individual under subparagraph (A) did not participate in such activities.

(c) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—For purpose as of this section the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 4. CERTAIN OFFICIALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA INELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE VISAS AND EXCLUDED FROM ADMISSION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any national of the People's Republic of China described in paragraphs (1) or (2) of section 3(a) shall be ineligible to receive visas and shall be excluded from admission into the United States.

SEC. 5. SUNSET PROVISION.

Section 4 shall cease to have effect 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the amendments printed in the bill are adopted.

The text of H.R. 967, as amended pursuant to House Resolution 302, is as follows:

H.R. 967

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

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President should make freedom of religion one of the major objectives of United States foreign policy with respect of China. As part of this policy, the Department of State should raise in every relevant bilateral and multilateral forum the issue of individuals imprisoned, detained, confined, or otherwise harassed by the Chinese Government on religious grounds. In its communications with the Chinese Government, the Department of State should provide specific names of individuals of concern and request a complete and timely response from the Chinese Government regarding the individuals' whereabouts and condition, the charges against them, and sentence imposed. The goal of these official communications should be the expeditious release of all religious prisoners in China and Tibet and the end of the Chinese Government's policy and practice of harassing and repressing religious believers.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR THE PARTICIPATION OF CERTAIN CHINESE OFFICIALS IN CONFERENCES, EXCHANGES, PROGRAMS, AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal years after fiscal year 1997, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and the United States Agency for International Development may be used for the purpose of providing travel expenses and per diem for the participation of nationals of the People's Republic of China described in paragraphs (1) and (2) in conferences, exchanges, programs, and activities:

(1) The head or political secretary of any of the following Chinese Government-created or approved organizations:

- (A) The Chinese Buddhist Association.
- (B) The Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association.
- (C) The National Congress of Catholic Representatives.
- (D) The Chinese Catholic Bishops' Conference.
- (E) The Chinese Protestant "Three Self" Patriotic Movement.
- (F) The China Christian Council.
- (G) The Chinese Taoist Association.
- (H) The Chinese Islamic Association.

(2) Any military or civilian official or employee of the Government of the People's Republic of China who carried out or directed the carrying out of any of the following policies or practices:

(A) Formulating, drafting, or implementing repressive religious policies.

(B) Imprisoning, detaining, or harassing individuals on religious grounds.

(C) Promoting or participating in policies or practices which hinder religious activities or the free expression of religious beliefs.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—

(1) Each Federal agency subject to the prohibition of subsection (a) shall certify in writing to the appropriate congressional committees no later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, that it did not pay, either directly or through a contractor or grantee, for travel expenses or per diem of any national of the People's Republic of China described in subsection (a).

(2) Each certification under paragraph (1) shall be supported by the following information:

(A) The name of each employee of any agency of the Government of the People's Republic of China whose travel expenses or per diem were paid by funds of the reporting agency of the United States Government.

(B) The procedures employed by the reporting agency of the United States Government to ascertain whether each individual under subparagraph (A) did or did not participate in activities described in subsection (a)(2).

(C) The reporting agency's basis for concluding that each individual under subparagraph (A) did not participate in such activities.

(c) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—For purposes of this section the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. CERTAIN OFFICIALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA INELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE VISAS AND EXCLUDED FROM ADMISSION.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any national of the People's Republic of China described in section 2(a)(2) (except the head of state, the head of government, and cabinet level ministers) shall be ineligible to receive visas and shall be excluded from admission into the United States.

(b) WAIVER.—The President may waive the requirement in subsection (a) with respect to an individual described in such subsection if the President—

(1) determines that it is vital to the national interest to do so; and

(2) provides written notification to the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 2(c)) containing a justification for the waiver.

SEC. 4. SUNSET PROVISION.

Sections 2 and 3 shall cease to have effect 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAVIS] each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 967.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 967 prohibits travel grants and visas for Chinese officials who repress religion in China and in occupied Tibet.

There are hundreds, if not thousands, of Christians, Muslims, and Buddhists who are serving long prison sentences in China and in occupied Tibet for merely practicing their religious faith. Let me underscore that. Large numbers of Catholics, Protestants, Muslims, and Buddhists are spending many years of their lives in prison for following their religious practices.

For example, the Beijing Government sentenced a 76-year-old Protestant leader to 15 years in prison for distributing Bibles. It sentenced a 65-year-old evangelical elder to an 11-year prison term for belonging to an evangelical group outside the government-sanctioned religious organizations.

A 60-year-old Roman Catholic priest was sentenced to 2 years of "reeducation through labor" for unknown charges. He had previously spent 13 years in prison because of his refusal to renounce ties with the Vatican.

The 6-year-old Panchen Lama and his family have been detained for 2 years, and their whereabouts are still unknown. The list goes on and on.

Although the President and Prime Minister of China have signed directives and set policy that are behind the current crackdown of religious practitioners, the bill does not prevent them or the cabinet ministers from receiving United States visas. However, it would stop others who carry out their directives by imprisoning, torturing, or repressing people for practicing their religion.

This measure sends a strong message that we find religious repression repugnant and at grave odds with important American values. It is simple, it is modest, and it is the right thing to do.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his hard work on this and all of these so-called China bills.

We should not be providing travel grants to any Chinese officials, and especially not to those who are repressing religious freedom in that country. Religious freedom is one of the most basic human rights that any individual can have. This Congress should encourage the Clinton administration to make ending religious persecution the most important part of its policy toward China.

The Chinese are committing horrible persecution, even as we speak. Nina Shea said in her recent book, "Lion's Den,"

Millions of American Christians pray in their churches each week, oblivious to the

fact that Christians in many parts of the world suffer brutal torture, arrest, imprisonment, and even death—their homes and communities laid waste—for no other reasons than that they are Christians. The shocking untold story of our time is that more Christians have died in this century simply for being Christians than from the first 19 centuries after the birth of Christ.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is simply deplorable.

In addition, Michael Horowitz, a leader in speaking out against this persecution, who happens to be Jewish, said in a recent interview,

I am speaking out on behalf of persecuted Christians precisely because I am a Jew in the most deeply rooted sense.

I see eerie parallels between the way the elites of the world are dealing with Christians, who have become the scapegoats of choice for thug regimes around the world, and the way the elites dealt with the Jews when Hitler came to power.

Another parallel,

Mr. Horowitz continued,

is the tongue-tied silence of the Christian community in the face of this persecution. A similar silence was evident in the years leading to the Holocaust. Silence, anybody's silence, in the face of persecution is deadly. So, for me,

Mr. Horowitz said,

sparking our campaign for awareness and action is the most important thing I expect to do. What thugs did to Jews, they are now doing to Christians. Christians are becoming the Jews of the 21st century.

□ 1545

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for not remaining silent on this issue. I hope the administration will follow his lead and end its silence on this most important issue. I think this is very important legislation, very valuable legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill and pass it by a very large margin.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill has, as its stated intention, to send a message to the country of China that we will not tolerate religious persecution, nor should anyone else in the world do so, and that is indeed a worthy message to send. This bill has also been described as a symbol to that effect, and that is also a worthy goal. And if the bill were to stop with its first section in which the Congress expresses its sense to that effect, this would be a worthy bill, but the bill fails to do so, and in failing to do so, it has two critical flaws which must lead me to speak in opposition to the bill.

The first is that this bill has as one of its central provisions to deny visas to those individuals who are thought to be associated with organizations inside China that are engaging in religious persecution. On the surface, this might have some appeal to suggest that we are going to keep these folks with whom we violently disagree outside our

borders. But think about it for a minute. If, in fact, our goal is to ultimately stop China and the rest of the world from engaging in religious persecution, we must in fact engage these individuals. We must hold them up. We must highlight the grave injustices that they are committing in China and allow that to undergo the scrutiny that invariably will occur in this country and around the world as these opinions, as these practices, are condemned and challenged and they are failed to be justified.

This is a collision with the truth. This is a collision with the fundamental values that represent who we are. We cannot have that conversation. We cannot have that scrutiny. We cannot have that criticism unless we have conversations with these people. So we must bring them into our country to expose them to that criticism and engage in a court of world opinion in which, on behalf of everybody in the world who disdains religious persecution, we speak out on their behalf, to have a conversation in which we ultimately will prevail.

The second fundamental flaw with this bill is it creates a serious risk, which no one can reasonably explain away, that we might suffer from the same lack of access to China. One of the most important things that is taking place in this country today is that there are many young men and women who are giving their lives to service, missionaries and advocates for human rights who are traveling to China.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that articles that were issued under Li Peng, 144 and 145, the Chinese now prohibit, strictly prohibit, any foreign proselytizing. If a missionary goes to China, he or she cannot speak out and proselytize, whether it be the Christian faith or any other faith.

So their law makes it a crime, and so much of a crime that deportation is the minimum of what would happen to that person. The maximum is that they will go to prison.

My staff and I and others in this Congress have worked to help people, some of whom were Americans who went over there and somehow drifted outside of the official boundaries and talked about Christ in one case, and he was arrested and was held and we had to intercede on his behalf. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is a valid point. But the issue I am referring to is a larger issue, and that is the grave risk that these individuals whom you describe will even lose the right to have access to the country, much as we would be denying to the individuals who are described in this bill, and that is a serious problem, to deprive our own folks who seek to speak out and

act against religious persecution in China an opportunity to go over there and to speak out with fear of imprisonment, but a choice that they have the right to make. We cannot afford to stop our advocacy, to stop our missionary work in China, by taking that risk, by denying access to individuals from China into this country.

So the unintended effect of this bill could conceivably be to cut off all dialogue, all debate, which we will ultimately win because we are right on the subject of religious persecution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I rise in support of this issue to tell the gentleman that he is moving in the right direction, and a similar bill to this same germaneness passed I think this House not too long ago, and I think the gentleman is going to receive a unanimous vote today.

But I come here today to suggest something. Mr. Speaker, we are going through a very contentious problem with my bill, which is a foreign operations appropriation bill, and in the foreign operations appropriation bill we have about 100 pages which appropriates the money that the gentleman has essentially authorized us to spend in foreign countries.

Now, in addition to the 100 pages of my bill, we have 400 pages of authorization language that the gentleman's committee and the Senate have drafted, and in order to save time on all of these bills, let me suggest to the gentleman that we just group them all together, and I will put them in my appropriation bill, and we will save 6 or 7 hours on debating this issue and accomplish the mission that we are after, and that is to send China a message in writing a bill that the President will sign.

So I come here trying to facilitate the gentleman to tell him that he has a great bill, that he is a great chairman, that he is moving in the right direction, but we are running out of time here in this Congress to pass an appropriation bill. Since we now have 400 pages of authorization language in my bill, I am willing to make it 410, and I will accept this language in my bill, and then we can bring my bill out of committee and the gentleman's committee will be happy and my committee will be happy, the Congress will be happy, because we will have been able to resolve a problem that is going to keep us here for several weeks if we do not do something in a timely manner.

So I come here offering the gentleman a suggestion, a possibility, a vehicle to pass this legislation. Just tell me, this legislation is good, which I agree with the gentleman, it is good, and we would like to see this to become law, and I will take that language and just insert it in my bill and the President will sign it.

So I come here making a suggestion and in strong support in addition to that of a way to get this passed and all of these China bills that we are talking about passed. Let us just stick them in the appropriation bill like we do everything else.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman for his generous offer, and of course, the gentleman and I both should meet with leadership to further discuss the gentleman's proposal, but I thank the gentleman for his constructive suggestion.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

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

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the chairman of the subcommittee, who suggested that we can place all of these China bills in the foreign operations bill. As the ranking member on that committee, I heartily approve of the suggestion of our chairman, but I would not want to do that without the full debate that we are having here, and I think that is the value of this China package.

I think the value of the discussion probably exceeds some of the clout within this legislation because this is indeed a gentle touch, but nonetheless a necessary one, and I commend my colleagues, especially the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] for their leadership in putting this package together.

To the issue of freedom of religion in China, the reason that this legislation that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is proposing, promoting religious freedom in China, the persecution of Christians, Buddhists, Muslims, and others, is well documented. Do not take my word for it. The State Department's own Country Report states, in the area of freedom of religion, "Although the Constitution affirms toleration of religious beliefs, the Chinese government seeks to restrict all," and that is the Chinese Constitution affirms toleration of religious beliefs, "The Chinese government seeks to restrict all religious practice to closely controlled and government-sanctioned religious organizations and registered places of worship. At the annual National Religious Affairs Conference in January, religious policy was 'readjusted' to emphasize harder line aspects. During the year," that would be of 1996, "many religious

groups were subjected to increased restrictions, although the degree of restriction varied significantly in different regions of China."

"The campaign to shut down unauthorized groups is in the hands of the police and religious affairs officials and is being conducted concurrently with other police actions against criminals and underground separatists, pro-democracy and labor groups. The national goal for 1996 was to register or close down all unregistered religious groups."

"In 1996 police closed down dozens of underground mosques, temples and seminaries and hundreds of Protestant house church groups, many with significant memberships; leaders of such groups, including itinerant teachers and evangelists, increasingly have been detained for lengthy investigation. There are NGO reports of deaths of detainees by beating. Some congregations have been hit with heavy fines. In Shanghai, home of the patriotic Protestant headquarters, authorities have been particularly tough."

I will conclude from the pages of reports on lack of religious freedom in China, but to say that Premier Li Peng stated recently that China upholds freedom of religious belief, but that religion should serve the aims of socialism. That is from our Country Report that states the condition of religious freedom, or lack thereof, in China.

I too want to quote from Nina Shays' article and just state that in it she says, "Catholics and other Christians are being persecuted and martyred before an unknowing, indifferent world and before a largely mute Christian community." And that, unfortunately, is true as well.

That is why the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] in this legislation is so important, because we cannot continue to ignore religious persecution in China while we profess to support religious freedom throughout the world.

When President Jiang was here, again, at the famous breakfast, I handed him a letter from Ignatius Cardinal Kung Pin-Mei, the Bishop of Shanghai. Cardinal Kung asked President Jiang in this letter—

In the name of 8 million Roman Catholic faithful and clergy in China and also in my name, I respectfully appeal to you, Mr. Chairman Jiang, to defend the right of the Chinese citizens to true religious freedom and to permit the Roman Catholics to maintain religious communion with the Pope in order to keep the fullness of their faith.

I further appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, to immediately release Su Zhimin, Bishop of Baoding Diocese, Hebei and An Shuxin, Auxiliary Bishop of Baoding; Han Ding Xiang, Bishop of Yong Nian, Hebei; Zeng Fingmu, Bishop of Yu Jiang, Jiangxi; and all other faithful and clergy who are being held in detention camps, labor camps and jails in China.

□ 1600

The Cardinal goes on to say, "May China, under your able leadership, be internationally known as a country which has true religious freedom."

In calling for the freedom of these bishops, of course, Cardinal Kung, who is in exile because he cannot practice his faith in China, is calling the world's attention to the religious persecution of Catholics as well as Christians, Muslims and Buddhists in China. If this Congress is willing to withhold a visa to a family member of a Canadian businessman because he is doing business with Cuba, why should we not withhold a visa for a repressor of religion in China?

I urge my colleagues to support the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and vote "aye."

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. Speaker, again I want to emphasize how important it is to have the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] as chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and to have the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] who is leading the fight for this package of legislation, which is so important.

If these people that suffer in China today are going to be relieved of any of this oppression, it is going to be because of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], who do truly outstanding work on this.

One thing that I like particularly about this package of China bills is that we get to hone in on particular aspects of Communist China's dictatorial methods and irresponsible practices.

So far we have been able to demonstrate China's abusive treatment of political opposition, its use of slave labor, and its rogue proliferation activities. Now Chairman GILMAN with his Free the Clergy Act has brought to light China's abominable record of persecuting religious believers. After all, that is what we Americans cherish the most. We like to live where we want to live, work where we want to work, and worship in the church or the religion of our choice.

Think of it in this manner. We are better able to see just how methodical is the tyranny of Communist totalitarians. Mr. Speaker, religious faith of any sort is dangerous to Communists because faith leads to strength and independence, and Communists like their people to be weak, and they like them to be dependent, not independent. They are easier to control that way. That is why ever since Lenin, Communist totalitarians have been destroying places of worship; killing and jailing priests, ministers, rabbis; raiding prayer sessions; and filling people's heads with atheistic propaganda.

That is part of the Communist doctrine, atheism. That is why they have to set up sham churches led by men who ought to be ashamed of themselves. I think it is a disgrace that we

would even let these people in this country. It is beyond belief that we would fund their travel in this country with taxpayer dollars. That is why this is such a thoughtful and necessary bill.

To those who say denying visas to these persecutors or denying funding to these charlatan religious figures would deny us the opportunity to turn them, or something like that, I say, wake up. We cannot turn totalitarians. Did we turn Brezhnev or Gorbachev by letting them tour America? Absolutely not. Did we turn Jiang last week after we rolled out the red carpet for him and gave him all the goodies? His offensive and arrogant speech before he left this country gave us the answer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great bill. Chairman GILMAN has enlightened us by introducing this and bringing this to the floor. It should pass immediately.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], a member of our committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 967, and commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for the moral leadership that he is providing to the Members of the Committee on International Relations. During my tenure here in this body, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has been a strong voice for morality in American foreign policy, and a man who I deeply respect. It is no surprise that he would be the author of this piece of legislation.

When discussing this bill, we must understand that the Chinese Communist Government is the most egregious persecutor of religious believers in the world. In China there are more Christians, Buddhists, and Muslims as political prisoners, being held as political prisoners, being held in slave labor camps, than in all the other countries of the world combined.

Recently the Chinese Government kidnaped a 6-year-old boy in Tibet. What was his crime? He was a 6-year-old boy that was a designated leader in the Dalai Lama's Buddhist faith. The Chinese Communists took this young boy and they tried to replace him with another young boy that is designated by the Communist Party. In other words, the Communist Party in China is trying to replace the Dalai Lama, take over their religion, oppress these people who have a different faith than this atheistic Communist ideology that controls their actions.

This bill that we are discussing today will deny American tax dollars to pay for the visits of any member of the Communist Chinese Government involved in persecuting religious believers or leaders in State-created mock religious organizations, so that they cannot visit the United States at tax-

payer expense unless the President of the United States certifies that it is in the national interests of the United States to do so.

Symbolically, this bill sends a message to both President Clinton and the Chinese Communist leadership that religious freedom does matter to the people of the United States and to our elected representatives. It sends a message to the oppressed people of the world, and especially the repressed believers in China, that we care about freedom of religion and we care about them.

This bill prevents certain officials from visiting here at taxpayers' expense. But we are not talking about certain officials, what we are talking about is the worst of all officials on this planet. We are talking about government officials who are engaged in torture and repression of people for their religious convictions.

In committee it was argued, and we have just heard argued today on this floor, it is OK to condemn religious persecution, just do not do anything about it. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we do not want Communist jailers and torturers, people who have tortured people for their belief in God, to be visiting this country.

At the very least, if we are going to do something about it, at the very least, we should set a standard and say that people who are engaged in this antihuman rights campaign in China and in other countries to oppress people's religious beliefs, that they should not visit our country at taxpayers' expense.

It is absurd and nonsensical to argue that these brutal thugs will change their ways if they simply come to the United States and enjoy some chablis and California cuisine with the people here, and our liberalism will just sort of ooze over them and they will change.

We do not want the Adolph Eichmanns of this generation visiting the United States at taxpayers' expense. The Nazis would not change their ways because they were horrible people. They were villains, they were evil, they should not have visited the United States at our expense because they were not going to change their ways.

The same is true for the people who engage in torture and oppression in Communist China today. We do not want to change their minds, we want to change their position. We want them out of power. If we are going to bring anybody to the United States, it should be members of those religious communities who are being oppressed in China.

Our heart goes out to the Christians, to the Muslims, to the Buddhists who are being tortured and brutalized by this clique of thugs in China. Let us bring them here. Let us express our appreciation to those people. Let us socialize with them. Let us send the message that we are on their side, and not the side of these people with blood running off of their hands. We should be on

the side of the oppressed wherever in this world there is oppression. We should never be on the side of the oppressor. We should never give the image that that is what we are.

Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy that last month our trade deficit swelled. What was the reason for this in the United States, between the United States and China? Because we were buying Christmas tree decorations from a government, from a country that is dominated by a government that is the worst oppressor of Christians on this planet. This is Kafkaesque, inviting these oppressors here to socialize with us, thinking they will change their ways.

Let us stand for morality, let us stand for justice. Let us just not speak cliches about human rights, let us do something about it, so the people of the world will know that America still stands for something. Support the Gilman amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. There are some points I want to make to clarify a point I had made earlier.

For a point of clarification, I want to say how appropriate the legislation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is. Some have said, why should we deny visas? It is the policy of the Clinton administration to deny visas to family members, say, for example, of Canadian businessmen if those Canadian businessmen are doing business with Cuba. Their children cannot get a visa to the United States. If that is the Clinton administration policy, why then would they, and I do not necessarily support that, in fact, I do not, but how can the administration that supports that then turn around and say, but we think it is inappropriate to deny the visa of a torturer and a persecutor of religion in China and Tibet?

It is on the subject of Tibet I am going to use a little more of my time. The country report on China and Tibet reports that during the year 1996, authorities increased repression, imprisonment, and abuse or torture of monks and nuns accused of political activism. This is a tactic the Chinese use. They accuse the nuns and priests of activism because of their loyalty to the Dalai Lama, His Holiness.

According to authoritative Chinese press reports from May, Beijing launched a campaign to limit criminal activity in the guise of religious practice. The crackdown appears to have three goals: to stop acts of defiance, to break the political power wielded by the Lamas and to remove officials loyal to the Dalai Lama.

In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, the Chinese authorities have kidnapped the Panchen Lama and installed their own successor to His Holiness, the Dalai Lama. Imagine, imagine that they

have kidnapped this child and replaced him with another child.

I just want to reiterate what my colleagues have mentioned as well. When I asked the question and others in the room asked the question about religious repression in China, President Jiang categorically denied that there was religious repression in China, right there before a mixed audience, the House and Senate, bicameral, bipartisan; categorically denied. That was an untruth. We must show the world what the truth is. This legislation does that, and has a penalty attached to it. I urge my colleagues to support the Gilman amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 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, I thank my friend and classmate for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I was very privileged to work with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and others in what ended up to be a bipartisan way in putting together H.R. 2095, the China Human Rights and Democracy Act. One of the key items in H.R. 2095 is our goal of ensuring that those who are responsible for religious persecution are not able to receive visas to come into this country.

I say that as one who is strongly committed to what I still believe is the most powerful force for positive change in the 5,000-year history of China, that being economic reform. Our commercial ties there are key to that.

So I think it is very, very important to note that people like our new colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. JOE PITTS], who joined me when we met with the Chinese Ambassador to specifically ask for the release of Pastor Su, and unfortunately that has not happened, and I believe we need to continue on a separate track to apply as much pressure.

Now, quiet diplomacy is the route we are taking, but frankly, as we proceed with a debate like this, I think it is very fair for those of us who want to strengthen ties but at the same time raise our voices to let our concern be heard.

