The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 352, nays 53, answered “present” 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Table of representatives voting]

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress does not approve the extension of the authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 recommended by the President to the Congress on June 3, 1999, with respect to the People’s Republic of China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Gillmor). Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 22, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Archer) and a Member in support of the joint resolution each will control 1½ hours.

Is the gentleman from California (Mr. Stark) in favor of the joint resolution?

Mr. STARK. I am in favor of the joint resolution, [PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY]

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Traficant) will state his inquiry.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, if all of these Members who are controlling time favor normal trade relations for China, I would ask unanimous consent to control half of the time on this side in opposition to normal trade relations for China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman from Ohio that the time has already been divided, half in favor and half opposed to the joint resolution.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on House Joint Resolution 57.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Rangel) in opposition to the joint resolution, and that he be permitted to yield further blocks of time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield one-half of my time in support of the joint resolution to the gentleman from California (Mr. Rohrabacher), and that in turn, he be allowed to yield blocks of that time so yielded.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield half of my time in support of the joint resolution to the gentleman from California (Mr. Rohrabacher), and a Member in support of the joint resolution each will be recognized for 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Archer).
Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution, which would cut off normal trade relations between the U.S. and China.

The relationship between China and the U.S. is very fragile now, as we all know, perhaps more fragile than ever. A number of developments have contributed to the precarious position in which we find ourselves today: the concern about Chinese espionage, escalating tensions between China and Taiwan, the mistaken bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade, and more recently, the repression of Chinese civilians who practice their faith.

In no way should we discount the gravity of these developments, nor their impact on the U.S.-China relations. Rather, we should respect the significance of each and resolve to improve the situation. We should certainly not take steps that would cause relations to deteriorate even further, lest we risk far greater consequences for America, for China, and for the entire world in the future.

Mr. Speaker, denying normal trade relations to China at this volatile stage would be such a step, and that is why I strongly oppose this resolution. House Joint Resolution 57 would subject all Chinese imports to prohibitive duty rates averaging about 44 percent. Of our 234 trading partners, only six, countries such as Cuba, Laos, and North Korea, receive this exclusionary tariff treatment.

As a practical matter, China would likely retaliate with mirror sanctions against U.S. exports of goods and services to China totalling $18 billion and growing. Exports to China support 200,000 U.S. jobs. These are higher paid jobs, paying about 15 to 18 percent above the average manufacturing wage.

American firms and workers have competitors in Japan and Europe with a keen interest in this dynamic market. China's infrastructure needs require a total of $744 billion over the next decade, including transportation, power, communication, and many, many other services. They must be sourced abroad. Japan and Europe will be more than happy to replace the United States as a reliable supplier to China, capturing the business Americans would be forced to forfeit.

The question is, who will be hurt? The answer is, not the Chinese. It will be American workers losing high-paid manufacturing jobs.

House Joint Resolution 57 penalizes U.S. consumers, as well. China supplies low-priced consumer goods such as toys and games, apparel, shoes, and simple electronics. Americans, particularly those in lower-income brackets, depend on access to these reasonably priced items for their families, to improve their family's standard of living.

Reversing China's NTR status would amount, in effect, to a $300 a year tax increase on the average American family of four. Costs of goods sold as inputs in U.S. factories would also skyrocket, reducing the competitiveness of finished American manufactured products worldwide. The question is: Who will be hurt? The answer is: Not the Chinese, it will be American families.

It is less easy to quantify how dangerous H.J. Res. 57 would be to U.S. national security interests in this tumultuous region of the world. By threatening the Chinese, H.J. Res. 57 would deal a devastating blow to the people of Hong Kong as they struggle to maintain their way of life and autonomy following the territory's reversion to China. Taiwan's economy, too, would suffer with severe disruption. Securing Chinese cooperation on dangerous issues such as North Korea and the weapons proliferation will never happen without a functioning trade relationship between the U.S. and China.

China is one of the world's oldest and most influential civilizations. I recognize that progress toward a more democratic and open society is slow, agonizing, irregular; but it is common sense to appreciate that China will not respond positively to draconian trade sanctions. Advancement of human rights, religious freedom, and democratic principles will not be achieved if we cut ties completely with the Chinese people.

American political business and religious leaders need to remain engaged in China in order to further our values there. The most valuable American export to China is American ideals. Religious freedom is increasing in China, and we even see free elections in Chinese villages where non-Communist candidates have been elected. The question is: Would this be happening without the impact of Americans and American society on China? The answer is: No, it would not.

The open lines of communication that accompany a basic trade relationship with China support the economic and foreign policy interests of the United States in a strategically important and dangerous region of the world. We cannot undermine U.S. political, economic, and security interests by unraveling the trade relations that benefit both countries. We cannot turn our backs on the Chinese people who compromise one-fifth of the world's population.

I urge a "no" vote on H.J. Res. 57.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to distribute it as he sees fit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I oppose renewing normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China. Indeed, it may be among the world's oldest civilizations, but today those wonderful people are lead by barbarous fascists.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, asked: Who is hurt? I can give my colleagues a list of the people that are hurt. Current relationships with China: Millions of Tibetans, 6 million having been killed since the Chinese occupation in 1949; 2,000 political prisoners, these just religious dissidents; 30 to 40 million human rights abuse victims; people who cannot live with Hong Kong, with children; women pregnant outside of family planning rules have been abducted and forced to have sterilization.

The inhumane treatment of human beings in China is documented over and over and over again. As far as national security, it has been documented recently by the Cox committee that China is stealing military secrets from us in preparation for nuclear war and has violated the proliferation and non-proliferation agreements and does not deserve our trade relationship.

Whatever help may go to Boeing and Hewlett-Packard and whoever wants to sell a bunch of roame planes and airplanes to China is paid for by the blood and sweat that makes the cheap T-shirts and cheap shoes that are sold by Wal-Mart and others who import the slave labor produced goods.

We cannot continue this. This is just a matter of will Americans do business with murderers, with torturers, with child molesters, with people who are being lead by leaders who have no spark of humanity. This cannot go on.

The only message they understand is profit. They care not one whit for decency. The only thing we can do is cut into our profit at some small risk to the richest manufacturing companies in this country. Let us make a statement for human rights. Let us make a statement for childhood suffrage. Let us make a statement for decency. Let us make a statement for all the American values and suggest that we are rich enough and strong enough that we can deal with China: millions of Americans, 30 to 40 million human rights abuse victims, millions of people who are hurt.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu), one of the leading Members of the freshman class of the House of Representatives in the Democratic Caucus who has much experience and knowledge in this area.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the first Chinese American to stand in this House, as a trade and international trade lawyer, I People who are all free to negotiate. But special responsibilities run deep in this House, because the Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled almost
Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the author of this legislation that we are discussing today, I dedicate this bill to Ginetta Sagan, a champion of human rights, who has inspired me for many, many years.

The legislation we are talking about will deny normal trade relations, formerly Most Favored Nation status, to Communist China. This preferential trade status should not be granted to a despotic regime. It should not be granted to regimes that are engaged in aggression, militarism, and a systematic abuse of human rights of their own people.

I certainly disagree with the last speaker who suggested that the United States of America is in some way morally equivalent to this dastardly, tyrannical regime, the world’s worst human rights abuser. By ignoring the nature of the Communist regime that rules China with an iron hand we are doing no favor to the Chinese people. We are doing no favor to the Chinese people.

Mr. Speaker, we will be told time and again during this debate that bestowing this preferential trade status on Communist China will tend to civilize the Chinese people and moderate the ruler-like rulers there. All empirical evidence suggests the opposite. Since Tiananmen Square 10 years ago, which was a massacre of democracy advocates that the Beijing regime still denies, but since then the Chinese regime continues in Tibet and the repression throughout China has escalated.

We have just heard today someone say that freedom of religion has never been greater in China. Yet, in fact, in the last few weeks a new generation of victims are being rounded up and brutalized, many disappearing into the Lao Gai prison camps, which are the Chinese version of the Nazi concentration camps, or the gulag system of the former Soviet Union. Victims are part of a meditation and exercise movement, a religious minority based purely on Chinese cultural and spiritual traditions. This has grown to some 70 million practitioners, including some members of the Communist party and their families.

Yet these innocent people, who have no political agenda, have now joined the Tibetans, the Chinese Muslims, and the Christians, who refused to register in their registered churches, in that they are all becoming enemies of the state.

The leaders of this same tyrannical regime that is persecuting these religious people still boasts in their meetings, and it has been quoted in their last meeting just a month ago, that they will “destroy capitalism.” I think we can read that the United States of America is who they want to destroy.

This is the same regime that is using its annual $70 billion trade surplus, and we are permitting them that trade surplus with our irrational policy that we are talking about today, they are using that to modernize their military. They
are building nuclear-armed missiles based solely on American technology, and stolen American technology, missiles that are aimed at the United States and that could incinerate millions of Americans.

After 10 years of debating this issue in Congress, as their trade surplus with the United States continues to grow, there is absolutely no sign of moderation or liberalization on the mainland of China.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we will hear that China must be given this preferential trade status because we cannot isolate or refuse totrade with this vast potential market. Glassy-eyed businessmen can overlook any crime, shut their ears to any pleas for mercy in their quest for the China market. Well, China is the market of the future, it always has been, and as long as it is under Communist Chinese rule, it always will be. The Communist rulers are playing Americans as saps. Little Taiwan, with its 20 million people, buys more from us than all of mainland China with its 1.2 billion people. So does tiny Singapore.

This debate, no matter how the other side maytrim otherwise, is not about isolating China or cutting it off from trade. Americans will still be free to trade with China at their own risk. But those are the operative words we are talking about today. They will be trading at their own risk. The reason these powerful lobbying forces are pushing for normal trade relations status is that it will permit wealthy financial interests to invest in Communist China with the benefits of subsidies provided by the American taxpayer.

In short, American businessmen will be able to close down their factories in the United States, as they have been doing, and they will be able to move them to China with a subsidy by the taxpayers of the United States of America. And that is what this debate is really all about. Because people will still be free to sell their products over in China, no matter what happens in this particular debate.

This debate is not about free trade. Obviously, it is about subsidy, as I just said. But if it was truly about free trade, I would be on the other side. I believe in free trade. Free trade between free people. What we have is manipulated trade on their side and free trade only for our people. We are pushing the Communist Chinese and their clique that rules that country. It is not free trade; it is just a masking phrase for a totally insane policy that permits huge tariffs on any American product that they are trying to sell into China versus low tariffs on the Chinese products that are flooding into the United States and putting our people out of work.

There has been a short-term profit. Sure, there have been a short-term profit, to a few billionaires in the United States. But it is not in the long-term interest of the American people, who are now in the shadow of Chinese nuclear weapons that are aimed at the United States and our cities.

I am asking my colleagues to join me in changing a policy that is out of control and self-destructive. Our current policy is not good for the American public. It is not good for the Chinese people. It is not making peace more likely, and America's technology is flowing to a regime that is very similar to the Japanese militarists of the 1930s. This is simply emboldening. I just like our trade policy did with the Japanese back in the 1930s we are simply emboldening the bullying boys in Beijing to continue their repression, their aggression, and their belligerency.

This immoral policy of accommodating the Japanese back in the 1930s did not work and did not lead to peace or freedom, and it will not give us peace and freedom in our time. I ask my colleagues to join me in standing up for democracy, for the economic interests of our people, and for a rational, peaceful trade.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have a strong opposition to H.J. Res. 57, which would terminate normal trade relations with China 60 days after enactment. By raising tariffs to the prohibitive levels that applied before 1980, and thereby prompting mirrored retaliation on the part of American businesses, this resolution would precipitate a $18 billion of U.S. exports, this resolution would effectively extinguish trade relations between our two countries.

And for my distinguished colleague and friend from California who was just on the floor, I would remind him that his State exported $2.5 billion, and that translates into roughly 40,000, almost 50,000 domestic jobs that pay, on average, 15 to 20 percent more than most jobs.

During the debate today, proponents of the bill will urge Members to send a signal to China in order to combat the spread of human rights. Unfortunately, revoking normal trade relations is a rash policy that offers no solution to the problems of human rights. Unfortunately, revoking normal trade relations is a rash policy that offers no practical plan for bringing the political and economic change to China that we all seek. I urge my colleagues on this panel to support a more pragmatic policy which acknowledges that a nation of 1.2 billion people is more likely to imitate our powerful example over time than it is to bend as a result of our threats.

My goal in maintaining normal trade relations is to support the continued presence of Americans throughout Chinese society, whether they be entrepreneurs, teachers, religious leaders, or missionaries. And speaking of missionaries, I might note that we had a visit here on the Hill with Ned Graham, Billy Graham's son, and they have been engaged in missionary activity in mainland China for several years and have distributed literally millions of Bibles to the Chinese. They have even contracted with a publishing firm in mainland China to print their Bibles. Thanks would be threatened if we revoked NTR.

Since the economic opening of China by Deng Xiaoping in 1978 and the transition of China from central planned socialism to a more capitalist system, 200 million Chinese citizens have been lifted out of absolute poverty. Likewise, while restrictions on organized religion remain, there has been a marked growth in religious activity in China's long history. The Chinese Government has allowed an unprecedented increase in the ability to own property, a home or a business, to travel and to keep profits. In a few years, more than half of the state-run industries will be privatized.

While preserving NTR trade status offers hope for improving the welfare of the Chinese people, it is also squarely in the U.S. national interest. Revoking NTR would be interpreted by the Chinese as an act of hostility. This would strengthen the hand of those in China who oppose further reform and opening to the West. It would jeopardize China's new willingness to embrace the market-oriented trade disciplines of the WTO as evidenced in the April 8 package of concessions put on the table by Premier Zhu Rongji at the summit meeting with President Clinton.

U.S. negotiators secured progress toward an expansive bilateral market access agreement, along with Chinese commitments to adopt WTO rules relating to such issues as technology transfer, subsidies, product safeguards, and state enterprises. China also agreed to end sanitary and phytosanitary bans on the importation of United States wheat, meat, and citrus products.
If implemented, these commitments could represent substantial new opportunities for U.S. exports to China, because Chinese markets, already huge, will grow even further in areas such as agriculture and information technology.

Unlike any other major trade agreement, this is a one-sided set of concessions. In exchange for steep tariff reductions and wholesale reforms of the Chinese trading system, the United States gives up nothing. At the same time, China overwhelmingly preserves its positive influence over the direction of the turbulent change that is occurring in China.

I urge the administration to get back to the table with the Chinese as soon as possible. The United States has a unique opportunity at this point in time. In my view, the President should have seized this historic opportunity to lock China into a binding WTO agreement. Clearly, a protectionist move to revoke normal trade relations with China would permanently derail the potential WTO deal. History in Asia and the political evolution in China will be entirely different if we allow this deal to slip through our fingers.

Maintaining normal trade relations is in the economic interest of all Americans because it preserves 200,000 U.S. jobs which are directly supported by U.S. exports to China.

My home State of Illinois sold almost a billion dollars of products to China in 1992. These are jobs that pay wages, as I indicated earlier, 15 to 20 percent higher than jobs supported by sales to the domestic market. They would be the first casualties in a war of trade retaliation.

Mr. Speaker, trade is the one area where the mutual advantage for China and the United States is clear; and, for that reason, I strongly urge a "no" vote on H.J. Res. 57.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Bonior) the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I see nothing clear in the advantage of trade with China.

Ten years ago, the Chinese tanks rumbled into Tiananmen Square to crush an historic call for freedom and reform. Despite that danger, many demonstrators stood their ground. Hundreds were beaten; they were arrested; and they were shot.

Now, 10 years later, many of those arrested that grim day are still in prison. One of them, Zhang Shanguang, served 7 years. After Tiananmen Square, he was released, only to be rearrested because he dared to speak out on behalf of laid-off workers.

Just over the past week, Chinese authorities arrested more than 5,000 people solely on the basis of their religious beliefs. They joined countless others already locked away in dark cells and reeducation camps simply because they spoke about their faith or their right to form a union or their right to seek justice in their country.

By any measure, any measure conceivable, this is an abysmal record.

Well, some say we need to give the Chinese authorities more time, we need to give them more time by way of economic incentive to change. We are told to be patient.

Ten years is long enough to see that nothing has changed. In fact, it has gotten worse. The current regime continues to abuse human rights and political rights without the slightest hesitation.

The authorities even arrested a man recently in downtown Beijing for wearing a T-shirt and on the T-shirt were the words "labor rights." They arrested him and threw him in prison for wearing a T-shirt.

Even as we speak, Nike is negotiating a deal with a sweatshop in China that pays teenage girls 16 cents an hour to make gym shoes that sell for $120 a pair. They work 12 hours a day for 16 cents an hour. And they have no power, no power to speak up for a better deal or to organize or no right to basic dignity, no hope at all in this situation they find themselves in.

That is something we do not negotiate about it, unless we use our courage to leverage our economic strength to enact real reform. We could give the people of China a chance to help themselves. Our policy of granting China special trade status no matter what they do year after year has failed.

How long are we going to ignore China's policy of slave labor, of prison labor, of forced abortions, of ethnic persecution, of religious persecution? And what are we ignoring it for? A $57 billion trade deficit?

Now, this really is surreal when we think about it. We sell more to Belgium than we do to over a billion Chinese. So why do we do things in reverse? Well, they asked the right question, a new approach. Let us demand proof of progress before we grant China special trade status.

Let us not, as the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu) so eloquently spoke just a few minutes here, engage in a system of cash register engagement with China. Let us be beyond that. Let us be beyond that. Let us stand for the ideals for which our Founding Fathers came before this country and before the world.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the resolution to deny China MFN status.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 57.

Our relationship with China indeed faces many major problems. The question in each case is whether using this annual review to withdraw NTR will confront the challenges.

I want to focus today on two of these aspects, our trade relationships and our human rights relationships.

First is the trade. Clearly, there are major problems to confront in our trade relationship with China. The large and growing current trade deficit; how we integrate a huge economy that remains nonmarket-based in many vital respects and that does not operate within a clear rule of law into a world trading order based on free market rules and the rule of law.

The fundamental problem of our trade rather than by addressing the structural issues, issues which are helping to create the trade deficit today, which must be addressed as we look at the longer run is that China will increasingly be a competitor to us in a way it has never been before.

By any measure, any measure conceivable, this is an abysmal record. The current trade deficit results, in part, because China restricts market access and because it exploits and manipulates its nonmarket mechanisms, both capital and labor.

It is imperative that we address these problems in negotiations with the Chinese in the bilateral WTO access talks. Some were addressed before the negotiations broke off, but others were not. And they were reasons the U.S. could not sign off on an agreement with the Chinese a few months ago.

The answer on key trade issues is not to withdraw NTR today but to insist on clearly adequate terms and conditions before NTR is granted on a permanent basis. Enactment of today's resolution would bring further trade negotiations with the Chinese to a halt, to a complete halt. It would indeed lower our trade deficit. It would do so by terminating most of our trade rather than by addressing the structural issues, issues which are helping to create the trade deficit today, which must be addressed as we look at the longer run when China will increasingly be a competitor to us in a way it has never been before.

And what is our response today? Well, we say that we will confront China on human rights. The recent suppression even considered.
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The Nation has got a deficit with Japan. The Nation has a $70-billion deficit, and we are in fact threatening the future of each and every one of our constituents and citizens.

I do not know what it is going to take. I do not know what it will wise up until there is a Chinese dragon eating our assets around here. I think that is what it is going to have to take.

I want a reciprocal trade agreement with China, with Japan. Engagement is fine if it is not a one-way toll bridge for America. I think it is time for our committees who have jurisdiction over trade to start bringing out the trade measures. That is the most significant problem facing our country.

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

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution. I oppose these so-called normal trade relations with China.

Trade with communist China is a one-way street. It now exceeds $1 billion a week. Experts say it will exceed $70 billion this year.

I want the Members to know that China, with money from Uncle Sam, is buying attack aircraft, nuclear submarines, and intercontinental ballistic missiles. And we are continuing to simply talk about a trade scenario. Unbelievable.

The record is clear. China has already threatened to nuke Taiwan. And we are now kow towing to China with a one-China policy.

China, as we debate this measure, has 14 intercontinental ballistic missiles pointed at American cities according to the Central Intelligence Agency. China is arming terrorist nations who hate America. And we are today voting again to continue a policy that is anti-American and threatens our national security.

The bottom line of this debate: Congress is financing the greatest threat in our Nation's history.

We have got to be dumb, my colleagues. This is not just a trade matter. This is much more. The records show over the last several years China is spying and buying America right out from under us while Congress is granting Chinese officials gallery passes.

I have heard of all of the trade surpluses. I am sure I am going to hear one from Ohio. Ohio has got a deficit with China.
human rights, on the whole issue of espionage, the trade deficit, one would have to say that our relationship with China is a very difficult one, it is an uncertain one, and it is one that obviously has a lot of ups and downs.

I think it is important to continue on our trade relations with China.

It is somewhat unfortunate that we have this debate tied with trade, because what eventually happens here is the fact that trade continues on and to some extent the comments made by the proponents of trade with China become diminished. We should really highlight the issues of human rights, the whole issue of proliferation, but it should be in a different forum, one in which we can all join together and deal with.

The reason we must continue on trade with China is pretty simple. China is 22 percent of the world population. One out of every five individuals on this planet is Chinese. Over the next 20 or 30 years, China will become one of the most dangerous players in the world if we begin to try to isolate them; or, on the other hand, if we engage the Chinese, perhaps, not certainly but perhaps, we can enter into a period where the U.S. and China and other countries of the free world begin to operate and work together. This is a strategic issue for the United States. This is an important issue for the United States.

Let me address, if I may, the issue of human rights just for a moment in conclusion. Yes, there is political repression in China and there is very little political rights in China. On the other hand, the continuing engagement of the U.S. and other countries with the Chinese, there are probably more personal freedoms than we have ever had. Hopefully that middle class in China will begin to understand that it must, over time, change its own government. That is the key to trade with China and that is the key to make China a more open form of government, along with the open economy it is trying to achieve at this time.

I urge a strong "no" vote on this resolution.

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

Let me again state, this is not about isolating China; this is not about not trading with China. Those arguments are irrelevant. Those arguments are not what this is about. Normal trade relations, by providing this privileged status for Communist China, simply says that if we do not, and I am saying that I am not, and from voting for this resolution we are saying we should not, provides that we can subsidize the investment in China by the American taxpayers.

If my resolution passes today, people will still be able to trade with China all they want. They can sell all their goods, they can try to set up their factories, but they have to do so at their own risk. The reason the business community is supporting this is that is the way they are then, by taking away normal trade relations with China, taking away their right to get government subsidies when they close factories here and set them up in Communist China. It does not isolate China. People can continue in engagement. It is going to subsidize them and subsidize the people who are providing them what they need to build their infrastructure to outcompete us. That makes all the sense in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill for a simple reason. This is not the time to reward or to go with the most favored nation status for China's admission to the World Trade Organization. These intricate trade negotiations and rules that are the stuff of lawyers and government officials are vitally important because prices, product quality, consumer choice, jobs and investments are ultimately tied to trade. Trade with Asia is critical to California's and America's continued economic growth.

The American people have been exposed to China in the last 5 years. Unfortunately, much of this attention has been the negative headlines of espionage, protests against the tragic mistaken bombing of the Chinese embassy in the Hague, Chinese anti-American campaign activities. Though these all deserve to be discussed and examined in full, what has not received enough attention has been the truly revolutionary change sweeping across China.

China is literally revamping its entire economic system, an enormous undertaking. It's the equivalent of the people switching to driving on the other side of the road, repudiating their whole political ideology and changing their economic system all at once. This type of economic and political revolution can't happen overnight. If it did, there could be such instability and shock to the system that redistributed and political repression might reappear. When China tried swift, radical change during the Cultural Revolution and the Great Leap Forward, 80 million people died. But things are changing in China, and mostly for the better. We can be under no illusions about the fact that the Beijing government represents a representative, authoritarian dictatorship. Yet although political rights are largely nonexistent, there is no question that personal freedom is on the rise, due in large part to marketplace engagement.

Year after year, the United States has extended normal trading relations to China. The objections of those who think that curtailing trade will solve our problems with China. I have never understood the argument that limiting Chinese interaction with America's vibrant free market, democratic institutions and renowned individual spirit of free enterprise would somehow strengthen democratic activists and weaken entrenched leaders. Trade with China is profit or reward that should be given and taken away; it is a crucial tool needed to foster change in the Chinese system that retrenchment, bloodshed and important countries on opposite sides of the world.

