

speech, and imprisonment of people for their religious beliefs. The report speaks for itself, stating that last year: "The (Lao) Government's human rights record remained poor, and it continued to commit serious abuses. Citizens do not have the right to change their government. Members of the security forces abused detainees, especially those suspected of insurgent or antigovernment activity. Prisoners were abused and tortured, and prison conditions generally are extremely harsh and life threatening. . . . The judiciary was subject to executive, legislative, and LPRP influence, was corrupt, and did not ensure citizens due process. The Government infringed on citizens' privacy rights. The Government restricted freedom of speech, the press, assembly, and association. The Government continued to restrict freedom of religion, and police and provincial authorities arrested and detained more than 60 members of Christian churches, with 4 members of religious communities in custody or incarcerated for their religious beliefs at year's end." These appalling human rights abuses are of particular concern in the so-called "Saysamboun Special Zone" in Laos, where reports of LPDR military offenses against ethnic minorities are common and disturbing. Finally, it is important to note that independent human rights monitoring organizations such as Amnesty International continue to be barred from entering Laos by the LPDR government.

(3) The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom this year called Laos one of the world's worst violators of religious freedom, stating that forced renunciations of faith and imprisonment of people for their religious beliefs are tragically frequent. In its 2003 report to the president and Congress, the commission urged the Bush administration to name Laos a "Country of Particular Concern," which would place it in the company of such terrifying regimes as Saddam Hussein's Iraq, Sudan, Burma and North Korea. According to the commissions report, "for at least the last several years, the government of Laos has engaged in particularly severe violations of religious freedom . . . these include the arrest and prolonged detention and imprisonment of members of religious minorities on account of their religious activities, as well as instances where Lao officials have forced Christians to renounce their faith. Between 100 and 200 individuals have been arrested since 1999. At the same time, dozens of churches have been closed. These violations have continued to be committed in the past year. . . ."

(4) Shockingly, the LPDR continues to foster close ties with Kim Jong-Il's Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK)—stating two years ago that relations "of friendship and cooperation" between Laos and the North Korean pariah state "are steadily growing stronger," and congratulating the North Korean people "on the shining successes made in their efforts to build a powerful nation . . . under the wise leadership of Kim Jong-Il." In a joint communiqué issued July 17, 2001 by the leadership of the LPDR and DPRK, the North Korean government also commended the Lao government for the "great successes made in their efforts to consolidate and develop the people's democratic system and estimated the daily rising role and position of the LPDR."

(5) The LPDR recently held state-sanctioned rallies speaking out against U.S. military action in Iraq in the most inflammatory of terms—stating that "the war will bring disaster to the whole of humanity," and "demand(ing) the U.S. respect the peace and sovereignty of Iraq." These and other similarly belligerent comments were transmitted throughout Laos on state-run radio and around the globe through various media services.

(6) A substantial majority of Laotian-Americans—many of whom know, first hand, the brutality meted out by the LPDR regime—are strongly opposed to offering NTR to Laos. These people, many of whom are Hmong-Americans who assisted the United States military during the Vietnam War, view the offer of NTR to the government of Laos as a fundamental betrayal of not only them personally, but of our American principles. According to the most recent census, there are approximately 170,000 Hmong living in the United States. An almost equal number of Lao live in the United States as well.

(7) Although some argue that Laos presents a potentially lucrative market for U.S. companies, the facts show otherwise. While proponents of improved trade relations with Laos claim that the potential economic benefits outweigh the significant moral questions about Laos as a trading partner, the truth is that the LPDR's Gross Domestic Product in 2001 was estimated to be \$9.2 billion. For comparison, the Gross Municipal Product of Fort Wayne, Indiana in 2001 was more than double that amount: \$18.8 billion. Laos' authoritarian internal economic policies, not a lack of trade with the United States, has created this dismal reality. Without substantial change in those policies, neither the people of Laos nor the United States will ever benefit economically from NTR.

This letter should not be interpreted as a statement that we believe the door to NTR for Laos should be shut forever. In our opinion, however, Laos has failed miserably to demonstrate that it is ready for or deserves NTR at this time. In fact, in the six years since the negotiation of the U.S.-LPDR bilateral trade agreement, the Lao regime's record on basic issues like those mentioned above has actually become worse, not better.