□ 1615

So it seems to me that we have a very, very important responsibility to support this legislation because we do have many people who have faced religious persecution and we need to do what we can to release them. I agree with the statements that my colleagues have made, we should not reward those who are responsible for it by granting them visas to come into this country.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the dis-

tinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong, strong support of this bill. I would hope it could be almost passed with a unanimous vote, because it is important to note, the Chinese Government is watching really today.

In fact, this debate right now is being watched in Beijing. This debate right now is being watched up on Connecticut Avenue at the Chinese Embassy. What is said here and what tabulation up on both of these things and the tabulation on the board at the end is a message to the Chinese Government that they will get literally in about a half hour from now. The message is the body is divided, or the message is that we are together.

There is major, major persecution. I almost feel it is a redundancy to say, but there are probably six or seven Catholic bishops in jail today as we meet. And all the people that gave the announcement, including the administration, that Bishop Su was out of jail, it is just not true. He is not out of jail.

In fact, we have a press release dated today that says Bishop Su is still in jail. It says he was never released, as reported by the news agency. He is now being held in the detention center. So he is not out of jail.

They are also persecuting the Protestant Church. There have been a number of Protestant pastors who have been arrested.

For those in this body who maintain that they care about diversity, they are persecuting a lot of Muslims in China in addition to we all know what they are doing with regard to Tibet.

Mr. Speaker, I just urge that we pass this vote with, hopefully, a unanimous vote or almost a unanimous vote, knowing that the Chinese in Beijing are watching and the Chinese up at the Chinese Embassy are watching, and also the people of China.

And can my colleagues imagine, if they were the loved one of a Catholic bishop or a Catholic priest or a Protestant pastor or a Buddhist monk or a Buddhist nun, and they heard that the United States Congress, the people's House, had passed this resolution by an overwhelming vote with regard to, free the clergy, can we imagine the inspiration that we would get?

So I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the other gentleman that worked on this bill for their support.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how many speakers are left on the other side.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have two other speakers that are not here. They have been detained. I believe they are working on some committee work. So I would be the last speaker. So if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAVIS] would like to close on his side, then I will close on our side.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I think it is perfectly clear that the issue here is not whether there is any lack of disgust or resolve with respect to religious persecution that is occurring within the boundaries of China. The issue here is the best way to deal with that.

I think it is also fair to say that there is yet to be any credible argument to refute the fact that, by denying visas here, we are disengaging ourselves from an important conversation that needs to be held not just within the borders of this country in the conferences we have on human rights, but in the court of world opinion throughout the world, which we are responsible for conducting by bringing people together to debate issues and values.

Of course, we should not be afraid to debate those who would try to defend some of the reprehensible practices that currently occur in China, and we should welcome the scrutiny that we can bring to bear on these folks by bringing them to conferences and having them speak.

As has been suggested by a number of people here today, it is our burden to raise awareness of these issues, to expose these practices to the world and let the heat of truth bear upon them, because we will prevail, ultimately, in convincing the rest of the world that more pressure needs to be brought to bear on China to put an end to what is occurring there.

One of the supporters of the bill made the comment, we need to show the world where the truth is. I would suggest to my colleagues that it is fundamentally the case, as our first amendment stands for, that there is no better way to do that than to make sure that we have an open and honest discussion in this country that has to include the people who would, amazingly enough, attempt to defend some of these reprehensible practices that are occurring in China.

In fact, as a result of the meeting that recently occurred with the President of China here with our President, there is a delegation of religious leaders from our country who will be visiting China in the future to pursue exactly the type of conversation that we may ultimately lose if this bill were to pass and China were to retaliate by denying visas to our religious leaders who seek to enter that country to shake the opinion of not just people around the world but people inside the borders of China who sympathize with us and want to fight to stop human rights abuses.

Let me finally say, there has been some suggestion that there ought not to be any controversy with respect to this bill. And that certainly would be true if the bill had ended with the first section, as I described earlier, which simply states the sense of Congress that we should, under no circumstances, tolerate religious persecution in China. But because the bill goes so much further and because it contains the two inherent flaws that I

have referred to, the bill was in fact heavily opposed in the committee when it first came up and in fact failed.

And, in fact, there was opposition to that bill from the chairman of the subcommittee, who has jurisdiction over China. And there was opposition from other prominent members of the majority party. The bill only passed when it was brought up on a motion for reconsideration; and even then, it was a very close vote with strong bipartisan opposition.

So the bill and its objectives is noble. And certainly we need to work together, Democrats and Republicans, put politics aside, to not just call attention to the religious persecution that occurs in China but to find effective ways to stop it.

This bill is not an effective way to stop it. This bill will discontinue some very important conversations that have led us to the progress we have had to date, and it also may have the effect of cutting off our ability to send some of our religious leaders into China to hopefully build up more momentum within that country to stop their own religious persecution. For those reasons, I would urge that this bill be defeated.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for this bill, and especially the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] for his leadership in crafting this package, which is comprehensive, mutually reinforcing, and really sends a clear, unambiguous message to the dictatorship in Beijing that we mean business.

Yes, there are some who do not support linking most favored nation status. And the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], who spoke earlier so eloquently, is one of those. But this is one of those issues that most of us, almost all of us, can coalesce around and really present a genuine, authentic, united front that we will not tolerate human rights abuses in any way, shape, or form.

First, the bill that is before us would prohibit U.S. taxpayer funding for participation in U.S. cultural or educational supported exchange programs to PRC officials who have been directly involved in persecution, as well as to the officials who direct the agencies that have committed the persecution, including, but not limited to, the heads of Government-run religious front organizations.

What do we mean by that? No travel expenses. The U.S. taxpayer will not foot the bill to bring these people to our shores. No per diem expenses. We are not going to shell out money so they can eat high on the hog while back home they are the persecutors.

Second, the bill would deny U.S. visas to people who actually partici-

pated in or directed religious persecution. Like other visa exclusion grounds for terrorists and narcotraffickers, this would be adjudicated on a case-by-case basis by consular officers.

The Government of China, as we know so clearly, and every reputable human rights group bears witness to this and the State Department country reports on human rights practices also bear witness to this terrible truth that millions of Christians are being persecuted today.

It is strictly forbidden to be a Christian outside the official church run by the Government. If you want to be a Catholic, for example, the Government requires you to join a church that does not recognize the Pope, has censored huge portions of the Bible. It is almost like Swiss cheese; whole parts of the Bible have been ripped out and are strictly prohibited from being taught. And they can never say anything about government policy and the linkage that policy might have to morality.

It also proscribes the teaching of religion to anyone under the age of 18. So no young people can hear about God in China in the officially-run churches. And if they do so in the underground church, the full weight of the dictatorship is levied against them.

Catholics who insist on belonging to the real Catholic Church have been imprisoned. This includes, at least four Catholic bishops and dozens, literally dozens, of priests. As a matter of fact, when the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I met with Li Peng in Beijing years ago back in 1994, we handed him a list of imprisoned pastors. He would not even look at it and just was in total denial in a way that is much akin to what President Jiang Zemin was when he said to us, incredulously, that they have had religious freedom in China since Mao. Do any of my colleagues in this Chamber believe that, the Cultural Revolution, when it was a high tide of crackdown, that that was religious tolerance? Of course not.

We know since 1894, with the issuance of Decrees 194 and 195, the crackdown has accelerated, and they are trying to stamp out from the face of that country any kind of religious observance that is not carefully circumscribed and run by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

The situation, Mr. Speaker, is no better for other religious believers either. The Government has conducted a ruthless campaign against Tibetans, including the destruction of monasteries, the imprisonment and torture of monks and nuns, and the arrest and subsequent disappearance of the 7-year-old child, the Panchen Lama.

In Xinjiang Autonomous Region, formerly the independent nation of East Turkistan, Moslem leaders are persecuted for fidelity to their religion, the Islam. Recently we had a hearing in my subcommittee and we heard the kind of horrific excesses that the security forces bring to bear against those who want to practice their Moslem faith.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of this bill have already gone, and this happened in committee, and I regret that it happened, but it happened. There have been changes in this bill. This has been a modified bill. The committee adopted an amendment that stripped all the findings of fact from the bill on the ground that the Chinese Government had not been asked for its opinion on these findings.

Another amendment was adopted that limited the denial of visas to persons who either carried out persecution themselves or directed the carrying out of persecution.

Another amendment to the visa provision limitation made a special exemption to the heads of the state-run churches. So the gentleman is incorrect based on the plain language of the bill, religious affairs ministers and cabinet ministers and heads of state.

Finally, even in a narrow class of cases, we provided the President with waiver authority that, in the event he finds that admitting one of these persecutors is somehow vital to the national interest of the United States, he can do so.

This is an extremely moderate bill. Any of my colleagues who pretend otherwise ought to read the bill over again.

I ask my colleagues to read the bill. When it talks about those who will be denied per diem and travel expenses and perhaps they may be denied a visa, we are talking, and this is right from the bill,

any military or civilian officer or employee of the Government of the People's Republic of China who carried out or directed the carrying out of any of the following policies or practices formulating, drafting, or implementing repressive religious policies, imprisoning, detaining, or harassing individuals on religious grounds, or promoting or participating in policies or practices which hinder religious activities or the free expression of religious beliefs.

This is very, very, I think, clear and very tight, and this is the minimum that we should be doing.

Finally, just let me make a point about one particular Catholic priest that I met when I was there, and I have met many people in the underground church, but Bishop Su of Baoding Province, a man who has spent almost 20 years in the Laogai, in the gulags of China, he has been tortured in hideous ways, sleep deprivation, genitals being cattle-prodded, and all kinds of horrible things. Here he is, a Catholic bishop.

□ 1630

The Chinese Government has now re-arrested him. Madeleine Albright and our very distinguished State Department announced with much flourish that he had been released. It turns out that was another case of disinformation. We have reliable, I will not say it is absolutely correct, nobody ever knows in a closed society, but very reliable information strongly suggesting that he is still being held in

Jingyuan County Detention Center in Baoding Province. As Members know, there was all this talk that constructive engagement somehow is working. "Look, Bishop Su has been released." No, he is still in prison. What was his crime? He wants to preach the gospel. He wants to talk about Christ. He celebrated mass for our very small delegation in a small, dingy apartment. The next day we heard that he was arrested. I did not even want to meet with him. I thought that might bring the security apparatus down upon his head, and sure enough it did. So if Members think that preaching is free and somehow not censored, we are only fooling ourselves. For meeting with me and 5 or 6 other people and celebrating mass, this man is now in prison.

When we toast glasses and we say let us have more partnership and constructive engagement, let us not forget the men and women who are languishing in these gulags simply because of their faith. This is Muslims, Buddhists, Catholics, evangelical Protestants in the People's Republic of China.

They do this for the human rights activists as well, as we all know. Wei Jingsheng is just one of many who had the courage to speak out and say basic human rights need to be protected. He is also languishing in a prison and has been severely beaten.

Finally, just let me say a point about the heads of these officially recognized churches. This is what Jiang Zemin said recently in the People's Daily, March 14, 1996. He said state religious policy is to "actively guide religion so that it can be adapted to socialist society." I met with the head of the Religious Affairs Department on a number of occasions, here and in the People's Republic of China. I asked him if he was a believer. He said absolutely not. He is an avowed atheist. He said in the Chinese press that the handling of religious matters needed to be done according to the dictates of Lenin. He did not even say Mao. He said Lenin. We all know what Lenin did to the church and how he persecuted the church in the former Soviet Union.

Rev. Deng Fucun, the general secretary of the government-run Three Self Patriotic Movement, made the preposterous claim in the Western press on July 16 that there was no such thing as an underground church. I and many of my colleagues have met numerous members who were part of this underground church. They are brave souls. Some surface. Many are in hiding.

Another atheist who heads the Protestant church, again government-run, said, and I quote, that there is no persecution in China. Again these people become front people. Let us not forget that this has happened in other Communist dictatorships. People come here, and again what the bill proscribes is that we feed them, we pay for their food and we pay for their lodging and their airfare and the like.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very modest bill. This will advance the ball a little

bit, not a whole lot but a little bit in the realm of religious freedom. We stand today with the oppressed, not the oppressor. I hope that people will support this important bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, if the bill were to have the effect of causing the Chinese Government to deny visas to some of our religious leaders who attempt to support the underground church he refers to, how does that advance our cause of stopping religious persecution?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. First of all, we are talking about people who have persecuted. We are talking about saying that there is some penalty affixed. First of all, if our people meet with the underground church over there, as I have discovered and others have discovered, that means potentially that these people that we meet with end up going to prison. They without question will get interrogated, but they might even go to prison for a week, a month, who knows how long. That is all up to the dictates of the State. Right now they are people who it is probably better we have a minimum, if no contact with because we would do nothing but lead the secret police to their doorsteps.

Let me also say for these others to come here at our expense to me just, when they are fronting, especially if they have been found to be persecutors, is to allow the jailers and the persecutors to come here. We need to have a penalty affixed to that. That is why this is such a modest bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REGULA). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 366, nays 54, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 595]

YEAS—366

Abercrombie
Aderholt

Allen
Andrews

Archer
Army

Bachus	Ewing	LoBiondo
Baessler	Farr	Lowey
Baker	Fawell	Lucas
Baldacci	Filner	Luther
Ballenger	Flake	Maloney (CT)
Barcia	Foglietta	Manton
Barr	Foley	Manzullo
Barrett (NE)	Ford	Markey
Barrett (WI)	Fossella	Mascara
Bartlett	Fowler	Matsui
Barton	Fox	McCarthy (MO)
Bass	Franks (NJ)	McCarthy (NY)
Bateman	Frelinghuysen	McCollum
Bentsen	Frost	McCreery
Bereuter	Furse	McDade
Berry	Gallegly	McHale
Bilbray	Ganske	McHugh
Bilirakis	Gekas	McInnis
Bishop	Gephardt	McIntosh
Blagojevich	Gibbons	McIntyre
Bliley	Gilchrest	McKeon
Blumenauer	Gillmor	McNulty
Blunt	Gilman	Meehan
Boehrlert	Goode	Meek
Boehner	Goodlatte	Menendez
Bonilla	Goodling	Metcalf
Bonior	Gordon	Miller (CA)
Bono	Goss	Miller (FL)
Borski	Graham	Moakley
Boswell	Granger	Mollohan
Boucher	Green	Moran (KS)
Boyd	Greenwood	Moran (VA)
Brady	Gutknecht	Morella
Brown (FL)	Hall (OH)	Murtha
Brown (OH)	Hall (TX)	Myrick
Bryant	Hansen	Nethercutt
Bunning	Harman	Neumann
Burr	Hastert	Ney
Burton	Hastings (WA)	Northup
Buyer	Hayworth	Norwood
Callahan	Hefley	Nussle
Calvert	Hefner	Oberstar
Camp	Herger	Obey
Campbell	Hill	Olver
Canady	Hilleary	Ortiz
Cannon	Hinchey	Owens
Cardin	Hinojosa	Oxley
Castle	Hobson	Packard
Chabot	Hoekstra	Pallone
Chambliss	Holden	Pappas
Chenoweth	Hooley	Parker
Christensen	Horn	Pascrell
Clayton	Hostettler	Pastor
Clement	Hoyer	Paxon
Coble	Hulshof	Pease
Coburn	Hunter	Pelosi
Collins	Hutchinson	Peterson (MN)
Combest	Hyde	Peterson (PA)
Condit	Inglis	Petri
Cook	Istook	Pickering
Cooksey	Jackson (IL)	Pitts
Costello	Jackson-Lee	Pombo
Cox	(TX)	Pomeroy
Coyne	Jenkins	Porter
Cramer	John	Poshard
Crane	Johnson (WI)	Price (NC)
Crapo	Jones	Pryce (OH)
Cummings	Kanjorski	Quinn
Cunningham	Kaptur	Radanovich
Danner	Kasich	Rahall
Davis (VA)	Kelly	Ramstad
Deal	Kennedy (MA)	Redmond
DeFazio	Kennedy (RI)	Regula
DeGette	Kildee	Reyes
Delahunt	Kilpatrick	Riggs
DeLay	Kim	Rivers
Deutsch	Kind (WI)	Rodriguez
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Roemer
Dickey	Kingston	Rogan
Dicks	Kleczka	Rogers
Dixon	Klink	Rohrabacher
Doggett	Klug	Ros-Lehtinen
Dooley	Knollenberg	Rothman
Doolittle	Kolbe	Roukema
Doyle	LaHood	Royce
Dreier	Lampson	Ryun
Duncan	Lantos	Salmon
Dunn	Largent	Sanchez
Edwards	Latham	Sanders
Ehlers	LaTourette	Sandlin
Ehrlich	Lazio	Sanford
Emerson	Leach	Sawyer
Engel	Levin	Saxton
English	Lewis (CA)	Scarborough
Ensign	Lewis (GA)	Schaefer, Dan
Eshoo	Lewis (KY)	Schaffer, Bob
Etheridge	Linder	Schumer
Evans	Lipinski	Scott
Everett	Livingston	Sensbrenner

Sessions Stark
Shadegg Stearns
Shaw Stenholm
Shays Strickland
Shimkus Stump
Shuster Stupak
Sisisky Sununu
Skeen Talent
Skelton Tanner
Slaughter Tauscher
Smith (MI) Tauzin
Smith (NJ) Taylor (MS)
Smith (OR) Taylor (NC)
Smith (TX) Thomas
Smith, Linda Thornberry
Snowbarger Thune
Snyder Thurman
Solomon Tiaht
Souder Tierney
Spence Torres
Spratt Towns
Stabenow Traficant

NAYS—54

Ackerman Jefferson
Becerra Johnson (CT)
Berman Johnson, E. B.
Brown (CA) Kennelly
Clay Kucinich
Clyburn LaFalce
Davis (FL) Lofgren
Davis (IL) Maloney (NY)
DeLauro Martinez
Dellums McDermott
Dingell McGovern
Fattah Millender-
Fazio McDonald
Frank (MA) Minge
Gejdenson Mink
Hamilton Nadler
Hastings (FL) Paul
Hilliard Payne
Houghton Pickett

NOT VOTING—13

Carson Gutierrez Portman
Conyers Johnson, Sam Riley
Cubin McKinney Schiff
Forbes Mica
Gonzalez Neal

□ 1658

Messrs. McDERMOTT, FRANK of Massachusetts, THOMPSON, NADLER, SERRANO, MARTINEZ, STOKES, RUSH, VENTO and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. McCARTHY of Missouri and Messrs. SKELTON, CANNON, MORAN of Virginia, BONIOR and ALLEN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MR. WISE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KOLBE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 185, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 596]

AYES—227

Abercrombie Gibbons
Aderholt Gilchrist
Archer Gillmor
Armey Gilman
Bachus Goode
Baker Goodlatte
Ballenger Goodling
Barr Goss
Barrett (NE) Graham
Bartlett Granger
Barton Greenwood
Bass Gutknecht
Bateman Hall (TX)
Bereuter Hansen
Bilbray Hastert
Bilirakis Hastings (WA)
Bliley Hayworth
Blunt Hefley
Boehler Herger
Bonilla Hill
Bono Hilleary
Boyd Hobson
Brady Hoekstra
Bryant Horn
Bunning Hostettler
Burr Houghton
Burton Hulshof
Buyer Hunter
Callahan Hutchinson
Calvert Hyde
Camp Inglis
Campbell Istook
Canady Jenkins
Cannon Johnson (CT)
Castle Jones
Chabot Kasich
Chambliss Kelly
Chenoweth Kim
Christensen King (NY)
Coble Kingston
Coburn Klug
Collins Knollenberg
Combest Kolbe
Cook LaHood
Cooksey Largent
Cox Latham
Crane LaTourrette
Crapo Lazio
Cunningham Leach
Davis (VA) Lewis (CA)
Deal Lewis (KY)
DeLay Linder
Diaz-Balart Livingston
Dickey LoBiondo
Doolittle Lucas
Dreier Manullo
Duncan McCollum
Dunn McCreary
Ehlers McDade
Ehrlich McHugh
Emerson McInnis
English McIntosh
Ensign McIntyre
Everett McKeon
Ewing Metcalf
Fawell Miller (FL)
Foley Moran (KS)
Fossella Morella
Fowler Myrick
Fox Nethercutt
Franks (NJ) Neumann
Frelinghuysen Ney
Gallegly Northup
Ganske Norwood
Gejdenson Nussle
Gekas Oxley

NOES—185

Ackerman Brown (CA)
Allen Brown (FL)
Andrews Brown (OH)
Baesler Cardin
Baldacci Clay
Barcia Clayton
Barrett (WI) Clement
Becerra Clyburn
Bentsen Condit
Berman Costello
Berry Coyne
Bishop Cramer
Blagojevich Cummings
Blumenauer Danner
Bonior Davis (IL)
Borski DeFazio
Boswell DeGette
Boucher Delahunt

Flake Maloney (CT)
Foglietta Maloney (NY)
Ford Manton
Frank (MA) Markey
Frost Martinez
Furse Mascara
Gephardt Matsui
Gordon McCarthy (MO)
Green McCarthy (NY)
Hall (OH) McDermott
Hamilton McGovern
Harman McHale
Hastings (FL) McNulty
Hefner Meehan
Hilliard Meek
Hinchev Menendez
Hinojosa Millender-
Holden McDonald
Hooley Miller (CA)
Jackson (IL) Minge
Jackson-Lee Mink
(TX) Moakley
Jefferson Mollohan
Johnson (WI) Moran (VA)
Johnson, E. B. Murtha
Kanjorski Nadler
Kaptur Oberstar
Kennedy (MA) Obey
Kennedy (RI) Olver
Kennelly Ortiz
Kildee Owens
Kilpatrick Pallone
Kind (WI) Pascrell
Klecza Pastor
Klink Payne
Kucinich Pelosi
LaFalce Peterson (MN)
Lampson Pickett
Lantos Pomeroy
Levin Poshard
Lewis (GA) Price (NC)
Lipinski Rahall
Lofgren Rangel
Lowey Reyes
Luther Rivers

NOT VOTING—21

Boehner Gutierrez Portman
Carson Hoyer Riggs
Conyers John Riley
Cubin Johnson, Sam Schiff
Davis (FL) McKinney Solomon
Forbes Mica Stokes
Gonzalez Neal Waters

□ 1718

Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, MARKEY and DEUTSCH changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1119) "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 858) "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the

United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution providing for corrections to be made in the enrollment of H.R. 1119.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

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

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 75, nays 333, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 597]

YEAS—75

Andrews	Hilleary	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Hinchey	Pascarell
Bonior	Hoyer	Payne
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Clement	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Clyburn	(TX)	Rangel
Conyers	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Coyne	Johnson (WI)	Sabo
Davis (FL)	Kennelly	Sanchez
DeFazio	Kilpatrick	Schaffer, Bob
Delahunt	LaFalce	Scott
DeLauro	Lantos	Skelton
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Dingell	Lowe	Strickland
Doggett	Markey	Thurman
Engel	McDermott	Torres
Eshoo	McNulty	Towns
Evans	Meehan	Velazquez
Fazio	Meek	Vento
Filner	Menendez	Waters
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)	Waxman
Furse	Mink	Wise
Gejdenson	Moakley	Woolsey
Gephardt	Obey	Yates
Harman	Olver	
Hastings (FL)	Owens	