One out of every five individuals on this planet is Chinese. China will begin to understand that it has accomplished thus far.

Has it accomplished the overall goal of changing unacceptable behavior by the Chinese? Is it a government which poses a threat to the free world? Are the Chinese any freer? Are they able to exercise their rights as individuals and as citizens of the state without reprisals? Do American businesses have unlimited access to Chinese markets? Are they subject to barriers and widespread discrimination? Are the American people any safer?

Reports by the Central Intelligence Agency show that 13 of China's 18 long-range strategic missiles have single nuclear warheads. At U.S. cities, China also has an array of strategic missiles that U.S. military and intelligence officials say are targeted on U.S. forces deployed in Asia.

Defense and intelligence experts show that China continues to transfer dangerous technology to Iran and Pakistan and is actively involved in the transfer of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and missiles to other rogue states. The PRC is subsidizing China's nuclear and clear industries and prolonging the status quo. We have all read with grave concerns over the objections of those who think that curtailing trade will solve our problems with China. I have never understood the argument that limiting Chinese interaction with America's vibrant free market, democratic institutions and renowned individual spirit of free enterprise would somehow strengthen democratic activists and weaken entrenched leaders.

Trade with China is profit or reward that should be given and taken away; it is a crucial tool needed to foster change in the Chinese system that retrenchment, bloodshed and important countries on opposite sides of the world.

China is 22 percent of the world population. One out of every five individuals on this planet is Chinese. China's and America's continued economic growth.

The American people have been exposed to China in the last 5 years. Unfortunately, much of this attention has been the negative headlines of espionage, protests against the tragic mistaken bombing of the Chinese embassy in the Hague, Chinese anti-American campaign activities. Though these all deserve to be discussed and examined in full, what has not received enough attention has been the truly revolutionary change sweeping across China.

China is literally revamping its entire economic system, an enormous undertaking. It's the equivalent of the people switching to driving on the other side of the road, repudiating their whole political ideology and changing their economic system all at once. This type of economic and political revolution can't happen overnight. If it did, there could be such instability and shock to the system that redistributed and political repression might reappear. When China tried swift, radical change during the Cultural Revolution and the Great Leap Forward, 80 million people died. But things are changing in China, and mostly for the better. We can be under no illusions about the fact that the Beijing government represents a representative, authoritarian dictatorship. Yet although political rights are largely nonexistent, there is no question that personal freedom is on the rise, due in large part to marketplace engagement.

Year after year, the United States has extended normal trading relations to China. The objections of those who think that curtailing trade will solve our problems with China. I have never understood the argument that limiting Chinese interaction with America's vibrant free market, democratic institutions and renowned individual spirit of free enterprise would somehow strengthen democratic activists and weaken entrenched leaders.

Trade with China is profit or reward that should be given and taken away; it is a crucial tool needed to foster change in the Chinese system that retrenchment, bloodshed and important countries on opposite sides of the world.

One out of every five individuals on this planet is Chinese. China will begin to understand that it has accomplished thus far.

Has it accomplished the overall goal of changing unacceptable behavior by the Chinese? Is it a government which poses a threat to the free world? Are the Chinese any freer? Are they able to exercise their rights as individuals and as citizens of the state without reprisals? Do American businesses have unlimited access to Chinese markets? Are they subject to barriers and widespread discrimination? Are the American people any safer?

Reports by the Central Intelligence Agency show that 13 of China's 18 long-range strategic missiles have single nuclear warheads. At U.S. cities, China also has an array of strategic missiles that U.S. military and intelligence officials say are targeted on U.S. forces deployed in Asia.

Defense and intelligence experts show that China continues to transfer dangerous technology to Iran and Pakistan and is actively involved in the transfer of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and missiles to other rogue states. The PRC is subsidizing China's nuclear and clear industries and prolonging the status quo. We have all read with grave concerns over the objections of those who think that curtailing trade will solve our problems with China. I have never understood the argument that limiting Chinese interaction with America's vibrant free market, democratic institutions and renowned individual spirit of free enterprise would somehow strengthen democratic activists and weaken entrenched leaders.
is admitted to the WTO and agrees to take the painful steps necessary to bring its economy in line with world standards and practices. China's WTO membership will bring major benefits to Americans, by fully opening China's vast market to American manufacturers, farmers and service industries. Of particular importance to my state of California are exports of our manufactured goods, property rights of our world-class entertainers and high-tech industries. What a win-win scenario this is for American workers, businesses and consumers.

As Americans, we must pursue China for our own self-interest as much as to help China get better, with the top priority being the security of our national security. China is a business partner, but we cannot confuse that with a strategic relationship. We do share some mutual interests that it is hoped would be increased as friendly ties improve. But just as a business wouldn't share its confidential marketing strategies or cost structure with a competitor, the U.S. government and American businesses must take care not to leak sensitive material to the Chinese government. China is simultaneously our business partner and our competitor.

What we must do is approve normal trade relations and its entry into the WTO for the sake of our national security. A stable relationship between trade relations, divorced form yearly fights and political trends, will increase prosperity and improve the lives of the American and Chinese people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER). (Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution and urge a "no" vote.

I stand here today in support of free trade with China, our globe's most populous nation, our fourth largest trading partner. When we have issues such as this before this House, I am often asked, as I travel throughout the diverse district that I have the privilege of representing, what does this all mean to America? What does this debate that we are having today mean to the folks on the South Side of Chicago and in the south suburbs of Illinois?

Exports to China total almost $1 billion from the State of Illinois. An economist will tell you that for every $1 billion in exports, it is over 17,000 jobs that are at stake. Illinois sent over 775 million dollars' worth of manufacturing exports, tractors made in the Quad Cities, industrial heavy equipment, food products, textile mill products, apparel, lumber and wood products, furniture, paper products, printing goods, chemical products, rubber and plastics, leather products, stone, clay and glass products, fabricated metal products, transportation equipment, electronic equipment, farm goods, corn, soybeans, wheat, pork, beef, all from the State of Illinois.

I learned firsthand in the late 1970s what it meant for free trade with China. After President Nixon opened up China, we sent a shipment of breeding stock, breeding swine from Illinois to China and they came from our farm.

That was the first shipment of American breeding stock to China. We learned the advantage personally at that time. But for thousands of Illinoisans, free trade means jobs.

When you think about it, this vote today could jeopardize over 17,000 jobs in Illinois. I urge my colleagues when they consider how to cast their vote as to which of their neighbors will lose their job if this resolution succeeds. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to suggest that while there were $14 billion of stuff that we exported to China, you figure 20,000 jobs per billion, that is 280,000 jobs. That is hardly as many as the Chinese have killed in Tibet since their horrid reign. It is how you decide you want to take care of people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the leader in the fight, for human rights in China, for sensible trade negotiations that will lead to nonproliferation and workers' rights and human rights. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of her remarks that she be allowed temporarily to control my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I have to husband the time very carefully because we proudly have so many people who want to come to the floor today to speak on behalf of human rights in China, fair trade for the United States, and a safer world.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because the President must request a special waiver to be called for normal trade relations to China. He must request a special waiver for normal trade relations to China. What we are not here about today is to isolate China or any discussion of it. So anyone who is on the other side of this issue who wishes to characterize those of us who want to help the Chinese people as isolating them do a grave disservice to the debate.

The issue is not whether bringing this issue every year is productive or constructive or has improved human rights in China. The issue before this body is: Is the present policy, the Bush-Clinton China policy, working? We were told when they delinked trade and human rights that it would lead to improvement in both. Wrong, it has led to failure in both.

Now we are calling this normal trade relations because we changed the name last year. There have been all kinds of name changes. For example, this policy was called constructive engagement before. It was neither constructive nor true engagement, so then they changed it to a strategic partnership. It was not that either, so now they call it purposeful, principled engagement with our eyes open.

Do not take my word for it, it is in their book: Purposeful, principled engagement with our eyes open.

Mr. Speaker, that is a refreshing change from with our eyes closed, when the atrocities in China and the unfair trade practices and the proliferation of weapons. And I am just waiting for next year when I think maybe it will be called purposeful, principled engagement with China with our eyes wide open and the wax cleaned out of our ears.

Because then, maybe then, the administration and the proponents of this absolute concession to China, maybe then with the wax cleaned out of their ears, they will hear the pleadings of the monks and nuns in Tibet who have been tortured for decades by the People's Liberation Army. They will hear them over the sound of the army of lobbyists here in Washington, D.C. here to lobby on this issue. And maybe then with the wax out of their ears, they will hear the voices of the Panchen Lama, the baby chosen by His Holiness to be the next Dalai Lama, kidnapped by the regime. And we have said nothing.

Maybe then they will hear that baby cry over the clinking of champagne glasses as they toast the abusers of human rights in China. And maybe with the wax out of their ears they will hear the cries of people still in prison for speaking freely. Maybe then they will hear the pleadings of the families and the prisoners still in prison, hundreds of them, for speaking freely in Tiananmen Square, and the thousands who are in jail because of their religious beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put in the RECORD the statement of the U.S. Conference of Bishops opposing renewing MFN and in support of this resolution:


Dear Representative: The upcoming vote on extending "normal trade relations" status to the People's Republic of China presents the Congress with a significant opportunity and challenge to send an unmistakably clear message about our national concern for the protection of basic human rights.

Each time over the past several years when the issue has arisen, it has been our conviction that no Administration has been sufficiently committed to pressuring the Chinese authorities on their systemic violations of certain fundamental human rights. Our Conference has focused particularly on the issues of religious freedom and we have repeatedly cited the persecution of religious groups, such as the unregistered Protestant and Catholic churches, and the intrusive interference by the state in the internal life of the "open" or recognized churches.

The persecution and control of Tibetan Buddhism is especially shameful and known to all. We acknowledge that the present Administration has made efforts to raise issues with the Chinese authorities, but little, if anything, has changed on the human rights
front in these last years of increased engagement. Indeed, the continued detention of religious figures as well as of democracy advocates only point up the necessity for unmitigated official U.S. firmness on 3 issues of human rights and religious freedom.

The trade status debate may not be the best forum to offer the Congress an important opportunity to raise the priority of human rights and religious liberty. Therefore, I urge you to send as clear a message as possible by voting to overturn the President’s waiver of the relevant sanctions of the 1974 Trade Act. A strong vote to deny MFN/NTS status to China should strengthen the Administration’s commitment to human rights at the top of the China agenda and send a strong signal that the status quo is not acceptable.

Sincerely yours,


So, Mr. Chairman, I plead with my colleagues who have voted on the other side of this issue. Ten years is enough. The trade deficit has gone from 3 billion to 56 billion. It will be $67 billion for this year.

It has not led to better trade relations, it has not led to more U.S. products going into China. Quite the reverse. A $67 billion trade surplus for the regime to consolidate its power, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction continues, the human rights violations continue. And this past week, they have arrested between 10 and 20,000 people for the practice of their self-help, for their own self-help group. Ten to 20,000 people, no food, no water. Do not give the regime a waiver to abuse human rights, abuse trade practices, and proliferate weapons of mass destruction.

Vote for the Rohrabacher amendment. This is not normal.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of normal trade relations with China and do so because we are confronted with two choices. The choices are clear and simple. We can have a constructive and purposeful engagement policy with China or we can have a new Cold War with a new evil empire with new costs to our taxpayers for a larger defense budget.

Now I think that we have made some limited progress with China, probably the most important bilateral relationship that we are going to have with any country in the world over the next 50 years. What are some of the things that we have done where we have been successful? So far, there has been a lot of the problems on the floor today. Well, one example is the East Gates International headed by Ned Graham, the son of the Reverend Billy Graham, has been able to distribute 2.5 million Bibles legally in China since 1992 and help us work to provide enough Bibles so that we have done where we have been successful. So far, they have distributed 2.5 million Bibles legally in China since 1992 and help us work to provide enough Bibles to give away.

With respect to proliferation and arms control efforts, China has joined the nuclear nonproliferation treaty; they have signed a chemical weapons convention; they have signed the biological weapons convention; they have signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; and they have signed the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights.

Now there are some successes. Have they made enough progress on human rights? Absolutely not, and that is one of the reasons why we need to engage them, and I had a meeting with a host of leaders from China. We met with Premier Zhu Rongji a few months ago, and we pushed him and we pushed him and we asked questions and we tried to get him to do more and more and more on the human rights issue.

But the choice is clear. Are we going to have a constructive engagement policy with China or a new evil empire with China? Please vote down this policy on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 107, disapproving the President’s request to provide “Normal Trade Relations” (NTR) in 1999 with products made in China. Since I have served in Congress, I have supported “constructive engagement” with China as a method of improving our critically important bilateral relations. We must communicate our foreign policy goals to advance human rights and religious freedom. While progress at times remains slow and painful, continued talks and diplomacy are key aspects of this important bilateral relationship.

Ten years ago Tiananmen Square, Chinese students courageously demonstrated in support of democracy, but they were met by violence from a regime fearful of change. We continue to stand for human rights in China, and I firmly believe that a continued policy of principled and purposeful engagement reinforces our efforts to move China toward broader freedoms and openness. We have successfully influenced China to make significant progress, but much more must be achieved.

We continue to have serious differences with China on human rights, their efforts to acquire sensitive information, nuclear nonproliferation, regional stability and transnational threats such as drug trafficking, terrorism, and smuggling people across borders. We will continue to deal directly with these differences. As the President stated when he announced his decision to extend NTR: “We pursue engagement with our eyes wide open, without illusions.”

Accordingly, we should continue to speak and negotiate frankly about our differences and to firmly protect our national interests. However, a policy of disengagement and confrontation would serve only to strengthen those in China who oppose greater openness and freedom. Through constructive engagement, we will remain sensitive and respond quickly to ongoing human rights violations, including China’s recent massive crackdown on members of Falun Gong and religious suppression in Tibet and against Protestant “house churches” in Henan.

In particular, we should call for the immediate release of Chinese activists—Xu Wenli, Qing Yongming and Wang Youcai—who received stiff prison sentences for advocating the China Democracy Party last year.

Earlier this year, I met Premier Zhu Rongji at the Blair House and wrote a follow-up letter that was signed by ten Members of the House of Representatives who support NTR in which we called for their immediate release.

Clearly, trade encourages human rights, and it has facilitated the work of the religious communities active in China. For example, East Gates International, headed by Ned Graham, son of evangelist Billy Graham, has been able to distribute 2.5 million Bibles legally in China since 1992. This organization can communicate freely with its contacts in China because of the proliferation of information-exchange technology such as e-mail, faxes, and cellular telephones—a development made possible by trade and economic reform. As Billy Graham has written, “Do not treat China as an adversary but as a friend.”

Revoke NTR would rupture our relationship with a third of the world’s population and jeopardize our political and economic security. Such an action would make China more defensive, isolated and unpredictable, weakening the forces of change and nullifying the progress achieved so far. Moreover, revoking NTR would undermine our efforts to encourage constructive Chinese participation in international organizations. China’s adherence to international standards on human rights, weapons of mass destruction, crime and drugs, immigration, the environment, economic reform and trade. Indeed, constructive engagement means advancing U.S. interests in tangible ways.

As Brent Scowcroft said in a recent New York Times article, “The U.S. has at least another two decades to encourage China’s responsible development before it presents us with a direct military challenge. As China’s intentions are clarified beyond question, the U.S. and its regional partners will be able to make constant course adjustments.” To be sure, we will keep a close eye on China, particularly in the wake of its recent moves in the disputed Spratly Islands where it has unilaterally installed military facilities, and its hostile posturing against Taiwan.

While the Cox Report uncovered troubling lapses in security at the U.S. national laboratories, we must maintain perspective on China’s record but ensure our national security. To that end, we should continue to engage China in easing tensions on the Korean peninsula, as well as to cooperate efforts to combat terrorism, drug trafficking and intellectual property piracy. As a result of our engagement policy, China has joined the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and Zangger Committee, the Chemical Weapons Convention, and the Biological Weapons Convention. Additionally, China signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and pledged to ratify it soon, and has facilitated the work of the Western religious communities active in China. Furthermore, maintaining NTR with China—as every President has requested since 1980—is good for U.S. farmers, workers, small businesses, and the economy. Last year, we exported $14 billion worth of goods, of which the largest portion went to market abroad. Revoking NTR would invite retaliation against U.S. exporters and investors, as tariffs on imports from China would immediately increase from an average 6 percent to 44 percent. In turn, China would immediately start buying from our European and Asian competitors. This would seriously jeopardize more than 400,000 U.S. jobs which currently depend on exports to China and Hong Kong.
I have seen the repression in Tibet with my own eyes. It is frightening. The Tibetan culture and religion are still being systematically destroyed. Tibetan Buddhist monks and nuns are being arrested and tortured. Tibetan Buddhist monasteries are still being controlled by cadres of Chinese communist security officials. The Tibetan people are still being deprived of their freedom, their livelihood and their culture.
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Thousands of Uyghur political prisoners are in jail and are being tortured. Recently, a group of Uyghurs shared with the Congressional Human Rights Caucus how they had been tortured in prison. I am submitting for the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Abdugheni Musa, who was arrested and tortured in 1995 for organizing a peaceful youth rally.

Democracy activists are still being watched, arrested, imprisoned, held under house arrest and sent to reeducation through labor camps. Scores of individuals associated with the Democratic Party have been arrested and given long sentences in the last few months.

Over one hundred Tiananmen Square protesters are still in prison.

Those wishing to remember the 10th anniversary of the tragic events of spring 1989 when hundreds of protesters were brutally massacred at Tiananmen Square were prevented by the Chinese government from doing so. The families of the dead, wounded and exiled who are demanding an apology from the government of China for its actions in 1989 are being persecuted.

The Chinese government allowed and encouraged protesters to destroy the U.S. Embassy in Beijing. They bused in people. The Chinese Ambassador insulted the intelligence of the American people on Sunday talk shows with his demands.

China is running a massive system of gulag slave labor camps—the laogai. The State Department’s 1998 report on human rights in China said 230,000 people were detained in “re-education through labor camps” in China at the end of last year. People are sent to re-education through labor camps without a trial or any kind of judicial proceeding.

China still has a program in which the kidneys, corneas and other organs are taken from executed prisoners and sold to foreign buyers for tens of thousands of dollars. Some of these organs are being peddled in the United States, against U.S. law.

It still engages in coercive population practices—including forced abortions and sterilizations. There are 7 to 15 million abortions a year in China, 6 to 12 times more than in the United States. The Population Research Institute, most of these abortions are performed under duress, with threats, bribes and sanctions—and sometimes outright force—used to elicit compliance.

So nothing has really changed with regard to human rights in China.

Our policy has done nothing to improve China’s behavior regarding proliferation. According to Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet, China remains a “key supplier” of technologies.

Tenet, China remains a "key supplier" of technology used to elicit compliance.

It is interesting to note that in years past, when the Chinese government actually feared that China’s ability to trade on favorable terms with the United States, China is now a greater threat to the U.S. national security than it has ever been in the past.

We also need to remember that China has deliberately tried to influence our political process through illegal campaign donations.

Our current policy has yielded very little progress on issues that the American people care about. Some 67 percent of Americans surveyed by Zogby earlier this year said that they do not want the U.S. to put increased restrictions on trade with China because of China’s human rights abuses. Many Americans are concerned about China’s nuclear espionage as well.

It is interesting to note that in years past, when the Chinese government actually feared that they would be selected to host the year 2000 Olympics, President Clinton and Congress wanted to reward China with NTR. Today I thank you very much for giving me this precious opportunity to testify before you. My name is Abdugheni Musa. I am a Uyghur from Ghulja City in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of China. I have come to testify on the brutal torture methods of the Chinese government through my personal accounts of suffering in the Chinese prison.

In February 1995, some young Uyghur business men and I organized The Ili Youth Mashrap, a traditional Uyghur cultural event, in order to improve morality, say no to drugs, strengthen our religious faith and build local economy. This traditional event was strong social impact on the Uyghurs in Ghulja City and was welcomed everywhere.

However, the social impact of Mashrap shocked and worried the Chinese authorities. Thus, it became the very reason for the Chinese government to suppress the Mashrap and its participants.

As of late, the Chinese government labeled Mashrap as illegal and then started arresting the Uyghur youth that organized and participated this event.

The Ghulja municipal police arrested me on June 7, 1996 and detained me in Yengi Hayat prison. In jail, I constantly and repeatedly faced physical and mental torture from the Chinese prison guards.

Two days after my arrest at 12:30 a.m., the Chinese prison guards dragged me into a
Yusuf and I were put into the same cell at that time. Today he is still serving prison terms in the Chinese prison. To get his confession, the Chinese guards tortured my friend Abdusalam Keyim on a high voltage electric chair. Then he was stripped naked and forced into an extremely low degree freezing cell that caused his body to convulse all over my body. My heart irregularly pounded and my eyes blackened. I fainted several times during the torture. Exacting the seventh day of my arrest, again the Chinese guards dragged me to the basement for confession in the middle of the night. With harrowing terror they yanked my hair top into my genital. The more the guard inserted the more he wounding it. This caused severe damage to my urinary system. As a result, I fainted and u rinated blood for more than a month.

During the torture, one of the Chinese guards pointed his finger at me and said, "We will castrate the inferior masculinity of your turban-heads and prostitute your girls. What can you turban-heads do to us great Chinese nation? With our spit, your will all drown into the water. We will etch into the electric club and knock you down again and again." For three times, the Chinese guards allowed the Chinese inmates to brutalize me. For more than one month, no one from the outside came to see me. I lay OPAWA in the cell and started using the dogs to bite naked Yusuf. One of the dogs viciously attacked him and bit his genital. He fell and crawled on the floor holding his private parts. Then, the Chinese guards continued to molest him with the dogs hoping to annihilate our will of resistance. But the ruthless Chinese guards stripped Yusuf naked and crawled on the floor holding his private parts in the cell and started using the dogs to bite nak ed Yusuf. One of the dogs viciously attacked him and bit his genital. He fell and crawled on the floor holding his private parts. Then, the Chinese guards continued to molest him with the dogs hoping to annihilate our will of resistance.

The most shocking and heinous crime the Chinese prison guards committed in jail is that they allowed the Chinese inmates to rape the Uyghur girls. On 27 june 1996, the Chinese prison guards brought Peride, a 21-year old pious Uyghur Muslim girl, from the ladies' cell into the interrogation cell. They stripped her naked and told her to ask her God to save her. Later, they put her naked into a cell with six Chinese inmates. These six Chinese criminals took turn and raped her one by one.

We heard Peride's painful cries coming out of the Chinese cell. We yelled, cried, kicked the metal bars and the wall. Instead of punishing the Chinese inmates, the guards furiously rushed into our cell and beat us up with electric chairs. The guards had Peride out of the Chinese cell since she was already fainted. Peride was from the Konji neighborhood in Ghulja City. When I escaped to Kazakhstan, a friend of mine who was put in this jail told me the following account. One day in January 1997, the Chinese guards dragged an 18-year old Uyghur girl, Renata, a 23-year old Uyghur girl, naked and put her into Chinese cell. Like Peride, Renata was group-raped by the Chinese inmates. Renata was from Kekpekyuz village at Jeliyuz County.

Now I want to give a list of names of my Uyghur friends and acquaintances that suffered and continually suffered in the Chinese prisons. Some of those who are still unknown or missing today.