We believe that if, over the next few years, the LPDR government is able to successfully demonstrate concrete improvements in these areas of concern, consideration of NTR for Laos may be appropriate. Until then, however, we should send a strong message to the LPDR regime that economic rewards from the United States will not be forthcoming unless it can improve its abysmal record.

Respectfully,

Mark Green, Barney Frank, Duncan Hunter, Earl Pomeroy, John Doolittle, Patrick Kennedy, William Delahunt, Ron Kind, James Langevin, Howard Coble, Robin Hayes, Sue Myrick, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Christopher Smith, Gil Gutknecht, Devin Nunes, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Thomas Petri, George Radanovich, Mark Kennedy, Frank Wolf, Dana Rohrabacher.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, as a long time supporter of Hmong veterans and their families in Wisconsin and across the United States, I am pleased to be a cosponsor and express my support for House Resolution 402 which calls for democratic and human rights reforms in Laos.

Many Americans don't realize the vital role Hmong soldiers played in the Vietnam War. School history books often ignore that before U.S. soldiers even landed in Vietnam or Laos, CIA agents arrived to train young Hmong men and women to fight against their oppressors. These brave Hmong fought valiantly for democracy and for freedom for their people. They rescued downed American pilots and took bullets that otherwise would have found their way to the bodies of American soldiers.

In defense of their country and in service to U.S. troops, nearly 40,000 Hmong troops were killed, approximately 58,000 were injured in combat and more than 2,500 are still missing in action today. These numbers don't begin to

represent the thousands of Hmong soldiers and civilians hunted down and massacred by communist forces after the U.S. armed forces began their withdrawal from the region in 1975. The survivors lost many loved ones and lost their homeland. The United States owes these veterans a great deal.

Edgar Buell, a former senior U.S. official working with the Hmong during the war years, best summed up their dedication to the U.S. and western democratic principles when he said, "Everyone of them that died, that was an American back home that didn't die. Somebody in nearly every Hmong family was either fighting or died from fighting . . . They became refugees because we . . . encouraged them to fight for us. I promised them myself: 'Have no fear, we will take care of you.'"

Yet, we hear reports that the persecution of the Hmong in Laos continues to this day, with charges of starvation, families being separated, and other acts of violence.

Over the last twenty years, thousands of Hmong have settled in Wisconsin and other places across the United States, sharing their tragic history and brave sacrifices with their fellow Americans. On their behalf, we must fulfill Edgar Buell's promise and encourage the government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to stop civil rights violations against the Hmong and others, and allow free and open political activities in Laos.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 402.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ARBITRARY DETENTION OF DR. WANG BINGZHANG

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 326) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the arbitrary detention of Dr. Wang Bingzhang by the Government of the People's Republic of China and urging his immediate release.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 326

Whereas Dr. Wang Bingzhang is a permanent resident of the United States and his sister and daughter are United States citizens;

Whereas Dr. Wang received his Ph.D. at McGill University in Canada in coronary-arterial research and is a well-respected leader

of the overseas Chinese pro-democracy movement and the founder of China Spring magazine;

Whereas Dr. Wang is currently serving a life sentence in prison in the People's Republic of China and is suffering from gastritis, varicose veins, phlebitis, and depression;

Whereas Dr. Wang was abducted in northern Vietnam in June 2002 after meeting with a Chinese labor activist;

Whereas Dr. Wang was driven to the border between Vietnam and the People's Republic of China and forced back to China by boat;

Whereas Dr. Wang was blindfolded and bound and held in various places in Guangxi Province and his captors demanded a \$10,000,000 ransom, which Dr. Wang was unable to pay;

Whereas Dr. Wang although provided his captors with the names and telephone numbers of his relatives, they were never contacted;

Whereas Dr. Wang was finally taken to a Buddhist temple in Fangchenggang City in southern Guangxi Province where his abductors unexpectedly left and moments later he was "rescued" by the Chinese police;

Whereas Dr. Wang was detained by the Chinese police and then transported to Nanning, the capital of Guangxi Province;

Whereas Dr. Wang was held incommunicado for six months, during which time the Government of the People's Republic of China denied any knowledge of his whereabouts;

Whereas on December 4, 2002, the Chinese Government reversed itself, admitting that Dr. Wang had been in its custody since July 3, 2002;