NAYS—333

Abercrombie	Bonilla	Coburn
Ackerman	Bono	Collins
Aderholt	Borski	Combest
Allen	Boswell	Condit
Archer	Boucher	Cook
Armey	Boyd	Cooksey
Bachus	Brady	Costello
Baessler	Brown (CA)	Cox
Baker	Brown (OH)	Cramer
Baldacci	Bryant	Crane
Ballenger	Bunning	Crapo
Barcia	Burr	Cunningham
Barrett (NE)	Burton	Danner
Bartlett	Buyer	Davis (IL)
Bass	Callahan	Davis (VA)
Bateman	Calvert	Deal
Bentsen	Camp	DeGette
Bereuter	Campbell	DeLay
Berman	Canady	Dellums
Berry	Cannon	Diaz-Balart
Bilbray	Cardin	Dickey
Bilirakis	Castle	Dicks
Bishop	Chabot	Dixon
Blagojevich	Chambliss	Dooley
Bliley	Chenoweth	Doolittle
Blumenauer	Christensen	Doyle
Blunt	Clay	Dreier
Boehrlert	Clayton	Duncan
Boehner	Coble	Dunn

Edwards	Kucinich	Roemer
Ehlers	LaHood	Rogan
Ehrlich	Lampson	Rogers
Emerson	Largent	Rohrabacher
English	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
Ensign	LaTourrette	Rothman
Etheridge	Lazio	Roukema
Everett	Leach	Royce
Ewing	Levin	Rush
Farr	Lewis (CA)	Ryun
Fattah	Lewis (KY)	Salmon
Fawell	Linder	Sanders
Flake	Lipinski	Sandlin
Foley	Livingston	Sanford
Ford	LoBiondo	Sawyer
Fossella	Lofgren	Saxton
Fowler	Lucas	Scarborough
Fox	Luther	Schaefer, Dan
Franks (NJ)	Maloney (CT)	Schumer
Frelinghuysen	Maloney (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Frost	Manton	Serrano
Gallegly	Manzullo	Sessions
Ganske	Martinez	Shadegg
Gibbons	Mascara	Shaw
Gilchrest	Matsui	Shays
Gillmor	McCarthy (MO)	Sherman
Gilman	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus
Goode	McCollum	Shuster
Goodlatte	McCrary	Sisisky
Goodling	McDade	Skaggs
Gordon	McGovern	Skeen
Goss	McHale	Smith (MI)
Graham	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Granger	McInnis	Smith (OR)
Green	McIntosh	Smith (TX)
Greenwood	McIntyre	Smith, Adam
Gutierrez	McKeon	Smith, Linda
Gutknecht	Metcalf	Snowbarger
Hall (OH)	Millender-	Snyder
Hall (TX)	McDonald	Solomon
Hamilton	Minge	Souder
Hansen	Mollohan	Spence
Hastert	Moran (KS)	Spratt
Hastings (WA)	Moran (VA)	Stabenow
Hayworth	Morella	Stark
Hefley	Murtha	Stearns
Hefner	Myrick	Stenholm
Hergert	Nadler	Stokes
Hill	Nethercutt	Stump
Hilliard	Neumann	Stupak
Hinojosa	Ney	Sununu
Hobson	Northup	Tanner
Hoekstra	Norwood	Tauscher
Holden	Nussle	Tauzin
Hooley	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Horn	Ortiz	Taylor (NC)
Hostettler	Oxley	Thomas
Houghton	Packard	Thompson
Hulshof	Pappas	Thornberry
Hunter	Parker	Thune
Hyde	Pastor	Tiahrt
Inglis	Paul	Tierney
Istook	Paxon	Trafcant
Jenkins	Pease	Turner
John	Peterson (PA)	Upton
Johnson (CT)	Petri	Visclosky
Johnson, E. B.	Pickering	Walsh
Jones	Pitts	Wamp
Kanjorski	Pombo	Watkins
Kaptur	Pomeroy	Watt (NC)
Kasich	Porter	Watts (OK)
Kelly	Poshard	Weldon (FL)
Kennedy (RI)	Price (NC)	Weller
Kildee	Pryce (OH)	Wexler
Kim	Radanovich	Weygand
Kind (WI)	Rahall	Whitfield
King (NY)	Ramstad	Wicker
Kingston	Redmond	Wolf
Klecicka	Regula	Wynn
Klink	Reyes	Young (AK)
Klug	Riggs	Young (FL)
Knollenberg	Rivers	
Kolbe	Rodriguez	

NOT VOTING—25

Barr	Gonzalez	Portman
Barton	Hutchinson	Quinn
Becerra	Johnson, Sam	Riley
Carson	Kennedy (MA)	Schiff
Cubin	McKinney	Talent
Cummings	Mica	Weldon (PA)
Foglietta	Miller (FL)	White
Forbes	Neal	
Gekas	Pickett	

□ 1736

So the motion to adjourn was re-jected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, today I attended the dedication of the George Bush Library at College Station, TX. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the following rollcalls: Nos. 587, 588, 589, 590, 592, 593, 595, and 596.

I would have voted "no" on the following rollcalls: Nos. 586, 591, 594, and 597.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, because I was in Houston attending the dedication of the George Bush Library, I was absent for rollcall votes 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, and 597.

Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 587, 588, 589, 590, 592, 593, 595, 596, and "nay" on 585, 586, 591, 594, and 597.

FORCED ABORTION CONDEMNATION ACT

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 302, and as the designee of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I call up the bill (H.R. 2570) to condemn those officials of the Chinese Communist Party, the Government of the People's Republic of China, and other persons who are involved in the enforcement of forced abortions by preventing such persons from entering or remaining in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. GIBBONS]. The bill is considered as read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 2570 is as follows:

H.R. 2570

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Forced Abortion Condemnation Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Forced abortion was rightly denounced as a crime against humanity by the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal.

(2) For over 15 years there have been frequent and credible reports of forced abortion and forced sterilization in connection with the population control policies of the People's Republic of China. These reports indicate the following:

(A) Although it is the stated position of the politburo of the Chinese Communist Party that forced abortion and forced sterilization have no role in the population control program, in fact the Communist Chinese Government encourages both forced abortion and forced sterilization through a combination of strictly enforced birth quotas and immunity for local population control officials who engage in coercion. Officials acknowledge that there have been instances of forced abortions and sterilization, and no evidence has been made available to suggest that the perpetrators have been punished.

(B) People's Republic of China population control officials, in cooperation with employers and works unit officials, routinely

monitor women's menstrual cycles and subject women who conceive without government authorization to extreme psychological pressure, to harsh economic sanctions, including unpayable fines and loss of employment, and often to physical force.

(C) Official sanctions for giving birth to unauthorized children include fines in amounts several times larger than the per capita annual incomes of residents of the People's Republic of China. In Fujian, for example, the average fine is estimated to be twice a family's gross annual income. Families which cannot pay the fine may be subject to confiscation and destruction of their homes and personal property.

(D) Especially harsh punishments have been inflicted on those whose resistance is motivated by religion. For example, according to a 1995 Amnesty International report, the Catholic inhabitants of 2 villages in Hebei Province were subjected to population control under the slogan "better to have more graves than one more child". Enforcement measures included torture, sexual abuse, and the detention of resisters' relatives as hostages.

(E) Forced abortions in Communist China often have taken place in the very late stages of pregnancy.

(F) Since 1994 forced abortion and sterilization have been used in Communist China not only to regulate the number of children, but also to eliminate those who are regarded as defective in accordance with the official eugenic policy known as the "Natal and Health Care Law".

SEC. 3. DENIAL OF ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES OF PERSONS IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA ENGAGED IN ENFORCEMENT OF FORCED ABORTION POLICY.

The Secretary of State may not issue any visa to, and the Attorney General may not admit to the United States, any national of the People's Republic of China, including any official of the Communist Party or the Government of the People's Republic of China and its regional, local, and village authorities who the Secretary finds, based on credible information, has been involved in the establishment or enforcement of population control policies resulting in a woman being forced to undergo an abortion against her free choice, or resulting in a man or woman being forced to undergo sterilization against his or her free choice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the amendments printed in part 3 of House Report 105-379 are adopted.

The text of H.R. 2570, as amended by the amendments printed in part 3 of House Report 105-379, is as follows:

H.R. 2570

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Forced Abortion Condemnation Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Forced abortion was rightly denounced as a crime against humanity by the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal.

(2) For over 15 years there have been frequent and credible reports of forced abortion and forced sterilization in connection with the population control policies of the People's Republic of China. These reports indicate the following:

(A) Although it is the stated position of the politburo of the Chinese Communist Party that forced abortion and forced sterilization have no role in the population con-

trol program, in fact the Communist Chinese Government encourages both forced abortion and forced sterilization through a combination of strictly enforced birth quotas and immunity for local population control officials who engage in coercion. Officials acknowledge that there have been instances of forced abortions and sterilization, and no evidence has been made available to suggest that the perpetrators have been punished.

(B) People's Republic of China population control officials, in cooperation with employers and works unit officials, routinely monitor women's menstrual cycles and subject women who conceive without government authorization to extreme psychological pressure, to harsh economic sanctions, including unpayable fines and loss of employment, and often to physical force.

(C) Official sanctions for giving birth to unauthorized children include fines in amounts several times larger than the per capita annual incomes of residents of the People's Republic of China. In Fujian, for example, the average fine is estimated to be twice a family's gross annual income. Families which cannot pay the fine may be subject to confiscation and destruction of their homes and personal property.

(D) Especially harsh punishments have been inflicted on those whose resistance is motivated by religion. For example, according to a 1995 Amnesty International report, the Catholic inhabitants of 2 villages in Hebei Province were subjected to population control under the slogan "better to have more graves than one more child". Enforcement measures included torture, sexual abuse, and the detention of resisters' relatives as hostages.

(E) Forced abortions in Communist China often have taken place in the very late stages of pregnancy.

(F) Since 1994 forced abortion and sterilization have been used in Communist China not only to regulate the number of children, but also to eliminate those who are regarded as defective in accordance with the official eugenic policy known as the "Natal and Health Care Law".

SEC. 3. DENIAL OF ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES OF PERSONS IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA ENGAGED IN ENFORCEMENT OF FORCED ABORTION POLICY.

The Secretary of State may not issue any visa to, and the Attorney General may not admit to the United States, any national of the People's Republic of China, including any official of the Communist Party or the Government of the People's Republic of China and its regional, local, and village authorities—except the head of state, the head of government, and cabinet level ministers—who the Secretary finds, based on credible information, has been involved in the establishment or enforcement of population control policies resulting in a woman being forced to undergo an abortion against her free choice, or resulting in a man or woman being forced to undergo sterilization against his or her free choice.

SEC. 4. WAIVER.

The President may waive the requirement contained in section 3 with respect to a national of the People's Republic of China if the President—

(1) determines that it is in the national interest of the United States to do so; and

(2) provides written notification to the Congress containing a justification for the waiver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] for 30 minutes.

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

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the House is considering today H.R. 2570, legislation I have introduced to condemn the practice of coerced abortion and sterilization in China.

I want to state at the outset that this legislation, in my opinion, does not take a prochoice or a prolife position. It simply condemns China's all too common practice of forcing women to undergo involuntary abortions and sterilization under China's one-child-per-couple policies, and prohibits the State Department from issuing United States visas to Chinese officials involved in the establishment or enforcement of these practices. Mr. Speaker, I believe these are goals that we all support.

Let me also take this opportunity to note my support for provisions offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], which were self-executing in the rule, and to thank him for his contributions in this regard.

The tragic and wholly unacceptable practices that are targeted in this legislation have been well-documented. I would note that the latest edition of the State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices states, "The Chinese Government continued to implement highly intrusive one-child family planning policies first adopted in the late 1970's. Poor supervision of local officials who are under intense pressure to meet family planning targets results in instances of abuse, including forced abortion and sterilization. There were credible reports that several women were forced to undergo abortions of unauthorized pregnancies in Fujian. A well-documented story of a 1994 forced 8-month abortion has been reported in the coastal province Guangdong. A 1995 incident involving a forced sterilization was also reported in Guangzhou."

Amnesty International has also expressed its strong opposition to these practices. In its 1996 report, *Women in China, Detained, Victimized*, but Mobilized, it stated its profound concerns about them, observing, and I quote, "Testimonies have indicated that officials have resorted to physical coercion resulting in torture or cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment when faced with this pressure. Family planning cadres continue to be disciplined and fired for failing to keep to birth quotas."

I am aware that some have concerns about how we can assure compliance

with this legislation's requirement that visas be denied to individuals involved with these nefarious practices. While I would expect that a determined effort would be made to identify persons involved in such acts prior to the issuance of visas, I recognize that enforcement will not be easy in every instance.

I would state that what is most important is that we provide both a strong condemnation of these practices, which this bill does, and a mechanism for taking action against those responsible for them when information about their activities comes to light.

Mr. Speaker, involuntary abortion and sterilization represent intolerable human rights violations of the first order. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GIBBONS). As the designee of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will not take the 30 minutes, other than to say how proud I am to be able to stand here today and associate myself with the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER]. I have the good fortune, Mr. Speaker, to be associated, as well, with the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] on the Committee on National Security, and in this instance I can say that I believe we are cooperating, if you will, in the same manner and in the same sense of commitment and dedication that is exemplified in the work on the Committee on National Security.

This is, Mr. Speaker, most profoundly a human rights issue. It is not something that we are putting forward, or I should say the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] has put forward, if I can speak for her in this instance, because of ideological considerations with respect to the very real differences that people may have with respect to questions of choice and abortion here in the United States. This, on the contrary, is a situation in which we are speaking of force.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that I became involved in political work in the first place was that I could not understand as a child, as a young man growing up, how people could do the things that they did that I discovered when I first was exposed to the Holocaust. I could not understand it. I could not comprehend it as a student.

One of the things that propelled me in my academic career was to try to come to grips with what it was in us as human beings that caused us to be indifferent to the suffering of other human beings; in fact, to perpetrate death, terror, destruction, inhumanity, one to another.

In this instance, Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind that the

forced abortion and sterilization circumstances and actions which the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] has outlined and which Amnesty International has chronicled is taking place.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, this took place in Nazi Germany. If I learned anything over that period of time in my academic studies in my attempt to try to come to grips with what human beings are capable of doing to one another, I recognized that it is because we dehumanize other people that it is able to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you have had some experience yourself in warfare and in the destructive capacity that humankind has. We have not overcome it, but, hopefully, we learn something from it. One of the things I think that we learn, I hope that we learn, is that we cannot allow historical reference to simply be abstract, we have to see whether it applies in our own lives and our own time. It does little good.

I can think, and, again, I would hope that I am not speaking for the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] on this other than in a way that recognizes and is cognizant of the thrust of her philosophy behind putting this bill forward. It is one thing to recognize a Thomas More, that we must stand for those things which perk our conscience and which require us as human beings to make visible or expression of witness. That is what this is.

I agree with the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] that we are not in a position to command enforcement. That would be extraordinarily difficult. That is not an argument against it. That is an argument for us to stand up and do these things precisely because it is difficult.

Bearing witnesses is not always an easy task. But because it involves logistical difficulties is not a reason to stop doing it or to urge that it be done. On the contrary, it seems to me it is even more pertinent and even more important that we stand up now.

So this, I repeat, from my earlier espousal of the Ros-Lehtinen bill on human rights abuses toward prisoners in China and in Tibet, in China and Tibet, that we have to bring the light into the cells and we have to bring the light onto this situation of forced abortion and sterilization, not because we are trying to single out China and take a superior, a patronizing position, an imperialistic position, where we feel that we can condescend toward China in this regard. Quite the contrary. China is a signatory to various international covenants and treaties, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that is in the purview of the United Nations.

Everything that we are doing with respect to these bills in general, and most particularly to this bill in particular, is a direct reflection of treaty and covenant obligations that we have as a nation, that China has as a nation,

and that we as individuals surely express. It most certainly, I believe, exemplifies what we stand for when we take our oath of office, hold up our hand, Mr. Speaker, as all of us have been privileged to do on the floor of this House, to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Inherent in that, that which has been given to us, the honor and privilege of serving here, is to reflect upon the philosophical basis of the origin of the Constitution which allows us to be free men and women here today. We are, in a very real sense, I believe, defending those who are unable totally to defend themselves under these circumstances.

So, Mr. Speaker, I request the favorable attention of our colleagues. I hope that perhaps those young people might be in the same circumstances I found myself so many years ago, trying to understand how to be a human being, what it is that differentiates us from the other animals, the other species. I have come to the conclusion, and this bill is a visible manifestation of it, that all animals die, Mr. Speaker. The difference is in the details of their lives. And the details of our lives are such that we are able to reflect, we are able to imagine.

Few animals are able to contemplate the nature of their deaths or the nature of the meaning of their deaths, let alone their lives. But we are capable, this species, homo sapiens, is capable of that and, in fact, is obligated to do that. We have to justify our lives on this Earth in the time given to us. This bill is one of the times we have to justify our lives. And in voting for it, I think we act on that obligation.

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], for his gracious comment. We have worked very closely together on the Committee on National Security, and I am pleased to be working with him on this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN].

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like for the Members of this body and the American public to think about for a minute their children. If they have more than one child, if they lived in China today, it would not exist. Because of the oppressive practices of this Government, that if they had a Katie or a Sara, that I do, a second or third child, and unfortunate enough to be born in China, either they would be terminated against their will or strangled at birth. That is what this issue is about, whether or not they have the right to reproduce themselves and have offspring as a basic human choice.

What is happening in China today? If their first child is born and happens to be a female, what happens? Oftentimes

that child is strangled at birth. Why? Because a female in China is not as capable of caring for their parents at an advanced age as a male is because of their society.

Regrettably, our country has separated human rights issues from economic issues under what I believe to be a very false pretense that, in fact, we can engage on an economic level and that we will change these horrendous practices. I do not believe that is what is going to change them.

I think even though we cannot significantly effectively enforce what we are trying to do today, we have an obligation to say to the people who live in China they do have the basic right of reproducing themselves, they do have the right to have a second and a third child if they so choose, a God given right, and that no government anywhere in the world has the right to take that right away from them.

It saddens me that we, as a nation, have such a diverse challenge when we look at Cuba and we say they have human rights abuses and we cannot trade with them, but because the economic potential is so much greater in China, that we abandon that principle. We should not abandon these people. We should enforce at every level that our Government interacts with China that they stop this practice.

I would beg and plead with the Members of this body to think of their own children and the fact that, if they lived in China, only one of those children would exist.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. All of us in this House, whether pro-choice or pro-life, joined together in sending a very clear message to the Chinese Government that the United States will not tolerate a policy of forced abortions and sterilizations.

As a mother of three and a grandmother of two, I cannot imagine anything more abhorrent. This policy is anathema to all of us who celebrate the beauty of life. Members in this House who support abortion rights believe very, very strongly that every woman in the world should have the basic right to choose, a woman should have the information they need to make their own decisions.

I would urge my colleagues who are on the floor today supporting the right of Chinese women to control their own bodies to accord the same rights and respect to American women. Let us support reproductive choice in China and in the United States. Forced abortion must be condemned. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS].

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today to urge Members to support H.R. 2570, the Forced Abortion Condemnation Act. This bill would deny a visa to any Chinese official who carries out forced abortion or sterilization and condemns those in the Chinese Communist Party who oversee and enforce this process.

Women all over China are victimized daily due to their ability and desire to bear children. I would like to share just one story with my colleagues today that I believe demonstrates the need for this bill.

When Steven Mosher, a Ph.D. candidate at the time, attended a family planning meeting at Equality Commune in China, he observed some of these coercive procedures.

Mosher writes, "From Sandhead Brigade there were 18 women, all 5 to 9 months pregnant, many red-eyed from lack of sleep and crying. They sat listlessly on short plank benches arranged in a semicircle about the front of the room where He Kaifeng, a commune cadre and Communist Party member of many years of experience in mass meetings, explained the purpose of the meeting in no uncertain terms." His message to the women was anything but reassuring. He said, slowly and deliberately, "None of you has any choice in this matter. The two of you who are 8 or 9 months pregnant will have a Caesarean. The rest of you will have a shot which will cause you to abort." In order to be allowed to return home to their families, the women had to agree to abort their babies no matter how far along their pregnancies were.

Mr. Speaker, this is not family planning. Forced abortions are outright human rights abuses. I do not believe that this is a pro-life or pro-choice issue. This is a human issue. It is an issue of blatant governmental abuse. The United States must not in any way be a part of it.

We, as Members of Congress, must agree that China's so-called population control techniques are inhumane. We have a moral obligation to play absolutely no part in assisting such abominable abuse of women and their families.

My colleagues, listen to the cries of these women in China. Acknowledge their grief. Vote "yes" on H.R. 2570.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, we have no other Members wishing to speak at this time, and therefore I will yield back the remainder of the time allotted to us.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have more speakers than we have time remaining. If the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] would be gracious enough to yield time.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] such time as may still be reserved for this side.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS].

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this concerted effort to, hopefully, force China to change its present practice of religious persecution, suppression of individual freedoms and liberties, systematic genocide of children, and intimidation of Taiwan.

Despite its many claims of reforms aimed at improving its business climate, China is still a Communist regime. China imprisons citizens who hold prayer meetings in their homes. That is repression. China requires registration of all religious groups and imprisons those who refuse to register. That is repression. China refuses to recognize the Catholic Church's appointment of a bishop, in fear that he will advocate service to the Pope or to the state. And that is repression.

We all are, sadly, aware of the population control efforts which force abortion of Chinese children, especially girls.

□ 1800

We are also all sadly aware of the crackdowns on dissidents who dare speak out for democracy and fairness. And we are all disturbed by China's constant threats to the security of the people of Taiwan, such as the missile firings and military exercises. Too often those who rattle sabers become tempted to use them.

In my view, trade is an important component in encouraging China to move towards democracy. Once the forces of free market and free enterprise start their dynamic reaction, heavy-handed regimes can no longer contain their by-product, a real desire for more and more freedom. China's leaders can try to build a free market without free people, but they will not succeed. A free market requires, demands and therefore leads to a free people.

The United States granted normal trade relations to China for one primary purpose, to foster change. China's President thinks that there are no strings attached to the generous treatment our country has afforded China. But today we in Congress need to send a message to Jiang Zemin, stop the religious persecution, stop killing babies, stop arresting and killing peaceful dissidents and stop the threats aimed at Taiwan.

This legislative package sends that message. It offers an important set of tools for fostering human rights improvement and freedom for the people of China.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to support the China package in its entirety.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R.

2570, the Forced Abortion Condemnation Act. As we heard earlier, this legislation would deny visas to Chinese officials who carry out forced abortion and sterilization practices. H.R. 2570 would accomplish that by condemning those Chinese officials who oversee and enforce abortion or sterilization practices on their citizens.

When I was in Hong Kong about a year ago, I had a good visit with an individual whose father is high up in the Chinese Government. We talked about this problem. With 1.2 billion people in China, he said, "Jon, we have abortion out of necessity. I don't agree with it, but you point the finger at China and here in America you have abortion out of convenience and you murder 1.5 million children every year."

I could not respond to that. He was right. So as we are condemning China and what is going on over there with the forced abortions, abortion is abortion. Whether it is forced abortion, it is the unborn child that we are talking about here.