1. Turgan Tursun, 27, religious student, arrested on February 5, 1997 as a "separatist". He was sentenced to 5-year in jail. Currently, Turgan is serving his prison terms in ilji Prefecture jail. He was from Ghulja tannery.
2. Iminjan, 29, teacher, arrested after February 1997 as a "separatist". He was sentenced to 15-year in jail. Currently, Iminjan is serving his term in ilji Prefecture jail. He was from Ghulja tannery.
3. Yusufjan Eysa, 29, private businessman, arrested in January 1997. He was missing for one year at that point by his father in Qapqal jail. Yusufjan was sentenced to 5-year in jail. Currently, he is serving his term at Ghulji municipal prison.
4. Seydahmet Yunus, 24, religious student, arrested in April 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Erkin Street in Ghulja City. He is still missing.
5. Ablet, 26, religious student, arrested in April 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Mashrapbay Street in Ghulja City. He is still missing. Ablet was from Totdukan neighborhood in Ghulja City. He is still missing.
6. Tursun, 26, religious student, arrested in April 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Totdukan neighborhood in Ghulja City. He is still missing.
7. Kahar, 26, religious student, arrested in May 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Totdukan neighborhood in Ghulja City. He is still missing.
8. Ablikim Muhammadjan, 24, religious student, arrested in April 1998 as a "separatist". He was from the Watergate neighborhood in Ghulja City. He is still missing.
9. Mirzat, 25, religious student, arrested in April 1998 as a "separatist". He was from the Watergate neighborhood in Ghulja City. He is still missing.
10. Zulpiyar Mamat, 26, religious student, arrested in March 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Totdukan neighborhood in Ghulja City. He is still missing.
II. Yiar, 26, religious student, arrested in May 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Azaatyuz village at jeliyuz County in Ghulja. He is still missing.
12. Dawud, 26, religious student, arrested in May 1998 as a "separatist". He was from Azaatyuz village at jeliyuz County in Ghulja. He is still missing.
13. Ablet Kirahi, 53, a religious mullah, arrested in December 1996 as a "separatist". He was from Totdukan neighborhood in Ghulja City. He is still missing.
14. Muhammadjan Karim, 29, religious teacher, arrested in june 1997 as a "separatist". He was from Topecayz village at jeliyuz County in Ghulja. He is still missing.
15. Sultan Tursun, 25, religious student, arrested in February 1997 as a "separatist". He was from Totdukan neighborhood in Ghulja City.

Dear ladies and gentlemen, all of these people are my good friends. The Chinese government has imprisoned a person from all parts of Uyghur family in Ghulja City since 1996. At present, the Chinese government is still arresting hundreds of Uyghurs and mercilessly torturing them in the prisons. The Chinese human rights violation of the Uyghur people is nowhere to be found in the world. It is my sincere hope from the bottom of my heart that the United States, the United Nations, and the international community take necessary measures to guarantee the fundamental human right of the Uyghur people and help free all of our political prisoners in the Chinese prisons.

Thank you,
Abdugheni Musa.
anything, has changed on the human rights front in these last years of increased engagement. Indeed, the continued detention of religious figures as well as of democracy advocates represents a needless waste of U.S. firmness on issues of human rights and religious freedom.

The trade status debate may not be the best forum, but it does offer the Congress an important opportunity to raise the priority of human rights and religious liberty. Therefore, I urge you to send as clear a message as possible by voting to overturn the President’s waiver of the relevant sanctions of the 1974 Trade Act. A strong vote to deny MFN/NTS status to China should strengthen the Administration’s commitment to putting human rights at the top of the China agenda and send a strong signal that the status quo is not acceptable.

Sincerely yours,
W. REVEREND THEODORE E.
President
Archbishop of Newark; Chairman, International Policy Committee, U.S. Catholic Conference.

---

FRC URGES HOUSE TO TAKE A STAND FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND FREEDOM; REJECT "ABNORMAL TRADE STATUS" FOR CHINA

WASHINGTON, DC-"On June 3, President Clinton, with callous audacity commemorated the eve of the 10th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre by asking Congress once again to reward China with re-newal of its Normal Trade Relations (NTR) status. A strange thing to do, considering that there’s nothing ‘normal’ about U.S. relations with China," said Bill Saunders, Foreign Policy and Human Rights Counsel for Family Research Council (FRC), on Thursday. "What is normal about conducting business as usual with a Chinese regime that lies to its people about NATO’s accidental bombing and virtually holds our ambassador hostage in the U.S. embassy by staging riots around him?"

While the President insists that the Administration’s policy of “constructive engagement” is having a positive impact in China, all of the evidence shows that this is not true. The State Department’s annual Human Rights Report released in February found that human rights have deteriorated significantly in China in the past year. Along with the ongoing crackdown on political dissidents, the report highlighted religious persecution. And Catholic groups continued abusive reproductive policies including forced abortion, and persecution of ethnic minorities. The Cox Report reveals that espionage can occur and national security can be threatened when we treat an authoritarian regime as if it’s a democratic ally sharing American interests.

"The last time America seriously debated China’s trade status was two years ago. Human rights and religious liberty have continued to deteriorate significantly in China in the past year, however, despite promises from the Clinton Administration, that China’s policies were improving, we have observed slippage in the most basic rights in China."

The persecution of indigenous people and their religions is of special concern to me. The situation of the Tibetans is most well known, but all of the 50 or so indigenous peoples in China experience restrictions of their freedoms.

The Clinton Administration has made an effort to raise issues of human rights, labor rights, and religious freedom with the Chinese, but little has changed. The current administration’s overtures to China lead the Chinese to believe that the past year, however, despite promises from the Clinton Administration, that China’s policies were improving, we have observed slippage in the most basic rights in China.
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Shan, Henan. Her hometown in Fang Cheng county, Henan Province, is known as the “Jerusalem of China” where the Chinese House church movement was initiated in the 1980's and continues to grow in the ministries of millions of Christians in China.

14. Zhao Song Yin. Evangelical Zhao was imprisoned on August 10, 1997, in Ping Ding Shan, Henan, in the county of Henan, Henan province, known as the “Jerusalem of China” where the Chinese House church movement was initiated in the 1980's and continues to grow in the ministries of millions of Christians in China.

15. Philip Guoqing Xu. Philip Xu is a 43-year-old traveling Bible teacher based in Shanghai, was arrested on June 16, 1997, and is presently in solitary confinement. Since late 1997, he has been allowed family visits and was allowed to send a letter from prison in May 1998. His legal situation is uncertain. He was sentenced without a trial to 3 years of labor camp (with labor at day and solitary confinement at night) in DA FUNG in northern Jiangsu Province. His wife was turned away when she tried to visit him on October 22, 1997.

16. Huang Dehong. Huang Dehong, a Protestant from Baokang, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Baokang Labor Educational Camp in Jiangxi.

17. Huan Debao. Huan Debao, a Protestant from Baokang, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Baokang Prefectural Labor Educational Camp.

18. Hui Qin. Hui Qin, a Protestant from Lushan, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Lushan Labor Educational Camp in Anhui.

19. Dai Chenggang. Dai Chenggang, a Protestant from Baokang, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Baokang Labor Educational Camp in Anhui.


21. Li Qingshu. Li Qingshu, a Protestant from Feng Yang, Anhui province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Feng Yang Labor Educational Camp.


23. Brother Song. Brother Song, a Protestant from Zhaoyang, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Zhaoyang Labor Educational Camp in Hubei since April 6, 1999.

24. Li Shouhui. Li Shouhui, a Protestant from Qianjiang, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Qianjiang Labor Educational Camp in Hubei since April 6, 1999.

25. Jia Ping. Jia Ping, a Protestant from Xiantao, Hubei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xiantao Labor Educational Camp in Hubei since April 6, 1999.

26. Huang Zhihai. Huang Zhihai, a Protestant from Hebei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Tangshan Labor Educational Camp in Hebei.

27. Fan Jinxia. Fan Jinxia, a Protestant from Hebei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Tangshan Labor Educational Camp in Hebei.

28. Yang Xiaofang. Yang Xiaofang, a Protestant from Hebei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Tangshan Labor Educational Camp in Hebei.

29. Liang Fujuan. Liang Fujuan, a Protestant from Hebei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Tangshan Labor Educational Camp in Hebei.

30. Huang Xiaojuan. Huang Xiaojuan, a Protestant from Hebei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Tangshan Labor Educational Camp in Hebei.

31. Zhu Qin. Zhu Qin, a Protestant from Hebei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Tangshan Labor Educational Camp, in Hebei.

32. Zheng Fang. Zheng Fang, a Protestant from Hebei province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Tangshan Labor Educational Camp, in Hebei.

33. Ye Kesheng. Ye Kesheng, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Shibailihe Labor Educational Camp in Henan.

34. Xu Ying. Xu Ying, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Shibailihe Labor Educational Camp in Henan.


36. Wang Xuchu. Wang Xuchu, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xinyang Municipal Labor Educational Camp.

37. Liang Fujuan. Liang Fujuan, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xinyang Municipal Labor Educational Camp.

38. Huang Zhihai. Huang Zhihai, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xinyang Municipal Labor Educational Camp.

39. Liang Fujuan. Liang Fujuan, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xinyang Municipal Labor Educational Camp.

40. Hou Feng. Hou Feng, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xinyang Municipal Labor Educational Camp.

41. Tian Lin. Tian Lin, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xinyang Municipal Labor Educational Camp.

42. Meng Qingli. Meng Qingli, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xinyang Municipal Labor Educational Camp.

43. Wu Guifang. Wu Guifang, a Protestant from Xingyang province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Urumqi Labor Educational Camp in Xinjiang.

44. Gwei Chuan-Lun, Guei Chuan-Lun, a Protestant from Yang, Anhui province, is being detained in Baofeng Labor Educational Camp in Xuanzhuang.

45. Liu Hai-Kuan. Liu Hai-Kuan, a Protestant from Yang, Anhui province, is being detained in Baofeng Labor Educational Camp in Xuanzhuang.


47. Lin Ke-Wei. Lin Ke-Wei, a Protestant from Xi-Lin, Anhui province, is being detained in Nanhu Agricultural Labor Educational Camp.

48. Peng Shu-Xia. Peng Shu-Xia, a Protestant from Chang Feng, Anhui province, is being detained in Women Labor Educational Camp in Hefei, Anhui.

49. Wang Chuan-Bing. Wang Chuan-Bing, a Protestant from Qing-gang, Heilingjiang province, is being detained in Qing-gang Detention Center in Heilingjiang.

50. Wang Xincai. Wang Xincai, a Protestant from Lushan, Henan province, is being detained in Luoshan Labor Educational Camp in Zhengzhou, Henan.

51. Wu J uesheng. Wu J uesheng, a Protestant, is being detained in Da-an Labor Educational Camp in the Biyang Prefecture of Henan province.


53. Xu Dajiang. Xu Dajiang, a Protestant from Xinyang, Henan province, affiliated with China Evangelistic Fellowship, is being detained in Xinyang Municipal Labor Educational Camp.

54. Zhao Wu Na. Zhao Wu Na is a 50-year-old (born 1948) evangelical Christian woman from Shanghai who was arrested on December 28, 1997, and detained in a labor camp. A graduate of the government-sponsored East China Theological Seminary, she resigned from the Patriotic Three-Self movement and began to evangelize independently. Her husband has disappeared and she believes that he has been kidnapped by government agents in a covert operation.

ROMAN CATHOLICS

55. Bishop Zeng Jingmu. [Transferred to house arrest on May 9, 1998] The 78-year old Roman Catholic Bishop of Yu Jiang, Jiangxi province, Bishop Zeng was sentenced without a trial, in March 1996 to three years of “re-education through labor” in the laogai for his religious activities for being arrested the previous November. He had already spent about two decades in communist prisons for his faith. Reportedly, Bishop Zeng was weakened by a serious case of pneumonia which he had contracted during his ten-year detention in October 1995. In 1994, he had been arrested on August 14, one day before an Assumption Day raid by Public Security officials in the town of Yu Jiang and held without charge until December 1994. He has been under Amnesty International as a prisoner of conscience.

56. Bishop An Shun. Bishop An was arrested in February 1996 as a preemptive strike against the popular annual May 24 Catholic Pilgrimage to the shrine of Mary in Our Lady of Dongliu in Harbin. The pilgrim masses were crushed all over town, other clergy from the area were imprisoned or placed under house arrest, and some churches and prayer houses in national camp in Xuanzhuang, Anhui.

57. Bishop Shu. Bishop Shu was arrested in February 1996 as a preemptive strike against the popular annual May 24 Catholic Pilgrimage to the shrine of Mary in Our Lady of Dongliu in Harbin. The pilgrim masses were crushed all over town, other clergy from the area were imprisoned or placed under house arrest, and some churches and prayer houses in national camp in Xuanzhuang, Anhui.

58. Bishop An Shun. Bishop An was arrested in February 1996 as a preemptive strike against the popular annual May 24 Catholic Pilgrimage to the shrine of Mary in Our Lady of Dongliu in Harbin. The pilgrim masses were crushed all over town, other clergy from the area were imprisoned or placed under house arrest, and some churches and prayer houses in national camp in Xuanzhuang, Anhui.
57. Bishop James Su Zhimin. Bishop Su Zhimin, 65, the Roman Catholic bishop of Baoding in Hebei Province who respects the authority of the Vatican, has spent twenty years in prison, during which time he has been repeatedly falsified as a "counter-revolutionary," beaten, physically abused and placed under police surveillance. Bishop Su, who has never been charged with any crime, has been prevented by police from exercising his religious activity. In 1995, Bishop Su was visited by a group of bishops from the Brazilian Catholic Church who are barred from visiting him. Previously arrested on April 21, 1994, while celebrating Mass in Xining, Bishop Su was later detained in a prison in Yong Nian until being re-arrested in April 1994. He was then transferred to a labor camp near Dashaping in Lanzhou. Released on parole on April 14, 1996, he remains under surveillance, that is, for the "reform through labor." Bishop Su is currently under close police surveillance. His whereabouts and well-being are not known. He is in state custody, presumably in a labor camp.

58. Bishop Ulasij Jia Zhigu. The 58-year-old Bishop of Zhengding, Hebei province, and secretary-general of the underground Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association. Bishop Jia was arrested in late March 1996 and detained in Xining until his re-arrest in April 1994. He was last known to be detained in Lian Chuan City's detention center. Bishop Jia is a free man. His whereabouts and well-being are not known. He is in state custody, presumably in a labor camp.

59. Bishop James Jia Mingtian. Bishop Su's residence was ransacked and his Bible, catechism, code of Canon Law, and other religious materials were confiscated by police. He has been repeatedly imprisoned for his faith for 25 years between 1957 and 1982. He was also arrested on June 30, 1984, and thereafter placed under police surveillance and restrictions of movement. Bishop Jia Mingtian was arrested on August 20, along with five others whose names remain unknown. He was arrested while celebrating Mass at a famous underground Catholic procession, Xianxian on May 31, 1998. He has not been reported to have been released since his arrest.

60. Bishop Deng Ruolun. Bishop Deng Ruolun, a first apostle of the Vatican, has spent twenty years in prison, during which time he has been repeatedly falsified as a "counter-revolutionary," beaten, physically abused and placed under police surveillance. Bishop Deng Ruolun, who has never been charged with any crime, has been prevented by police from exercising his religious activity. In 1995, Bishop Deng Ruolun was visited by a group of bishops from the Brazilian Catholic Church who are barred from visiting him. Previously arrested on April 21, 1994, while celebrating Mass in Xining, Bishop Deng Ruolun was later detained in a prison in Yong Nian until being re-arrested in April 1994. He was then transferred to a labor camp near Dashaping in Lanzhou. Released on parole on April 14, 1996, he remains under surveillance, that is, for the "reform through labor." Bishop Deng Ruolun is currently under close police surveillance. His whereabouts and well-being are not known. He is in state custody, presumably in a labor camp.

61. Bishop Joseph Li Side. In his 60's, the Bishop of Tianjin, Bishop Li Side was arrested in late March 1996 and detained in Xining until his re-arrest in April 1994. He was then transferred to a labor camp near Dashaping in Lanzhou. Released on parole on April 14, 1996, he remains under surveillance, that is, for the "reform through labor." Bishop Li Side is currently under close police surveillance. His whereabouts and well-being are not known. He is in state custody, presumably in a labor camp.

62. Bishop Casimir Wang Milu. The 55-year-old Bishop of Wenzhou diocese, Bishop Milu was arrested in late March 1996 and detained along Bishop Su Zhimin. He had been reportedly in and out of detention since then and at last report in mid-1997 he was behind bars once again. He had been previously arrested on January 28, 1991, and held without trial until being released in August 1997.

63. Bishop Casimis Shi Enxiang. The 71-year-old auxiliary Bishop of Yixian, Hebei province, Bishop Shi was originally arrested in December 1990 and held by Xushui County Public Security Bureau. His whereabouts remained unknown for close to three years. He was thought to have been held in a "re-education through labor" camp near Handan or in the "old labor camp," either of which he was released and permitted to return home. Although reportedly in poor health, he resumed duties as Auxiliary Bishop of Yixian, thought under police surveillance and restrictions of movement.

64. Bishop Han Dingsiang. Bishop Dingsiang was arrested in Yong Nian. He has been arrested and released several times and it is believed he is currently in jail.

65. Bishop Han Jingtao. Bishop Jingtao has been prevented by police from exercising his ministry.

66. Bishop Liu Guandong Bishop Guandong, of Yixian, is under strict surveillance by Chinese authorities. His whereabouts are unknown. He is in state custody, presumably in a labor camp.


68. Rev. Guo Bo Le. A Roman Catholic priest from Shanghai, Rev. Guo was sentenced in January 1996 to two years of imprisonment at a "reform through labor" camp because of "illegal religious activity." He was arrested while celebrating Mass on a boat for about 250 fishermen. Guo's other "illegal" activities included administering the sacraments of the underground evangelical church centers, organizing catechetical institutes, teaching Bible classes and "baptizing" the Catholic Patriotic Association. According to an official of the famous underground Catholic procession, Xianxian on May 31, 1998. He has not been reported to have been released since his arrest.

69. Rev. Peter Cui Xingang. The 31-year-old Pastor of the Church of Our Lady of China in Dongdu village, Hebei province, the site of the Vatican-sponsored underground church center was arrested in late March 1996 and detained along Bishop Su Zhimin. He had been reportedly in and out of detention since then and at last report in mid-1997 he was behind bars once again. He had been previously arrested on January 28, 1991, and held without trial until being released in August 1997.

70. Rev. John Wang Zhongfa. Rev. Zhongfa, a is a 67 year-old Roman Catholic priest of Wenzhou diocese, Zhejiang province, was arrested in late March 1996 and detained along Bishop Su Zhimin. He had been reportedly in and out of detention since then and at last report in mid-1997 he was behind bars once again. He had been previously arrested on January 28, 1991, and held without trial until being released in August 1997.

71. Rev. Fr. Deng Ruolun. Fr. Ruolun, a first apostle of the Vatican, has spent twenty years in prison, during which time he has been repeatedly falsified as a "counter-revolutionary," beaten, physically abused and placed under police surveillance. Fr. Ruolun, who has never been charged with any crime, has been prevented by police from exercising his religious activity. In 1995, Bishop Ruolun was visited by a group of bishops from the Brazilian Catholic Church who are barred from visiting him. Previously arrested on April 21, 1994, while celebrating Mass in Xining, Bishop Ruolun was later detained in a prison in Yong Nian until being re-arrested in April 1994. He was then transferred to a labor camp near Dashaping in Lanzhou. Released on parole on April 14, 1996, he remains under surveillance, that is, for the "reform through labor." Bishop Ruolun is currently under close police surveillance. His whereabouts and well-being are not known. He is in state custody, presumably in a labor camp.
arrested were jailed or tortured. Their current whereabouts and legal status are unknown. The following 11 names are those identified as detained:

75. Jia Futian, from the village of An Jia Zhuang, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years in prison.

76. Liu Haicheng. Liu Haicheng was arrested in mid August of 1997, from An Guo, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years in prison.

77. Zhou Xiaoling. Zhou Xiaoling, like Liu Haicheng, was arrested in mid August of 1997, and then transferred for allowing a private mass in his own home.

78. Xiao Lan. Xiao Lan, a 32-year-old Catholic nun, was arrested in Jiangxi province in mid August of 1997.

79. Long Mei. Long Mei, a 24-year-old Catholic nun, was arrested in Jiangxi province in mid August of 1997.

80. Yuan Mei. Yuan Mei, a 20-year-old Catholic nun, was arrested in Jiangxi province in mid August of 1997.


82. Dong Jiqing. Dong Jiqing, a 30-year-old Catholic nun, was arrested in Jiangxi province in mid August of 1997.

83. Ma Qian. Ma Qian, a 24-year-old Catholic nun, was arrested in Jiangxi province in mid August of 1997.


85. Lin Rengui. Fr. Rengui, of Pingtang county, was arrested during Christmas of 1997. He was imprisoned in 1998.

86. Ma Qian. Ma Qian, a priest from Baoding, is being pursued for capture.

87. Wang Chengi. Fr. Chengi, was arrested on August 15, 1997, and then tortured for alluding a private mass in his own home. He was sentenced to three years and is currently at Shandong #1 Reeducation camp.

88. Wei Jingkun. Fr. Jingkun, of Baoding, was arrested on August 15, 1996.

89. Yang Qingqi, of the village of Shi Xiang, was arrested in Jinjina county, was arrested in 1996 and given a three-year sentence. He is currently at Tianjin #5 prison.

90. An Xianliang. An Xianliang, a Catholic from the village of An Jia Zhuang, was arrested in 1996.

91. Li Shengxin. Li Shengxin, a Catholic from An Guo, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years in prison.

92. Gao Shuping. Gao Shuping, a Catholic from Yu Jiang, was arrested in April 1995 and sentenced to two years.

93. Xie Suqian. Xie Suqian, a Catholic from Yu Jiang, was arrested in April 1995 and sentenced to two years.

94. Wang Yungang. Wang Yungang, a Catholic, was arrested in Baoding, Hebei Province, during an underground Holy Mass on Pentecost Sunday, May 23, 1999, while aiding the escape of the presiding priest.

95. Xie Suqian. Xie Suqian, a Catholic from the village of An Jia Zhuang, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years.

96. Yu Qixiang. Yu Qixiang, a Catholic from Yu J Jiang, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to two years.

97. Yu Shuishen. Yu Shuishen, a Catholic from Yu J Jiang, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years in prison.

98. Li Quibo. Li Quibo, a Catholic, was arrested in 1996.

99. Li Lianshu. Li Lianshu, a Catholic, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years.

100. Li Xin. Li Xin, a Catholic, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years in prison.

101. Pan Kunning. Pan Kunning, a Catholic from Yu J Jiang, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to five years.

102. Rao Yanping. Rao Yanping, a Catholic from Yu J Jiang, was arrested in April 1996 and sentenced to five years.

103. Wang Chengqun. Wang Chengqun, a Catholic from Baoding, was arrested in April 1996 and sentenced to five years.

104. Wang Yungang. Wang Yungang, a Catholic, was arrested during Christmas 1996, and sentenced to two years and currently is at Shandong #1 Reeducation camp.

105. Xie Suqian. Xie Suqian, a Catholic from Baoding, was arrested on August 15, 1996.

106. Yao Jinqiu. Yao Jinqiu, a Catholic from the village of An Jia Zhuang, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years.

107. Yu Qixiang. Yu Qixiang, a Catholic from Yu J Jiang, was arrested in April 1996 and sentenced to two years.

108. Yu Shuishen. Yu Shuishen, a Catholic from Yu J Jiang, was arrested in 1996 and sentenced to three years in prison.

109. Zhou Quanxin. Zhou Quanxin, a Catholic layman, was arrested in Baoding, Hebei Province, during an underground Holy Mass on Pentecost Sunday, May 23, 1999, while aiding the escape of the presiding priest.

110. Zhou Zhenpeng. Zhou Zhenpeng, a Catholic layman, was arrested in Baoding, Hebei Province, during an underground Holy Mass on Pentecost Sunday, May 23, 1999, while aiding the escape of the presiding priest.

111. Zhou Zhenqian. Zhou Zhenqian, a Catholic layman, was arrested in Baoding, Hebei Province, during an underground Holy Mass on Pentecost Sunday, May 23, 1999, while aiding the escape of the presiding priest.

112. Zhou Zhenquan. Zhou Zhenquan, a Catholic layman, was arrested in Baoding, Hebei Province, during an underground Holy Mass on Pentecost Sunday, May 23, 1999, while aiding the escape of the presiding priest.

Sources:
Cardinal Kung Foundation; Church sources in China; Family members of religious prisoners; Compass Direct; Fides (the Vatican's congregation for mission countries, Propaganda Fides); Information Center of Human Rights and Democratic Movement in China; Jun Fan; Christian Solidarity Worldwide; Amnesty International; United Nations; Information Center of Human Rights and Democratic Movement in China; Fides; Information Center of Human Rights and Democratic Movement in China; Propaganda Fides; Information Center of Human Rights and Democratic Movement in China; Jun Fan; Christian Solidarity Worldwide; Amnesty International; United Nations; Information Center of Human Rights and Democratic Movement in China; Fides; Information Center of Human Rights and Democratic Movement in China; Jun Fan; Catholic news outlets and the question of MFN.