Whereas on December 5, 2002, Dr. Wang was charged with "offenses of espionage" and "the conduct of terrorist activities";

Whereas on January 22, 2003, Dr. Wang was tried by the Intermediate People's Court in the city of Shenzhen in Guangdong Province;

Whereas Dr. Wang's trial lasted only half a day and was closed to the public because the Chinese Government indicated that "state secrets" might be revealed, thereby precluding family members, supporters, and reporters from attending;

Whereas at the trial, Dr. Wang declared himself innocent of all charges;

Whereas at the trial, the Chinese Government refused to release any evidence of Dr. Wang's wrongdoing;

Whereas at the trial, Dr. Wang was denied the right to due process, specifically the right to the presumption of innocence, the right to adequate time and facilities to prepare for his own defense, the right to a fair trial before an independent and impartial tribunal, the right to call witnesses on his own behalf, the right to cross-examine witnesses testifying against him, and in general, the lack of other due process guarantees that would ensure his adequate defense and a full hearing;

Whereas Dr. Wang's trial represented the first time the Chinese Government had brought charges against a pro-democracy dissident under its new terrorism laws;

Whereas although Dr. Wang was convicted and sentenced to life in prison on February 10, 2003, Dr. Wang's lawyers stated that there was insufficient evidence to convict him;

Whereas Dr. Wang's lawyers immediately appealed the court's verdict, but the appeal was rejected on February 28, 2003;

Whereas a human rights petition was submitted on Dr. Wang's behalf to the United Nations Arbitrary Working Group of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights;

Whereas the petition claimed that Dr. Wang was being arbitrarily detained and that the judicial standards employed in his trial fell far short of internationally recog-

nized standards for judicial proceedings under provisions of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

Whereas in its opinion, the United Nations Working Group noted that Dr. Wang is an internationally recognized pro-democracy activist as opposed to the Chinese Government's characterization of Dr. Wang as an individual who advocates violence and suggests the use of methods such as kidnapping and bombings to achieve his goals, and that Dr. Wang had boasted of carrying out many violent terrorist activities;

Whereas in its opinion, the United Nations Working Group further noted that the Chinese Government offered "no evidence of any specific occasion on which Wang made the alleged calls to violence" and that "[o]ther than the kidnapping of which Wang himself was a victim, as the Government itself acknowledges, no information has been given about other kidnappings or acts of violence initiated by Wang";

Whereas in its opinion, the United Nations Working Group further stated that "Wang, during his first five months in detention, did not have knowledge of the charges, the right to legal counsel, or the right to judicial review of the arrest and detention; and that, after that date, he did not benefit from the right to the presumption of innocence, the right to adequate time and facilities for defense, the right to a fair trial before an independent and impartial tribunal, the right to a speedy trial and the right to cross-examine witnesses";

Whereas in conclusion, the United Nations Working Group declared that "the detention of Wang Bingzhang is arbitrary, being in contravention of articles 9, 10 and 11 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights" and requested "the [Chinese] Government to take the necessary steps to remedy the situation of Wang Bingzhang and bring it into conformity with the standards and principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights";

Whereas the United States Congressional-Executive Commission on China made the following recommendation in its 2003 annual report: "The President and the Congress should increase diplomatic efforts to hold the Chinese government to [its commitments on human rights matters during the December 2002 U.S.-China human rights dialogue], particularly the release of those arbitrarily detained";

Whereas the report also stated the following: "The Chinese [G]overnment has also taken advantage of the global war on terrorism to persecute . . . political dissidents. In February 2003, Wang Bingzhang, a U.S. permanent resident and veteran pro-democracy activist, was convicted of 'leading a terrorism organization' and 'spying' and sentenced to life imprisonment"; and

Whereas the report finally noted that "[i]n July 2003, the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention declared that Wang's arrest and imprisonment violated international law": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Dr. Wang Bingzhang, a permanent resident of the United States, is being arbitrarily detained in the People's Republic of China in violation of international law;

(2) the United States Government should request the Government of the People's Republic of China to release Dr. Wang, permitting him to immediately return to the United States; and

(3) the President should make the immediate release of Dr. Wang by the Government of the People's Republic of China a top priority of United States foreign policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the concurrent resolution that is under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this concurrent resolution sponsored by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) expressing the indignation of the Congress over the continued arbitrary detention of Dr. Wang Bingzhang by the Government of the People's Republic of China. In recent years, we have all noted Beijing's pattern of using trumped-up charges to arrest and detain Chinese academics and democracy proponents who live outside China during their visits back to their ancestral homeland.