I welcome those that have voted against the pro-life movement in the past to this debate today. I think it is wonderful that we are all coming together to support this type of cause. But I encourage us to look at the end result, the unborn child. There is no issue that is more gruesome than abortion, the fact that we are losing unborn children.

If the Chinese Government can continue to take a look at this issue, to work with us, to take a look at what we are trying to do here in America, to move us closer, I believe we can begin to work to save children all around the world. There is no doubt about it that this is a human rights issue. It is a human rights issue that must be stopped, it must be stopped now. I believe that H.R. 2570 is a step in the right direction. It sends a clear message to the Chinese Government, it sends a clear message to the Chinese people that America believes in life, that Americans all around the world who are fighting for this cause for freedom, freedom for those that do not have a right to speak, for those that are yet to be born, that it is a fight worth fighting for.

We welcome all those people today and we hope for a unanimous decision here. I hope that everybody will join this cause for freedom for the unborn around the world.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and I thank her for her leadership on this issue.

Let me just begin by saying that forced abortion was rightly construed by the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal to be a crime against humanity. This House of Representatives throughout the 1980's and 1990's has repeatedly gone on the record with recorded votes to again reassert that what is going on

in the People's Republic of China is eerily reminiscent of what went on during the Nazi era where forced abortion was employed with devastating consequences against particularly Polish women that the Third Reich had deemed to be expendable.

It is an exploitation of women. It steals their children. It is a State-sponsored rape, and the baby dies a very cruel and merciless death either by chemical poisoning or by dismemberment. We know for a fact, and there has been much documentation on this, that many of these babies are killed very late in pregnancy. The mothers desperately want to have these children. They often try to evade the population cadres, the family planning cadres who scour the countryside looking for these women and then if they find that they are with child, they then hound them, they browbeat them, they use peer pressure and a host of other techniques of psychological persuasion, and if that does not work, then they make an example of them and truss them and get them to these abortion mills.

Just a few weeks ago, the Chinese government rolled out another hideous manifestation of this forced abortion policy. They announced about 600, according to a wire service copy, 600 new mobile abortion clinics. We put mammography and other health screening on wheels and we save lives, we mitigate the pain of breast cancer and things of that kind through those kinds of detection devices. What do the Chinese do? They are putting abortion clinics on wheels, and 600 of these will join this other army of abortionists that scour the country of China to kill the babies.

I led 3 human rights trips to the People's Republic of China. I have met with Peng Peiyun, who runs the population program and she totally denies that coercion is part of their program. I have met with Li Peng, the premier of China, totally denies that there is any kind of coercion, forced abortion or forced sterilization. When the President of China, Jiang Zemin, was in town, I raised the question at the breakfast which was attended by Members of the House and the Senate about forced abortion, and again he denied it.

Let me also remind Members, because we had some people who do not usually take the pro-life point of view today speaking, we welcome their input, that the United Nations Population Fund has whitewashed these crimes against humanity since the one child per couple policy was conceived back in 1979. They have given awards. The U.N. gave an award in the early 1980s for excellence in population matters, at a time when a high tide, at a time when forced abortions and sterilizations were actually on the rise. If that does not stand with the oppressor and the exploiter of women and children, I do not know what does.

And the UNFPA, the U.N. Population Fund continues to whitewash and to

defend the policy. Dr. Sadik, the Executive Director of the UNFPA, and I have met with her a number of times. She has said this to me personally, she has also said it on Night Watch, a CBS news program and other programs that are in the public domain, that the Chinese program is purely voluntary. I say to my colleagues, nothing could be further from the truth. The U.N. Population Fund stands, I believe, accused by their own words and by their complicity in this program as being complicit in the maiming and the killing of women and children in the People's Republic of China.

Civilizations, Mr. Speaker, have long been judged by how they treat women and children, old people and strangers. Vulnerable people bring out the kindness in every society. But they also bring out the cruelty. Every so often they become the object of practices that are so heinous that all of us recoil in horror. In China today, forced abortion and forced sterilization fits that.

Let me just remind Members as well that a couple of years ago the Chinese announced another manifestation of this hideous program. In 1994, they targeted the handicapped. Again in a move that was totally reminiscent of the Third Reich, they said that the Down's syndrome kids, the kids that somehow do not measure up, would be targeted for elimination as part of their eugenics policy. We need to condemn that as well. Handicapped kids are valuable. We should love them and embrace them and protect them. No government has a right to forcibly abort and kill these children because they are found to be afflicted with some anomaly like Down's syndrome or any other kind of anomaly. I chair the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights. I have had 4 hearings on forced abortions. Let us not forget that the Clinton administration, until it finally signed the immigration bill that reversed his policy, would not even provide asylum for women who are fleeing coerced abortion and forced sterilization in China. We brought in after, and we had to subpoena these witnesses, some of the women who had suffered this cruelty of 6-month late-term abortions, forced abortions, and I will put the entire testimony of those brave women into this record. But one of the women talked about how she had found a baby girl who had been abandoned crying. And like the good Samaritan, and maybe she never even heard of that story, I think most of my colleagues have, she picked up this little girl. And what happened to her? The family planning cadre said that counts against your number. And then they visited her, and after 10 times trying to tell her and persuade her to be sterilized, they finally forced her to be sterilized.

Another woman in the hearing, and many of my colleagues were at that hearing, my wife was at that hearing, I had a tear in my eye. She broke down and could not even continue her testimony. When she talked about how late

in her pregnancy, she was worn down to the point where she could resist it no more and they took her, she was broken and beaten and finally her baby was forcibly aborted as well. I urge Members, because time does not permit a full reading of this testimony, but these people have come forward. They were even being held here, I would say parenthetically because they did not get asylum until Congress passed the law that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] offered as an amendment to that important bill.

Finally, just let me say to my colleagues, we need to go on record, this hopefully will be a unanimous or a near unanimous vote in favor of this legislation, but I hope that it continues when we start talking about those organizations like Planned Parenthood Federation, IPPF based in London, the United Nations Population Fund. When I hear such strong words from my colleagues on the other side of the issue as we heard today, let us not forget that these organizations front, are complicit with and become very much part of the fabric of the implementation of this coercive population control program. Let us not in any way accept the bogus denials that the Jiang Zemins and the Li Pengs and Peng Peiyuns and all the others and the Dr. Sadik, who runs the UNFPA, and others offer to try to get us to take a look and say, "Oh, maybe it's not as bad as we thought." We need to stand up strongly. This legislation advances the ball.

Again we will be revisiting this over and over again. When this chapter is finally written someday, those who are complicit will have shame and sorrow over their face. Let us stand with the oppressed and not the oppressor.

Mr. Speaker, the material referred to in my remarks is as follows:

I would like to introduce Weng Kang Di, who will begin. And he and Chen Yun Fei are husband and wife. And I just would note parenthetically have been separated for 2 years. They are husband and wife, and this hearing provides an opportunity for the first time, in a long time, for them to see one another.

If you could proceed.

[Interpreter speaking in Chinese.]

Mr. SMITH. Please pull the microphone very close so we can hear the Translator as well as the witness.

[Interpreter speaking in Chinese.]

Mr. SMITH. If Weng would want to proceed with his testimony.

STATEMENT OF WENG KANG DI, ASYLUM SEEKER

Mr. WENG KANG DI. My name is Weng Kang Di. And Chen Yun Fei is my wife.

My wife will tell you what happened to us.

STATEMENT OF CHEN YUN FEI, ASYLUM SEEKER

Ms. CHEN YUN FEI. I am a woman from the countryside, so I do not know how to say those very polite languages. I would like you to forgive me for that.

I come to the United States because of the Chinese family planning program.

The reason I came to the United States is because the Chinese Government does not allow us to have more than one child.

Because I have more than one child, that is why they try to suppress me, oppress me; and that is why I escaped to the United States.

Shall I say something more specifically?

Mr. SMITH. If you could give the details about your situation, the treatment by the family planning cadres, for example, why did you feel so threatened, whether or not you were mistreated.

Ms. CHEN YUN FEI. The Chinese Government only allows us to have only one child, and I have three children. And that is why they want us, people who have more than one child, to have sterilization and also fine a certain amount of money.

If a person got pregnant, then they want you to bear the child before it is mature. If you are pregnant, they will force you to have abortion. So I am a woman from the countryside. I do not want to have sterilization.

I would like to tell you my story.

I have come to the United States. I consider the U.S. Government is a democratic government. And I believe that you will rescue us.

Now I am going to tell you my story.

In 1982, the second child of my husband and mine were born. And then the local government from the people's commune, from the sterilization group, they come to our home and noticed us, sent us notice to have me sterilized.

Because it is so imminent, I told them, yes, OK, I will go and have sterilization. And this is a way that I pushed them away at first.

I took the opportunity after they left, I escaped to other places.

I can only escape by telling them I agree that I will have sterilization. That is the only way I can get them away.

At that time, the sterilization campaign was just at the beginning, so they were not pursuing very tightly.

In 1986, the first part of 1986, when the sterilization program, the family program, was at its height and it is very unfortunate that I got pregnant again. It was like a two to 3 months pregnancy I was. And at that time, the cadres of the local government were trying to catch women every place. So you could hear the sound of crying, you know, everywhere. And they used the tractors to put on this big loudspeaker to tell people that those people who are pregnant, you have to go to have it born immature. And then if you are pregnant, you have to have abortion—early stage of abortion. And also, after you have abortion, you are going to have sterilization and be fined a certain amount of money.

I did not want to have sterilization, so I was very, very afraid. And also I was thinking even if I had sterilization, I have to be fined and I do not have money. I am a country woman. So I stealthily went to a place to find a medical student who learned to be a doctor to help me to have the abortion. This person is in private practice.

And this person, this medical student, he was very afraid. He did not dare to help me, because he said if the government found out he would be in trouble. It was a great risk. But I begged this person again and again. So finally he helped me to have this abortion.

Because he is a medical student, he did not have the full grasp of the technique to do this abortion, so after the abortion I got this very serious infection because we had done that in a hurry. From then on, I was in poor health.

Now after the abortion, I went home. But on my way home, I saw a baby girl which was only born like seven or 8 days, lying on the road, crying very hard, and it is very weak, this little girl. And a lot of people were watching, so I asked people around to help this child who can take this child home, otherwise, this child is going to die because she has nothing to eat. But those people around said, you are talking nonsense. You

know this is the time that the campaign is at its height; who dare to have this child home? So if you want to rescue this child, you are the person who will bring this child home. So I was very angry because I thought, you know, you people did not want to help, this child is going to die. So I said, if nobody wants to help this child, I am going to help the child. If you are afraid of the government, I am not afraid of the government. So finally, I took the child home.

People were talking that this child belonged to a family, the last name of the family was Sun. Because in China if you do not have a son, then people will look down upon you if there is no way for you to have a voice. So that is why the family abandoned this child on the roadside. And I remember what people, the last name is Sun. So I gave her a name called Sun Sisi, still using her own last name. So I adopted her.

So after I returned home, later the government, the cadres of the local government, found out. And then they came to my home saying that, you know what you did and you already have two boys and you picked up another girl and so you have to have the sterilization.

So I did not want to have sterilization, and I begged them to let me have the child. And I said, what you said is really ridiculous because this child was not my own. I just picked her up from the roadside. But they said, since you picked up the child, it should be accountable among your family planning program. It belongs to you so you have to have sterilization since you have three children.

So I told them that the reason that women, after they have their child born, to abandon the child at the roadside was all due to the government policy. If I did not rescue the child, the child was going to die. And when they heard what I said, they were very angry.

So I did not want to have the sterilization, I told them, if you really want to have sterilization, then you go and ask this mother of the child to have sterilization, that is the Sun family, this girl's mother. But they said, since you picked up, you have to go to have sterilization. So we argued back and forth for a long time. And they came to my home insistent that I should have this sterilization. They came many, many times.

So they came to my home more than 10 times, and they said this woman who dares to counter the government; so they forced me to sterilization. I begged them that, since I had already had one abortion, I am in poor health. So they insisted that I am now going to have the sterilization. And then the cadres got very angry. They said this woman is very, very tough, very difficult to deal with; so let us have her husband to have the sterilization.

And when my husband heard that they wanted him to be sterilized, so he jumped out of the window and escaped. And so I begged them, saying that, please do not have my husband sterilized because the whole family relied on him to till the land. Because in China we use all manual labor. You have to carry water bucket by bucket. So everything—he is the mainstay of the labor in the field. So I was very, very frightened and while at the same time I was very angry. So I fainted, and the whole family was crying and I did not know what happened because I fainted.

That was in 1986. Now conditions are turning better. People are using tractors. At that time everything was manual labor. So after I came to, the whole family was crying and the cadres were gone and my husband was back. Then I said I would not let my husband be sterilized because I have to rely on him to till the land. Then I decided that we have to

go because they will not let us off the hook. Either I will be sterilized or my husband will be sterilized. So we escaped to a place which is closed to where Mao Zedong had his headquarters. It is a very, very tough place, a lot of mountains and wild places, not much to eat.

That was a very barren place. I started to work mending other people's old shoes. It is a very, very deplorable place. The living condition is very, very little. People slept on this bed made of mud. And at the end of the bed, there was a stove. You put firewood in. Then the heat would go through under the bed. That is the heat you have to have in the winter. That is called a kang. And people all live in the cave. So I started up—because the people were very poor, they have to have their old shoes mended again and again. And I started to do this to make some money.

I would not dare to go back home, and I stayed at that place for 7 years. That place has a very, very hurricane kind of a big storm, windy and a lot of snow in winter. People eat, mainly, maize and sorghum.

I was very eager to back to visit to see my children and my family, but I was afraid if I went back home I would be caught again. So I stayed there for 7 years. But when I first went there, this place was deplorable; there was no family planning program going on. But after 7 years, they started having the family planning campaign. They came to the cave where we stayed to check so-called identification. Everyone has an identification. They checked the identification to see whether there is anything wrong.

I returned home in February 1993. And then shortly after that, the government got to know that I was back and so they came to my home saying, that, OK, now you are back; we have been looking for you for several years; we could not find you. And then I begged them not to—I told them that I am not going to have more children, so please do not ask me to have sterilization. They said, no, you are among the list; you are still in the list; you have to have the sterilization. And then they said, this woman is very stubborn.

So even if you have sterilization, we are going to fine more the money that we are going to fine you. So I was very, very angry. I told them that the money you fine you should not use that money, if you use that money—because they divide the money among themselves—if you use the money to eat or something, then you will die. Then they started to bind me, you know, to force me to the sterilization place. And I told them that I did not do anything wrong. I was not a robber. I did not steal anything. They only thing I had done is to have more children than one child.

So I was very afraid because my husband, when we just returned, when people saw these cadres were coming, they shouted, they are coming again, they are coming again. So my husband left again. He escaped. I told him that, you escape; I will deal with them by myself. So he escaped.

I told the cadres that, do not, you know, bind me together using a rope or something. I will go and have sterilization by myself. So under such circumstances, I was forced to have sterilization done.

After the sterilization, five or 6 days later, I went home; but I was not—I did not agree with their policy. And they are going to—because I knew they, said, they are going to fine me more money than usual. So I thought that, I do not have the money. And then my family told me that my husband escaped because the relatives and friends thought it is very pathetic and they helped him to escape to a foreign country. And I thought to myself, what am I going to do by myself; I do not have the physical strength to till the

land by myself and they are going to fine a lot of money. And I had three children. I did not have enough money.

So I escaped, too.

So I am here.

Mr. SMITH. I thank you very much for that testimony, and there will be some questions by members of the panel. But I would like to ask the other witnesses if they could testify before we go to that.

Hu Shuye, if you would not mind speaking next.

STATEMENT OF HU SHUYE, ASYLUM SEEKER

Ms. HU SHUYE. I do not speak very well Mandarin, so please forgive me.

I left China because of the family planning program.

I was pregnant 6 months and was forced to have an abortion.

In November I was told to have sterilization because I have two children and one abortion already. And I did not want to have this sterilization, and I left home for a month. And after I came home they forced me to have sterilized.

I had no way out. They forced me. They dragged me to have this surgery done.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, can counsel tell the story?

Mr. SMITH. Craig, would that be possible?

Mr. HYDE. Do you know her story?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately this lady's counsel is not present. We could for any of the others.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mrs. SMITH. Could we let someone else testify and let her gain her composure, please.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, that is a very good idea.

I would like to ask Li Bao Yu if she could make her statement at this point.

STATEMENT OF LI BAO YU, ASYLUM SEEKER

Ms. LI BAO YU. I am a Chinese citizen, and my name is Li Bao Yu. I had a daughter born in 1990. Because I was afraid of the family planning program, I did not register her birth. Later the government found out, and they asked me to have an IUD put into my body; but I begged them not to do that. But they just approved. They insisted on having an IUD in.

So they forced me to put in this IUD. And after that, my health deteriorated. My doctor said, you have to take this IUD out before your health can return to normal. So my husband and I went to this family planning office to ask them to let me have this IUD taken out, but they did not. I promised them that I am not going to have more children.

They did not approve our request, and my husband was very angry; so he started to quarrel with the cadres. The cadres threatened him: "If you are going to continue to disobey us and quarrel with us, then we are going to sterilize you." So I persuaded my husband to go home. And then after that, my mother found a private doctor and had my IUD taken out. After that, my health began to improve.

In my native place, they have inspections of the family planning program every season; and I would not dare to have inspection because they will find out that I had this IUD taken out by myself. But they kept on sending me notice telling me to have this inspection. I always gave them excuse, I am not home; but they came to my home many times. They could not find me, so they were very angry. In January I became pregnant again. After 3 months, they still could not find me. One day they came and I happened to be home, so they wanted me to go have an exam.

My husband at that time was not home because he was * * * I said: "Let me wait until he comes home. Then I will * * * this exam."

They disapproved. They did not agree. So * * * dragged me to the place to have the exam. After the exam * * * course, they go to know that I was pregnant and had * * * taken out. They wanted me to have an abortion. I begged them. They did not agree. They threatened me saying that, if you do not have this abortion, then your first child, your daughter, will forever not allow to have her identification registered. Because in China if you register a born baby, you have certain kind of coupons, whatever. They threatened me that if I do not agree to have this abortion, then my first child will forever have no chance of being a registered, normal citizen.

Mr. SMITH. If I could interrupt, does that mean denial of education or health care or job opportunities? What does that mean?

Ms. LI BAO YU. Yes.

So I was forced to have this abortion. And after that, my health was very poor. Because that was a hospital in the countryside, the hygienic conditions is not very good. I had a very negative impact on my health. I was bleeding profusely. And they wanted me to have sterilization following the abortion. But the doctor said since I was bleeding so much, it is not possible to have sterilization immediately.

I was not in a condition to return home, so I stayed in the hospital; and my husband came to visit me in the hospital. He was very angry and argued with the cadres. And the doctor had nothing—there is nothing that the doctor can do for my poor health. So the cadres from the family planning office, they kept on arguing with my husband. They have the power in their hands, so we are not in a position to fight with them. After I went home, they again said that, when your health improved a little, you still have to have the sterilization done.

Because I am a housewife in the countryside, I have to do everything at home. My husband was a worker at the time. But since my health was poor, I could not do so much. I felt burdened. Sometimes I went to my sister's place to see a doctor. And sometimes my husband stayed alone at home. And the family planning program office kept on telling me that when you have your health improved, you have to have the sterilization. Later my husband escaped to his relative's home and I escaped to my sister's home.

So none of us would dare to go home. Later, because of my husband's work—the need for his work, so he has to return home. Then the family planning office informed him to asked him to inform me to go and have the sterilization. They insisted on that. And my husband told them that, my wife was still sick. So they argued again. And then they said: "If you argue with us, then you go and have the sterilization." And they then started to struggle with each other, and he escaped later.

My husband thought at that time that under such circumstances it is not going to maintain peace any more. They will, anyway, come to force us to have sterilization. So through somebody's recommendation, my husband escaped to the United States.

After my husband left China, I was at home by myself. My health was still not very good—no, she was not at home at first. She would not dare to go home. But her health was not good.

In 1992, during the Chinese New Year, she wanted to go home to spend the New Year together with her family; so she returned. After a few days, she did not know how they found out. The family program cadres came to my home again and forced—pressuring me to have sterilization. At that time, I escaped through the back door.

I thought, since my husband was not home, they would not pursue me any more; but it

was not the case. They kept on pressuring me. I would not dare go home. That means, even if I had had a home, I cannot go home. Under such circumstances, my mother and other relatives, they helped me to find a way to escape to the United States.

Mr. SMITH. The bells that you heard, just by way of explanation, means that there are votes again occurring on the House floor. We will take a very short break and then resume some of the questioning as Members do return.

Again, just let me say before we break for recess—and perhaps you could translate this for them—hearing you tell your stories—and I think I speak for everybody on this panel and I speak for Members of the Congress, both parties, Democrats and Republicans—you really represent the voices and the tears of the women of China. The crimes that have been committed against you and against the women of China are no less serious than the crimes that were committed by the Nazis.

It is even more appalling when we realize that the Clinton administration wants to send you back to your oppressors. And when we realize that groups like the U.N. Population Fund stand by and cheer as China achieves these targets in population control when every one of those numbers represents a person who has been injured, made sick, exploited, and hurt by their government.

The subcommittee is in recess for 10 minutes.

[Recess.]

Mr. SMITH. The subcommittee will resume its hearing. Again, I want to thank our witnesses for their very, very eloquent statements and for their willingness to tell us in such detail the difficulties that they have encountered and the exploitation that they have experienced.

It is my understanding that Hu Shuye, you might be willing to and able to, perhaps, proceed with some of your testimony. If you could tell us, and be as brief as you would like, some of the particulars about the government's coercive abortion that they inflicted upon you at 6 months.

The INTERPRETER. She said she does not know how to speak, so if you could ask questions, she will be able to answer.

Mr. SMITH. When the government found you were pregnant, what kind of means did they use to force you to undergo the abortion?

The INTERPRETER. Let me explain for us, because Ms. Hu said her Mandarin is not good enough to express herself.

Mr. SMITH. Right. I remember that from earlier.

The INTERPRETER. So she is using her own dialect. And Ms. Chen is translating her dialect to me, and I will translate to you.

Mr. SMITH. All right. Thank you.

Ms. HU SHUYE. They said—there were between 30 to 40 that came to my home. And they said, since you have three children, you have to have an abortion since you are now, again, pregnant. So they dragged me to have an abortion.

Mr. SMITH. Did they literally drag her?

Ms. HU SHUYE. There was a car, and these 30 to 40 people dragged me onto the car and then drove away.

Mr. SMITH. Prior to that, were there attempts to persuade her to abort the child?

Ms. HU SHUYE. They did ask me to have this abortion. Then since I was not willing to, they moved all my furniture, whatever I had at home, to the government office.

I was forced to have an abortion in June when I was 6 months pregnant. And then in November, they came again to force me to have sterilization.

I escaped in November. And in December, my mother-in-law got cancer and passed away on December 17th. So I went home to

attend the funeral. And then on the 20th, the family program office got to know that I was home; so they came and dragged me away to have an abortion.

I was forced to have an abortion when I was 6 months pregnant. And then after that, they wanted me to have sterilization. So I escaped in November. And then in December I went back for the funeral. And then I was forced to have sterilization. And then after a few years, in 1989, the family program office told me that, you have too many children, you should be fined a certain amount of money.