The Efect of MFN on China
(By Wei Jingkong)

The reason that a representative of the highest level of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) met with me in 1994 was that many in the inner circles of the CCP believed that I could influence the future of MFN, due to my meeting with Secretary of State Warren Christopher.

Among the conditions which were promised to me at that time, some were met very faithfully. Even though I had been illegally detained and I could not even go to the toilet without the scrutiny of a guard, there were no access to newspapers or radio. Not only did I have no contact with the outside world, but even my sources of news were cut off. This occurred because, although the delinking of MFN with human rights had not been made public, the Chinese government had already received reliable assurances of this from the American side. At the time, the American government was in communication, and after I came to the U.S. in 1997 I received proof that confirmed my earlier suspicions.

While the Chinese government began to lobby in the U.S. for permanent MFN status, I was sentenced to 14 years and was sent to prison. From the end of 1996 until early 1997, as lobbying for "permanent MFN status" for China was called for openly in the U.S. Congress, the CCP convened a meeting on politics and law, and the ranking politics and law committee members publicly called for a crackdown on resistance, hunger strikes and other activities by political prisoners.

Conditions for political prisoners in China's jails quickly became more oppressive. Almost all conditions necessary to sustain life disappeared; many more were beaten and the use of hand cuffs and punishment cells became more common. I also received this type of treatment. For details, please see the newspaper reports from the first part of 1997, and July of 1997. And I was bloodstreamed about the conditions of Chinese political prisoners were comparatively frequent. During discussion about MFN in the U.S. Congress, this issue was often discussed. Demands to suspend MFN increased, and, in China, the government ceased carrying out oppressive measures against political prisoners. The use of shackles and punishment cells stopped, prisoners were returned to their normal cells, and the most necessary items for daily life were restored to court U.S. Congress.

The events described above clearly show that the strategy of using MFN to put pressure on the Chinese government is highly effective. Although the Chinese government is not consistent in U.S. policy have prevented effective pressure on China to democratize, the effectiveness of the use of the MFN issue to improve conditions for political prisoners and limit arrests of dissidents has been clearly shown.
Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues from Virginia to consult with the Reverend Billy Graham and Pat Robertson.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON). 

Mr. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. Denying NTR to China will undermine our interests, United States economic interests. It is our twelfth largest market and increased imports from the United States 11 percent last year all on products made by highly skilled workers earning high wages.

Connecticut exports to China in 1998 totaled more than $301 million ranking it tenth in the Nation. Connecticut businesses and its workers have a direct interest in maintaining normal trading relations with China and with further opening China's markets. With a quarter of the world's population and the third largest economy, China's buying power is growing and will be large, and not insignificant, in the years ahead. If we do not engage this emerging major market, other nations will replace our interests.

Connecticut exports to China in 1998 totaled more than $301 million ranking it tenth in the Nation. Connecticut businesses and its workers have a direct interest in maintaining normal trading relations with China and in further opening its markets.

Furthermore, western companies have brought management practices to China that develop individual initiative and respect workers' ideas. They are modernizing their economy without the level of unemployment, crime, and turmoil that has plagued other nations faced with this challenge.

Business as usual, trade as usual, and China does not change. We are sending the wrong message. We have a moral obligation, a mission, and a mandate to stand up for human rights and democracy. We must send a strong message that China must change its ways if it wants to continue trading with the United States. Our foreign policy, our trade policy must be a reflection of our ideals and values. Renewing MFN allows China to continue its terrible abuses without repercussion. It is just fact that China is making quiet but significant progress in many areas. Unlike Russia, China has recognized the need to recapitalize their state-owned businesses and has gradually sold many to foreign companies. They are modernizing their economy without the level of unemployment, crime, and turmoil that has plagued other nations faced with this challenge.

In sum, China is modernizing its economy and governance through a process that is harmonious with her cultural traditions, but that should not obscure the growth of values in common with people in the west. It should certainly not obscure our common interest in the growth of trade between our nations based on the principles that undergird the WTO relationships. By renewing NTR and working with China to enter WTO we can help China adopt free and fair trade practices that make our goods more affordable. Distribution rights under WTO will provide access to customers. Good for China, good for us,

I urge renewal of the normal trade relations with China and opposition to this resolution of disapproval.

I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. Denying NTR to China will undermine our entire U.S. economic interests. It is our 12th largest market and increased imports from the U.S. 11 percent last year. With a population of 1.2 billion, China imported approximately $18 billion worth of U.S. goods and services in 1998, supporting thousands of high-wage, high-skill, export-related American jobs. This represents an increase of more than 11 percent from the previous year, making China the 12th largest U.S. export market.

Connecticut exports to China in 1998 totaled more than $301 million, ranking it 10th in the nation. Connecticut businesses and its workers have a direct interest in maintaining normal trading relations with China and in further opening its markets.

I urge the renewal of normal trade relations with China and opposition to this resolution of disapproval.
Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we should continue normal trade relations with China. This is a very important issue to the United States of America, as well as to the future of China.

As is the case with almost all important legislation, the rhetoric is heated and the arguments are exaggerated. That is only natural, because the debate we are involved in is a complexity that oftentimes is far beyond the immediate issue in front of us: trade.

The debate ranges on both sides to economic, political, strategic, security, and human issues. Yet, I do not believe there is a better vehicle to express our opinions, our positions, and even our frustrations about our relationship with China.

China is the largest emerging market in the world, and it is increasing its importance politically and militarily to the United States. China's leadership will, whether we like it or not, shape much of what happens throughout Asia and the Pacific. We must try to influence what happens inside of China. We must ensure that the course of our contact by China's influence and leadership, and, of course, we must take the opportunity to see how best we can influence how China emerges as a greater economic and military power.

But how do we influence China if we refuse to trade with them and they retaliate against us? How do democratic values emerge? How do they learn to tolerate dissent? How do they come to respect human rights and religious liberties? Do we sit back and hope that the Europeans are willing to demonstrate these values, or do we actively engage the Chinese at all levels and patiently work for change within that country? I do not think there is anybody who is willing to say that there has been no change in China during the last 20 years. I do not think anyone would say that that change has been sufficient. In fact, it seems painstakingly slow, but it is a change, and we must see to it that it continues to occur.

We must not lose sight of the penalty here. It is to deny to China what we give to almost every other nation in the world: normal trade relations, exactly what the term implies. The aberration in not giving the course of change to grant NTR to China; it is with those exactly what the term implies. The aberration is not with the course of change to grant NTR to China; it is with those who would apply the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act to China.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations and a member of this body who served in World War II in the Pacific and knows full well the price that we pay as a country for an unrealistic policy towards a militaristic regime.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 57, a resolution disapproving granting MFN, now called NTR, to the People's Republic of China.

It has been 10 years since the massacre of Tianamen Square, and since then, the world has witnessed a marked deterioration of human and religious rights in the People's Republic of China and in occupied Tibet and in East Turkistan. Since 1989, our trade deficit has grown from $6 billion to a projected $67 billion. China's continued boycott against the democratic Taiwan and its naval actions against the Philippines directly reflect its new-found wealth and its military prowess. Both give unrestricted access to our U.S. markets.

U.S. industry estimates of intellectual property losses in China due to counterfeiting and due to trademark piracy have continually exceeded $2 billion over the past several years. Some U.S. companies estimate losses from counterfeiting alone for 15 to 20 percent of their total sales in China. I find it astounding that Microsoft alone has lost an estimated $1 billion in software piracy in China over the past 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's transfer of American resources and wealth through our so-called "engagement policy" with the dictators in Beijing has led to serious long-term consequences. The engagement policy failure has fueled an enormous trade imbalance that dwarfs all reason. China's enormous foreign currency reserves permit Beijing to belligerently discriminate against our products, and transfer of deadly weapons of mass destruction to terrorist nations. So-called engagement policy has cleared the way for China's regional hegemony.

China's experts within the administration have presided over this Nation's singular greatest foreign policy disaster. It has led to the thefts of our nuclear weapons designs, the weakening of our national security and strategic alliances, and the trivialization of respect for our American interests.

Last week, it was reported that a Protestant worshipper was killed by security forces; and this week, thousands of followers of Falun Gong, the spiritual movement that was recently outlawed, were arrested.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I support H.J. Res. 57 and I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution revoking Normal Trade Relations for China.

Many of my colleagues have said that this body should signal our disapproval of China's human rights policies by denying NTR. I would caution those who seek to send such a signal to first answer one very basic question: Will your vote to revoke NTR for China today actually change the behavior of China tomorrow? Think about it. Will ending NTR free the political prisoners, reverse the abuse of human rights, and stop the persecution of religious groups? Will denying NTR teach the youth of China the values of democracy, the principles of capitalism, and the merits of a free and open society?

Make no mistake; ending NTR for China will not achieve these goals. It will portend, however, the end of U.S. trade with China and the end of our influence in China.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to retain our influence and our trade relations with China by voting against the resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote against the resolution to revoke Normal Trade Relations for China.

Many of my colleagues have said that this body should signal our disapproval of Chinese policy by denying NTR.

Mr. Speaker, I would caution those who seek to "signal" China by ending NTR to think about the moment today about the likely consequences and first answer one very basic question.

Will your vote to end NTR for China today actually change the behavior of China tomorrow? Think about it.

Will ending NTR free the political prisoners, reverse the abuse of human rights, and stop the persecution of religious groups?

Will denying NTR bolster the moderates or will it strengthen the hands of the hard-liners as they struggle to control the future course of China's policy?

Most importantly, will revoking NTR teach the youth of China the values of democracy, the principles of capitalism, and the merits of a free and open society?

Mr. Speaker, if I thought that ending NTR would actually achieve these goals in China, I too would cast my vote of disapproval today.

But make no mistake; denying China NTR denies the U.S. the ability to influence China's workers, China's human rights policies, China's politics, and perhaps most importantly, China's future.

Make no mistake; ending NTR for China will effectively end all hope of gaining WTO accession. It will end our best hope of getting China to open its markets and live by the world's trade rules. And it will effectively put an end to our trade with China.

In short, revoking NTR for China will send much more than a signal: it will portend the end of U.S. trade with China, and the end of our influence in China.

I urge my colleagues to vote to retain our influence—and our trade relations—with China by voting against the resolution today.

Mrs. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who has been a
champion of human rights, particularly in the New Independent States and in eastern and central Europe, and a champion throughout the world for human rights.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman from California for yielding to me, who herself has been such a great leader on this issue.

I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 57 disapproving the extension of Normal Trade Relations, and we all use it as a guide in trade relations. He quotes three reasons for the reason to the establishment of NTR.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, trade with China is absolutely essential. We face the challenges that trade with China press, or we can turn our back and face the consequences: lost markets for America's farmers and the possibility of food shortages in China. China does not have enough food to feed its population. They have 25 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of the world's arable land. We have no agriculture surplus with China that is absolutely essential to our agricultural community. In 1997, U.S. agriculture sales to China totaled $4 billion. We have a huge trade surplus in agriculture with China, 250 percent in our favor. They are one of our largest wheat customers.

China has a 1.2 billion citizens. It is increasing food imports. NTR is critical to our market access. As the Chinese economy-improves, more value-added goods will be bought. China will have to play fair to enter the World Trade Organization. China must show improved access to U.S. agricultural products and revoking NTR will derail this progress.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN). (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

I rise in opposition to this resolution and in support of continuing trade relations with China. For my part, I do not believe that isolating China economically will do anything to improve their human rights record. I would not make the mistake of now believing we can isolate one quarter of the world's population and then expect to have any influence on their social and political institutions.

I, too, am outraged by the political and religious oppression that has taken place in China, but shutting the few openings in China that exist cannot stop it. Rather, I believe that the more involved we are with the Chinese, the more we are commercially engaged with China, the more results we can achieve in securing greater political and religious freedoms for the people of China, as well.
Mr. Speaker, trade does open the window of the world to the Chinese people and to our American ideals. We need to keep that window open. Closing it hurts us more than China.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 57 and urge my colleagues to continue Normal Trade Relations (NTR) with China.

This debate over China NTR gives focus to our economic, as well as strategic, relations with China. And this debate allows Members to express the deep concerns of all Americans about political and religious oppression that occurs in China.

For my part, I do not believe that isolating China economically will do anything to improve their human rights record. We must not make the mistake now of believing we can isolate one-quarter of the world's population and then expect to have any influence on their social and political institutions.

I, too, am outraged by political and religious oppression that has taken place in China, but shutting the few openings in China that exist cannot stop it. I believe that the more involved we become, the more we are commercially engaged with China, the more results we can achieve in securing greater political and religious freedoms for the people of China as well.

Trade does open the window to the world for the people of China. In that regard, just let me talk briefly about just one industry—the telecommunications industry—and what its greater presence will do for the people of China. All of our lives are being changed dramatically by the "information" revolution. And, all of us realize that increased access to information for the people of China from sources outside China is one of the best ways we have of exposing Chinese citizens to new ideas, to broader horizons, and to new opportunities and choices for their future.

Our American telecommunications companies are at the forefront of building the infrastructure that makes information available to people around the globe.

So, let's look at China's market for these information technologies.

China is adding the equivalent of one million cell phones per month.

China is adding the equivalent of one Bell company per year.

In 1998, only ten percent of China's population had a telephone in their home.

In the U.S., roughly one half of all households have access to the Internet. In Brazil, one out of 70 families has access. In China, only one out of 400 families has access.

Yes, this is a vast untapped market for U.S. companies. And, I can assure that if we are not in China, all of our foreign competitors will be.

But it is also much more than an untapped market. Expanding access to information for the Chinese people is an untapped opportunity to expose them to our ideas and our freedoms.

There are so many other examples of both the economic and strategic opportunities in China.

And those economic opportunities are significant.

Last year alone, the United States exported $18 billion in goods and services to China, our fifth largest trading partner. Our exports to China amount to over $350 million and that trade employs some 5,000 to 8,000 residents of my state. And the potential for growth is enormous.

Here are a few examples.

One New Jersey company that has been active in China for twenty years, signed a contract for the largest single boiler project in Chinese history. This project alone will yield $310 million in orders for American goods and services, including sales for many small and medium sized companies.

Another New Jersey infrastructure company projects a market of $18 billion for its products in China over the next decade. And their sales have already increased 100% over the past five years.

One of our energy companies anticipates a $13 billion market in China over the next ten years.

For one of our insurance companies, 40% of their new premiums were sold in China in 1998.

It is clear from just these few examples that failing to extend Normal Trade Relations Status to China will slam the door shut for American products and services in the world's most populous market. It only serves to leave China open to our foreign competitors who all have strong holdings in China. American companies and their employees would be punished by this shortsighted action, not the Chinese government.

Again, renewal of NTR is as much an economic decision as it is a key component of our national strategy to integrate China more fully into the family of nations. We need to maintain a stable political and economic relationship with China.

I believe that the best way to promote the cause of human freedom and democracy and our American ideals is our very presence, economically and otherwise, in China.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution and in support of extending Normal Trade Relations with China.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been so very hard at work on behalf of human rights in China and a fair deal for the American worker.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 57. I find it interesting that so many of the same folks who talk about political espionage are here defending trade.

To those who argue for us to continue putting the leaders of Beijing above the workers of America, I ask them to please listen for a moment. This is hypocrisy. After years of hearing the same arguments for most-favored-nation trading status, it is time for this Congress to say enough is enough.

Extending this status to China has failed to produce the results we want. We still see unconscionable human rights abuses, which we would not tolerate in other countries. We still see nuclear weapons proliferation, which we have not tolerated in other nations. We still see a widening trade deficit every year.

The annual exercise of reviewing and renewing China's NTR status has been an exercise in futility. America needs a new approach. The data tells us what we need to do today. We are told we need to engage China in order to achieve our economic goals. Let us get beyond the rhetoric and look at the facts.

Our competitors are on track to last year's deficit with China, not close the gap. If the trend continues, our trade deficit would reach $66 billion. What does this huge imbalance mean to American taxpayers, American workers? China has engaged that strategy to manage trade, not normalize trade. It ignores intellectual property rights, it evades restrictions on Chinese textile exports, and has put the Great Wall up to prohibit foreign products from entering the market.

The U.S. levies an average NTR tariff rate of 2 percent on the Chinese. They levy a 17 percent rate on NTR trade. This is a one-way street. We should think about the families in America, and the strong holdings of our competitors in China and a fair deal for the American worker.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution that would end normal trade relations with China. With normal trade relations, our farmers and ranchers can sell their products in China on the same terms as their competitors from Canada, Australia, South America, and Europe.

Last year U.S. agricultural exports to China exceeded $3 billion, making it the fourth largest market in the world for U.S. agricultural products. Demand for agricultural products is likely to increase as China's economy continues to grow at a rate of about 8 percent annually. That is why our competitors are eager for us to give up on the Chinese market.

In recent years the Canadian Wheat Board has worked tirelessly to promote its products in China.

The Australians hold an 8 percent stake in a flour and feed mill in Shenzhen, China, and it brought together a consortium to upgrade China's grain handling and storage facilities with $1 billion worth of projects. Another failure for the doomsayers.

Our farmers are facing record low prices. While our competitors are out building market share in China, we sit here and debate whether we even want to have a normal trade relationship with its 1,237,000,000 customers.

We must continue our efforts towards WTO membership for China. However, we have consistently told China that its entry to the WTO depends upon a commercially meaningful agreement.
China cannot expect to maintain indefinitely the $1 billion per week trade surplus it currently enjoys with the United States.

In agriculture, the message seems to have been received. China is changing slowly, but it is changing slowly in connection with its bid to join the WTO, China has agreed to reduce overall average tariffs for agricultural products from the current 30 to 50 percent to 17 percent by 2004. For priority U.S. products, the rate will be even lower. U.S. estimates that with entry into WTO, China's net agricultural imports would increase by over $8 billion annually. That is a benefit to the United States workers, men and women producing the tractors, making the fertilizer, making all of the products that are utilized here in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting normal trade relations with China by voting no on this disapproval.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Coburn), a healer, a doctor, a person concerned about human health and human beings.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Mr. Speaker, I have put a sign I know that not everybody can read, but this is a contrast between two countries, country A and country B. It is the exact representation made by the State Department in discussing human rights in those two countries as of the end of 1998.

I want to share with the Members just a minute what our own government says about these two countries. Then I am going to tell Members what these two countries are. The government human rights record worsens significantly, there were problems in many areas, including extrajudicial killings, disappearances, torture, brutal and arbitrary arrests, and detention. That is country A.

Country B, the government's human rights record deteriorated sharply beginning in the final months of the year with a crackdown against organized political dissent. Abuses included instances of extrajudicial killings, torture, mistreatment of prisoners, forced confessions, arbitrary arrests, detention, lengthy incomunicado detention, and denial of due process.

One other as far as let us look at, discrimination and violence against women remain serious problems. Discrimination against women and ethnic minorities worsened during the year.

Country B, discrimination against women, minorities, and that disabled. Violence against women, including coercive family planning practices, which sometimes include forced abortion, forced sterilization, prostitution, trafficking in women and children, and abuse of children. They are all problems in the other country.

I want Members to know who these two countries are. Country A we just spent billions of dollars bombing. It is called Yugoslavia, the great enemy Yugoslavia, that perpetrated such terrible acts on the Kosovar Albanians. We spent billions bombing them.

The other country, country B, is China, which we have elevated and said we must trade with regardless of what they do to their people. We are schizophrenic if we do continue to have normal trade relations with China. Why would we bomb one that has an identical record, and say the other must be our best trading partner? It is not fair, Mr. Speaker. Is America going to sell its soul? Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of extending normal trade relations with China. Trade between the United States and China is a net plus for the American people. It supports hundreds of thousands of high-paying jobs. It creates competition in the economy. It results in the American people receiving better goods and services at lower prices.

During today's debate, and I have heard much of it already, there has been a lot of talk about the trade deficit, about nuclear espionage and human rights. These are all very important issues. They deserve our immediate attention. However, disrupting our economic relationship with China will not do anything to solve these problems. It will only add more tensions to an already tense relationship with the Chinese and create bigger problems in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge my colleagues to protect the economic interests of the United States by supporting normal trade relations with China. Vote no on House Joint Resolution 57, and yes for better paying jobs and greater economic opportunities for the American people.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), who has been a hard worker for human rights throughout the world and a star in the freshman class.

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to renewing normal trade relations with China. I do believe that the United States needs to engage with China in an ongoing dialogue about joint economic concerns, but our dialogue cannot be limited to a discussion of trade. America's agenda needs to be broadly based, reflecting our democratic values, like free speech, freedom of religion, the right to privacy, and the right to organize. Trade is only a part of our relationship with China.

This is my first time participating in this annual ritual of NTR renewal. I call it a ritual because each year we walk through the same steps in which many of us criticize China's political and social repression. Then the majority decides we must continue NTR as our best hope for creating change in China.

It certainly seems to make sense except for one thing. It has not been working. Since 1980 when we began this NTR renewal ritual, we have seen some reforms. However, no similar progress is being made on human rights, labor standard, and democratic reform. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of H. Res. 57.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his courtesy in yielding me this time.

Today the United States and China spend hundreds of millions of dollars spying on each other. But despite all the spying, I do not think we really know each other very well.

China is in fact a study in contradiction. Today, it is more modern and open than ever before in its 4,000-year history. Yet, it is in fact reacting defensively in an agitated fashion regarding the continued controversy with Taiwan.

We have our demonstrators outside here on the grounds of the Capitol dealing with the local religious movement, Falun Gong, that has captured so much interest in China.

It is an ancient nation that is modernizing rapidly, but this society filled with state-run activities is paying a substantial price as it downsizes its bureaucracy, modernizes its institutions, and privatizes its state-owned industry.

The United States has paid a terrible price in the past for misunderstanding China. During World War II, we bet on the wrong horse. Barbara Tuchman's brilliant biography of John Stillwell makes clear the waste of resources for the corrupt Kuomintang government of Chiang Kai-Shek, who was not interested in fighting the Japanese, when we could have done something more constructive with Mao Tse-Tung.

During the Korean War, we had thousands, tens of thousands, of needless American casualties under General MacArthur, in flagrant disregard of orders and common sense, overplayed his hand. Yet, the Cold War was won more quickly in part because Richard Nixon had the courage to reverse his course of action and engage in a strategic alliance with China.

Lots of countries we disagree with abuse human rights and do not honor democracy or the free market. Sometimes, sadly, that happens with the United States companies. We gave arms to terrorists with Ronald Reagan.

Normal trading relations does not mean we condone that behavior. It just...
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time. I want to thank the gentleman for leading our debate and introducing his resolution.

Mr. Speaker, each year at this time, Congress has the opportunity to review the results of the administration’s China policy, and each year it becomes more apparent how miserably that policy has failed.

In the 5 years since President Clinton delinked China’s MFN status from human rights, there has been significant regression, no progress in China. Now, as we hold this debate, Beijing is conducting another major crackdown, the most important internal security exercise since the Tiananmen Square massacre against religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the Chinese government knows this vote is taking place today. We are being watched, and we are being tested. The test is simple. If we ignore the latest escalation in the brutality, if we just vote the same way we have in the past, then we fail. We will have abandoned the Chinese people. We will have abandoned our ideals of democracy and human rights.

I ask my colleagues, what will it take for us to say no more business as usual with Communist China? I would respectfully submit that any reasonable limit has been passed a long time ago.

Mr. Speaker, the administration’s so-called policy of constructive engagement on behalf of human rights has been a disaster, even according to the administration’s own benchmarks. In quarterly reports, Amnesty International tracks the seven human rights policy goals that President Clinton announced before his 1996 trip to Beijing. Those Amnesty reports detail a complete lack of progress in all categories. Let me explain. On the release of all prisoners of conscience and Tiananmen Square dissidents, Amnesty reports total failure, regression.

Two, review of all counter-revolutionary prison terms: Total failure, no progress.

All religious freedom. Amnesty reports total failure, no progress.

Four, prevent coercive family planning and harvesting of organs: Total failure, no progress.

Five, fully implement pledges on human rights treaties: No progress.

Six, review of reeducation through labor system: Total failure, no progress.

Seven, end police and prison brutality: Again, Amnesty reports total failure, no progress.