In Dr. Wang's case, however, Beijing has gone one step further in its attempt to muzzle the overseas Chinese community through tactics of fear and intimidation. Dr. Wang was not detained within the borders of China itself. He was instead kidnapped, abducted during a visit to Vietnam, bound and blindfolded, and forcibly transported across the border between Vietnam and China in a clear violation of international law. This case serves to demonstrate that despite historic differences, the communist regimes in Hanoi and Beijing are willing to make common cause when it comes to suppressing the voices of the advocates of democratic reform. This is common among communist brotherhood.

The People's Republic of China's legal transgressions and abuses in this case are so egregious that the United Nations, despite its sensitivity to Beijing's status as a permanent member of the Security Council, declared that the detention of Dr. Wang is a contravention of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Beijing has further attempted to manipulate heightened post-September 11 international concerns over terrorism by charging Dr. Wang with "the conduct of terrorist activities" due to his advocacy of labor rights in China. The Working Group of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, however, has rendered a finding that the Chinese government has offered "no evidence of any specific occasion on which Dr. Wang made the alleged calls to violence," further noting that Dr. Wang himself was a victim

of kidnapping by the very Chinese authorities who have accused him. Such false labeling of a victim of abduction as a terrorist is a cynical maneuver which demeans the memory of the victims of genuine terrorist attacks throughout the world. This is a perfect example of some of the things that the Chinese communists do that is just unthinkable, and the world should condemn them for that.

Beijing's border controls not only include cases of bringing people forcibly back into China, as with the case of Dr. Wang and the group of Tibetan refugees who were forcibly repatriated by the Chinese communists in Nepal last year. Beijing also seeks to forcibly keep people from leaving. We have heard that before. Remember the Berlin Wall? The People's Republic of China crossed a new line of inhumanity on the borders last month when, according to a reliable NGO report, Chinese border guards shot in the back and killed a North Korean refugee as he was attempting to cross into Mongolia, where he would have received safe haven and have been free. It reminds us of the Berlin Wall and the German border guards shooting to kill refugees when all they wanted was freedom.

I say here today: Beijing, tear down the walls of oppression, of arbitrary abduction of democracy advocates, and of victimization of refugees on the run who cannot defend themselves.

First, let Dr. Wang go. He is suffering in prison from serious medical conditions. He never had any intention of entering China's territory, and he needs to return to his waiting family, who misses him dearly here in the United States. And second, lift the bamboo curtain of intimidation directed at both its own citizens inside China and the overseas Chinese community which is calling for political as well as economic reform in their homeland.

China has undergone profound change in the last 2 decades. Beijing has increasingly sought, through such actions as participation in international peacekeeping and through hosting the 2008 Olympic Games, to take its place among the advanced countries of the world. But China cannot truly be a great nation until Beijing ends its systematic suppression of individual human rights such as clearly demonstrated in the case of Dr. Wang Bingzhang.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that a country that is economically as strong as China is would stoop to shooting a person in the back who wants to gain freedom just to stop them from getting out of their country, and it boggles my mind that China would actually go into Vietnam, kidnap somebody, blindfold them, and take them forcibly back to China when all they wanted was to see freedom and labor rights in China, and keeping this gentleman from his family, I think, is just unthinkable. So if anybody in the

Chinese embassy is paying attention, this is something they should address very quickly and get this man back home to his family.

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

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

I strongly support this important resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

I first would like to acknowledge the excellent work on this resolution of the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO). I would also like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON); the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), subcommittee chairman; and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of our full committee for their strong support of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, the litany of human rights abuses conducted by the Chinese government on its own citizens is nothing new to Members of this House. This resolution, however, calls our attention to a case where China's complete disregard for human rights and the rule of law has been brought to new heights.

Having completely suppressed dissent at home, the Chinese government has actually begun kidnapping Chinese dissidents abroad to be brought to China for persecution.

In June, 2002, Dr. Wang Bingzhang, a permanent resident of the United States and the leader in the overseas Chinese democracy movement, was in Vietnam to meet with Chinese labor leaders. Dr. Wang was kidnapped from Vietnam, forced over the border into China, and eventually jailed by the Chinese government. He was held incommunicado for 6 months while the Chinese authorities denied that they knew anything about his fate.