Mr. SMITH. So she was fined for the children that she had is what you are saying.

You know, I would like to yield to Mr. Hyde. He has a comment.

Mr. HYDE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder if I might ask both counsel to answer these questions:

We have heard heart breaking stories of oppression and torture and a denial of one of the primary human rights, civil rights, namely, the right to have children. And I am appalled at what I have heard.

But I am equally appalled at my own country at what state these women find themselves in the "Land of the Free," and the "Home of the Brave," "Give me your Tired, your poor, Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

I understand they are under arrest, they are under manacles. Now, I well know that for years Soviet Jewish people, who could get an exit visa, all came here as refugees because by definition they were persecuted, being Jewish people, in the Soviet Union. And they came here by the thousands. And many of them did not have family here, and it was not a question of reunification but under asylum. Because they were persecuted, they were permitted to come in here.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 2570. I want to commend the bill's authors, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, for bringing forward this important measure.

Mr. Speaker, we have no illusions about the Chinese regime and its poor record on human rights. Among the many human rights violations committed by the Chinese Government, one of the most despicable aspects of Chinese policy is its one-child mandate and its provincial eugenics policy. Under these policies, mothers are forced to abort their second or third children and to allow the deaths of children suffering from mental and other health problems. Government edicts are enforced against the fathers, mothers and especially children of China with countless victims in its wake. We must send a clear signal that we will have nothing to do with this "Brave New World." If America is to stand for anything, it

stands for the sanctity of the family and its most basic rights.

While the central Chinese Government denies all of these charges, in their command and control society the understandable goal of limiting the growth of China's 1.3 billion person population is perverted into commands by local governments and Communist Party cadres to force abortions and the deaths of innocent infants, especially girls, to enforce quotas and other measures to restrict population growth.

I note reports from Hebei Province officials who told workers that it was "better to have more graves than one more child." We cannot sit idly by while this happens. This is a policy worthy of the dictatorships of the Soviet Union or wartime Germany, not a nation claiming to offer leadership in the 21st century.

□ 1815

I note that the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal listed such actions as crimes against humanity. China, our ally in World War II, is now the No. 1 violator of that sanction.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of voluntary family planning, but I must say that there is nothing voluntary about China's program. It is sad to note that in almost all of the other countries where mothers and fathers have a choice, parents make their own decision to have smaller families. The Chinese people are no different. If Chinese parents actually had a choice, they would space their children farther apart and, in the end, probably would reduce the size of their families.

Regrettably the Chinese Government does not trust its people. The government has inserted itself in the most basic of human decisions of parents to have a child or to care for an impaired son or daughter.

Mr. Speaker, I heard countless reports from people who have suffered under the Chinese Government. They came from all parts of China speaking Mandarin, Cantonese, and even Tibetans who have suffered under the one-child eugenics policy.

I commend my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, and my colleague from California, Ms. PELOSI, who joined with us in condemning these abuses of the most basic human rights.

In sum, I strongly support this bill in its denial of U.S. visas to the perpetrators of these crimes. Such people have no business in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this measure to the floor, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

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

That is the end of our speakers, Mr. Speaker, and I would just like to comment that we have heard from Members from a wide spectrum of philosophies here today all united in support of this bill, so I would urge my colleagues to cast their vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for H.R. 2570, the Forced Abortion Condemnation Act. One of the most contentious ongoing debates before Congress is whether or not a woman has a right to choose abortion over life. But this debate is not about the right to choose. This is about forcing a woman to undergo a dangerous procedure without her consent. Regardless of whether you believe in the right to life or the right to choose, we can all agree that this practice is inhuman and barbaric. And one that we, as Americans, cannot and should not condone.

H.R. 2570 denies visas to Chinese officials who carry out forced abortion or sterilization procedures and condemns those in the Chinese Communist Party and other Chinese nationals who oversee and enforce this process. Forced abortion was officially deemed a crime against humanity by the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal after World War II. What the Nazis did back then is no different than what is happening today in China. China's population control methods of forced abortions and sterilizations are not the way to control overpopulation in that country. The practice holds grave implications for religious liberty and basic human rights.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2570.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). All time has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 598]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie	Blagojevich	Cardin
Ackerman	Bliley	Castle
Aderholt	Blumenauer	Chabot
Allen	Blunt	Chambliss
Andrews	Boehlert	Chenoweth
Archer	Boehner	Christensen
Army	Bonilla	Clayton
Bachus	Bonior	Clement
Baesler	Bono	Clyburn
Baker	Borski	Coble
Baldacci	Boswell	Coburn
Ballenger	Boucher	Collins
Barcia	Boyd	Combest
Barr	Brady	Condit
Barrett (NE)	Brown (FL)	Conyers
Barrett (WI)	Brown (OH)	Cook
Bartlett	Bryant	Cooksey
Barton	Bunning	Costello
Bass	Burr	Cox
Becerra	Burton	Coyne
Bentsen	Buyer	Cramer
Bereuter	Callahan	Crane
Berman	Calvert	Crapo
Berry	Camp	Cummings
Bilbray	Campbell	Cunningham
Bilirakis	Canady	Danner
Bishop	Cannon	Davis (FL)

Davis (IL)	Hyde	Oberstar
Davis (VA)	Inglis	Obey
Deal	Istook	Olver
DeFazio	Jackson (IL)	Ortiz
DeGette	Jackson-Lee	Owens
Delahunt	(TX)	Oxley
DeLauro	Jefferson	Packard
DeLay	Jenkins	Pallone
Dellums	John	Pappas
Deutsch	Johnson (CT)	Parker
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (WI)	Pascrell
Dickey	Johnson, E.B.	Pastor
Dicks	Johnson, Sam	Paul
Dingell	Jones	Paxon
Dixon	Kanjorski	Payne
Doggett	Kaptur	Pease
Dooley	Kasich	Pelosi
Doolittle	Kelly	Peterson (MN)
Doyle	Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (PA)
Dreier	Kennedy (RI)	Petri
Duncan	Kennelly	Pickering
Dunn	Kildee	Pitts
Edwards	Kilpatrick	Pombo
Ehlers	Kim	Pomeroy
Ehrlich	Kind (WI)	Porter
Emerson	King (NY)	Portman
Engel	Kingston	Poshard
English	Klecza	Price (NC)
Ensign	Klink	Pryce (OH)
Eshoo	Klug	Quinn
Etheridge	Knollenberg	Radanovich
Evans	Kolbe	Rahall
Everett	Kucinich	Ramstad
Ewing	LaFalce	Rangel
Farr	LaHood	Redmond
Fattah	Lampson	Regula
Fawell	Largent	Reyes
Fazio	Latham	Riggs
Filner	Lazio	Rivers
Flake	Leach	Rodriguez
Foglietta	Levin	Roemer
Foley	Lewis (CA)	Rogan
Forbes	Lewis (GA)	Rogers
Ford	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher
Fossella	Linder	Rothman
Fowler	Lipinski	Roukema
Fox	Livingston	Roybal-Allard
Frank (MA)	LoBiondo	Royce
Frank (NJ)	Lofgren	Rush
Frelinghuysen	Lowe	Ryun
Frost	Lucas	Sabo
Gallegly	Luther	Salmon
Ganske	Maloney (CT)	Sanchez
Gejdenson	Maloney (NY)	Sanders
Gekas	Manton	Sandlin
Gephardt	Manzullo	Sanford
Gibbons	Markey	Sawyer
Gilchrest	Martinez	Saxton
Gillmor	Mascara	Scarborough
Gilman	Matsui	Schaefer, Dan
Goode	McCarthy (MO)	Schaffer, Bob
Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Schumer
Goodling	McCollum	Scott
Gordon	McCrery	Sensenbrenner
Goss	McDade	Serrano
Graham	McDermott	Sessions
Granger	McGovern	Shadegg
Green	McHale	Shaw
Greenwood	McHugh	Shays
Gutierrez	McInnis	Sherman
Gutknecht	McIntosh	Shimkus
Hall (OH)	McIntyre	Shuster
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Sisisky
Hamilton	McNulty	Skaggs
Hansen	Meehan	Skeen
Harman	Meek	Skelton
Hastert	Menendez	Slaughter
Hastings (FL)	Metcalf	Smith (MI)
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hayworth	Millender-	Smith (OR)
Hefley	McDonald	Smith (TX)
Hefner	Miller (CA)	Smith, Adam
Heger	Miller (FL)	Smith, Linda
Hill	Minge	Snowbarger
Hilleary	Mink	Snyder
Hilliard	Moakley	Solomon
Hinchey	Mollohan	Souder
Hinojosa	Moran (KS)	Spence
Hobson	Moran (VA)	Spratt
Hoekstra	Morella	Stabenow
Holden	Murtha	Stark
Hooley	Myrick	Stearns
Horn	Nadler	Stenholm
Hostettler	Nethercutt	Stokes
Houghton	Neumann	Strickland
Hoyer	Ney	Stump
Hulshof	Northup	Stupak
Hunter	Norwood	Sununu
Hutchinson	Nussle	Talent

Tanner	Traficant	Weldon (PA)
Tauzin	Turner	Weller
Taylor (MS)	Upton	Wexler
Taylor (NC)	Velazquez	Weygand
Thomas	Vento	White
Thompson	Visclosky	Whitfield
Thornberry	Walsh	Wicker
Thune	Wamp	Wise
Thurman	Waters	Wolf
Tiahrt	Watkins	Woolsey
Tierney	Watt (NC)	Wynn
Torres	Watts (OK)	Young (AK)
Towns	Weldon (FL)	Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Brown (CA)

NOT VOTING—17

Bateman	Lantos	Ros-Lehtinen
Carson	LaTourette	Schiff
Clay	McKinney	Tauscher
Cubin	Neal	Waxman
Furse	Pickett	Yates
Gonzalez	Riley	

□ 1840

Mr. FLAKE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 598, I was late returning to the floor and was not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MRS. FOWLER

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayeas 245, noes 171, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 599]

AYES—245

Aderholt	Boswell	Condit
Archer	Boyd	Cook
Army	Brady	Cooksey
Bachus	Bryant	Cox
Baesler	Bunning	Cramer
Baker	Burr	Crane
Ballenger	Burton	Crapo
Barr	Buyer	Cunningham
Barrett (NE)	Callahan	Davis (FL)
Barrett (WI)	Calvert	Davis (VA)
Bartlett	Camp	Deal
Barton	Campbell	DeLay
Bass	Canady	Diaz-Balart
Bateman	Cannon	Dickey
Bentsen	Castle	Doolittle
Bilbray	Chabot	Dreier
Bilirakis	Chambliss	Duncan
Bliley	Chenoweth	Dunn
Blunt	Christensen	Ehlers
Boehner	Coble	Ehrlich
Bonilla	Coburn	Emerson
Bono	Collins	English
	Combest	Ensign

Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
John
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent

Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
McCarthy (NY)
McCormack
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers

Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Souder
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Murtha
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rodriguez

Bereuter
Carson
Clay
Cubin
Foglietta
Gonzalez

Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabu
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Stokes

NOT VOTING—17

Harman
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Lantos
McKinney
Neal

□ 1858

Mr. ROEMER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 599, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DOGGETT moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 66, nays 350, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 600]

YEAS—66

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyle
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett

Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bonior
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyle
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Eshoo

Evans
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyle
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Eshoo

McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Mink
Oberstar
Olver
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Rangel
Rodriguez
Sabu
Sanchez
Scott
Skelton

Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Viscosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

Reyes
Riley
Schiff
Solomon
Yates

Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
NAYS—350
Ensign
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoolley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham

Waters
Waxman
Wise
Woolsey
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowe
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCormack
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush

Ryun	Smith (OR)	Tiaht
Salmon	Smith (TX)	Tierney
Sanders	Smith, Adam	Trafficant
Sandlin	Smith, Linda	Turner
Sanford	Snowbarger	Upton
Sawyer	Snyder	Viscolsky
Saxton	Solomon	Walsh
Scarborough	Souder	Wamp
Schaefer, Dan	Spence	Watkins
Schaffer, Bob	Spratt	Watt (NC)
Schumer	Stabenow	Watts (OK)
Sensenbrenner	Stearns	Weldon (FL)
Serrano	Stenholm	Weldon (PA)
Sessions	Stump	Weller
Shadegg	Sununu	Wexler
Shaw	Talent	Weygand
Shays	Tanner	White
Sherman	Tauscher	Whitfield
Shimkus	Tauzin	Wicker
Sisisky	Taylor (MS)	Wolf
Skaggs	Taylor (NC)	Wynn
Skeen	Thomas	Young (AK)
Slaughter	Thompson	Young (FL)
Smith (MI)	Thornberry	
Smith (NJ)	Thune	

NOT VOTING—17

Ballenger	Gutierrez	Riley
Carson	Kennedy (MA)	Schiff
Clayton	McKinney	Shuster
Cubin	Neal	Stokes
Foglietta	Owens	Yates
Gonzalez	Reyes	

□ 1921

Mr. MCNULTY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

UNITED STATES-TAIWAN ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COOPERATION ACT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 302, I call up the bill (H.R. 2386) to implement the provisions of the Taiwan Relations Act concerning the stability and security of Taiwan and United States cooperation with Taiwan on the development and acquisition of defensive military articles, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 2386 is as follows:

H.R. 2386

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "United States-Taiwan Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense Cooperation Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The stability and security of Taiwan and the balance of power in the Taiwan Strait are key elements for the continued peace and stability of the greater Asia-Pacific region, and the indefinite continuation of such stability and security and balance of power is in the vital national security interest of the United States.

(2) The People's Republic of China is currently engaged in a comprehensive military modernization campaign that is enhancing the power-projection capabilities of the People's Liberation Army, including the introduction of advanced ballistic and cruise missiles that could alter the current balance of power in the Taiwan Strait and in the greater Asia-Pacific region.

(3) The current lack of transparency in the People's Republic of China military infrastructure and its associated defense establishment and the opaqueness of the comprehensive efforts of the People's Liberation Army to modernize its ballistic and cruise missile programs could spark a regional arms race that would destabilize the East Asia and Western Pacific regions and threaten vital United States national security interests.

(4) In March 1996, the People's Liberation Army created a temporary, but de facto, blockade of both the international shipping lanes of the Taiwan Strait and the international airspace around Taiwan by conducting live-fire military exercises which included the launch of several advanced, nuclear-capable M-9 ballistic missiles to target areas close to major ports in both the northern and southern areas of Taiwan.

(5) In March 1996, the locations of People's Liberation Army military activities and M-9 missile target areas nearby to Taiwan's two largest ports, Keelung and Kaohsiung, created a de facto blockade of the Taiwan Strait, international waters and airspace, interfered with United States and international shipping and aviation, and impinged upon the national security interests of the United States, requiring the immediate deployment of two United States aircraft carrier battle groups to the South China Sea.

(6) The actions of the People's Liberation Army in such close proximity to Taiwan were deliberate attempts to disrupt Taiwan's social and economic stability and were carried out as attempts to intimidate the people of Taiwan during the period leading up to Taiwan's historic first democratic presidential election.

(7) The early development and deployment of an effective United States theater missile defense system to the Asia-Pacific region, and the adjustment of United States policy to include Taiwan, including the Penghu Islands, Kinmen, and Matsu, under the protection of such defense system, would be prudent and appropriate responses to—

(A) the refusal by the People's Republic of China to renounce the use of force to determine the future of Taiwan;

(B) the nature of the military threat of the People's Republic of China posed by the increased focus of the People's Liberation Army on advanced missile development; and

(C) the demonstrated intent of the Government of the People's Republic of China to use live-fire military exercises and ballistic missile tests against the people and Government of Taiwan as tools of so-called coercive missile tests against the people and Government of Taiwan as tools of so-called coercive diplomacy.

(8) The early deployment of a United States theater anti-ballistic missile system in the Asia-Pacific region would maintain a balance of power in the Taiwan Strait and deter the People's Republic of China from resorting to military intimidation tactics to coerce or manipulate the people and freely-elected Government of Taiwan in the future.

(9) Taiwan's local air-defense capability provided by the United States Modified Air Defense System (MADS) is not adequate for the task of defending local areas of Taiwan, including the Penghu Islands, Kinmen, and Matsu, from limited ballistic missile attacks or deterring the threat and use of force against Taiwan by the People's Liberation Army to achieve the political goals of the core leadership of the People's Republic of China.

(10) Taiwan has requested further United States cooperation on missile defense, including the conduct of a joint architecture study of the requirements for the establishment and operation of a missile defense sys-

tem for Taiwan, including the Penghu Islands, Kinmen, and Matsu.

SEC. 3. APPLICABILITY OF TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT.

Section 3 of the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3302) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) The provisions of subsections (a) and (b) supersede any provision of the Joint Communiqué of the United States and China of August 17, 1982."

SEC. 4. STUDY AND REPORT RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF A THEATER BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a study of the architecture requirements for the establishment and operation of a theater ballistic missile defense system in the Asia-Pacific region that would have the capability to protect Taiwan from ballistic missile attacks. The study shall include a description of appropriate measures by which the United States would cooperate with Taiwan and provide Taiwan with an advanced local-area ballistic missile defense system.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than July 1, 1998, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a report containing—

(1) the results of the study conducted under subsection (a);

(2) the factors used to obtain such results;

(3) a description of any existing United States missile defense system that could be transferred to Taiwan in accordance with the Taiwan Relations Act in order to allow Taiwan to provide for its self-defense against limited ballistic missile attacks.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report under subsection (b) shall be submitted in both classified and unclassified form.

SEC. 5. TRANSFER OF BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS TO TAIWAN.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President, if requested by the Government of Taiwan and in accordance with the results of the study conducted under section 4, should transfer to the Government of Taiwan appropriate defense articles or defense services under the foreign military sales program under chapter 2 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761 et seq.) for the purpose of establishing and operating a local-area ballistic missile defense system to protect Taiwan, including the Penghu Islands, Kinmen, and Matsu, against limited ballistic missile attacks.

SEC. 6. STATEMENT OF POLICY RELATING TO UNITED STATES THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES FOR THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

The Congress declares that it is in the national interest of the United States that Taiwan be included in any effort at ballistic missile defense cooperation, networking, or interoperability with friendly and allied nations in the Asia-Pacific region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill and modified by the amendments printed in part 4 of House Report 105-379 is adopted.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as amended pursuant to House Resolution 302 is as follows:

H.R. 2386

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "United States-Taiwan Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense Cooperation Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The stability and security of Taiwan and the balance of power in the Taiwan Strait are key elements for the continued peace and stability of the greater Asia-Pacific region, and the indefinite continuation of such stability and security and balance of power is in the vital national security interest of the United States.

(2) The People's Republic of China is currently engaged in a comprehensive military modernization campaign that is enhancing the power-projection capabilities of the People's Liberation Army, including the introduction of advanced ballistic and cruise missiles that could alter the current balance of power in the Taiwan Strait and in the greater Asia-Pacific region.

(3) The current lack of transparency in the People's Republic of China military infrastructure and its associated defense establishment and the opaqueness of the comprehensive efforts of the People's Liberation Army to modernize its ballistic and cruise missile programs could spark a regional arms race that would destabilize the East Asia and Western Pacific regions and threaten vital United States national security interests.

(4) In March 1996, the People's Liberation Army created a temporary, but de facto, blockade of both the international shipping lanes of the Taiwan Strait and the international airspace around Taiwan by conducting live-fire military exercises which included the launch of several advanced, nuclear-capable M-9 ballistic missiles to target areas close to major ports in both the northern and southern areas of Taiwan.

(5) In March 1996, the locations of People's Liberation Army military activities and M-9 missile target areas nearby to Taiwan's two largest ports, Keelung and Kaohsiung, created a de facto blockade of the Taiwan Strait, international waters and airspace, interfered with United States and international shipping and aviation, and impinged upon the national security interests of the United States, requiring the immediate deployment of two United States aircraft carrier battle groups to the South China Sea.

(6) The actions of the People's Liberation Army in such close proximity to Taiwan were deliberate attempts to disrupt Taiwan's social and economic stability and were carried out as attempts to intimidate the people of Taiwan during the period leading up to Taiwan's historic first democratic presidential election.

(7) The early development and deployment of an effective United States theater missile defense system to the Asia-Pacific region, and the adjustment of United States policy to include Taiwan, including the Penghu Islands, Kinmen, and Matsu, under the protection of such defense system, would be prudent and appropriate responses to—

(A) the refusal by the People's Republic of China to renounce the use of force to determine the future of Taiwan;

(B) the nature of the military threat of the People's Republic of China posed by the increased focus of the People's Liberation Army on advanced missile development; and

(C) the demonstrated intent of the Government of the People's Republic of China to use live-fire military exercises and ballistic missile tests against the people and Government of Taiwan as tools of so-called coercive diplomacy.

(8) The early deployment of a United States theater anti-ballistic missile system

in the Asia-Pacific region would maintain a balance of power in the Taiwan Strait and deter the People's Republic of China from resorting to military intimidation tactics to coerce or manipulate the people and freely-elected Government of Taiwan in the future.

(9) While Taiwan is currently acquiring a local aircraft and ballistic and cruise missile defense capability in the form of the Modified Air Defense System (MADS), a larger portion of Taiwan's territory and population would be protected if this system were expanded to include a defense of the Taichung region, Kaohsiung, the Penghu Islands, Kinmen, and Matsu from limited ballistic missile attacks and a deterrent against the threat and use of force against Taiwan by the People's Liberation Army to achieve the political goals of the core leadership of the People's Republic of China.

(10) Taiwan has requested further United States cooperation on missile defense, including the conduct of a joint architecture study of the requirements for the establishment and operation of a missile defense system for Taiwan, including the Penghu Islands, Kinmen, and Matsu.

(11) On June 9, 1898, the "Convention Respecting an Extension of Hong Kong Territory" was agreed to between representatives of the governments of Great Britain and China to lease the New Territories for the period of 99 years beginning on July 1, 1898.

(12) On December 19, 1984, the "Sino-British Joint Declaration", agreed to between representatives of the governments of Great Britain and China, established the terms for the return to China on July 1, 1997, of the Hong Kong area (including the Hong Kong Island, Kowloon, and the New Territories (hereafter in this resolution referred to as "Hong Kong").

(13) No treaties exist between the People's Republic of China and Taiwan which determine the future status of Taiwan.

(14) The People's Republic of China attempts to apply to Taiwan the formula commonly known as "one country, two systems" in an effort to annex Taiwan to China.

(15) The People's Republic of China has refused to renounce the use of force against Taiwan and held military exercises in the Taiwan Strait in March 1996 in an attempt to intimidate the people of Taiwan in their first presidential elections.

(16) The Taiwan Relations Act states that "[i]t is the policy of the United States . . . to consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means, including by boycotts or embargoes, a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States".

SEC. 3. STUDY AND REPORT RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF A THEATER BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a study of the architecture requirements for the establishment and operation of a theater ballistic missile defense system in the Asia-Pacific region that would have the capability to protect Taiwan from ballistic missile attacks. The study shall include a description of appropriate measures by which the United States would cooperate with Taiwan and provide Taiwan with an advanced local-area ballistic missile defense system.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than July 1, 1998, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a report containing—

(1) the results of the study conducted under subsection (a);

(2) the factors used to obtain such results;

(3) a description of any existing United States missile defense system that could be transferred to Taiwan in accordance with the Taiwan Relations Act in order to allow Taiwan to provide for its self-defense against limited ballistic missile attacks.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report under subsection (b) shall be submitted in both classified and unclassified form.