Mr. Speaker, the Communist government of the PRC blatantly and systematically violates the most fundamental human rights by tracking down and stamps out political dissidents. I just turn on television news. It is happening before our very eyes. The Beijing dictatorship imprisons religious leaders, ranging from the 10-year-old Panchen Lama to Bishop Su of Baoding. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) mentioned this holy and heroic man earlier. I led a human rights delegation to China a few years ago. Bishop Su met us and celebrated mass. For that he was put into prison. Bishop Su said nothing offensive about the government. He loved those who hated him.

The Chinese government also harvests and sells the internal organs of executed prisoners. Harry Wu—the former Chinese human rights leaders testified about this practice at one of my hearings. China, as we all know, forces women who have unauthorized pregnancies to abort their babies and then to be sterilized against their will. Brothers and sisters are illegal China—forced abortion is common place. China continues to brutalize the indigenous peoples of Tibet and of Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region, and it summarily executes Muslim Uighur political and religious prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, when will we learn the lesson that, when dealing with the PRC, the U.S. cannot settle for paper promises or deferred compliance? The Chinese dictatorship regularly tells bold-faced lies about the way it treats its own people. It says, for example, that nobody died in Tiananmen Square. Mr. Cho Hao Tlea, the Defense Minister in this city, said no one died there. Mr. Speaker, I am hearing of several of the leaders of the democracy movement, some of the dissidents in correspondence who gave compelling testimony about how people died at Tiananmen Square, and, yet, the defense minister said nobody died. Incredible! I invited the defense minister to our hearing—he was a no show.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, the Chinese Government claims religious freedom exists in the PRC. We know now there is no religious freedom. But brother knows better.

Mr. Speaker, since my time is about to expire, I just want to remind Members that when the business community and the administration want to see intellectual property rights protected, what do we do? We threaten sanctions. I believe we should put people at least on par with pirated software, CDs, and movies. This Congress should declare that torture, forced abortion, and theft crimes against humanity count at least as much as protecting copyrights and consumer goods. Sanctions do work if consistently applied.

I urge a ‘yes’ vote on the very important resolution of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER). And salute him for his wisdom in offering it today.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING).

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the resolution which would unilaterally isolate China from the U.S. only. Support normal trade relations with China. I support China being a part of the WTO. China will be one of the superpowers in the next millennium. Peaceful co-existence between us is to all of our benefit.

Now, we all understand that things are not as we would like them in China. But how do we most impact China? It is by engaging them, engaging in fair trade, our intercourse with China since the close of the Cold War has paid dividends. To put our head in the sand and walk away from it would be ill-advised.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to again express my strong support for continuing Normal Trade Relations with China.

Since I came to Congress in 1991, this debate has gone on every year and every year I have come to the floor to explain how important trade with China is to our farmers.

It is essential that we continue to grant Normal Trade Relations to China. China will be the most important market for the United States in the 21st Century and granting Normal Trade Relations status is the foundation of any typical bilateral trading relationship.

The recent negotiations for China’s accession to the World Trade Organization are proof that China is already America’s 4th largest agriculture export market and if the administration will complete the WTO accession agreement our farmers and ranchers will have the level playing field that they have been waiting for.

I urge members to vote against this resolution of disapproval and urge the Administration to complete the bilateral agreement for China’s accession to the WTO.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), a person who has been a faithful trooper in the fight for human rights throughout the world and a great leader.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, we have been told that, with MFN, China has made progress in many areas. To that I ask, what progress?
Right now, as we speak, thousands of Buddhists have been and are being arrested and jailed, and arrested for their beliefs, and that is their only crime. Repression of religion is not progress.

Just last year, last year, three founders of the China Democracy Party were jailed for expressing opposition to China policy. Repression of democracy is not progress.

Child labor and the forced labor of political prisoners continues to be business as usual in China. Denial of workers' rights is not progress. Forced abortion, nuclear proliferation, and an expanded trade deficit is not progress.

Extending China's NTR status amounts to rewarding China for continuing its human rights violations.

Vote to support real progress. Vote for H.J. Res. 57.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Moran).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we are not in conflict over the facts. I think we agree on the facts. What we are debating is the conclusions as to how to best address those facts.

We agree that forced sterilizations and forced abortions occur, and they are wrong. We are not disputing that. We agree that communism does not work, that it is a bankrupt ideology, that it offends the human condition, that it represses the human spirit, that it is just plain wrong.

But I would hope we would also agree on other facts that cannot be disputed. One such fact is that there is no other major Nation that does not extend normal trading relations with China. That is all we are talking about, continuing the normal trading relations that we extend to every other trading partner, but for a very few pariahs.

We would also hope that we would agree that there are about 200,000 American jobs tied directly to U.S. exports to China.

But I would hope we would also agree that if we cut off normal trading relations with China and isolate them, that there is an adverse impact upon our economy, and that there will be other countries coming in to fill the gap, countries who, in many cases, have far less commitment to human rights and economic progress, and individual liberties than the United States does. We must all share a confidence in our universalism, if it is to human rights. Surely, no one on the other side is suggesting that we who will vote to extend NTR to China are so heartless that we don't care about the numerous violations of human rights that occur on a daily basis.

I think these things are clear. So when we weigh all the facts, we who agree that human rights are being violated every day, have come to the conclusion that the best way to change China's actions is to improve their standard of living.

If we improve their standard of living, they will want to have individual freedoms. They will insist upon it. They will insist upon a free enterprise economy. Eventually, they will become a democratic state. That is what we want. We agree on the facts. We want to get to the same place. We are just as committed.

Support normal trade relations with China. Reject this resolution before us today. Give the Chinese people their best chance to break the chains of communist ideology.

I rise to oppose this resolution and support renewal of normal trade relations with China. This is not a disagreement over facts but rather over judgement on how best to address those facts. I share the concerns expressed by some of my colleagues regarding human rights abuses by the People's Republic of China.

I am deeply troubled by the religious persecution that is occurring in China, including the recent crack-down on Falun Gong practitioners. Christians, Catholics and anyone who puts the rule above their State is considered to be a threat to China's leaders today. However, I disagree with the premise that discontinuing normal trade relations will somehow positively improve human rights in China.

Promoting normal trade and continued economic engagement over time, will help open up Chinese society. History has proven this inevitability. The very activities that trade and engagement bring to China help foster a climate under which religious teachings can spread and flourish.

Canceling or conditioning NTR further iso-
lating China would only damage our interests and undermine support among our allies to keep pressure on the Chinese government to institute more fundamental political and economic reforms and human rights protections.

I would like to remind my colleagues that trade is not a partisan issue. NTR status for China has been supported by every President, Republican and Democrat alike, who has confronted this issue.

By continuing normal trading relations with China, we extend ordinary tariff treatment that we grant to all but a few nations. We are not providing China special treatment and we are not endorsing China's policies. We are simply supporting the best way to promote U.S. interests.

But, we should continue normal trade rela-
tions with China for more than just economic reasons. It is in our national interest.

By resuming NTR with China, we advance our long-term national interests in achieving democratic and market reforms in the world's most populous nation.

Our national interest are best served by a secure, stable and open China. The way we engage the Chinese government will help determine whether China becomes a community of nations and follows the rule of law or becomes more isolated and unpredictable.

Continuing normal trading relations with China also serves our best economic interests. Approximately 200,000 U.S. jobs are tied directly to U.S. exports to China.

In the absence of this relationship, we would be placing our firms that are making great strides gaining new market share in China at a severe disadvantage.

We would be standing alone on a trade policy that neither our allies nor our trade competitors would follow. Our competitors would reap the benefits of business opportunities that would otherwise go to U.S. firms.

The United States is the only major country that does not extend "permanent" normal trade relations to China. Revoking NTR status with China would only increase prices which U.S. consumers pay for goods and services and ultimately cost U.S. jobs. If the Chinese do not buy our products, they will buy them from Europe and other Asian countries.

We would also be passing the cost of higher tariffs on Chinese exports, more than $500 million annually, on to U.S. consumers. Clearly, it's the American consumer who loses if we do not continue NTR with China.

Higher tariffs on Chinese imports would only shift our demand for inexpensive, mass-mar-
ket consumer goods to other developing countries and would not result in a net gain in U.S. manufacturing jobs.

China is the fifth largest trading partner of the U.S. Two-way trade between the U.S. and China has increased almost tenfold between 1990 and 1997, increasing from roughly $10 billion to $75 billion.

This growth is expected to continue to rise in the 21st century as more Chinese benefit from an improved standard of living and increased purchasing power.

Our current trade imbalance with China can best be narrowed through increased trade and liberalization of the Chinese economy. As their income rises, demand for high-quality U.S. products increases and our trade deficits decline.

In short, we have much to lose and little to gain by failing to continue our current trading relationship with China. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in our national interest and support normal trade relations with China.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Burton), the man who has studied this issue and realizes that Japan and Nazi Germany were both very, very developed in their economy, and they also were aggressors and human rights abusers.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. First we gift wrap and hand over to Communist China virtually all of our sensitive secrets. Now we are going to grant them most preferential trade status. What in the world is going on?

China has stolen data on the W-88 nuclear warhead and the neutron bomb. They have funneled illegal campaign contributions to the Democratic party and the administration. They are transferring missile technology to countries like North Korea and Iran. They continue to violate basic human rights. They are circumventing our trade laws by transshipping their textile goods through third countries.

Does this sound like a country that deserves preferential treatment?

According to Paul Redmund, the CIA's chief spy hunter, China's spying was far more damaging to national security than Aldrich Ames and would turn out to be as bad as the Rosenberg's, who were executed back in the 1950s for that.

A team of U.S. nuclear experts practiced fainted when the CIA showed...
them the data that China has stolen. The Chinese penetration is total, said one official. They are deep, deep into the labs' black programs, thus endangering every man, woman and child in this country.

Why are we rewarding China for its spying? For God's sake, this is the country that funneled illegal contributions to President Clinton's 1996 reelection campaign. This is the country that told John Johnny Chung, we like your President, and then gave him $300,000 to give to the Democrat Party.

Johnny Chung testified under oath that he was directed to make illegal contributions to the President's campaign by General J, who is the head of China's military spy operations worldwide. General J met with him three times and ordered that $300,000 be directed to Chung for political contributions here in the United States.

One of its joint ventures was the Indonesia-based international firm called the United Indra. It was formed by Mr. Chang, J,James Riady, close friends of the President, and who frequently visited the White House. James Riady's chief advisor on political donations was John Huang, a former employee of Lippo. John Huang was given a job from the Clinton administration at the Commerce Department. He later left Commerce to work for the Democratic National Committee where, with the help of James Riady, he collected nearly $3 million in illegal contributions from China. Mr. Speaker, Johnny Chung, John Huang, and Charlie Trie together raised over $3 million in illegal donations that we know of that have been linked to the Bank of China.

We had 121 people take the fifth amendment or flee the country. A number of the most important people among this list are hiding in China. When my staff attempted to travel to China to interview these people, the Chinese Government denied us visas and threatened to arrest our investigators. Does this sound like a country that deserves preferential trade status? Does it really make sense to give preferential trade status to a country that is helping North Korea build a missile capable of delivering nuclear warheads to the West Coast of the United States?

With respect to trade, in the last 10 years, 91 percent of all illegal transportation cases have been filed against China. The U.S. Customs Department has cited China for illegally transporting textiles and apparel goods through more than 30 other countries.

Mr. Speaker, in just about every area I can think of China's record stinks.
normal trade relations. We need to have cooler thoughts, both in our government and in China. By not renewing normal trade relations for this year, we invite international competitors to establish a stronger foothold while further isolating our companies in what has the potential to be one of the largest consumer markets. Again, our competitors are not as concerned about the human rights in China as we are.

Also, I need to remember that this is just the annual renewal of normal trade relations with China. We have a lot of work to do before we admit China to the World Trade Organization, but we are heading down the right path. This is one step in that direction. We will revisit this issue again, if not this fall, again next year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of this resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this measure which would disapprove continued normal trade relations trading status with China.

As we know, NTR trading status does not provide any preferential treatment but rather grants the ordinary tariff treatment that the United States extends to virtually every nation in the world. Fewer than a dozen countries do not have NTR status, including North Korea, Cuba, Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, and Libya.

The problem with the underlying resolution, as well intentioned as it is among its sponsors, is, I believe, that it will alienate any type of relationship we may have with China. And while we have had severe problems because of their espionage program against the United States, and we all have severe concerns about their human rights violations, I do not think it is a country that we want to just cut off relations with; I think there are both foreign policy concerns and economic concerns.

Furthermore, I think, in my opinion, there really are two China's. There is the old hard-line China that is fighting the new market-oriented China. And we have a fight going on in the upper levels of the Chinese Government of whether or not to move the economy towards more market orientation, which we know will bring about capital flight and will bring about more freedoms in the countries; and the old-hard line regime that wants to stop that. I think by cutting off trade relations, as the underlying resolution would propose to do, it would undercut those who want to move towards a more market-oriented government.

Finally, what effect would this have? This would force the Chinese to devalue their currency, which would be incredibly destabilizing to the region where the U.S. has about 35 percent of its export market. That, in turn, would increase our trade deficit here, cost American jobs, not create American jobs; and I think that would be detrimental to the American economy. So to vote for this resolution, while well intentioned, it is, in my opinion, a vote against American industry and a vote against those American workers who have the potential to be one of the largest consumer markets. Again, our competitors are not as concerned about the human rights in China as we are.

I would like to take a few moments to discuss the effects of trade on our economy. Whenever trade policy is discussed, people forget the many benefits that free trade bestows on our Nation. Exports have grown rapidly in the last decade, creating thousands of new jobs, and these jobs pay considerably more than jobs that are unrelated to trade.

Trade also benefits consumers. As these trade barriers fall, resources are able to flow more efficiently. American companies engaged in international trade become leaner and more competitive. As a result, consumers in all our districts enjoy lower prices and better products.
Indeed, the efficiencies created by trade have been a critical component to the economic prosperity we now enjoy. I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her consistent work on behalf of human rights throughout the world.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. STARK) for his vote on this resolution to not oppose normal trade relations with China.

I do not cast this vote lightly. My district is part of the wonderful gateway to Asia. Our local economy is heavily dependent on our trade with China even with the trade deficit increasing from $63 billion to about $70 billion.

However, I am acutely and painfully aware of the importance of basic human rights to the people throughout the world. There continues to be major violations by the Chinese Government of the rights of the Chinese people.

I am a firm believer of self-determination for China. China has chosen communism. It is their right. However, it is wrong to round up, intimidate, and to arrest people, place them in slave labor camps with no due process.

The time is now to send a strong, unyielding message that the United States will not condone mass suffering and oppression.

We are not talking about cutting off our relationship with China. We want to modify our trade relations so that people of China and the United States can benefit from a fair and free trade policy.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

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

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to this resolution of disapproval regarding normal trade relations with China.

Clearly, the United States’ relationship with China is complicated. Recent events, including the bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, China's reaction to the bombing, and evidence of spying in that nation's labs have only added complexities to our relationship.

We are all in agreement that we must take steps necessary to protect our national security interests and to ensure that our national intelligence programs prevent future security breaches. But at this critical juncture, we would be foolish to abandon our economic and political relationship with China and with it our ability to influence economic, political, and humanitarian policies in the future.

I agree with Presidents Clinton, Bush, Reagan, Carter, and Ford that a policy of engagement is better than a policy of isolation. We cannot afford to embrace a Cold War mentality that would demonize and isolate China.

A policy of economic and political engagement is the surest way to promote U.S. interests in China, to advance democracy and human rights within China, and to enhance future economic opportunities for U.S. workers and businesses.

In addition to today's important vote, we must move swiftly to finalize a WTO agreement that will bring China into the international trade community. The United States is aggressively pursuing a WTO agreement for the past 21 months, and Ambassador Barshefsky should be complimented for the agreement that she has negotiated to date; and hopefully, it will be realized.

While a WTO agreement would present tremendous opportunities for U.S. workers and businesses, bringing China into the WTO is more than just a matter of market share. China’s accession into the WTO would lock China into a rules-based international organization and bring them into the legal framework of the international community through the WTO.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the problems that currently exist in China. I appreciate the efforts of some of my colleagues and remain committed to improving the area of human rights and trade policy and proliferation.

Since the reestablishment of diplomatic relations with China in 1979, total trade between our two nations has increased from $4.8 billion in 1980 to $75.4 billion in 1997. This makes China our fourth largest trading partner. China's economy is growing at an average rate of almost 10 percent a year, making it one of the fastest growing economies in the world.

In order for the United States to remain the dominant economic power in the world, we cannot close the door on the most populous nation in the world. China will continue to have a growing influence on the world's economy. For U.S. businesses and workers to continue to prosper and grow, we need continued economic engagement with China by renewing Normal Trade Relations.

In addition to today's important vote, we must move swiftly and finalize a WTO agreement that will bring China into the international trade community. The United States has been aggressively pursuing a WTO agreement for the past 21 months, and while an agreement has not been finalized, the deal currently on the table presents tremendous market opportunities for all sectors of the U.S. economy including agriculture, information technology, financial services, and manufacturers. Ambassador Barshefsky and her negotiating team are to be commended for their extraordinary efforts in reaching this unprecedented agreement.

As a member who represents the nation's number one agricultural district, I want to thank the Administration for negotiating an agreement that presents tremendous opportunities for U.S. producers. With respect to agriculture, high Chinese tariffs on nearly all agricultural products would be reduced substantially over the next four years. It is projected that by the year 2003, 37 percent of the world food demand will come from China. American ranchers and farmers are the most efficient and innovative in the world. The WTO agreement on the table would move to level the playing field and allow U.S. agriculture tremendous access to the world's largest agricultural market.

And agriculture isn't the only sector that would benefit. The agreement would also open Chinese markets to a number of U.S. industrial products and services including information technology products, automobiles, insurance and financial services. Quotas on information technology products would be reduced from 15.3 percent to zero, and China would agree to adhere to the Information Technology Agreement negotiated in 1996. In addition, the agreement offers U.S. investment in telecommunications and entertainment for the first time, and would subject China to more rigorous requirements for protection to ensure respect for U.S. copyrights, trademarks and patents. Automobile tariffs would be reduced from 80–100 percent to 25 percent. American insurance companies would be able to sell a wide range of products throughout China, as compared to the current policy that limits life insurance sales to Shanghai and Guangzhou. And American banks would be able to operate anywhere in China.

In addition to tariff reductions and other market access agreements, bringing China under the umbrella of the WTO would make China accountable for its trade practices and subject to WTO enforcement actions.

I support the Administration's policy, and am encouraged by recent reports that negotiations will resume in the near future. In spite of the recent strains place on our relationship with China, it is in our overwhelming interest to finalize a WTO agreement and maintain our policy of economic and political engagement.

A policy of continued engagement is the most effective way we have to protect our national security interests and promote our economic and political ideals.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the problems that currently exist in China, and I appreciate the efforts of some of my colleagues in remaining committed to improvements in the area of human rights, trade policy and proliferation. However, I strongly disagree with the philosophy of isolation and disengagement, and believe it would be a mistake to disapprove the extension of NTR.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), a strong voice for America's values and American security.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 57, which was commendably introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) in direct defiance to the Jackson-Vanik amendment renewed by the President on June 3.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to address an issue that we characterize as
normal trade status, normal trade relations, and we want to extend it.

The implications, of course, going along with that phrase "normal trade status," "normal trade relations," would be that something good is happening and the way we want to continue it, normal trade relations. But in reality, Mr. Speaker, nothing good is happening as a result of having these trade relationships with China. Nor are they in fact do not export very much and as a matter of fact every year it gets worse. The amount of products that we actually export from the United States to China is relatively small. A variety of reasons: The Chinese, of course the government keeps a number of obstacles in place to prevent us from actually exporting our merchandise. And beyond that, of course, there is no market.

Relatively few people in China can buy anything when the average income is $600 a year. That is one problem.

On the other side, of course, we do import a great deal from China; and we say that this is a good thing because we can import products that are cheaper. Our consumers can buy cheaper products.

Well, it is absolutely true that we can buy cheaper products from China. It is much more difficult for American workers to compete with workers in China. Because, of course, workers in China, for the most part, are not paid anything. They are, in fact, slave laborers.

A recent South China Morning Post article stated, China directory contains detailed financial information on 99 labor camps with annual commercial sales of $942 million to the United States.

In other words, we import almost a billion dollars of slave labor products, slave labor produced products. How proud does that make my colleagues feel?

Vote for the amendment.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), our distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the continuation of normal trade relations between the United States and China.

There is no doubt that China has, in fact, been a significant factor in the economic expansion we have all enjoyed in this country during the 1990s. In my own district, in Cincinnati, Ohio, we have almost doubled our exports to China during that time period. That means more jobs for my constituents, more prosperity for the families and businesses that I represent in southwest Ohio, and a healthy economy for my area, for the State of Ohio, and literally for all of the United States. And China is far from perfect. The lack of respect for human rights, the findings of the Cox report, the situation in Taiwan and other issues are serious problems. But none of these problems can be solved by disengagement.

In fact, our involvement with China, our engagement with China is one of the major reasons that the Chinese Government is stumbling and lurch in the right direction with regard to liberalizing their economy in particular, but also relaxing restrictions on human rights, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) pointed out. The example based on the testimony of missionaries who are in China.

Mr. Speaker, today this Congress is presented with a very clear and stark choice. We can choose to be constructive agents for positive change in China by continuing normal trade relations, or we can choose to be virtual enemies, returning to an antagonistic Cold War style relationship.

I would like to pose a few questions. Will our Nation's best interests be served by putting the world's most populous country into the rare category of only six countries who do not have normal trading relations, and reuniting North and South Korea? Will our Nation benefit by denying NTR status to China when not one of our competitors in Europe or Asia are not likely to follow suit?

Finally, will our children live in a safer and more secure world if we spend the next 50 years in a costly and distracting Cold War in China?

Mr. Speaker, I support continued engagement.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, there is a grotesque quality to this debate. If someone walks into this room, he really does not know whether he is listening to people who favor or oppose extending preferential trade relations with China because almost everybody begins by denouncing the horrendous human rights conditions in China.

Well, then, how horrendous.

Ten years ago, I put up in my office this poster demonstrating how a single individual with the courage of his convictions stood up to this monstrous, corrupt, communist dictatorship. Nothing has changed. Nothing has changed.

What moral authority this body has, it relinquishes it every year as we debate this issue.

The future of China does not rest with the communist leadership of this country. It rests with the new people who are passionately committed to a free and Democratic vote, are arrested daily, and are persecuted by this rotten dictatorship.

Support the resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) our distinguished colleague and a member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, although I understand and deeply respect the arguments of my colleagues who believe it is in the best interests of the United States to remove NTR with the People's Republic of China, I must respectfully oppose adoption of the measure before us.

Mr. Speaker, the facts cannot be contested that it is the direct fruit of our policy in China engagement which has been upheld in bipartisan fashion by five administrations since President Nixon.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with my colleagues that China has much more progress to make, especially in the areas of human rights, weapons proliferation, fair trade, and Taiwan's status. However, punishing China with NTR removal will not further these meritorious aims.

An economic war with China will result in immeasurable damage with the U.S. I believe this will fundamentally isolate the forces for continued progress and gradual reform in China, while propping up strongmen and hardliners like Li Peng and the PLA leadership who reject our country. The opportunities for heightened conflict with our country.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous move at a time when even China is además very volatile and extremely unstable both economically and politically.

In the interest of peace and stability for the people of China, people of the United States, and the peoples of the Asia-Pacific nations, I urge our colleagues to consider carefully the ramifications of H.J.Res. 57 and vote against this measure.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a man who served in Vietnam and a man who represents many military personnel deeply concerned about the security of our country.

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

Let us kind of review the bidding here. China has stolen American nuclear secrets. China has used hard American dollars that we have sent them pursuant to this trade loss that we experience with them every year to buy missile cruisers from Russia which we experience with them every year to buy missile cruisers from Russia which have one mission, and that mission is to kill American aircraft carriers. china has proliferated components for weapons of mass destruction to terrorist nations which have a stated goal of using those weapons of mass destruction on America.