□ 1815

Dr. Wang was then charged with espionage and terrorist activities, though the government produced no evidence linking him to these charges. He was prevented from calling witnesses to support his case, to have sufficient time to prepare his defense and to cross-examine the witnesses against him.

After this mockery of a trial, Dr. Wang was sentenced to life in prison in February of 2003. His appeal was denied.

Mr. Speaker, the kidnapping, trial and conviction of Dr. Wang is an outrageous violation of internationally recognized human rights. A United Nations working group declared that the detention of Dr. Wang is arbitrary and contravenes the universal declaration of human rights.

Dr. Wang is in poor health, and our resolution simply asks that he be released so that he may return to his family here in the United States. I strongly support passage of this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gen-

tlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my gracious friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member on the committee, for yielding me time and thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) for allowing this resolution to be brought to the floor and heard.

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very concerned about this particular individual. His daughter came to my office not quite a year ago asking for us to take some action on behalf of her family. Yes, they are very worried. They are very concerned. Because they cannot be in contact with their family member, their father, they are not able to provide him any kind of assistance, so they are incommunicado and are not able to help this individual.

This particular case is a clear case of a violation of human rights by the People's Republic of China. Dr. Wang, as you have heard, was held for 6 months before they actually filed charges against him. He was sentenced to life in prison on January 22, 2003, after, as you have heard, a very abrupt, half-day trial where he was not allowed time to prepare a defense, he was not allowed to cross-examine the government's witnesses, he was not allowed to call any witnesses of his own, nor was he allowed to provide his own defense.

To date, there has been no evidence to link him to the crimes he was charged with, nor have they released him. It is no surprise that the United Nations working group has declared this detention illegal.

I will include for the RECORD two articles that were printed on Dr. Wang.

Today, while we go about our business of enjoying freedom and liberty in the United States, it is inconceivable to us that a person such as Dr. Wang would sit in a prison. He has not sent any communication to his family, he has been allowed no visitors, and he has been denied access to medical care.

Our government must continue to put international pressure on China and many other countries to improve their human rights efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues who cosigned this resolution and urge this House to sign up for human rights and human decency. Please vote "yes" on H. Con. Res. 326 and call on China to end its illegal detention of Dr. Wang.

Mr. Speaker, I include the articles referred to earlier for the RECORD.

[From Reuters News, Dec. 6, 2003]

CHINA ACTIVIST PLANS HUNGER STRIKE DURING WEN TRIP

BEIJING.—A jailed Chinese dissident who spent years in the United States plans to stage a hunger strike to coincide with a trip by Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao to the United States, a U.S.-based rights group said on Saturday. Wang Bingzhang, who was handed a life sentence on terrorism and espionage charges by a Chinese court in February, aimed to protest against his solitary confinement at the Shaoguan prison in Guangdong province, the Worldrights group said.

"From solitary confinement, Dr. Wang is calling on the leaders of America to stand with him and to demand his unconditional release," it is said in a statement.

Wen is due to meet with U.S. President George W. Bush early next week to discuss trade and issues related to Taiwan, which Beijing views as a renegade province, among others.

Wang, a U.S. green card holder in his mid-50s said by family members to have renounced Chinese citizenship, was the first democracy activist charged by China with terrorism and espionage.

[From the South China Morning Post, Dec. 11, 2003]

FEARS GROW FOR HEALTH OF JAILED
DISSIDENT

(By Verna Yu)

Imprisoned dissident Wang Bingzhang is on the brink of a nervous breakdown due to the "mental torture" he has suffered in jail, and is threatening to go on a hunger strike, his brother says. Wang Bingwu, who visited his older brother at a prison in Shaoguan, Guangdong, last Friday, said he found the solitary confinement and mandatory "political education" imposed three times a day increasingly difficult to bear.

"He told me to tell the world that in order to end his solitary confinement and mental torture, he would go on a hunger strike," Mr. Wang said in Hong Kong yesterday.

Critics say the so-called "political education" sessions in mainland prisons typically include several hours of brainwashing, forced self-criticism and confession of alleged crimes.