SEC. 4. TRANSFER OF BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS TO TAIWAN.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President, if requested by the Government of Taiwan and in accordance with the results of the study conducted under section 3, should transfer to the Government of Taiwan appropriate defense articles or defense services under the foreign military sales program under chapter 2 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761 et seq.) for the purpose of establishing and operating a local-area ballistic missile defense system to protect Taiwan, including the Penghu Islands, Kinmen, and Matsu, against limited ballistic missile attacks.

SEC. 5. STATEMENT OF POLICY RELATING TO UNITED STATES THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES FOR THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

The Congress declares that it is in the national interest of the United States that Taiwan be included in any effort at ballistic missile defense cooperation, networking, or interoperability with friendly and allied nations in the Asia-Pacific region.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS URGING THE PRESIDENT TO MAKE CLEAR TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA THE COMMITMENT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO SECURITY AND DEMOCRACY IN TAIWAN.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Clinton Administration should make clear to the leadership of the People's Republic of China, the American people's firm commitment for security and democracy for the people of Taiwan and that the United States fully expects that the resolution of security issues on both sides of the Taiwan Strait will be resolved by peaceful means.

SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING TAIWAN.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the transfer of Hong Kong to the People's Republic of China does not alter the current and future status of Taiwan;

(2) the future of Taiwan should be determined by peaceful means through a democratic process; and

(3) the United States should assist in the defense of Taiwan in case of threats or military attack by the People's Republic of China against Taiwan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 302, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2386.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], a member of the Committee on National Security, for introducing this legislation. And I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the measure, and I support it wholeheartedly.

I want to thank, too, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for their amendments, which help to further clarify and improve the initial bill.

The People's Republic of China is currently engaged in a comprehensive military modernization program that is enhancing the power projection capabilities of its armed forces, the People's Liberation Army. Included in this modernization program is the development and deployment of advanced ballistic missiles that can soon alter the balance of power across the Taiwan Strait.

The security of Taiwan and the maintenance of a balance of power in the Taiwan Strait are key aspects for continued peace and prosperity in the region and an assurance that the question of Taiwan will be resolved peacefully as the United States and China have agreed in previous communiqués. The PRC should hold no doubt that the United States would view with great concern any efforts to do otherwise.

Furthermore, there are pragmatic reasons to be concerned. We all should be deeply troubled by the actions of the Chinese just last year when they fired ballistic missiles into international air and sea lanes off the coast of Taiwan in an effort to intimidate the people of Taiwan during the first democratic elections in 5,000 years of Chinese history.

Mr. Speaker, the United States had to respond by deploying two aircraft carriers to the region. This sort of missile diplomacy by the Chinese is unacceptable. For our own national security and for peace and stability of the region, we should consider providing Taiwan with this sort of defensive system when it is fielded in the Asia-Pacific region. This bill does just that.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], chairman of our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific and chairman of our Committee on International Relations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment I placed at the desk be considered as adopted.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEREUTER:

In section 7(3) after the word "States" insert the following: ", in accordance with the Taiwan Relations Act and the constitutional processes of the United States,".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is considered as adopted.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill, for several reasons. First of all, it is apparent I think, as we read the bill, that it has a flawed internal logic. It mandates a study and a Presidential report about the establishment of a theater ballistic missile defense system that includes Taiwan. At the same time, without waiting for the results of that study, it calls for making such a system available to Taiwan. That does not, it seems to me, make a lot of sense.

Secondly, I do not think the bill is necessary. Taiwan does not need this technology and, so far, does not even want it. The United States Department of Defense already has an ongoing ballistic missile defense program with Taiwan. It sold Taiwan a Patriot derivative that is comparable to a system just introduced in the U.S. Army last year.

The senior Taiwanese military leaders are not ready to commit to an unproved ballistic missile defense technology. It really is not a question of money. Taiwan has purchased over \$8 billion in arms from the United States in the last 5 years. It has \$87 billion in reserves. If it wanted this technology, Taiwan would be knocking on our door to buy it. But nobody is knocking.

I have a letter dated September 29, 1997, from the United States Department of Defense. It reads, in part, "Senior Taiwan military leaders are highly skeptical of a significant investment in the area of ballistic missile defense. The Taiwan military is rightly concerned about the potential for a huge diversion of resources to ballistic missile defense programs that have an uncertain future at best."

□ 1930

The third reason is I think the bill is provocative. Everyone knows that China regards Taiwan as an integral part of the People's Republic of China. Offering Taiwan some of the world's most advanced weaponry, weaponry that Taiwan does not want or need, appears to be deliberately designed to provoke China. I do not think that helps our friends in Taiwan, and it carries some risk for Taiwan.

There was another reason to be against this bill, but I think that reason has now been corrected by the unanimous consent made at the suggestion of the gentleman from Nebraska. I want to thank him for making that unanimous consent, because I think the language that was inserted into the bill by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] has now had an addition to it which brings the language in the bill in line with the framework that has provided peace and sta-

bility and prosperity in the region for over two decades. It does not, I think, alter that framework language. I think the unanimous consent language is a good addition to this bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think the bill has an internal logic in it that is flawed. I think the bill is not necessary. I think it is provocative. It carries, it seems to me, some risk with no prospect for any benefit. I think, therefore, it may reduce and not enhance the security of our friends in Taiwan. It is my understanding that the administration strongly opposes this bill. I urge its defeat.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the committee, for helping to shepherd this bill through the process and get it to the House floor and for all the work that he has done and other members of the committee, including the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], have done with respect to the contents of the bill.

The bill is logical, it is reasonable, it is prudent and it is in total accord with the Taiwan Relations Act. There is no faulty logic that I can see, internal logic flaw that the gentleman from Indiana says there is. Reading the part of the bill that I think he is talking about, and that is the part of the bill that, following the study, says:

"It is the sense of the Congress that the President, if requested by the Government of Taiwan and in accordance with the results of the study conducted under section 3, should transfer to the Government of Taiwan appropriate defense articles under the foreign military sales program under chapter 2 of the Arms Export Control Act for the purpose of establishing and operating a local-area defense ballistic missile defense system to protect Taiwan."

That says in accordance with the results of the study. That obviously infers that the study has to be completed. We cannot transfer the articles until we have results, and so I think that is a reasonable, logical sequence that is manifest in the bill and I do not see any problem there.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, to send an unmistakable signal to friends and foes alike. I think that that is the lesson we learned in the Middle East with respect to the invasion of Kuwait. Saddam Hussein claims that he was under the notion that we did not care if there was an invasion of Kuwait. Maybe he is lying, maybe he is misbehaving. He does that often. But certainly the statements of our representatives were not clear, were not unambiguous. It is important if you are going to defend an ally and you are going to offer that defense umbrella and that defense umbrella was unmistakably offered in the recent incident

when China lobbed missiles, M-9 missiles over the bow of Taiwan and we came to the aid of Taiwan with American ships and American force projection, it is obvious that Taiwan is under our defense umbrella. We have demonstrated that.

It is also obvious that missiles are the weapon of choice for China. They are building missiles at a rapid rate. The administration tells us that by the year 2010, there will be over 2,000 missiles, many of them fast missiles, ballistic missiles, in the Chinese army. If we are going to defend Taiwan and hopefully if we are going to give Taiwan the ability to defend itself so that American troops do not always have to be rushed into that area of the world and American navies do not always have to be projected into that area of the world, it is important to meet the weapon of the day. The weapon of the day clearly and the weapon of the future for China is missiles, theater ballistic missiles, some of them fairly fast, some of them faster than the PAC-II missiles that we are currently developing.

All this bill does is request that DOD, that the President and DOD commence a study to evaluate an architecture that could be deployed in this area of Asia. And upon completing that study and if requested by the government of Taiwan and in accord with the Taiwan Relations Act, which incidentally says that the United States will provide articles of defense for Taiwan, then it is the sense of Congress that we should put together a defense system that includes in its area the defense of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, I would say simply this is something that we are doing with our allies around the world. We are working on theater missile defense with our European allies right now. We are developing a partnership program in cooperation with Israel with development of the TMD system, the Arrow, which is an antitheater missile defense system, and it is absolutely appropriate, reasonable and logical and in the interest of the United States to have this study and ask the Clinton administration to report back to us and then take further action if the study, the results of the study and the request of Taiwan is in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend everybody who has worked on this language and put it together. I think this is an important part of our China package. It says that we stand with our friends and that we continue, as we do under the Taiwan Relations Act, to support our friends with defense articles and that we realize that defending against M-9 missiles and their successors is an important part of that duty.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, this bill concerns our national security, but it was not heard, it was not debated, it was not marked up, it was not reported by the Committee on National Security because the committee waived jurisdiction. The first time I knew of it was today when the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] called it to my attention. I read the bill, read the report, read the dissenting views and I reluctantly oppose it, reluctantly because I think those who sponsor it are well-intended, but I disagree with the means they are using to advance this particular proposal.

On its face, this bill does seem simple. It asks the Pentagon to study the architecture of a theater ballistic missile defense system in the Asia-Pacific region which would protect Taiwan. It asks those who do that study to spell out just how the United States would cooperate with Taiwan and how we would provide Taiwan, specifically Taiwan, with a missile defense system which would not only cover Taiwan but would cover Matsu and Kinmen and the Penghu Islands. The bill asks for the study by July 1 and, even before the bill is completed and the study is started, it throws in a sense of the Congress that this resolution should make clear to the People's Republic of China the commitment of the American people to security in Taiwan. Just what that means, I am not really sure. I would be cautious about the way we broadcast such commitments to the world without clearly knowing what security obligations we are undertaking.

The study sought by this bill in my opinion is wholly unnecessary. The BMD or ABM missile defense architecture it asks for is easy enough to spell out right here on the floor of the House. First of all, it would consist of the THAAD, theater high altitude interceptor, on the ground in Taiwan when it becomes operational, maybe 4, 5, 6 years from now. The THAAD would take out incoming missiles in their late mid-phase, as they honed in on Taiwan. It would have to be complemented because there would probably be some leakers that the THAAD would not get by a Navy system called the Upper Tier or Area Defense. This would be based on surface ships like cruisers, the Aegis cruisers specifically, and when and if it becomes operational 4, 5, 6 years from now, its role would be to take out incoming missiles in the ascent phase, right after booster burnout if at all possible. Both of these systems would be complemented by, in the case with the THAAD, ground-based radar, based in Taiwan, and by the SPY radar on Aegis cruisers, and both would likely include some linkage to our DSB satellite for the detection of a missile launch and to queue the interceptors and their radars. Eventually around 2004, 2005 or 2006 this system would probably be tied into our so-called SMTS, low earth orbit satellites, 18 to 24 of them, with infrared seekers that will be in orbit around the whole

globe if our plans are carried out today as they are designed.

This system is not deployed today, it is not ready for deployment. The THAAD is not deployed today, it is not ready for deployment. The Navy's Upper Tier system is not deployed today. The THAAD and the Upper Tier system have been tested 4 or 5 times each and each has yet to make a successful intercept. They are still in the late phases of engineering development. The SMTS, the low earth orbit satellite, are at least 6 or 7 years off before they can be deployed.

Nevertheless, knowing what we know of these components today, doing a little viewgraph engineering, we can design this architecture. We do not have to spend \$500,000 to design the architecture. We know basically what it is. So this bill serves no practical purpose that I can see, none whatsoever. If Members want to know what the architecture is, I have just about told them what it can be. If they want anything more elaborate, it is too early to tell because the components are not yet systems in being. To the extent that Members want to know more, they can get it. Write the Ballistic Missile Defense Office a letter, have the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the Committee on National Security write him a letter and he will be over here in a week, not 6 or 7 months. A week. He will tell you essentially what I have just told you except he has got CAD/CAM, he will bring drawings, he will bring viewgraphs, he will bring anything you want to see on the architecture. You will not have to wait 6 months and it will not cost you \$500,000.

If you want the United States to cooperate with Taiwan, we are already cooperating with Taiwan in a very discreet manner, but in a very concrete manner as well. The Taiwanese are right now buying and taking delivery of the PAC-II, Patriot II batteries, 8 of them altogether. In addition, we are letting them have our extended range intercept missiles called the PAC-IIIs, the latest thing off the production line. We are making those available to them as well. So we are actually cooperating now.

We do not need to wave this red flag, and we can accomplish the same purpose that this resolution proposes without the provocation and without the cost. A wise President once said with respect to our foreign policy that we should speak softly but carry a big stick. A wise Congress would do well to remember that sage advice and vote this resolution down.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the distinguished chairman of our Committee on National Security.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this

time. I rise in support of H.R. 2386, the United States-Taiwan Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense Cooperation Act. In my opinion, issues of national security have been ignored for far too long in the debate over the People's Republic of China.

□ 1945

While promoting American political values and free trade are essential elements of United States foreign policy, protecting our national security interests is the bedrock upon which our policy ought to be built.

Today in East Asia, and despite recent fluctuations in financial markets, economic activity is proceeding at a frenetic pace bringing prosperity to more and more people. Likewise, as clearly demonstrated in Taiwan, democracy is taking hold. These developments are a direct result of a general geopolitical stability that characterizes much of East Asia, a stability more often than not guaranteed by the United States.

The quandary we now face is how to look at China in the context of an Asian, even a global, security regime. China's economy is growing by leaps and bounds and is already recognized in the region as a great power. However, whether or not Chinese political, economic and military power will be a force for stability remains unknown and raises several fundamental questions.

First, what are China's national ambitions? China, the so-called Middle Kingdom, has long considered itself a great nation and center of the civilized world. Chinese leaders have stated that they intend to become a dominant power in Asia as well as a world power. China is not content with the current geopolitical status quo and appears to envision a long-term competition with the United States both in the region and elsewhere.

Second, what are China's strategic goals? China is embroiled in a variety of border disputes and claims of sovereignty around virtually its entire perimeter. Moreover, as Chinese leaders realize that their economic growth is increasingly dependent on foreign trade, their security interests also are becoming more expansive. China's ties to Iran and other Middle East nations, links to Latin America and budding strategic partnership with Russia are indicative of Beijing's broadening horizons.

Third, what is China's national military strategy? Great power ambitions and expanding strategic horizons have forced the Chinese to shift from their longtime focus on homeland defense to developing the ability to project power in maritime East Asia and beyond.

Finally, where is China headed with regard to military modernization? Until recently, assessments of Chinese modernization have focused primarily on the new warships and combat aircraft being built and bought, especially from Russia. However, the People's Re-

public, the People's Liberation Army has proved an astute student of the lessons of Operation Desert Storm. The PLA was stunned at the effectiveness with which our Armed Forces waged a high technology war.

At the same time the Chinese obviously noted the inability of the United States to fully defend against the crude Scud missiles in Saddam Hussein's arsenal. During last year's tense confrontation between China and Taiwan, the PLA used ballistic missiles as an aggressive form of blockade in support of its own coercive diplomacy. China's President Jiang Zemin himself concluded several years ago in reviewing the lessons of the Gulf War, and I quote, modern warfare has become high-tech warfare. It is a multidimensional war, electronic war, missile war, unquote.

According to Jiang, the ability to conduct this missile war is our major principle in military modernization. Those who downplay China's military buildup do not understand the kind of threat this missile war presents. Preserving some measure of stability in East Asia will in the future increasingly rely on effective missile defenses.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that we all must recognize that protection of America's own national security interests is essential to our evolving China policy. If we fail to recognize this reality, our overall China policy will be inconsistent; in the long run, ineffective.

H.R. 2386, the United States-Taiwan Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense Cooperation Act, represents an important statement on one security-related element of our China policy. Defending Taiwan against the very real threat of Chinese ballistic missile attack will promote regional stability, and it will strengthen our United States alliances.

I urge the support of my colleagues.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2386. This bill addresses two core issues in U.S. policies toward China: No. 1, the current and future political status of Taiwan; and, No. 2, the defense of Taiwan from threats or military attacks by China.

H. Con. Resolution 100, which I introduced back on June 18 just prior to the return of Hong Kong to China, is now included in the bill of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER]. My legislation has 42 cosponsors and broad bipartisan support. It specifically expresses the sense of Congress that, one, the transfer of Hong Kong to China does not alter the current and future status of Taiwan; two, the future status of Taiwan should be determined by peaceful means through a democratic process; and, three, the United States should assist in the defense of Taiwan in cases of threat or military attack by China against Taiwan.

The historic transfer of Hong Kong to China on July 1 should bear no con-

sequence on the future status of Taiwan. The case of Taiwan is separate and distinct from Taiwan. Unlike Hong Kong, Taiwan has never entered into any agreements with China that determine the future status of Taiwan. Taiwan is, in fact, a de facto independent state and should determine its official future political status peacefully through democratic means.

Beijing's claim on Taiwan is based neither on historic nor legal realities. The facts are clear. With the exception of a brief period from 1887 to 1895, Taiwan has been free of Chinese rule. Today Taiwan has separate governments, financial markets, dialects and cultures from mainland China.

Mr. Speaker, by calling something black does not make it black; by calling something white does not make it white. Taiwan is a de facto independent state.

The second major component of this legislation is the U.S. role in the defense of Taiwan. I was deeply concerned last year as I watched the so-called military exercises by the Chinese in the Taiwan Strait. It is obvious that the Chinese attempted to test the will of the United States with those exercises. The United States demonstrated with the deployment of two aircraft carriers and aggressive diplomacy that we would stand up to the Chinese and defend Taiwan against these acts of aggression.

H.R. 2386 will further the U.S. commitment to assist in the defense of Taiwan by providing them with arms of a defensive nature which should act as a deterrent from future Chinese threats and protection in case of an attack. H.R. 2386 is consistent with the three communiqués and the Taiwan Relations Act which states that any threat to Taiwan's safety and security is of grave concern to the United States.

Speaker GINGRICH bolstered the basis of the communiqués and the act on his recent visit to China when he told China's President that the United States will defend Taiwan, period. I commend the Speaker for his comments and urge this body to adopt such a stance with the passage of this legislation.

This is not a partisan issue. I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we have a responsibility to fortify and defend democracies throughout the world. That is at the crux of U.S. foreign policy. Our relations with Taiwan should not be treated any differently.

The issue is not for the U.S. Congress to determine the current or future status of Taiwan or to be their sole defenders in all confrontations. Rather, it is our duty to ensure that Taiwan has the means to defend itself against acts of aggression by China as it seeks to define its political status.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] for this important piece of legislation, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for their

hard work and leadership. I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 2386.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to have to raise my voice tonight because I respect all the Members on this issue and, as a matter of fact, good friends with them. But I would disagree, and I would like to explain on some of the issues.

During the Navy I served with Admiral Brown on 7th Fleet staff. I was responsible for the defense of all Southeast Asia countries. For example, in Korea it was Team Spirit. We dealt with the host countries, not only the potential and exercise threat, but I had linguists that actually monitored North Korea in the real threat. We had Yama Secura, Japan; Cobra Gold and Tangent Flash in Philippines, and part of that was the threat on Taiwan.

China is not our ally, in my opinion. I think that Hong Kong will have much more effect on China than China has on Hong Kong. And I do not think there will be peace in the Middle East in my lifetime, but I believe we have to engage in the Middle East and constantly work in that direction.

I think the same is true with China. I think we have to engage in China, realizing that it takes a long time to change a 10,000-year-old dog, and especially a dog that has got very sharp and brutal teeth and is willing to use them at any time.

The real problem: During the recent missile firings from China in the direction of Taiwan, any time we take the U.S. fleet through the straits, they are in peril. It could be very difficult, and China has a formidable force that could make us pay bitterly. That is why the Upper-Tier system connected with the THAAD system is so very important, and the treaty not to slow down the missiles, because that would make us have to have more Aegis cruisers.

But while we are trying to get through those straits, Taiwan is going to have a period of time where it is very difficult for them to survive. It is not very far across those straits, and they have the landing forces in which Taiwan is going to have to have some defense for itself. This will help us. If we get there after China was already embarked, we could pay even a bitter price.

So I support the gentleman's amendment, and I think it is very important.

I would say one other thing not connected to this bill, that Israel just sold missiles to Turkey. I plan on offering a bill that denies or will refuse to have Turkey employ those air-to-air missiles in Cyprus, because I think that would be potentially dangerous.

I thank Members on both sides of the aisle for their thoughtfulness.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, it was not that long ago when we stood and watched as Red Chinese missiles were flung over the islands of Taiwan in an attempt to intimidate the people who lived there during their first free election.

□ 2000

This was an attempt by a regime in Beijing, the last remnants of Communist dictatorships on this planet, to exert their power over the 20 million people of Taiwan, and we stood helplessly. No, we did not just stand helplessly, but we did send aircraft carriers.

Is it more important for us to send aircraft carriers? Is that what we want as our only option, is to send offensive weapons into this troubled region, when the Chinese Communists decide to flex their muscles?

It would be a travesty for us not to develop a system, a defensive system, with the Taiwanese, that we can exercise when the Communist Chinese are trying to exert their influence in an improper way.

We have seen them do it before, and we had no other option but to send those aircraft carriers. Thousands of American lives were at stake in order to prevent aggression upon Taiwan.

This resolution that we are discussing today will lead, hopefully, after a study, towards a relationship with Taiwan, where we will be permitted to defend Taiwan, something that is completely within the Taiwan Relations Act. This is an agreement we have had with the Chinese, with the Communist Chinese, over the years, that we could sell them defensive weapons. If we back away from this, if we back away from this alternative, what are the Chinese Communists going to say?

Certainly they do not believe we are going to use offensive weapons against them should they move against Taiwan. No. They will say what we have heard here earlier before tonight, and that is, "Well, you can talk about freedom, you can talk about being against oppression in China, just don't do anything about it."

Well, here we have an option that we can do something about potential aggression that threatens the peace of the world and puts the democracies of the world on notice and on the line about what their response will be. We can prepare with the Taiwanese a defensive missile system that will protect them against this type of horrible aggression of high-technology missiles aimed at their population centers.

We should not back away from this. If we do, we will have no other option but to send offensive weapons into that theater at a time of crisis and chaos. That is the very last thing that we want to do, is leave ourselves with that option, only the offensive option.

So I would plead with my colleagues, let us do what is right. We can strike a blow for freedom, but not threaten anyone, because these are defensive

systems we are talking about. We can provide ourselves the option that in a future crisis we will have something other than an offensive threat that actually threatens their people in a response to Communist Chinese aggressive acts. It makes all the sense in the world.

Those of us who are trying to make sure that we have a more peaceful world, those of us who do not want to send a wrong message to Communist Chinese bosses in Beijing, we want to send them the message that we are strongly behind democracy in Taiwan and will not see them take it out by force, it is good to provide them a missile defense system.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] would respond to a question, is the gentleman aware that we are now providing Taiwan PAC-2 missile defense systems and we also have agreed to sell them PAC-3, and that is state of the art, that is the best we can provide right now?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is totally consistent with our agreement.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I understand. The gentleman is saying we would have nothing other than an offensive option. We are already providing them with the most that we have got.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. We are moving forward.