A lot of my friends have talked about this policy of engagement. And yet what do we see in terms of China's real view of the United States? I think China's view of the United States is one that is seen through a very cynical lens. They view America's policy toward China as being one that is driven by corporate greed. And under that, they see no reason to change their policy in any of the very important areas where we would like to see
a change of policy because they believe that America’s real goals, our goals of trying to secure the world, our goals of trying to help our friends and allies, some of whom are threatened by China, will always be superseded by what they view as corporate greed. Let us prove them wrong. Let us pass Rohrabacher.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT).

(Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending normal trade relations with China and in support of keeping open the lines of communication and the doors through which we not only trade goods and services but also promote ideas and sell democracy.

The House should soundly defeat this resolution.

For many, China’s spying and its poor record on human rights are reason enough to support the resolution. But, it’s not enough. And it would be counterproductive. Ignoring and trying to punish this country of 1 billion accomplishes nothing but further isolating the very people we want to help. And we are right in pursuing a peaceful relationship with a country emerging as a world superpower.

The lines of communication and trade must stay open. It is through them that the power of American ideals, such as respect for the individual and the importance of individual freedom, can be shared. I will agree with many of my colleagues who have taken the floor today to call this a vote about abortion, but I disagree that a vote for this resolution is a pro-life vote. I want to keep open the means we have to touch those lives and let those poor people know there is a form of government that would never allow coerced abortions and force sterilizations upon its citizens.

By engaging China, we have and do make a positive difference. Change has been slow in China, but change will continue only with our continued input and influence.

No less important are the benefits to America of NTR. We must consider what denial of NTR will do for our exporters, especially US farmers and ranchers. We’re in the depths of a price crisis in agriculture. Our producers haven’t received prices this low for decades. Closing off even one trade avenue would only worsen the situation, and it would have only a negligible affect on China’s behavior.

By 2003, China will account for 37 percent of the world’s food demand. That’s a lot of mouths to fill. With China’s growing middle class and their growing demand for our superior products, this presents a tremendous opportunity for US producers.

I urge my colleagues, please don’t “cut off our nose to spite our face” with China. Our farmers and ranchers need this market, and the people of China need our ideas and support if they are to bring about change in their government and in their lives. Let’s keep the lines open.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield ½ minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to disapproving normal trade relations status for the People’s Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has had some serious issues with China: China’s abysmal human rights record, its alleged attempts to influence the White House by way of illegal campaign contributions, its theft of our military secrets.

These are legitimate points of concern between our nations. But supporters of this resolution are wrong to assume that they are connected or can be somehow corrected by revoking normal trade relations with China.

Let me repeat what has been said many times before. Engaging China through trade does not constitute an endorsement of China’s actions or policies. As Secretary of State Madeleine Albright correctly stated in a letter to Congress, “Revolving normal trade relations would do nothing to encourage the forces of change in China. It would not free a single prisoner, open a single church, or expose a single Chinese citizen to a new idea. It would seriously disadvantage America’s growing economic interest in China, rupture the overall United States-Sino relationship, and place at risk efforts to bring China into a rules-based international community.”

I would hasten to add that revoking normal trade relations with China would also jeopardize thousands of American jobs and would dramatically drive up prices for American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on this resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the most constructive step Congress can take today to fortify our Nation’s political ideals and economic foundation is to say “no” to renewing China’s “special” trade status. There is nothing “normal” about China’s trade relationship with the United States today. It is astoundingly abnormal, with gigantic and growing trade deficits.

This year it will amount to over $60 billion more of China’s goods coming into this country than our exports allowed into their nation; over half a million lost jobs in the United States; China, now the second largest holder of US dollar reserves and buying political influence around the world with that money, restructuring their markets and transshipping goods through Japan here to the United States.

All I can say is our ancestors in the Kennedy and Rogowski families came to this country for freedom. They were freedom lovers. They were opportunity lovers. I refuse to be a placeholder in this Congress for Chinese state monopolies or the Communist Party, and I certainly don’t want to be a placeholder for some of the largest multinationals on the face of the globe who merely want to make profits off the backs of those who work as slaves.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 57 which would cut off normal trade relations with China.

We have heard a number of bad things that have been occurring in China and certainly all of us would agree that they must change. But there are, I think, a number of issues that have to be raised before we deal with the issue of normal trade relations and decide what we should do with a country as large and as important as China.

I respect the point of view of my colleagues who have expressed support for this resolution, especially the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) who have been so adamant on this issue and so in many ways responsible in what they have done. We must change that trade imbalance that we have with China. That is not tolerable. The human rights conditions in China must improve. We all know that. And the piracy of American ingenuity, our intellectual products, whether it is our films, our music, we must protect all of those things from piracy that we see going on in China. But you cannot negotiate and you cannot settle anything if you are not willing to sit down at the table with folks. You have to engage. There is no way we can ever deal with the piracy issues, the human rights issues, the issues of the trade imbalance, if we are not willing to sit down at the table with China. This is where we need to go together.” It would be foolish for us to just all of a sudden break.

Are the Europeans, any European country breaking relations with China on economic matters? Are the Asians, any Asian country breaking economic relations with China? Are the Latin Americans, any Latin American country breaking relations with China because of the issues that we have raised? No, I don’t believe that is the case.

Not a one. Not one country that is part of the WTO has said, “We’re going to treat China the way this resolution would have the U.S. treat China.”
Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in opposition to this resolution and in support of free trade.

Mr. Speaker, the reason a country engages in free trade is not altruism—we do not engage in free trade to the benefit of a trading partner. Even if the reciprocal country does not lower its tariffs we can still benefit.

Open and free trade with all nations, short of war, should be pursued for two specific reasons. One, it’s in the right of the citizens of a free country to spend their money any way they see fit, anywhere in the world. And two, free trade provides the best deal for consumers allowing each to cast dollar votes with each purchase respecting quality and price. The foreign competition is a blessing in that it challenges domestic industries to do better. The Japanese car industry certainly resulted in American car manufacturer’s offering more competitive products.

In setting trade policy we must not assume that it is our job to solve any internal political problems of countries who may have any more to do with its responsibility to deal with in internal shortcomings.

Our biggest problem here in the Congress is that we seemingly never have a chance to vote for genuine free trade. The choice is almost always our own businesses, ingenuously subsidize trade or sanctions-plus-protectionism. Our careless use of language (most likely deliberate) is deceitful.

Genuine free trade would involve low tariffs and no subsidies. Export-Import Bank funding, OPIC, and trade development subsidies to our foreign competitors would never exist. Trading with China should be permissible, but aid should never occur either directly or through multilateral banking organizations such as the IMF or World Bank. A true free trade policy would exclude the management of trade by international agencies such as the WTO and NAFTA. Unfortunately, these agencies are used too frequently to officially place restrictions on countries or firms that sell products “too cheaply”—a benefit to consumers but challenging to domestic or to free market “competitors.” This is nothing more than worldwide managed trade (regulatory cartels) and will eventually lead to a trade war despite all the grandiose talk of free trade.

Trade policy should never be mixed with the issue of domestic political problems. Dictatorial governments trading with freer nations are more likely to respect civil liberties if they are trading with them. Also, it is true that nations that trade are less likely to go to war with each other than countries with extensive trade relations are simply less likely to go to war with each other than countries without these ties.

Renewing NTR with China will benefit our economy by expanding U.S. export opportunities and by providing American consumers access to low-cost goods.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, renewing NTR with China will help the Chinese people to liberate themselves from the dictatorship under which they live. Chinese Communist leadership has embarked on, what is for them, a dangerous course. Unlike most other Communist dictatorships this century, Deng Xiaoping chose to open China to foreign investment, enterprise and engagement with the West. His bet was that he could enjoy the economic benefits of capitalism without losing the Communist Party’s monopoly on political control.

If we engage China, Deng’s successors will lose that bet and the people of China will be the winners of freedom. Freedom is ultimately indivisible and once tasted, Mr. Speaker, it is irresistible. People who enjoy economic freedom will demand political freedom. People who read American newspapers will eventually demand their own free press. People who travel to the United States on business will see the incomparable superiority of freedom and in time demand it for themselves.

I urge a ‘no’ vote on this resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this is supposed to be about trade, but I also being a threat to our national sovereignty. If trade with China is to help us commercially and help the cause of peace, so too would trade with all countries.

I look forward to the day that our trade debate may advance from the rhetoric of managed trade versus protectionism to that of true free trade, without subsidies or WTO-like management; or better yet, free trade with an internationally accepted monetary unit recognizing the fallacy of mismanaged fiat currencies.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, rejecting this resolution and renewing NTR with China will help to safeguard American security with respect to a potential adversary, will serve American economic interests, and will encourage policies that will allow individual liberty, the rule of law and thus respect for human rights ultimately to flourish in China. The security that comes with the expanded trade opportunities that it brings in nonmilitarily sensitive goods reduces the likelihood of military conflict between the United States and China. Countries with extensive trade relations are simply less likely to go to war with each other than countries without these ties.

Renewing NTR with China will benefit our economy by expanding U.S. export opportunities and by providing American consumers access to low-cost goods.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, renewing NTR with China will help the Chinese people to liberate themselves from the dictatorship under which they live. Deng Xiaoping chose to open China to foreign investment, enterprise and engagement with the West. His bet was that he could enjoy the economic benefits of capitalism without losing the Communist Party’s monopoly on political control.

If we engage China, Deng’s successors will lose that bet and the people of China will be the winners of freedom. Freedom is ultimately indivisible and once tasted, Mr. Speaker, it is irresistible. People who enjoy economic freedom will demand political freedom. People who read American newspapers will eventually demand their own free press. People who travel to the United States on business will see the incomparable superiority of freedom and in time demand it for themselves.

I urge a ‘no’ vote on this resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this is supposed to be about trade, but I also
think it might be a form of genetic engineering. We are taking a gene of the global multinational corporation with its campaign to drive down wages and lower working conditions and knock out workers' rights and we are ethically combining it with a totalitarian, both pro-Americanist government which uses slave labor, violates human rights, attacks religious liberties, tortures children, forces abortions and attacks people who simply want to survive, and the same government is involved in the manufacturing of weapons of mass destruction.

Now, this is genetic engineering and we are combining this and we call it normal trade relations. There is nothing normal about this combination. We are talking about creating a Frankenstein. We should go back to the laboratory and work with the living.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment generally on the overall policy that the United States has had with China over the years. I think it is important to note that this is not a Democratic issue or Republican issue in fact, even the good will and intentions of the Nixon administration in opening the door to China, we might have missed even that.

And so we come to this point where annually we go through a ritual of dealing with a country that seems not to listen. I am troubled in both our debate and what we are requested to do. And so I would like to just offer what I hope the votes are taken today and as I reluctantly vote to provide the NTR with its continuation, that the American policy, both Republican and Democrats, both this administration and Congress, be focused on action items of what we should be doing.

First of all, I think it is horrific of the siege of the American embassy in the former Yugoslavia which we apologized, I think we should demand compensation for the U.S. embassy and its consuls offices. I believe we should demand, of course, the relationship between Taiwan and China, actively engage in maintaining a normal dialogue between our nations. We might have missed even that.

And so we come to this point where we should do our homework, to do something about it.

I rise today to express my serious concern regarding normal trade relations with China. Opponents of the resolution argue that while China may be engaged in many atrocious practices, they believe that if we revoked normal trade relations it is too drastic a step and would most likely prove to be counterproductive.

This year's annual vote on the trade status between the United States and China has, however, assumed even more attention of late. This year has presented the U.S.-Chinese relationship with many obstacles and hurdles to maintaining a normal dialogue between our two nations. We are all more than familiar with the issues in this relationship including: the trade deficit with China which continues to widen. Second only to Japan, Chinese predatory trade practices have resulted in a trade deficit of an estimated $60 billion. This trade deficit is growing at a faster rate than that with any other major trading partner.

The unresolved status of Taiwan continues to go unresolved. The Chinese refusal to agree to renounce the use of force continues to alarm its Asian neighbors.

China's slow and often times stagnant pace of reform in the area of human rights. The Chinese seemingly have learned little from the Tiananmen Square massacre; ten years later they continue to hamper pro-democracy efforts and religious freedom.

Chinese efforts to stem the proliferation of nuclear arms continue to proceed at a snail's pace. The Chinese庑ed ballistic missile technology to Syria and Pakistan, provides nuclear and chemical weapons technology to Iran, and refuses to comply with the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

In addition to these issues, the United States is still reviewing the ramifications of the Cox Report. We are also still struggling to come to an understanding of the Chinese government's reaction to the mistaken bombing of the China's embassy. The tragic bombing was clearly a mistake and the administration apologized for this mistake but despite these efforts the Chinese government nevertheless a violent protest to go unchecked and threaten the lives of our embassy personnel.

Opponents of this legislation have stated that the argument over normal trade status is not just about what kind of country China is— it is about what kind of nation we are. I agree with this statement because I believe that we are not a nation who quits in the middle of the race. Our relationship with China is not a sprint but rather a marathon race. A relationship begun in earnest during the Nixon administration, China has continually opened itself largely due to the insistence of the United States.

The stakes in this year's Normal Trade Relations debate are higher than ever. The United States and China are on the verge of a major trade agreement sealing the terms for Chinese accession to the World Trade Organization. Such a breakthrough would open China's markets to American products, companies, workers, and farmers and bring China under global trade rules and enforcement procedures. Normal Trade Relations is important to our efforts to complete a World Trade Organization. The China market is particularly important for American agriculture, which is experiencing a serious economic downturn because of declining U.S. exports to Asia.

Removing Normal Trade Relations would almost certainly remove all hope of reducing the widening gulf between our two nations and building a lasting bridge of communication. In simple dollar and sense terms, it would cost the American people both jobs. United States exports to China have tripled over the last decade and support over 170,000 American jobs.

America's relationship with China will go through many ups-and-downs, just like our relationship with every other country. Even the most difficult issues may require the strong assertion of U.S. interests. But it is vital that the fundamental elements of stable U.S.-China relations remain intact. Revoking Normal Trade Relations or enacting anti-China legislation is not a solution and would threaten America's vital stake in cooperation with China on proliferation, security, and trade. However, the United States must be firm in its relationship with China on its Human Rights abuses compensation for the students that could not the tremendous damage that is being done in the former Yugoslavia, and I vote for Most Favored Nation status for China in 1995, and I wait a year, and it got worse. And in 1996 we heard the same arguments over again, engagement was the only way to lower the deficit and improve human rights. And I voted for it again, Mr. Speaker, and it got worse, and the same the following year, and the same last year.

When I got here in 1995, the trade deficit with China was $33 billion. Today it is projected to be $67 billion. I have heard a speaker say that there is no argument about the facts here, only about what the end result is going to be. Well, Mr. Speaker, the facts are that the steelworkers, a man who has sometimes disagreed with me, but always in a very pleasant way, but one who shares our basic values and concern for the working people of our country and his district.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Doyle), a friend of mine, a real gentleman. Ambassador Chas, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

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

Mr. CHANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Nussle), our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means.
(Mr. NUSSELE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NUSSELE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution, in support of normal trade relations.

Mr. BERIEUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BERIEUTER).

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

Mr. BERIEUTER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific and a member of the Cox Committee, I rise in opposition to the resolution. I strongly support the continuation of NTR status for China because it is clearly both in America's short-term and long-term national interests. Continuing NTR is not about granting a favor or a preference to China; it is about acting in our own national interest. That is what this debate is all about. Rather than ranting and raving about problems in human rights and democratic freedoms, I prefer to focus realistically on doing something about them. This is not the right forum for addressing those issues.

Mr. Speaker, even as President Nixon announced the opening of China, U.S. policymakers have sought to promote a stable and peaceful Asia where America's trade interests could be advanced without sacrificing security. Successive administrations have expanded trade relations and economic liberalization key tenets of our China policy. The goal is not only to expand U.S. trade, but also to provide a means of giving China a stake in a peaceful, stable, economically dynamic Asian Pacific region and pulling that country into an international community.

Overall, this responsible approach has been successful despite the increasingly problematic nature of Sino-American relations. It has protected not only our own national interests, but also those of our friends and allies.

The U.S. has convinced nearly every other country in the region that the best way to avoid conflict is to engage each other in trade and close economic ties. Abandoning this basic tenet of our foreign policy with respect to China would be a serious shock and would be an extraordinary setback for much of what our Nation has been trying to achieve in the entire Asian Pacific region. Mr. Speaker, it would send a signal to the world that the United States is not a reliable trading partner, and it would galvanize many countries scrambling to choose between China and the United States.

Finally, remember that it is certainly premature to view China as an enemy or an adversary, although we can make it our adversary if we adopt a policy of trying to isolate and ostracize China.

There is perhaps no more important set of related foreign policy issues for the 21st century than the challenges and opportunities posed by the emergence of a powerful and fast-growing China. However, today we are not having a debate focused on those important challenges. Instead, we are debating whether to impose 1930s Great Depression-era Smoot-Hawley trade tariffs on China that the rest of the world and China know for our own American interests we realistically will never impose.

This particular annual debate has become highly counterproductive; it is very damaging to Sino-American relations and almost certain to produce little, if any, positive results in China or in our relationship with that country and its people. It unnecessarily wastes our precious foreign policy leverage and seriously damages our Government's credibility with the leadership of China and with our allies. It hinders our ability to coax the Chinese into the international system of world trade rules, non-proliferation norms, and human rights standards. Moreover, Beijing knows the United States cannot deny NTR without severely harming American workers, farmers, consumers or businesses, or do it without devastating the economies of Hong Kong and Taiwan.

It is true as NTR opponents argue, that ending normal trade relations with China would deliver a very serious blow to the Chinese economy, but the draconian action of raising the average weighted tariff on Chinese imports to 44 percent harm the United States economy as well. China is already the 13th largest market abroad for American goods and the 4th largest market for American agricultural exports. If NTR is denied to China, Beijing will certainly retaliate with over $14 billion in tariffs on U.S. exports to China. As a result, many of the approximately 200,000 high-paying export jobs related to United States-China trade would disappear while the European Union, Canada, Japan, Australia, Brazil, and other major trading nations would rush to fill the void.

Maintaining NTR is crucial to being able to re-engage in negotiations with China on its accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO), negotiations which could result in a much greater opening of China's markets to U.S. agricultural, industrial and service exports. As the pending agreement is export-oriented, it is the American worker, farmer and businessman who benefit from increased sales to China. The agreement would also institute significant reforms that reduce the competitive coercion on American businesses to transfer their industrial technology to China or for China to require manufacturing offsets to transfer jobs from the United States to China.

Just focusing specifically on agriculture for a minute, it is certainly worth remembering that the American Farm Bureau has called China "the most important growth market for U.S. agriculture in the 21st century." The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that, over the next decade, 75 percent of the growth in American agriculture will come from sales to China, of which half will come from increased U.S. exports to China. In the China WTO accession negotiations and have been halted but which the Administration quite rightly wants to resume having mistakenly rejected a commercial viable package during Premier Zhu's visit last April, it is China that is making all of the concessions. The United States is not giving up anything. In manufactured goods and service exports, the news was almost all incredibly good. In agriculture, for example, the pork, beef, soybean, corn and wheat markets that are growing the most quickly in the world today are American exports today would be opened significantly with tariffs dropping from over 40 percent today down to 12 percent or lower. In-
Let us support this sensible resolution. Let us end the policy which just does not work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I am not anti-Chinese. I am not saying that we not want to have good relations with the People's Republic of China.

I do not want another cold war with China, and I want to see our country do everything it can to establish warm and positive relations with China.

I support this resolution because our current trade policy with China is a disaster. We currently have a $67 billion trade deficit with China, in a year in which we are experiencing a record breaking $224 billion overall trade deficit. Economists tell us that for every one billion dollars we have in a trade deficit we lose 17,000 jobs—many of them decent paying manufacturing jobs. That means that our trade deficit with China is costing us approximately 1,139,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned that, over the last 20 years, many of the largest corporations in this country have invested tens of billions of dollars in China in the search for very cheap labor. They are not investing in Vermont, New York or Mississippi. They are not hiring young American workers. They are not re-building our manufacturing base. Instead, they are hiring desperate workers in China. China pays an hour to produce products which are then sold in the United States and elsewhere—products not meant for the Chinese market but for the world market.

The result of this whole trend is that corporate profits soar, the average American worker today is earning 12% less in inflation accounted for weekly earnings compared to 1973. In terms of hourly wages, in 1973 the average American worker earned $13.61. Today, in the midst of this so-called booming economy, that worker is earning $12.77 an hour—6% less than in 1973. I should also add that that American worker is now working 160 hours a year more than was the case 20 years ago in order to make up for the drop in his or her real wages.

Mr. Speaker, we must stop the race to the bottom. We want to see the people in China and all developing countries improve their standard of living, but we must help that happen in a way that does not hurt American workers. We must not continue to play American workers off against Chinese workers. American workers should not have to compete against the workers in China who are paid extremely low wages, who cannot form unions, who cannot even elect their political leaders.

In fairness to the working people of this country, we must not continue MFN with China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. J. Res. 57, a resolution to disapprove normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China.

It is clear to see that our trade deficit with China has skyrocketed over the years, and hundreds of thousands of good paying American jobs have been exported. In 1993 we had a $22 billion trade deficit with China. Last year the deficit was $60 billion. Thanks to this administration's misguided trade policies, we have traded away good paying American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, over the years we have been bending over backwards for Beijing. I ask the question: Why?

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. J. Res. 57, a resolution to disapprove normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China.

It is clear to see that our trade deficit with China has skyrocketed over the years, and hundreds of thousands of good paying American jobs have been exported. In 1993, we had a $22 billion trade deficit with China. Last year, the deficit was $60 billion. Thanks to the Administration's misguided trade policies, we've traded away good paying American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, over the years, we've been bending over backwards for Beijing. Why?

They need us more than we need them. They need the American market. We have one of the strongest and wealthiest consumer markets in the world. They sell billions of dollars of their products in our market. They need us. They need America. But while they insist we open up more of our markets, they've steadfastly refused to open up theirs.

Then why should we give NTR to China? Supporters argue that by staying engaged with China is the only way we can improve their behavior. But I would ask those supporters, in the last twenty years, have we seen any improvement?

Has China improved their human rights record? No. They're still considered one of the most egregious offenders in the world. They prosecute Christians, throw pro-democracy activists in labor camps and gulags, and promote forced abductions and sterilization.

Has China improved their unfair trade practices? No. They continue to keep American products by imposing high trade barriers. They dump our shores with their cheap products, but won't allow us to fairly sell American goods in their market. Democratic Taiwan, a little island of only 23 million people, buys American goods in their market. Democratic Taiwan, a little island of only 23 million people, buys American products by imposing high trade barriers. They refuse to join international efforts to control nuclear proliferation.

Has China been our friend in the international arena? No. They send spies over to steal our nuclear technology. They continue to threaten their democratic neighbors in the Pacific region. They recently renewed threats to steal our nuclear technology. They continue to threaten their democratic neighbors in the Pacific region. They recently renewed threats to steal our nuclear technology. They continue to threaten their democratic neighbors in the Pacific region. They recently renewed threats to steal our nuclear technology. They continue to threaten their democratic neighbors in the Pacific region. They recently renewed threats to steal our nuclear technology.

We've given China opportunity after opportunity to show their friendship. We've offered them our hand in friendship, but they've refused to take it. They continue to confront us as enemies.

A recent article in The People's Daily, a Communist controlled newspaper in China, the U.S. was likened to Nazi Germany. Is that the action of a friend?

Mr. Speaker, extending NTR to China is not in line with our strategic interests, and it is not in line with American ideals. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this resolution and against NTR for China.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Rohrabacher amendment, and listening to the arguments that have been made today that suggest we discontinue normal trade relations with China, one of the points that is being made is that we need to send a message to China that we disapprove particularly of some of the reprehensible behavior that appeared to have happened recently with their government.

I agree we need to send a message to China. They certainly should not be engaged in conduct that is contrary to the very values which we stand for and practice every day. But I strongly disagree that this is the proper means by which to send a message.

This is not just a sense of Congress, this is not just a message. This is a complete collapse of our trade relationship with China.

Listen to what some of the missionaries have said who serve in that country and care very deeply about many of the human rights issues that we have discussed here on the floor of the House today. They have argued for constructive engagement to continue in China.

Let us not set off another trade war just to send a message. The United States trade representative has estimated that it could cost consumers as much as half a billion dollars in increased prices for shoes, clothing, and small appliances if we were to end this trade relationship entirely and set off a trade war.