He was arrested and convicted on espionage and terrorism charges and given a life sentence in February. He was found guilty of providing intelligence to Taiwan between 1982 and 1990. He and his family deny the charges.

Mr. Wang said his brother looked frail and was suffering from stomach ailments and varicose ulcers. He said his brother was given medicine in prison but was banned from taking other medication that his family brought from America.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) for his leadership on this issue and a lot of other issues. Regardless of party and regardless of what the political pressure is, the gentleman has taken a stand; and being a new Member of Congress, I want to thank the gentleman for an opportunity to be able to witness that up close.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of Dr. Wang is a very interesting one, for a variety of reasons. The one reason that strikes me, and the gentleman from Indiana alluded to this, is that he was meeting with a labor activist. I find that very interesting, and I find this particular situation a symptom of a larger disease that we are trying to deal with.

They are saying there was a violation of three articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. There is obviously no longer a Universal Declaration of Human Rights because countries like China do not agree to this kind of standard that we have set.

So this man was trying to help organize labor in China and trying to help bring some dignity and justice to the labor industry in China. It is obvious that China does not want it, but I think it is becoming more and more apparent that the major corporations in the United States who do business in China do not want China to have labor standards either.

If citizens of the regime in China try to unionize, they will be arrested, they will be beaten, they will be tortured. Many of the workers are bonded workers that come from the farms and go in to work in some of the factories. These people in China and the government of China do not enforce the minimum wage standards that they have, nor some of the safety rules that they have.

Why do they not want to do this? Because if they enforce these rules, as the AFL-CIO has indicated to us, there would be a 10 percent to 77 percent increase in the cost of goods coming out of China. We do not want to say that we want to raise prices, but I thought that this would bring about global competition, and I thought we were going to spread democracy. We want to lift the Chinese worker up. We want to lift them up to live, hopefully, one day, with the standards that we have here in the United States of America.

But just think, if this would happen, if there would be a 10 to 77 percent increase in the goods coming out of the Chinese market, the U.S. worker would finally be able to compete, Mr. Speaker, would finally be able to compete; and it would eliminate the problem we are even having dealing with the currency right now, if we would have those kinds of labor and human rights standards put in place.

I want to share a quote from the President of the United States when he was in Cleveland, Ohio, on March 10, 2003. He said to the workers in Ohio, "Ohio workers, if given a level playing field, can outproduce any worker anywhere on Earth," if we had a level playing field.

What we need to do is ask this administration to get tough on China. A level playing field will not just fall out of the sky.

Then when we saw, and the AFL-CIO petitioned for, an opportunity to try to fix the currency manipulation problems and some of the labor rights problems, four Members of this administration's cabinet said that the administration's efforts at diplomatic engagement with Beijing on these two issues, currency and labor rights, would produce more results than threatening punitive tariffs.

Efforts at diplomatic engagement? This is coming from an administration that, when they walk the halls of the United Nations, it is like a bull in a china shop. They have no diplomatic touch. We have alienated all of our allies. Now we want to go and try to deal with China with diplomacy, while they are abusing workers, while they are

abusing people, going to Vietnam to pick people up who are going to help workers organize in China.

Something needs to be done, and something needs to be done now. I appreciate the opportunity that the gentleman from California has given me and the gentleman from California.

I rise in support of this; but, again, I think it is a symptom of a larger problem that needs to be dealt with, and this administration and this Congress need to continue to push China to enforce the human rights that we have been exporting from this country for many, many years and want to continue to export out of this country.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 326.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING CONCERN OF CONGRESS OVER IRAN'S DEVELOPMENT OF MEANS TO PRODUCE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 398) expressing the concern of Congress over Iran's development of the means to produce nuclear weapons.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 398

Whereas the United States has for years attempted to alert the international community to Iran's covert nuclear activities in support of an intention to develop a nuclear weapon, contrary to its obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT);

Whereas Iran's covert activities to develop the means to produce nuclear weapons are finally beginning to be revealed to the international community;

Whereas Iran did not declare to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) the existence of the Natanz Pilot Fuel Enrichment Plant and the production-scale Fuel Enrichment Facility under construction at Natanz until February 2003, after the existence of the plant and facility was revealed by an opposition group;

Whereas it is estimated that the Pilot Fuel Enrichment Plant could produce enough highly enriched uranium for a nuclear weapon every year-and-a-half to two years;