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, it is the understanding I have, and I have asked some of our experts on this, the missiles that China is evolving right now outstrip the capability of PAC-2 and PAC-3.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, there is no question about that. To the extent they are effective at all, it is what we have got, and we are giving them that right now, number one. Number two, the THAAD and the upper-tier are not available to give. They are not in production.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, so this makes absolute sense to have a track that you are following that starts us working with Taiwan to develop that system, so that when we have it, it is mature, it is in place, and it takes over for the PAC-2 and the PAC-3, which cannot handle the M-9.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman must understand, this is a study. What harm has it done to study this issue, so we can be prepared in case what we have already done is not adequate to meet the threats of the future?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, there is no harm done. The study is unnecessary. The Ballistic Missile Defense Organization can come right now and paint you the architecture, but the components to fill in the architecture are not systems in being; they are several years off from production.

The fact that we are providing the PAC-3 is ample indication that when these systems are available, we will provide them, too. That is enough. You do not have to go this far.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and also thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. Speaker, I guess I have spoken enough on these bills over the last couple of days. I guess I will not go back into the problems that exist with the People's Republic of China. It is just sickening to think about the deplorable human rights violations, the religious persecution, and the sale of chemical and biological factories to countries like Iran, and missiles. It just goes on and on and on.

But let me just go back to 1978 when something very sad happened. We had a President named Jimmy Carter, and he was one of the kindest, most decent men I think I ever met; too kind and too decent perhaps. But he saw fit to derecognize a country called the Republic of China, and now it is called Taiwan.

But all during the fight, all during those years, during the Second World War and then fighting communism, Taiwan and the Republic of China were one of the links in the chain of defense against the spread of death and deadly atheistic communism, and we, the United States of America, turned our back, for the first time in history, on these people that stood side by side with us, shoulder to shoulder. It was just disgraceful, but it happened.

Then, in 1979, even before Ronald Reagan got here, Members sitting here today, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], myself, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], and others, wrote something called the Taiwan Relations Act, and it is now the law of the land.

The law of the land always supercedes any kind of communiques, any kind of agreements that are made between people. It is the law of the land, and that Taiwan Relations Act says that we will provide the people of Taiwan with the qualitative and quantitative weaponry to defend themselves.

Well, with what we see happening throughout the Chinese Government in recent years, with the missile proliferation, we know there is a real danger, not only to the American fleet

there and American soldiers in the area, but certainly to the people of Taiwan, to which we owe a great deal.

That is why this bill is so terribly important today. We need to pass this legislation. We need to continue to send the message to the People's Republic of China that we will not put up with what they attempted to do back in March of 1996 when they tried to interrupt the elections going on in free China, on Taiwan, with their missile deployment.

We need to stand steady with our allies, even though we do not recognize them officially, and this legislation does just that. That is why I have such great praise for the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], who amended the legislation, and certainly the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for bringing this important legislation to the floor of this House. I urge support of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who can remember back to March 1996 knows why we need this bill. Recall how, during that month, Taiwan was conducting the first democratic presidential election in the history of Chinese civilization. Well, that was too much for the Communist dictators in Beijing, so they started firing missiles just off the coast of democratic Taiwan.

It was one of the most despicable acts by Communist China since Tiananmen Square. That, and that alone, is why we need this bill. China is building its missile arsenal aggressively, and we know what they intend to do with them. Peaceful, democratic Taiwan needs to be able to defend itself.

This bill only requires a study of Taiwan's defense needs. How can you reasonably oppose it? Let me remind members that the Taiwan Relations Act obligates us to provide defensive weapons to Taiwan. The law grants Congress a role in the analysis of Taiwan's defense needs and states that defense sales to Taiwan will be based solely on our assessment of those needs.

Now I know that the Pentagon has sent a letter over here opposing this bill and stating that Taiwan doesn't want or need a lot of missile defense, and Mr. Speaker, that upsets me because I know it is untrue and so does the Pentagon. Everytime I talk to the Taiwanese I hear them say they want missile defenses. It's a high priority for them and don't believe otherwise.

I commend Mr. HUNTER and Chairman GILMAN for bringing us this bill and I also commend Mr. DEUTSCH for his addition to the bill, which reminds us that Hong Kong is no model for Taiwan and which restates over commitment and obligation to assist Taiwan should they become victims of Communist Chinese aggression.

I urge an aye vote on this critical legislation. Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak out of order for just a moment with respect to H.R. 2358, the Political Freedom in China Act, which was debated here a day or so ago. During that debate, I was waiting for a letter to come over from the White House with respect to

the Gilman-Markey amendment. The letter did not arrive on time, so I am going to read that letter now with respect to H.R. 2358. The letter is dated November 5, 1997.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing to express the Administration's strong opposition to legislation offered by Representatives Gilman and Markey in connection with the certification by the President on China's nonproliferation policies and practices. In our judgment, the legislation would put at risk the substantial achievements we have made in our nonproliferation dialogue with China and undercut our ability to make further progress.

First, the United States achieved extremely valuable nonproliferation commitments from China, based on the current law governing certifications to Congress implementing the U.S.-China agreement for Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation. By "moving the goalposts," this proposal would undermine our credibility with China, possibly causing Beijing to reconsider some of its important commitments, for example regarding Iran.

The existing 30-day review period provides ample time for consideration of the President's certification package. Even when the nuclear cooperation agreement is in full effect, nuclear exports will be licensed on a case-by-case basis, and may be suspended at any time. This provides continuing leverage over Chinese behavior and a lengthy period of time for monitoring the implementation of Chinese assurances.

Second, this proposal would imprudently revise the established process under the Atomic Energy Act for Congressional consideration of agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation. Unlike previous law, which established clear requirements for the President's certifications, under this proposal Congress could permanently block nuclear exports to China, without providing any guidance to the Executive Branch as to the conditions that need to be met to implement the agreement for peaceful nuclear cooperation. Going forward with the nuclear cooperation would then require the passage of new legislation in order to undo the prohibition on nuclear exports. This would amount to a fundamental and unnecessary review of the Atomic Energy Act and a major obstacle to ever reaching agreement with China on the conditions for peaceful nuclear cooperation.

Sincerely, John Hilly, Senior Advisor to the President and Director for Legislative Affairs.

I thank the Speaker for permitting me to read this statement.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on the bill pending, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], who has been one of the major movers in these series of bills that we have been considering the last few days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is recognized for 7½ minutes.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and I also thank the ranking member for his very, very worthwhile comments and important perspective on this, because, frankly, we are this close, even though he opposes the bill,

to agreeing on all the fundamental points.

The ranking member, after all, makes the point that while this bill would support a study of cooperation with Taiwan on theater missile defense, that is already our policy. We already supply missile defense systems. We have supplied four Patriot systems to Taiwan. We already cooperate with them on missile defense. But, whereas the fact that this bill is consistent with our policy is my reason for supporting it and offering it, it is the ranking member's reason for opposing it.

As we heard in debate, the Patriot systems that we have made available to Taiwan, and which, incidentally, Taiwan purchases, we do not provide them as foreign aid, they have long since outgrown that, are inadequate to deal with the very realistic threats that Taiwan now faces and that this Congress faced in one of its finest moments last year.

We all recall when Franklin Delano Roosevelt called the United States of America the arsenal of democracy, making it very plain that sometimes in order to have freedom one has to fight for it, and the United States was then and is now the arsenal of democracy. But the People's Republic of China we saw last year is essentially the arsenal of antidemocracy, because they used their military power to try to prevent legislative elections in 1995 in Taiwan and the first ever presidential elections in 1996, in 5,000 years of Chinese history.

□ 2015

The People's Republic of China, the government run by the Communist Party in Beijing, is fond of saying that Taiwan is but a province of China, it is part of China. If that is so, then we in America should reward the progress that democracy is making in Taiwan.

We, in America, should look favorably upon this, and we should look with grave concern upon any effort by the largest standing military on Earth, the People's Liberation Army, to use force to prevent democracy in Taiwan, and that is exactly what went on in 1995 when missiles were launched in order to intimidate the electorate. When that preceded in 1996, when 150,000 troops were amassed in Fujian Province right on the border of the Taiwan Strait, 220 fighter aircraft, and when the effect of launching the missiles was to blockade, effectively, the entire island, both ends of the Island of Taiwan and interfere not just with Taiwan's shipping, but with the United States, to interfere with commercial shipping, to interfere with commercial air travel by the United States, we took it very, very seriously, and we also responded here in the Congress.

The United States House of Representatives moved a very pointed resolution on the floor of this House that I introduced, the Policy Committee prepared, that stated that if the Peo-

ple's Republic of China should try to invade the Island of Taiwan by force, without provocation to attack Taiwan, then the United States would defend Taiwan, and that resolution passed this House of Representatives with 435 Members, with only 14 votes against.

It was a strong and clear statement, a strong and clear statement in response to what theretofore had been the Clinton administration's utterly ambiguous policy. In fact, the Clinton administration called their policy strategic ambiguity. But abandoning immediately their policy of so-called strategic ambiguity in the teeth of this very, very clear statement from the United States Congress within days of the passage of our resolution, stating clearly that if, without provocation, the People's Republic of China would attack the Island of Taiwan, the administration sent two carrier battle groups into the Taiwan Strait, a clear show of support for the democratic elections that were about to take place on the Island of Taiwan. And within days of that measure, the People's Republic of China canceled the scheduled balance of their military exercises of the missile test and called off the blockade.

The scheduled presidential elections, the first ever in 5,000 years of Chinese history, took place on schedule. The months following have been peaceful. That is all to the good.

But it is ironic that the Clinton administration described its own policy of strategic ambiguity when that would be my criticism of it. How is the government in Beijing to know what would be the United States response if they did attack, and why would we want them to be in the dark about that? We were risking war through weakness, rather than advancing a policy of peace through strength.

The missile threat to Taiwan is very, very clear. That is why our policy of cooperating with them on theater missile defense is the right policy, and that is why congressional leadership on this issue remains important.

What this bill seeks is very simple, a study by the Defense Department, by the Clinton Defense Department, of an appropriate defensive system for the Asia Pacific region. There is a July 1, 1998 reporting date back to the Congress, and the Clinton administration will make its own determination in that report to Congress whether or not an adequate missile defense, adequate to the new threats, the very real and existing threats that Taiwan now faces, is available for sale to Taiwan, consistent with the Taiwan Relations Act, and in fact, that is the language of the bill itself.

That is what this bill does. It is utterly reasonable, and because this Congress has so strongly in the past supported the Taiwan Relations Act, made it clear to the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party in Beijing that aggression is no way to deal with the cross-strait problems, it

is important that we not back away from that tonight. It is important that we vote in favor of this legislation, because the peace of the strait depends upon it, because the peace of Asia and the Pacific depend upon it, and the peace of the world depend upon it.

I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for bringing this bill to the floor, and I congratulate its author, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2386, the United States-Taiwan Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense Cooperation Act. The Taiwanese people only wish to see that the safety and security of Taiwan is enhanced. The United States must play an important role in this process.

This legislation, H.R. 2386, requires the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on a plan for Taiwan to acquire a missile defense system to protect the territory of Taiwan. The missile firings conducted by the Chinese Government off the coast of Taiwan less than 2 years ago is proof that Taiwan's long term security and the United States' interests in the Pacific Rim demand that we stand firm in ensuring Taiwan's safety.

This study will ensure that all facets of Taiwan's security are examined and the feasibility of a missile defense system is fully considered. The Taiwanese people should be reassured that their safety is of great concern to the American people.

I ask my colleagues to please join me in supporting H.R. 2386, the United States-Taiwan Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense Cooperation Act.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] for his concluding remarks, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 301, nays 116, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 601]

YEAS—301

Abercrombie	Baker	Barton
Aderholt	Ballenger	Bass
Andrews	Barcia	Bateman
Armey	Barr	Bereuter
Bachus	Barrett (NE)	Bilbray
Baesler	Bartlett	Bilirakis

Bishop	Herger	Peterson (MN)	Bentsen	Gillmor	Oberstar	[Roll No. 602]		
Bliley	Hill	Peterson (PA)	Berman	Gordon	Obey	AYES—245		
Blunt	Hilleary	Petri	Berry	Hamilton	Olver			
Boehrlert	Hilliard	Pickering	Blagojevich	Harman	Pastor	Abercrombie	Gilchrest	Parker
Bonilla	Hinojosa	Pitts	Blumenauer	Hefner	Paul	Aderholt	Gillmor	Paul
Bono	Hobson	Pombo	Bonior	Hinchey	Payne	Archer	Gilman	Paxon
Boswell	Hoekstra	Pomeroy	Borski	Houghton	Pelosi	Armey	Goode	Pease
Boyd	Holden	Porter	Boucher	Hoyer	Pickett	Bachus	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Brady	Hooley	Portman	Brown (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Poshard	Baesler	Goodling	Petri
Brown (FL)	Horn	Pryce (OH)	Cardin	Jefferson	Price (NC)	Baker	Goss	Pickering
Brown (OH)	Hostettler	Quinn	Castle	Johnson (WI)	Rivers	Ballenger	Graham	Pitts
Bryant	Hulshof	Radanovich	Clayton	Kanjorski	Roemer	Barr	Granger	Pombo
Bunning	Hunter	Rahall	Clement	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard	Barrett (NE)	Greenwood	Porter
Burr	Hutchinson	Ramstad	Conyers	Kennedy (RI)	Rush	Bartlett	Gutknecht	Portman
Burton	Hyde	Rangel	Costello	Kennedy	Sabo	Barton	Pryce (OH)	Pryce (OH)
Buyer	Inglis	Redmond	Coyne	Kleccka	Sanders	Bass	Hansen	Quinn
Callahan	Istook	Regula	Cummings	Kucinich	Sanford	Bateman	Hastert	Radanovich
Calvert	Jackson-Lee	Reyes	Davis (FL)	LaFalce	Sawyer	Bereuter	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Camp	(TX)	Riggs	Davis (IL)	Levin	Scott	Bilbray	Hayworth	Redmond
Campbell	Jenkins	Rodriguez	Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Serrano	Bilirakis	Hefley	Regula
Canady	John	Rogan	Dellums	Lofgren	Skaggs	Bliley	Herger	Riggs
Cannon	Johnson (CT)	Rogers	Dicks	Lowe	Skelton	Blunt	Hill	Rivers
Chabot	Johnson, E. B.	Rohrabacher	Dingell	Luther	Smith, Adam	Boehrlert	Hilleary	Rogan
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen	Dixon	Markey	Snyder	Boehner	Hobson	Rogers
Chenoweth	Jones	Rothman	Doggett	Matsui	Spratt	Bonilla	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Christensen	Kaptur	Roukema	Dooley	McDermott	Stabenow	Bono	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Clay	Kasich	Royce	Edwards	McGovern	Stark	Boswell	Hostettler	Roukema
Clyburn	Kelly	Ryun	Eshoo	Meehan	Thurman	Boyd	Houghton	Royce
Coble	Kildee	Salmon	Evans	Millender-	Tierney	Brady	Hulshof	Ryun
Collins	Kilpatrick	Sanchez	Farr	McDonald	Velazquez	Bryant	Hunter	Salmon
Combest	Kim	Sandlin	Fattah	Miller (CA)	Vento	Bunning	Hutchinson	Sandlin
Condit	Kind (WI)	Saxton	Fazio	Minge	Visclosky	Burr	Hyde	Sanford
Cook	King (NY)	Scarborough	Finler	Mink	Waters	Burton	Inglis	Saxton
Cooksey	Kingston	Schaefer, Dan	Ford	Moakley	Watt (NC)	Buyer	Istook	Scarborough
Cox	Klink	Schaffer, Bob	Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Waxman	Callahan	Jenkins	Schaefer, Dan
Cramer	Klug	Schumer	Frank (MA)	Moralla	Woolsey	Calvert	John	Schaffer, Bob
Crane	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner	Gejdenson	Murtha	Wynn	Camp	Johnson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Crapo	Kolbe	Sessions				Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Sessions
Cunningham	LaHood	Shadegg				Canady	Jones	Shadegg
Danner	Lampson	Shaw	Boehner	Foglietta	Riley	Cannon	Kasich	Shaw
Davis (VA)	Lantos	Shays	Carson	Gonzalez	Schiff	Castle	Kelly	Shays
Deal	Largent	Sherman	Coburn	Greenwood	Stokes	Chabot	Kim	Sherman
DeFazio	Latham	Shimkus	Cubin	Linder	Yates	Chambliss	Kind (WI)	Shimkus
DeGette	LaTourette	Shuster	DeLauro	McKinney		Chenoweth	King (NY)	Shuster
DeLay	Lazio	Sisisky	Flake	Neal		Christensen	Kingston	Sisisky
Deutsch	Leach	Skeen				Coble	Klug	Skeen
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Slaughter				Coburn	Knollenberg	Smith (MI)
Dickey	Lewis (KY)	Smith (MI)				Collins	Kolbe	Smith (NJ)
Doolittle	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)				Combest	LaHood	Smith (OR)
Doyle	Livingston	Smith (OR)				Condit	Largent	Smith (TX)
Dreier	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)				Cook	Latham	Smith, Linda
Duncan	Lucas	Smith, Linda				Cooksey	LaTourette	Snowbarger
Dunn	Maloney (CT)	Snowbarger				Cox	Lazio	Solomon
Ehlers	Maloney (NY)	Solomon				Crane	Leach	Spence
Ehrlich	Manton	Souder				Crapo	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Emerson	Manzullo	Spence				Cunningham	Lewis (KY)	Stenholm
Engel	Martinez	Stearns				Davis (VA)	Linder	Strickland
English	Mascara	Stenholm				Deal	Livingston	Stump
Ensign	McCarthy (MO)	Strickland				DeLay	LoBiondo	Sununu
Etheridge	McCarthy (NY)	Stump				Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Talent
Everett	McCollum	Stupak				Dickey	Manzullo	Tauzin
Ewing	McCrery	Sununu				Doolittle	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Fawell	McDade	Talent				Dreier	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Foley	McHale	Tanner				Duncan	McCrery	Thomas
Forbes	McHugh	Tauscher				Dunn	McDade	Thornberry
Fossella	McInnis	Tauzin				Ehlers	McHugh	Thune
Fowler	McIntosh	Taylor (MS)				Ehrlich	McInnis	Tiahrt
Fox	McIntyre	Taylor (NC)				Emerson	McIntosh	Tierney
Franks (NJ)	McKeon	Thomas				English	McIntyre	Trafficant
Frelinghuysen	McNulty	Thompson				Ensign	McKeon	Turner
Frost	Meek	Thornberry				Eshoo	Metcalf	Upton
Gallegly	Menendez	Thune				Everett	Mica	Walsh
Ganske	Metcalf	Tiahrt				Ewing	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Gekas	Mica	Torres				Fawell	Moran (KS)	Watkins
Gephardt	Miller (FL)	Towns				Foley	Morella	Watts (OK)
Gibbons	Mollohan	Trafficant				Forbes	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Gilchrest	Moran (KS)	Turner				Fossella	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)
Gilman	Myrick	Upton				Fowler	Neumann	Weller
Goode	Nadler	Walsh				Fox	Ney	White
Goodlatte	Nethercutt	Wamp				Franks (NJ)	Northup	Whitfield
Goodling	Neumann	Watkins				Frelinghuysen	Norwood	Wicker
Goss	Ney	Watts (OK)				Gallegly	Nussle	Wolf
Graham	Northup	Weldon (FL)				Ganske	Oxley	Young (AK)
Granger	Norwood	Weldon (PA)				Gekas	Packard	Young (FL)
Green	Nussle	Weller				Gibbons	Pappas	
Gutierrez	Ortiz	Wexler						
Gutknecht	Owens	Weygand						
Hall (OH)	Oxley	White						
Hall (TX)	Packard	Whitfield						
Hansen	Pallone	Wicker						
Hastert	Pappas	Wise						
Hastings (FL)	Parker	Wolf						
Hastings (WA)	Pascrell	Young (AK)						
Hayworth	Pease	Young (FL)						
Hefley								

NAYS—116

Ackerman	Archer	Barrett (WI)
Allen	Baldacci	Becerra

NOT VOTING—16

□ 2043

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Riley for, with Ms. McKinney against.