The question has been raised today by a number of very eloquent speakers, what has changed since we have allowed normal trade relations to continue over the years? Where have we seen progress? Well, what is about to change is that we hopefully will have a debate on the House floor in just a few months about whether China enters the World Trade Organization, and this will be an incredibly fundamental debate. It will be an opportunity for us to engage China on a broader scale than ever before in an attempt to expose them to our values and to expose them to more people from our country.

A number of us met with the premier of China just a few months ago, and many of us told him that, as we begin to trade more with this country, we invariably will expect more from that country as we expose them to our values, as we exchange more citizens on a regular basis. We believe democracy will be contagious, we believe our values will be contagious because we think that we stand for many universal truths. That is when constructive engagement really begins to have a dramatic and long term impact, when we begin to expose them to our values, and we talk as a Congress about how we are going to use that to really have truly long-term improvement in the lives of the citizens of China regardless.
of what their government chooses to do and the progress the government chooses to make.

So today let us send the appropriate message which is this is not an endorsement of policies that China is engaged in that we strongly disagree with, but it is a clear recognition once again that a trade war is not in our Nation’s best interests and that we should defeat this motion today.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for the moment.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of normal trade relations with China and in opposition to this resolution of disapproval. I have grave concerns about the Chinese Government. Their policy and practice include religious persecution, stealing our national secrets, unfair trade practices, and military intimidation of their neighbors.

Let us be clear. The Chinese government is no friend of the United States or democracy. However, I would subscribe to Ronald Reagan’s philosophy on domestic adversariness: contain them militarily, engage them diplomatically, and flood them with Western goods and influence.

Sad to say, the Clinton-Gore administration on the diplomatic front is suspect on the diplomatic front; yet on the trade front where Congress has a say, we should not fail. Maintaining normal trading relations is important to the Chinese people, but it is also important to California farmers. These hard-working farmers support 14 million jobs in California, have led the Nation in production since 1948. California’s agricultural exports to China have risen nearly 50 percent since 1993 and now total over $2.4 billion annually.

With all these exports to China, California sent an equal amount of American ideals, moral values, and capitalism.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to just take a moment to respond to some comments I have heard here today.

First, we are here to complain about a policy that does not work. To those who say that the trade will lead to human rights, this trickle-down notion, this trickle-down liberty notion has not worked. So we do not want to start a trade war with China. I am going to tell my colleagues why that is not going to happen.

First of all, though I want to recognize once again that the name has been changed from Most Favored Nation status to Normal Trade Relations, and that the name was not changed to protect the innocent. The human rights violations continue. As we speak, the regime that we want to hand $67 billion to is rounding up people for their freedom of expression in China.

On the trade issue, here is the item: $71 billion. So if we threaten to revoke MFN or NTR, whatever colleagues want to call it, the Chinese are not going to walk away. Where are they going to sell $71 billion dollars’ worth of goods? They cannot. The same threat that the administration used on intellectual property violations should apply here. So they are not going any place with 72 billion dollars’ worth of goods.

I urge my colleagues to vote nay on the resolution.

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

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMkus). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Chair.

Is there some notion or plan for a quorum call? So we just finish this debate in the next few minutes, and there will be no quorum call?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No. Mr. ROHRABACHER. Then I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At this point a point of no quorum is not in order.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. It is just like clock work. As spring turns into summer and the throngs of tourists begin their dissent on the Nation’s Capital once again, we come to the House floor for what has become an almost ritualistic debate about trade relations with China. Once again, we find ourselves driven to view our trade relations with 1.3 billion people through the narrow prism of a decades-old statute to fit this situation. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to end this kind of debate. If we are ever to develop a truly coherent and a comprehensive policy towards this nation, the largest on the face of this planet, we have to break free from this debate.

Our relationship with China is complex, and it is increasingly important. There are a myriad of issues that are intertwined in this relationship: nuclear proliferation, regional security, the bilateral trade balance, intellectual property protection, religious freedom, the future of Taiwan, Tibet and Hong Kong, and political and economic freedom for the people of China. How can we possibly deal with these complex issues through an annual congressional debate that asks a single question: Should we conduct commercial relations with China on the same basis that we do with other countries?

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to take a step forward with me today. Vote down this resolution of disapproval and join in forging a truly comprehensive policy towards the People’s Republic of China.

I believe to my very core that the most important thing we can do for human rights in China is to help bring a rules-based system of trading to that region and the only way we can do this is to get China into the World Trade Organization. We must help those who are reformers in China to help themselves. We must continue to work to bring the rule of law to China. We must strengthen our relationship with our allies by maintaining a strong military presence in that region, and we must be clear and consistent in our message to the Chinese government.

But one thing is clear. This annual debate over whether we will continue our political and economic relations with China is never constructive. It hampers our ability to formulate a comprehensive and effective policy toward the region, and I believe it is time for it to end.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a renewal of Normal Trade Relations. History has shown economic growth to be an effective catalyst for political change. The principles of individual liberty and a freedom embodied in economic liberalization will prevail, but only if we have the political courage to make the right choice to let them flourish, and that means renewing Normal Trade Relations with China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, last year legislation overhauling the Internal Revenue Service included a provision changing the term Most Favored Nation trading status to Normal Trade Relations. Apparently supporters of MFN for China decided that changing the name would make this debate go away. The debate is the same. Only the names have been changed in order to protect the guilty.

Yet no mistake about it, the People’s Republic of China is guilty. They are guilty of stealing American nuclear weapons secrets. They are guilty of proliferating weapons of mass destruction around the world. They are guilty of gross violations of human rights. They are guilty of a wide array of unfair trade practices. China has already been convicted in the court of
public opinion. The question is, what is this Congress going to do in response to China's reckless behavior? Are we going to extend Normal Trade Relations for another year, or are we going to stop business as usual until China reforms itself?

Let us look at Beijing's proliferation rap sheet. They refuse to join international efforts to stem proliferation of nuclear arms, continue to transfer advanced ballistic missile technology to Syria and Pakistan; and they provide nuclear and chemical weapons technology to Iran, and they refuse to comply with the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. The Central Intelligence Agency has reported in February of this year that China remains a key supplier of technology inconsistent with nonproliferation goals.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing that will really make them reexamine this behavior is if this Congress actually denies them Most Favored Nation, Normal Trade Relations. Let us not forget that we already have a $60 billion trade deficit with them. Only Japan exceeds it, and that will not last for long. They continue to engage in proliferation activities; they continue to engage in human rights violations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this disapproval motion.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, in an imperfect world, we do not have the choice of dealing with perfect nations. Certainly we are far from perfect as a nation, as are we, and I must admit I am especially bothered by recent detentions in China, and I hope the Chinese know that this Congress is sensitive to those detentions.

But we have a choice today. It is engagement, or it is isolation. Let us see how that has worked in other circumstances. We chose isolation in the case of our dealings with Cuba. What has happened? Thirty-eight years later Castro is still in power. Let us choose engagement and look at that and its track record. We chose to engage the former Soviet Union. Today, they are a democratic nation, struggling with an economy, albeit, but a democratic nation.

The choice today is not dealing with perfect nations; it is a choice between isolation and engagement. I would suggest that the policy of engagement with China, as important of a nation as it is, is vital for America and the world in the 21st century.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHIMKUS) to be used for yielding on his side.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the joint resolution and in opposition to the extension of MFN to China.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and in opposition to the extension of normal trade relations with China.

Our agricultural economy is in a desperate situation and we need to move to improve access to international markets. But China has had years to prove that it is a viable market for American agricultural products and has failed to do so.

Despite years of engagement and normal trade relations, our trade with China has been going backwards and we still face severe roadblocks in agricultural goods.

Let's review some of the supposed benefits the United States has realized from normal trade relations:

- Our overall trade deficit had increased from $6.2 billion in 1989 to $56.9 billion in 1998.
- The average Chinese tariff on agricultural imports is 40%.
- Some agricultural commodities are assessed tariffs greater than 100%.
- Agricultural exports to China have actually decreased by nearly $100 million since 1989.

Such a deal! I am sure those that claim trade benefits from this relationship have some "lake front" property in the Gobi desert for us too.

I believe we must increase our access to international markets for a variety of agricultural commodities, especially meat like pork. Like many of my colleagues and my constituents, I am concerned about the future of America's pork industry. China is a huge potential market—there are more than one billion people in China and they consume vast quantities of pork.

Well, let's take a look at how this market has treated the American pork industry under normal trade relations:

Chinese pork production in 1997 was 42.5 million metric tons compared to the 7.8 metric tons produced in the U.S. How can we expect to increase pork exports to this market that produces 6 times the amount of pork we do when there are agricultural barriers in place?

U.S. pork exports to China in 1997 totaled only 150,000 metric tons—less than 2% of our domestic production.

Overall pork and swine exports to China in 1998 amounted to only $6.5 million dollars.

Some point to recent reductions in agricultural tariffs on certain products as an indication of Chinese capitulation. Yet, they fail to note that China continues to implement several non-tariff trade barriers.

The U.S. Trade Representative reported this year that China still conducts import substitution. In other words, the Chinese government does deny permission to import foreign products when a domestic alternative exists, or, given their closed society, whenever they want.

Look at the numbers I just cited: China produces a lot of pork. NTR will not alter this competitive structure.

Normal trade relations have not altered these protectionist policies and will not promote changes in the future.

Years of normal trade relations have not resulted in a significant reduction in trade restrictions. Normal trade with China has not resulted in a better trade relationship.

Instead, China has sold us a bill of goods in which realization of potential markets remains problematically around the world.

The result has been an increase in our trade deficit with a Communist regime.

Let's think about that. We can argue the benefits and detriments of trade with China all day. But we also need to consider that this Communist government spied on American nuclear facilities.

They stole vital American nuclear secrets. They have the capability to strike American soil with nuclear weapons!

How can we reward such actions with Most Favored Nation trading status? That's right—we may have changed its name, but the impact is the same—Most Favored Nation.

What kind of message do we want to send to the international community? We can send one of two messages:

"The steal from us, threaten your neighbors and violate your people's basic human rights and you will reap the benefits of American capitalism."

Or, "Play by rules, respect the security of your neighbors and preserve the rights of your people, or feel the consequences of your actions."

Let's send the right message. That America will not be violated or manipulated.

I urge my colleagues to vote against rewarding this country with preferential trade status and vote for House Resolution 57.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox), the distinguished chairman of the Cox Commission, a bipartisan select committee that was set up to investigate certain national security challenges that we face with Communist China.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to debate the President's waiver of the Jackson-Vanik law, which, by its terms, requires that in order to get lower tariff treatment, the People's Republic of China must have fair immigration policies. Yet, having listened to the debate, I have not heard the substance of Jackson-Vanik come up at all; neither the supporters nor the opponents of this resolution have even mentioned the PRC's immigration policies. Instead, this debate has been cast as a debate about free trade, and by the supporters of the resolution as a debate about political, economic, religious, civil and other human rights concerns in the People's Republic of China.

If this resolution really was about free trade, if this debate were really about free trade, then I would vote in support of free trade. Because it is in America's interests and it is in the interests of all of our trading partners. It is at least arguable that human rights violations are a separate issue from the question of tariff rates on beanie babies being imported into the United States.

Yes, sadly, in order to guarantee the defeat of this resolution, its opponents are whitewashing the government's record, making extravagant, that is to
say the People's Republic of China's record, making extravagant claims about the progress of democracy in China; there is none, or the liberal limbs of certain of China's Communist rulers. That certainly requires a double standard. On China's Guatemala's, the democratic government and people and society in Taiwan buy far more from the United States than all of the PRC and have one of the highest standards of living in the world.

Whitewashing human rights abuses in the PRC, which is what this debate has come to symbolize is not in our Nation's interests, nor in the interests of the people of China. It is for this reason, especially on a vote that is largely symbolic, the President has already granted this waiver and everyone knows that there will not be a two-thirds vote in the Senate or the House or both to override, so especially on a symbolic vote, I cannot join with the opponents.

The PRC really does deny freedom of speech; the PRC really does deny freedom of thought. The Communist government really does persecute religious groups that it cannot control, and it really has jailed millions of people, prisoners of conscience, in the notorious laogai slave labor camps that Harry Wu has so courageously documented.

Last year, President Clinton signed a law passed by this Congress that required the Secretary of Defense to send us a list of People's Liberation Army-controlled companies operating in the United States. The administration is in violation of that law; they have been for years. Mr. Chairman, the President has already granted this waiver and everyone knows that there will not be a two-thirds vote in the Senate or the House or both to override, so especially on a symbolic vote, I cannot join with the opponents.

The permanent normal trade relationship to the People's Republic of China is also an extension of normal trade relations to the People's Liberation Army. I know of no responsible U.S. corporation that wishes this.

This debate and this vote is not about tariff rates. It is about sending a signal to Beijing. I cannot rubber stamp the Clinton policy towards China, and I am heartened that a big number of Republicans and Democrats today who want to revoke normal trade relations status for China. I, too, am deeply concerned that top nuclear secrets were stolen from U.S. nuclear labs, but I blame the United States more than I blame China. In my judgment, the Clinton administration failed to understand the fundamental difference between promoting a strong business relationship with China and maintaining a strong strategic military advantage with that Nation.

The distinguished Cox Report counsels changes in our counterintelligence and military security, but it does not call into question our business relations with China, but I blame the United States more than I blame China. In my judgment, the Clinton administration failed to understand the fundamental difference between promoting a strong business relationship with China and maintaining a strong strategic military advantage with that Nation.
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Some have characterized this as a debate about whether China has violated human rights and whether China has much of a defensible record on religious freedom, or whether they have much of a progressive record towards democracy. But I readily concede, and I think most people who stand in opposition to the resolution readily concede that China does not have a sterling record on any of these items. In fact, it has an abysmal record.

But I think it is really a debate as to whether the denial of normal trade relations will have much of an effect on any of these matters. Closing the door to the PRC, and in de facto punishing it with high tariffs, is not the answer to alleviating human rights conditions there or preventing espionage in the future. This is just simply too simplistic.

The United States is already tied to the rest of the world, to the high tech, to integrated tapestry of economic, political, and social coexistence. We need to maintain our policy of engagement with China.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 57, which would revoke Normal Trade Relations (NTR) with the People’s Republic of China (PRC).

Closing the door to the PRC and de facto punishing it with high tariffs is not the answer to alleviating human rights conditions there or preventing espionage in the form of stealing nuclear secrets. This so-called solution is too simplistic a plan. The fact is the United States is already tied to the rest of the globe in a sophisticated and integrated tapestry of economic, political, and social coexistence. This punished effort to have our interests in global commerce and leadership. What evidence do we have that suspension of NTR would lead to a conciliatory PRC ready to bend at the will of American morality and ethics? None. In the other hand, free traders and many observers will attest that NTR suspension will backfire on the United States guaranteed. A minimum of 400,000 American jobs, which depend on exports to the PRC and Hong Kong, will be threatened. In addition, more than the Asian financial crisis will stall and further hurt American businesses and workers. Our economic competitors would be more than eager to supplant the United States’ position as one of the PRC’s largest trading partners. It takes little genius to realize that the phenomenon that has protected the United States from the Asian crisis has been our aggregate consumption. This measure would be sure to stymie this indeed.

The political ramifications of suspending NTR with the PRC are clearly negative. There is the hard-line PRC coming to the fore as feelings of American attempts to ostensibly contain the PRC are heightened. In addition, our ASEAN and Asian allies fear that political instability in the PRC will mean instability in the Asia-Pacific region. Americans living in the continental United States may feel insulated from the turmoil in the Asia-Pacific, but for the Americans living in the area, such as the residents of Guam, this threat of tumult, whether economic or political, is very real. While the rest of America rode on an economic high during the height of the Asian financial crisis, Guam experienced an economic depression which has catapulted our unemployment level to 14% today.

I am fully in support of improving the lives of PRC citizens, which includes greater democracy, respect for human rights, and regional stability, but suspending NTR is not the way to do it. Engaging the PRC is the answer. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.J. Res. 57 in the interest of Americans.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu).

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

Mr. Speaker, as the first Chinese American to serve in this House, as a high technology and international trade attorney, I have a special responsibility in this debate. I thank my colleagues for the honor of speaking now.

This debate is not about engagement, because we all believe in engagement; but not just business engagement, because the business of America must be more than just business, and engagement must be through more than just the cash register. This debate is about how we view the Chinese people and about how we view ourselves.

Cash register engagement views the Chinese people as just workers and consumers. 2 billion strong arms to do our work, 2 billion consumers to wear American jeans. Full engagement recognizes that Chinese people are people like us, people with hopes and aspirations, aspirations to walk the path of freedom that we have blazed.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what this debate is really about. It is about who we are as a free people, what are our values, what does this Congress stand for; our integrity as individuals. Can we live up to the legacy of our forebears, those in this Congress who swore themselves to liberty, and in so doing, pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor?

In this debate, in this debate I would like to address three groups.

First, to the Chinese people, so rich in culture and history and heritage, I encourage them to strive not just for prosperity but for freedom, also, because if they achieve prosperity, their children will thank them. But if they achieve both prosperity and liberty, their children will view them the way that I view my parents, as ordinary people who rose to extraordinary challenges. And in rising to these great challenges, they became giants of our era. I just want to remind the Chinese that with what my parents achieved in their era, their children will measure themselves against the legacy of freedom and prosperity that they can leave them. Rise to the challenge of history.

To the people of Oregon, those who have honored me back home with the greatest honor that an immigrant boy could ever hope to have, I represent thee in this Congress, know that we have a trade-dependent State, but they and I understand that the business of America must be more than just business.

We understand that those who came West, whether they came West across the ocean in crashing wooden ships or whether they came West across the prairie in creaking wooden wagons, they came West not just to get rich, they came West to be free. Oregonians expect to be represented by men and women of conscience. Join me in my vote of conscience today. Stand with me and stand with our forebears.

Finally, to my colleagues in this Chamber, they know what it means to cast this vote in a trade-dependent district, but I ask them to stand with me and to stand with our forebears who set their lives, their liberties, and their sacred honor on the line. Stand with me, and stand with all those who would walk the path of freedom with us.

For the past 10 years we have strayed from the path of liberty. Through two administrations we have listened to the siren song of the cash register. We have walked into a moral wasteland. What has it gained us but 10 years of growing trade deficits, $60 billion in an extra trade deficit, and millions of Chinese prisoners of conscience than ever?

We can change this with a vote today. Let me make this perfectly clear. If Members take away nothing more than this from this debate, know this, that with our vote today we can make one of the clearest differences of our congressional service. When we take this voting card and we insert it into that slot, when we insert it into that slot, we are literally, on the inside, the deepest, darkest dungeons ever built by man. When we face that red button and that green button, we can literally set people free by choosing that green button, because years ago, 6 or 7 or 8 years ago when the vote was close in this Chamber, the government in Beijing would set people free every single year in order to affect the vote in this Chamber. By choosing the green button, we can set people free today.

This, Mr. Speaker, is mere for us, it is mere for us, it is mere for us, it is mere for us. This is mere for us, it is mere for us, it is mere for us. For us, it is mere for us.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, by a previous agreement, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. Dunn).

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNAP) ordered the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. Dunn) to the Bar.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution and in support of our continuing policy of engagement through normal trade relations with China.

The open exchange of goods and services has been a critical component of...
fostering understanding between nations for centuries. Creating an environment of normal relations and ongoing engagement only serves to lower the walls of fear and suspicion while building a spirit of cooperation throughout the globe.

Make no mistake, our relationship with China is complex and evolving, a road filled with obstruction. We have legitimate concerns about nuclear proliferation: our own security protection, the security of Taiwan and the rest of the region, and human rights.

So what should be our objective with China with respect to trade relations? I believe that liberalized trade with a Communist society in the process of opening itself up to the community will some day deliver to our trading partners our most precious gift, and that is the gift of freedom.

There is important work being done in China by western groups attempting to fan this flame of democracy. The National Endowment for Democracy and the International Republican Institute are just two such groups sowing the seeds of freedom inside China. Ned Graham, a resident of my home State of Washington and son of evangelist Billy Graham, has been very successful in spreading the message of religious freedom in China.

His group, Eastgates International, has distributed 2.5 million Bibles in China since 1992. According to Mr. Graham, he can communicate freely with his contacts in China because of the proliferation of information exchange technology, a development that has been made possible by trade and economic reform.

Continuing normal trade relations with China, the United States' fourth largest trading partner, will only serve to build on this success. I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the honorable chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, by pre-arrangement, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of my friends for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a debate between those who care about national security and the security of our Nation's labs and those who care about trade. In fact, national security is our number one priority and should continue to be. In a bipartisan way, we are going to work to address that.

At the same time, we can not ignore the very important issues of human rights and of religious persecution. Mr. Speaker, I will take a back seat to no one when it comes to raising concerns about those human rights issues.

Ten years ago this summer, I joined with my colleagues marching to the Chinese Embassy to protest the Tiananmen Square massacre. Just last week, I met with family members of the Falun Gong religious movement whose relatives are being persecuted in China.

The fact of the matter is, our national interests are best served by maintaining commercial relations with our fourth largest trading partner and an emerging power in the Pacific. The key fact today is that the very same reforms that in our vibrant commercial relationship have been the single most powerful force for change in the 5,000-year history of China.

Now, in the last 2 decades, China has undergone a remarkable transformation. I should say to my colleagues who have raised the issue of Taiwan that, 2 decades ago, in Taiwan, there was a very repressive regime. Yet, relations were made possible by the transformation of China.

So in the last 2 decades, if we look at China, it has, in fact, undergone a remarkable transformation driven by market reforms and an open door to trade and foreign investment. Now this transformation is changing Chinese society and accelerating progress towards increased personal freedom, individual economic choice, and access to outside sources of information.

Many thoughtful analysts who study these changes that are taking place in China believe that the best hope for freedom and democracy in China lies along this path of reform.

About 10 days ago, I called professor Harry Rowen at the Hoover Institution who served in the Reagan administration, in fact one of the great experts on China's news in U.S.-China relations has caused him to change his mind about the long-term prospects for political freedom in China, which he wrote about 3 years ago in "National Interest." While a reality today, it is just as true that we are witnessing several remarkable pro-democratic developments in China.

For the first time in Chinese history, the judicial system gives criminal suspects the same basic rights afforded our system. Forced confessions have been ruled invalid as a means of proving guilt. These reforms have led to a rapid rise in commercial litigation and the cases involving the Chinese Government. There are even civil rights lawsuits that exist.

Now, I have been following for years, having served as a board member of the International Republican Institute, the work of the National Endowment for Democracy. We have been working to bolster freedom in village elections. Thanks to our efforts, we have seen in rural China a whole thrust of village elections. Today, 500 million Chinese experience local democracy by voting in competitive village elections where half of the winners have been nonCommunist candidates.

China's Internet users have doubled to 4 million since the end of 1998, and we now have seen just a report this morning that there are going to be 280 million cell phone users there. This is the right thing to do to maintain our commercial ties. I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about maintaining commercial relations with Communist China. It is about maintaining the current commercial relations with Communist China. This is not about isolating Communist China or disengaging from Communist China. It will not prevent anybody from talking to Communist China. This is not about banning trade with Communist China or ending trade with Communist China.

It is about altering the current rules of the game with trade.

This is about what? H.J. Res. 57 raises tariffs on products as long as they keep their high tariffs and roadblocks to American manufactured products. In other words, it ends the Chinese tariff advantage against our products.

Well, does it also do? It eliminates the subsidies. This resolution, H.J. Res. 57, would end the trading status which eliminates the subsidies. Our resolution eliminates the subsidies and loan guarantees that are now given to U.S. companies to do business in the United States and set them up in Communist China in order to take advantage of slave labor. Do we really want to subsidize businessmen this way? This resolution ends that practice.

Yes, it changes the current rules of the game. Under the current system, under those rules of the game where they can have high tariffs against our products, we let them flood their products into our country and subsidize the investment of our businessmen in China, in Communist China, to give jobs to their people and put our people out of work, give them the ability to outcompete us with our technology.

Under those rules of the game, we have had a $70 billion trade surplus. What have they done with that? They have used it to modernize their weapons. With that technology that they stole from us, from our missiles, and our weapons systems, they are using this $70 billion to modernize their weapons at us and to threaten American cities and threaten the lives of every American citizen.

Does a government like this deserve normal trade relations? I say no. It is time to change the rules of the game to protect America's interest, America's security.

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

Mr. Speaker, I feel deeply about the outstanding issues with China. We have had, indeed, a healthy debate. These are the right issues. Unfortunately, this resolution is the wrong answer.
I want to talk about trade and human rights. We have to be concerned about the imbalance of trade as shown on this chart. We have to be concerned about how we integrate a still non-market economy and one that is not based on law into a system that is based on the rule of law and on free market economy rules. We have to worry about that integration and how it is going to occur.

I very much disagree with those who think it is easy, that we should have just signed on the dotted line when Premier Zhu was here. There were outstanding issues that needed to be resolved, both in terms of market access and also in terms of the role of capital markets and labor markets in China when it is still not anything close to a market-based society.

How are we doing that? The best hope is to negotiate these issues in WTO accession by China. That is the best way to do it. Are we there yet? No. Can we get there? I hope so. If we do not, I will vote "no" on permanent NTR. If we make more progress, I could vote "yes".

But look, face it, all of our concern about market issues, about the imbalance of trade. We hope to, if not a rather soon fashion, address these issues will be pulled away from us if we were to pass this resolution. China accession, WTO accession negotiations would come to a careening halt, not only for the foreseeable future. We have got to do the hard work on trade.

I want to say a word about human rights. I feel deeply about this, too. One of my family entered China the day of Tiananmen Square. But, look, this discussion every year is not moving the ball forward. Everybody knows that, if we were to pass this resolution, it would not pass the Senate. If it were ever to pass the Senate, it would be vetoed by the President. We have got to do the hard work on human rights beyond this annual discussion.

So, look, the issues are the correct ones. But we need more than symbolism. We need more than symbolism. We need to do the hard work every day, day-to-day, on these trade issues and human rights issues. In that sense, this resolution is a diversion.

I hope out of this discussion will come a dedication to do WTO China trade. There is the interest of American workers and businesses and on human rights every day find new mechanisms to express ourselves.

We do not take ourselves seriously enough when we devote ourselves only once in a year. This is an every-year job on trade. It is an every-day job on trade. It is an every-year job on human rights. It is an every-day job on human rights.

Let us roll up our sleeves and do more in symbolism, and I am going to vote "no" on this resolution and then get busy solving the trade and human rights issues that are embedded in our present relationship with China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Gephardt), the distinguished minority leader, to close debate for our side.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I commend the leadership of the gentle- men from California (Ms. Pelosi) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu), a new Member of the House who comes from a district that is heavily dependent on trade. I want to commend his courage in making the statement he made today. He said that, on and on, that we must look at, trade, rule of law, human rights, that not only has China not made progress in the last year, in fact, I would say that they are moving in the exact wrong direction that they ought to be moving in.

Let us first talk about trade. In 1988, the year before Tiananmen Square, we had a $3.5 billion deficit with China. In 1997, it was $50 billion. This year, it will be $70 billion. In fact, our exports to China in this year will decline to less than $14 billion. We export more to Belgium, a country of 10 million people, than we export to China.

Why is this the case? It is the case because we are not allowed to export obviously it did it from his heart and his mind, and I really, really admire the statement that he made. I rise today to ask Members to vote for this resolution. It is clear to me that, on and on, that we must look at, trade, rule of law, human rights, that not only has China not made progress in the last year, in fact, I would say that they are moving in the exact wrong direction that they ought to be moving in.

Today is the day to take that stand. For trade, let us stand for rule of law and protect our property. If we do not take a stand on MFN, ultimately there is no way to get China to ultimately accept a rule of law and protect our property.

Finally, let me talk about human rights. Abraham Lincoln said that the Declaration of Independence gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world for all future time. The issue of human rights is not just an American issue, it is an issue for every human being in this world. And the primary reason to take this stand today against MFN for China is because they refuse, right till today, to give their people basic, decent human rights.

We remember Tiananmen Square, but let us look forward to today. There is a group in China that wants to practice its own form of religious belief, Falun Gong. They are arresting people today who they do not want to express their beliefs. They are arresting people in the Chinese government who are suspected now of allowing the people to carry out these beliefs in China.

Tell me if they are making progress. They are making progress in the wrong direction. When will America stand up and simply say that the human rights my country must be enjoyed by every citizen in this world, including the billion people who live in China.

Today is the day to take that stand. Vote for this resolution. Let us stand for trade, let us stand for rule of law and let us stand, most importantly, for the human rights of the people in China.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Oxley).

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Before I get into the thrust of my comments, I think we must all once again be reminded that what this debate is really all about is extending normal trading ties with China for another year.

Normal Trade Relations, or NTR, does not grant China special status to the Chinese. Rather, it simply grants the Chinese the same trading status that the U.S. has with most of the rest of the world.

China is our fourth largest trading partner. We exported $14 billion in goods and services to the Chinese in 1998, which supported over 200,000 high-wage American jobs.

Revolving NTR would push tariffs on Chinese goods from four to 40 percent, resulting in an effective tax increase of nearly $300 per American family.

I understand and appreciate the concerns opponents of NTR have with the government of the People's Republic of China. I harbor no illusions about the benevolence of the PRG's leadership.

A country that arrests people for speaking their minds is not about to protect people's property. A country that seizes political dissidents is not about to protect our property. A country that seizes the assets of foreign corporations is not about to protect our property. If we do not take a stand on MFN, ultimately there is no way to get China to ultimately accept a rule of law and protect our property.

Finally, let me talk about human rights. Abraham Lincoln said that our Declaration of Independence gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world for all future time. The issue of human rights is not just an American issue; it is an issue for every human being in this world. And the primary reason to take this stand today against MFN for China is because they refuse, right till today, to give their people basic, decent human rights.

We remember Tiananmen Square, but let us look forward to today. There is a group in China that wants to practice its own form of religious belief, Falun Gong. They are arresting people today who they do not want to express their beliefs. They are arresting people in the Chinese government who are suspected now of allowing the people to carry out these beliefs in China.

Tell me if they are making progress. They are making progress in the wrong direction. When will America stand up and simply say that the human rights my country must be enjoyed by every citizen in this world, including the billion people who live in China.

Today is the day to take that stand. Vote for this resolution. Let us stand for trade, let us stand for rule of law and let us stand, most importantly, for the human rights of the people in China.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Gephardt), the distinguished minority leader, to close debate for our side.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I commend the leadership of the gentle- men from California (Ms. Pelosi) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu), a new Member of the House who comes from a district that is heavily dependent on trade. I want to commend his courage in making the statement he made today. He said that, on and on, that we must look at, trade, rule of law, human rights, that not only has China not made progress in the last year, in fact, I would say that they are moving in the exact wrong direction that they ought to be moving in.

Let us first talk about trade. In 1988, the year before Tiananmen Square, we had a $3.5 billion deficit with China. In 1997, it was $50 billion. This year, it will be $70 billion. In fact, our exports to China in this year will decline to less than $14 billion. We export more to Belgium, a country of 10 million people, than we export to China.

Why is this the case? It is the case because we are not allowed to export obviously it did it from his heart and his mind, and I really, really admire the statement that he made. I rise today to ask Members to vote for this resolution. It is clear to me that, on and on, that we must look at, trade, rule of law, human rights, that not only has China not made progress in the last year, in fact, I would say that they are moving in the exact wrong direction that they ought to be moving in.

Today is the day to take that stand. Vote for this resolution. Let us stand for trade, let us stand for rule of law and let us stand, most importantly, for the human rights of the people in China.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Oxley).

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Before I get into the thrust of my comments, I think we must all once again be reminded that what this debate is really all about is extending normal trading ties with China for another year.

Normal Trade Relations, or NTR, does not grant China special status to the Chinese. Rather, it simply grants the Chinese the same trading status that the U.S. has with most of the rest of the world.

China is our fourth largest trading partner. We exported $14 billion in goods and services to the Chinese in 1998, which supported over 200,000 high-wage American jobs.

Revolving NTR would push tariffs on Chinese goods from four to 40 percent, resulting in an effective tax increase of nearly $300 per American family.

I understand and appreciate the concerns opponents of NTR have with the government of the People's Republic of China. I harbor no illusions about the benevolence of the PRG's leadership.
However, I firmly believe that engagement with China offers the best hope for democratic reform there. I have to ask what opponents of engagement hope to accomplish by revoking NTR. To my mind, it would be a step backward.

Again, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution and promote, rather than stifle, positive change in China.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me wrap up by expressing my total commitment to the traditional bipartisan support we have given toward advancing normal trade relations with China, and I am talking about all of our presidents, President Ford, President Carter, President Reagan, President Bush, President Clinton, all of them; and most recently, in addition, 17 former secretaries of State, Defense and national security advisers, all of whom endorse the view that the Cold War has passed and we must pursue of continuing normal trade relations with China.

Normal trade relations supports U.S. jobs. In addition to that, it maintains our ability to create a positive change in China, paves the way for further trade liberalization, and preserves our security interests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 57.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the resolution which would unilaterally isolate China from the United States. I support Normal Trade Relations with China. I support China being part of the WTO. China will be one of the superpowers in the next millennium. Peaceful coexistence is of benefit to us all.

Now, we all understand that things are not as we would like them in China. But how do we most impact that? I think by engaging them in fair trade, our discourse with China since since the close of the cold war has passed dividends. To put our head in the sand and to back away would be ill-advised.

I come to the floor today to again express my strong support for continuing Normal Trade Relations with China.

Since I came to Congress in 1991, this debate has gone on every year and every year I have come to the floor to explain how important trade with China is to our farmers. It is essential that we continue to grant Normal Trade Relations to China. China will be the most important market for the United States in the 21st Century and granting Normal Trade Relation status is the foundation of any typical bilateral trading relationship.

The recent negotiations for China's accession to the World Trade Organization are proof that China is ready to join the international trade community and we cannot pass up this opportunity.

My home state of Illinois is the 6th leading exporter in the United States and over half a million jobs in Illinois rely on exports. The current crisis in agriculture has placed a spotlight on the huge need for increased foreign market access.

USDA has predicted that 75% of the growth in American farm exports over the next 10 years will be to Asia—and China will make up over half of this amount.

China is already America's 4th largest agriculture export market and if the administration will complete the WTO accession agreement our farmers and ranchers will have the level playing field that they have been waiting for.

I urge Members to vote against this resolution of disapproval and urge the administration to complete the bilateral agreement for China's accession to the WTO.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of this debate agree that the Chinese government behaves badly, and does things we don't like.

We agree that we want a future China that is more democratic. The need to respect the human rights of its citizens, and a member of the international community that plays by the rules.

We also agree that U.S. policy should promote a better China.

But we disagree on the best way to do that. One side argues that the best way is to punish China for past behavior.

The other side argues that the best way is to engage China to encourage better behavior in the future.

I agree with the latter.

If we approve this resolution, and cut off Normal Trade Relations with China, we can say we have punished China for bad behavior. But will it cause them to release the members of the Falun Gong religious group? Will it cause them to stop feeding Taiwan? Will it cause them to drop market barriers to our products, and equalize our trade balance? I have not heard a convincing case that, if we withdraw NTR, China will make these improvements we seek.

China has 1.3 billion people. It has a larger landmass than the U.S. We can't push China around. Dictates by our government will have minimal, if any, effect on the degree of freedom and democracy in China. These values are more effectively transmitted to the Chinese people through non-governmental means; business engagement, global financial linkage, cultural and educational exchange, non-governmental organization involvement and, most of all, the Internet.

The United States-China relationship is very complex, and requires careful management and diplomacy. An ad-hoc approach will not solicit better behavior, and will likely backfire on us.

Change in China will not happen overnight. We must be firm and strong in communicating our differences with the Chinese government. But at the same time, we must recognize that a long-term change is best nurtured through engagement with the Chinese people.

I urge members to vote against H.J. Res. 57.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my deep concerns with our continued relations with the People's Republic of China. Mr. Speaker, today we must send a crystal clear message to China that their business-as-usual attitude must not continue. On almost every level China is promoting and advocating policies which indicate an unwillingness to negotiate honestly with the United States.

Whether it be on copyright infringement, use of prison labor, religious freedom, military build up, trading of weapons of mass destruction, labor rights, the illegal importation of guns into the United States, espionage against the United States, illegal campaign contributions to United States candidates and government repression of the rights and freedoms of the Chinese people, the government of the People's Republic of China must change their policies.

They must understand that if we are going to consider their inclusion into the World Trade Organization (WTO) they must make substantial, measurable progress in all of these areas.

As world leaders in commerce and industry and the world's only superpower, we must set the example for the rest of the world to follow on this issue. This afternoon, my good friend the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox), spoke on the floor of China seeing the United States as a "paper tiger." That rings of truth. The government of the Peoples Republic of China will not take us seriously unless we are willing to back our demands for action and negotiation with concrete actions of our own.

Let me be clear, I do not stand here today advocating for passage of H.J. Res. 57. Passage of this joint resolution would send the wrong message. I voted against H.J. Res. 57 and was pleased that it failed. We should not unilaterally cut off trade relations with China. That is the wrong policy and will only serve to fuel the forces of repression and lawlessness in China. Today I speak for the development of a new relationship with the government of the People's Republic of China. A relationship that rewards positive, measurable actions and penalizes them for double dealing, theft and repression. I call on the Administration to develop relations with China based on these principles before China's government descends further down the wrong path.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the resolution pending before us today to deny Normal Trade Relations (NTR) Status for the People's Republic of China.

I cast this vote with some reluctance. I do believe that there is value to a policy that engages China—the most populous country in the world and permanent member of the United Nations Security Council—in an effort to move it in the right direction. My vote against the renewal of NTR does not mean that I do not support free trade or the possibility of including China in the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Having said that, however, I continue to be deeply troubled by aspects of Chinese behavior—behavior that in my judgment ought to impede forward progress on the NTR issue. It is because I still have grave concerns about a variety of issues regarding China, that my vote on this bill will remain consistent with my votes in previous years.

First, the revelations of the Cox Report raise profound questions in my mind about the suitability of conferring NTR status on China at this time.

Second, despite commitments by Chinese leaders, China continues to engage in the proliferation of technologies related to weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. Press reports only last week indicated that Chinese companies continue to sell missile technology to North Korea, despite our nation's active efforts to prevent further transfers to that country.

I have also expressed concern in recent years about Chinese companies that are owned by the Peoples Liberation Army (PLA). Legislation I proposed called on the Defense Department to publish the names of Chinese companies exporting products to the United States that are owned and operated by the PLA. Despite this legislation being signed into
against Taiwan. And it repeatedly has been in Belgrade. It recently began saber-rattling by accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy fomented anti-American hatred after our clear condemnations. China flagrantly violated the law that makes entry into the World Trade Organization and normalization of trade relations (NTR) status for products from China. I believe that it is in the best interest of United States agriculture to continue, and eventually expand, our trading relationship with China.

U.S. agriculture exports to China were more than $2 billion last year. China represents an agriculture market that is vital to the long-term success of our farmers and ranchers. Agriculture trade with China can strengthen development of private enterprise in that country and bring China more fully into world trade membership. More than 30 agricultural organizations representing producers, processors, and exporters support extension of normal trade relations with China.

There are few countries that do not have normal trade relations (NTR) status with the United States. NTR status allows a country’s products to enter into the United States at the same tariff rates that apply to other trading partners. In fact, NTR provides special treatment. It allows us to treat all countries’ imports in the same manner. Failure to do so subjects U.S. agriculture to serious negative impact on American agriculture, the first to feel the impact of embargoes and retaliation.

Recently the United States signed a bilateral agreement with China that will break down the artificial barriers China erected for certain U.S. agricultural products. China has closed its market for far too long to high quality U.S. meat, wheat, citrus and poultry. Under this agreement, China will accept specific science-based standards and our farmers and ranchers will have access to the vast Chinese market.

Failure to continue normal trade relations with China may jeopardize this agreement. Additionally, I am encouraged by the progress made by the U.S. Trade Representative in negotiating the rules for China's accession to the World Trade Organization. The USTR is negotiating to secure China's agreement to trade concessions that result in lower tariffs and improved access. Based on the information provided by the USTR, if the preliminary agreements reached remain a part of a final agreement with China, significant progress has been made. I urge the Administration to continue its negotiations. Free and fair trade agreements are good for U.S. agriculture.

International trade is important for American agriculture and for the success and prosperity of American farmers and ranchers.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and in support of extension of normal trade relations to China. It is my hope that all of our friends and neighbors can work together toward a balance of trade between the two countries. We continue to maintain a United States presence in China, and over the past decade it has increased from $6 billion to an expected $305 billion by the end of 1999.

I am hopeful that consideration of the inclusion of China in the WTO will be the start of a move toward more open access to the Chinese market, and that it will provide a fundamental change in dynamics between the two countries that will result in fair trade practices. While I understand the importance of maintaining trade relations with China, I also think that it is important that our country be on an equal footing with China in regard to trade.

If China were to resume negotiations on entry into the World Trade Organization and reach a bilateral agreement with the United States on the terms of participation, the issue of NTR would merit a thorough reconsideration. Failure to extend China's NTR status—by my judgment, would accrue to the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 57, which would disapprove the President's extension of Normal Trade Relations—what used to be called Most Favored Nation status—with the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 57, a resolution of disapproval of normal trade relations (NTR) status for products from China. I believe that it is in the best interest of United States agriculture to continue, and eventually expand, our trading relationship with China.

U.S. agriculture exports to China were more than $2 billion last year. China represents an agriculture market that is vital to the long-term success of our farmers and ranchers. Agriculture trade with China can strengthen development of private enterprise in that country and bring China more fully into world trade membership.

More than 30 agricultural organizations representing producers, processors, and exporters support extension of normal trade relations with China.

There are few countries that do not have normal trade relations (NTR) status with the United States. NTR status allows a country’s products to enter into the United States at the same tariff rates that apply to other trading partners. In fact, NTR provides special treatment. It allows us to treat all countries’ imports in the same manner. Failure to do so subjects U.S. agriculture to serious negative impact on American agriculture, the first to feel the impact of embargoes and retaliation.

Recently the United States signed a bilateral agreement with China that will break down the artificial barriers China erected for certain U.S. agricultural products. China has closed its market for far too long to high quality U.S. meat, wheat, citrus and poultry. Under this agreement, China will accept specific science-based standards and our farmers and ranchers will have access to the vast Chinese market.

Failure to continue normal trade relations with China may jeopardize this agreement. Additionally, I am encouraged by the progress made by the U.S. Trade Representative in negotiating the rules for China’s accession to the World Trade Organization. The USTR is negotiating to secure China’s agreement to trade concessions that result in lower tariffs and improved access. Based on the information provided by the USTR, if the preliminary agreements reached remain a part of a final agreement with China, significant progress has been made. I urge the Administration to continue its negotiations. Free and fair trade agreements are good for U.S. agriculture.

International trade is important for American agriculture and for the success and prosperity of American farmers and ranchers.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and in support of extending Normal Trade Relations with China.

U.S. exports to China have quadrupled over the past decade and last year alone, our exports to China has closed its market for far too long to high quality U.S. meat, wheat, citrus and poultry. Under this agreement, China will accept specific science-based standards and our farmers and ranchers will have access to the vast Chinese market.

failure to continue normal trade relations with China may jeopardize this agreement.

Additionally, I am encouraged by the progress made by the U.S. Trade Representative in negotiating the rules for China’s accession to the World Trade Organization. The USTR is negotiating to secure China’s agreement to trade concessions that result in lower tariffs and improved access. Based on the information provided by the USTR, if the preliminary agreements reached remain a part of a final agreement with China, significant progress has been made. I urge the Administration to continue its negotiations. Free and fair trade agreements are good for U.S. agriculture.

International trade is important for American agriculture and for the success and prosperity of American farmers and ranchers.
Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, the decision that Congress will make today with regard to maintaining Normal Trade Relations with the People's Republic of China represents another important step in defining our future relationship with China.

The Select Committee on U.S. Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China, on which I served as Ranking Minority Member, found some very disturbing information with regard to the theft of nuclear technology from our research labs by the PRC. However, the most disturbing finding of the Committee was that these losses resulted from our own security and counter-intelligence failures. Together with the Administration, we have begun to take steps to address this problem, and I am hopeful that our plan will be successful in preventing another serious security breach.

Although I fully recognize the seriousness of these thefts, I do not believe that they should deter us from maintaining our trade partnership with China.

Trade between the United States and China is of tremendous benefit to both nations. China, with one-quarter of the world's population, represents the world's largest emerging market. Although many segments of China's economy have not yet matured, the United States today exports $14.3 billion worth of goods to China, four times greater than 10 years ago—supporting more than 400,000 high-wage jobs. Within the State of Washington alone, exports to China totaled nearly $1.1 billion in 1996, and more than $8 billion worth of goods passed through the ports of my state either going to or coming from China.

China represents a huge potential market for future sales in my state for the sale of aircraft, high-tech products, agricultural goods, and forest products. For aircraft alone, the Chinese market is worth over $140 billion during the next 20 years. Lack of NTR trading status would not only jeopardize access to that market, but also bring retaliation against our country's trading sectors and hundreds of thousands of workers.

The people of China also benefit from trade with the United States. As that market opens wider and the Chinese economy develops, the Chinese middle class grows in strength, both politically and economic. I believe that developing a viable middle class in China is the best way to provide a solid foundation upon which an open, democratic society may be created. Denying NTR status through this Resolution today will run counter to that objective, greatly hindering this transition, and is clearly not in our nation's best interests.

Supporters of this Resolution argue that by denying NTR status to China, we will be forcing the government to make significant changes to their policies. I believe the exact opposite result would occur. If we choose not to renew NTR status to China, our international competitors will not hesitate to fill the void that will be left by our absence. Effectively, we will be excluding ourselves from the economy of the largest nation on the earth.

In the aerospace industry, for example, the European consortium Airbus is both willing and capable of replacing Boeing as the leading supplier of commercial aircraft to China. Similarly, I believe it would be exceedingly more difficult for our government to make progress on curbing the enormous problem of software piracy that robs Microsoft and the many other American software companies of hundreds of millions of dollars each year. Let me assure my colleagues that in the long run, denying NTR status will be much worse for our economic well-being than it will be for China's.

As we vote today to decide the future of our relationship with China, I urge members to support continued engagement with China by opposing the Resolution to disapprove Normal Trade Relations.

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

Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 22, 1999, the joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and we read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the votes appeared to have been 170 ayes and 0 noes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. 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 170, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

YEAS—170

Abercrombie Delahunt  Jackson (IL)  Jackson (NC)
Adler Delaur o Jones (OH)  Kaptur
Baldwin Diaz-Balart  Katsi ch
Barcia Doolittle  Kennedy
Bartletti  Dorgan  Kennedy
Barton Ehrl ich  Kil Patrick
Bishop Engel  King (NY)
Bono Evans  Kingst on
Borkski Everett  Klink
Brady (PA)  Fowler  Kusinich
Brown (FL)  Frank (MA)  Lantos
Brown (OH)  Gallegly  L e e
Burr Ganske  Lewis (GA)
Butler Gejdenson  Lipinski
Campano Gershenson  Lollando
Cardin Gibbons  Martinez
Carson Gilman  Mascara
Chenubis Good e  M cCarty
Chenoweth Goodling  McCinney
Clay Graham  Meek (FL)
Clyburn Gutierrez  Meek (NY)
Colebe Hall (OH)  Menendez
Cook Hastings (FL)  Miller, George
Collins Hayes  Mink
Condit Hayworth  Mollhoff
Cook Hefley  Nadler
Costello Hillary  Ney
Cox Hilliard  Norwood
Coyne Hincheny  O bey
Cubin Hobson  Oliver
Cummins Hobo n  Olivia
Davis (IL) Horn  Owens
DeFazio Hostetter  Pallone
Deal Hunter  Payne
Defazio Hyde  Pelosi
For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, $901,531,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed $72,630,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Navy determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WISE, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed their vote from "aye" to "nay."

Mr. HOEFFEL, SIMPSON, PETRI, and SHADEGG changed their vote from "nay" to "aye."

The joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, $777,238,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed $36,412,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Air Force determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, $593,615,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004: Provided, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be commingled with such provisions in other appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as he may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the amounts to which transferred: Provided further, That the amount appropriated, not to exceed $46,324,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $227,456,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the