Messrs. RUSH, HOYER, DELAHUNT, WYNN, HINCHEY, and MOAKLEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. DOGGETT changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. NADLER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 175, not voting 13, as follows:

Ackerman	Blumenauer	Conyers
Allen	Bonior	Costello
Andrews	Borski	Coyne
Baldacci	Boucher	Cramer
Barcia	Brown (CA)	Cummings
Barrett (WI)	Brown (FL)	Danner
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Davis (FL)
Bentsen	Cardin	Davis (IL)
Berman	Clay	DeFazio
Berry	Clayton	DeGette
Bishop	Clement	Delahunt
Blagojevich	Clyburn	DeLauro

Dellums	Kildee	Payne
Deutsch	Kilpatrick	Pelosi
Dicks	Klecza	Peterson (MN)
Dingell	Klink	Pickett
Dixon	Kucinich	Pomeroy
Doggett	LaFalce	Poshard
Dooley	Lampson	Price (NC)
Doyle	Lantos	Rahall
Edwards	Levin	Rangel
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Reyes
Etheridge	Lipinski	Rodriguez
Evans	Lofgren	Roemer
Farr	Lowey	Rothman
Fattah	Luther	Roybal-Allard
Fazio	Maloney (CT)	Rush
Filner	Maloney (NY)	Sanchez
Ford	Manton	Sanders
Frank (MA)	Markey	Sawyer
Frost	Martinez	Schumer
Furse	Mascara	Scott
Gejdenson	Matsui	Serrano
Gephardt	McCarthy (MO)	Skaggs
Gordon	McDermott	Skelton
Green	McGovern	Slaughter
Gutierrez	McHale	Smith, Adam
Hall (OH)	McNulty	Snyder
Hamilton	Meehan	Spratt
Harman	Meek	Stabenow
Hastings (FL)	Menendez	Stark
Hefner	Millender-	Stupak
Hilliard	McDonald	Tanner
Hinchev	Miller (CA)	Tauscher
Hinojosa	Minge	Thompson
Holden	Mink	Thurman
Hooley	Moakley	Torres
Hoyer	Mollohan	Towns
Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)	Velazquez
Jackson-Lee	Murtha	Vento
(TX)	Nadler	Visclosky
Jefferson	Oberstar	Waters
Johnson (WI)	Obey	Watt (NC)
Johnson, E. B.	Olver	Waxman
Kanjorski	Ortiz	Wexler
Kaptur	Owens	Weygand
Kennedy (MA)	Pallone	Wise
Kennedy (RI)	Pascrell	Woolsey
Kennelly	Pastor	Wynn

NOT VOTING—13

Carson	McKinney	Souder
Cubin	Neal	Stokes
Flake	Riley	Yates
Foglietta	Sabo	
Gonzalez	Schiff	

□ 2103

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2621, RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT AUTHORITIES ACT OF 1997

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-386) on the resolution (H. Res. 309) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2621) to extend trade authorities procedures with respect to reciprocal trade agreements, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gejdenson moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 91, noes 321, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 603]

AYES—91

Andrews	Frost	Olver
Barrett (WI)	Furse	Owens
Becerra	Gejdenson	Pallone
Berry	Gephardt	Pastor
Blumenauer	Gillmor	Payne
Bonior	Harman	Pelosi
Borski	Hilleary	Peterson (MN)
Brown (CA)	Hinchev	Pickett
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Pitts
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Clement	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Clyburn	Johnson, Sam	Sabo
Conyers	Kennedy (RI)	Sanchez
Davis (FL)	Kennelly	Scott
DeFazio	Kilpatrick	Skelton
DeGette	LaFalce	Slaughter
Delahunt	Lantos	Smith, Adam
DeLauro	Levin	Spratt
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Dicks	Markey	Stupak
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson
Doggett	McDermott	Thurman
Doolittle	McIntyre	Torres
Engel	McNulty	Towns
Eshoo	Meek	Velazquez
Evans	Menendez	Waxman
Farr	Miller (CA)	Weygand
Fattah	Mink	Wise
Fazio	Moakley	Woolsey
Filner	Murtha	
Frank (MA)	Obey	

NOES—321

Abercrombie	Cardin	Forbes
Ackerman	Castle	Ford
Aderholt	Chabot	Fossella
Allen	Chambliss	Fowler
Archer	Chenoweth	Fox
Armey	Christensen	Franks (NJ)
Bachus	Clay	Frelinghuysen
Baesler	Clayton	Gallely
Baker	Coble	Ganske
Baldacci	Coburn	Gekas
Ballenger	Combest	Gibbons
Barr	Condit	Gilchrest
Barrett (NE)	Cook	Gilman
Bartlett	Cooksey	Goode
Barton	Costello	Goodlatte
Bass	Cox	Goodling
Bateman	Coyne	Gordon
Bentsen	Cramer	Goss
Bereuter	Crane	Graham
Berman	Crapo	Granger
Bilbray	Cummings	Green
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Greenwood
Bishop	Danner	Gutierrez
Blagojevich	Davis (IL)	Gutknecht
Bliley	Davis (VA)	Hall (OH)
Blunt	Deal	Hall (TX)
Boehlert	DeLay	Hamilton
Boehner	Dellums	Hansen
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart	Hastert
Bono	Dickey	Hastings (FL)
Boswell	Dixon	Hastings (WA)
Boucher	Dooley	Hayworth
Boyd	Doyle	Hefley
Brady	Dreier	Hefner
Bryant	Duncan	Heger
Bunning	Dunn	Hill
Burr	Edwards	Hilliard
Burton	Ehlers	Hinojosa
Buyer	Ehrlich	Hobson
Callahan	Emerson	Hoekstra
Calvert	English	Holden
Camp	Ensign	Hooley
Campbell	Etheridge	Horn
Canady	Fawell	Hostettler
Cannon	Foley	Houghton

Hulshof	Metcalf	Saxton
Hunter	Mica	Scarborough
Hutchinson	Millender-	Schaefer, Dan
Hyde	McDonald	Schaffer, Bob
Inglis	Miller (FL)	Schumer
Istook	Minge	Sensenbrenner
Jackson-Lee	Mollohan	Serrano
(TX)	Moran (KS)	Sessions
Jenkins	Moran (VA)	Shadegg
John	Morella	Shaw
Johnson (CT)	Myrick	Shays
Johnson (WI)	Nadler	Sherman
Jones	Nethercutt	Shimkus
Kanjorski	Neumann	Shuster
Kaptur	Ney	Sisisky
Kasich	Northup	Skaggs
Kelly	Norwood	Skeen
Kennedy (MA)	Nussle	Smith (MI)
Kildee	Oberstar	Smith (NJ)
Kim	Ortiz	Smith (OR)
Kind (WI)	Oxley	Smith (TX)
King (NY)	Packard	Smith, Linda
Kingston	Pappas	Snowbarger
Klecza	Parker	Snyder
Klink	Pascrell	Solomon
Klug	Paul	Spence
Knollenberg	Paxon	Stabenow
Kolbe	Pease	Stearns
Kucinich	Peterson (PA)	Stenholm
LaHood	Petri	Stokes
Lampson	Pickering	Strickland
Largent	Pombo	Stump
Latham	Pomeroy	Sununu
LaTourette	Porter	Talent
Lazio	Portman	Tanner
Leach	Poshard	Tauscher
Lewis (CA)	Price (NC)	Tauzin
Lewis (KY)	Pryce (OH)	Taylor (MS)
Linder	Quinn	Taylor (NC)
Lipinski	Radanovich	Thomas
Livingston	Rahall	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Ramstad	Thune
Lofgren	Rangel	Tiahrt
Lowey	Redmond	Tierney
Lucas	Regula	Trafficant
Luther	Reyes	Turner
Maloney (CT)	Riggs	Upton
Maloney (NY)	Rivers	Visclosky
Manton	Rodriguez	Walsh
Manzullo	Roemer	Wamp
Martinez	Rogan	Waters
Mascara	Rogers	Watkins
Matsui	Rohrabacher	Watt (NC)
McCarthy (MO)	Ros-Lehtinen	Watts (OK)
McCollum	Rothman	Weldon (FL)
McCrary	Roukema	Weller
McDade	Royce	Wexler
McGovern	Ryun	White
McHale	Salmon	Wicker
McHugh	Sanders	Wolf
McInnis	Sandlin	Wynn
McIntosh	Sanford	Young (FL)
McKeon	Sawyer	

NOT VOTING—21

Barcia	Foglietta	Schiff
Carson	Gonzalez	Souder
Collins	Jefferson	Vento
Cubin	McKinney	Weldon (PA)
Everett	Meehan	Whitfield
Ewing	Neal	Yates
Flake	Riley	Young (AK)

□ 2121

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1202

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 1202.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BLUNT]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMUNIST CHINA SUBSIDY
REDUCTION ACT OF 1997

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

H.R. 2605

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) regarding international financial institutions—

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

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

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

Title XV of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 2620—2620-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

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

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

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

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

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

H.R. 2605

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) regarding international financial institutions—

(A) despite the People's Republic of China's access to international capital and world financial markets, international financial institutions have annually provided it with more than \$4,000,000,000 in loans in recent

years, amounting to almost a third of the loan commitments of the Asian Development Bank and 17.1 percent of the loan approvals by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in 1995; and

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

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

Title XV of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 2620—2620-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(d) REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.—

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

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

(e) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—
(1) the term "industrial cooperation project" refers to a for-profit activity the business operations of which employ more than 25 individuals or have assets greater than \$25,000; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is also one of the easiest votes we should have in this Congress during this nine-bill presentation here today. How in the world could we ever justify, morally that is,

making easy money loans funded by American workers and American taxpayers to the government of this totalitarian dictatorship that kills its own people, is engaged in a massive military buildup, and which happens to despise the United States of America? That massive military buildup is being paid for by these free-interest loans that we are giving them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2130

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The fifth and final reason to oppose these loans is that they are just plain immoral. Let us remember that no matter the fancy title of the project, whether it is to be poverty reduction or

sustainable development, these loans go to the Government of Communist China. Yes, these loans go to the butchers of Beijing. It is a moral outrage to sit here and see this continue to happen year after year after year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I would urge support of the bill.

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

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

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

As tomorrow I will oppose so-called fast track authority because I think it

is constitutionally unenforceable for Congress to give up its power to amend a bill, I think it is also inappropriate for us to infringe on the authority of the Chief Executive to implement United States foreign policy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2145

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to offer a motion to recommit. I am going to offer a motion to recommit to try to do what is right, not for the big bosses who go to the teas and the coffees at

the White House, or who give phoney loans to the other political party so that they can kind of process it through and use it during their elections, because they really have tainted both political parties, I mean let us be honest with each other. That is what they have done and they have not done it for our benefit, they did it for theirs.

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

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

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

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

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

They put their constituents ahead of what was best for the Speaker of the House.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2200

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

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

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

where they are not made to be fools. People know that when it is happening.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me, and I never want to do this, but let me admonish my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR], a little bit. All of these bills were put together on a bipartisan nature. That is why they are middle of the road. Believe me, on

all nine of these bills I had tougher measures, but the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and others objected to them. We made the decision to only put out the bills that were agreed to on a bipartisan basis. All nine are bipartisan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the Chinese. This is what should be done.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I know this is not germane, and I know there are going to be some par-

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2215

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

sold \$6.75 billion worth of U.S.-dollar-denominated bonds.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF MISSISSIPPI

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

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

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

□ 2230

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as I said, every bill that we have voted on is trying to affect Chinese policy. This bill is asking the Secretary of the Treasury to take steps to affect Chinese policy. My amendment

asks the Secretary of the Treasury to take substantial, realistic steps to affect Chinese policy. We are only going to get one last chance this session to do something substantive. As I have pointed out, the Committee on Rules has voted against bills that they are cosponsors of.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Members of this House to do what each of us begged for the opportunity to do every other year, and, that is, stand up for the rights of the American citizens, to strike a blow against the thugs when we get the chance. Tonight we have a chance. Tonight we can decide that we will have some lame excuse and go back and tell the constituents of each of our individual districts, that, "Dog-gone it, we couldn't do anything about those Chinese thugs because the Rules Committee said we weren't germane."

Or we can say that there are some things more important than the rules of the House in the integrity of this Nation, simple things like right and wrong, simple fairness for the American working people. That is more important than the rules of the House that can be changed at any moment. That is what I am asking Members of this body to vote on, and that is why I am asking Members to vote against tabling this motion and then turn around to vote for this motion to recommit so that all of these things that have done nothing will at least be followed up by a measure that does something for the people of America and gets the attention of the thugs in Peking.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

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

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

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

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

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

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. COX OF CALIFORNIA

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

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

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

[Roll No. 604]

YEAS—220

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

NAYS—192

Abercrombie	Brown (CA)	DeLauro
Ackerman	Brown (FL)	Dellums
Allen	Brown (OH)	Deutsch
Andrews	Cardin	Dicks
Baesler	Clay	Dingell
Baldacci	Clayton	Doggett
Barcia	Clement	Dooley
Barrett (WI)	Clyburn	Doyle
Becerra	Condit	Edwards
Bentsen	Conyers	Engel
Berman	Costello	Eshoo
Berry	Coyne	Etheridge
Bishop	Cramer	Evans
Blagojevich	Cummings	Farr
Blumenauer	Danner	Fattah
Bonior	Davis (FL)	Fazio
Borski	Davis (IL)	Filner
Boswell	DeFazio	Ford
Boucher	DeGette	Frank (MA)
Boyd	Delahunt	Frost

Furse	Maloney (NY)	Roybal-Allard
Gejdenson	Manton	Rush
Goode	Markey	Sabo
Gordon	Martinez	Sanchez
Green	Mascara	Sanders
Gutierrez	Matsui	Sandlin
Hall (OH)	McCarthy (MO)	Sawyer
Hall (TX)	McCarthy (NY)	Schumer
Harman	McDermott	Scott
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Serrano
Hefner	McHale	Sherman
Hilliard	McIntyre	Sisisky
Hinchey	McNulty	Skelton
Hinojosa	Meehan	Slaughter
Holden	Meek	Smith, Adam
Hooley	Menendez	Snyder
Hoyer	Minge	Spratt
Jackson (IL)	Mink	Stabenow
Jackson-Lee	Moakley	Stenholm
(TX)	Mollohan	Stokes
Jefferson	Moran (VA)	Strickland
John	Murtha	Stupak
Johnson (WI)	Nadler	Tanner
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Tauscher
Kanjorski	Obey	Taylor (MS)
Kaptur	Olver	Thompson
Kennedy (MA)	Ortiz	Thurman
Kennedy (RI)	Owens	Tierney
Kennelly	Pallone	Torres
Kildee	Pascrell	Towns
Kilpatrick	Pastor	Traficant
Kind (WI)	Payne	Turner
Klecza	Pelosi	Velazquez
Klink	Peterson (MN)	Vento
Kucinich	Pickett	Visclosky
LaFalce	Pomeroy	Waters
Lampson	Poshard	Watt (NC)
Lantos	Price (NC)	Waxman
Levin	Rahall	Wexler
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Weygand
Lipinski	Reyes	Wise
Lofgren	Rivers	Woolsey
Lowey	Rodriguez	Wynn
Luther	Roemer	
Maloney (CT)	Rothman	

NOT VOTING—21

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

□ 2256

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

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

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 605]

AYES—354

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

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Ensign
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Fattah
Fawell
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman

Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCreery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon

McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalfe
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshards
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak

Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres

Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)

Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—59

Ackerman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Blagojevich
Brown (CA)
Campbell
Castle
Conyers
Coyne
Davis (FL)
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Engel
English
Eshoo
Ewing
Farr
Fazio

NOT VOTING—20

Carson
Cubin
Dixon
Flake
Foglietta
Gephardt
Gonzalez

Furse
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Hastert
Hinchev
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lofgren
Lowey
Manzullo
McDermott
Meeke
Millender-
McDonald
Minge
Mink
Moran (VA)

Rush
Schiff
Smith (OR)
Stark
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2316

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

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

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

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

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

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

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

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

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

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

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

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

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

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

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

Wessington Springs, South Dakota) [MM Docket No. 96-124, RM-8813, RM-8864] received October 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5791. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and RECORDS Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (New London, Iowa) [MM Docket No. 97-148, RM-9088] received October 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5792. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and RECORDS Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Levan, Oakley, Utah and Green River, Wyoming) [MM Docket No. 96-230, RM-8911, RM-9049] received October 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5793. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with New Zealand (Transmittal No. DTC-125-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

5794. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Canada (Transmittal No. DTC-131-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

5795. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Germany (Transmittal No. DTC-128-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

5796. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting a consolidated report on audit and investigative coverage required by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5797. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting a consolidated report on audit and investigative coverage required by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5798. A letter from the Executive Director, Japan-United States Friendship Commission, transmitting the FY 1997 report pursuant to the Inspector General Act Amendment of 1988 and the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5799. A letter from the Acting Associate Administrator for Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting NASA's 1998 Strategic Plan, pursuant to Public Law 103-62; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5800. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, transmitting the FY 1997 report pursuant to the Inspector General Act and the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5801. A letter from the Independent Counsel, Office of Independent Counsel, transmitting the FY 1997 report pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5802. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the annual report providing information on the FY 1997 activities of the agency's formal management control review program, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5803. A letter from the Director, The President's Crime Prevention Council, transmitting a consolidated annual report required by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5804. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Tax Treatment of Cafeteria Plans [TD 8738] (RIN: 1545-AV43) received November 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5805. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the triennial report on the present state of knowledge of the Earth's upper atmosphere, pursuant to Public Law 101-549; jointly to the Committees on Science and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2283. A bill to expand the boundaries of Arches National Park in the State of Utah to include portions of the following drainages, Salt Wash, Lost Spring Canyon, Fish Sheep Draw, Clover Canyon, Cordova Canyon, Mine Draw, and Cottonwood Wash, which are currently under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and to include a portion of Fish Sheep Draw, which is currently owned by the State of Utah; with an amendment (Rept. 105-385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 309. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2621) to extend trade authorities procedures with respect to reciprocal trade agreements, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-386). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of Rule X and clause 4 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. GINGRICH):

H.R. 2832. A bill concerning United States policy with respect to Jerusalem as the capital of Israel; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. GINGRICH):

H.R. 2833. A bill to amend the Anglo-Irish Agreement Support Act of 1986 to require

compliance with principles of economic justice under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LATOURETTE (for himself and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 2834. A bill to permit the city of Cleveland, Ohio, to convey certain lands that the United States conveyed to the city; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 2835. A bill to amend the Act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 2836. A bill to designate the building of the United States Postal Service located at 180 East Kellogg Boulevard in Saint Paul, Minnesota, as the "Eugene J. McCarthy Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia):

H.R. 2837. A bill to reform the naturalization process, to clarify the procedures for investigating the criminal background of individuals submitting applications in connection with certain benefits under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2838. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional protections for taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 2839. A bill to improve the quality of child care provided through Federal facilities and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on House Oversight, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. JOHN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. LARGENT):

H.R. 2840. A bill to provide Government-wide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky:

H.R. 2841. A bill to extend the time required for the construction of a hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 2842. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to allow leave for parent-teacher conferences; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, and House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BLUNT):

H.R. 2843. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to reevaluate the equipment in medical kits carried on, and to make a decision regarding requiring automatic external

defibrillators to be carried on, aircraft operated by air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FAZIO of California (for himself and Mr. DOOLEY of California):

H.R. 2844. A bill to amend provisions of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 that relate to timber sales, to provide more equitable payments to States for the benefit of counties in which national forests are situated; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2845. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to provide that daylight savings time end on the first Sunday after the first Monday in November each year; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. KASICH):

H.R. 2846. A bill to prohibit spending Federal education funds on national testing without explicit and specific legislation; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mr. WELLER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON):

H.R. 2847. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. REYES, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. FORD, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. KLINK, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BENTSEN):

H.R. 2848. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require the arbitration of initial contract negotiation disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself and Mr. KASICH):

H.R. 2849. A bill to provide for the establishment of demonstration projects designed to determine the social, civic, psychological, and economic effects of providing to individuals and families with limited means an opportunity to accumulate assets, and to determine the extent to which an asset-based policy may be used to enable individuals and families with limited means to achieve economic self-sufficiency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FROST, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. LUTHER, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. KIND of Wisconsin):

H.R. 2850. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to require better reporting of unidentified persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut:

H.R. 2851. A bill to prohibit application of a payment limit to a drug or biological

under part B of the Medicare Program based on a less costly alternative for courses of treatment begun before the change in payment; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2852. A bill to amend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve and strengthen the recruitment and training of American teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2853. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to set aside all entrance fees, special use fees, and concession fees from the National Park System into a National Park Capital Improvement Fund at the Department of the Treasury, and to secure bonds for particular, high-priority capital improvements to the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LATOURETTE (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GREEN, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii):

H.R. 2854. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require group health plans and group and individual health insurance coverage to provide post-delivery follow-up care for mothers and newborns discharged less than 48 hours following a vaginal delivery or less than 96 following a delivery by cesarean section; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2855. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the installation of the collision avoidance system known as TCAS-II on large cargo aircraft; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H.R. 2856. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue regulations relating to recirculation of fresh air in commercial aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 2857. A bill to suspend the duty on 2,6-Dimethyl-m-Dioxan-4-ol Acetate until January 1, 2001; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ (for himself, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 2858. A bill to provide for an increase in pay and allowances for members of the uniformed services for fiscal year 1998, to improve certain authorities relating to the pay and allowance and the health care of such

members, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for military construction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. BOB SCHAEFFER (for himself, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, Mr. SKAGGS, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 2859. A bill to prohibit commercial air tours over the Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 2860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to use 50 percent of any Federal budget surplus in the general fund for reductions in Social Security taxes and to provide that the remainder of the surplus shall be used to increase discretionary non-defense spending and to reduce the outstanding public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 2861. A bill to improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TRAFICANT (for himself and Mr. NEY):

H.R. 2862. A bill to direct the Capitol Police Board to establish a pay scale and benefit package for members and civilian employees of the United States Capitol Police equivalent to the pay scale and benefit package applicable to members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 2863. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to clarify restrictions under that Act on baiting, to facilitate acquisition of migratory bird habitat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GREENWOOD (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. MANTON, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. LANTOS):

H.J. Res. 99. A joint resolution expressing the appreciation of Congress and the American people for the service performed during World War I and World War II by members of the Navy who were assigned as gun crews on board merchant ships as part of the Naval Armed Guard Service; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. JONES:

H.J. Res. 100. A joint resolution commending the personnel who served in the United States Navy Asiatic Fleet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. LUTHER:

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the motion picture industry should work to discourage tobacco use among our youth; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H. Res. 310. A resolution calling on the Emir of Kuwait to provide funds for research, diagnosis, treatment, and compensation relating to injuries and illnesses suffered by United States veterans who served

in the Persian Gulf War; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 38: Mr. COLLINS.
 H.R. 47: Mr. SALMON.
 H.R. 164: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. LAFALCE.
 H.R. 264: Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 303: Ms. DANNER.
 H.R. 367: Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.
 H.R. 550: Mr. BONIOR.
 H.R. 633: Mr. CARDIN.
 H.R. 738: Mr. FLAKE.
 H.R. 746: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 806: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. DINGELL.
 H.R. 851: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. FURSE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. STARK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 902: Mr. EWING, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BASS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. FAWELL.
 H.R. 915: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 919: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 953: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 965: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. FAWELL.
 H.R. 971: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 979: Mrs. THURMAN.
 H.R. 981: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 992: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.
 H.R. 1054: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. LAZIO of New York.
 H.R. 1114: Mr. MCCREY.
 H.R. 1126: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. PAPPAS.
 H.R. 1129: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. SPRATT.
 H.R. 1146: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 1147: Mr. SAM JOHNSON.
 H.R. 1173: Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 1176: Mr. WEYGAND.
 H.R. 1195: Mr. GILLMOR.
 H.R. 1215: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 1334: Mr. CLYBURN.
 H.R. 1376: Ms. FURSE.
 H.R. 1378: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. CANNON.
 H.R. 1425: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 1432: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1481: Mr. MCHUGH.
 H.R. 1507: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1525: Mrs. MORELLA.
 H.R. 1666: Mr. SALMON.
 H.R. 1737: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1749: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. YATES, and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 1800: Mr. GUTKNECHT.
 H.R. 1828: Mr. SALMON.
 H.R. 1873: Mr. HORN.
 H.R. 2124: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. GOODE.
 H.R. 2174: Mr. FILNER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GEJDENSON.
 H.R. 2183: Mr. GOODLING, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. LUTHER.
 H.R. 2202: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. JENKINS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. VENTO.
 H.R. 2231: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON.
 H.R. 2252: Mrs. THURMAN.
 H.R. 2273: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 2290: Mr. MARTINEZ.
 H.R. 2321: Mr. HULSHOF.
 H.R. 2382: Mr. CLYBURN.
 H.R. 2456: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 2457: Ms. SANCHEZ.
 H.R. 2462: Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 2468: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 2485: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 2488: Mr. GREEN.
 H.R. 2492: Mr. Gutierrez.
 H.R. 2495: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. EDWARDS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 2509: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 2526: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 2553: Mr. TORRES.
 H.R. 2593: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. HILL, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KOLBE, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. FARR of California.
 H.R. 2596: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 2597: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 2611: Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. ROGAN.

H.R. 2631: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. LAFALCE.
 H.R. 2671: Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 2693: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.
 H.R. 2697: Mr. TURNER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. GREEN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LAMPSON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. FOWLER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DIXON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. FURSE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. ESHOO, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 2699: Mr. MATSUI.
 H.R. 2717: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 2718: Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 2733: Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BRADY, Mr. COBURN, Ms. FURSE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 2748: Mr. MCHUGH.
 H.R. 2761: Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H.R. 2795: Mr. BEREUTER.
 H.R. 2804: Ms. CARSON.
 H.R. 2805: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 2829: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALLAHAN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. KLINK, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MASCARA, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. POSHARD, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.J. Res. 83: Mr. NORWOOD.
 H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. FARR of California.
 H. Con. Res. 150: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. MCHUGH.
 H. Con. Res. 152: Mr. BORSKI.
 H. Res. 267: Mr. NEUMAN and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1202: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2198: Mr. ARMEY.